

*The Cloister and Beyond:
Regulating the Life of the Canonical Clergy in
Francia,
from Pippin III to Louis the Pious*



Stephen Ling

Submitted for the degree of Ph.D

School of History (2015)

University of Leicester

For Lucy.

Abstract

Stephen Ling: The Cloister and Beyond: Regulating the Life of the Canonical Clergy in Francia, from Pippin III to Louis the Pious.

Frankish ecclesiastics exerted great effort in defining and regulating the life of the canonical clergy between the reigns of Pippin III and Louis the Pious. Church councils and assemblies convened by Carolingian kings, such as the Synod of Ver (755) and the Council of Aachen (816), sought to impose order. These councils distinguished between three interrelated groups: the secular clergy, the canonical clergy and monks. Separating the lives of these orders was no easy task, as there was significant debate over the definition of each group. In response to these queries and admonitions, bishops regulated the life of the clergy in their diocese. Notably, Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766) produced the first extant rule for canons. This text has attracted much historiographical attention and is often seen as providing the basis for the influential Canonical Institute produced at the Council of Aachen (816). This thesis examines the interplay between central attempts to establish the norms of the life of canons and local response to such efforts. Focusing on the latter demonstrates the variety of approaches taken towards the regulation of the clergy in this period and concludes that the significance and impact of Chrodegang's Rule has been overstated. The thesis is divided into three parts. Part I investigates how the canonical clergy were defined as a group. Part II examines the different local texts and traditions used to regulate the clergy between c. 750 and 813. Finally, part III provides a detailed textual analysis of the Canonical Institute (816), highlighting that this prominent text drew widely on a variety of different traditions used to regulate the clergy, establishing concordance out of diversity.

Preface: A Note on Hyperlinks

Due to the word limit of this thesis I have provided stable hyperlinks to digitised primary source collections that are in the public domain, including the dMGH. These links are embedded in the references contained in the footnotes and will be functional in the electronic version of this thesis.

Acknowledgements

Without the aid, support, and advice of my friends and family this thesis would be a lesser work. Over the last four years Jo Story has offered sound advice and kind words, no one could have asked for a better supervisor. My research has benefitted from the wider medieval community at the University of Leicester. In particular I wish to thank Helen Foxhall Forbes, Morn Capper, and Chantal Biemann for many useful conversations. Likewise, Matthew Potter, Charlotte Ball, Megan Leyland, Freya Brooks, Pragya Vohra Moon have been supportive friendly faces throughout this process. I must also thank the members of the Latin Reading Group, particularly Chris Mitchell, who commented on many of the Latin translations contained within this thesis. His help with Bern manuscript is much appreciated. Lucy Brunt, Nicole Peterson, Daniel Ryan, Natalie Ling and David Ling all acted as proof-readers for the various chapters contained within this thesis, their observations and corrections have improved this work. For sharing their thoughts on the Bern MS., I thank David Ganz and Charles West, and for allowing me to see an advanced copy of her chapter of Hincmar of Rheims, I thank Rachel Stone. For their moral and financial support over the last decade, I thank my parents, David and Tricia Ling. Finally this thesis is dedicated to my fiancé, Lucy Brunt. Her moral and intellectual support throughout this process has been invaluable.

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 9
Part I: <i>Definitions</i>	
Chapter 1: Categorizing the clergy in Francia, c.750–c.840	p. 22
Part II: <i>Local Regulation</i>	
Chapter 2: Bishops and the Monasticised Clergy (c. 750–784)	p. 64
Chapter 3: Regulating the ‘life’ of the clergy c. 785–813	p. 100
Chapter 4: The 813 Councils and the regulation of the canonical clergy	p. 130
Part III: <i>Concordance</i>	
Chapter 5: The Canonical Institute (816): establishing concordance from local traditions	p. 159
Conclusion	p. 199
Appendix	p. 206

List of Tables

Table 1:	Contents of Rome, BAV, Pal. lat. 485.	p. 49
Table 2:	The Structure of the Rule of Chrodegang and the Canonical Institute	p. 176
Table 3:	Sources for the Divine Office within the Canonical Institute	p. 177
Table 4:	Contents of Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS. AA. 90. 11	p. 211

Abbreviations

<i>AL</i>	<i>Annales Laureshamense</i> [Annals of Lorsch], (ed.), G. H. Pertz, MGH, SS. I (Hanover, 1826) pp. <u>22-39</u> ; extracts trans., P. D. King, <i>Charlemagne: Translated Sources</i> (Kendal, 1987) pp. 137-145
<i>Alcuin, Ep.</i>	<i>Alcuini sive Albini epistolae</i> , (ed.), Ernst Dümmler, MGH, <i>Epistolae Karolini Aevi</i> , II, <i>Epp. III</i> (Berlin, 1895) pp. <u>1-493</u> ; extracts trans., S. Allott, <i>Alcuin of York: His Life and Letters</i> (York, 1974)
<i>AMP</i>	<i>Annales Mettense Priores</i> [Earlier Annals of Metz] (ed.), B. von Simson, MGH, <i>SRG in Usum Separatim Editi</i> , X (Hanover, 1905), pp. <u>1-98</u>
<i>ANS</i>	<i>Anglo-Norman Studies</i>
<i>ARF</i>	<i>Annales regni francorum</i> [Royal Frankish Annals], (ed.), F. Kurze, MGH, <i>SRG in Usum Separatim Editi</i> , VI (Hanover, 1895); trans., B. Scholz, <i>Carolingian Chronicles</i> (Ann Arbor, MI, 1970), pp. 35-127
<i>ARF (rev.)</i>	<i>Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi</i> [Revised Royal Frankish Annals], (ed.), F. Kurze, MGH, <i>SRG in Usum Separatim Editi</i> , VI (Hanover, 1895); trans., B. Scholz, <i>Carolingian Chronicles</i> (Michigan, 1970), pp. 35-127
<i>Astronomus</i>	<i>Vita Hludowici Imperatoris</i> , [The Astronomer], (ed.), E. Tremp, MGH, <i>SRG in Usum Separatim Editi</i> , DXIV, (Hannover, 1995), pp. <u>279-559</u> ; trans., T. F. X. Noble, <i>Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan and the Astronomer</i> (Pennsylvania, PA, 2009) pp. 226-303
<i>BAV</i>	Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
<i>Bischoff, Katalog</i>	B. Bischoff, <i>Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)</i> , Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der Mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz / Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 3 vols (Wiesbaden, 1998–2014), Vol. 1: Aachen – Lambach, Vol. 2: Laon – Paderborn, Vol. 3: Padua-Zwickau
<i>Capit. I, II</i>	<i>Capitularia Regum Francorum</i> , (eds.), A. Boretius and V. Krause, MGH, <i>Leges Sectio III</i> , 2 vols. (Hanover, 1883-97)

<i>Capit. Epis.</i> , I, II	<i>Capitula Episcoporum</i> , (eds.), P. Brommer et al. MGH, <i>Leges Sectio VI</i> , 2 vols., (Hanover, 1984 and 1995)
CC	<i>Codex Carolinus</i> , (ed.), W. Gundlach MGH, <i>Epistolae Merovingi et Karolini aevi I</i> (Epp. III) (Berlin, 1892), pp. <u>476-657</u>
CCCM	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis</i>
CCM	<i>Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum</i>
<i>Conc.</i> II.1, II.2	<i>Concilia aevi karolini</i> II.1 and II.2 (ed.), A. Werminghoff, MGH, <i>Leges Sectio V</i> , 2 vols., (Hanover, 1906-1908)
<i>Dipl. Kar.</i> I	<i>Die Urkunden der Karolinger I: Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Großen</i> , (eds.), E. Mühlbacher et al., MGH, <i>Diplomata Karolinorum I</i> (Hanover, 1906)
EHR	<i>English Historical Review</i>
EME	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
EnlR	<i>Regula Longior Canoniorum seu Regula S. Chrodegangi Interpolata</i> , [The Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang], (ed. and trans.), J. Bertram, <i>The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary</i> (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 184-286
IC	<i>Institutio Canoniorum Concilii Aquisgranensis</i> a. 816 [The Canonical Institute] (ed.), A. Werminghoff, MGH, <i>Conc.</i> II.1 (Hanover, 1906), pp. <u>307-421</u> ; extracts trans., J. Bertram (ed. and trans.) <i>The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary</i> (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 132-175
LEM	<i>Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus</i> , (ed. and trans.), D. Kempf, <i>Paul the Deacon, Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus: Edition, Translation, and Introduction</i> . (Paris, 2013), pp. 48-91
LP	<i>Liber Pontificalis</i> [Book of the Popes], (ed.), L. Duchesne, <i>Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire</i> , Vol. I. (Paris, 1886); trans., R. Davis, <i>The Lives of the Eighth Century Popes</i> (Liverpool, 1992)
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
SS	<i>Scriptores</i>
SRG	<i>Scriptores rerum Germanicarum</i>

<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistolae</i>
<i>Epp.</i>	<i>Epistolae</i> (in Quart)
<i>Conc.</i>	<i>Concilia</i>
<i>Capit.</i>	<i>Capitularia</i>
<i>Dipl.</i>	<i>Diplomata</i>
 <i>NCMH</i>	 <i>New Cambridge Medieval History</i>
 <i>ODNB</i>	 H. C. G. Matthew et al., (eds.), <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i> (Oxford, 2004)
 <i>PL</i>	 <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , (ed.), J. P. Migne, <i>Patrologia Cursus Completus, Series Latina</i> , 221 vols. (Paris, 1841-1866)
 <i>RB</i>	 <i>The Rule of Saint Benedict</i> , (ed. and trans.,) B. L. Vernerde (London, 2011)
 <i>RC</i>	 <i>Regula Sancti Chrodegangi</i> , [Chrodegang's Rule], (ed. and trans.,) J. Bertram, <i>The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary</i> (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 27-84
 <i>SCH</i>	 Studies in Church History
 <i>TRHS</i>	 <i>Transactions of the Royal Historical Society</i>

Introduction

The eighth and ninth centuries witnessed an increasing focus on defining and regulating the life of the clergy within Francia. Generally speaking, there were two types of cleric in this period: the canonical clergy who lived semi-monastic lives within the cloister, and the diocesan extra-claustral clergy who dealt with the pastoral needs of the laity. These clergy served the Frankish Church alongside an extensive network of monastic houses. Throughout the eighth and ninth centuries the Frankish kings and their bishops sought to define, regulate, and order the lives of both groups of clergy. Texts such as Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750), Theodulf of Orléans' First Episcopal Statute (c. 798), and the Canonical Institute (816) were all created with this purpose in mind. This process of defining and regulating the clerical order is the subject of this thesis, which focuses primarily on the period between 750 and 816. It explores the different attempts to regulate the lives of the clergy across the Frankish realm and assesses the impact of key texts such as Chrodegang's Rule. It will demonstrate that throughout this period local approaches to the regulation of the clergy dominated, and argue that the status of Chrodegang's Rule has been widely overstated.

i. Overview

Chrodegang, Archbishop of Metz (754–66), and his *Regula Canonicorum* loom large in any discussion of Carolingian attempts to regulate the life of the canonical clergy. Chrodegang's text, composed around 750, was the first rule written specifically for the canonical clergy and as such, has received much historiographical attention. Scholars such as Semmler, Morhain and, Claussen have emphasised the importance of this text and its wider influence particularly on the Canonical Institute issued at the Council of Aachen in 816.¹ Historians have tended to ascribe any mention of canonical clergy, rules for canons, or general commands for the clergy to live canonically, to the influence of Chrodegang's Rule. Semmler noted that the testament of Bishop Remi of Strasbourg (788) referred to the canonical clergy of his Cathedral

¹ J. Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', in F. Knöpp *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764* (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 229-245; Ewig, 'Saint Chrodegang et la Reform de L'Eglise Franque', in *Saint Chrodegang. Communications Présentées au Colloque Tenu à L'Occasion du douzième Centenaire de sa Mort* (Metz, 1967), pp. 25-53; E. Morhain, 'Origine et Historie de la <<Regula Canonicorum>> de Saint Chrodegang', in *Miscellanea Pio Paschini, Studi di Storia Ecclesiastica*, vol. 1 *Lateranum*, N.S. XIV, pp. 173-185; M. A. Claussen, *Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 61-62.

and thus, postulated that this community was following the Rule of Chrodegang.² Likewise, McKitterick suggests that the community of St Denis lived according to a rule similar to that of Chrodegang's.³ Key documents such as the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 (c.70), which commands canons to live 'in conformity with their Rule [*suam regulam*]', have also been seen as representative of an interest in Chrodegang's text.⁴ Yet, while both the *Admonitio Generalis* and the Canonical Institute were circulated widely and survive in numerous manuscripts, only four copies of Chrodegang's original rule are extant.⁵ As some have acknowledged, this small number of manuscripts makes it difficult to detect the direct influence of Chrodegang's text.⁶ Three key documents may offer an insight into the variety and heterogeneity of the life of canons in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. Crucially, these documents were issued by the court and thus represent the concerns of the Carolingian emperor and his chief advisors.

The first two of these documents are briefing papers issued by Charlemagne in 811, perhaps as part of the preparations for the five regional Church Councils held across the empire in 813.⁷ These *capitula* are titled: 'Capitulary on Matters to be discussed with Counts, Bishops, and Abbots' (hereafter 811A), and 'Capitula About

² Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237, fn. 108; *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Strassburg*, (ed.), W. Wiegand (Strasbourg, 1879), no. 16, pp. 11-14.

³ R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians, 751-987* (London, 1983), pp. 58-59, 110-111 and 279.

⁴ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek, et al., *Die Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usus Scholarum Separatim Editi*, XVI (Weisbaden, 2013), c. 71, pp. 224-227; *Admonitio Generalis*, 789, (ed.), MGH, *Capit I*, c. 73, p. 60; trans., P. D. King, *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Kendal, 1987), p. 217; see also: J. Barrow, 'Review Article: Chrodegang his Rule and its Successors', *EME* 14:2 (2006), p. 202; N. P. Brooks, 'Was Cathedral Reform at Christ Church Canterbury in the Early Ninth Century of Continental Inspiration?', in H. Sauer and J. Story (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon England and the Continent* (Tempe, 2011), p. 305.

⁵ Bern, Burgerbibliothek 289 (Metz, s. viii/ixⁱⁿ); Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 94 (Western France, possibly the vicinity of Tours, s. ix^{2/3}); Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. Lat. 555 (Franco-German border area, s. ix¹, possibly at Lorsch during the xvi); Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 81 (Orval/ Luxembourg, s. xi/xii). For discussion of the manuscripts of Chrodegang's Rule in both its original and enlarged form see: B. Langefeld, *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang* (Frankfurt, 2003), pp. 31-55; Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos., 570 and 6539. For details of manuscripts containing the *Admonitio Generalis*, see: H. Mordek et al. (eds.), *Die Amonitio Generalis*, pp. 63-112. For details of manuscripts containing the Canonical Institute see: H. Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium Regum Francorum Manuscripta* (Munich, 1995), pp. 1045-1061.

⁶ Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 203; Brooks, 'Cathedral Reform' p. 305.

⁷ J. L. Nelson, 'The Voice of Charlemagne' in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.) *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 76-88; M. E. Moore, *Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300-850* (Washington D. C., 2011), p. 279.

Matters to be discussed With Bishops and Abbots' (hereafter 811B).⁸ The documents are not conventional capitularies, if such a thing may be said to exist, rather, they are memoranda containing a list of questions for consideration of the key office holders of the kingdom.⁹ The capitularies were written in the first person and Nelson has argued that we may be able to detect the voice and personal interests of Charlemagne within them.¹⁰ Clauses 11 and 12 of 811A are particularly salient to any discussion of the regulation of canons and monks in the empire. The author asked:

11. About the life of those who are called canons, what sort ought it to be?¹¹

12. About the *conversatio* of monks, and whether any can be monks except those who observe the Rule of Benedict. It must be asked if there were monks in Gaul before the tradition of the Rule of St Benedict reached these dioceses.¹²

Both of these statements demonstrate the ill-defined nature of the life of the canonical clergy and the monastic order. Nonetheless, clause 12 shows a clear preference for monks to follow the Rule of St. Benedict. By comparison, clause 11 does not refer to or show favour for, any specific canonical rule or set of precepts. At the very least this illustrates there was debate around which texts ought to be used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy. 811B also develops the themes of the earlier memorandum and in clause 10 the author returned to his musings on the life of the monastic and canonical orders, asking:

In which of the canons or in the rule of which holy father is it laid down that anyone can be made a cleric against his will? And where did Christ command, or which apostle preached, that a community should be formed in a church of canons or monks consisting of persons unwilling or refusing or low-born?¹³

⁸ *Capitula Tractanda cum Comitibus Episcopis et Abbatibus*, MGH, *Capit.* 1., no. 71, pp. 161-162; and *Capitula de Causis cum Episcopis et Abbatibus Tractandis*, MGH, *Capit.* 1., no. 72, pp. 162-164; For a translation of these memoranda see J. L. Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', pp. 85-88.

⁹ Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', pp. 76-88.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 80-85.

¹¹ *Capitula Tractanda*, p. 161; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', p. 86.

¹² *Ibid.*.

¹³ *Capitula de Causis*, p. 163; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charleamagne', p. 87.

Here then the variety of canons, and rules, that might be drawn upon when regulating the life of the canonical clergy and the monastic order were acknowledged. If this precept referred to Chrodegang's Rule, it did so alongside other traditions.

The Canonical Institute of 816, so often seen as Chrodegang's Rule writ large, also suggests that a variety of texts and traditions were used to regulate the canonical clergy of the Frankish realm. Addressing this variety and perhaps offering an answer to questions raised in the 811 capitularies, may be the very *raison d'être* of the Canonical Institute, as its prologue clearly stated:

The emperor also desired that, because the definition of the way of life of the canonical clergy was dispersed in many places among the sacred canons and the sayings of the holy Fathers, the Council should confer, and agree to extract from the said sacred canons and writings of the holy Fathers a pattern for that way of life, for the benefit of the simple and less educated.¹⁴

The evidence of these important texts suggests that the pre-eminence of Chrodegang's Rule cannot be assumed. In order to understand Carolingian attempts to define and regulate the life of the canonical clergy a more holistic approach must be taken. This thesis takes such an approach and will investigate the use and influence of Chrodegang's Rule alongside normative texts, such as Theodulf of Orléans' First Episcopal Statute (c. 798). It will focus on the interplay between the efforts of the court to establish the norms of the canonical way of life, and local responses to such attempts. The thesis is split into three parts— Part I: *Definitions*; Part II: *Local Regulation*; and Part III: *Concordance*.

Part I: *Definitions* comprises a single chapter, and seeks to understand how Carolingian churchmen defined the canonical clergy as a distinct group. The chapter examines the terminology used to describe different types of cleric in Carolingian capitularies, such as the Capitulary for the Missi (802), and other documents such as the Rule of Chrodegang (c. 750). It examines the role of the cloister in defining different groups of clerics and explores the conceptual difference between canons, extra-claustral clerics, and 'secular' clergy. It argues that the communal holding of property was a defining feature of the order of canons, who did not take monastic vows of

¹⁴ IC, p. 312; trans. J. Bertram, *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries* (Aldershot, 2005), p.132.

poverty but also gave up some of their rights to private property.

Part II: *Local Regulation* consists of three chapters and examines the various local attempts to regulate the life of the canonical clergy from c. 750-813. This section assesses the impact and spread of Chrodegang's Rule. Chapter 2 focuses on the period between c. 750 and c. 785, which was dominated by the prominent figures of Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766), Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784), and Wilicar of Sens (d. c.785). The different approaches taken towards the regulation of clergy by these figures and their contemporaries is examined at length. The mid 780s form a useful demarcation point, and with the deaths of Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785) and Fulrad of St. Denis (784), a new group of ecclesiastics came to dominate the court.¹⁵ Chapter 3 analyses the regulation of the clergy by this new court milieu, and discusses the period between c. 785 and 813. The role of Angilramn of Metz (d. 791), who served as archchaplain of the palace and primate of the Frankish Church, receives particular attention. His interest and promotion of Chrodegang's Rule will be discussed at length. This chapter also examines the role of Alcuin (d. 804) and Theodulf of Orléans (d. 821) as well as the texts associated with these influential thinkers. The *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and Theodulf's First Statute (c. 798) are subjected to close analysis. Finally, Hildebald of Mainz (d. 818), who succeeded Angilramn as archchaplain, will also receive much attention. This interesting and under-studied figure played a prominent role in the regulation of the clergy.¹⁶ As archchaplain of the palace he oversaw the convening of the Synod of Frankfurt (794), the Council of Mainz (813), and very likely played a prominent part in the creation of the Canonical Institute (816). Chapter 3 addresses his early years as archchaplain and his continuation of the work begun by Angilramn of Metz (d. 791). Meanwhile, Chapter 4 focuses exclusively on the 813 councils and analyses the local attempts to regulate the clergy that may be detected within their findings. Part II will therefore place Chrodegang's Rule in its wider context, and demonstrate the varied approaches taken towards the clergy during the reigns of Pippin III (d. 768) and Charlemagne (d. 814).

Part III: *Concordance* comprises a single chapter, which focuses solely on the

¹⁵ D. A. Bullough, 'Aula Renovata: The Carolingian Court before the Aachen Palace', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71, (1985), pp. 267-301.

¹⁶ For an overview of Hildebald's career see: D. A. Bullough, 'Charlemagne's Men of God: Alcuin, Hildebald, Arn', in Story (ed.) *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 142-146; D. Espelo, 'A Testimony of Carolingian Rule: The Codex Epistolaris Carolinus as a Product of its Time' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Universiteit Utrecht, 2014), pp. 30-36 and 61-79.

Canonical Institute issued at the 816 council of Aachen. Through a close textual analysis of the Institute, this chapter analyses the different texts and traditions used to create this most influential document.¹⁷ It examines how those gathered at Aachen in 816 made use of Chrodegang's Rule, as well as other texts including: the Rule of Benedict; Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute; and the works of Isidore of Seville. This analysis shows that the authors of the Institute drew widely on the different traditions used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy between the 750s and 816. From these various texts they sought to find concordance and establish the very essence of the canonical life.¹⁸

ii. Historiographical Background

ii.a. The Enclosed Clergy and the Pastoral Clergy

At the outset it is important to discuss the historiographical background that surrounds this topic. The regulation of the clergy in the Carolingian world has long attracted scholarly attention, but over the course of the last decade the study of the clergy has come of age. Scholars such as Claussen, de Jong, van Rhijn and Bertram have offered new insights into the definition and regulation of both the enclosed and pastoral clergy.¹⁹

This thesis is particularly indebted to the important work on Chrodegang's Rule undertaken by Claussen, Bertram, and Langefeld.²⁰ Claussen's masterful *Reform*

¹⁷ For the impact of the Canonical Institute see: Barrow, *The Clergy in the Medieval World: Secular Clerics, Their Families and Careers in North-Western Europe* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 81-85; R. Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Dom Kapiteln in Deutschland* (Bonn, 1976), pp. 250-260; M. Gaillard, *D'une réforme à l'autre (816-934): les communautés religieuses en Lorraine à l'époque carolingienne* (Paris 2006), pp. 124-147.

¹⁸ This approach is inspired by Choy's recent discussion of Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia Regularum*: R. Choy, 'The Deposit of Monastic Faith: The Carolingians on the Essence of Monasticism', in P. D. Clarke and C. Methuen (eds.), *The Church on its Past*, SCH 49 (2013), pp. 74-87.

¹⁹ Notable publications on this subject include: Claussen, *Reform*; M.A. Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis: The Acts of the Apostles, Chrodegang's Regula Canonicorum and Early Carolingian Reform', in D. Blanks, M. Frassetto and A. Livingstone (eds.), *Medieval Monks and their World: Ideas and Realities: Studies in Honour of Richard Sullivan* (Boston, MA, 2006) pp. 119-146; C. van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period* (Turnout, 2007); M. de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum: The Cloister and Clerical Purity in the Carolingian World', in M. Frassetto (ed.), *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform* (London, 1998), pp. 49-80; Barrow, *Clergy*; Barrow, 'Chrodegang', pp. 201-212; B. Langefeld, *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang* (Frankfurt, 2003); Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*.

²⁰ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*; Claussen, *Reform*; Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis', pp. 119-146; Langefeld, *Old English*.

of the Frankish Church provides an excellent analysis of the content of Chrodegang's Rule. He not only discusses the structure of the text but also Chrodegang's sources and includes a detailed analysis of the relationship between the *Regula Canonorum* and the Rule of St. Benedict.²¹ As well as examining the Benedictine aspects of the *Regula Canonorum*, Claussen identifies the Roman and Gallic sources selected by Chrodegang for use within his rule.²² Despite these useful observations, Claussen does not discuss the influence of Pope Zachary's 747 letter to the Frankish court.²³ A more significant flaw in Claussen's analysis is his assumption that Chrodegang's Rule was immediately influential, and spread quickly throughout Francia.²⁴ He presents a teleological interpretation of the relationship between Chrodegang's Rule and the Canonical Institute (816). This thesis will demonstrate that these assumptions do not stand up to scrutiny.

Bertram's translations of Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750), the Canonical Institute (816), and the Enlarged Rule (c.850) afford further insights. While he does not provide a full edition of the Canonical Institute (816), he does transcribe and translate the final 31 chapters that form a discreet rule for canons.²⁵ As Bertram's critical aim is to introduce his translations he does not provide the equivalent level of analysis provided by Claussen. Nonetheless by highlighting the importance of Pope Zachary's letter to the Frankish court (747), and making detailed textual observations on the *regula* contained within the Canonical Institute (816), he offers an insightful analysis. Importantly he notes that the Canonical Institute contains only 'verbal echoes' of Chrodegang's Rule and he therefore rejects the teleological approach that directly associates these two texts.²⁶

Langefeld's main focus is on the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang (compiled c. 850), and she provides a translation of the Old English version of the text produced in the eleventh century.²⁷ The Enlarged Rule lies beyond the chronological framework of this thesis. However, as well as this translation, Langefeld analyses the four

²¹ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 58-166.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 166-206.

²³ CC. no. 3, pp. 479-487.

²⁴ Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 208; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 61-62.

²⁵ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 132-175.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 85-86.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-86.

manuscripts containing the original Rule of Chrodegang (composed c. 750) and the ten manuscripts of the Enlarged Rule (c. 850).²⁸ Her summary of these documents has proved very useful as she notes the associated texts that which were bound with Chrodegang's Rule. These additional texts, particularly Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute, served a regulatory purpose in their own right and may have been used in an enclosed setting. While complementing Chrodegang's Rule, these normative texts also presented alternative traditions that were used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy, and will be closely examined in this thesis.

While the regulation of the enclosed clergy has attracted much attention, the work of van Rhijn has brought a new understanding of Carolingian attempts to control and regulate the life of the pastoral clergy. Her analysis of the series of Episcopal Statutes produced in two waves between c. 789 and c. 875 has much to offer this study. Van Rhijn's discussion of inter-linked nature of canon law books, capitularies and episcopal statutes, offers great insights into how the provisions of these documents were used to regulate the life of clergy.²⁹ Although she does not extend her examination to the enclosed clergy, following van Rhijn's approach this thesis will discuss the link between canon law and the regulation of the clergy, both within the cloister and outside it. Despite van Rhijn's many useful observations, her exclusive focus on the pastoral clergy means she does not consider the possible role episcopal statutes played in regulating life within the enclosure.³⁰ Much like Claussen she also overstates the influence of Chrodegang's Rule.

