

THE ORDINES OF VAT. LAT. 7701 AND THE LITURGICAL CULTURE OF CAROLINGIAN CHIETI

by Arthur Westwell¹*

The study of medieval liturgy is well served by a fuller appreciation of the unique richness of individual manuscripts. One example, Vat. Lat. 7701, is a key piece of evidence for uncovering the reception of the Carolingian project to ‘correct’ liturgy in Chieti, Abruzzo. This manuscript is a ‘pontifical’, created for the personal use of a ninth-century bishop of Chieti. Within this book, he described and prescribed his own liturgical duties, those which made up his office as the Carolingians understood it. The peculiarities of the manuscript and some of its unique features are best understood by reference to this imperative. Alongside other products of the Carolingian scriptorium at Chieti, the manuscript reveals that even bishops at the southernmost tip of the Carolingian Empire saw themselves as fully engaged in an Empire-wide programme to amend liturgical practice, which did not aim for uniformity but led to significant creativity. This programme was associated with imperial authority, but led by bishops themselves. Local liturgical variation is undeniable in our manuscript, but the sharing of texts and communication with sees all across the Empire are equally visible components.

Lo studio della liturgia medievale può trarre vantaggio da un più pieno apprezzamento della ricchezza, unica nel suo genere, di manoscritti personali. Un esempio in tal senso è il Vat. Lat. 7701, una fonte chiave per gettare luce sulla ricezione a Chieti (Abruzzo) del progetto carolingio di riforma della liturgia. Il manoscritto è un ‘pontificale’, creato per uso personale di un vescovo di Chieti nel IX sec. All’interno di questo libro, egli descrive e stabilisce i suoi doveri liturgici, quelli che erano competenza della sua carica secondo quanto inteso dai Carolingi. Le peculiarità del manoscritto e alcune delle sue caratteristiche — uniche nel loro genere — si possono capire bene facendo riferimento a questa esigenza. Insieme ad altri prodotti dello scriptorium carolingio di Chieti, il manoscritto rivela come persino i vescovi nelle parti più meridionali dell’impero carolingio percepissero il loro pieno coinvolgimento in un programma di modifica globale della pratica liturgica, che non mirava all’uniformità ma che portava a una significativa creatività. Questo programma era associato con l’autorità imperiale, ma condotto dai vescovi stessi. La variazione liturgica locale è innegabile nel nostro manoscritto, ma la condivisione di testi e la comunicazione con le vedute di tutto l’impero sono componenti ugualmente visibili.

INTRODUCTION

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Lat. 7701, in common with most early medieval liturgical manuscripts, has received the cursory interest of specialists but little

¹ I must acknowledge the patience and diligence of those who reviewed earlier versions of this article, who gave incisive and helpful criticism.

else.² In one classic treatment, representative of traditional modes of liturgical scholarship, it was sufficient to call it simply ‘the Pontifical of Central Italy’ (Vogel, 1986: 228). Such a terse description reduces the richness of liturgical manuscripts, which can now be rediscovered as artefacts of agenda, principle and intention. Rooted firmly in the messy reality of the manuscripts available to us, recent studies have encouraged a move away from strict categorization, and towards a recognition of individual manuscripts’ complexity and interest (Hen, 2001; Gittos and Hamilton, 2015; Parkes, 2015).³ They have given us tools to allow these manuscripts to speak, and for us to hear their ‘human stories’, as Parkes (2015: 2) has memorably put it.

This process has been particularly fruitful for manuscripts of the Carolingian period (broadly 750–888), which is no accident. The intervention by the Carolingians in the liturgy has been recognized, since the writings of McKitterick and Hen, as profoundly local and diverse in its application, though guided always by a shared understanding of authoritative models, notably the Roman Church (McKitterick, 1977: 115–54; 1997; Reynolds, 1995: 620–1; Hen, 2011).⁴ Previously, liturgists had more or less characterized the Carolingian project as the imperial imposition of uniformity upon a passive mass of subjects (Vogel, 1965: 217; 1979; Angenendt, 1982: 173ff.). Significantly, this was the understanding of Andrieu (1931–61, particularly vol. II, 1948: xvii–xlix), who offered the only sustained assessment of Carolingian liturgical *ordines*. But now it is understood that those who wrote liturgical manuscripts were active participants in shaping what a ‘correct’ liturgy would look like where they were. Therefore, a liturgical manuscript produced in any one diocese presents something of how the general Carolingian liturgical project was enacted or understood there. This article will examine Vat. Lat. 7701 as a liturgical product of ninth-century Chieti, reflecting attitudes and ideals there. It will also present a case study of how the Carolingian liturgical programme operated in the kingdom of Italy, particularly useful since Italy has been comparatively neglected in studies of the Carolingian programme of *correctio* (correction) (for example, Angenendt, 1992; Smith, 2003; De Jong, 2005).

In 1985, Niels Krogh Rasmussen discussed Vat. Lat. 7701 with Roger Reynolds in Spoleto (‘Discussione’, Rasmussen, 1987: 602–3). Reynolds called the manuscript a ‘strange little so-called pontifical’, and Rasmussen confessed he was ‘astonished’ by it. Both would later publish on the text, but their early confusion reveals a problem: they saw Vat. Lat. 7701 exclusively in the strict

² Vat. Lat. 7701 has been digitized, though only from microfilm, by the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana: http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.7701. I was able to examine this manuscript in person thanks to the British School at Rome, and the generosity of the Trust of Roger and Ingrid Pilkington.

³ For studies on individual liturgical manuscripts: Hen and Meens, 2004; Rose, 2005: 13–328; Diesenberger, Meens and Rose, 2016.

⁴ Keefe, 2002, on baptism is also useful.

typological framework of the ‘pontifical’. Rasmussen later (1998: 375–99) gave a detailed description of the contents. In his introduction, he quoted correspondence from palaeographer Bernhard Bischoff who provided dating for the various scripts in the manuscript. Beneventan symptoms in the script made it clear that the text was central or southern Italian. For the relevant core in Caroline Minuscule, Bischoff pointed to the second half (fols 1–57r) or third quarter of the ninth century (fols 58f.), that is more or less between 850 and 875.⁵ Locating it further evaded Rasmussen, but his one-time interlocutor in Spoleto, Reynolds (1990: 441–2), revealed it was from Chieti. Reynolds noticed the significant attention paid to Saint Thomas the Apostle in Vat. Lat. 7701. Thomas comes first in the manuscript’s litany of apostles on fol. 57v and, in the blessing which would be said on the anniversary of a church’s dedication, his name is specifically given to the church in question:

Deus qui hoc templum sanctum suo gloriosissimo nomini in honore **thome beati apostoli** sui uoluit dedicari ...⁶

The cathedral in Chieti was dedicated to Saint Thomas the Apostle in the early Middle Ages, and it is the only cathedral church in the area to which this blessing could apply (Reynolds, 1985: 439). However, Reynolds (1990: 442) maintained an erroneous tenth-century date for the manuscript, based on an earlier palaeographical assessment that can no longer be substantiated. Therefore, he could not see the manuscript as Carolingian, nor compare it to contemporary manuscripts, both essential to interpreting it.

The *Annales Regni Francorum* described Chieti as having been seized from the Lombards and burned in the year 801 by King Pippin of Italy (773–810), son of Charlemagne (Kurze, 1895: 116). This savage conquest followed decades of devastating war in Abruzzo. But over the next few decades Chieti seems to have fully recovered, a measure of Carolingian success, and perhaps a sign of a deliberate policy to integrate this southernmost tip of the Empire via an effective bishopric at its heart, whose remit would include the restoration of cultural, intellectual and liturgical activity along Carolingian lines.⁷ Crucially, on 14 May 840, Bishop Theodorich of Chieti, quite possibly of Frankish origin, organized the clergy into a foundation of secular canons at the *canonica* of San Giustino, attached to the cathedral of Saint Thomas.⁸ The record of this

⁵ Rasmussen, 1998: 376, ‘Vatic. Lat. stellt sich nach meine Notizien folgendermassen dar: foll.1–57r italienisch, saec.IX2 (wohl III.Viertel), fol.57v Litanei, ca.s.IX ex., foll.58rf. ital.ca.saec.IX ¾ (foll.22–23r, 65v nachgezogen). Zusätze sind (ausser der ubr.auf fol.1r ca. s.XI od.XII): 23v u. (z.T.) 24r saec.X; 34v Z.T. von einer Hand wie 74v f. saec.X. od X–XI, z.T. beneventanisch s.XI’; Bischoff, 1998–2014, vol. III, 2014: 456 is significantly less specific.

⁶ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 54r, ‘God who wished to dedicate this holy temple to his most glorious name in the honour of the blessed apostle Thomas ...’

⁷ On ninth-century Chieti, see Pelligrini, 1958: 74–6; 1990: 591–3; Feller, 1998: 36, 121–2, 788–9; Rosso, 2003: 583–93.

