

Byzantium of original scriptural exegesis in favour of the *florilegium* of patristic sources, Krueger makes the important point that the replacement of the earlier forms was not complete or absolute. The earlier mode of exegetical hymnody continued to be performed through this period in conjunction with the newer *kanons*. The increasing convergence of the ‘cathedral’ and ‘monastic’ rites in Byzantium after the ninth century meant that lay audiences were also exposed to *kanons* written originally for monastic communities. Although the main evidence presented here is textual, the author integrates Byzantine works of art into the discussion at several points in a way that both enhances the argument for the formation of the penitent self and points indirectly to the dissemination of these models beyond the texts under discussion. Krueger’s lucid text is supported by ample and up-to-date documentation. While contemporary theorists make only occasional appearances by name, their impact is evident throughout as an aid to the sustained focus on the way in which the liturgy both scripted and reflected the Byzantine self. This book opens up new perspectives within liturgical scholarship, asking not only what the Byzantines heard and saw in the liturgy, but how what they heard and saw shaped their own view of themselves. It is thus a work of enormous value to anyone seeking a deeper understanding of Byzantine religious experience.

QUEEN’S COLLEGE,
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

WARREN T. WOODFIN

Liturgy and society in early medieval Rome. By John F. Romano. (Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West.) Pp. xii + 308. Farnham–Burlington, Vt: Ashgate, 2014. £70. 978 1 4094 4393 3
JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S0022046915002377

The Church of Rome in the early Middle Ages arguably shaped ecclesiastical life for all of medieval Christendom, so it remains the focus of intense scholarly activity. Given the apparent centrality of Roman liturgy to the rest of the world, it remains puzzling that its analysis has not hitherto been a key tool for examining medieval Roman history. Historians often eschew liturgy as a source, perhaps because it requires such technical knowledge, or maybe because some think that it remained marginal to daily life or the workings of power. Romano’s book, developed out of a 2007 PhD dissertation, boldly attempts to promote liturgy as a source. He claims that prayer and liturgical ritual were the primary means by which the bishops and priests of Rome communicated with Romans and the world. The core of the book is the analysis and translation of *Ordo Romanus I*, the first extant liturgy of the papal mass at Rome, dating from the late seventh century. Romano has published research on this document before, but here it receives robust treatment – not a revision of M. Andreiu’s critical edition, but a ‘rereading’ calibrating the weight given to certain manuscripts and a circumspect study in the light of broad historical questions. Romano is clearly correct to lament the insularity of early medieval liturgical studies and to stress the need to study Rome and its liturgical development as part of a larger process of constructing authority for the bishop of Rome. His study, however, avoids engaging with the social history which would help us make sense of all this liturgy – laity as audience (mostly as

pilgrims) appear only very briefly in this Church-driven view of medieval Rome. We know very little about lay prayer and practice, and virtually nothing about monastic liturgy. All of our preserved sources are papal, but it does not follow that all the liturgy of Rome was directed at promoting the papacy. Further, the ‘canny’ use of liturgy to ‘order the papal court’ was surely not the end in itself of the carefully orchestrated ceremonies and the textual and visual apparatus that accompanied them. The bishops of Rome had mundane as well as religious aims in marshalling and manipulating the thoughts and hearts of Romans and non-Romans alike. These issues of interpretation aside, the book achieves one of its main aims: it makes the liturgy of early medieval Rome come alive as well as newly accessible and intelligible to the wider audience of scholars and students of medieval Rome.

BIRKBECK COLLEGE,
LONDON

CAROLINE GOODSON

The formation of Christian Europe. The Carolingians, baptism and the imperium christianum. By Owen M. Phelan. Pp. ix + 312. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. £65. 978 0 19 871803 1

JEH (67) 2016; doi:10.1017/S002204691500233X

Owen Phelan’s monograph offers a rich and wide-reaching study of Christian formation in the Carolingian world. Building upon excellent recent scholarship on Carolingian *correctio* and early medieval baptism, Phelan argues that, under the Carolingians, baptism came to occupy a central place in the Christian reform movement and in the creation and maintenance of a Christian political community. In short, not only did baptism act as the ‘most basic organizing principle’ (p. 1) for the *imperium christianum*, but ideas associated with it also constituted the most enduring part of the Carolingian legacy. While these claims to overwhelming significance are somewhat overplayed, Phelan’s work nevertheless serves as an important contribution which will be appreciated by scholars and students of early medieval Christianity alike.

Phelan engages convincingly with recent work – most notably, that of Mayke de Jong – which seeks to break down perceived barriers between the ‘secular’ and ‘religious’ in the Carolingian world. Chapter i, which skilfully traces the semantic development of the concept of *sacramentum* (to be rendered into English by the paired concepts of ‘oath’ and ‘sacrament’) sets the scene in this regard: as Phelan writes, there existed ‘a very deliberate correspondence cultivated by Carolingian leaders between civil and religious obligations anchored in the [imperial] *sacramentum*’ (p. 36). Phelan is undoubtedly right to highlight the dual significance of this concept, which structured inclusion in the Carolingian political order and in the Christian *ecclesia* alike. Yet while he argues convincingly for the importance of baptism as a *sacramentum* (pp. 42–7), the primacy that he allots to baptism among *sacramenta* in subsequent chapters is never explicitly demonstrated. At certain points, his analysis overreaches in this regard, for instance when taking Nithard’s *Historia*, among other works, to ‘confirm that the *sacramentum* of baptism structured Carolingian moral analysis’ (p. 217).