De Jong's observations on the importance of the cloister as a site of clerical education that safeguarded the clergy's ritual purity are also important to this study.³¹ As she points out, the boys trained in the cloisters' schools maintained an old boy network, and examining such networks is crucial to understanding the relationship between the canonical clergy and the extra-claustral clergy.³² In a similar vein the various discussions around the provision of pastoral care in Anglo-Saxon England has helped to inform the approach taken in this thesis. The debate around the so-called

²⁸ Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 31-55.

²⁹ van Rhijn, *Shepherd's of the Lord.*, pp. 1-49, 101-112 and 139-156.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-9.

³¹ de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. 49-80; M. de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996) pp. 126-156

³² de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. 58-60.

‘minster hypothesis’, which argued that the provision of pastoral care was the primary goal behind the foundation of most minsters, has created a nuanced understanding of the role of the monastery within wider society.³³ In particular Cubitt has examined the relationship between enclosed clerical communities and the provisional pastoral care outside the bounds of the cloister.³⁴ Building upon Cubitt’s work, Thacker has suggested that English priests in the seventh and eighth centuries were highly mobile, living within communities but traveling widely to provide pastoral care to those who lived in the countryside.³⁵ As will be discussed in Part I, this model can be expanded to the Frankish Church and it appears the extra-claustral clergy were expected to involve themselves in the life of enclosed communities and ‘old boys’ seem to have maintained close links with their motherhouses, namely their home institutions.³⁶

ii.b. The concept of reform and the problems of a teleological approach

Thus far the word ‘reform’ has not been mentioned. This is a deliberate choice as the term is problematic, particularly when applied to the regulation of the clergy in the eighth and ninth centuries. As Barrow, Smith, and Reuter have noted, this phrase and its modern meanings are often inaccurately applied to the early medieval past.³⁷

³³ For contributions to this debate see amongst others: J. Blair (ed.), *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition, 950-1250* (Oxford, 1988); S. Foot, ‘Parochial Ministry in Early Anglo-Saxon England: The Role of Monastic Communities’ in W. J. Sheils (ed.) *The Ministry Clerical and Lay*, SCH 26 (Woodbridge, 1989) pp. 43-54; J. Blair and R. Sharpe (ed.) *Pastoral Care Before the Parish* (Leicester, 1992); J. Blair, ‘Debate: Ecclesiastical Organization and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England’, *EME* 4.1 (1995) pp. 193-212; E. Cambridge and D. Rollason, ‘Debate: The Pastoral Organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church: a review of the ‘Minster Hypothesis’, *EME* 4.1 (1995) p. 87-104; S. Foot, ‘The Role of the Minster in Earlier Anglo-Saxon Society’, in B. Thompson (ed.), *Monasteries and Society in Medieval Britain* (Stamford, 1999) pp. 35-58; J. Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 1-8; S. Foot, *Monastic Life in Anglo-Saxon England c. 600-900* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 1-31.

³⁴ C. Cubitt, ‘The Clergy in Early Anglo-Saxon England’ *Historical Research*, vol. 78, no. 201 (August, 2005), pp. 273-287; C. Cubitt, ‘Images of St Peter: The Clergy and the Religious Life in Anglo-Saxon England’, in P. Cavell (ed.), *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England: Approaches to Current Scholarship and Teaching* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 41-54.

³⁵ A. Thacker, ‘Priests and Pastoral Care in Early Anglo-Saxon England’ in G. Brown and L. Voigts (eds.), *The study of medieval manuscripts of England: Festschrift in Honor of Richard W. Pfaff* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 187-208.

³⁶ The merits of such an approach have been pointed by Mériaux. See: C. Mériaux, ‘Orde et Hiérarchie au Sein du Clergé Rural Pendant Le Haut Moyen Âge’, in F. Bougard, D. Iogna-Prat & R. Le Jan (eds.) *Hierarchie et Stratification Sociale Dans L’Occident Medieval (400-1100)*, (Turnhout, 2008), p. 132.

³⁷ J. Barrow, ‘Chrodegang’, p. 208; J. Barrow, ‘Ideas and Applications of Reform’, in J. M. H. Smith and T. F. X. Noble (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity 3: Early Medieval Christianities, c.600- c.1100* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 345-360; J. M. H. Smith, ‘Emending Evil Ways and praising

The Carolingians used the phrase *reformare* sparingly, usually in the context of the punishment of serfs.³⁸ While the concept of reform is used widely by historians who examine the process of change in this period, it is seldom mentioned within our sources. Instead the normative texts which sought to regulate the life of the clergy called for correction, emendation, and renewal. Some view the medieval terms *correctio* and *renovatio* as synonyms for our modern word reform. McKitterick, for example, uses the words *correctio* and reform interchangeably.³⁹ As such Carolingian calls for *correctio* are often viewed as part of a wider ‘reform programme’ that spanned the reigns of Pippin III, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. Charlemagne’s *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and his so-called ‘programmatic capitularies’ are seen as keen statements of reforming intent.⁴⁰ Meanwhile, the reign of Louis the Pious and his grand imperial Church councils are seen as the pinnacle of the reform movement.⁴¹ This overly teleological approach is problematic. The idea of a ‘reform programme’ with ‘programmatic capitularies’ suggests the Carolingian kings had a clear concept of how the Church should be re-ordered, yet the 811 memoranda illustrated Charlemagne’s confusion over the diversity of religious practices within his kingdom.⁴² Charlemagne was undoubtedly concerned to ensure his people worshipped and lived correctly, but in this task he was guided by the various approaches taken by his leading ecclesiastics, each of whom interpreted orthodoxy in different ways. The regional councils held in 813 demonstrate this point, although they are commonly discussed together, each council emphasised the local interests and traditions of the various territories that made the Frankish empire. Similarly Choy’s recent interpretation of Benedict of Aniane’s agenda when compiling his *Concordia Regularum* has demonstrated that this was not an attempt to enforce

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* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 189–92 and pp. 214–215; T. Reuter, ‘Kirchenreform und Kirchenpolitik im Zeitalter Karl Martells: Begriffe und Wirklichkeit’, in J. Jörg et al. (eds.), *Karl Martell in Seiner Zeit* (Sigmaringen, 1994), pp. 39–42.

³⁸ Barrow, ‘Chrodegang’, p. 208.

³⁹ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 237–243 and 292–382 (esp. 306–311); See also: Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 203–328; J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 258–292.

⁴⁰ See amongst others: McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 237–243; F. L. Ganshof, ‘Charlemagne’s Programme for Imperial Government’, in his *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971) pp. 55–86.

⁴¹ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 203–328; Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, pp. 258–292.

⁴² *Capitula Tractanda*, pp. 161–162; and *Capitula de Causis*, pp. 162–164; trans., Nelson, ‘Voice of Charlemagne’, pp. 85–88.

submission to the Rule of Benedict, but to discern the essence of monasticism from the various traditions that existed within Francia.⁴³ As such Aniane's text highlighted the common ground between such diverse practices, an approach that can also be detected within the Canonical Institute (816).⁴⁴

As part of these teleological interpretations of reform, Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750) has been too readily linked with the Canonical Institute (816). As will be shown in part III of this thesis, the two texts are very different in nature, and scholars such as Morhain and Claussen have overstated the influence of Chrodegang's work on the later text.⁴⁵ Claussen's teleological interpretation of Carolingian efforts to regulate the clergy is the major weakness of his work and he uncritically links Chrodegang with later Carolingian reformers:

In separating these groups [monks and canons] and clarifying their respective purposes, the success of Chrodegang is incontestable, first in Metz, and then, after 816, throughout the Frankish empire. And in this task of distinction, he set the stage for all the later reforms that affected the religious of Francia, including those of Charlemagne, Benedict of Aniane, and Louis the Pious.⁴⁶

Claussen is not alone in proclaiming the influence of the *Regula Canonicorum*. Despite the work of Langefeld and Bertram, who both discuss the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang, there is still a general confusion between Chrodegang's Rule (c.750) and the later Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang (c.850).⁴⁷ This illustrates the importance of considering the context in which each document was issued, rather than seeking to tie all attempts to regulate the clergy into a grand narrative of reform. This thesis will demonstrate that it is only through an examination of the interplay between central efforts to define and regulate the lives of the clergy, and local response to such attempts, that a full understanding of the regulation of clergy can be gained.

⁴³ Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', pp. 74-87.

⁴⁴ This focus on concord rather than unity was also suggested by McKitterick. R. McKitterick, 'Unity and Diversity in the Carolingian Church', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, SCH 32 (Oxford, 1996), pp. 59-83. See below Part III.

⁴⁵ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 1-66; Morhain, 'Origine et histoire', pp. 173-185.

⁴⁶ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 61-62.

⁴⁷ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 175-286; Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 11-15.

Part I: *Definitions*

Chapter 1: Categorising the clergy in Francia, c. 750-c.816

I. 1. Introduction

Before any discussion of the regulation of the canonical clergy can be undertaken, it is essential to set the parameters of this study by analysing the key terms, practices, signs and symbols, which ideologically distinguished the canonical clergy as an order within the Church. This chapter will address this thorny issue. It will first outline the difficulties in distinguishing between monks, canonical clergy and extra-claustral clerics in the early middle ages. Then, through an analysis of a variety of normative texts it will argue that although definitions were not fixed in this period, different attitudes towards property were an important ideological marker distinguishing monks, canons and secular clerics.

I.1.i. The difficulties of defining and distinguishing monks, canons and extra-claustral clerics in the Early Middle Ages.

Defining and distinguishing the different groups who lived a religious life in the early medieval world is not any easy task. Clerics and monks are often confused in the sources produced in the period, yet there was a key ideological difference between these two orders. Clerics performed sacramental, liturgical and pastoral duties and in so doing interacted directly with the laity and secular society.¹ They said masses, baptised the young, anointed the sick and dying. They granted absolution and instituted penitential acts. They gave sermons and interpreted the word of God for the laity. By comparison monks were meant to live secluded and ascetic lives, following a strict rule, and devoting their attention to the Divine Office and the daily round of prayers.² These ideological foundations were often blurred in reality. Monks could be ordained into clergy and sometimes fulfilled a pastoral role.³ Clerics who lived communally,

¹ For a discussion of these roles see amongst others : R. Reynolds, 'Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions', in his *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 1-31; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 27-71.

² Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 3-5.

³ T. L. Amos, 'Monks and Pastoral Care in the Early Middle Ages', in T. F. X. Noble & J. J. Contreni (eds.) *Religion, Culture and Society in the Middle Ages, Studies in Honour of Richard Sullivan* (Kalazmazoo, MI, 1987), pp. 165-180; M. de Jong, 'Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer',

known as canons, sought to live ascetic ‘regular’ lives, sleeping in one dormitory and performing the Divine Office. By adopting aspects of the monastic form of life these groups blurred the distinction between clergy and monks. As Paul the Deacon put it, the clergy of Metz lived ‘within the confines of a cloister in the image of a monastery’.⁴ Across the eighth and ninth centuries there was also debate surrounding the extent to which clerics tasked with pastoral care ought to be involved within enclosed communities. There was a concerted effort by Churchmen such as Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766) and Raban Maur (d. 856) to include diocesan priests in the key rituals of the enclosure. Chrodegang in particular had an inclusive attitude towards these extra-claustral clerics.⁵ By comparison, Hincmar of Rheims (d. 882), perhaps following the ideals of his mentor abbot Hilduin (d. 840), was critical of such practices within his own diocese.⁶

A variety of titles and terms were applied to different groups of cleric in a range of sources, including: papal letters; conciliar decrees; capitularies; episcopal statutes and the rules written for canons. They were referred to as ‘seculars’; ‘regulars’; ‘canons’; ‘canonical clergy’; or simply addressed as clerics; parochial priests; and *sacerdotes*. Identifying exactly what the authors of this period meant by these diverse titles represents something of a Gordian knot, and there has been a tendency to broadly apply the term ‘secular clergy’ to all clerics in this period. The use of this term has arisen as the clergy did not take vows of poverty and they are therefore seen as analogous to the more clearly defined secular clergy of the central and later middle ages. These ‘seculars’ owned property and lived less austere lives than their cousins, the ‘regular clergy’, who took vows of poverty, lived enclosed lives, and followed the Augustinian Rule.⁷ The use of the term ‘secular clergy’ therefore anachronistically and negatively compares the enclosed clergy of the early Middle Ages with the more

in R. McKitterick (ed.) *NCMH*, Vol. 2, pp. 623-629; J. Raaijmakers, *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c. 744- c. 900* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 187-188 and pp. 214-236; D. Parsons, ‘Some Churches of Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Southern Germany’, *Early Medieval Europe* 8.1 (1999) pp. 31-67.

⁴ *LEM*, pp. 86-87; see also: de Jong, ‘Carolingian Monasticism’, pp. 627-629; van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 40.

⁵ *RC*, p. 40, trans., p. 68; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 234-236.

⁶ Hincmar von Reims, *Viertes Kapitular, Capit. Epis.* II, p. 80; van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 6-8 and 139-145. For a discussion of Hilduin and Hincmar’s enforcement of a monastic way of life at St. Denis see Part II of this thesis.

⁷ For a discussion of this process and the clerical adoption of the Augustinian Rule in the eleventh century, see: Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 100-114.

disciplined form of life practised by the Augustinian canons.⁸ Even Bertram, who in 2005 edited and translated the Rule of Chrodegang, entitled his book: *The Chrodegang Rules – The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries*. Bertram acknowledges this problem and laments his title stating:

It was only after the eleventh and twelfth-century developments that a new distinction emerged between those communities of *canonici* who adopted the Rule of St Augustine and took vows including poverty, and those who did not. The former retained the title *canonici regulares* while the latter reluctantly accepted the label *canonici seculares*.⁹

Scholars such as van Rhijn and Claussen have popularised an alternative title, the ‘canonical clergy’, as a way of describing the clerics of the period who lived enclosed lives.¹⁰ This phrase was certainly more commonly used in the eighth and ninth centuries to describe the enclosed clergy and was favoured by Chrodegang of Metz (d. 755). However, this term is still imprecise as it was sometimes applied to those who lived beyond the bounds of the cloister, a point that will be explored within this chapter. Thus, Chrodegang discussed nearly all the clergy as ‘canonical’, whether they slept in the enclosure or not.¹¹ Even when straightforward terminology is used, it is often difficult to establish exactly who is being discussed. For example, the Synod of Ver (755) refers to both regular and secular clerics [*de clero quam de regularibus vel secularibus*] but it is difficult to know from the context if these regulars were monks, enclosed clergy or both.¹² Prior to the issuing of the Canonical Institute in 816, the lack of clear and widely accepted text that defined the way of life to be practised by canons, was a major stumbling block to establishing a clear distinction between monks and canons. As Part II of this thesis will demonstrate, during the reigns of Pippin III and Charlemagne local definitions and attempts to regulate the life of the canonical clergy dominated. Different ecclesiastics had their own definition of the canonical clergy, based on their understanding of canon law and on the local traditions within their

⁸ For a particularly strong espousal of such views see: J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction into England* (London, 1950), pp. 7-26.

⁹ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 4.

¹⁰ Claussen, *Reform*, particularly, pp. 206-248; van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 39-46.

¹¹ This is particularly notable in the description of the Sunday Chapter and meal which included those clerics who lived in the city: *RC*, c. 8, c. 21, c. 30. Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 91-92 and pp. 206-248.

¹² *Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, *Capit. I*, no. 14, c. 3, p. 33.

dioceses and foundations. One of the more unusual examples of this may be seen in Alcuin's discussion of the community led by Arn of Salzburg. In 802 Alcuin advised the bishop to:

Diligently examine any person who may congregate, any from the canons, any from the monks, and any who are given to the third grade, who fluctuate between the two, in a superior grade to canons and remaining inferior to monks.¹³

While this definition was accepted at Tours and in Salzburg, both of which may have had established mixed communities of canons and monks, it was criticised by others at court.¹⁴ In 802 Alcuin's community at Tours was lampooned for sometimes calling themselves 'monks [*monachos*], sometimes canons [*canonicos*] and sometimes neither [*neutrum*].'¹⁵

The plurality of approaches taken by ecclesiastics who sought to regulate and define the life of their clergy worried and vexed the Carolingian kings. At different points Pippin III (c. 747), Charlemagne (811), and Louis the Pious (816) all sought to clarify and define the exact form of life to be practised by monks and canons.¹⁶

Council and court documents admonished both groups to outwardly demonstrate their

¹³ Alcuin, *Ep.*, no. 258, p. 416; Bullough, 'What has Ingeld', pp. 99-101.

¹⁴ For a discussion of St. Martin's Tours and other mixed communities in the pre-Carolingian era see: L. Pietri, 'Les Abbés de Basilique dans la Gaule au VI^e Siècle', *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, vol. 69, no. 182, (1983), pp. 5-28. For a discussion of the debate over the way of life practised at St. Martins see: O. G. Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen und deistlichen Gemeinschaften im westfränkischen Bereich: Bestandteil des Quellenwerkes Societas et fraternitas Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften*. (Munich, 1978), pp. 120-134. The criticism leveled at the community in 802 certainly suggests that this site continued to have a mixed clerical-monastic community. Bullough argues that the Cathedral community at Salzburg had close links with the monastic foundation of St. Peter's. D. Bullough, 'What has Ingeld to do with Lindisfarne', *ASE*, 22 (1993), pp.100-101.

¹⁵ Alcuin, *Ep.*, no. 247, pp. 399-401, at p. 400; trans., S. Allott, *Alcuin of York. His Life and Letters* (York, 1974), no. 116, p. 122. For information on the context in which this letter was sent see: R. Meens, 'Sanctuary, Penance, and Dispute Settlement under Charlemagne: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans over a Sinful Cleric', *Speculum* 82 (2007), pp. 277-300; Bullough, 'What has Ingeld?', pp. 93-125; S. Collins, *The Carolingian Debate Over Sacred Space* (Basingstoke, 2012), pp. 91-121.

¹⁶ Around 747 Pippin III wrote to Pope Zachary requesting clarity on a number of ecclesiastical matters including the nature of life within episcopal communities. Pippin's letter is lost, but Zachary's response is preserved in: *CC*. no. 3, pp. 479-487; Charlemagne's concerns regarding the confusing nature of the life of canons is preserved in the briefing papers circulated in 811: *Capitula Tractanda*, pp. 161-162; and *Capitula de Causis*, pp. 162-164; For a translation of these memoranda see J. L. Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', pp. 85-88; Louis the Pious addressed the need to define the life of the canonical clergy in the prologue to the Canonical Institute of 816: *IC*, p. 312; trans, Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p.132.

way of life by wearing the garb associated with their order of the Church.¹⁷ Such expressions of function and mission were key to distinguishing monks from canons and offered a tool of correction, forcing the individual to state their chosen way of life in their outward appearance. As chapter 75 of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) stated:

To clerics it seems in all ways proper to use that those clerics who pretend, by dress or by name, to be monks, but who are not, ought to be corrected and set to rights, so that they be either true monks or true canons.¹⁸

The wearing of correct vestments in both houses of canons and monasteries was a sign that orthodoxy was maintained and at times was a clear expression of *correctio* in action. Thus when in 829 the community of St. Denis were forced to accept a new monastic custom they appeared before the emperor wearing their monastic *cuculli* as a sign of their renewed life.¹⁹ Likewise, despite the controversy that surrounded Alcuin's mixed community at Tours, his hagiographer described him entering heaven dressed correctly in the *dalmatica*, which was a sign of both his clerical office and his specific grade of deacon.²⁰ Emphasis was also placed on the importance of clergymen appearing in front of their bishop vested 'in the proper order' and the bishop was instructed to ensure his community were clothed in the correct manner.²¹ As Miller points out, the exchange of priestly and clerical garments helped to spread ideas of 'proper vesture', and by the end of the period the linen *cappa* had become standard clerical garb.²² Unsurprisingly having a uniform helped to promote uniformity at its

¹⁷ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), H. Mordek et al., *Die Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usus Scholarum Separatim Editi*, XVI (Weisbaden, 2013), c. 75, p. 228; *Admonitio Generalis*, 789, Capit I, no. 22, c. 77 p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218; *Duplex Legationis Edictum*, 789, Capit I, no. 23., c. 10, p. 63, trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 220; *IC*, c. 125, p. 397; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 154-155.

¹⁸ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), H. Mordek et al., c. 75, p. 228; *Admonitio Generalis*, 789, Capit I, no. 22, c. 77 p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218.

¹⁹ *Monuments Historiques*, no. 124, pp. 87-88. See also Beckonhofer, *Day of Reckoning*, pp. 13-14. This affair will be discussed in more detail in Part II.2.v.

²⁰ *Vita Alcuini*, (ed.) W. Arndt, MGH, *SS* 15.1 (Hanover, 1887), c. 27, p. 196; Bullough, 'What has Ingeld', p. 101, fn. 27. For a discussion of the *dalmatica* see: Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 21-22; 28-29 and p. 249.

²¹ *CC.*, no. 3, pp. 480-481; *RC*, c. 33, p. 49, trans., pp. 79-80; *Theodulfi Aurelianensis Episc. Capitula ad Presbyteros Parochiae Suae.*, *PL*, 105, col. 208; trans., McCracken and Cabisiss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 119-120. For an alternative version see: *Theodulf I*, c. 45, p. 141-142. The significance of these commands will be discussed in Part II. 3. iii.

²² Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, p. 29; *RC*, c. 29, p. 45, trans., pp. 74-75; *IC*, c. 115 and c. 125, p. 397 and p. 405; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 145 and p. 154. It should be noted that *Chrodegang*

most basic level.

Ensuring clerics and monks wore the correct clothing may have helped to promote external expressions of orthodoxy and correction, but as chapter 75 of the *Admonitio* made clear, wearing a certain type of clothing did not guarantee that canons and monks lived their lives according to their office. The blurred lines between these orders, even when vested ‘properly’, can be detected in the papal guidance issued to Pippin III by pope Zachary (c.747). Chapter 1 of this epistle addressed, ‘the honour due to metropolitans, chorbishops and parochial priests’, and contained a decretal written by Zachary himself stating:

So that a bishop might show his rank he should wear his robes; likewise too the priests and cardinals. And if they might wish to live holding to the monastic way of life [*monachica vita*] the low ranked who are subject to him [the bishop] shall pay respect to him dressed in clean robes, so that in secret they would serve their way of life in their hearts. Indeed he [God] does not entrust the honour of the robes, but the brilliance of the soul. In truth monks [wear] alike woollen robes and shall without pause make use of the rule of monastic discipline [*regulam monachicae disciplinae*], together with the admirable traditions of the venerable fathers. That is to say they renounce anything secular, conferring entire purpose to God, avoiding all illicit things from which they ought to abstain, in order that so much of their body might sustain their work, their only remuneration the reward that may be earned from God. The apostles of course were granted the divine order, he [God] ordered the use of two woollen tunics, not to be owned, [and] not [made of] linen. Therefore let he who will have obeyed the precept given by the Lord, hold fast to good deeds [and] he will have eternal life.²³

This influential tract emphasised the importance of clerical dress as a sign of rank and order within the episcopal community and also permitted a bishop and his parochial priests, ‘to live holding to the monastic way of life [*monachica vita*]’. While this statement offered useful guidance, it is easy to see how it obscured the distinction between the monastic and the clerical orders. Although Zachary advised that robes denote order and clerical rank, he did not give specifics and clerics were even

suggests the *Cappa* should be made of wool, whereas the Canonical Institute orders clerics to wear linen.

²³ CC., no. 3, pp. 480-481.

permitted to wear wool, something later prohibited by the Canonical Institute (816).²⁴ Rather than outward expressions of order, it was the exact nature of the internal life of monks, canons and priests that caused much discussion and debate between 750 and 816. As already noted in the introduction to this thesis, defining the precise way of life practised by canons and monks was one of the chief concerns addressed by the court in the briefing papers sent out to key officials in 811.²⁵ Even after the creation of the Canonical Institute in 816 conflicts and debate continued over which communities were monastic and which were canonical. At St. Denis abbot Hilduin struggled to enforce his interpretation of the monastic way of life onto the community who strongly opposed their abbot's understanding of the monastic rule.²⁶ While Hilduin's opponents considered themselves to be monastic, Louis the Pious and Hilduin saw them as canons, as they had 'ceased holding to the monastic life' having lived 'in accordance with the rule, although less perfectly.'²⁷ At the end of the period under examination within this thesis there was still a lack of consistency in the distinction between monks, canons and the pastoral clergy. Indeed, the problem of the blurring of the monks and canons grew in the tenth and eleventh centuries as increasing numbers of canons adopted monastic rules, and as an increasing number of monks became ordained priests.²⁸ These ambiguities and historiographical misconceptions make it difficult to see clear distinctions between monks, canons and extra-claustral clerics. Despite this, the various attempts to define and distinguish the clerical from the monastic slowly established a core set of principles which loosely defined the canonical clergy as a group. Through a close examination of texts, such as Chrodegang's Rule, Alcuin's letters and various capitularies, this chapter will draw out the core principles used to define the canonical clergy between the reigns of Pippin III and Louis the Pious.

²⁴ IC, c. 115 and c. 125, p. 397 and p. 405; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 145 and p. 154.

²⁵ *Capitula Tractanda*, pp. 161-162; and *Capitula de Causis*, pp. 162-164.

²⁶ The nature of the community at St. Denis will be discussed at length in Part II.2.v.

²⁷ *Imperiale De Restauratione Habitus Monachorum Beati Dyonisii*, (ed.) J. Tardif, *Monuments Historiques*, no. 124 (Paris, 1866), pp. 87-88; See also Beckonhofer, *Day of Reckoning: Power and Accountability in Medieval France* (Philadelphia, PA, 2004), pp. 13-14.

²⁸ G. Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 12.

I.1.ii. Defining the *Claustrum* in a clerical context.

The cloister lay at the heart of the religious life of monks, the canonical clergy, and also served as a model for extra-claustral clerics. As such this term will be used frequently within this thesis. Before a discussion of the definition of the canonical clergy can be undertaken it is essential to consider how Frankish Churchmen conceived of this holy and exclusive space, which preserved the ritual and ideological purity of the religious life.²⁹ The word cloister is commonly associated with the colonnaded quadrangle that is a defining archetype of monastic architecture. This model of the cloister became more common during the late eighth and ninth centuries and was a feature associated with houses of canons attached to episcopal seats.³⁰ Such features were also present in the idealised plan of St. Gall, produced around 817 for abbot Gozbert (d. 837).³¹ This design for the perfect monastery shows three distinct quadrangles which are demarked by the title *claustum*.³² These cloisters were designated for use by three groups of monks: *oblates*; the sick; and the main community.³³ While this model of the cloister, based around a central quadrangle, would become a standard of monastic architecture, the word *claustum* should not automatically be associated with such clear-cut designs. Older and variant forms of the cloister existed, for instance the prominent monastery of St. Riquier had an odd triangular shape.³⁴ Much like the clothing discussed above, such outward symbols of holiness were of secondary importance to the inner workings of the community. Returning to the plan of St. Gall, the buildings that surround the three

²⁹ de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. 49-80, esp., pp. 55-64

³⁰ Such features have been in Rouen at the Cathedral basilica of Notre Dame and its attached collegiate church of St. Stephen. See: C. Loveluck, *North West Europe in the Early Middle Ages, AD 600-1150* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 154-158. For a discussion of the development of the 'square cloister' alongside other forms see: W. Horn and E. Born, *The Plan of St. Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy of, and life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, Vol. 1, (London, 1979), pp. 241-257.

³¹ The plan can be viewed at: http://www.stgallplan.org/en/index_plan.html [Accessed, 25/03/2016]. For a discussion of the plans significance see amongst others: R. E. Sullivan, 'What was Carolingian Monasticism? The Plan of St. Gall and the History of Monasticism', in A. C. Murray (ed.) *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (London, 1998), pp. 251-288; Horn and Born, *The Plan of St. Gall*, Vol. 1, esp., pp. 20-25, pp. 241-257; C. M. Malone and W. Horn, 'The Plan of St. Gall and its effect on later Monastic Planning', in Horn and Born (ed.), *The Plan of St. Gall*, Vol. II, pp. 315-355.