⁸ Ughelli, 1720: 679, presents his ethnicity as fact, but gives no evidence.

reorganization, proclaimed at a local synod, was copied by Ughelli from a manuscript of Chieti cathedral, now lost (Werminghoff, 1908: 788–91; taken from Ughelli, 1720: 669–70). Led by their *magister*, Giselperto, the *canonici* would perform liturgical functions such as singing at service, but they were also scribes at the scribal school.⁹ Theodorich explicitly presents the initiative as his response to the edicts of the Carolingian Emperor, then Louis the Pious (813–June 840):

ibi inter caetera cum consensu omnium praedictorum canonicam instuere certauimus, habentes normam firmitatis, eo quod a domino imperatore Augusto per diuersa episcopia iam diu ea fieri praeceptum est.¹⁰

These *canonici* would have obeyed at least a version of the authorized rule for secular canons which Louis promulgated at Aachen in 816 (Werminghoff, 1906: 421–56; De Jong, 1995: 632–3; Rosso, 2003: 591). Almost 30 years had elapsed before Chieti attempted to obey the edicts of this council, a reminder that organizing the affairs of the church did not happen at the same pace everywhere, and adjusted itself to local circumstance. Theodorich's organization of a clerical community with a rule from Aachen would have been entirely new in Chieti, as it was in other areas of Italy to which the Franks brought it (Miller, 2000: 80–2; Witt, 2011: 38–9). It stemmed from the Frankish vision of an ordered church and society. This is important in the examination of Vat. Lat. 7701, the only known surviving liturgical book from the ninth-century scribal school housed in that *canonica*. There are only two manuscripts assigned to Chieti by Bischoff's *Katalog* (Bischoff, 1998–2014, vol. I, 1998: 485; vol. III, 2014: 619): Vatican Reg. Lat. 1997 (second half of the ninth century), a canon law collection, and Karlsruhe Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. Perg. 229 (after 821), which is a miscellany.¹¹ Both contain some liturgical material and can thus form part of this investigation, but, most importantly, this article brings that meagre count up to three.

THE STRUCTURE AND PURPOSE OF VAT. LAT. 7701

Rasmussen provided a detailed list of the contents of Vat. Lat. 7701. His policy was to link each individual prayer and ordo text back to the closest edited

⁹ Werminghoff, 1908: 791. The *canonici* are named as Leo praepositus, Gundefrid, Gasulphus presbyter, Theopo, Gualdefred, Iohannes, Leopardus, Lambertus, Luitprand, Antefred, Ianfred and Murtianus.

¹⁰ Werminghoff, 1908: 789: 'Therefore among other things, with the consent of everyone above mentioned, we resolved to institute a *canonica*, having the law of surety, by that which has been commanded for some time from the Lord Emperor Augustus to diverse episcopacies.'

¹¹ Both are digitized: Reg. Lat., 1997 (http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.1997); Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 229, for which see Supino-Martini, 1977: 148–52; <https://digital.blb-karlsruhe.de/blbhs/Handschriften/content/pageview/16955>.

version, but he did not underline the consequences of some of these identifications. Furthermore, Rasmussen's own understanding of what a pontifical was conditioned his analysis. He presented Vat. Lat. 7701 as a union of three originally separate liturgical booklets, or what are called *libelli* (Rasmussen, 1976: 393–410; 1998: 396–8; Vogel, 1986: 227; Palazzo, 1990). Rasmussen had attempted to argue that the fusion of *libelli* created the earliest 'pontificals', but his analysis applies better to some manuscripts than others, and is less helpful for Vat. Lat. 7701. Table 1 is a condensed version of what Rasmussen determined was the structure and content (Rasmussen, 1998: 396–7).

What Rasmussen termed sections 1 and 2 of the manuscript do not, on my examination, seem to have been originally separate. Their initials are almost identical and their layout is not sufficiently different to warrant Rasmussen's conclusions. The same set of rituals they contain (ordination, the Chrism Mass, the consecration of churches and the episcopal blessings) are found in a number of complete manuscripts contemporary with Vat. Lat. 7701. While these manuscripts are pontificals, they cannot be seen as fusions of *libelli* but are wholesale accomplishments. Notable are two later ninth-century pontificals from the Rhine, Freiburg Universitätsbibliothek 368 and the one-time Donaueschingen Fürstliche Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek 192, of Basel and Constance respectively.¹² Neither can be presented as fusions of *libelli*. Vat. Lat. 7701 was more likely conceived in the same way, with the first two sections intact. The third section may originally have been separate. It has much more distinctive layout and ornamentation. Nevertheless, the decision to bind this third section to the 'pontifical' of Chieti was made in the ninth century (Rasmussen, 1998: 376). An ordo of Holy Week was written on the final folios at the same time, and a litany was added to blank folio 57v. Bischoff dated the litany to the end of the ninth century. Both additions unite the book by referring to texts in previous sections. Therefore, the composition of the manuscript can be seen as a phenomenon not too distinct from the original writing of the liturgical elements, and very close to the Carolingian period.

Later repairs created some difficulties. In the third section, the *ordo Romanus* for a council was divided in half and put back in an incorrect order. In the same process, the latter part of the *ordo Romanus* for Holy Week was also lost, leaving it a partial record of Maundy Thursday, and only half of Good Friday. A first folio is missing as well, since the ordinations are only entitled ITEM BENEDICTIO but it is possible to reconstruct what was there.

To help understand our manuscript, Hen (2001: 13) recommended a 'double axis of classification' for liturgical manuscripts: according to type, and according to functional destination. It has been stated that our manuscript is a pontifical. In practice, this means it offers the suite of rites which only a bishop

¹² Edited in Metzger, 1914; Rasmussen, 1998: 420; the former remains at Freiburg and has been digitized (<http://dl.ub.uni-freiburg.de/diglit/hs363/0007?sid=133bdf39288ecd1400f77671464897a8>); also Bischoff, 1998–2014, vol. I, 1998: 272; the latter was sold to an undisclosed private collector (Sotheby's, 21 June 1982, lot 5); see Vogel, 1986: 241 n. 214.

Table 1. Rasmussen's reconstruction of Vat. Lat. 7701.

Section 1 (Consecrations and Ordinations)	fols 1–9r	ITEM BENEDICTIO SUPER EOS QUI SACROS ORDINIBUS BENEDICENDI SUNT. ¹	Gelasian ordinations ²
	fols 9v–18r	ITEM MISSALE CHRISMALIS ³	Gelasian Chrism Mass ⁴
	fols 18r–18v	Primitus enim antequam pontifex ... ⁵	Ordo Romanus XLI ⁶ for the dedication of a church
	fols 19v–24r	ORDO AD ECCLESIAM DEDICANDAM. ⁷	Gelasian prayers for the dedication of a church ⁸
	fols 24v–34v	AD CONSECRANDAM PATENAM ⁹	Gelasian dedication of liturgical objects ¹⁰
Section 2 (Benedictional)	fols 35r–56v	IN NOMINE DOMINI NOSTRI IHU CHRISTI INCIPIUNT BENEDICTIOES PRESULUM DICENDE AD MISSAS SUPER POPULUM ¹¹	Gregorian Benedictional ¹²
	fol. 57v	INCIPIIT LETANIA ¹³	Litany
Section 3 (Capitulary and Council Ordo)	fols 58r–59v	... et ego diligam eum et manifestabo ... ¹⁴	<i>Ordo Romanus</i> for a council (part 2) ¹⁵
	fols 59v–64v	EMANDATO ADQUE AMMONITIO. DE MANDATO DOMNI IMPERATORIS. ¹⁶	Capitulary ¹⁷
	fols 64v–65v	Feria V in cena domini ¹⁸	Partial <i>ordo Romanus</i> of Holy Week
	fols 66r–73r	ORDO ROMANUS QUALITER CONCILIUM AGATUR ¹⁹	<i>Ordo Romanus</i> for a council (part 1)

¹ 'Then the blessing over those who are consecrated to sacred orders'.

² Reynolds, 1999: 12–19, edited from this manuscript and related texts.

³ 'Then the Chrism Mass'.

⁴ Related to Heiming, 1984: 56–8.

⁵ 'But first of all before the pontiff ...'

⁶ A version of that which is edited by Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 339–47.

⁷ 'Then the ordo for the dedication of a church'. The title seems to have been misplaced from the above text.

⁸ Analogue to Dumas, 1981: 360–4.

⁹ 'For the consecration of a paten'.

¹⁰ Analogue to Dumas, 1981: 364–71.

¹¹ 'In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, here begin the blessings said by the bishop over the people at masses.'

¹² Version of that edited at Deshusses, 1971: 576–98.

¹³ 'The litany begins'.

¹⁴ 'And I will love him and I will show ...'

¹⁵ Discussed and edited from this manuscript by Schneider, 1996: 55–7, 331–42.

¹⁶ 'Emendation and Admonition. Concerning the mandate of the lord emperor'.

¹⁷ Edited from this manuscript by Schneider, 2007: 469–96.

¹⁸ 'Maundy Thursday, on the Lord's Supper'.

¹⁹ 'The Roman ordo for how a council is to be done'.

would require: he alone could ordain, consecrate a church or say the episcopal blessings. Yet a pontifical is not a single, simple thing (Hamilton, 2011; Parkes, 2015: 135–82). These rites were storehouses of spiritual power, and the book containing them a symbol of episcopal authority. The Carolingians, for example, repeatedly legislated about the proper consecration on Maundy Thursday of the chrism, sacred oils used in anointing.¹³ The right to consecrate and distribute chrism belonged to the bishop alone, they said, and thereby made every priest in his diocese directly dependent on him, useful for a measure of oversight. By placing the ceremony of consecration, the Chrism Mass, among other exclusively episcopal rites, our manuscript implicitly argues the same.¹⁴ However, monasteries also produced pontificals, as did communities of clerics for their own purposes. Pontificals were not solely liturgical either: most contain educational material explaining the accompanying rites, whilst some, like our own, are vehicles also for legal texts, all nuances one cannot find in the traditional definitions. The functional destination for our pontifical, Vat. Lat. 7701, however, was the hand of the bishop of Chieti, and it actually aided him in the performance of the rituals it described. This can be demonstrated by a survey of its *ordines*.

MAKING MINISTERS

The first section of the manuscript, that of consecration of persons and objects, is a sustained extract from the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century (Vogel, 1986: 70–8). The Gelasian of the eighth century (henceforth, GVIII) was the main sacramentary form that rivalled the Gregorian Sacramentary, the papal text sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne between 781 and 791, and regarded as the ‘purer’ Roman source (Vogel, 1986: 79–102). But no effort was actually made to impose the Gregorian, and the GVIII, ‘basically Frankish prayer-books for the use of the Frankish Church’ (Hen, 2001: 60), flourished as a viable alternative (Hen, 2011: 58–61, 79). One might ask if the GVIII’s fluidity and demonstrable responsiveness to local traditions, which make it a difficult tradition to firmly pin down, contributed to this popularity. The variety present in the GVIII traditions means that what they looked like in Italy may have been very different from our extant versions, exclusively from modern-day France. No complete GVIII Sacramentary survives from ninth-century Italy, though there exist some important fragments, but our manuscript can help to reconstruct the influence of this tradition in one Italian centre, Chieti (Vogel, 1986: 72–3).

Vat. Lat. 7701 opens with ordination. Here, it carries rituals for ordaining seven grades of the church, from porter (*ostiarius*) to priest (*presbyter*), all

¹³ Aachen 836, canon 8, Werminghoff, 1908: 710; Meaux-Paris, 845/846, canon 46, Hartmann, 1984: 107. The forger of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals even invented a papal decretal for the purpose: Migne, 1853: 153–4. Also Reynolds, 1975: 326.

¹⁴ On the importance of letting pontifical texts dialogue, Jones, 2005: 128.

involving the bishop.¹⁵ This is a particular version of the composite text often entitled the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*.¹⁶ The text has three elements: first, each grade has a simple rubric detailing the most important ritual action for the ordination; second, they are each given a set of prayers to be said; and thirdly, there is the distinctive interpolation in the middle, an *ordo* detailing what claims to be Roman practice of ordination in Saint Peter's. In [Table 2](#) our pontifical is compared with the parallel text in a GVIII, the Phillipps Sacramentary of Autun and *c.* 800. The prayer texts are generally variations on the terms *Prefatio* for prayer and *Benedictio* for blessing.

There are four major instances of what we might call 'correction'. First, there are interventions to ensure that every one of the minor orders received two prayers, whereas, in the original GVIII, lector and acolyte only have one each. For the lector, the Chieti compiler simply extracts a speech which was originally undifferentiated from the rubric: this is the text *Elegant te fratres* and he gives it its own title as *PREFATIO*.¹⁷ In the acolyte, however, a completely new prayer, attested in no copy of the GVIII, was inserted under the title *BENEDICTIO*. The original GVIII benediction is shifted to be second, under the new title *ITEM COLLECTIO UT SUPRA*.¹⁸ This original text underlined the New Testament roots of the acolyte by Christ's associations with light and water:

Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus qui per Iesum Christum filium tuum in hunc mundum lumen claritatis misisti et in cruce passionis suae triumphum sanguine et aqua ex latere ...¹⁹

The new benediction added here gives the Old Testament roots:

Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus qui Moysen et Aaron locutus es ut accerenduntur lucerna in tabernaculo testimonii ...²⁰

One other recension of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* does the same thing, with the exact same blessing text added. This is Donaueschingen 192, from late ninth-century Constance (Metzger, 1914: 7*). We are offered here a glimpse into liturgical relations across the Alps, a shared solution to a shared anxiety about the acolyte's rite. Furthermore, making reference to the grade's Old and New

¹⁵ Reynolds, 1999: 12–19, has edited a version.

¹⁶ As in Heiming, 1984: 181, 'Ordo for how the Sacred Orders are to be Blessed'; Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. III, 1951: 596–9; Reynolds, 1995: 605, 620.

¹⁷ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 1v, 'The brothers chose you ...'; for the original disposition Heiming, 1984: 182.

¹⁸ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 2v, 'Then the Collect as above.'

¹⁹ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 2v, 'Oh Holy Lord, Omnipotent Father, Eternal God who through your son Jesus Christ in this world sent a light of clarity into the world and in the cross of his passion blood and water from his side ...'

²⁰ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 2v, 'Oh Holy Lord, Omnipotent Father, Eternal God, who spoke unto Moses and Aaron so that lights might be kindled in the tabernacle of witness ...'

Table 2. Ordination rituals of Vat. Lat. 7701 and the Phillipps Sacramentary (GVIII).

Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 1–9r	Berlin Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1667, fols 130v–138r ¹
{lost folio}	ORDO DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS BENEDICENDIS Haec autem in singulis ... (Extract from Pope Zosimus on the length to be spent in holy orders)
ITEM BENEDICTIONES SUPER EOS QUI SACRIS ORDINIBUS BENEDICENDI SUNT. ²	INCIPIT ORDO DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS BENEDICENDIS ³
The porter is given the keys to the church, without knowledge of the bishop with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO	The porter is given the keys to the church without knowledge of the bishop with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO
The lector is instructed by the bishop with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO	The lector is instructed by the bishop with BENEDICTIO
The exorcist receives a booklet of exorcisms from the bishop with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO	The exorcist receives a booklet of exorcisms from the bishop, with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO
The acolyte is taught by the bishop, receives candle and empty cruet from the archdeacon, with BENEDICTIO and COLLECTIO	The acolyte is taught by the bishop, receives candle and empty cruet from archdeacon, with BENEDICTIO.
ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA SEDIS APOSTOLICE ECCLESIE DIACONI SUBDIACONI UEL PRESBITERI HORDINANDI SUNT Mensis primi quarti septimi et decimi FERIA III et VI scrutandi sunt ipsi electi secundum canones, si sint digni hoc onus fungi. SABBATORUM die in XII lectiones ad sanctum petrum ... ⁴ (An ordo purporting to be Roman detailing procedure on Ember Wednesday, Friday and Saturday for higher clergy)	ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA SEDIS APOSTOLICE ECCLESIAE PRESBYTERI DIACONI UEL SUBDIACONI ELIGENDI SUNT Mensis primi III, VI et Xmi sabbatorum die in XII lectiones ad sanctum Petrum ... ⁵ (An ordo purporting to be Roman detailing procedure on Ember Saturday for higher clergy)
Subdeacon does not receive imposition of hands, he receives the empty paten and chalice from bishop, and the cruet and towel from the archdeacon, with PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO	CAPITULUM SANCTI GREGORII PAPE (Extracts from Gregory and Leo) Subdeacon does not receive imposition of hands, he receives the empty paten and chalice from bishop, and the cruet and towel from the archdeacon, with EXHIBEATUR, PREFATIO and BENEDICTIO
No rubric for the deacon. AD ORDINANDUM, SEQUITUR ORATIO, CONSECRATIO, AD CONSUMMANDUM and BENEDICTIO SEQUITUR.	The bishop lays hands on the deacon with AD ORDINANDUM, CONSECRATIO, AD CONSUMMANDUM and BENEDICTIO SEQUITUR.
The bishop lays hands on the head of the priest, other priests present do likewise. ALLOCUTIO AD POPULUM, (rubric repeated by scribal error), AD ORDINANDOS, CONSECRATIO, CONSECRATIO (scribal error — should say CONSUMMATIO), ITEM BENEDICTIO, HIC UESTIS EUM PLANETA, CONSECRATIO MANUUM	The bishop lays hands on the head of the priest, other priests present do likewise. ALLOCUTIO AD POPULUM, ORATIO AD ORDINANDOS, SEQUITUR ORATIO, CONSECRATIO, CONSUMMATIO, ITEM BENEDICTIO, HIC VESTIS EI CASULA and CONSECRATIO MANUS

No episcopal ordination

Two bishops hold the gospel book over the head of the new bishop and another blesses him. Others lay hands. EXORTATIO, ORATIO, CONSECRATIO, CONSECRATIO MANUS.

¹ Heiming, 1984: 181–90.

² ‘Then the blessings over those who are to be blessed to the sacred orders’

³ ‘Here begins the ordo for how the sacred are to be blessed’.

⁴ ‘Ordo how in the apostolic Roman church deacons, subdeacons and priests are to be ordained. On the first, fourth, seventh and tenth months, on Wednesday and Friday they are to be examined to see if they should be worthy to perform this labour. The Saturdays at Saint Peter’s in twelve readings ...’

⁵ ‘Ordo how in the apostolic Roman church, priests, deacons and subdeacons are chosen. The first, fourth, seventh and tenth months, the Saturdays at Saint Peter’s in twelve readings ...’

Testament roots, pleasing in its symmetry, recalls several of the multiplicity of Carolingian tracts circulating on the origins and purposes of the church’s hierarchy (e.g. Reynolds, 1975: 323).

A second matter of interest comes in the central interpolation concerning the ‘Ember Days’, the text entitled in our manuscript *ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA SEDIS APOSTOLICE ECCLESIE DIACONI SUBDIACONI UEL PRESBITERI HORDINANDI SUNT*.²¹ In each of the four seasons, three days (Wednesday, Friday and Saturday) were devoted to a special fast, and ordination of higher clergy came to attach itself firmly to the Saturday, as this ordo describes (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 213–32). The Ember Days were one of the key points of Carolingian engagement with Roman liturgical custom.²² The most widespread liturgical directory for what happened on these days, and how they related to ordination, was the text found in the *GVIII, ORDO QUALITER*. But it was deficient in dealing only with the Saturday. Only a single sacramentary of this type, the Sacramentary of Angoulême, added a special reference to the Wednesday and Friday.²³ This same reference is to be found in our manuscript:

*Feria III et VI scrutandi sunt ipsi electi secundum canones, si sint digni hoc onus fungi*²⁴

There were many direct imperial orders from the Frankish centre that the clergy, particularly priests, should be properly examined prior to ordination (Vyoukal, 1913; Reynolds, 1975: 324; De Jong, 2005: 122). So, in clarifying the Ember Days, and in allowing space for examination, these interpolations tie into the

²¹ ‘AN ORDO FOR HOW IN THE ROMAN SEE OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH DEACONS, SUBDEACONS AND PRIESTS SHOULD BE ORDAINED’; the somewhat tautological addition of the word *ecclesie* is not a feature of other recensions of this text.

²² At the 813 Council of Mainz Canon 34; Werminhoff, 1906: 269; also Morin, 1913.