³² <http://www.stgallplan.org/recto.html> [Accessed, 25/03/2016]

³³ Ibid; For a discussion of these features, see: Horn and Born, *The Plan of St. Gall*, Vol. 1, pp. 247-321.

³⁴ Horn and Born, *The Plan of St. Gall*, Vol. 1, p. 245, pp. 250-251.

cloisters offer an insight into the fundamentals that defined the communal life within such enclosures. Each *claustrum* was surrounded by a sleeping room or dormitory, a refectory with its service buildings of a cellar and kitchen, and of course a chapel or church. These key features are those picked by the authors of the normative texts which sort to apply the principles of the monastic life to the canonical clergy. As the council of Tours (813) put it:

We considered that the canonical clergy of the city, who dwell in the bishop's household. As they live in the the cloister, where they will easily be able to perform the canonical hours. Likewise may they all sleep in one dormitory, and similarly may they dine in one refectory.³⁵

Such statements neatly summarise the key features of the enclosed life and followed the general principles of monasticism as espoused in the Rule of Benedict. These buildings acted to maintain the purity of the monks and priests whose prayers and litanies, performed as part of the Divine Office, mediated between man and God.³⁶ This focus on purity is made clear within the Rule of Benedict, which states:

If when we want to propose something to powerful men, we do not presume to do so except with humility and reverence, how much more should we petition the Lord God of all things with all humility and pure devotion. Let us know that we will be heard not in loquacity but in the purity of heart and tearful compunction.³⁷

By living together 'in congregation', purity could be maintained through mutual supervision.³⁸ A common dormitory with separate beds ensured individuals would avoid the sinful temptations of the flesh. The young, who were more prone to sexual activity, were supervised by more senior members of the community who slept amongst them.³⁹ Dining together in community guaranteed that all ate a humble diet

³⁵ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, c.10, p. 289; See also: *RC*, cc. 3-7 and cc. 21-24, pp. 30-33 and pp. 40-42, trans., pp. 56-60 and pp. 68-71; *IC*, c. 117, p. 398, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 147-147.

³⁶ de Jong, 'Carolingian Monasticism', p. 629; Loveluck, *North West Europe*, pp. 161-163; M. McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Medieval France* (London, 1994), esp., pp. 67-101 and pp. 178-250.

³⁷ *RB*, c. 20, pp. 92-93.

³⁸ de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', p. 55.

³⁹ *RB*, c. 22, pp. 96-97; *RC*, c. 3, pp. 30-31, trans., pp. 56-57; *IC*, c. 135, p. 413, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 162-163.

and avoided ‘illicit things from which they ought to abstain’.⁴⁰ The oversight of the abbot or bishop, and the reading of sacred texts during the meal, meant the refectory avoided the licentious behaviour that accompanied lay feasting.⁴¹ ‘Humility and reverence’ were the ideological orders of the day. The common meal also mirrored the life of the apostolic community which was the basis for the Christian life.⁴² For clerics whose role was defined by their sacramental duties, the purity, discipline and supervision of the enclosure, meant the sacraments they performed were unpolluted by worldly sinful actions.⁴³

Three buildings: the church, the dormitory, and the refectory, were the defining features of any cloister. These functional buildings were spaces that ensured the purity of the enclosed life. Perhaps more significantly than these buildings was the exclusive nature of the enclosure. As a space it was physically separated from the secular world by a locked door. The word *claustrum* means a barrier, bolt, door or gate and it is closely linked with the word *clavis*, meaning a door-key. Carolingian ecclesiastics consistently ordered monks to remain within the enclosure.⁴⁴ Here they followed the guidance of the Rule of Benedict:

The monastery should be set up so that all necessities – that is, water, a mill, a garden – are inside the *monasterium* and various crafts can be practised there, so there is no need for monks to roam outside, which is not at all beneficial for their souls.⁴⁵

While texts used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy followed the spirit of these instructions, they had a more flexible interpretation of the *claustrum*. There was an understanding, and expectation, that the canonical clergy would have to leave the enclosure to see to the pastoral needs of the laity. In light of this the Rule of Chrodegang (c. 750) and the Canonical Institute (816) add clauses to the description

⁴⁰ CC., no. 3, pp. 480-481.

⁴¹ RB, c. 38, pp. 134-135; RC, c. 21, p. 40, trans., pp. 68-69.

⁴² M. A. Claussen, ‘Practical Exegesis: The Acts of the Apostles, Chrodegang’s ‘Regula Canonicorum’ and Early Carolingian Reform’, in D. Blanks et al., (eds.) *Medieval Monks and their World: Ideas and Realities* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 119-147, esp., pp. 132-146.

⁴³ de Jong, *Imitatio Morum*, pp. 49-55.

⁴⁴ *Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, c. 10, p. 35; *Duplex Legationis Edictum*, 789, Capit I., no. 23., c. 1, p. 63, trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 220; *Concilium Francofurtense*, a. 794, Conc. II. 1, no. 19, c. 11, p. 168, trans., Loyn and Percival, *Reign of Charlemagne*, p. 59; *Capitulare Aquisgranense*, a. 801-813, , Capit I, no. 77, c. 1, p. 170, trans., Loyn and Percival, *Reign of Charlemagne*, p. 82.

⁴⁵ RB c. 66, pp. 214-215.

of the office of the porter that are missing in the Rule of Benedict. Both texts focus on the need to physically lock the *claustrum* after Compline, and request that the *clavis* should be handed to the archdeacon or bishop.⁴⁶ This act of locking created the exclusive space of the cloister and any canonical clergy who had not returned to the Cathedral precinct by Compline were to be refused admittance.⁴⁷ While women were permitted within the enclosure to attend church, once Compline was completed, and the gates locked, the enclosure became an exclusive space for the sole use of the congregation of canons.⁴⁸ Interestingly, both the Rule of Chrodegang, and the Canonical Institute, extended the command that the doors and gates should be locked after Compline to the wider clergy. Chrodegang requested:

The custodians of the churches, who sleep therein, or in the houses next to them, should preserve silence as far as possible, like the rest of the clergy, and after Compline they should not eat or drink. They must not allow those who have stayed outside the gate after Compline to come in.⁴⁹

Meanwhile the Canonical Institute (816) expected these cleric custodians to mirror the principles and practices of canonical communities stating:

The custodians of churches must be well acquainted with the distinct times for the Hours and be sure that the bells are rung at the proper times, and that the lamps are ready to be lit promptly. It is their responsibility also to ensure that none of the goods of the church entrusted to them are lost.⁵⁰

This implies that just as the porter was to ‘lock the doors’ after Vespers and Compline, so too were wardens to lock their local churches. Such acts created cloisters in miniature, ensuring the clergy remained pure even if they could not live within the formal enclosures that defined episcopal and canonical communities. These sentiments can be detected in the *conviva*, where extra-claustral clerics gathered to celebrate key feast days. The extra-claustral congregation described with Bern

⁴⁶ *RC*, c. 27, pp. 43-44, trans., p. 73; *IC* c. 131 and c. 143, pp. 408-409 and pp. 417-418, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 158-159 and pp. 167-168.

⁴⁷ *RC*, c. 27, pp. 43-44, trans., p. 73

⁴⁸ *IC*, c. 144., p. 418, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168.

⁴⁹ *RC*, c. 27, pp. 43-44, trans., p. 73

⁵⁰ *IC* c. 131 and c. 143, pp. 408-409, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 159.

Burgerbibliothek AA. 90.11 created some sort of cloister when they met to dine together and celebrate the feast of All Saints.⁵¹ Their ‘master’ was to ‘have command of the door, so that through the whole house silence may be maintained’.⁵² This act of locking the door creating an exclusive, pure and sacred space, imitating the *claustrum*.

While the cloister was clearly a physical space associated directly with communities of canonical clergy, who lived a communal life under the supervision of the bishop or his representative, it also served as a model for those who slept beyond its walls. The following analysis will demonstrate that the canonical clergy must be viewed as a wide group that included extra-claustral clerics who sought to associate themselves physically, economically, and spiritually with enclosed communities.

I.1.iii. The Synod of Ver (755) and Chrodegang’s Rule (c.750): Regulars, Seculars and Canonical Clerics.

Two sibling documents, the Synod of Ver (755) and the Rule of Chrodegang, provide a useful starting point for the analysis of Carolingian attempts to define and distinguish between monks and different types of cleric. The Synod of Ver (755) offered one of the first attempts, however imprecisely, to do just that. Chapter 3 stated:

In order that each and everyone of the bishops might have power within his diocese, with regard to all clergy, whether regulars [*regularibus*] or seculars [*secularibus*], to[ward the] correct[ion] and emend[ation] [of them] according to the holy canonical order [*secundum ordinem canonicam*], so thus their lives may be pleasing to God.⁵³

These themes are also addressed in chapters 10 and 11 of the council document. Chapter 10 focused on the monastic order, commanding them to remain within the enclosure living a true regular life.⁵⁴ Chapter 11 continued this theme and although it uses imprecise language, seems to address the canonical clergy. These tonsured men are also to ensure they live a regular life within a monastery or under the authority of

⁵¹ This manuscript and the community it describes are discussed in the Appendix.

⁵² ‘Magister vero vester iubeat ostiariae, ut per totum domum illius silentium faciat’, Wilmart, ‘Règlement Ecclésiastique’, pp. 48-49.

⁵³ *Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, p. 33.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

the bishop:

Concerning those men who call themselves close to God because they are tonsured and presently hold their own property or income and neither live under the hand of bishop nor by a rule in a monastery, so we are satisfied, let them be in a monastery under a regular order or under a canonical order, under the hand of the bishop.⁵⁵

Here it is worth noting that the origins of the title *canonici* may lie in those priests listed on the *kanon* of a church and who were therefore entitled to take an income from ecclesiastical property.⁵⁶ Alternatively, the name may denote those priests who lived according to the ‘canons’ or regulations of the Church.⁵⁷ This was certainly Isidore of Seville’s influential interpretation.⁵⁸ Both of these definitions fit with the broad and imprecise description provided in chapter 11 of the Synod of Ver (755).

The synod was presided over by the newly re-anointed Carolingian king, Pippin III.⁵⁹ As well as being a clear expression of Pippin’s new royal authority, the council addressed many of the subjects discussed within Pope Zachary’s 747 letter to the Frankish court.⁶⁰ The statements made at Ver represent discussions around the definition and the nature of the monastic and clerical orders, which may have been sparked by Zachary’s decretal. Establishing precisely what chapter 3 of the Synod of Ver meant when it referred to ‘regulars’ and ‘seculars’ is difficult and these terms were open to interpretation.⁶¹ It is likely that Chrodegang of Metz was present at the council and he may have played a key role, perhaps authoring the preface and other

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 74-75; R. Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Dom Kapiteln in Deutschland* (Bonn, 1976), pp. 100-106.

⁵⁷ Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 74-75; H. Picker, *Pastor Doctus: Klerikerbild und Karolingische Reformen bei Hrabanus Maurus* (Mainz, 2001), pp. 118-119; C. Dereine, ‘Chanoines’, in A. Baudrillart and R. Aubert (eds.) *Dictionnaire d’Histoire et de Geographie Ecclésiastiques*, Vol. XII, (Paris, 1953), pp. 354-364.

⁵⁸ *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum, libri XX*, (ed.), W. M. Lindsay, (Oxford 1911), Digitised as part of the Latin Library: <<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/isidore/6.shtml>>> [accessed 16/07/2015]; trans. S. A. Barney et al., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 143. For the influence of Isidore of Seville on Carolingian attempts to regulate the clergy see part II. 4 and part III of this thesis.

⁵⁹ M. J. Enright, *Iona, Tara, and Soissons: The Origin of the Royal Anointing Ritual* (Berlin, 1985), p. 91; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 47- 51 and 60-66; For the account of Pippin III’s second coronation see: *RFA*, 754, p. 12; trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 40.

⁶⁰ Both the Synod of Ver (c. 15) and Zachary’s letter also discuss marriage legislation. *Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, p. 36; CC. no. 3, pp. 479-487.

⁶¹ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 39-40.

key sections of the Synod, which shared the same spirit and agenda as Chrodegang's Rule.⁶² Despite this, it is unlikely that Chrodegang was the sole author of the text and it is also notable that while sharing a similar focus on episcopal authority the council document and Chrodegang's Rule use different terms to describe the clergy.

Chrodegang avoids referring to his clerics as either 'regulars' or 'seculars'. It is likely that this council document was a product of concordance, consensus and compromise, and the direct input of Pippin III and other figures, such as the scribe Badilo, cannot be ruled out.⁶³ Whatever Chrodegang's exact role at the Synod of Ver, it seems likely that he was responding to the findings of this synod and to the 747 papal letter when he composed his rule.⁶⁴ Chrodegang's Rule therefore offers an insight into how an important Frankish bishop interpreted the Synod of Ver and its references to 'seculars' and 'regulars'.

Chrodegang's Rule presents an inclusive model of the ordering of the clergy. As Claussen has demonstrated, Chrodegang considers all the priesthood and diaconate of the city to be part of a wider community of 'canonical clergy'.⁶⁵ The extra-claustral clergy were included in the most important rituals within the enclosure. Chapter 8 commanded that any clergy who lived in the city, but outside the cloister [*foris claustra*], were to attend the Chapter, Vigils and Lauds on Sundays and key feast days.⁶⁶ They were also expected to dine with their enclosed brethren on these occasions. Chapter 21 provides additional details of the dining arrangements within the cathedral refectory and, although the extra-claustral clergy were seated at a separate table to their enclosed brothers, they are referred to as *clerici canonici*.⁶⁷ All

⁶² Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 47- 51 and 60-66.

⁶³ For arguments in favour of Badilo's role at Ver, see: Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 270-271; M. Garrison, 'The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.) *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 131-134. This point is also acknowledged in Claussen, *Reform*, p. 48, fn. 160. For the input of Pippin III see: Enright, *Iona, Tara, Soissons*, p. 91. For discussion of consensus politics at Carolingian assemblies, see: J. L. Nelson, 'Legislation and Consensus in the Reign of Charles the Bald', in P. Wormald et al. (eds.), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society. Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 202-227; T. Reuter, 'Assembly Politics in Western Europe from the Eighth Century to the Twelfth.' in P. Lineham & J. L. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001) pp. 432-451.

⁶⁴ The close relationship between Zachary's letter, the Synod of Ver (755) and Chrodegang's Rule will be explored in part II. 2. i of this thesis.

⁶⁵ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 206-248.

⁶⁶ *RC*, p. 34, trans., p. 61.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 40, trans., p. 68; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 234-236.

clergy were tied together in the rituals that accompanied the feasting and the common meal was an expression of confraternity and spiritual brotherhood that transcended the bounds of the enclosure.⁶⁸ Such a model seems to contradict the traditional interpretations of the ‘regular clergy’, as these extra-claustral clerics did not sleep in the enclosure nor were they involved in the Daily Office. At first glance it appears that Chrodegang’s canonical clergy cannot be synonymous with the regular clergy described at the Synod of Ver (755). However, there was one notable exception to Chrodegang’s inclusive model, for in an addendum to Chapter 21, Chrodegang commands:

Within the refectory, neither layman nor cleric [*clericus*] other than those in the congregation [*congregatione*] may eat or drink without the bidding of the bishop or his delegates. None of the subservient clergy [*clericis servitoribus*], those under the command of their seniors, may enter the enclosure when the clergy [*clerus*] come to chapter, nor the refectory, unless it be necessary, or the bishop, or his delegates command them.⁶⁹

This clause is interesting because it deliberately excludes some of the clergy from the inner sanctum of the cloister. These clerical servants are categorised alongside the laity and thus may be analogous to the seculars mentioned in the synod of Ver (755). It is possible that these clerical servants were those in minor orders who assisted with the pastoral care of the laity and who were free to marry.⁷⁰ Such minor clerics may also have been polluted by their ability to own private property, a point which will be discussed below. The addendum in chapter 21 also correlates to chapter 3 of the rule, which states:

In the lodgings that are inside the enclosure [*mansiones infra ipsa claustra*], neither cleric nor layman should presume to drink, to eat or to sleep save for the clerics who are members of the congregation, or those clerics who at the bishop’s command look

⁶⁸ This practice conforms with Thacker’s model. Thacker, ‘Priests and Pastoral Care’, pp. 187-209. Some extra-claustral clerics also sought to mirror the practices of the cloister when they dined together at *conviva*. This is certainly true of the confraternity described within Bern MS. AA. 90. 11. For a discussion of this manuscript and the confraternity it describes see the Appendix.

⁶⁹ RC, p. 40, trans., p. 69.

⁷⁰ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 69, fn. 90. For a discussion of the minor orders see: R. E. Reynolds, ‘Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions’ in his *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 25-31; J. Barrow, ‘Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, c. 900- c.1200’, *ANS* 30 (2007), pp. 41-67; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 27-70; J. Barrow, *Who served at the Altar at Brixworth? Clergy in English Ministers, c. 800-c. 1100*, 28th Brixworth Lecture, 2010 (Leicester, 2013); Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 42-52.

after the older ones within the enclosure. [*clerici qui in ipsa congregatione sunt, aut illi clerici qui ibidem in ipsa claustra per iussionem episcopi sui seniori suis deserviunt.*] Any of the clergy who have their own clerks [*suum clericum*] within the enclosure, as we have mentioned, should make sure that they possess a chasuble with the other vestments, and that on Sundays and other feast days they stand in the Church of God, vested in proper order [*vestiti in ordinibus*].⁷¹

The lodgings mentioned here refer to the private *mansiones* granted by the bishop to certain members of the community.⁷² Such ‘seniors’ were qualified to supervise those in minor orders and were commanded to do so within the dormitory:

Within the dormitory they should likewise sleep separately, and mixed with the seniors, to make sure all is well, since the elder ones can see the younger behave as God would have them do.⁷³

Chrodegang also described the office of the porter (c. 27), highlighting his supervisory role: ‘there should be one Porter, with an assistant, who is to guard the gates and entrances of the enclosure’.⁷⁴ It seems practical that the porter might require a *mansio* of his own close to the entrance of the Cathedral close and his assistant may well have been a young oblate in minor orders, perhaps even an *ostiarius* or ‘doorkeeper’.⁷⁵ Chapter 3 makes it clear that private *mansiones* were to be the exception rather than the norm. Likewise, assistant clerics within these *mansiones* were to be an exception. Unless those in minor orders were young oblates in training to become the deacons and priests, their sexual incontinence could pollute the holy environment of the cloister.⁷⁶

⁷¹ RC, pp. 31-32, trans., pp. 56-57.

⁷² Ibid., c. 3, p. 30 trans., p. 56.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ RC, p. 43 trans., p. 73.

⁷⁵ For discussion of the doorkeeper see: Reynolds, ‘Hierarchies and Functions’, pp. 1-31 Barrow, ‘Grades of Ordination’, pp. 41-67; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 27-70.

⁷⁶ For more on importance of clerical purity and the Sacred space of the clerical enclosure see: de Jong, ‘*Imitatio Morum*’, pp. 49-80; R. Meens, ‘Ritual Purity and the Influence of Gregory the Great in the Early Middle Ages’, in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, SCH 32 (1996), pp. 31-45.

Returning to the model of the community expressed in Chapter 21 of the rule, Chrodegang envisaged a clear ecclesiastical hierarchy with seven tables representing the apostolic community of the Church:⁷⁷

The first table is for the bishop and his guests and pilgrims, where too the archdeacon may sit, and whoever the bishop bids. The second table is for priests; the third for deacons; the fourth for sub-deacons; the fifth for the remaining orders, the sixth for abbots and whoever the superior bids, at the seventh the canons [*clerici canonici*] who live outside the canonical close [*extra-claustra canonica in civitate commanent*] should eat on Sundays and festivals.⁷⁸

The first five tables were allocated to members of the enclosed community with the brethren from the monasteries and churches of Metz seated at the sixth and seventh tables. Those clergy associated with the lay world, either through their sexual behaviour or through their association with private property, were excluded and not permitted into the sacred space of the refectory. Chrodegang was not alone in comparing servant clerics to the laity. Theodulf of Orléans also alluded to this group in his First Episcopal Statute (c.4), commanding that priests should bring to the local synod: ‘two or three clergy or laymen with whom you may celebrate the solemnities of the Masses’.⁷⁹ That these assistants could be counted either as clerics or laymen further supports the notion that Carolingian Churchmen considered those in minor orders to be ‘seculars’.

Chrodegang of Metz famously permitted his clerics to receive an income from the lands they owned outside of the enclosure. However, much like his view on private *mansiones*, he saw such provisions as an exception to the norms of his rule. Chapter 31: ‘How one who intends to join this Order of Canons, may make a solemn donation of his property in person, to the Church while reserving the use of it for the duration of his life’, is one of the longest within the entire rule, and the author felt exercised to write at length on this issue.⁸⁰ It has been suggested that the final four chapters (30–34) of the rule were written after the main body of the text. These chapters deal with practical problems which may have arisen from the implementation

⁷⁷ Claussen, ‘Practical Exegesis’, pp. 119-147.

⁷⁸ *RC*, p. 40, trans., p. 68.

⁷⁹ *Theodulf von Orléans, Erstes Kapitular, (Theodulf I)*, MGH, *Capit Epis. I.*, p. 106; trans., G. E. McCracken, in P. Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, (Toronto, ONT, 2004), p. 107.

⁸⁰ *RC*, pp. 46-48, trans., pp. 76-79.

of the rule.⁸¹ Chapter 31 may represent the thoughts of Chrodegang, or perhaps those of his successor Angilramn, on a particularly problematic aspect of life within canonical communities.⁸² There are several points within chapter 31 that provide insights into

how the Carolingians defined and categorised the different sub-groups within the Church, namely monks, canonical clergy and seculars. As Claussen has noted, the chapter seeks to model life within the cloister on the apostolic community, described in the Acts of the Apostles.⁸³ Opening with a carefully worded adaption of Acts: 2 and 4:⁸⁴

We read that in the early Church, at the time of the Apostles, they were so much of one mind, so united [*unianimen concordemque*], that they left everything, and each one sold his lands and laid the price before the feet of the Apostles; that no one of them called anything his own, but they had ‘all things in common’ [*omnia communia*], so that they were said to have ‘but one heart and one soul’ [*cor unum et animam unam*]. Everyday, ‘breaking bread from house to house’, they shared what they held in common [*in commune*], men, women and children alike, and the whole crowd were fired with faith and driven by love for their to provide enough for everyone in thanksgiving.⁸⁵

This is clearly the ideal image to which the Metz community were to aspire. However, Chrodegang reluctantly acknowledged that such vows of poverty may lie beyond those who wished to be admitted to the community and, after invoking Acts, he turned his attention towards the income of the clergy, encouraging new members to think of the common good of the Church and the community:

But since nowadays they cannot be persuaded of this, let us at least agree upon this, that we should adapt our behavior to theirs to some extent; for it would be very lazy, half-hearted and remiss of us who are supposed to be particularly observant of canonical rules

⁸¹ Claussen, ‘Practical Exegesis’, pp. 124-125.

⁸² For the problem of enclosed communities living aristocratic lifestyles, albeit in an English setting see: P. Wormald, *Corruption, Decline and the ‘Real World’ of the Early English Church: Aristocrats as Abbots*, Brixworth Lecture 21, (Leicester, 2003). For Angilramn’s interest in Chrodegang’s Rule see Part 2. 3. i.

⁸³ Claussen, ‘Practical Exegesis’, pp.132-136.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133.

⁸⁵ *RC*, p. 46, trans., pp. 76-77.

[*peculariis canonicis inservire debemus*], not to be prepared to make some attempt to copy their perfection, given that, as we have seen, in those days the whole community were as one in the name of God.⁸⁶

As Claussen has argued, Chrodegang did not necessarily promote the renunciation of all property, but rather a new attitude towards it.⁸⁷ This approach was explicitly taken from Julian Pomerius' *De Vita Contemplativa* (mis-identified as Prosper):

St Prosper and other holy fathers have told us, on divine authority, that clerics who wish to live on the goods of the Church should make over their own property by a legal deed, to God and to the church in which they serve.'⁸⁸

Indeed, almost the whole of Book 2, chapter 12 of the *De Vita Contemplativa* is quoted within is this chapter of the rule.⁸⁹ Following the example of this text, Chrodegang explained that just as the individual was subsumed into the community, so too was his property. The mechanics of this transfer are discussed at length by Chrodegang, who outlined the different ways a canon's private property could become a communal asset. Firstly, he commanded that: 'whether we like it or not, our property [*carnalium*] descends not to our earthly heirs and relations but to the Church'.⁹⁰ The details of this arrangement are given:

For the lifetime of these clerics they may, if they prefer, possess the income from their property, by agreement with the church, as long as all property itself is held in common, and that the property reverts on their death to the Church or the congregation of canons to whom it had already been granted.⁹¹

Chrodegang justifies this position, stating that while those who do not renounce their property are 'weak' [*infirmi*] and 'unwilling' [*dare noluerint*], they nonetheless benefit

⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 46-7, trans., p. 77.

⁸⁷ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 184-203.

⁸⁸ Quia sanctus Prosper vel alii sancti Patres secundum divinam auctoritatem sancxerunt, ut illi clerici qui de rebus ecclesiae vivere cupiunt, res proprias quas habent per instrumenta carta Deo et ecclesia cui deserviunt condonent; *RC*, p.47, trans., p. 77.

⁸⁹ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 195-203.

⁹⁰ *RC*, p. 47, trans., p. 77.

⁹¹ Ita tamen ut ipsi clerici, dum advivent, si ita placuerit, res suas usufructuario ordine per beneficium ecclesiae habeant, ut omnia sit communia et post obitum eorum ad ecclesiam vel ad canonicum ordinem, cui ante date fuerant, revertantur; Ibid.

the community by not drawing ‘on the property of the church [*rebus ecclesie*] as the other canons do’.⁹² Thus by living off their own income the cleric frees up a stipend that can be given to those canons ‘who have nothing’ [*nihil habentibus conferenda*].⁹³

The penultimate section of the chapter discusses the *precaria* that clerics may receive once they are admitted to the ‘order of canons’.⁹⁴ The use of this word may support the argument of those who see the clerics of the early middle ages as ‘secular’, and it is certainly notable that this term was used to denote the rights of *seculares* in chapter 11 of the Aquitanian Capitulary (768).⁹⁵ Nonetheless, Chrodegang once again emphasised the communal nature of this payment. The *precaria* was not to be paid directly to the cleric, but flowed through the bishop.⁹⁶ This arrangement may also be alluded to within chapter 11 of the Synod of Ver (755), which as noted above requested that those who are tonsured and hold property should live ‘under the hand of the bishop’.⁹⁷ Returning to the analysis of chapter 31 of Chrodegang’s Rule, the bishop emphasises that clerics were to renounce control of all property, even though they received income from it:

The clerics shall have no power to diminish, sell or exchange any of the property which they hold *in precaria*, neither in land, vineyards or forests, meadows, houses, buildings, serfs or freemen, nor any other immovable property [*res immobilibus*], except as we have said, during their lifetime they may do as they please with the revenue or produce [*fructa*] of their labour [*laborare potuerint*].⁹⁸

It is this holding of property in common that was key to defining the canonical clergy as a group. Unlike monks, who took full vows of poverty, the canonical clergy of the congregation of Metz could receive an income from their former properties, the ownership of such lands becoming communal upon entry into the cloister or association with the congregation. This communal ownership was based on the practices of the apostolic community, but also meant that canonical clergy were no

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ *Pippini Capitulare Aquitanicum*, a. 768, p. 43.