²³ Saint-Roch, 1987: 316, ‘Mensis primi quarti septimi et decimi feria III et sexta scrutandi sunt ipsi electi secundum canones, si sint digni hoc onus fungi.’

²⁴ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 3r. ‘Wednesday and Friday, these are to be examined according to the canons, if they should be worthy to perform this labour.’

general Carolingian project. They link our manuscript to the peculiar GVIII tradition of Angoulême.

Thirdly, the rubric for the deacon is erased in Vat. Lat. 7701. In most copies of the text, this rubric runs:

Diaconus cum ordinatur. Solus episcopus qui eum benedicit, manum super caput illius ponat, quia non ad sacerdotium sed ad ministerium consecratur.²⁵

Amalarius of Metz, a widely published Carolingian scholar of liturgy, found this text highly questionable. As he tells it, in his *Liber Officialis*, first written in 822:

With us there is a certain book on the sacred orders (*de sacris ordinibus*), I do not know who wrote it . . . that says that the bishop alone should lay his hand on the deacon ‘because he is not consecrated to the priesthood but to ministry’ . . . Is the writer of this book more learned and holier than the apostles, who laid many hands upon the deacons when they were ordained? And should the bishop alone therefore lay his hand on the deacon, as if he alone could invoke the virtue of the graces that the many apostles invoked?²⁶

Ughelli (1720: 673) recorded that a copy of Amalarius’s *Liber Officialis* was transcribed in Chieti by the scribe Sicardus, in the late ninth century, though the manuscript is now lost. The erasure of the deacon, inexplicable otherwise, could therefore be a response to discussion among elites in the Carolingian centre, in which Italians on the periphery were interested.

Finally, Vat. Lat. 7701 has no ordination for a bishop. For this, Rasmussen (1998: 398) posited extraordinary influence. This bishop in central Italy, he said, did not dare to intrude on the pope’s prerogative to ordain bishops. However, Rome’s influence was not unduly felt elsewhere in the manuscript. For example, Rome did not practise the unction of a priest’s hands, visible here in the prayer CONSECRATIO MANUUM.²⁷ Rasmussen, who was here labouring under his own strict understanding of what a pontifical ought to be, was misled. The absence of a bishop’s ordination is far from unique. A manuscript Rasmussen examined (1998: 136–66), Leiden Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS Codices Bibliothecae Publicae 111.2, which offers two sets of ordinations of the later ninth century, one from Paris and one from northern France, lacks the bishop’s rite in both. Freiburg 368, from Basel, is also missing

²⁵ Heiming 1984: 184, ‘When the deacon is ordained, only the bishop who blesses him may put his hand over the head of this one, because he is not to be consecrated to the priesthood, but to the ministry.’

²⁶ Hanssens, 1948: 224, ‘Et libellus quidam apud nos de sacris ordinibus, nescio cuius auctoris . . . qui dicit solum episcopum debere manus imponere super diaconum “quia non ad sacerdotium consecratur, sed ad ministerium”. Numquid scriptor libelli doctior atque sanctior apostolis, qui posuerunt plures manus imponere super diaconos quando consecrabantur, et propterea solus episcopus ponat manum super diaconum, ac si solus possit precari virtutem gratiarum quam plures apostolici precabantur?’ Translated by Knibbs, 2014: 422.

²⁷ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 9v, ‘Consecration of Hands’; see Pope Nicholas’s letter to Radoald of Bourges, 864: Perels and Dümmler, 1925: 632–6; Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 15; Ellard, 1933: 59–61, 101, refers to Vat. Lat. 7701.

it (Metzger, 1914: 15*–17*). In another Italian version of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, from eleventh-century Lucca Biblioteca Capitolare MS 606, the bishop has also been removed.²⁸ One cannot posit papal prerogative for these. Far simpler, and more easily understandable, is that pontifical manuscripts responded to the needs of the bishops themselves, representing what was most useful to them. Each of these manuscripts already represents a selective reduction from the full sacramentary; reducing them further by cutting out the ritual that a bishop of lower rank would rarely attend seems reasonable. Offering seven grades was also theologically desirable (Reynolds, 1972; 1995: 602–3).

Thus, the interventions in the ordination ritual seem to be concurrent with influences also visible across the Alps. Similarities with the version of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* from a lost Sacramentary of Rheims, such as the use of the archaic word *planeta* for chasuble in the priestly ordination, may also preserve an otherwise obscure link (Morin, 1695: 236–9). The importance of this ordination ritual in Chieti is attested because the same version of the text is copied into another of the city's manuscripts, Reg. Lat. 1997, as Reynolds (1990: 440–2) demonstrated. This manuscript is notably the subject of an article by Supino-Martini (1977). It primarily contains a canonical collection, the Teatine Collection (Kéry, 1999: 24), in a developing pre-Caroline minuscule, dated to the decade after the establishment of a scriptorium in Chieti, c. 850. Perhaps a decade later, c. 860, the blank last pages were filled in by a new hand writing in a fully developed Caroline minuscule (Supino-Martini, 1977: 142–3). This hand presents a striking resemblance to the scribes of Vat. Lat. 7701, particularly those in the second section. On folios 156r–160r, this hand added the ordination rite, with the same otherwise unique title ITEM BENEDICTIONES, and it has almost all the peculiarities of the Chieti version. Reg. Lat. 1997 reveals what was written on the missing first folio of our manuscript, Vat. Lat. 7701 (and that only one folio was missing):

INCIPIIT ORDO DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS. Haec autem in singulis gradibus obseruanda sunt tempora si ab infantia ecclesiasticis nomen dederit ...²⁹

The text explains how long one should spend in each ecclesiastical grade, an obvious accompaniment to the ordination rites. The Phillipps GVIII Sacramentary offered this text, an extract from a decretal of Pope Zosimus (417–18) (Migne, 1845: cols 672–3). Placing such writings around liturgical texts of uncertain provenance integrated them into a Carolingian understanding

²⁸ Fols. 187r–188r. The manuscript is a missal, perhaps from the monastery of San Salvatore on Monte Amiato, with pontifical elements. The unelaborated form of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* here, close in many ways to Vat. Lat. 7701, suggests it was copied from a ninth-century source; Ellard, 1933: 101.

²⁹ Reg. Lat. 1997, fol. 156r, 'Here begins the Ordo of the Sacred Orders. But these are the times which should be observed in each of the grades. If from childhood one will have given the name of ecclesiastic ...'

of authority, for which Amalarius of Metz's confusion over who wrote the *libellus de sacris ordinibus* is instructive. In Reg. Lat. 1997 itself, the whole complex of the *ordo de sacris benedicendis* is inserted into a canonical context, where it would surely be read with weight (writings of Gregory the Great and Isidore in the same hand precede it).

CONSECRATING CHURCHES

The description of the Chrism Mass for Maundy Thursday follows ordination, showing particular affinity with the Phillipps Sacramentary (Heiming, 1984: 56–8). Since the GVIII was structured according to the liturgical year, this text was purposefully extracted from its original place by the compiler. Another *ordo* comes thereafter, at fol. 14v. This is the text known as *ordo Romanus* XLI, henceforth OR XLI. That designation originates in Andrieu's editions (1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 311–47), though he was not aware that Vat. Lat. 7701 contained an example. It presents a Frankish rite for the dedication of a church, an ornate ritual involving several aspersions of the space with holy water, and tracing of the alphabet.³⁰

This ceremony too came to be incorporated into the GVIII Sacramentary and, there, was accompanied by an announcement and by the eight prayers that would be said during the ceremony. The same structure follows in our manuscript, with nine prayers (see Table 3). Thereafter follow GVIII blessings for liturgical objects which would be used in the new church: paten, chalice, altars, bell and cross. There are one or two peculiarities in Vat. Lat. 7701's version of OR XLI (Ramussen, 1985: 383). One is found on folio 17r, concerning the bishop's blessing of the vessels and linens for the new church:

DEINDE PONTIFEX BENEDICIT SICUT IN SACRAMENTORUM CONTINETUR
Domine deus omnipotens.³¹

That prayer incipit *Domine deus omnipotens* is not specified in almost every other example of OR XLI (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 346). There, the reference to the sacramentary had to suffice, and one had to track down the required prayer inside it, making performance more difficult. Yet, in our manuscript, this very prayer *Domine deus omnipotens* is to be found only a few folios later, at fol. 24r, entitled PREFATIO LINTEAMINUM.³² Thus, the addition unites the manuscript and allows a greater accessibility of both word and actions of the ceremony. Of the full prayers which follow OR XLI, each one has its place in the narrative, and is signalled with an incipit. Like the ordination rituals, this framework allowed the *ordo* to be actively performed

³⁰ Some discussion of this by Vogel, 1986: 180–1; Gittos, 2013: 215–19.

³¹ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 17r, 'Then the Pontiff blesses them as is contained in the sacramentary: Lord, almighty god.'

³² Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 24r, 'Prayer of the Linens'.

Table 3. The church dedication ordo in Vat. Lat. 7701.

Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 18r–24v		
fols 14v–18r	‘Primitus enim pontifex ...’ ¹	OR XLI, GVIII
fols 18r–18v	DENUNTIATIO QUANDO RELIQUIE PONENDAE SUNT ²	OR XLI, GVIII
fol. 18v	ORDO AD ECCLESIAM DEDICANDUM	GVIII
fols 18v–19r	‘Magnificare domine ...’ ³ BENEDICTIO SALIS ET AQUAE ‘Deus qui ad salutem ...’ ⁴	GVIII
fol. 19v	ALIA ‘Exorcizo te ...’ ⁵	GVIII
fol. 20r	ORATIO AD CONSECRANDUM VINUM ET AQUAM ‘Creator et conservator ...’ ⁶	GVIII
fol. 20r	ORATIO IN DEDICATIONE BASILE NOVE ‘Deus qui loca nomini tuo ...’ ⁷	GVIII
fols 20v–21r	[...] ‘Deus sanctificationum omnipotens ...’ ⁸	GVIII
fols 21r–21v	BENEDICTIO ALTARIS ‘Deus patris omnipotentis ...’ ⁹	GVIII
fols 21v–22r	BENEDICTIO ALTARIS EIUSDEM ‘Deus omnipotens in cuius honore ...’ ¹⁰	GVIII
fols 22r–23v	DICATUR ISTA ORATIO SICUT PREFATIO ‘Deus sancte pater clemens ...’ ¹¹	Unknown. (Ordo of Lucca)
fol. 23v (addition)	QUANDO RELIQUIAE LEVANTUR ‘Aufer a nobis ...’ ¹²	Gregorian, OR XLII ¹³
fol. 23v (addition)	ANTE IANUAM ‘Domus tua domine ...’ ¹⁴	Gregorian
fol. 23v (addition)	ORATIO INFRA DOMUS ‘Deus qui sacrandorum tibi ...’ ¹⁵	Gregorian
fol. 23v (addition)	ALIA ‘Deus qui hedificamini ...’ ¹⁶	Unknown
fol. 24r (addition)	ALIA ‘Deus qui de vivis et electis ...’ ¹⁷	GVIII
fols 24r–24v	PREFATIO LINTEAMINUM ‘Domine deus omnipotens ...’ ¹⁸	GVIII

¹ ‘First of all the pontiff ...’

² ‘Announcement when the relics are to be placed.’

³ ‘Ordo for the dedication of a church: Magnify, O lord ...’ The title seems misplaced here from OR XLI, which lacks a title.

⁴ ‘Blessing of salt and water: Oh God, who for the salvation ...’

⁵ ‘Another: I exorcize thee ...’

⁶ ‘Prayer for the consecration of water and wine: Creator and conservator ...’

⁷ ‘Prayer for the dedication of a new basilica: God, who this place to your name ...’

⁸ Title effaced: ‘Almighty God of sanctifications ...’

⁹ ‘Blessing of the altar: God, father almighty ...’

¹⁰ ‘Blessing of the same altar: Almighty God in whose honour ...’

¹¹ ‘Say this oration like a prayer: Holy God merciful father ...’

¹² ‘When relics are lifted: Take away from us ...’

¹³ Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 397.

¹⁴ ‘Before the door: Your house, oh Lord ...’

¹⁵ ‘Prayer within the building: God who by consecrating to you ...’

¹⁶ ‘Another: God whom we have exalted ...’

¹⁷ ‘Another: God who from the living and elect ...’

¹⁸ ‘Prayer of the linens: Oh Lord almighty God ...’

without the weight of the sacramentary, which also contained masses for the whole liturgical year. The oddity is the prayer *Deus sancte pater clemens*, not present in the GVIII tradition. It is found, however, in an eleventh-century church dedication ritual in Lucca Biblioteca Capitolare 605 which is described as ‘Ambrosian’, meaning of the traditions particular to Milan (Mercati, 1902: 23–4). Gros (1969: 373) suggested that the prayer was still, in origin, a Frankish one, because it is also found in an English pontifical of the tenth century which likely took it from the Continent.³³ In Vat. Lat. 7701 the prayer is presented in a particularly early witness, but it was most likely part of a common Frankish inheritance of church dedication texts in Italy that also affected Milan.

More evidence of completion, even personalization, of the church dedication ceremony is found between folios 23v and 24r with the material labelled in Table 3 as ‘addition’. Here, the original compilers had left a significant gap between *Deus sancte pater clemens* and before the opening of the next prayer under the title PREFATIO LINTEAMINUM. Another hand took advantage of this to add five new prayers, also pertaining to the church dedication, but none from the original GVIII ritual.³⁴ Three are given specific titles relating to their place in ceremonial: QUANDO RELIQUIAE LEVANTUR, ANTE IANUA and ORATIO INTRA DOMUM.³⁵ These first three prayers were taken from another sacramentary tradition, the Gregorian Sacramentary. They are all part of the original Roman nucleus of this tradition, in the form Pope Hadrian sent it to Charlemagne, which is known as the *Hadrianum*. The prayer QUANDO LEVANTUR RELIQUIAE *Aufer a nobis* appears in the *Hadrianum* under the same title, and is presented together with the prayer *Domus tua domine*, which is entitled ANTE IANUA in Vat. Lat. 7701 (Deshusses, 1971: 303). The prayer which is given in Vat. Lat. 7701 under the title ORATIO INTRA DOMUM appears in the *Hadrianum* a little later, in the Mass for the dedication of a church (Deshusses, 1971: 304). This implies that this compiler had a Gregorian Sacramentary at his disposal and used it to supplement the GVIII text. He saw no absolute distinction between sacramentary traditions, but took from each what was useful to him. Following this extract from the Gregorian traditions, there are two prayers given under the title ALIA; thus they are alternatives to the ORATIO INTRA DOMUM. The second ALIA prayer, *Deus qui de uiuis et electis*, is found in some examples of the GVIII, but there is actually a prayer for the anniversary of the dedication of a church (Dumas, 1981: 378). It was put to new use here as part of the consecration. The first ALIA prayer, *Deus qui hedificamini ecclesiam*, is attested in no other liturgical book, so may be peculiar to Chieti.

³³ Mercati, 1902: 24, n. 1; the Egbert Pontifical (Paris BnF Lat. 10575) for which see Rasmussen, 1998: 423–4; edited at Banting, 1989: 41–2.

³⁴ Rasmussen 1998: 384, ‘Ecriture plus fine, mais à peine postérieure à la main principale’.

³⁵ Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 23v–24r, ‘When the relics are lifted’, ‘Before the Door’ and ‘Prayer within the Building’.

Examining their titles, it becomes clear that these five prayers were added by the scribe to fill gaps in the GVIII narrative of church dedication. At OR XLI nn. 3–4, it is instructed that the bishop, priests and deacons pray while the clergy sing *Agnus Dei*.³⁶ Yet no prayer was provided in the GVIII for the bishop to say. The title of the three prayers under INTRA DOMUM suggests the moment just after the bishop had entered the church, and three alternatives would allow for chant to continue at length. The prayer coming before them, ANTE IANUA, would be said previously at OR XLI n. 2, while the bishop waited before the doors of the church (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 340). The first, QUANDO RELIQUIAE LEVANTUR, fills an implied need. At OR XLI, n. 28, relics were lifted and taken into the church (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 346). The burial of relics under the altar was a precondition for proper consecration, but they had to be treated with care (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 326–44; Smith, 2015). OR XLI n. 28 tells us that the relics were prepared beforehand, for which our prayer would suit, as would the announcement, DENUNTIATIO CUM RELIQUIÆ PONENDAE SUNT.³⁷ These five prayers seem to have been added to fill needs arising from the performance of OR XLI, needs the bishop felt himself. The prayers might have been his choice from an additional sacramentary he had on hand, to better reflect the entire unfolding of the church dedication ceremony.

Given this, the litany on fol. 57v, which puzzled Rasmussen, reveals itself to be another accompaniment to this ordo for church dedication. At OR XLI n. 3, it is specified that the clergy sing a litany before the doors of the church.³⁸ This is exactly where the litany in our manuscript would be sung, according to the slightly damaged opening:

INCIPIIT LETANIA. [...] cantor ante ianuam ecclesiae dicitur ...³⁹

This litany was sung alternating between the cantor, who was head of chant at the cathedral, and the *scola*, the canons of San Giustino. It was obviously added onto a spare folio to allow for the ceremonial performance of the litany in the ceremony of church dedication. This particular litany goes through all the twelve apostles, with Thomas, as patron of Chieti, in first place. Devotion to individual apostles, particularly liturgical commemoration of them, proliferated first in Carolingian Francia, and spread via the GVIII (Borella, 1948: 87–93). Therefore, while the litany is itself quite singular, it was probably the outworking in Italy of devotion to the apostolic saints put to use as a dedication litany.

³⁶ Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 340, ‘cum uenerint sacerdotes uel leuitae prosternunt se super stramenta usquedum dicunt: Agnus dei qui tollit peccata mundi. Ut autem surrexerint ab oratione ...’

³⁷ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 18r: ‘Announcement when relics are to be placed’.

³⁸ Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. IV, 1956: 340, ‘ad ostium ecclesiae ... Deinde incipit clerus laetanium’.

³⁹ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 57v: ‘The litany begins: [...] the cantor before the door of church is said ...’

CALLING A COUNCIL, CONSULTING A CAPITULARY AND HOLDING HOLY WEEK

Most of Rasmussen's third section encompasses the *ORDO ROMANUS AD CONCILIUM AGATUR*, for the performance of a church synod over three days (Schneider, 1996: 331–42). Schneider (1996: 55–7) believed this text came from Bavaria, perhaps composed by Arn of Salzburg. As such, it is evidence that the lively liturgical exchange between Carolingian Italy and Bavaria reached as far south as Chieti (Schmid, 1987: 51–92; Diesenberger, Meens and Rose, 2016: 39–40, 67, 211–12). Rasmussen (1998: 398) was troubled that the text presents itself as an *ordo* for a council overseen by a metropolitan archbishop. This does not, however, mean that the text was only of interest to a metropolitan, as he assumed. Parkes (2015: 182) reminds us that 'liturgy emphatically did not need to be used to be of value to a tenth- or eleventh-century audience', and this is certainly true also of the ninth century. There are any number of reasons why a bishop of Chieti might want a copy of a metropolitan *ordo*: as record of a council he had attended, as a model for his own smaller synod, or for intellectual interest. In this version, for example, there are many long speeches, comprising citations of Alcuin and Isidore.