⁹⁶ Et *precaria*, si ita ei placuerit, exinde ab episcopo accipant; *RC*, p.47, trans., p. 78.

⁹⁷ *Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, p. 35.

⁹⁸ *RC*, p. 48, trans., p. 79.

longer involved in the land exchanges and disputes which dominated aristocratic society. The removal of such aristocratic ties can also be seen elsewhere within Chrodegang's Rule, and chapter 2 states that rank within the community was to be based on clerical grade and date of ordination.⁹⁹ Meanwhile 'seculars' continued to own and administer their own private estates while fulfilling the duties of their ministry.

Chapter 31 also retained the traditional monastic model of renouncing all property upon entrance to the community, and Chrodegang concluded his discussion by stating that one who gives away all their goods is, 'able to bring to perfection the good work [*qualiter opus bonum*] which he has begun at God's inspiration'.¹⁰⁰ Here Chrodegang acknowledged that a full vow of poverty is superior to the lesser form of life practised by canons. However, the fact that one could take a vow of poverty and still remain a member of the 'order of canons', demonstrates the lack of fixed distinctions in the period. Despite this caveat the communal ownership of property seems to have been a defining feature of the canonical clergy and was discussed widely in other normative texts produced in the period.

I.1.iv. Canons, secular clergy and property ownership in Carolingian capitularies and conciliar decrees

While Chrodegang's Rule represents the traditions of only one Cathedral community, it corresponds with other documents that sought to provide the norms by which the bishop and his cathedral community were to live. For instance, chapter 41 of the Council of Frankfurt commands that:

The relatives or heirs of a bishop should in no circumstances inherit after his death any property [*propriis rebus*] which was acquired by him after he was consecrated bishop, either by purchase or by gift; rather, it should go in full to his church [*ad suam ecclesiam catholicam*]. Such property as he had before [*quam prius habuit*] then shall, unless he make a gift from it to the Church, pass to his heirs and relatives.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ *RC*, pp. 30-31, trans., pp. 56-57; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 67-68.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*; Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis', p. 139.

¹⁰¹ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, MGH, *Conc. II, Teil I*, no. 19, p. 170; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 61-62.

Obviously there are clear differences between this provision and Chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule, notably the bishop's family was permitted to retain any land held by the bishop prior to his consecration.¹⁰² Despite this, the guiding principle remains the same, once a clergyman had been appointed bishop all new property would be held in common by 'his church'.

The Canonical Institute of 816 maintains a similar focus on the communal nature of property ownership by congregations of canons. Chapters 120 and 121 devoted much attention to this subject. Chapter 120, 'Which of the clerics who are aggregated into the congregation of canons should receive a stipend', makes it clear that clerics who own private property cannot be admitted into the congregation of canons:

Those who serve the Church, and are eager to accept or to demand things of which they have no need, are too worldly in their thoughts [*carnaliter sapiunt*]. It is shameful, indeed, if clergy who were faithful and fruitful come to despise their eternal reward for the sake of earthly property [*propter stipendium saeculare praemia sempiterna contemnat*], so that he may have the means to live, how can he accept property he will need to account for? [*Si propter hoc non vult sua quisque relinquere, ut habeat unde vivat, ut quid accipit unde rationem reddat?*] Why multiple your sins with the sins of others?¹⁰³

In a similar vein to Chrodegang, the authors of the Institute provide clarifying comments to this idealistic stance stating that:¹⁰⁴

It is necessary for the clergy to stay clear of this peril in accepting the goods of the Church [*in accipiendis ecclesiasticis sumptibus suum vitare periculum*]. Those who have their own property, as well as that of the Church, and confer some benefit on the Church either within the enclosure or outside [*aut interius aut exterius*], should receive food and drink and a share of the donations [*partes elemosinarum*] to the congregation, and be content with these, otherwise if they accept more they will be seen as a burden on the poor.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² The relationship between these two texts is explored below, Part II. 3. i.

¹⁰³ *IC*, p. 399; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 148. Here the *IC* quotes from Julian Pomerius, *De Vita Contemplativa*. For this text see: *PL* 59, col. 411-420.

¹⁰⁴ The relationship between chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule, Julian Pomerius' *De Vita Contemplativa*, and chapters 120-121 of the Institute will be explored in more detail in Part III. 5. iii(c).

¹⁰⁵ *IC*, pp. 399-400; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules* p. 148.

Again there was an extension of the community beyond the bounds of the enclosure, as those who were tied to the cloister by bonds of confraternity were expected to live by the same regular norms as those who slept in the enclosure. Crucially, any who wished to become a canon had to renounce their individual claim to property. While they might have landholdings, they received the same stipend as other members of the community. Chapter 121 reiterates the importance of this common stipend and in open criticism of the old practices of Metz stated:

It can happen that in a number of congregations of canons [*canonicorum congregationibus*] certain clerics who are well endowed with riches [*divitiis affluunt*], and confer little or no benefit on the Church, receive a greater stipend [*annonam accipiant*] than others [*maiores caeteris*], who are actively engaged in the work of God. This is quite unreasonable and unacceptable; it should never happen, and you can find no warrant whatsoever for it to be allowed, either in scripture or in the traditions of the holy fathers [*traditionibus sanctorum patrum*]. Since this practice is backed by no authority, but has obviously arisen through gluttony and avarice, it remains for us to cut it away with the scimitar of justice, and the sentence of judgment, so that it may be utterly eradicated from any places where it occurs.¹⁰⁶

The colourful judicial language used within this clause demonstrates that common ownership and equality of income were a fundamental basic within canonical communities. Any clergy who did not own land in common, thus might well be called worldly and secular.

The divide between canons and secular clergy, as well as the notion that the norms of the canonical life should be spread beyond the bounds of the cloister, can also be detected in the 802 capitulary for the Missi. Much like the synod of Ver (755), chapter 1 distinguishes between the secular clergy and canons, who were to live under close supervision:¹⁰⁷

Everyone is to be admonished to persist wholeheartedly in his way of life and calling: canons are to observe the canonical way of life [*canonici vita canonica*] in full, without concern for filthy lucre, nuns are to maintain their way of life, under diligent supervision;

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 400; trans., p. 149.

¹⁰⁷ de Jong, *Imitatio Morum*, pp. 53-54.

laymen and seculars [*seculares*] are to keep their laws properly, without wicked fraud; and all are to live in perfect charity and peace with one another.¹⁰⁸

This precept, alongside the first nine chapters of the capitulary, forms part of the new imperial oath defining the duties of all the king's subjects.¹⁰⁹ The next part of the text, formed of chapters 10-24, exclusively discussed ecclesiastical affairs. This section begins with the command, 'That bishops and priests are to live the canonical life [*secundum canones vibrant*] and to teach others to do the same'.¹¹⁰ This clause likely drew on chapter 70 of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) which commanded monks and 'clerics of the holy order' to:

Maintain an upright and laudable way of life, as the Lord Himself commands in the gospel, 'Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven', that many may be drawn to God's service by their upright way of life and they may gather and associate to themselves not only children of servile condition but also the sons of freemen. And let schools [*scolae*] for teaching boys the psalms, musical notation, singing, computation and grammar be created in every monastery and episcopal residence [*per singula monasteria vel episcopia*].¹¹¹

Enclosed communities were therefore to set an example to the rest of the clergy and were to educate child *oblates* in the correct form of the clerical life.¹¹² Chapters 21-24 of the capitulary for the Missi provided more details of the nature of the clerical order. Firstly, chapter 21 emphasised the authority of the bishop over all 'priests and canons'.¹¹³ Chapters 22-24 build upon this provision, highlighting the difference

¹⁰⁸ *Capitulare Missorum Generale*, 802, p. 92; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 234.

¹⁰⁹ The significance of this text and the oath it contained has been debated at great length. See amongst others: M. Costambeys, M. Innes and S. MacLean, *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 182-189; R. McKitterick, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 233-243 and 256-266; F. L. Ganshof, 'Charlemagne's Programme for Imperial Government,' in his *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971), pp. 55-86.

¹¹⁰ *Capitulare Missorum Generale*, 802, p. 93.

¹¹¹ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), H. Mordek, et al., c. 70, pp. 222-225; *Admonitio Generalis*, 789, *Capit. I.*, c. 72, pp. 59-60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 217.

¹¹² de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. 49-80.

¹¹³ *Capitulare Missorum Generale*, 802, p. 95; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 238.

between canons and secular clerics.¹¹⁴ It is worth quoting this section of the text in full:

Ch. 22. Moreover, canons are to observe the canonical life in full [*vitam obserbent canonicam*] in the episcopal residence and also in the monasteries [*domo episcopali vel etiam monasteria*] and to be taught with all diligence, in accordance with canonical discipline [*canonica disciplina*]. They are by no means to be permitted to wander about outside [*foris vagari*] but are to live under the fullest supervision [*omni custodia vibrant*], not given to filthy lucre, not fornicators, not thieves, not killers, not ravishers, not quarrelsome, not wrathful, not arrogant, not drunken, but chaste of heart and body, humble, modest, sober, gentle, peaceloving, that they may be worthy, as children of God, to be promoted to holy order [*sacro ordine promovere*]- not roaming through the villages and farms adjoining or near the church like the so-called *sarabaitae* with no authority or discipline [*sine magisterio vel disciplina*] over them, engaging in dissipation, and fornicating, and doing other iniquitous things which it would be absurd to tolerate.

[Ch. 23.] Priests are carefully to supervise clerics whom they have with them, so that they may live the canonical life [*canonice vibrant*], having avoided hollow games or secular banquets or songs or the enjoyment of luxuries, but live salubriously and castely [*caste et salubre vibrant*].

[Ch. 24.] Moreover, if any priest or deacon presumes hereafter to have women other than those permitted by the canons [*canonicam licentiam*] in his house with him, he is to be deprived of both his honour and his inheritance [*hereditatem privetur*] pending appearance in our presence.¹¹⁵

This precept began by outlining the importance of the enclosure as a means to ensure the purity of the clergy and much like the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), the author of the text saw the enclosure as a site for clerical education.¹¹⁶ The second half of the extract suggests that the norms practised within the enclosure were to be spread from the cloister to the wider clergy, and implied that the priests mentioned in chapter 23 were extra-claustral. It was the duty of these extra-claustral priests to ensure that those secular clerics, who assisted them with the pastoral care of the laity, lived close to the

¹¹⁴ Although Boretius divides this section of the text into chapters 22-24, it should be noted that the original manuscript (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 4613) unifies all of these provisions into one chapter. *Capitulare Missorum Generale*, p. 95, fn. 'e'. For details of the manuscript see: Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium*, pp. 469-476.

¹¹⁵ *Capitulare Missorum Generale*, 802, pp. 95-96.

¹¹⁶ de Jong, *Imitatio Morum*, pp. 49-80.

ideals of the cloister.¹¹⁷ Likewise, chapter 24 addressed those secular priests and deacons who lived in their own houses and owned private property; commanding that such high-grade secular clerics were not to marry. The fact that both the cloistered canons and secular clergy were addressed together in this precept illustrates that they were conceived as part of the same ecclesiastical order, sharing the same mission and identity. However, it is interesting that this chapter specifically targets local priests, and while aiming to spread canonical discipline from the bishop's community to the diocesan clergy, also acknowledges the different nature of this sub-group who own private property.

The capitularies and rules examined above offer an idealised account of the ordering of the clergy, and they make it clear that the cloister was to be placed at the heart of the life of all clerics. Membership of congregations of canons was to transcend the boundary of the cloister, and even those who did not live an enclosed life were tied to it, joining the congregation at key moments such as feast days where bonds of confraternity were reinforced. The communal ownership of property was held up as the ideal for the clergy, both cloistered and extra-claustral. Nonetheless, it is also clear that a less rigorous and more secular form of life was permitted. Priests were sometimes allowed to own private property so long as they continued to live in accordance with canon law and serve the needs of the laity.

I.1.v. An 'Old Boy Network': Motherhouses, masters and pupils¹¹⁸

That *oblates* educated within both monasteries and houses of canons were destined to undertake pastoral work outside the enclosure is made clear in the documents used to train them, and in the letters sent between school masters and their former pupils who served as parochial priests.¹¹⁹ Schoolbooks such as Raban Maur's, *De Institutione Clericorum Libri Tres* provided the knowledge clerics would need to serve both in the

¹¹⁷ See the Appendix for an example of extra-claustral clerics behaving in this manner.

¹¹⁸ de Jong discusses the creation of 'Old boy networks' in her, *Imitatio Morum*, pp. 58-60. I also inspiration from the approach taken by Thacker in his 'Priests and Pastoral Care', pp. 187-209.

¹¹⁹ For oblation in the Carolingian era, see: de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, for Hrabanus Maurus' views on oblation, see, pp. 73-77, for a discussion of the school room see, pp. 228-245; H. Picker, *Pastor Doctus: Klerikerbild und Karolingische Reformen bei Hrabanus Maurus* (Mainz, 2001), pp. 56-89. For a general overview of clerical training in the cloister see: Barrow, *Clergy*, pp.180-200.

cloister and outside it.¹²⁰ Raban wrote his educational treatise in the wake of the issuing of the Canonical Institute (816) and drew on the same authoritative authors cited within that text to compile his manual. As such, Raban Maur followed the command of the emperor to explain the text of the Institute to those ‘who are dull of heart and cannot understand it’ and to ‘copy the rule with due attention, to study it and understand it, and to carry it out in practice with strict observance’.¹²¹ The *De Institutione Clericorum* was composed for use at Fulda, but was dedicated to Aistulf, Archbishop of Mainz (d. 826), suggesting that the text was intended for the education of a wider clerical audience.¹²²

Raban’s manual was divided into three sections. The first discussed grades of cleric and the different types of sacraments with a particular focus on the role of the Eucharist in the Mass and rites of baptism.¹²³ The second contained summaries of: the Divine Office; the liturgical year; feast days; hymns; heresies; prayers and blessings. Meanwhile the third addressed grammar, rhetoric, and mathematics.¹²⁴ This third book was compiled from various authoritative texts including: Augustine’s ‘On Christian Doctrine’; Gregory the Great’s ‘Pastoral Care’; Cassiodorus’s ‘Institutes of Divine and Secular Learning’; and Isidore of Seville’s ‘Etymologies’.¹²⁵ The description of the Divine Office contained within the second book of this text would have been of particular use in an enclosed setting, while the provisions of the first and third sections would have proved useful to those who were involved in pastoral care. In particular Gregory the Great’s ‘Pastoral Care’ offered guidance to those who served outside the enclosure, helping them to understand their duties, particularly the role of a preacher. Within the manual Raban Maur gave specific advice on preaching, emphasising that those who give sermons should modify the style of their message to meet the needs of their audience.¹²⁶

¹²⁰ *Hrabanus Maurus, De Institutione Clericorum Libri Tres*, (ed.), D. Zimpel (Frankfurt, 1996), pp. 160-270.

¹²¹ *Hludowici Imperatoris Epistolae ad Archiepiscopos Missae, Conc. II.1*, no. 39C, 458-459; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 172.

¹²² M. C. Miller, ‘Reform, Clerical Culture and Politics’, in J. Arnold (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook to Christianity* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 311-312.

¹²³ J. Contreni, ‘The Pursuit of Knowledge in Carolingian Europe’, in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voice of Teachers: Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age* (Columbus, OH, 1995), p. 109.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Ibid; These authors and texts were all cited within the Canonical Institute. See Part III of this thesis.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

Other schoolbooks were also used to prepare *oblates* for their role outside the enclosure. Paxton has identified a late ninth-century manuscript (Rome, BAV, Pal. lat. 485) used explicitly for this purpose.¹²⁷ The manuscript is made up of 16 quires written in a variety of hands dated between c.860 and c.880.¹²⁸ The first two quires may have had an independent life prior to their inclusion in the codex, but nonetheless, they form part of a coherently planned work compiled either by Bishop Adalbero of Augsburg (d. 909), or Bishop Haito of Mainz (d. 913).¹²⁹ Paxton summarises the contents of the document in the following table:

Table 1: Contents of Rome, BAV, Pal. lat. 485.¹³⁰

<i>Folio</i>	<i>Quire</i>	<i>Contents</i>
1-3	i.	Penance; Latin/German formulae
4-15	ii.	Computus; calender
16-23	iv. (3rd quire missing)	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
24-31	v.	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
32-9	vi.	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
40-7	vii.	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
48-55	viii.	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
56-61	ix.	Mass and Baptismal Expositions
62-3	x.	Benedictions
64-71	xi.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books
72-9	xii.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books
80-7	xiii.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books

¹²⁷ F. S. Paxton, 'Bonus Liber: A Late Carolingian Clerical Manual from Lorsch (Bibliotheca Vaticana MS. Pal. Lat. 485)' in L. Mayali and S. A. J. Tibbets (eds.), *The Two Laws: Studies in Medieval Legal History Dedicated to Stephan Kuttner* (Washington, D. C., 1990) pp. 1-30. Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6531.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-7.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

88-93	xiv.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books
94-9	xv.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books
100-5	xvi.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books
106-13	xvii.	Nicene Canons; Canons of the Apostles; Episcopal Capitularies; Penitential Books

Although this manuscript was created after the period under examination in this thesis, it draws on earlier authoritative educational texts. The contents of the first quire are of particular interest as they provide instructions for the performance of penance in two settings and in two languages. The first section consists of a Latin letter written by a ‘certain wise man’, likely to be Othmar (d. 759) an eighth century abbot of St. Gall.¹³¹ The letter contains a typical formula for confession within a cloistered setting namely, ‘an invocation followed by catalogues of sins in thought and deed and of neglect of Christian duties, a second invocation, and a prayer for forgiveness’.¹³² The second section of the quire (fol. 2v-3v) is radically different to Othmar’s letter and takes the form of an Old High German text that is overtly aimed at the laity. This refers to sins against ‘one’s parents, lord, neighbours, and children, and to the failure to pay the tithe’.¹³³ The quire therefore provided instructions for how penance was to be conducted both within the cloister and in the secular world. *Oblates* were given the tools they needed to perform their duties wherever they were needed. The rest of the codex would have proved most useful to those training to undertake pastoral care. Notably the thirteenth quire contained a copy of Theodulf’s First Episcopal Statute (c. 798) with discrete and fully rubricated chapter titles.¹³⁴

Raban’s *De Institutione Clericorum*, and *Bonus Liber* identified by Paxton, illustrates that clerics trained within monastic and clerical enclosures were prepared to serve both in the secular world and also in the enclosed communities. Once the oblate

¹³¹ Ibid., p. 9.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid., p. 14, pp. 21-22 and p. 27. Theodulf’s First Episcopal Statute will be discussed below, Part II. 3. iii.

had completed his training, whether he remained within his enclosure, moved to another community, or undertook pastoral work in the parishes, links were maintained with his motherhouse. The monastery of Fulda provides a useful case study, demonstrating how these extra-claustral clergy were categorised by their motherhouses. Both abbots Bagulf (779-802) and Raban Maur (822-842) compiled lists of the brothers who formed part of the Fulda congregation. These lists included both those who lived within the bounds of the monastery and those who lived in the dependent *cellae* that were owned and operated by the house and likely saw to the pastoral needs of the laity.¹³⁵ The community of Fulda was also keen to commemorate their dead brethren and the *Annales Necrologici* list the deceased brothers who were to be prayed for during the liturgical rituals of the Daily Office.¹³⁶ The majority of those brothers listed by Bagulf and Raban Maur (living) are also listed in the *Annales Necrologici* (posthumously); even if the brother had long since left the confines of the cloister to pursue an ecclesiastical career elsewhere, his home community remembered him in both life and death.¹³⁷ Einhard, who had trained at Fulda, was included in the list of the dead, even though he never took holy orders and left the cloister to serve at court.¹³⁸ The list compiled by Raban Maur is of further use as over two thirds of those listed were priests, deacons or clerics.¹³⁹ Although many would have served functions within the abbey church, others would have been involved in the provision of pastoral care, working from the *cellae* that formed part of

¹³⁵ Bagulf's list, the *nomina fratrum de congregatione sancti Bonifacii de monasterio quod Fulda nominatur*, was composed in 782. Both Bagulf's and Hrabanus' lists are preserved in the Reichenau confraternity book. For discussions see: J. Raaijmakers, *The Making of the Monastic Community at Fulda*, c. 744-c.900 (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 74-80 and 181-189; J. Raaijmakers, 'Memory and identity: the *Annales necrologici* of Fulda', in R. Corradini et al. (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2006), pp. 308-312; de Jong, *Samuels Image*, pp. 242-245; M. M. Hildebrandt, *The External School in Carolingian Society* (Leiden, 1992), pp. 147-150.

¹³⁶ Five manuscript fragments survive of the *Annales Necrologici*. Three of these record the deceased of the eighth and ninth centuries: Rome, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. Lat. 2531, fol. 6v-29v, Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek, Hs. B1, fol. 22r-24r and Munich, Bayerische Statsbibliothek, Clm 4012, fol. 1r-4v. Bishcoff, *Katalog*, nos. 6443 and 1331. For discussion, see: Raaijmakers, 'Memory and Identity', pp. 303-332, particularly, pp. 306-307; Raaijmakers, *Fulda*, pp. 61-72, pp. 179-189 and pp. 279-292; de Jong, *Samuels Image*, pp. 242-245. For the importance of praying for the dead during the Divine Office see: M. McLaughlin, *Consorting With Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Medieval France* (London, 1994), pp. 67-101.

¹³⁷ Raaijmakers, 'Memory and Identity', p. 308.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 309. For Einhard's career see: P. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, ONT, 1998), pp. xi-xlii.

¹³⁹ Raaijmakers, 'Memory and Identity', p. 308.; Raaijmakers, *Community of Fulda*, pp. 187-189.

Fulda's family of churches.¹⁴⁰ Such clerics who trained together within the cloister formed members of an 'old boy network' that can be detected in the vast letter collection of Alcuin.¹⁴¹ The deacon's letters to his pupils recalled their shared experience within the enclosure and emphasised the spiritual union shared by master and pupil:¹⁴²

What a happy time it was when 'we dined together' by my fireside. Now all is changed. The old man is left behind, begetting other sons and lamenting the scattering of his old boys. But 'what does the damnable hunger for gold not do?' Let us be together in spirit while separated in body.¹⁴³

Alcuin not only wrote to those who lived within the enclosure, but also to former pupils engaged in pastoral work. Letter MGH 134, to the priest Odwin, is a key example. Odwin undertook pastoral work in Septimania during the 790s and may have been part of the anti-Adoptionist preaching campaign co-ordinated by Alcuin and Benedict of Aniane.¹⁴⁴ In his letter, Alcuin began by renewing his ties with Odwin and reminding him of his cloistered upbringing:

As by divine grace and long labour I enabled [*perduxi labore*] you to qualify for the priesthood [*sacerdotalis honoris dignus habearis*], I hope you will carry out your duty [*ministres*] in the house of God with a distinction worthy of the care I took to instruct you so that you would understand the order of holy baptism [*Dei erudire curavi ad cognoscendum rationabilem sacri baptismatis ordinem*]. So I would like to write to you briefly on the inner meaning of the whole service, that you may know how important it is to omit nothing that has been put in the service by the holy fathers [*quod a sanctis*

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. 58-60.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 61. For an in depth discussion of Alcuin's letters see: D. A. Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 35-123.

¹⁴³ *Alcuin*, Ep. no. 215, p. 359; trans., Allott, *Alcuin of York*, no. 120, p. 129; Bullough, pp. 109-110.

¹⁴⁴ *Alcuin*, Ep. no. 134, p. 202-203; trans., Allott, *Alcuin of York*, no. 131, pp. 136-137; Odwin was linked with the anti-Adoptionist preaching campaign by Barlow Page in his edition of Alcuin's letters: R. B. Page, 'The Letters of Alcuin', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Columbia, 1909). This text is available online

<<http://archive.org/stream/lettersofalcuin00pageuoft/lettersofalcuin00pageuoft_djvu.txt>> [Accessed 16/07/2014]. For this preaching campaign see: C. J. Chandler, 'Heresy and Empire: The Role of the Adoptionist Controversy in Charlemagne's Conquest of the Spanish March', *The International History Review* 24:3 (2002) pp. 505-527, esp. 524; A. Cabaniss, 'Translator Introduction' in, A. Grabowsky and C. Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane: The Emperor's Monk* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2008), pp. 36-40.

patribus institutum est in illo officio].¹⁴⁵

Once these ties had been renewed Alcuin moved on to discuss the rite of baptism and how it should be performed. In particular he argued against the Spanish practice of a single immersion:

His nostrils are touched so that he may stand by the faith he has received as long as they draw breath. His breast also is anointed with same oil, that the devil's entry may be blocked by the sign of the cross. His shoulders also are marked to give him protection on all sides. The anointing of the breast and shoulders also marks firm faith and persistence in good works. So he is baptised three times in the name of the Holy Trinity. Man who was made in the image of the Trinity is rightly renewed to that image by calling upon the Trinity, and he who has fallen into death in the third degree of sin, that is, by free will, should rise to life by grace being raised three times from the font.¹⁴⁶

Although not explicitly anti-Adoptionist, this section of the letter no doubt provided guidance to a cleric working in the field, offering him both a practical reminder of the manner in which baptism should be conducted and an explanation of the rite in firm trinitarian terms. Odwin could certainly use the contents of this letter when preaching and although this priest had left the enclosed life, he remained spiritually tied to the enclosure and guided by it.

In another letter to an un-named priest (MGH 294), Alcuin exhorts his former pupil to remember the purity of his upbringing within the enclosure, admonishing him to live his life according to these virtues:

What is this I hear about you, my son, not from one person whispering in a corner but from crowds of people laughing at the story that you are still addicted to the filthy practices of boys and have never been willing to give up what you should never have done. Where is your fine education? [*Ubi est nobilissima eruditio tua?*] Your brilliant work on the scriptures? Your good character? Your courageous spirit? Your fear of hell? Your hope of glory? How is it you do not shrink from doing what you should forbid

¹⁴⁵ Alcuin, *Ep.* no. 134, p. 202; trans., Allott, *Alcuin of York*, p. 136.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.; trans., Allott, *Alcuin of York*, p. 137. For a discussion of this section of the letter see: Bullough, *Alcuin*, p. 213. For Alcuin's views on baptism see: O. Phelan, *The Formation of Christian Europe: The Carolingians, Baptism and the Imperium Christianum* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 94-147.

others to do?¹⁴⁷

Whether the cleric addressed was a member of an enclosed community or ministered in the secular world, what worried Alcuin is his former pupil's lack of purity, and how this may impede his mission. The cleric's implied sexual misdemeanours were a serious concern and a betrayal of the purity of his office and upbringing.

I.1.vi. Polyptyques and extra-claustral canonical clergy: real world examples of communal ownership of property.

The aforementioned schoolbooks and letters illustrate that those taught in the cloister were trained to undertake pastoral care beyond its walls, and also maintained links to their former communities. However, it is unclear whether these clerics continued to receive stipends from their motherhouse once they became extra-claustral. Polyptyques offer an insight into the economic relationship between local priests and enclosed communities. These administrative documents provided inventories of the landholdings of monasteries, outlining the economic value of their estates alongside any rents or duties owed by their tenants.¹⁴⁸ The two extant polyptyques listing the holdings of the monastery of Wissembourg are particularly salient to this discussion. The first forms the second section of *Brevium Exempla*, composed either in the last years of Charlemagne's reign, or at the beginning of the reign of Louis the Pious.¹⁴⁹ The landholdings of the monastery of Wissembourg are listed in two sections: each divided within the manuscript by sub-title, written in uncials, and demarked by a filled capital.¹⁵⁰ The first title states, 'clerics and laymen

¹⁴⁷ Alcuin, *Ep.* no. 294, p. 451-452; trans., Allott, *Alcuin of York*, no.127, pp. 133-134.