The Capitulary, unique to this manuscript and perhaps also gathered by Arn of Salzburg (Schneider 2007: 480–5), was an obvious accompaniment to a council *ordo*, since it extracts two chapters from a previous authoritative ruling: Charlemagne's *Capitulare Ecclesiasticarum* (of between 805 and 813), addressed directly to his bishops instructing them to teach the faith correctly and keep the peace.⁴⁰ But this capitulary also has a unique prologue, with an admonition from the emperor, depicting him sending out his *missi* (overseers) and demanding *emendatio* (emendation) and *corrigerere* (correction) from all of society in some of the most characteristic vocabulary of the Carolingian project.⁴¹ It focuses particularly on the bishop's role, to oversee through the authoritative canons:

the whole people, first of all over his secular canons, then similarly over abbots and monks and abbesses and consecrated virgins, over the counts and judges, admonishing (*ammonendo*) each one justly.⁴²

Hence, our pontifical also contains a guidebook for the bishop to the Carolingian project, and his duties in that, now going beyond the liturgical. Given that our manuscript offers a narrative of a bishop's liturgical roles and, therefore, his most distinctive responsibilities and rights, it is telling that the pontifical, once completed, also contained this admonition to the bishops from Charlemagne.

⁴⁰ Schneider, 2007: 474–5, text at 493–8: the *Capitulare Ecclesiasticarum* at Boretus, 1883: 275–80.

⁴¹ Schneider, 2007: 488. On the terminology: Smith, 2003; Barrow, 2008.

⁴² Schneider, 2007: 488–9, 'super populum scilicet universum, super suos primo canonicos, deinde super abbates et monachos similiter et abbatissas et deo virgines consecratas, super comites et iudices, ammonendo unumquemque iugiter'; Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 60v.

With Theodorich's appeal to Louis the Pious as he built a *canonica*, this text shows that the bishops of Chieti were aware of their responsibilities as Carolingian bishops, seeing their activities as linked to the emperor's will, and as part of a broader empire-wide programme that was led by bishops.

What now accompanies these texts is the *ordo Romanus* for Holy Week, whose title is simply FERIA V IN CENA DOMINI.⁴³ Originally it fell at the very end, but it now comes in the middle of two disordered halves of section three. Fols. 64v and 65r are in one hand, but on 65v a new hand intervenes, in a darker and less genteel script, to continue the text until it ends halfway through the ceremony of Good Friday, itself entitled *In Parasceven* (Rasmussen, 1998: 396; 'On Good Friday'). One assumes that originally the text continued with Holy Saturday. Rasmussen (1998: 396) again offered the closest edition. For Maundy Thursday: '*Pontifical Romano-Germanique* 99, 222, 252–6, 267, 270–83, *Ordo Romanus* L, 25;21, 60–8, 83–104'. For Good Friday: '*Pontifical Romano-Germanique* 99:304–7, *Ordo Romanus* L:27:1–12'. He identified the text with pieces from the Holy Week section of *Ordo Romanus* L, a part of the so-called *Pontifical Romano-Germanique* (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. V, 1961). OR L is a combination of many different sources, *ordines* and prayers, into a narrative of the liturgical year, appearing only in manuscripts after 950. Vat. Lat. 7701 thus offers an early version of what must have been a source text. Since we now know that the *Pontifical Romano-Germanique* never existed in a single manuscript as Andrieu imagined, but its coherence must arise from movements going back to the ninth century, such possible source texts have become of great importance (Parkes, 2015: 75–101). Elaborated versions of it are also found in two twelfth-century Italian pontificals: one in Macerata, and one from Chieti itself, Vat. Lat. 7818, also examined by Andrieu (Andrieu, 1931–61, vol. II, 1948: 52–61, 92–3; Gyug, 1981: 394; Reynolds, 1985: 438–44.).

This *ordo* seems designed for use in a small, urban cathedral like Chieti. For example, it suggests that the bishop would reserve some of Maundy Thursday's Host for Good Friday, to communicate then as well.⁴⁴ Again, this was a Frankish norm in contradiction with Roman practice (*Liber Officialis*, I.15.1, Hanssens, 1948: 107). Furthermore, it seems liturgically coherent with the whole of Vat. Lat. 7701, and, as such, suited to accompany a GVIII. The minor orders who take part in the ceremony of Maundy Thursday are those listed in the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*.⁴⁵ The Chrism Mass is appropriately situated in the ceremony of Maundy Thursday, and textual parallels link it back to *Missale Chrismale* in our manuscript. *Et intrat in consecratione emitte* (Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 65r) would refer to the prayer *Emitte, quaesumus, domine spiritum*

⁴³ 'Thursday, the Lord's Supper'.

⁴⁴ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 65v, 'et det ad seruandum usque in mane die parasceue ad communicandum'.

⁴⁵ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 65r, 'interim lectores ostiariis acolitis et subdiaconis ordinans se et stabunt per ordinem secundum eorum gradum'.

sanctum paraclitum (Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 10–11).⁴⁶ Again, the *scola* (representing the canons of San Giustino) is involved.⁴⁷

CORRECTIO IN CHIETI AND LITURGY IN ITALY

This survey makes it plain that Vat. Lat. 7701 passed through the hands of one who performed its rituals, the bishop of Chieti. This would also explain the manuscript's relatively plain aspect. Yet, some significant features give it resonance with more general priorities visible in the liturgical discourse beyond the Alps. Such texts not only described how to perform liturgy, they also prescribed a certain way of thinking about it. To which bishop exactly we owe Vat. Lat. 7701 remains unclear. Perhaps it was either Petrus, active at the time of a council in 853, or Theodorich II, to whom Pope John VIII wrote a letter in 880 (Ughelli, 1720: 670–3; Pelligrini, 1990: 247). But that bishop and his *canonica* certainly were working with Frankish texts, seeing themselves within a Carolingian programme.

The other two manuscripts from Chieti round out the picture of the diocese. In Reg. Lat. 1997, the Gelasian ordinations attach themselves quite naturally to a canonical collection which has numerous Frankish elements, including the colophon of Sigipert, amanuensis of Angilram of Metz (Supino-Martini, 1977: 136). Amidst their other additions, later scribes added extracts from the 860 synodical letter of a Frankish bishop and arch-chaplain to the court, Remigius of Lyons (d.875), implying full and sustained access in Chieti to the broader European episcopal dialogue.⁴⁸ This episcopal dialogue, as Patzold (2008) has shown, helped bishops to constitute and define themselves as an *ordo* at the same time as the first pontifical manuscripts in the style of Vat. Lat. 7701 constituted and defined their liturgical duties. These distinctive interpolations reveal that the bishops of central Italy were as much a part of this dialogue as those across the Alps, with whom Patzold dealt more extensively. The contents of the miscellany, Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 229, are a typical sweep of authorities found in other examples of Carolingian miscellany manuscripts: Isidore's *De Officiis* and other writings, Bede's *De Tempora Rationum*, and anonymous texts on the Creed which have an obvious teaching function (Supino-Martini, 1977: 149).⁴⁹ One of these is entitled TRACTATIO SYMBOLI AD COMPETENTES, i.e. it is for laypeople around baptism.⁵⁰ Such tracts are

⁴⁶ 'And he enters into the consecration: Emitte'; 'Send forth, we beseech, Lord, thy holy Spirit, the Paraclete ...'

⁴⁷ Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 64v–65v, 'Scola autem statim ut iussum fuerit inponat introitum ad missam cum psalmo et Gloria uel uersu et christeleison'; 'ueniens unus de scola paratus reaccipiens ampullam', etc.

⁴⁸ On fol. 1r; Supino-Martini, 1977; Pelligrini, 1990: 269.

⁴⁹ For contents, Holder, 1970: 521–7; Keefe, 2012: x, and one of the Creed tracts at 101–3.

⁵⁰ Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 229, fol. 54r, 'A Tract on the Symbol for *Competentes*.' This is edited at Keefe, 2012: 97–8.

attested across the Frankish world, and were tools for education (Keefe, 2002: vol. I: 143–57). This miscellany also encloses a set of prayers of that Carolingian genre called *libellus precum*, personal devotional guides (Wilmart, 1940; Salmon, 1974: 123–94).⁵¹ The content of these prayers certainly deserves a study of its own; here they serve to confirm that the scriptorium of Chieti was copying Frankish types of texts. With these manuscripts considered, some of the interventions in the ordination ritual are better contextualized.

Thus, the evidence appears to suggest that we see Chieti's scriptorium as a centre for the dissemination of the Carolingian programme in the heart of Italy. It was incorporated by Theodorich within a *canonica* whose founding manifesto was openly imperial Frankish. Given the destruction of Chieti in 801, mentioned in the *Annales Regni Francorum*, it is unlikely that many books survived, or that the liturgy had continued uninterrupted in the cathedral of Saint Thomas. Undoubtedly, entirely new Carolingian books and texts were brought into Chieti for copying. Given certain indications above, it seems that these books came largely from the Rhine Valley and Bavaria, both areas also having liturgically fertile links with the north of Italy. That the Chieti miscellany, Karlsruhe Aug. Perg. 229, later came to the monastery of Reichenau on Lake Constance is suggestive. In fact, parts of the manuscript cohere so well with certain texts in Reichenau's book lists that it is quite probable that exemplars for it originated there as well (Supino-Martini, 1977: 149–50).

A way into the broader Italian context is furnished by another piece of liturgy in Reg. Lat. 1997. On the final folio (160v) a set of *laudes* were written by another supplementing hand (Gaudenzi, 1916: 376, n. 1). *Laudes* were ritual invocations of Christ and the saints, asking their intercession, here presented to be sung on Christmas and saint's days.⁵² These *laudes* give us a Carolingian vision of hierarchy, with each level of society prayed for in turn: Pope, Bishop, Emperor, Empress, princes, judges, armies of Christians and the clerics (Kantorowicz, 1946: 59–62). For the last, invocations are offered in the first person, indicating that these *laudes* were written for the canons of San Giustino to sing themselves into place in the ideal Carolingian society. The Emperor and Empress are named Louis II of Italy (d.875) and his wife Engelberga, giving an obvious *terminus ante quem*.⁵³ Among the saints invoked is Giustino, the first bishop of Chieti, but before him come several Merovingian Frankish patrons: Medardus of Soissons, Eligius of Noyons, Remigius of Rheims and Vedastus of Cambrai (Pelligrini, 1990: 269, n. 167). The church dedication litany in Vat. Lat. 7701, in a somewhat similar format, invoked the aid of God for the 'emperors'.⁵⁴ It does not

⁵¹ For problems with the idea of *libelli precum* in scholarship and some sage discussion of historiography, see Boynton, 2008: 255–7.