¹⁴⁸ For a discussion of this sourcegroup see *Carolingian Polyptyques Database* (University of Leicester): <<<http://www.le.ac.uk/hi/polyptyques/index.html>>> [Accessed 21/09/2015].

¹⁴⁹ The *Brevium Exempla* survives in one extant manuscript: Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelf. 254 Helmst. (fols 9r-12r). The text is made up of three parts: the first lists the value of the lands and movable goods owned by the bishopric of Augburg, the second lists benefactions made to the monastery of Wissembourg as well as the benefices held from the monastery, the final section surveys five royal estates from northern France. For the text see: *Brevium Exempla Ad Describendas Res Ecclesiasticas et Fiscales*, MGH, *Capit I.*, no. 128, pp. 250-256; trans., see Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 98-105; See also the Carolingian Polyptyques website: <<<http://www.le.ac.uk/hi/polyptyques/brevium/site.html>>> [Accessed 09/02/2015]. For discussion see: H. J. Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 82-84; D. Campbell, 'The *Capitulare de villis*, the *Brevium exempla*, and the Carolingian court at Aachen', *EME* 18:3 (2010), pp. 243-264.

¹⁵⁰ The manuscript is digitised and can be accessed at through the *Wolfenbütteler Digitale Bibliothek* <<<http://diglib.hab.de/mss/254-helmst/start.htm>>> [Accessed 10/02/2015].

who have given their properties to the monastery called Wissembourg, and in return have received the usufruct of them'; while the second lists 'the holders of benefices of this same monastery'.¹⁵¹ In total the donations and precarial holdings of six men are discussed in the first section and of these three are members of the clergy:

10. Hartwic the priest has given to the monastery mentioned above a half share of the church built in the village of Hessiheim in the district of Worms, together with a demesne house, four servile manses (all occupied), and five *picturae* of vineyard. In return he has received the church in the village of Unkenstein, along with a demesne house, six servile manses (all occupied), five *picturae* of vineyard, and meadows yielding 20 loads of hay, on condition that he shall hold what he gave in precarial tenure [*habeat in precariam*] for the rest of his life.¹⁵²

13. Birniho the priest has given to the monastery a church in the village of Franconadal in the same district [Worms], along with a demesne house, seven servile manses (all occupied), three *picturae* of vineyard, and meadows yielding 20 loads of hay. In return he has received three servile manses (all vacant) in the village of Marisga in the same district, with one *pictura* of vineyard and meadows yielding 10 loads of hay.¹⁵³

15. Graolf the clerk [*clericus*] has given to the monastery a demesne house in the same village [Wisa] and district [Worms], with five servile manses (all occupied), and four *picturae* of vineyard. In return he has received a demesne house in the same village and district, with five servile manses (all occupied), and five *picturae* of vineyard.¹⁵⁴

The actions of these priests certainly chime with Chrodegang's provisions regarding the communal ownership of land.¹⁵⁵ By giving half of his church to the monastery, Hartwic now shared ownership with the community of Wissembourg. He was also given further lands to support him. Similarly, Birniho gave his church to Wissembourg and received precarial land. Graolf seems to be somewhat different to

¹⁵¹ 'De illis clericis et laicis, qui illorum proprietates donaverunt ad monasterium quod vocatur Wizunburch et e contra receperunt ad usum fructuarium' and, 'De beneficiariis qui de eodem monasterio beneficium habere videntur'; *Brevium exempla*, pp. 252-253; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 101.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 253; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 101.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ *RC*, c. 31.

the aforementioned priests and was given the moniker *clericus*. While this could suggest that he did not share the priestly grade held by Hartwic and Birniho, the use of *clericus* may also be a synonym for canon. The description of his precarial tenancy most closely follows the practices outlined in Chrodegang's Rule, and Graolf entered into a closer relationship with the monastery than Hartwic and Birniho. Both of these priests donated land to the monastery, but in return they received additional rights in neighbouring villages. By comparison, Graolf donated all his lands in the village of Wisa and received usufruct over his donation and an addition *pictura* of vineyard. Therefore unlike the other priests, Graolf made a full donation of property and in return received the spiritual benefit of association with the monastery and the title of cleric.

It is likely that the priests and clerics entering into precarial relationships with the monastery of Wissembourg were aware of Chrodegang's Rule. Wissembourg was at once a monastic house and an episcopal foundation.¹⁵⁶ Its abbot, Bernhar (d. 826), served a dual role as bishop of Worms (803-26), and abbot of Wissembourg (811-26).¹⁵⁷ Thus much like the precepts of Chrodegang's Rule, it was the bishop who granted these precarial estates back to his clerics and it is likely that Bernhar was familiar with Chrodegang's text, which was promoted by Archchaplains Angilramn of Metz (d. 791) and Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818).¹⁵⁸ Bernhar's association with Hildebald is made clear in the prologue to the council of Mainz (813), where he is listed alongside the archbishop.¹⁵⁹ The precarial grants described within the *Brevium Exempla* may thus represent the application of elements of the Rule of Chrodegang to the wider clergy of the Mainz archdiocese.

It should be noted that precarial grants were not preserved solely for the clergy, and the *Brevium Exempla* lists three laymen who gave land to the monastery in return

¹⁵⁶ For discussions of the implications of episcopal use of monastic foundations see Part II.

¹⁵⁷ The *Brevium Exempla* lists the holdings of the bishopric of Augsburg alongside details of the lands of Wissembourg, in the diocese of Worms, it seems likely that the document was composed after 811 when the metropolitanates of East Francia were reconfigured, drawing Worms, Speyer, Strasbourg, Constance, Chur, Paderborn, Augsburg, Eichstätt, Halberstadt, Hildersheim and Würzburg into the archdiocese of Mainz. For this re-organisation see: McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 372-373. For Bernhar's association with the *Brevium* see: Hummer, *Politics and Power*, pp. 82-84. An alternative dating of c. 794 has also been suggested, see: D. Campbell, 'The *Capitulare de villis*, the *Brevium exempla*, and the Carolingian court at Aachen', *EME* 18:3 (2010), pp. 243-264.

¹⁵⁸ See below Part II. 3. i and Part II. 4. i.

¹⁵⁹ *Concilium Moguntinense*, 813; MGH, *Conc. II.*, Teil I, no. 36, p. 259.

for precarial tenancies.¹⁶⁰ As Hummer has shown, precarial tenancies, the gift of ecclesiastical land in exchange for rent, became increasingly common in the late eighth century.¹⁶¹ Such arrangements were advantageous to both the monastic landholder and to the tenant, whether they were ecclesiastical or secular. Despite this, Chrodegang's Rule demonstrates that the granting of lands to enclosed communities, by local priests, was an act imbued with ideological significance. It allowed the priest to join the spiritual congregation of the cloistered community. The common holding of land was key to this membership, and precarial tenancies ensured that the local clergy had the wherewithal to perform their pastoral duties, while living canonical lives. It is interesting to note that the *Brevium Exempla* distinguishes between those who had gifted land to the monastery and those who held benefices from the monastery. Although no clergy are mentioned as holding benefices in the *Brevium Exempla*, the polyptyque for the monastery of Wissembourg, compiled c.818-819, refers to such arrangements.¹⁶² The description of the villages of Lamsheim and Littersheim both list benefices held by priests:

15.1 In Lamsheim there are 317 iurnales of the manor, 80 meadows, 4 cartloads of wine, 8 farmsteads, and 10 have a priest in *beneficium*.¹⁶³

16.1 In Littersheim there are 283 iurnales of the manor, 1 cartload of wine, 100 meadows, and 15 farmsteads . . .¹⁶⁴

16.3 A 16th farmstead has a priest in *beneficium*.¹⁶⁵

The polyptyque also reveals that these villages owed duties to the Church of St Martin.¹⁶⁶ Although the document does not give details of this church, it likely refers to St. Martin's basilica in Edesheim, which was in part owned by the monastery of

¹⁶⁰ For the development of precarial tenure in the Frankish kingdom, see: Hummer, *Politics and Society*, pp. 76-130.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 71-105.

¹⁶² For discussion and translation see: <<<http://www.le.ac.uk/hi/polyptyques/wissembourg/site.html>>> [Accessed 16/02/2015]. This text was originally printed in: C. Zeuss, (ed.), *Traditiones Possessionesque Wizenburgenses, Codices Duo Cum Supplementis* (Speyer, 1842), pp. 95-115.

¹⁶³ << <http://www.le.ac.uk/hi/polyptyques/wissembourg/latin2english.html>>> [Accessed 16/02/2015]

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Ad missam Sancti Martini uncias .III. dare; Ibid.

Wissembourg, having been donated in 714.¹⁶⁷ The priest, or priests, mentioned as holders of benefices in Littersheim and Lambsheim may well have been linked to this foundation and represented the interests of both St. Martin's and its motherhouse of Wissembourg. These priests would also likely have contributed to the provision of pastoral care in the villages surrounding Edesheim, including Lambsheim and Littersheim. While it cannot be known with any certainty that these priests were considered canons, the fact that they drew an income from the communal holdings of the monastery of Wissembourg may have distinguished them from the secular clerics, who owned private estates, and were not directly linked to the cloister.

I.1.vii. An alternative view: Hincmar of Rheims (d. 882).

The evidence discussed above suggests that a wide group of ecclesiastics from Chrodegang to Raban Maur defined the canonical clergy as a group through their spiritual and economic associations with the cloister. Canonical clergy did not necessarily have to live a full communal life within the bounds of the enclosure to be considered part of this group. The practicalities of their pastoral office meant they could sleep outside the communal dormitory, which was a key feature of the cloister. Such clerics were expected to maintain close relationships with enclosed communities, forming part of a wider spiritual and economic network. The ideological importance of these networks cannot be overstated. They offered a means of spreading the spiritual norms of the enclosure to those tasked with pastoral care, and by becoming members of a congregation of canons, clerics could identify themselves with this more disciplined and pure group within the Church. This certainly seems to have been attractive to certain clerics and in his Fourth Episcopal Statute (874), Hincmar of Rheims complained that parochial priests were too keen to associate themselves with enclosed communities and so neglect their pastoral duties:

While you owe allegiance to the monastic cloister it is inevitable that those people living in country parishes will have no one to carry out the last rites. If it is a stormy or silent night, the journey of a canon obliged to leave from the monastic cloister and proceed to the

¹⁶⁷ The charter was preserved in the Wissenbourg cartulary (c. 860) illustrating the monasteries continuing interest in this foundation. See: H. J. Hummer, 'The Production and Preservation of documents in Francia: The Evidence of Cartularies', in W. Brown, et al. (eds.), *Documentary Culture and the Laity in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 198-199.

village of the sick will endanger the infirm or new-born infants.¹⁶⁸

Hincmar was clearly worried about the time it would take for a canon to reach the sick and dying. In his view, a cleric's pastoral duties were incompatible with the enclosed life.¹⁶⁹ However, while Hincmar disapproved of clerics entering the cloister without good reason, he still expected those who lived outside the enclosure to mirror the practices of cloistered communities. He sought to control and correct his clergy through the local dean who was empowered to act as the bishop's representative.¹⁷⁰ In his First Episcopal Statute Hincmar invoked the spirit of the cloister at the *convivia* held by diocesan priests and their dean on key feast days:

When priests come to the *convivium*, their dean should recite some old verse at the table and bless the meal, and then let them sit together according to their order and may they give honour and blessings to each other through the successive course of food and drink and one of their clerics should read a passage of holy reading. After the dinner, in the same manner, they recite a hymn following the example of the Lord and Saviour together with the disciples, as we read in the account of the last supper.¹⁷¹

This model has clear parallels to the description of the celebration of feast days within the Rule of Chrodegang, and both texts invoke the image of the apostolic community.¹⁷² The description of the reading at the meal may also have been inspired by chapter 38 of the rule of Benedict.¹⁷³ In a similar vein to the celebration of feast days within the cloister, the *conviva* offered extra-claustral clerics a means of renewing their bonds of brotherhood and their spiritual purity. Thus Hincmar presented his clerics with the opportunity to live in accordance with the principles of the enclosure, while ministering to their flocks. For Hincmar, there was a clear distinction between canons who lived in the enclosure and the clerics who served

¹⁶⁸ Hincmar von Reims, *Viertes Kapitular*, MGH, *Capit. Epis. II*, p. 81.

¹⁶⁹ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 6-8 and 139-145.

¹⁷⁰ C. Mériaux, 'Ordre et Hiérarchie au Sein du Clergé Rural Pendant Le Haut Moyen Âge', in F. Bougard, D. Iogna-Prat & R. Le Jan (eds.) *Hierarchie et Stratification Sociale Dans L'Occident Medieval (400-1100)*, (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 124-135.

¹⁷¹ *Hincmar von Reims, Erstes Kapitular*, a. 852, c. 14, p. 42; Mériaux, 'Ordre et Hiérarchie', pp. 133-135.

¹⁷² See above and *RC*, cc. 21 and 30, pp. 40-41 and pp. 45-46 trans., pp. 68-69 pp. 75-76.

¹⁷³ *RB*, pp. 134-135.

outside it, and he certainly disapproved of clerics tying themselves physically and economically to the cloister.¹⁷⁴ However, while this division was practical, the ideological foundations of both groups remained the same with the principles of the enclosed life informing the behaviour and actions of those priests who owned their own property and slept outside the bounds of the enclosure.

Hincmar may have been writing after the period considered by this thesis, but his interpretation was based firmly on the developments of the period under examination. As van Rhijn points out, much like Hincmar's Fourth Episcopal Statute, chapter 7 of the Synod of Frankfurt (794) emphasised that priests should not vacate their churches and thus abandon the needs of their lay congregations.¹⁷⁵ Hincmar's close association with abbot Hilduin of St. Denis (d. 840), whose interpretation of monasticism seemed to be particularly strict, also shaped his understanding of the nature of the monastic life.¹⁷⁶ It is therefore unsurprising to see him oppose clerical involvement within monastic foundations. Hincmar may well express a view shared by some of his contemporaries and it is important to again acknowledge that there was debate and fluidity around the definition of the canonical clergy and the extent to which diocesan clerics should be involved in the life of enclosed communities. The exact nature of the relationship between extra-claustral clerics and enclosed communities may very much have depended on the views of the local bishop or metropolitan. This point will be explored at length in Part II of this thesis.

I.1.viii. Conclusion.

Given Hincmar's views, it is clear that the distinction between canons and secular clerics was not fixed even by the end of the ninth century. Nevertheless, figures such as Chrodegang (d. 766), Alcuin (d. 804) and Raban Maur (d. 856), promoted an inclusive interpretation of the life of canons. Extra-claustral clerics were not only encouraged to adopt the practices of the cloister, but also to tie themselves financially and spiritually to motherhouses. Where possible, extra-claustral clerics were to be involved in the life of the enclosure, which offered both a site of spiritual renewal and

¹⁷⁴ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 6-8.

¹⁷⁵ *Concilium Francofurtense*, c. 7, p. 167; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Reign of Charlemagne*, p. 58; *Ibid*, pp. 7-8.

¹⁷⁶ For more on Hilduin and Hincmar's interpretation of monasticism see Part II. 2. v.

a place where the bishop could supervise the pastoral work done by the diocesan clergy. These ties are perhaps most notable in the networks formed by those educated in the cloister, and extra-claustral clerics maintained close links with their old masters and motherhouses. Figures such as Odwin looked to the cloister for guidance while fulfilling their pastoral mission. Within all this there was a clear focus on the importance of clerical purity. By entering the cloister on Sundays and feast days, the clergy were cleansed of the pollution they faced in their day to day involvement in the secular world. Those clerics who attached themselves to enclosed communities through precarious arrangements avoided the secular temptations associated with private wealth. The communal ownership of immovable property was enshrined by the practices of the Apostolic community, and by giving property to the Church extra-claustral clerics could share in the spiritual dividend that accompanied the enclosed life. Their brethren would pray for them, while the extra-claustral cleric undertook the necessary pastoral work associated with their office.

Documents such as the Capitulary for Missi (802) demonstrate that alongside the canonical clergy, who owned property communally, another group of clerics existed. These 'secular' clerics were primarily defined by the fact that they owned private property. Such private property was required to support some of the priests tasked with undertaking pastoral work. Such 'secular' priests were expected to fulfil their duties and encouraged to copy the behaviour of those in the enclosure, which served a spiritual model. The rituals of the cloister were to be invoked at the *conviva* that punctuated the life of extra-claustral clerics. Crucially, these seculars lived separate and lesser lives. Some 'seculars' may also have served as assistants to extra-claustral *canonici*. These servants were likely low-grade clerics who were permitted to marry.

Rather than see a distinction between the extra-claustral clergy and those clergy who slept within the enclosure, it seems the private ownership of immovable property was the major distinction between the canonical clergy and 'seculars'. Thus, to assess the manner in which the canonical clergy were regulated in Francia we must look at attempts to regulate the life of the clergy both within the cloister and beyond it.

Part II: *Local Regulation (c.750-814)*

II. Introduction

Part II of this thesis will examine the texts used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy between 750 and 813. It analyses the role played by Chrodegang of Metz's *Regula Canoniorum* and assesses the influence of this text. Understanding the traditions and texts used to regulate the clergy is crucial to understanding both their role in society and the nature and chronology of Carolingian efforts to distinguish monks, canons and secular clerics. This discussion focuses on two generations; the first associated with Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766) and Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784), and the second with Chrodegang's nephew, Angilramn (d. 791), and the new figures who first attended court in the 780s, including Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818). This part of the thesis therefore analyses the texts and traditions used to regulate the life of the clergy between the episcopacy of Chrodegang and the end of Charlemagne's reign. The mid-780s form a useful demarcation point in this discussion. In 784 the palace chaplain, Fulrad of St. Denis, died and Angilramn was appointed in his place. Wilicar of Sens, the primate of the Frankish empire and associate of Chrodegang, also died around 785. The mid 780s therefore witnessed the arrival of new and influential faces at court; Alcuin (d. 804), Theodulf of Orléans (d. 821) and Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818) all rose to prominence in this period. As Bullough pointed out, the late 780s and early 790s were a key turning point in the history of Charlemagne's reign and these new figures sought to regulate the clergy with renewed vigour.¹ This section of the thesis is divided into three chapters. Chapter 2 examines the regulation of clergy between c. 750 and c. 785, while Chapter 3 focuses on the period between c. 785 and 813. The so-called 'reform' councils of 813 are examined separately in chapter 4, here the different approaches taken towards the regulation at the councils of Mainz, Tours and Arles will be analysed at length. This part of the thesis discusses the relationship between court-driven kingdom-wide attempts to establish the norms of the life practised by 'those who are called canons', and local responses to such efforts.² It demonstrates that local traditions and approaches to the regulation of the canonical clergy dominated in this period.

¹ Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 267-301.

² *Capitula Tractanda*, p. 161; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', p. 86.

Chapter 2. Bishops and the Monasticised Clergy

(c.750- 785)

II. 2. Introduction

The period between c. 750 and 785 is one of great interest to those who study the history of the clergy. Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766) is seen as a seminal figure, whose *Regula Canonicorum* (c. 750) established a standard for the definition and regulation of the canonical clergy. Claussen in particular has argued strongly that Chrodegang's Rule was widely disseminated.¹ Figures such as Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784) and Heddo of Strasbourg (d. 776) are seen as drawing inspiration from Chrodegang's renewal at Metz, and it is often implied that these figures made use of Chrodegang's Rule.² This chapter examines the regulation of the clergy and the way of life practised in prominent communities across the kingdom. There will be a particular focus on the episcopal communities associated with Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766) and Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785), who served as primates of Gaul in this period. Fulrad (d. 784), who was given the title *archpriest*, and the nature of his community of St. Denis will also be discussed at length. Alongside these most prominent communities the way of life practised in other less significant episcopal sees, such as Strasbourg and Eichstätt, will also be examined. By analysing the various attempts made by these bishops to regulate practice within their episcopal sees this chapter argues that the direct influence of Chrodegang of Metz has been overstated. It will suggest that his rule represents but one of many local attempts to regulate the life of the canonical clergy in this period.

II.2.i Chrodegang of Metz (d.766)

Chrodegang of Metz was clearly a prominent figure at the court of Pippin III and he has even been associated with Pippin's coronation in 751.³ He was entrusted

¹ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 61-62.

² Ibid, p. 207; McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, p. 58-59; P. Wentzcke, *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg bis zum Jahre 1202* (Innsbruck, 1908), pp. 227-229; Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237, no. 108; C. Munier, 'Le Premier Millénaire', in L. Rapp (ed.), *La Diocese de Strasbourg* (Paris, 1982), p. 21.

³ Claussen, *Reform*, p. 27; McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, p. 56; R. McKitterick, 'The Illusion of

with escorting Pope Stephen to Francia on the occasion of Pippin's second coronation in 754 and it was in this year that he was promoted to archbishop, receiving his pallium from the Pope.⁴ Such a position offered Chrodegang a chance to spread his rule to those subject to his authority, and in his role as primate of the Frankish Church, Chrodegang has been associated with Pippin's key Church councils held at: Düren (748); Ver (755); Verberie (756); Compiègne (757) and Attigny (762).⁵ However, while Chrodegang's presence is attested at the councils of Compiègne (757) and Attigny (762), his attendance at the other councils has been debated.⁶ The Synod of Ver (755) and the Council of Attigny (762) have attracted particular attention and Ver is often linked to the creation of the *Regula Canonorum*, as the prologues to both documents share a similar focus.⁷ The synod of Attigny and the confraternity, formed between the bishops and abbots that attended the council, is also seen as evidence of Chrodegang's key role.⁸ The presence of some Southern bishops is highly significant; Hippolyte of Bellay/Condat and Wilicar of Sitten/ St. Maurice (the future archbishop of Sens) formed part of this *Totenbund* that unified the Frankish Church in communal prayer.⁹ Attigny (762) offered Chrodegang his best

Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals', *EHR* 115, no. 460 (2000), pp. 1-20 at 15; R. McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 150; It should of course be noted that Chrodegang is not directly associated with the coronation in any of the sources. It is perhaps telling that Paul the Deacon does not mention Chrodegang's involvement in the Coronation ritual in his *Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus*, a text that very much sought to place Metz at the heart of the Frankish past and present. For a discussion of this text see: D. Kempf, 'Paul the Deacon's *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus* and the role of Metz in the Carolingian realm', *Journal of Medieval History* 30.3 (2004), pp. 279-299; D. Kempf, *Paul the Deacon: Liber Episcopis Mettensibus: Edition, Translation, and Introduction* (Paris, 2013), pp. 12-28.

⁴ *Stephanus II, LP*, Vol.1, cc. 23-4, c. 53, pp. 334-447 and p. 456; trans., R. Davis, *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes* (Liverpool, 1992), pp. 60-64 and p. 76; Kemp, *LEM*, pp. 86-87. For a general account of the papal mission in 754 see: T.F. X. Noble, *Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal States* (Pennsylvania, 1986), pp. 71-86; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 27-28.

⁵ G. I. Halfond, *Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils, AD 511-768*, (Leiden 2010), pp. 192-200 and pp. 243-244; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 47; The Council of Düren is recorded in the *Annales Mettense Priores*; AMP, pp. 41-42; *Concilium Vernense*, 755, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 14, pp. 32-37; *Decretum Vermeriense*, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 16, pp. 39-42; *Decretum Compendiense*, 757, *Capit I*, no. 15, pp. 37-40; *Concilium Attiniacense* a. 762, MGH, *Conc. II, Teil. I*, no. 13, pp. 72-73.

⁶ *Decretum Compendiense*, 757, pp. 37-40; *Concilium Attiniacense* a. 762, pp. 72-73. Claussen associates the findings of these councils with Chrodegang's leadership, but others such as Parisse are more dubious; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 47; M. Parisse 'Chrodegango', in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* (Rome, 1976), pp. 314-319.

⁷ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 47-53, and pp. 60-66.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-57; Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, pp. 172-180; E. Ewig, 'Saint Chrodegang', pp. 28-53.

⁹ *Concilium Attiniacense* a. 762, pp. 72-73; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 55-57; Ewig, 'Saint Chrodegang', pp. 34-53.

opportunity to spread the practices of his Cathedral community to other dioceses that lay beyond the Frankish heartland, and the confraternity recorded in the council document provides a list of ecclesiastics who were associated with the archbishop.

Chrodegang's activity seems to have lessened in the wake of the Council of Attigny in 762 and the annals of Moselle and Lorsch both report that in that year Chrodegang was 'afflicted by a great sickness'.¹⁰ This illness seems to have dogged the archbishop in his final four years and it may be that his infirmity led to a loss of influence. In 764 Chrodegang was granted control of the Abbey of Lorsch, but this gift was from his kinsman Cancor and thus represents an intra-familial donation.¹¹ It is certainly of note that the see of Metz was left vacant upon Chrodegang's death in 766 and, although his nephew Angilramn would eventually succeed his uncle in 768, it was Fulrad of St. Denis and Wilicar of Sens who dominated ecclesiastical affairs until the 780s.¹² Those present at Attigny (762), notably the prominent figures of Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784), Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785) and Wilibald of Eichstätt (d. c. 787), offer useful case studies to assess the spread of Chrodegang's Rule and the manner in which the clergy were regulated in this period.

At the outset it is crucial to understand the aim and inspiration behind the Rule of Chrodegang. As noted above, the prologue to the rule shares some features with the prologue to the Synod of Ver (755); both focused on the need to restore the rules or discipline of the fathers and to establish the norms by which the clergy live.¹³ The synod of Ver called for the 'restoration' [*recuperare*] of the 'canonical institute' [*instituta canonica*].¹⁴ It also focused extensively on the duties of the various offices of the church and emphasised episcopal authority. This can be seen most clearly in chapter three of the council document, which stated that bishops were to have 'power'

¹⁰ *AL*, 762, p. 28; *Annales Mosellani*, 762, (ed.), I. M. Lappenberg, MGH, SS XVI (Hanover, 1859), p. 496.

¹¹ *AL*, 764, p. 28; *Annales Mosellani*, 764, p. 496; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 30; J. Semmler, 'Die Geschichte der Abtei Lorsch von der Gründung bis zum Ende der Salierzeit (764-1125)', in Knöpp (ed.) *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch*, pp. 75-82; M. Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400-1000* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 51-60.

¹² See below, Part II.

¹³ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 47-53, and 60-66; 'priscorum patrum regulae sanctae', *Concilium Vernense*, 755, p. 32-3; 'reliquorumque sanctorum patrum canonum auctoris inviolata perduraret', *RC*, pp. 27-28, trans., 52-35.

¹⁴ *Concilium Vernense*, 755, p. 32-3.

over the regular and secular clergy within their dioceses, and were to ‘correct and amend them’.¹⁵ Such themes corresponded to Chrodegang’s Rule which was an expression of both episcopal authority and pastoral duty, as Chrodegang stated in the rule’s prologue:

When I, however unworthy I was, had been granted the throne of this pontifical see, and had begun to examine the state of the pastoral care of my office, I noticed that both the clergy and people had sunk into such a state of neglect that I was moved with grief to investigate what I should do. I rely therefore on the help of God, and the aid and sympathetic advice of my spiritual brethren, who have urged me to the work of reform, in deciding to outline a brief rule.¹⁶

The concordance between the prologues to the rule and to the Synod of Ver certainly support the notion that these two texts are related and Chrodegang may well have assisted in the creation of the Ver capitulary. Despite this, as noted in Part 1 of this thesis there are key differences between the two texts. The prologue to the Synod of Ver (755) does not make use of the term canonical clergy which was favoured by Chrodegang, instead the synod (c. 3) discusses ‘regular clergy’, a fitting description for any clerics who lived monasticised lives.¹⁷ It is of note that five of the 27 bishops who signed the confraternity document at the council of Attigny (762), chose to highlight the monastic nature of their episcopal residencies.¹⁸ Such episcopal communities, while living a monastic life, were manned in part by a clerical retinue who assisted the bishop in his pastoral duties. The use of the term ‘regulars’ may reflect the input of bishops who led ‘monasticised’ communities.¹⁹ Thus while the Synod of Ver (755) is an expression of Chrodegang’s interests, it also reflected the concerns, interests and traditions of the wider episcopate.

¹⁵ ‘Ut unusquisque episcoporum potestatem habeat in sua parrochia tam de clero quam de regularibus vel saecularibus, ad corrigendum et emendandum secundum ordinem canonicam spiritale ut sic vivant, qualiter Deo placere possint’, *Concilium Vernense*, 755, p. 32-33.

¹⁶ *RC*, p. 27, trans., p. 52.

¹⁷ *RC*, p. 27, trans., p. 52; *Concilium Vernense*, 755, p. 32-33.

¹⁸ ‘Uuilliharius episcopus de monasterio sancti Maurici; Theodulfus episcopus de monasterio Laubicis; Yppolitus episcopus de monasterio Eogendi; Iacob episcopus de monasterio Gamundia; Uuillibaldus episcopus de monasterio Achistadi’, *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, p. 73.

¹⁹ See Part II.

Although Chrodegang avoided the use of explicitly monastic language to describe members of his community, it is telling that Paul the Deacon described Chrodegang's dealings with his cathedral clergy in monastic terms:

He brought the clergy together and made them live within the confines of a cloister in the image of a monastery. [*Instar cenobii intra claustrorum.*] He established for them a rule [*norma*] of how they should soldier in the Church. He provided them- with provisions and living resources- enough that not needing free time for perishable business, they might focus only on the Divine Office.²⁰

Claussen has argued that Paul misunderstood Chrodegang's purpose, and that the bishop sought to establish a new order in the Church rather than monasticise his clergy.²¹ However, whether Chrodegang imagined he was establishing a new order or not, what matters is how the re-foundation of his episcopal community was interpreted by the rest of the Frankish episcopate. Paul offered a clear statement that from his perspective, and perhaps also the perspective of his patron Angilramn of Metz, Chrodegang had applied monastic norms to the clergy of the cathedral close. This application of the monastic life to the clerical order was nothing new. Eugendus, the fifth-century abbot of Condat, led a congregation of priests who served the pastoral needs of the laity while sharing a common dormitory.²² The clerical nature of this overtly monastic foundation may well have continued into the eighth century, and at the Council of Attigny (762) Hippolyte of Belley referred to himself as bishop of the monastery of Condat.²³

Whether it was orthodox for clerics to live monastic lives was clearly a concern in the mid-eighth century and in the late 740s the Frankish Church, under the leadership of Pippin, mayor of the palace, sought papal advice on this particular issue and other ecclesiastic matters. Although Pippin's letter to the papacy does not survive, Pope Zachary's response is preserved in the *Codex Carolinus*.²⁴ This letter seems to have formed the basis for the Bonifatian Church council held at some point between

²⁰ Kempf, *LEM*, p. 86, trans., p. 87.

²¹ Claussen, *Reform*, p. 58.

²² Y. Fox, *Power and Religion in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 6; M. Dunn, *The Emergence of Monasticism: From the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2000), p. 85.

²³ *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, p. 73.

²⁴ CC, no. 3, pp. 479-487. For discussion see: A. T Hack, *Codex Carolinus: Päpstliche Epistolographie Im 8. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 2006), pp. 226-228 and 306-309.

745 and 747.²⁵ Very little is known about this synod and the only references to it are recorded in the letters of Boniface and Pope Zachary.²⁶ Although Pippin had bypassed the archbishop and sent his epistle directly to the papal court, Zachary felt compelled to inform Boniface of this correspondence, and to instruct him to lead the Church council that would promulgate the papal decree:

Be it known to you, beloved, that the most noble Pippin, palace mayor of the Frankish people, sent us an urgent request by a man of his, the pious priest Ardobanius, that we should send him certain chapters of the law regarding the priestly order and others concerning the salvation of souls, as also concerning unlawful marriage, and how these were to be observed in accordance with the ritual of the Christian religion and the sacred canons... We gave also therewith instructions that they were to be read in the assembly of priests and that Your Holiness was to be asked to be there.²⁷

The English Council of Clofesho (747) and the Frankish Council of 745/747 have long been associated with one another and Boniface is often seen as the inspiration for the convening of both synods.²⁸ However, the role of Zachary's correspondence as the root source of these councils is sometimes overshadowed by discussions regarding the involvement of this influential missionary.²⁹ It is likely that Boniface sent a copy of Zachary's letter (*CC no. 3*), or one similar to it, to Cuthbert of Canterbury and that this letter was used at the Council of Clofesho (747.) This can be inferred from the preface to the council which records that:

²⁵ There has been much debate over the significance and size of these councils. Jarnut argued that no councils were held in Francia between 745 and 747. Hartmann draws on the evidence of Boniface's letters to suggest councils met in both 745 and 747. J. Jarnut, 'Bonifatius und die Frankischen Reformkonzilien (743–748)', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte Kanonistische Abteilung* 66 (1979), p. 26; W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im frankenreich und Italien* (Paderborn, 1989). For a summary of their views see Halfond, *Frankish Church Councils*, p. 259; For a somewhat uncritical analysis see, Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 226–227.

²⁶ *Bonifati et Lull Epistolae*, (ed.), Ernst Dümmler, MGH, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, *Epp. III* (Berlin, 1895), nos. 60, 61, 77, 78, 82, pp. 323–27, pp. 348–56 and 362–64; trans., E. Emerton *Letters of Saint Boniface* (New York, 1940), pp. 107–113, pp. 135–141; Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, pp. 164–165.

²⁷ *Bonifati et Lull Epistolae*, no. 77, pp. 349; Emerton, *Letters*, p. 135.

²⁸ W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 85–86; C. Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c.650–c.850* (Leicester, 1995), pp. 102–113.

²⁹ Levison, *England and the Continent*, p. 16 and pp. 85–86; Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 99–102.

The writings of Pope Zachary, the pontiff and apostolic lord, to be venerated throughout the world, were in the first place produced and publicly recited, and explained in our tongue, as he himself, by apostolic authority enjoined.³⁰

It is clear that the papal letters of Zachary were influential on both sides of the Channel and they were viewed as sources of canon law. By the time the letter was included in the *Codex Carolinus* it would have been viewed in this light. To answer the questions posed to him by the Frankish court, Zachary made use of the *Collectio Dionysiana* and the decretals of various popes.³¹ Zachary also invoked his own apostolic authority, adding judgments in his own voice.³² As noted in part I the first chapter of the epistle, which deals with the ‘honour due to bishops and metropolitans’, is particularly relevant to any discussion of the regulation of the clergy. After quoting from the apostolic canons and the decretals of Pope Leo I, Zachary added the following command:

So that a bishop might show his rank he should wear his robes; likewise too the priests and cardinals. And if they might wish to live holding to the monastic way of life [*monachica vita*] the low ranked who are subject to him [the bishop] shall pay respect to him dressed in clean robes, so that in secret they would serve their way of life in their hearts. Indeed he [God] does not entrust the honour of the robes, but the brilliance of the soul. In truth monks [wear] alike woollen robes and shall without pause make use of the rule of monastic discipline [*regulam monachicae disciplinae*], together with the admirable traditions of the venerable fathers. That is to say they renounce anything secular, conferring entire purpose to God, avoiding all illicit things from which they ought to abstain, in order that so much of their body might sustain their work, their only remuneration the reward that may be earned from God. The apostles of course were granted the divine order, he [God] ordered the use of two woollen tunics, not to be owned, [and] not [made of] linen. Therefore let he who will have obeyed the precept given by the Lord, hold fast to good deeds [and] he will have eternal life.³³

³⁰ *Council of Clovesho, 747*, (eds.), A. W. Hadden and W. Stubbs (ed.), *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. III (Oxford, 1871), pp. 362-363; trans., J. Johnson, *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the English Church*, Vol. II (Oxford, 1851), pp. 242-243. It should be noted Zachary's letter to the English does not survive.

³¹ D. Jasper and H. Fuhrmann, *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, D. C., 2001) pp. 104-105; Noble, *Republic of St. Peter*, p. 64; Hack, *Codex Carolinus*, pp. 303-306. For a summary of this canon law text and a list of manuscripts containing the collection see: *The Carolingian Canon Law Project*: <http://ccl.rch.uky.edu/dionysiana-article> [Accessed 27/03/2016].

³² Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 12; Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, p. 165.

³³ Nam et nos ab apostolica auctoritate subiungimus, ut episcopus iuxta dignitatem suam indumentis utatur; simili modo et presbiteri cardiales. Et si monachica vita velle habeant vivendi, plebi quidem sibi

Here, bishops and clerics holding to a monastic form of life were accepted as living in accordance with the precepts of the Church. In effect, Zachary permitted the monasticisation of the cathedral close. This decree seems to have directly influenced Chrodegang, who is first attested as bishop in 748, and may well have been consecrated at the council of 745/747.³⁴ The *Regula Canonorum* essentially follows the advice of Zachary, combining the Rule of Benedict with the precepts of other esteemed authors.³⁵ Much like Zachary, Chrodegang pays particular attention to clothing within his rule, making textual allusions to the papal command. In chapters 8 and 33 the clergy are expected to present themselves to the bishop; ‘vested in chasubles and their usual vestments as is found in the Roman Order’.³⁶ Chapter 29 also deals directly with the clothing of the community, specifying that once a year priests and deacons were to be presented with two woollen tunics, and: ‘when they are given the new ones they should always return the old ones which they received the year before’.³⁷

Here we may find the origin of Chrodegang’s Rule, the impetus that led him to apply aspects of the Benedictine custom to his community.³⁸ The Synod of Ver (755) also shared many of the concerns expressed within Zachary’s letter, and the first part of chapter 3 of the synod drew directly on the papal letter:

subiectae preclariori vestē induti debitum praedicationis persolvant et in seereto propositum sui servent cordis, ut, qui videt in abscondito, Deus reddat illis in palam; Scriptum quippe est: ‘Quae dicitis in cordibus vestris, et in cubilibus vestris conpungimini’. Non enim nos honor commendat vestium, sed splendor animarum. Monachi vero lanea indu menta iuxta normam et regulam monachicae disciplinae atque traditionem sanctorum probabilium patrum sine intermissione utantur. Si enim, abrenuntiantes ea quae seculi sunt, tota se Deo intentione contulerunt, de omnibus illicitis debent abstinere? ut, quantum corpori suo sustinuerint laborem, tantum remunerationis praemium a Deo percipere mereantur. Apostolis quippe divinum datum est mandatum, duas tunicas non habendi – tunicas dixit utique laneas, non lineas. Qui ergo oboedierit dominico praecepto, bonis actibus inhaerens, habebit vitam aeternam. CC., no. 3, pp. 480-481.

³⁴ Chrodegang is first attested as bishop in the Gorze cartulary. *Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Gorze* (ed.) A. d’Herbomez (ed.), (Paris, 1898), no.1, pp. 1-4. It should be noted that Nightingale has argued the charter has been heavily altered and may well be a forgery. J. Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reforms: Lotharingia c.850-1000* (Oxford, 2001), p. 26, fn. 8. For discussion of Chrodegang’s consecration see: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 26-27; Semmler, ‘Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz’, pp. 230-31. Even if Chrodegang had not been appointed bishop in 747/748 he was still a prominent member of court and Paul the Deacon records that he served as ‘referendary’ prior to his appointment as bishop; Kempf, *LEM*, pp. 86-87.

³⁵ Although he does not discuss Zachary’s letter Claussen provides an excellent analysis of the others sources Chrodegang used to construct his rule: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 114-206.

³⁶ *RC*, p. 34, 49 trans., 60 and 79.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45, trans., p. 74.

³⁸ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 12, pp. 14-15; and 19, fn. 18.

Pope Zachary's Letter (747), Ch. 1 <i>The Honour due to Metropolitan Bishops, Chorepiscopis and parish priests</i>	The Synod of Ver (755), Ch. 3
Unusquisque enim episcopus habeat suae parrochiae potestatem , ut regat iuxta reverenciam singulis competentem. ³⁹	Ut unusquisque episcoporum potestatem habeat in sua parrochia tam de cleroquam de regularibus vel saecularibus, ad corrigendum et emendandum secundum ordinem canonicam spiritale ut sic vivant, qualiter Deo placere possint. ⁴⁰

The relationship between Zachary's letter, Chrodegang's Rule and the findings of the Synod of Ver are notable and demonstrate the continued discussion around the form of life practised within episcopal households. It is likely that Chrodegang drew on both the prologue to the synod of Ver and Pope Zachary's letter when constructing his rule. As Carpe argued, Chrodegang's Rule may well have been constructed over the course of his episcopate, and Claussen has noted that the final four chapters of Chrodegang's Rule seem to have been written after the main body of the text was completed.⁴¹ This epilogue of sorts does not share the same reliance on the Benedictine Rule as the rest of the text and responds to real world issues such as property ownership and admittance to the order.⁴² Angilramn of Metz also made at least one addition to the text (c. 20), permitting the congregation to eat meat 'from Pentecost to its Octave'.⁴³ Given this evidence it seems that for much of Chrodegang's episcopate the rule may well have been embryonic; as the author himself acknowledges in his prologue, he was dependent on the 'aid and sympathetic advice' given to him by his 'spiritual brethren'.⁴⁴ Such discussions would have taken place at key assemblies such as the Synod of Ver (755) and the Council of Attigny (762). This does not mean that Chrodegang was un-influential, but suggests that his

³⁹ CC, p. 480.

⁴⁰ *Concilium Vernense*, 755, p. 24.

⁴¹ W. D. Carpe, 'The Vita Canonica in the Regula Canonorum of Chrodegang of Metz' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975), pp. 77-82; Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis', pp. 119-147.

⁴² Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis', pp. 124-146; See Part 1 of this thesis.

⁴³ RC, p. 39, trans., p. 67; This addition is preserved in Rome, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. Lat. 555 (s. ix¹). For details see Langefeld, *Old English*, p. 34; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6539.

⁴⁴ RC, p. 27, trans., p. 52.

rule was one interpretation of the life of clerics. The examination of some of the episcopal and monastic foundations of Chrodegang's close contemporaries, particularly those who were listed as part of the *totenbund* formed Attigny (762), demonstrates that other texts and traditions were used to govern the life of episcopal communities.

II.2.ii The Bishops of Strasbourg: Heddo (d. 776) and Remi (d. 783)

Before discussing the more prominent monastic bishops and abbots associated with the council of Attigny (762), it is worth considering the way of life practised within the episcopal household of the bishops of Strasbourg, as it has been suggested that this community was one of the first to adopt Chrodegang's Rule.⁴⁵ Bishop Heddo of Strasbourg (d. 776) was a contemporary of Chrodegang, a follower of Pirmin (d. 753), Heddo owed his appointment as bishop of Strasbourg (734) to Charles Martel. Much like the archbishop of Metz, he was therefore a close ally of the Carolingian dynasty.⁴⁶ Heddo's presence at some of the major Church councils convened by Pippin and Carloman is attested, and he was named in both the German Council (742) and the Council of Attigny (762).⁴⁷ The Bishop of Strasbourg was also involved with other key churchmen including Chrodegang, who witnessed Heddo's privilege for the monastery of Arnulfsau-Schwarzach (749).⁴⁸ As Ewig noted, Heddo was likely on good terms with each of the ecclesiastics who witnessed the privilege; this included Bishops Jacob of Hornbach and Hippolyte of Condat, both of whom formed part of the confraternity declared at Attigny (762).⁴⁹ Given the association between Chrodegang and Heddo, it is perhaps unsurprising that Chrodegang seems to have

⁴⁵ Wentzcke, *Regesten der Bischöfe* (Innsbruck, 1908), pp. 227-229; Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237, no. 108; Munier, 'Le Premier Millénaire', p. 21.

⁴⁶ Hummer, *Politics and Power*, pp. 58-61 and p. 79.

⁴⁷ *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, p. 73; *Concilium in Austrasia Habitum Q. D. Germanicum*, 742, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, p. 1; For Heddo's activity as bishop see: P. Wentzcke, *Regesten*, pp. 222-227.

⁴⁸ *Regesta Alsaciae aevi merovingi et karolini, 490-918*, (ed.) A. Bruckner, (Strasbourg, 1949) no. 166, pp. 97-100. See also: Wentzcke, *Regesten*, p. 223; B. Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY, 1999) pp. 105-106; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 54.

⁴⁹ *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, p. 73; E. Ewig, 'Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der fränkischen Reichskirche unter Chrodegang von Metz', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 2 (1968) pp. 67-77; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 54.

influenced Heddo, and Chrodegang's privilege for Gorze (757), with its emphasis on episcopal rights and authority, was the model for Heddo's testament for Ettenheim (762).⁵⁰

Heddo was also active within his diocesan city, and began the process of rebuilding and enlarging the cathedral church of Strasbourg, work that continued during the episcopacy of his successor, Remi (d. 783).⁵¹ This physical renewal was likely accompanied by new attempts to regulate the life of the cathedral community. Munier has suggested that Heddo (d.776) and Remi (d. 783) looked to Metz as a model for the way of life practised by their own canons in Strasbourg.⁵² Likewise, Semmler pointed out, Remi's testament (778) provided for 'those clerics our canons', this document therefore uses the nomenclature found within Chrodegang's Rule.⁵³ Whether this represents the direct influence of the bishops of Metz is difficult to establish. While the origins of the term *canonici* are debated, it is clear that the name predates Chrodegang; it had been used from the fourth century onwards to describe clerics who had a right to claim financial support from the Church and from the sixth century onwards to describe those clerics who lived according to a rule or 'canon'.⁵⁴ Indeed, a close examination of the testament of Remi illustrates some key differences between the way of life practised at Metz and Strasbourg.

Remi gave precise details of an endowment for the Cathedral community and he granted his canons the monastery of Schönenwerd, St. Leodegar. However, he also ensured his family's precarial control of Schönenwerd for at least three generations:

Through your kindness my lady; while I myself and my successors,
my niece, Scholastica, and my great-nephew, Raderamn, live, they
shall be seen to be bound to hold usufruct [over the monastery of
Schönenwerd, St. Leodegar] and each year at the festival of St Mary
they themselves shall confer by census nourishment [*altarius*]. We

⁵⁰ Hummer, *Politics and Power*, p. 59; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 101-06, esp. fn. 22; A. Angenendt, 'Pirmin und Bonifatius. Ihr Verhältnis zu Mönchtum, Bischofsamt und Adel', in A. Borst (ed.) *Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau* (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 301-304.

⁵¹ Munier, 'Premier Millénaire', p. 21.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ 'Ut ipsos solidos illic clerici nostri canonici in nostra elymosina recipiant'; *Urkunden und Akten Stadt Strassburg*, pp. 11-14, at 13; Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237, fn. 108.

⁵⁴ J. Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 74-75; See also: Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Dom Kapiteln*, pp. 100-106; Picker, *Pastor Doctus*, pp. 118-119; C. Dereine, 'Chanoines', pp. 354-364; See also Part I of this thesis.

declare in this manner, let 20 *solidi* of silver be given, and this we wish: that those clerics our canons may receive the *solidi* in charity. Let they themselves [the canons] rightly please God and St. Mary day and night, giving service and entreating the Lord on our behalf. And let our names be written in the *liber vitae*, and also let my little body rest in that crypt, the new work, which I created.⁵⁵

As discussed in Part 1, the Rule of Chrodegang (c.31) makes it clear that while a canon may own property, and receive a stipend from it, they must ensure that: ‘whether we like it or not, our property descends not to our earthly heirs and relations, but to the Church.’⁵⁶ In his testament Remi foregoes this requirement, securing his family’s control of the monastery, while also ensuring the Cathedral community was well endowed. While the Metz community may have provided the inspiration for the regulation of the clergy at Strasbourg, it seems unlikely that the rule itself was implemented as a whole. In spite of the provisions of the Rule of Chrodegang, bishops passing Church property to their families remained a problem for the Frankish Church, and was directly addressed at the synod of Frankfurt (794).⁵⁷ It is perhaps notable that Angilramn of Metz did not witness the testament, and given his interest in the rule, it seems unlikely that he would have approved of such transactions. Interestingly, the prominent Willibald of Eichstätt was amongst the five bishops who witnessed the document. These bishops seem to have been unaware of the details of Chrodegang’s Rule or to have followed different traditions.⁵⁸ The case of Strasbourg and the testament of Remi present an insight into the difficulties of establishing the exact norms by which the canonical clergy were to live in the eighth century. Chrodegang’s renewal at Metz may have offered a template for others to

⁵⁵ Quod ego ipse et Scolastica nepta mea et Raderamnus abnepos meus, dum advivimus, per tuum beneficium domna mea et successores mei, qui tunc temporis esse videntur, habere debeamus sub usufructuario, et censum annis singulis ad festivitatem sanctae Matie in dedicatione ipsius altarius, quod modo dedicavimus, solidos 20 argento dare debeamus. Et hoc volumus, ut ipsos solidos illic clerici nostri canonici in nostra elymosina recipiant, ut ipsos melius delectet die noctuque deo et sanctae Marie, deservire et pro nobis dominum exorare, et ut nomina Scripta sint in libro vite, et ut corpusculum meum in illa cripta, quam novo opere feci, requiescat; *Urkunden und Akten Stadt Strassburg*, no. 15, p. 13.

⁵⁶ RC, p. 47 trans., p. 77.

⁵⁷ See Part II. 3. i.

⁵⁸ Willibald will be discussed below, Part II. 2. iii. The other bishops who witnessed the testament are: Gislebert of Noyon (d. 782); Weomad of Trier (d. 786); Walderic of Passau (d. 804); Walabert of Basel (d. 804); *Urkunden und Akten Stadt Strassburg*, no. 15, p. 13.

follow, but the individual bishop and the long-standing traditions of each foundation dictated the precise nature of the community.

II.2.iii Wilicar of Sens (d.c.785) and St. Maurice d'Agaune

One of the most significant of the bishops attested at Attigny (762) is Wilicar, who described himself as 'bishop of the monastery of St. Maurice'.⁵⁹ Identifying exactly who Wilicar was is problematic, primarily because a figure or figures bearing that name served as archbishop of Vienne, bishop of Sitten, abbot of St. Maurice, member of the papal curia, and Archbishop of Sens.⁶⁰ Theurillat argued that these various offices were in fact held by the same man, who had a very active ecclesiastical career spanning from the 730s through to the early 780s.⁶¹ This assertion is in part based on Ado of Vienne's ninth-century chronicle, which recalls that Wilicar was driven from his see of Vienne to St. Maurice by the destruction wrought by Charles Martel.⁶² Ado therefore conflates the bishop of Vienne with Wilicar of St. Maurice. It is impossible to know if Ado's conflation of these figures is correct, it would of course make Wilicar a very aged figure who lived into his 80s.⁶³ However, there is no reason to discount the claims of Ado, particularly as other sources support the idea that Wilicar held the various offices described above. In the mid-eighth century the abbey of St. Maurice was held by the bishop of Sitten, and Wilicar of Sens had links with both the monastery and the diocesan town.⁶⁴ Wilicar was first recorded as archbishop of Sens

⁵⁹ *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, p. 73.

⁶⁰ For discussions on the identification of Wilicar see: J. Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice: Des Origines à La Réforme Canoniale* (Sitten, 1954), pp. 112-121; D. Bullough, 'The Dating of the Codex Carolinus Nos. 95, 96, 97 Wilchar, and the beginnings of the Archbishopric of Sens', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 18 (1962), pp. 227-230; A. Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune de la Fondation de Sigismond au Règne de Charlemagne (515-814)', in B. Andenmatten et Laurent Ripart (eds.), *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1: Historie et Archéologie* (Gollion, 2015), pp. 126-130.

⁶¹ Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, pp. 112-121; see also Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', pp. 126-130.

⁶² *Ex Adonis Archiepiscopi Viennensis Chronico*, (ed.), G. Pertz, MGH, *SS II*, (Hanover, 1829), p. 319; Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, pp. 112-121; The effect of warfare on Vienne has been questioned by Fouracre and McKitterick: P. Fouracre, *The Age of Charles Martel* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 92-93; R. McKitterick, 'The Scripts of the Bobbio Missal', in Y. Hen and R. Meens (eds.), *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 42-44.

⁶³ Contemporaries such as Willibrord and Boniface certainly lived into their 80s.

⁶⁴ Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 127; L. Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers (IXe- Xe siècles) in B. Andenmatten et al. (eds.) *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1*, pp. 137-139; M. Zufferey, *Die Abtei St-Maurice d'Agaune im Hochmittelalter (830-1258)* (Grottingen, 1988), pp. 35-37.

and of the province of Gaul when he headed a delegation of Frankish bishops sent to the Council of Rome (769).⁶⁵ In 771 Wilicar continued this leading role and, alongside Fulrad of St. Denis, chaired Charlemagne's council held at Corbény.⁶⁶ On this occasion the revised version of the Royal Frankish Annals list Wilicar not as archbishop of Sens, but as bishop of Sitten.⁶⁷ Bullough believed that the author of the Revised Annals was mistaken in this designation and that Wilicar of Sitten and Wilicar of Sens were two separate individuals.⁶⁸ However, given Wilicar's prominent position in 771, serving as primate of the Frankish kingdom, it seems unlikely that the reviser would make such an error.

A second strand of evidence supports the hypothesis that Wilicar of Sens also served as bishop of Sitten/St. Maurice. In the late eighth century the relics of St. Victor, the Theban martyr and companion of St. Maurice, were brought to Sens; this translation is usually attributed to Wilicar.⁶⁹ The ties between Sens and St. Maurice d'Agaune continued after Wilicar's death and amongst the plethora of relics donated by Charlemagne (809) to the cathedral of Sens were those of St. Maurice and St. Victor.⁷⁰ The Carolingian period saw increased activity at both the monastery of St. Maurice and in Sitten. In the second half of the eighth century and again in the ninth century the church of St. Maurice d'Agaune was extensively rebuilt, and much like Fulrad's St. Denis these building works made clear architectural allusions to St Peter's in Rome.⁷¹ In the eighth century a ring crypt was constructed at the eastern end of the church.⁷² Then in the ninth century the church was reorientated, the choir was relocated to the western end of the church and the eighth-century ring crypt was

⁶⁵ *Stephanus III*, LP, Vol. 1, c.17, p. 473; trans., R. Davis, *Eighth-Century Popes*, pp. 96-97.

⁶⁶ *ARF*, 771, p. 32, trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 48.

⁶⁷ *ARF* (rev.), 771, p. 33, trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 48.

⁶⁸ Bullough, 'The Dating of the Codex Carolinus', pp. 227-230.

⁶⁹ C. Higgins, 'Some New Thoughts on the Nature Goddess Silk' in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, and C. Stancliffe, (eds.), *St. Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to c. 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989) p. 335; H. Granger-Taylor, 'The Inscription on the Nature Goddess Silk', in. Bonner et al. (eds.) *St Cuthbert*, pp. 344-345; Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, pp. 116-117; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 128; The beautiful 8th-century Persian/Byzantine silk shroud of St. Victor survives and can be viewed on the website for the musées de Bourgogne: << www.musees-bourgogne.org>> [Accessed 21/09/2015].