⁵² Reg. Lat. 1997, fol. 160v, 'In Christi nomine, incipit laudes de natiuitas domini siue in et in sanctorum cuilibet.'

⁵³ Reg. Lat. 1997, fol. 160v, 'Domno nostro hludiuico a deo coronato magno et pacifico imperator ... angelberge imperatrice salus et uita.'

⁵⁴ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 57v, 'Respondit scola ... imperatoribus uita.'

seem likely, as Rasmussen pondered (1998: 394), that the plural implied parallel intercession for the Emperor in Constantinople. More likely it was simply copied blindly, an anachronism from an era when there were two emperors in the West.

The potency of the *laudes* in the Italian context is attested by their presence in a number of pontifical manuscripts from the north. Verona Biblioteca Capitolare 92 (Verona, 814–17) and Cologne Dombibliothek 138 (north Italy, first quarter of the ninth century) offer them, and the eleventh-century manuscript Rome Biblioteca Nazionale Sessorianus 52 (Nonantola) copied from a ninth-century exemplar with *laudes* also praising Louis II.⁵⁵ All three are *ordo Romanus* manuscripts treated by Andrieu (1931–61, vol. 1, reprinted 1965: 471–6), representing his so-called ‘Collection B’. These manuscripts gathered a set of *ordines* narrating episcopal responsibilities: church dedication (OR XLI), baptism, Holy Week, ordination on the Ember Days (*ordo de sacris ordinibus*). In this, they are entirely parallel to Vat. Lat. 7701. They extracted from the Gelasian Sacramentary just as Vat. Lat. 7701 did, taking from it the same ordination rite and the consecrations of vessels. It is significant that Collection B also gathered *laudes*. *Laudes* passed into Italian pontificals from their original setting in Psalters once they became a feature of the episcopal Mass exclusively, that is, when they became another particular liturgical signifier of a bishop (Kantorowicz, 1946: 87). Verona, home of Verona 92, presents a particularly striking history. The bishop to whom we owe that pontifical was Ratold (770–840/58), a Frank educated at the abbey of Reichenau, as was his predecessor, Egino, and successor, Noting (Meerseemann, Adda and Deshusser, 1974: 3). During this tripartite Frankish episcopacy, Caroline minuscule script was brought to Verona, and to Ratold himself is attributed the foundation of a *scola sacerdotium* at Verona. This was a canonical community like Theodorich’s at Chieti (Meerseemann, Adda and Deshusser, 1974: 3–15; Ferrari, 1979: 270–1). Taking Verona 92 as representative of the episcopal liturgy Ratold performed, his Frankish upbringing could have conditioned him to use certain texts like the GVIII. Milan also incorporated certain key Frankish liturgical practices (some recognizably from the GVIII) and formed a canonical community under a Frankish bishop, Angilbert II (824–59).⁵⁶ These examples show that Theodorich’s activity in Chieti was part of a broader pattern. Undoubtedly, these appointments were intended to bring the bishoprics and their resources under the control of those loyal to the imperial crown, rather than those dreaming of the old Lombard hegemony. But the cultural and specifically liturgical effects of this policy are less well known. The Frankish

⁵⁵ For Verona 92, Andrieu, repr. vol. I, 1965: 367–73; Bischoff, 1998–2014, vol. III, 2014: 469; the Verona *Laudes* are edited in Meerseemann, Adda and Deshusser, 1974: 188–90; for Cologne 138, Andrieu, repr. vol. I, 1965: 101–8; located to Italy by Bischoff, 1998–2014, vol. I, 1988: 401; for Sessorianus 52, Andrieu, repr. vol. I, 1965: 287–94; the Sessorianus *laudes* are edited in Morin, 1897: 481–8.

⁵⁶ Borella, 1948: esp. 98, ‘Angilbert II, che li chiamò dall Francia a Milano, era ... “franco e pervaso di spirito franco”.’

bishops who came to Italian sees were educated with a Frankish understanding of episcopal duty, assuming that their responsibility was to enact *'correctio'*, and they undoubtedly communicated with other Frankish bishops across the Alps about how to do that. What resulted from their efforts would vary depending on the bishop himself and what was peculiar to the see. Yet, judging by Chieti, Verona and Milan, it included the formation of canonical communities and certain interventions in the liturgy, perhaps even inaugurated by the production of a pontifical.

Even if just nominally, Carolingian emperors certainly saw it as their duty to patronize 'correct' liturgy (Hen, 2001: 87–94). Therefore, it is interesting that Louis II himself may be linked more directly to our manuscript. Regarding the *laudes* in Reg. Lat. 1997, Gaudenzi (1916: 376–7) suggested a connection with Louis II's expedition against the Saracens in the south of Italy, 865 or 866. Perhaps, he supposed, clerics from Chieti had attended the Emperor and his wife at Pescaria and *laudes* were composed for the occasion.⁵⁷ It is certainly possible. Yet Vat. Lat. 7701 offers a more direct link to that campaign. The final blessing in the Benedictional of Vat. Lat. 7701, unique to this manuscript, is entitled *BENEDICTIO SUPER EXERCITUM ITURUM AD PROELIUM*.⁵⁸ It runs:

Omnipotens pater deus deorum rex regum et dominus dominorum translator in inelius communatorque regnorum benedicat uos atque custodiat preueniendo comitando et subsequendo proficiscendis in eius nomine **contra gentes paganorum**. Amen.⁵⁹

Surely the *gentes paganorum* cannot be other than the Saracens against whom Louis II sallied in 865/6? If so, this may more clearly date our pontifical to those years. Vat. Lat. 7701 was certainly not a dedicatory or presentation copy for the Emperor himself to see. Yet the presence of Louis II might have spurred the bishop of Chieti to the production of a new ritual book, representing the Frankish ideals of *correctio* he and his *canonica* were inculcating in the heart of Italy, a book which also defined his own authority in Frankish terms. This is certainly a fascinating 'human story' hidden in Vat. Lat. 7701's unassuming pages. The prayers added in eleventh-century Beneventan Script to the manuscript's last folios, signs of continued use and opportunity for further study, suggest that this Carolingian story continued to speak in Italy for generations to come.⁶⁰

Address for correspondence:

Dr Arthur Westwell

Paulinstrasse, 90/92, 54292 Trier, Germany

westwell@uni-trier.de

⁵⁷ Kantorowicz, 1946: 85, suggests Emperor Louis and his wife were at Chieti itself.

⁵⁸ Vat. Lat. 7701, fol. 56v; 'Blessing over an army going to battle'; for analogues, McCormick, 1986: 347–50.

⁵⁹ Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 56v–57r; 'The almighty father, god of gods, king of kings and lord of lords, carrier in perils, and the corrector of kingdoms, bless you and guard those setting forth, commanding and following in his name **against the pagans**. Amen.'

⁶⁰ Vat. Lat. 7701, fols 74r–87v; Rasmussen, 1989: 396.

REFERENCES

- Andrieu, M. (1931–61) (ed.) *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols, vol. I reprinted 1965. Louvain, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.
- Andrieu, M. (1948) (ed.) *Le Pontifical romain du moyen âge I*. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Angenendt, A. (1982) Die Liturgie und die Organisation des kirchlichen Lebens auf dem Lande. In *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto Medioevo: espansione e resistenza*: 169–226. Settimane di Studio del centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 28.
- Angenendt, A. (1992) Der 'richtige Kult' als ein Motiv der karolingischen Reform. In P. Ganz (ed.), *Das Buch als magisches und als Repräsentations-objekt*: 117–35. Wiesbaden, Harrossowitz.
- Banting, H. (1989) *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals* (Henry Bradshaw Society 114). London, Boydell and Brewer.
- Barrow, J. (2008) The ideas and application of reform. In J.M.H. Smith and T. Noble (eds), *The Cambridge History of Christianity III, 600–1100*: 345–62. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bischoff, B. (1998–2014) *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der Wisigotischen)*, 3 vols. Wiesbaden, Harrossowitz.
- Borella, P. (1948) Influssi carolingi e monastici sul Messale Ambrosiano. In *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlberg I*: 73–115. Rome, Edizioni liturgiche.
- Boynton, S. (2008) Libelli precum in the central Middle Ages. In R. Hammerling (ed.), *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*: 255–7. Leiden, Brill.
- De Jong, M. (1995) Carolingian monasticism: the power of prayer. In R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History II: c. 700–900*: 622–53. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- De Jong, M. (2005) Charlemagne's church. In J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne. Empire and Society*: 103–35. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Deshusses, J. (1971) (ed.) *Le sacramentaire grégorien: ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits I*. Freiburg, Éditions universitaires.
- Diesenberger, M., Meens, R. and Rose, E. (eds) (2016) *The Prague Sacramentary: Culture, Religion, and Politics in Late Eighth-Century Bavaria*. Turnhout, Brepols.
- Dumas, A. (1981) (ed.) *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 169). Turnhout, Brepols.
- Ellard, G. (1933) *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 A.D.* Cambridge (MA), The Mediaeval Academy of America.
- Feller, L. (1998) *Les Abruzzes médiévales: Territoire, économie et société en Italie centrale du IXe au XIIIe siècle*. Rome, École française de Rome.
- Ferrari, M. (1979) Libri liturgici e diffusione della scrittura carolina nell'Italia settentrionale. In *Culto cristiano: politica imperiale carolingia*: 265–80. Todi, Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 28.
- Gaudenzi, A. (1916) Appendice Prima: sui codici di Adriano III venuti a Nonantola e le falsificazioni romane del 769. *Bulletino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano* 37: 313–419.
- Gittos, H. (2013) *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Gittos, H. and Hamilton, S. (2015) (eds) *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*. Farnham, Ashgate.
- Gros, M.S. (1969) L'ordo pour la dédicace des églises dans le Sacramentaire de Nonantola. *Revue Bénédictine* 79: 368–74.
- Gyug, R. (1981) A Pontifical of Benevento (Macerata Biblioteca Comunale, Mozzi-Borgetti 378). *Mediaeval Studies* 51: 355–423.
- Hamilton, S. (2011) The Early Pontificals: the Anglo-Saxon evidence reconsidered from a continental perspective. In D. Rollason, C. Leyser and H. Williams (eds), *England and the*

- Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of William Levison*: 411–28. Turnhout, Brepols.
- Hanssens, J.M. (1948) *Amalarii Episcopi Liturgici Operi* II (*Studi e testi* 140). Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Hartmann, W. (1984) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Concilia Aevi Carolini* III. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Heiming, O. (1984) (ed.) *Liber Sacramentorum Augustodunensis* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 169B). Turnhout, Brepols.
- Hen, Y. (2001) *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)*. Woodbridge, Boydell & Brewer.
- Hen, Y. (2011) The romanization of the Frankish liturgy: ideal, reality and the rhetoric of reform. In C. Bolgia, R. McKitterick and J. Osborne (eds), *Rome across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c. 500–1400*: 111–23. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hen, Y. and Meens, R. (eds) (2004) *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Holder, A. (1970) *Die Handschrift der Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe V. Die Reichenauer Handschriften*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Jones, C. (2005) The Chrism Mass in later Anglo-Saxon England. In H. Gittos and B. Bedingfield (eds), *The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church*: 105–42 (Henry Bradshaw Society, Subsidia 5). Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer.
- Kantorowicz, E. (1946) *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship*. Oakwood, University of California Press.
- Keefe, S. (2002) *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*, 2 vols. Notre Dame, Indiana University Press.
- Keefe, S. (2012) (ed.) *Explanationes Symboli Aevi Carolini* (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 254). Turnhout, Brepols.
- Kéry, L. (1999) *Canonical Collections in the Early Middle Ages (ca.400–114): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature*. Washington DC, The Catholic University of America Press.
- Knibbs, E. (2014) *On the Liturgy*, 2 vols. Cambridge (MA), Harvard University Press.
- Kurze, E. (1895) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* VI. Hannover.
- McCormick, M. (1986) *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- McKitterick, R. (1977) *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789–895*. London, Royal Historical Society.
- McKitterick, R. (1997) Unity and diversity in the Carolingian Church. In R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Studies in Church History 32): 59–82. Cambridge (MA), Blackwell.
- Meerseemann, G., Adda, E. and Deshusses, J. (1974) (eds) *L'orazione dell'archidiacono Pacifico e il carpusum del cantore Stefano*. Freiburg, Edizioni Universitarie Friburgo Svizzera.
- Mercati, G. (1902) *Antiche reliquie liturgiche (Studi e testi* 7). Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Metzger, J. (1914) *Zwei Karolingische Pontifikalen vom Oberrhein*. Freiburg, Herder.
- Migne, J.P. (1845) *Patrologia Latina* XX. Paris.
- Migne, J.P. (1853) *Patrologia Latina*. CXXX. Paris.
- Miller, M.C. (2000) *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy*. Ithaca (NY), Cornell University Press.
- Morin, G. (1897) Notice sur un manuscrit important pour l'histoire de symbole. *Revue Bénédictine* 14: 481–8.
- Morin, G. (1913) Un opusculé de l'époque carolingienne sur la raison d'être des Quatre-Temps. *Revue Bénédictine* 30: 231–43.

- Morin, J. (1695) *Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiae ordinationibus secundum antiquos et recentiores Latinos, Graecos, Syros et Babylonios in tres partes distinctos* (second edition). Amsterdam.
- Palazzo, E. (1990) Le rôle des libelli dans la pratique liturgique du haut Moyen Âge: histoire et typologie. *Revue Mabillon* 62: 9–36.
- Parkes, H. (2015) *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books, Ritual and Music in Mainz, 950–1000*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Patzold, S. (2008) *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts*. Ostfildern, Thorbecke.
- Pellegrini, L. (1958) *Abruzzo Medievale: un itinerario storico attraverso la documentazione*. Altavilla Silentina, Studi Storici Meridionali.
- Pellegrini, L. (1990) La città e il territorio nell'alto medioevo. In *Chieti e la sua provincia*: 591–3. Chieti, Amministrazione provinciale.
- Perels, E. and Dümmler, E. (1925) (eds) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Epistolae Karolini Aevi* IV. Berlin, Wiedmann.
- Rasmussen, N.K. (1976) Unité et diversité des pontificaux latins aux VIII, IX et X siècles. In *Liturgie et l'Église particulière et liturgie de l'Église universelle* (Conférences Saint-Serge): 393–410. Rome, Edizioni Liturgiche.
- Rasmussen, N.K. (1987) Célébration épiscopale et célébration presbytérale: un essai de typologie, 581–600 / Discussione sulla lezione Rasmussen, 602–3. In *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale*. Spoleto, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto medioevo 33.
- Rasmussen, N.K. (1998) *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge: Genèse du livre de l'évêque*, ed. M. Haverals. Louvain, Spicilegium Sacrum Louvaniense.
- Reynolds, R. (1972) The *De Officiis vii Graduum*: its origin and development. *Mediaeval Studies* 34: 113–51.
- Reynolds, R. (1975) A ninth-century treatise on the origins, office and ordination of the bishop. *Revue Bénédictine* 85: 321–32. Reprinted as Article V in 1999, *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Reynolds, R. (1985) A South Italian ordination allocution. *Mediaeval Studies* 47: 438–44. Reprinted as Article XIV in 1999, *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Reynolds, R. (1990) The ritual of clerical ordination of the Sacramentarium Gelasianum saec. viii: early evidence from Southern Italy. In P. De Clerck and E. Palazzo (eds), *Rituels: Mélanges offerts à Pierre-Marie Gy, o.p.*: 437–44. Paris, Cerf. Reprinted as Article XII in 1999, *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Reynolds, R. (1995) The organization, law and liturgy of the western Church, 700–900. In R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History II: c.700–c.900*: 587–621. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Reynolds, R. (1999) Addenda to South Italian ordination rites. In *Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages*. Aldershot, Ashgate: 1–24.
- Rose, E. (2005) *Missale Gothicum* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 169D). Turnhout, Brepols.
- Rosso, U. (2003) Chieti. In U. Rosso and E. Tiboni (eds), *L'Abruzzo nel medioevo*: 583–93. Pescara, EDIARS.
- Saint-Roch, P. (1987) *Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 169C). Turnhout, Brepols.
- Salmon, P. (1974) *Analecta Liturgica: Extraits des Manuscrits Liturgiques de la Bibliothèque Vaticane (Studi e testi 273)*. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Schmid, A. (1987) Bayern und Italien vom 7. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert. In H. Beumann and W. Schröder (eds), *Die Transalpinen Verbindungen der Bayern, Alemannen und Franken bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*: 51–92. Sigmaringen, Jan Thorbecke Verlag.
- Schneider, H. (1996) (ed.) *Die Konzilsordines des Früh- und Hochmittelalters, Monumenta Germaniae Historiae: Ordines de caelebrando concilio*. Hannover, Hahn.

- Schneider, H. (2007) Karolingische Kapitularien und ihre bischöfliche Vermittlung. Unbekannte Texte aus dem Vaticanus latinus 7701. *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 63: 469–96.
- Smith, J.M.H. (2003) ‘Emending evil ways and praising God’s omnipotence’: Einhard and the uses of Roman martyrs. In K. Mills and A. Grafton (eds), *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing* (Studies in Comparative History): 189–223. Rochester (NY), University of Rochester Press.
- Smith, J.M.H. (2015) Relics: an evolving tradition in Latin Christianity. In C. Hahn and H.A. Klein (eds), *Saints and Sacred Matter: The Cult of Relics in Byzantium and Beyond* (Dumbarton Oaks symposia and colloquia): 41–60. Washington DC, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection.
- Supino-Martini, P. (1977) Per lo studio delle scritture altomedievale italiane: la collezione canonica chietina (Vat. Reg. Lat. 1997). *Scrittura e Civiltà* 1: 133–55.
- Ughelli, F. (1720) *Italia Sacra siue de episcopis Italiae* VI. Venice.
- Vogel, C. (1965) La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne. In W. Braunsfels (ed.), *Karl der Grosse Lebenswerk und Nachleben II: Das geistige Leben*: 217–32. Dusseldorf, L. Schwann.
- Vogel, C. (1979) Les motifs de la romanisation du culte sous Pepin le Bref (751/768) et Charlemagne (774/814). In *Atti del XVIII Convegno di Studi sulla spiritualità medievale*: 15–41. Perugia.
- Vogel, C. (1986) *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, revised and translated by W. Storey and N.K. Rasmussen. Washington DC, Pastoral Press.
- Vyoukal, E., (1913) Les examens du clergé paraissoit à l’époque carolingienne. *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 14: 81–96.
- Werminghoff, A. (1906) (ed.) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia Aevi Karolini* II, pt 1. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Werminghoff, A. (1908) (ed.) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia Aevi Karolini* II, pt 2. Hannover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Wilmart, A. (1940) (ed.) *Precum Libelli Quattuor Aevi Karolini*. Rome, Ephemerides liturgicae.
- Witt, R. (2011) *The Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.