⁷⁰ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 327; S. Foot, *Aethelstan: King of England* (London, 2011), p. 196.

⁷¹ For an up to date analysis of the archaeology of the site see: A. Antonini, 'Archéologie du Site Abbatial (Des Origines au Xe Siècle)', in B. Andenmatten et al. (eds.), *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune*, Vol. 1, pp. 59-107.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 82-94.

built over.⁷³ A new ring crypt was also constructed at the western end of the church.⁷⁴ Around the same time a new ring crypt was constructed at the church of St. Théodule in Sitten.⁷⁵ Such works are testament to the promotion of the cult of St. Maurice and his companions, and the translation of the relics of St. Victor served as part of this process, allowing Wilicar to offer patronage to his new archepiscopal seat, while maintaining links to St. Maurice d'Agaune which was the site of Victor's martyrdom.⁷⁶ It is likely that Wilicar was responsible for the first phase of the rebuilding work undertaken at St. Maurice which coincided with his tenure as bishop and abbot. Much like Remi of Strasbourg, Wilicar may even have wished for his body to be placed within the church he had rebuilt, and a sarcophagus bearing the following inscription was found in the nineteenth century:

+D(OMI)NE MISERERE ANIMAE FAMULI TV[I]
 VVLTCHERII SEDVNE[N]SIS [EP](ISCO)PI
 QVI OBIIT • VII K(A)L(ENDAS) IV[N](II) •
 RE[QVI]EM ETERNA(M) DONA EI D(OMI)[N]E
 ET L[VX] P(ER)P(ETV)A LVCEAT EI AM[E]N.⁷⁷

The inscription has been dated by Jörg to the end of tenth or the start of the eleventh century, and therefore cannot be confidently associated with the physical remains of Wilicar.⁷⁸ However, it is possible that his body was translated from its original resting place and, as Antonini notes, the inscription demonstrates that Wilicar was held in high regard within his old foundation and was fondly remembered as a patron and

⁷³ Ibid.; B. Rosenwein, 'One Site, Many Meanings: Saint-Maurice D'Agaune as a Place of Power in the Early Middle Ages', in M. de Jong et al. (eds.), *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 275-277; J. Crook, *The Architectural Setting of the Cult of Saints in the Early Christian West* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 96-98; J. Crook, 'The Enshrinement of Local Saints in Francia and England', in A. Thacker and R. Sharpe (eds.), *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 213-14.

⁷⁴ Antonini, 'Archéologie du Site Abbatial', pp. 82-94.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 82-94.

⁷⁶ For an overview of the development of the legend and cult of St. Maurice and the Theban legion see: E. Chevalley and C. Roduit, 'La Naissance du Culte des Saints d'Agaune et Les Premiers Textes Hagiographiques', in B. Andenmatten et al. (eds.), *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1*, pp. 33-58.

⁷⁷ Antonini, 'Archéologie du Site Abbatial', p. 81; for images of the inscription see: pp. 83 and p. 144

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 80-81; C. Jörg, *Corpus Inscriptioun Medii Aevi Helvetiae*, vol. 1 (1977), no. 41, p. 115.

renewer of the monastery.⁷⁹

Prior to his appointment as archbishop of Sens, Wilicar was an active member of the papal court and he was part of Stephen II's entourage on his visit to Francia in 753. This trip culminated in the second coronation of Pippin III and it is notable that the Pope punctuated his journey at the monastery of St. Maurice d'Agaune.⁸⁰ Much like Chrodegang and Fulrad, who were also involved in this operation, Wilicar had an interest in all things Roman, and all three of these prominent ecclesiastics sought to mirror the practices and architecture of St. Peter's in Rome within their own foundations.⁸¹ Given this varied evidence, on balance it seems likely that Theurillat's hypothesis is correct, and Wilicar of Sens is the same Wilicar attested at Attigny (762).

Although the details of Wilicar of Sens' career as archbishop are obscure, he certainly appears to have spent much time travelling between Francia and Rome.⁸² His transalpine connections may have helped to secure his title as primate of the Frankish Church. The late 760s and 770s were, to a certain extent, dominated by affairs on the Italian peninsula; both Carloman and Charlemagne were engaged in the power struggles between the Lombard kingdom and the papacy.⁸³ Wilicar's connections, and St. Maurice d'Agaune's strategic location at the foot of the St. Bernard pass, made him a logical successor to Chrodegang as primate of Gaul. Wilicar was a candidate pleasing to the Frankish kings and to the papal court.

Having established that Wilicar was closely allied to the Frankish court and with both Chrodegang and Fulrad, the form of life practised at St. Maurice d'Agaune must be examined. The monastery has a long and prestigious history; refounded in 515 by King Sigismund of Burgundy the site rose to become the 'greatest foundation

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 81. For discussions of the memory of monastic founders and patrons see: C. Cubitt, 'Monastic Memory and Identity in Early Anglo-Saxon England', in W. O. Frazer and A. Tyrrell (eds.) *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain* (London, 2000), pp. 253-277.

⁸⁰ *Stephanus II, LP*, Vol. 1, cc. 23-4, pp. 446-47, trans., pp. 61-63; Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, pp. 115-118; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 127.

⁸¹ For an overview of the use of ring crypts in Francia see: Crook, 'Enshrinement of Local Saints', pp. 210-222. For the renewal of St. Denis, see; Emerick, 'Building *more romano*' pp. 127-150. For Metz see; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 250-263.

⁸² Bullough, 'Dating of the Codex Carolinus', p. 230; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 128.

⁸³ For an overview see: N. Christie, *The Lombards: The Ancient Langobards* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 102-09; Noble, *Republic of St Peter*, pp. 40-71; M. Becher, *Charlemagne* (London, 2003), pp. 41-59; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 107-114.

of the Burgundian kingdom'.⁸⁴ A foundation charter survives for the monastery. This charter, preserved in a twelfth-century manuscript and a fifteenth-century cartulary, is clearly a later forgery, and was perhaps composed in the late eighth or early ninth century.⁸⁵ Nonetheless, it retains some details regarding the establishment of the monastery and, as Wood has suggested, the forger may well have had access to authentic documents.⁸⁶ The work of Rosenwein has shown that St. Maurice played a key role in the development of Western monasticism. Its liturgical system of constant prayer, with monks performing the *laus perennis* day and night, was hugely influential and served as the model for several key foundations including St. Denis.⁸⁷

Following its refoundation in 515, the way of life at St. Maurice appears to have been influenced by the leading episcopal and monastic foundations that dominated the Rhone valley in the sixth century.⁸⁸ Condat in particular may have offered guidance to the new monastery and it is possible that 'The Life and Rule of the Jura Fathers' was composed at Condat for the community of St. Maurice d'Agaune.⁸⁹ Moyse suggested this work was authored by Viventiolus (d.524) who was one of the four bishops mentioned in the forged foundation charter for St. Maurice.⁹⁰ As noted above, Condat seems to have been a mixed community and the 'Life and Rule of the Jura Fathers' recalls that abbot Eugendus led a community of priests who not only lived in the enclosure and shared a common dormitory, but also

⁸⁴ I. N. Wood, 'A Prelude to Columbanus: The Monastic Achievement in the Burgundian Territories', in H. B. Clarke and M. Brennan (eds.) *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford, 1981) pp. 15-19, at p. 15; see also: Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', pp. 111-33; Antonini, 'Archéologie du Site Abbatial', pp. 59-107.

⁸⁵ For the text and manuscript history see: Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, 57-85; M. Reymond, 'La Charte de Sigismond pour Sant-Maurice d'Agaune 515', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 6 (1926), pp. 1-60.

⁸⁶ Wood, 'Prelude to Columbanus', pp. 15-16; for the text and manuscript history see: Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, 57-85; M. Reymond, 'La Charte de Sigismond', pp. 1-60.

⁸⁷ B. Rosenwein, 'Perennial Prayer at Agaune', in S. Farmer and B. Rosenwein (eds.) *Monks and Nuns, Saints and Outcasts: Religion in Medieval Society* (London, 2000), pp. 37-57; Rosenwein, 'One Site, Many Meanings', pp. 271-90.

⁸⁸ Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', pp. 116-119.

⁸⁹ Wood, 'A Prelude to Columbanus', pp. 15-9; Fox, *Power and Religion*, pp. 5-9; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', pp. 121-123.

⁹⁰ G. Moyse, 'Les Origines du Monachisme dans le Diocèse de Besançon (Ve-Xe Siècles)', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 131.1, (1973), pp. 44-45; Wood, 'A Prelude to Columbanus', pp. 15-16. This attribution has been recently questioned in: A. Dubreucq, 'Les Relations entre Condat et Agaune' in N. Brocard et al. (eds.), *Autour de Saint Maurice* (Besançon, 2012), pp. 144-145. (This work came to my attention at a late stage and I have been unable to review this work. For discussion see: Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 121).

served the pastoral needs of the lay community.⁹¹ Given the regulatory and exemplary purpose of the ‘Life and Rule of the Jura Fathers’, it is interesting to note that Gregory of Tours used both clerical and monastic language to describe the community of St. Maurice. He referred to both a choir of monks [*choros psallentium monachorum*] and a choir of clerics [*clericis in choro canentium psalleret*].⁹² In the sixth century the monastery seems to have been manned by monasticised clerics or by a mixed community of monks and clerics. The community was tasked with performing the *laus perennis* but, following the example of Eugendus may also have been responsible for the pastoral care of the wider lay community.

The way of life of the monastery has also been linked to the ‘Rule of the Fathers’, this series of rules may have formed part of the ‘institutes’ referred to in the ‘Life and Rule of the Jura Fathers’.⁹³ At the very least these texts were circulating in the Rhone valley at the time St. Maurice was founded.⁹⁴ In light of this, the structure of the forged charter recording Sigismund’s foundation is intriguing. The charter provides an account of the assembly of bishops who witnessed the establishment of the monastery– this is presented as a dialogue between four bishops: Maximus of Geneva; Victor of Grenoble; Viventius of Lyon and Theodore of Martigny.⁹⁵ Such a dialogue echoed the structure and organisational principles of the Rule of the Four Fathers, with four eminent churchmen, in council, deciding on the form of life practised by the community.⁹⁶ Bishop Viventius was given a particularly prominent role and, in response to a question posed by King Sigismund (d. 542), he outlined and set the discipline of the monastery. This was based on elements of the

⁹¹ Fox, *Power and Religion*, p. 6.

⁹² *Sancti Georgii Florentii Greorii Episcopi Turnensis Libri Miraculorum*, *PL*, vol.71, c.76, col. 771-773; Dunn, *Emergence of Monasticism*, p. 97; trans., R. van Dam, *Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs* (Liverpool, 1988), c. 75, pp. 97-99. As Dunn points out van Dam’s translation does not pick up on this mixed use of language and simply describes St. Maurice as a community of monks.

⁹³ The Rules of the Fathers include: The Rule of the Four Fathers; The Second Rule of the Fathers; The Third Rule of the Fathers; and the Rule of Macarius; see also: Dunn, *Emergence of Monasticism*, pp. 85-88.

⁹⁴ Dunn, *Emergence of Monasticism*, pp. 82-90.

⁹⁵ For the text and commentary see: Theurillat, *L’Abbaye de Saint-Maurice*, pp. 57-82; see also: Wood, ‘Prelude to Columbanus’, p. 15; Rosenwein, ‘One Site, Many Meanings’, pp. 284-290.

⁹⁶ F. Masai, ‘La Vita Patrum Iurensium et Les Debuts du Monachisme à Saint-Maurice d’Agaune’, in J. Autenrieth and F. Brunhölzl (eds.), *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff* (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 52-53; For the Rule of the Four Fathers see: J. Neufville (ed.), ‘Règle des IV Pères et Seconde Règle des Pères: Texte Critique’, *Revue Bénédictine* 77 (1967), pp. 47-106; T. G. Kardong (trans.), ‘The Rule of the Four Fathers: A New English Translation and Commentary’, *American Benedictine Review* 54:2 (2003), pp. 142-180.

Benedictine Rule.⁹⁷ Drawing on chapter 21 of the rule, the authority of the abbot and his deans was emphasised. Likewise, mirroring chapter 55 of the Rule of Benedict, the abbot was to set the clothing and diet of the monastery.⁹⁸ The community was to share a dormitory, a refectory and a warming room. At first glance there is nothing particularly remarkable about these statements that effectively summarise the basics of the monastic life. However, for the forger, St. Maurice was an episcopal foundation and it was the local bishop who established the norms by which the community was to live. Given that the charter represented a created memory of the foundation of the monastery, it is notable that no abbot is present at this council.⁹⁹ This may well reflect the reality of the life within the foundation and archaeological work at the site has shown that alongside the ecclesiastical buildings there was a large *aula*, which likely operated as the residence of the bishop-abbot.¹⁰⁰ This residence would have served as a place where the bishop could hold court and receive prestigious guests, such as Charles the Younger (d. 811), who met Pope Leo (d. 816) at St. Maurice in 804.¹⁰¹ The *aula* predates the Carolingian era, however, was clearly in use in the eighth and ninth centuries and thus would have served as the locale for the meeting of these prestigious figures.¹⁰² A notable feature of this hall is its elevated podium, which would have provided a privileged sacred space, suitable for both royal and episcopal use. Such structures were symbols of authority placed on high, ‘to which moral

⁹⁷ *Iamque scimus probatum habere duscipulam ad sanctam conversacionem sanctum Ymnemodum quem praeesse constituimus monasterio huic: posteri eius ipsum ad omne opus explendum. Tamen sub brevitate instituimus ut omnes oboediant ei et sine preceptis ipsius nichil agatur, et quicquid a prioribus ordinatum fuerit iuniores sine murmuracione explicent et per singulas ormas singuli decani constituentur digni, ut abbas diviso pondere de providencia eorum sit securus De vestimentis vero, scimus quia locus iste aeris intemperie intemperatus est; propterea tam ad induendum quam et in lectis in abbatis sit consideracione, similiter de cibo et potu. Unum habeant dormitorium; unum habeant refectorium, unum locum ad calefaciendum. De disciplina vero: de grauiribus culpis secundum canones iudicentur, de minoribus autem ut abbas iudicaverit et fratres consenserint; Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de St.Maurice d'Agaune*, pp. 78-79; see also Masai, ‘Les Debuts du Monachisme’, pp. 52-53.*

⁹⁸ Masai, ‘Les Debuts du Monachisme’, pp. 52-53.

⁹⁹ For an exploration of institutional memory and identities, albeit in an Anglo-Saxon context, see: S. Foot, ‘Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?’, in E. M. Tyler and R. Balzaretti (eds.), *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 39-67; Cubitt, ‘Monastic Memory’, pp. 253-277.

¹⁰⁰ Antonini, ‘Archéologie du Site Abbatial’, pp. 100-107.

¹⁰¹ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 52 and 292; Foot, *Aethelstan*, p. 196; For a discussion of the development of the bishop’s palace in this period see: C. Miller, *The Bishop’s Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (London, 2000), pp. 54-86.

¹⁰² Antonini, ‘Archéologie du Site Abbatial’, p. 104.

interpretations were attached'.¹⁰³ It is of note that Leidrad of Lyons reported the addition of a similar structure to his episcopal residence in the hope of encouraging a royal visit.¹⁰⁴

Theurillet and Rosenwein have strongly argued that the forged foundation charter was compiled in the late eighth or early ninth century and, if they are correct, its creation coincided with the physical renewal of the monastery.¹⁰⁵ As Rosenwein has observed, much like Fulrad's Testament, the charter invoked a special relationship with the papal see, to whom the abbot 'had a right of appeal', the forger therefore used the most up to date privileges to model his own charter.¹⁰⁶ The two documents also describe how the monks were to be organised into small groups of *normae* or *turmae* to better perform the *laus perennis*.¹⁰⁷ These common features suggest the charter was composed around the time of Fulrad and it is possible that Wilicar commissioned this work.¹⁰⁸

What then can be said of the nature of Wilicar's community at St. Maurice? It is notable that by the reign of Louis the Pious the monastery (c .820) had fully converted to a canonical, as opposed to a monastic, form of life. Rather than adopt the new monastic ordinances issued in 816/817, the community was given dispensation to continue to live according to its ancient customs.¹⁰⁹ The new monastic regulations drawn up early in the reign of Louis the Pious had essentially banned the *laus perennis*, now instead of *turmae* of monks performing 450 psalms, the entire

¹⁰³ Ibid., pp.102-04; M. de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Balcony: The Solarium in ninth century narratives' in J. R. Davies and M. McCormick (eds.), *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 277-291, at 279.

¹⁰⁴ *Leidradi Lugdunensis Archiepiscopi Epistolae*, (ed.), E. Dummler, MGH, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, *Epp. IV* (Berlin, 1895), no. 30, pp.542-544; M. de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', in J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 103-104.

¹⁰⁵ Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de St.Maurice d'Agaune*, pp. 62-75; Rosenwein, 'One Site, Many Meanings', pp. 284-290; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', pp. 118-119; A tenth-century or eleventh-century date has also been suggested: F. Dubuis and A. Lugon, 'Les Premiers Siècles d'un Diocèse Alpin', *Vallensia* 47 (1992), pp. 128-129.

¹⁰⁶ Rosenwein, 'One Site, Many Meanings', pp. 286-290.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 286; While the forged charter does not use the phrase *turmae* it was used in the donation of Ayroenus (765): *La Donation d'Ayroenus à St. Maurice*, (ed.), M. Bisson, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique Suisse*, 3 (1909), pp. 294-296; For St. Denis see Part II. 2. v.

¹⁰⁸ Both Fulrad and Wilicar helped escort the pope into Francia in 753. After Chrodegang's death in 766 Fulrad and Wilicar represented the highest ecclesiastics within the Frankish kingdom and their active co-operation may be seen at the Council of Corbény (771).

¹⁰⁹ Zufferey, *Die Abtei Saint-Maurice*, pp. 49-52; Helvétius, 'L'abbaye d'Agaune', p. 129; Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers', pp. 137-139.

congregation was expected to sing just 183 psalms.¹¹⁰ It may be for this reason that the community at St. Maurice adopted the canonical way of life prescribed at Aachen in August 816.¹¹¹ However, it is unlikely that the house had an overnight conversion from the monastic to the canonical way of life.¹¹² Traditionally, the evolution of St. Maurice, from a monastic foundation to a house of canons, has been seen as the result of the secularisation brought about by royal and episcopal involvement at the site.¹¹³ St. Maurice was a frequent stopping off point for ambassadors passing between the papal and Frankish courts and such visitors could disrupt the life of a monastic community. When discussing episcopal or royal visits in his commentary on the Rule of Benedict, Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel moves away from the Benedictine custom and draws on the Rule of Fructuosus, giving the abbot leave to eat meat. This right could be extended to the rest of the community at the abbot's discretion.¹¹⁴ It was much less problematic for clerics to eat meat, and both the Rule of Chrodegang (c.22 and c. 28) and the Canonical Institute (c. 121) permit its general consumption.¹¹⁵ As such, these old views may have merit and a community of canons could deal with frequent high status secular visitors, without the disruption to the norms of life experienced by a strictly monastic community.

The mixed community of monks and clerics described in Gregory of Tours' 'Glory of the Martyrs', seems to have continued into the eighth century and the 765 donation of Ayroenus to St. Maurice discussed both clerics and monks.¹¹⁶ The allusions to the 'Rule of the Four Fathers' and to the 'Rule of Benedict' within the forged foundation charter may offer an insight into the texts and traditions used to regulate this mixed community that was *en route* to becoming a house of canons. That

¹¹⁰ M. de Jong, 'Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History*, II (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 632-633.

¹¹¹ Zufferey, *Die Abtei Saint-Maurice*, pp. 49-52; Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers', pp. 137-138.

¹¹² Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers', p. 139.

¹¹³ Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de St.Maurice d'Agaune*, pp. 119-120; Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers', p. 138.

¹¹⁴ M. D. Ponesse, 'Smaragdus of St. Mihiel and the Carolingian Monastic Reform', *Revue Bénédictine* 116.2 (2006), pp. 380-381 and 388-389.

¹¹⁵ *RC*, p. 39, and pp. 40-41, trans., p. 67 and pp. 69-70; *IC*, pp. 111-112, trans., pp. 149-151.

¹¹⁶ 'Ut, quitquit exinde ipsi clerici vel ipsi monachi de ipsa turma Valdensis...', 'Donation d'Ayroenus', p. 296; Theurillat, *L'Abbaye de St.Maurice d'Agaune*, pp. 119-120, no. 35. Helvétius also concluded that in the eighth century the monastery was manned by a mixed community of monks and canons: A. Helvétius, 'L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune dans le haut Moyen Age', in Brocard et al. (eds.) *Autour de Saint Maurice*, pp. 113-131. This work came to my attention at a late stage and I have been unable to view this work. For discussion see: Ripart, 'Les Temps Séculiers', pp. 138-139.

the 'Rule of the Four Fathers' was still of interest in the ninth century is attested by its inclusion in Benedict of Aniane's *Codex Regularum* and *Concordia Regularum*.¹¹⁷ More significantly, in the mid-ninth century elements of the Rule of the Four Fathers, along with the prologue to the Benedictine Rule, were adapted for use by a confraternity of extra-claustral clerics.¹¹⁸ Their custom was preserved in a late-tenth-century libellus now held in the Bern Burgerbibliothek.¹¹⁹ The origins of this manuscript and the community it describes are now lost. However, the confraternity, made up of twelve members, has been associated with the Parisian society of the twelve apostles, named and listed in the margin of a mid-ninth-century sacramentary (Vat. Ottob. Lat. 313).¹²⁰ The association with Paris is in part due to the litany to all saints which forms the final section of the libellus, this includes the saints St. Denis and St. Genevieve.¹²¹ Other saints in the list, notably St. Remi, St. Germain, St. Vedaste and St. Amand, all had cults that were based north of the alps, suggesting a Northern origin¹²² However, popular Southern saints were also well represented. St. Maurice and his companions were included in the list, as were St. Gervase and St. Protase, whose cults were popular in Vienne.¹²³ These saints, alongside the document's use of the Rule of the Four Fathers may imply a Southern origin for either the confraternity document or the text upon which it is based. While it cannot be directly linked with St. Maurice d'Agaune it is within the realms of possibility that the Rule of the Four Fathers, alongside the Rule of Benedict, was adapted for clerical use

¹¹⁷ Rosenwein, 'One Site, Many Meanings', p. 287; PL, 103, 435-434; *Benedicti Anianensis Concordia Regularum* (ed.), P. Bonnerue, CCCM 168A (Turnhout: 1999).

¹¹⁸ For details of this text and its manuscript see the Appendix.

¹¹⁹ Bern, Burgerbibliothek. MS. AA.90.11; for the edited text see: A. Wilmart, 'Le Règlement Ecclésiastique de Berne', *Revue Bénédictine* 51 (1939), pp. 43-52. For the dating of the manuscript, see: B. Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 570.

¹²⁰ G. Meersseman and G. P. Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis, Vol. 1, Italia Sacra: Studi E Documenti Di Storia Ecclesiastica* (Rome, 1977), pp. 150-169; L. Delisle, *Memoire sur D'anciens Sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886), pp. 150-151 and pp. 376-377; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6438.

¹²¹ For a full list of the saints included in the litany see the appendix; for a discussion of the Parisian Saints in the list see: Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis, Vol. 1*, pp. 150-169; for the cult St. Denis see, Emerick, 'Building More Romano', pp. 130-138; D. Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford, 1978), pp.105-106; G. M. Spiegel, 'The Cult of St. Denis and Capetian Kingship', in S. Wilson (ed.) *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 141-169; Crook, *Architectural Setting*, pp. 98-101; For St. Genevieve see: Farmer, *Dictionary of Saints*, pp. 164-165.

¹²² Farmer, *Dictionary of Saints*, p. 15, pp. 168-169, p. 341 and 388-389; for the cults of St. Germain and St. Remi see: Crook, *Architectural Setting*, pp. 141-144 and 146.

¹²³ A. Thacker, 'Loca Sanctorum: The Significance of Place in the Study of the Saints', in A. Thacker et al. (eds.), *Local Saints*, p. 10, p. 25 and p. 27.

at this site. This is certainly implied by the allusions to both these texts in the foundation charter for the monastery.

Wilicar was not the only bishop from the Rhône valley who emphasised the monastic nature of his episcopal seat. At Attigny (762), Hippolyte of Belley referred to himself as bishop of the monastery of Condat.¹²⁴ Much like Wilicar, although he was bishop of a city, he chose to establish himself at this prominent and ancient monastery. While both Wilicar and Hippolyte were closely associated with Chrodegang and the Frankish court, there is no evidence that they sought to model their episcopal communities on Metz.¹²⁵ Nonetheless, they undoubtedly contributed to discussions regarding the regulation of the Frankish clergy and by living at a monastic sites these bishops were following Pope Zachary's advice.¹²⁶ While moving in parallel with Chrodegang's renewal at Metz, Wilicar and Hippolyte sought to regulate the lives of the clergy according to the traditions of their region. Benedict of Aniane's inclusion of the Rule of the Four Fathers, the Second Rule of the Fathers, and the Rule of Ferreolus within his *Codex Regularum* are testament to the continued influence of the monastic texts produced in Provence and the Rhone valley.¹²⁷ Benedict's monastery of Aniane was located in Septimania and it is therefore unsurprising that such rich Southern traditions are preserved in his codex. As Choy has recently argued, the *Concordia Regularum* and *Codex Regularum* sought to recognise 'the one purpose for which all Rules existed'; namely to establish the concordance and the essence of monasticism from a plethora of traditions, all in some sense legitimate.¹²⁸ Benedict of Aniane therefore stood in a long tradition of monastic and episcopal figures who sought to set the way of the life of their communities in 'concordance' with the best practices they had witnessed.¹²⁹ Indeed, this is precisely what Chrodegang had sought to do at Metz. Although Benedict's *Concordia Regularum* is traditionally seen as compiling specifically monastic rules, it is interesting that Ardo's *Vita Benedicti* (c.18) recalls that:

¹²⁴ Yppolitus episcopus de monasterio Eogendi; *Concilium Attinacense*, a. 762, no. 13, p. 73.

¹²⁵ For Hippolyte's association with Chrodegang, see: Claussen, *Reform*, p. 54.

¹²⁶ CC. no.3, pp. 479-487

¹²⁷ Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', pp. 76-77.

¹²⁸ Ibid., p. 85.

¹²⁹ For the importance of concordance as oppose to unity see: McKitterick, 'Unity and Diversity', pp. 59-82.

He [Benedict] assembled the rules [*regulas congregavit*] of all the holy [*omnium sanctorum*] insofar as he could locate them. He became acquainted with a useful standard and wholesome customs for monasteries which he transmitted to his own monks to be observed. He established cantors, taught lectors, secured grammarians and experts in spiritual knowledge – some of them later became bishops.¹³⁰

‘Rules of all the holy’, may well refer to episcopal communities as well as strictly monastic foundations. Ardo also acknowledges that some of Benedict’s monastic community, such as Nibridus, were destined for clerical and episcopal careers. Benedict’s interest in the life of canons is evident in the epistles attached to the end of his life, and his deathbed letter (c. 43) addressed to his successor as abbot stated:

Hold Helsichar, who before all others upon earth has always been a loyal friend of canons [*amicus fidelissimus canonicorum*] and his brothers as in my place and may your refuge be always in him.¹³¹

Likewise, the monks of Aniane wrote to Ardo (c. 42) relating:

He [Benedict] had the greatest concern for the entire ecclesiastical order, whether monks, canons or layfolk, but especially for monks.¹³²

Thus, while Benedict was undoubtedly a monastic figure, he also seemed interested in the canonical life and may well have drawn on the customs of the well-established monasteries of Condat and St Maurice when compiling his *Concordia*. His familiarity with these traditions may originate in the time he spent in Burgundy as a monk at St. Seine.¹³³

The strength of these Southern traditions is all the more significant given Wilicar’s prominent role in the 770s and 780s. While taking up Chrodegang’s mantle as archbishop he also sought to do things his own way, maintaining his Southern links as bishop of Sitten and abbot of St. Maurice. During his tenure as primate there is

¹³⁰ *Vita Benedicti Abbatis Anianensis et indensis Auctore Ardone*, (ed.), W. Wattenbach, MGH, SS 15 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 206; trans., A. Cabaniss, in A. Grabowsky and C. Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane: The Emperor’s Monk, Ardo’s Life* (Kalamazoo, MI, 2008), p. 79.

¹³¹ *Vita Benedicti*, p. 220; trans., Cabaniss, in Grabowsky and Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane*, p. 107.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 219; trans., p. 104.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

little evidence for his promotion of Chrodegang's Rule. As he did not promote this text within his own diocese of Sitten, it seems unlikely that he would advocate its use elsewhere in Francia. This does not mean he was uninterested in the way of life practised by his clergy and he was concerned to ensure his enclosed clergy lived according to monastic discipline, as permitted in Zachary's letter of c. 747.¹³⁴

II.2.iv Willibald of Eichstätt (d. c. 786)

Willibald, the Anglo-Saxon bishop of Eichstätt, is the best documented of the monastic bishops listed at Attigny (762). Much like his associate, Heddo of Strasbourg, Willibald was well connected with both the Bonifatian mission and with Chrodegang of Metz. He was present at the German Council (742/743) and was part of the *Totenbund* formed at Attigny in 762.¹³⁵ The details of his life and peregrinations are recorded in the *Hodoeporicon* written by the bishop's relative, the nun Huncberc of Heidenheim.¹³⁶ This text was composed during Willibald's life and the author claims to relate the tales told to her by Willibald, 'in dictation from his own mouth' and in the presence of 'two deacons as witnesses'.¹³⁷ The *Hodoeporicon* therefore offers insights into both Willibald's own beliefs and the nature of his community at Eichstätt.¹³⁸ After his adventures in the Holy Land, Huncberc reports that Willibald joined the community of Monte Cassino. While holding several offices within the cloister, the *Hodoeporicon* (c. 5) emphasises Willibald's reverence for the Benedictine custom stating:

¹³⁴ See above, Part II. 2. i.

¹³⁵ *Concilium Germanicum*, a. 742, p. 2; *Concilium Attinacence*, a. 762, p. 73; For the association of Boniface and Willibalde see: D. Parsons, 'Some Churches of the Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Southern Germany: A Review of the Evidence', *EME* 8.1 (1999), pp. 31-40; I. Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400-1050* (Harlow, 2001), pp. 64-66.

¹³⁶ *Vitae Willibaldi et Wynnebaldi auctore sanctimoniali Heidenheimensi*, (ed.), O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS XV., Tom. 1 (Hannover, 1887), no. 7, pp. 80-117; trans., see: C. H. Talbot, in T. F. X. Noble and T. Head (ed.) *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania, PA, 1995), pp. 141-165; Huncberc was identified as the author of the *Hodoeporicon* by Bischoff, see: B. Bischoff, 'Wer ist die Nonne von Heidenheim', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens*, 49 (1931), pp. 387-397; For a discussion of the relationship between Huncberc and her and subject see: O. Limor, 'Pilgrims and Authors: Adomnàn's *De Locis Sanctis* and Hungeburc's *Hodoeporicon Sancti Willibaldi*', *Revue Bénédictine* 114.2 (2004), pp. 253-275.

¹³⁷ 'Ista non apocriforum venia erratica dissertatione relata esse cognoseamus, sed sicut illo ipso vidente et nobis referente de ori sui dictatione audire et nihilominus scribere destinavimus, duobus diaconibus testibus mecumque audientibus', *Vita Willibaldi*, Prologue, p. 87; trans., p. 144.

¹³⁸ Limor, 'Pilgrims and Authors', pp. 253-75.

For ten years [730-740] the venerable man Willibald tried to observe, as far as possible, every detail of the monastic observance as laid down by the Rule of St. Benedict. [*Benedicti regularis vitae institutionem*.] And he not only observed it himself but led the others, whom he had brought over long distances by foot and by sea, to follow him in the traditional path of regular life [*regularis vitae*].¹³⁹

In 740 Willibald was sent by Pope Zachary to assist the Bonifatian mission, and in that year Boniface ordained him to priestly orders at Eichstätt, then at Sülzenbrücken (742) consecrated him bishop.¹⁴⁰ As bishop, it appears that Willibald continued to favour a monastic form of life. Huncberg (c.6) stated:

Afterwards he began to build a monastery in the place called Eichstätt, and he shortly afterwards practised the monastic life [*monasterialis vitae disciplinam*] there according to the observance [*usum*] which he had seen at St. Benedict's [Monte Cassino], and not merely there, but also in many other monastic houses [*monachorum mansionibus*], which he had examined with his experienced eye as he travelled through various lands. This observance he taught to others by the example of his own life.¹⁴¹

Much like Benedict Biscop, while favouring the Benedictine Custom, Willibald sought to emulate the best practices he had seen on his travels.¹⁴² Despite this monastic focus, the *Hodoeporicon* suggests some of Willibald's community at Eichstätt were clergy; in the prologue it was the clerical order who were primarily addressed:

Here begins the life of the brothers Willibald and Wynnebald, addressed to all priests, deacons and princes of the ecclesiastical order. To all those most beloved in Christ, clerics known under the honorable title of priest, and deacons of the excellent nature, and abbots, as well as princes of the secular order: our pious bishop [Willibald] by virtue of his pastoral care appointed you, some as

¹³⁹ *Vita Willibaldi*, p. 102; trans., p.161.

¹⁴⁰ There has been some discussion over the location of Willibald's episcopal seat and it seems likely that at his consecration he was made bishop of Erfurt, however, this site was deemed unsuitable and Willibald soon withdrew to Eichstätt. See: D. Parsons, 'Some Churches of the Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Southern Germany: A Review of the Evidence', *EME*, 8.1 (1999), pp. 36-40.

¹⁴¹ *Vita Willibaldi*, p. 105; trans., p. 163.

¹⁴² P. Wormald, 'Bede and Benedict Biscop', pp. 405-434; H. Mayr-Harting, *The Venerable Bede, The Rule of St Benedict and Social Class*, Jarrow Lecture (1976), pp. 1-28; J. Story, *Carolingian Connections: Anglo-Saxon England and Carolingian Francia*, c. 750-870 (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 37-41.

priests in the holy order, others as deacons chosen for sobriety and chasteness, others as monks in the cenobitical army.¹⁴³

More tellingly, Huncberc (c. 6) reported that the veracity of her tale was corroborated by Willibald's 'deacons and other subordinates'.¹⁴⁴ This strongly suggests that Willibald lived with a mixed clerical and monastic community at Eichstätt, while living according to the monastic practices of Monte Cassino. Maintaining this theme, the *Hodoeporicon* concluded with a summary of Willibald's achievements as bishop, and again this demonstrates a clerical rather than monastic focus:

This, then, was Willibald, who at first began to practise a holy life [*sanctae conversationis*] with the support of but a few helpers, but who at last, after struggling in many ways against the opposition of numerous chieftains and courtiers, gained possession of a people worthy of the Lord. Far and wide through the vast province of Bavaria he drove his plough, sowing the seed and reaping the harvest with the help of many fellow-labourers. And all though the land of Bavaria, now dotted about with churches, priests' houses and the relics of the saints, [*aeclesiis atque presbiteris sanctorumque reliquiis*], he amassed treasures worthy of our Lord. From these places antiphons now resound, sacred lessons are chanted [*Inde nunc antephonas crepitant, inde lectiones resultant*], a noble throng of believers shout aloud the miracles of Christ and with joyful hearts echo from mouth to mouth triumphant praises of their Creator.¹⁴⁵

Such statements are self-congratulatory and likely overstate Willibald's achievements in Bavaria.¹⁴⁶ However, it is notable that the 'antiphons' and 'sacred lessons' come not from monasteries, but 'priest's houses' and 'churches'. All of this could reflect the Anglo-Saxon origins of both Willibald and Huncberc and the mixing of monastic and clerical roles.¹⁴⁷ Yet, as Cubitt has shown, the assumption that English writers did not distinguish between monastic and clerical foundations is

¹⁴³ *Vita Willibaldi*, p. 86; trans., p. 143.

¹⁴⁴ Ex illius ore dictata perscripsimus in monasterio Heidanheim, testibus mihi diaconis eius et aliis nonnullis iunioris eius. *Ibid.*, p. 105; trans., p. 163.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 106; trans., p. 164.

¹⁴⁶ The level of opposition faced seems to have been minimal. Likewise, syncretism and pagan practices were often overstated by eighth-century Christian writers. See: J. Palmer, *Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 113-177, for Bavaria and the *Hodoeporicon* see, pp. 129-31; J. Palmer, 'Defining Paganism in the Carolingian World', *EME* 15.4 (2007), pp. 402-25; J. Couser, 'Inventing Paganism in Eighth Century Bavaria', *EME* 18.1 (2010), pp. 26-42.

¹⁴⁷ Parsons, 'Churches of the Anglo-Saxon Missionaries', p. 65.

somewhat anachronistic.¹⁴⁸ More significantly, given Willibald's association with Boniface and with pope Zachary, it is likely that he was one of the bishops who in the 740s may have sought papal clarification on clerics living a monastic life. At the very least he would have been interested in Zachary's letter, and both the letter and the *Hodoeporicon* make use of the phrase *monasterialis vitae disciplinam*, applying this concept to the regulation of the clergy. At Eichstätt it seems that the community, while nominally monastic, was formed at least in part by clerics living monastic lives. A similar situation may be detected at St. Denis, which is sometimes seen to have adopted the canonical way of life during the second half of the eighth-century.

II. 2. v. **Fulrad (d.784), the abbots of St. Denis and monasticism**

St. Denis had a long association with both the Carolingian dynasty and the Frankish royal court. Charles Martel clearly favoured the abbey and made it one of the largest landholders north of the Seine.¹⁴⁹ Following the example of the Merovingian kings, such as Dagobert (d. 604), both Charles Martel (d. 741) and Pippin III (d. 768) were buried at the abbey.¹⁵⁰ As well as having an association with the Frankish crown, St. Denis had a personal resonance for Pippin III; educated within the abbey, he has been described as 'a man of St. Denis'.¹⁵¹ Following his coronation in 751, one of Pippin's first acts as king was to restore 46 properties to the abbey and the monastery continued to receive special immunities and properties under the abbacy of Fulrad (c. 750-84).¹⁵²

Fulrad is recorded as serving as palace chaplain in 749 when he was sent to Rome to seek papal approval for the usurpation of Childeric III.¹⁵³ It seems likely that he was not only active at court prior to this date, but was also part of Pippin's inner circle. His high standing is illustrated by the fact he was dispatched on this most

¹⁴⁸ Cubitt, 'Clergy of Early Anglo-Saxon', pp. 273-287.

¹⁴⁹ Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, pp. 132-134.

¹⁵⁰ Emerick, 'Building *More Romano*', pp. 130-138.

¹⁵¹ Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, p. 163.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 140-142; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 121-124.

¹⁵³ 'Burgliardus Wirzeburgensis episcopus et Folradus capellanus missi fuerunt ad Zachariam papam', *ARF* 749, p. 8; trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 39.

important mission. As both palace chaplain and abbot of St Denis, Fulrad was actively engaged with the political and religious affairs of the kingdom and he worked with Chrodegang and Wilicar on several key occasions. The *Liber Pontificalis* records that these figures escorted the Pope to his meeting with Pippin III at Ponthion in January 754.¹⁵⁴ They also met together at the Council of Attigny (762), and along with 41 other ecclesiastics created a spiritual confraternity, uniting in prayer episcopal communities and monastic houses from across the kingdom.¹⁵⁵ This association has led Claussen to suggest that Fulrad may have been one of the ‘spiritual brethren’ referred to in the prologue to Chrodegang’s Rule, who offered aid and advice to the bishop. It is likely that Chrodegang discussed such matters with other leading churchmen.¹⁵⁶ These close links, alongside Hincmar’s statements that he was raised as a canon at St Denis in the early-ninth-century, have led to the suggestion that Chrodegang’s Rule influenced the form of regulated life practised by Fulrad and his community.¹⁵⁷ Such claims cannot be supported with manuscript evidence and the form of life practised by the community at St. Denis in the late-eighth and early-ninth centuries is worthy of further analysis.¹⁵⁸

Defining the exact form of life practised by Fulrad and his community at St. Denis is difficult. As noted above, Fulrad held both the offices of palace chaplain and abbot of St. Denis and he was often referred to by both titles; thus chapters 47 and 49 of the Life of Stephen II call him ‘the venerable abbot and priest’.¹⁵⁹ As an abbot his function was clearly monastic, yet as chaplain his role was clerical. Obeying the dietary requirements of monastic custom, while serving at court, would have been difficult. The quantities of meat that the palace required are made clear in the *Capitulare de Villis*.¹⁶⁰ As the head of the palace administration the archchaplain may

¹⁵⁴ *Stephanus II, LP*, Vol. I, cc. 23-24, pp. 446-447, trans., Davis, *Eighth Century Popes*, pp. 61-62; Paul the Deacon only mentions Chrodegang’s Rule in this mission a point that will be discussed in Part II. 3. i. For an account of the papal mission in 754 see: Noble, *Republic*, pp. 71-86.

¹⁵⁵ *Concilium Attiniacense*, 762, pp. 72-73; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 55-57; Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, pp. 172-173.

¹⁵⁶ Claussen, *Reform*, p. 207.

¹⁵⁷ McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 58-59.

¹⁵⁸ As noted above only four manuscript copies of the Rule of Chrodegang survive, none have been associated with the Parisian region. For details see: Langefeld, *Enlarged Rule*, pp. 32-35.

¹⁵⁹ *Stephanus II, LP*, pp. 454-455, trans., Davis, *Eighth Century Popes* pp. 72 and p. 75.

¹⁶⁰ *Capitulare de Villis*, MGH *Capit I*, no.32, pp. 82-91; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 64-73; Prior to 817 it was of course possible for monks to eat poultry as the Rule of Benedict only bans the ‘the consumption of the meat of quadrupeds’; *RB*, c.39, pp. 138-139.

even have supervised the hunters and falconers that fulfilled a key role in the functioning of the palace.¹⁶¹ The palace was no place of monastic isolation and in his official roles, Fulrad bridged the divide between the clerical and monastic orders. He certainly cannot be viewed in strictly monastic terms.¹⁶²

Fulrad was granted great authority by both the Carolingian kings and the papacy and he was seen as more than a humble abbot.¹⁶³ Stephen II gave him the right to build monasteries throughout the kingdom without recourse to the local bishop.¹⁶⁴ Such rights were mirrored by Pippin III and Charlemagne; notably in 777 Fulrad was granted control of the Alsatian monastery of Salornnes and immunity from the authority of the bishop of Metz.¹⁶⁵ These supra-diocesan powers elevated Fulrad above the rest of the Frankish episcopate, leading Pope Hadrian to refer to him as ‘Fulrad, the abbot [and] archpriest of Francia’.¹⁶⁶ Clearly at this stage there was no issue with this mixing of monastic and clerical roles. As noted above, Willicar and Willibald lived in mixed clerical and monastic communities. Likewise, Chrodegang himself served as both bishop of Metz and abbot of Lorsch.¹⁶⁷ Perhaps then, Fulrad should be viewed in a similar light to these figures, as a cleric who lived a monasticised life. The abbey of St. Denis, as one of the most prominent cult sites in Francia, played an increasingly pastoral role during the eighth century, caring both for the monastery’s relics and as well for the pilgrims who visited the basilica. St. Denis

¹⁶¹ *Hincmarius De Ordini Palatii*, (eds.), T. Gross and R. Schieffer, MGH *Fontes Iures Germanici Antiqui in Usus Scholarum Separatim Editi* III (Hanover, 1980), c. 16, pp. 62-64; D. Herlihy (trans.), ‘Hincmar of Rheims On the Governance of the Palace’, in P. Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilisation*, p. 523.

¹⁶² Wood goes as far as to call him, ‘priest but not monk’: S. Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2006), p. 188.

¹⁶³ For Fulrad’s political role see, J. Story, ‘Cathwulf, kingship, and the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis’, *Speculum* 74.1 (1999), pp. 1-21.

¹⁶⁴ A. J. Stoclet, ‘Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710-784), Abbé et Archprêtre de monastères “exempts”’, *Le Moyen Âge*, 88 (1982), pp. 210-235, for the text of the privilege see, pp. 234-235; see also: Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 108-109.

¹⁶⁵ *Karl der Grosse Bestätigt der Kirche in Salonne*, (eds.), E. Mühlbacher et al., MGH, *Dipl. Kar. I.*, (Hanover, 1906), no. 118, pp. 164-168; For a translation and discussion of this immunity see: Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 115-134 and pp. 225-226; see also: Stoclet, ‘Abbé et Archprêtre de monastères’, pp. 223-233.

¹⁶⁶ ‘Carolo, Francorum regi, respondet se pallum Tilppino archiepiscopo Remensi per Fulradum, abbatem, Franciae archipresbyterum’, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, (ed.), P. Jaffé (Leipzig, 1885), no. 2410, p. 293; See also Emerick, ‘Building More Romano’, p. 137; Stoclet, ‘Abbé et Archprêtre’, p. 210.

¹⁶⁷ Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 113.

was certainly no place of tranquil monastic isolation, and Fulrad himself alludes to this in his testament:

When I will have departed from this world, so that my own sins [may be forgiven] through confession and the generosity of my own property [I give] to the holy place the church of the blessed martyrs Denis, Rusticus and Eleutherius, where the Lord himself laid their bodies to rest in that place called Cadolaco, where *turmae* of servants of God may be seen in attendance, praising Christ day and night. So that they undertake in charity the care of strangers or in charity of the *senodicorum*, of paupers, widows and orphans and the church lights. In order that the Lord may take pity and with the intercession of the saints and the prayers of paupers, grant me peace and in mercy accept that I may have earned a share in the blessed life.¹⁶⁸

Fulrad avoided using explicitly monastic language within his will and St. Denis is described as a church rather than a monastery. Equally, those who form the congregation are not explicitly referred to as monks, but are rather described as ‘servants of God’. This ambiguous catchall term could well refer to clergy, monks, or indeed both groups. Maintaining a clerical focus, Fulrad describes himself in priestly rather than abbatial terms, stating that he was ‘unworthy to be associated with the title *sacerdos*’.¹⁶⁹ The testament’s interest in the paupers that visited the church is also intriguing. While the Rule of Benedict certainly encourages monks to welcome strangers and pilgrims, the testament goes further and highlights the openness of the church at St. Denis.¹⁷⁰ It is through the prayers and intercessions of the ‘pilgrim paupers’ that Fulrad hopes to secure his redemption. The rebuilding of St. Denis during this period also highlights its role as a pastoral, rather than a strictly monastic church.¹⁷¹ It has long been acknowledged that the rebuilt St. Denis, with its T-shaped plan, was modeled on St. Peter’s in Rome.¹⁷² As Emerick has recently argued, these

¹⁶⁸ Quando de hunc saeculum ero migraturus. ut aliquid de peccatis meis per confessionem et largitatem de proprias pecunias meas, que ad ecclesiarum et ad loca sanctorum beatorum martirum Dionisio, Rustico et Eleutherio, ubi ipsi domni corpore requiescunt in loco qui dicitur Cadolaco, ubi plurima servorum dei turma laudes Christi die noctuque adesse videntur, ut in aelimonia eorum et susceptionem hospidum vel in aelimosina senodicorum, pauperum, viduarum, orfanorum et in lumen ecclesiarum conferre debeam, ut dominus per suam misericordiam et intercessionem sanctorum et orationes pauperum mihi in pace et misericordia debeat recipere, qualiter portionem merear habere in vita beatorum; A. J. Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v.710-784)* (Geneva, 1993), p. 469.

¹⁶⁹ Ego Fulradus, hasci indignus sacerdos vocatus; Ibid., p. 469.

¹⁷⁰ *RB*, pp. 172-175.

¹⁷¹ Emerick, ‘Building *More Romano*’, pp. 142-150.

¹⁷² This idea was first put forward by R. Krautheimer, ‘The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture,’ *The Art Bulletin*, 24 (1942), pp. 1-38; for an updated analysis see, Ibid., pp. 127-150.

links were more than architectural. At St. Denis Fulrad sought to imitate St. Peter's role as the 'pastoral church par excellence', creating a cult site for both royal rituals and where pilgrims could visit the relics of St. Denis and his companions.¹⁷³ Given that the monastery was the burial place of Charles Martel and Pippin III, it well suited the political and spiritual needs of Carloman and Charlemagne to maintain the abbey as a public and central place of worship.

Despite these pastoral and clerical concerns, in other places Fulrad maintained a monastic focus. At the council of Attigny (762) the delegates who signed the confraternity document were divided into two groups, bishops and abbots. Chrodegang led the bishops, while Fulrad led the abbots.¹⁷⁴ The capitulary divided the clerical order from the monastic and Chrodegang and Fulrad appear to lead their respective orders in prayer.¹⁷⁵ Here, unlike in his testament, Fulrad overtly records St. Denis as a monastery. Likewise, the aforementioned immunity for Salornnes (777) focused on Fulrad's role as abbot and his authority over Salornnes. The charter used explicitly monastic language:

The King found that the privilege contained the provision that neither bishop Angilramn, nor his successors nor any archdeacons or *missi* from his church at Metz could exercise the bishop's right to do ordinations or bless the chrism and altars at Salornnes unless asked to do so by the abbot of St. Denis ... henceforth no bishop at all, neither Angilramn nor his successors, may touch the monastery of Salornnes. Rather it is to be under the immunity and privilege of St. Denis, in accordance with the Rule [*regulariter*], like the other churches [*ecclesias*] that belong to the house of St. Denis [*casa sancti Dionisii*].¹⁷⁶

In 777 in both Charlemagne's and Fulrad's eyes St. Denis and Salornnes were strictly monastic, following a rule and independent of episcopal authority. Such independence from diocesan authority was primarily reserved for monastic foundations. Unlike the clerical Cathedral community of Metz, which was clearly

¹⁷³ Emerick, 'Building *More Romano*', pp. 142-150, at p. 150; A similar agenda may have been enacted at St. Maurice d'Agaune. See above, Part II. 2. iii.

¹⁷⁴ *Concilium Attiniacense*, 762, pp. 72-73.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.* As noted above, this divide is not clear-cut and several monastic-bishops are listed.

¹⁷⁶ *Karl der Grosse Bestätigt der Kirche in Salornne*, MGH, *Dipl. Kar. I.*, no. 118, pp. 164-168; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 225, trans., p. 116; For further discussion of this immunity see below, Part II. 3. i.

subject to the bishop's authority, Chrodegang's 757 privilege for the monastery of Gorze states:

It is fitting that we preserve their [the monks] quiet and order and tranquillity for them so that they may not be disturbed or plundered or despoiled against the order of reason – not by us nor our archdeacon or other delegate of St Stephen [of Metz] or anyone at all ... And unless we have been asked by the congregation or its abbot to give them the benefit of prayer, none of us should be allowed to enter the *secreta septa* of the monastery.¹⁷⁷

The reference to the Rule within the immunity for Salornnes, makes it likely that the community of St. Denis and its dependents remained monastic. However, while monastic in name, it is also clear that clergy and priests who came to be called canons formed part of the community of St. Denis. Monastic clergy and priest-monks were required to perform the masses for the dead which formed an integral part of the enclosed life in the eighth and ninth centuries.¹⁷⁸ Their presence in the cloister would not have been unusual and was indeed permitted in chapters 60 and 62 of the Benedictine rule.¹⁷⁹ As discussed above, clerics who lived some form of lesser monastic life were perfectly acceptable at the end of the eighth century, but would become increasingly unacceptable in the early-ninth-century. In the wake of Louis the Pious' imperial councils of 816/817, abbot Hilduin (814-c.855) felt it necessary to renew the community and enforce a stricter understanding of the Benedictine Rule at St Denis.¹⁸⁰ This attempt caused the community to split, with its more disciplined members forming a separate cell at Mours in the Oise valley.¹⁸¹ It was not until the synods of 829 and 832 that the conflict was resolved and the two communities were reunited.¹⁸² At this point the new version of the rule was accepted and enforced on

¹⁷⁷ *Concilium Compendiense*, a. 757, pp. 60-62; trans., Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 104-105. There are of course differences between the Gorze privilege and that issued for Salornnes, Chrodegang preserved his episcopal rights to visit the community and ordain its members. See Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 101-106.

¹⁷⁸ McLaughlin, *Consorting With Saints*, pp. 67-101.

¹⁷⁹ *RB*, pp. 194-95 and pp. 200-201.

¹⁸⁰ For an overview of these events see: R.F. Beckonhofer, *Day of Reckoning: Power and Accountability in Medieval France* (Philadelphia, PA, 2004), pp. 13-15; O. G. Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen und deistischen Gemeinschaften im westfränkischen Bereich: Bestandteil des Quellenwerkes Societas et fraternitas Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften*. (Munich, 1978), pp. 112-120.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸² *Concilia in Monasterio Sancti Dyonisii Habita*, 829-30, MGH, *Capit. II*, nos. 52 and 53, pp. 683-694.

the monastery.¹⁸³ The manner in which these event were recorded and remembered provides a window on the nature of the community prior to 816/817. Louis the Pious' charter, confirming the conclusions of the 832 synod, recalled that those at St. Denis who had 'ceased holding to the monastic life' had lived 'in accordance with the rule, although less perfectly' and at the synod they had petitioned 'to be restored in that place [St. Denis]'.¹⁸⁴ Here Louis alluded to clerics, who were not fully professed monks (at least in the eyes of Hilduin and Louis), but wore their garb and lived as part of the community of St. Denis. Such practices had been condemned at the Council of Aachen (816):

An abuse that we find has crept in among certain Canons, which needs to be checked by ecclesiastical authority, is that, contrary to the usage of the church, they are wearing cowls, which are garments of monks alone. Since their way of life is quite different from that of monks, they should not presume to wear their habits... it is just as indecent for a canon to wear a monk's habit, unless with the habit he intends to take on the monastic way of life. Since there is no authority for them to dress like that, and it has rightly been rebuked and corrected by those who know better, from now on this abuse must be rigorously forbidden.¹⁸⁵

It is significant that the charter records that those who submitted to the council in 832, wore their cowls [*cucullis*]. In his letter to Pope Nicholas (July 867) Hincmar recalled the changed nature of St. Denis, perhaps offering a narrative of the convulsions that accompanied Hilduin's attempt to enforce a more disciplined life at St. Denis:

¹⁸³ *Constitutio de Partitione Bonorum Monasterii S. Dyonisii*, 832, Ibid., no. 53, pp. 688-694 and *Imperiale De Restauratione Habitus Monachorum Beati Dyonisii*, (ed.) J. Tardif, *Monuments Historiques*, no. 124 (Paris, 1866), pp. 86-89.

¹⁸⁴ Qua confessione facta, cucullis sui propositi coram coetu episcoporum et ceterorum sacerdotum, cunctique sequentis ordinis cleri, nobilemque virorum non modica circum adsistente turba, se induerunt, atque in commune, ne aliquando, sicuti sibi aliisque jam in eodem loco contigerat, ab sanctae professionis propositio diabolico propulsarentur instinctu, regularem promissionem iteraverunt. Pars denique quaedam eorum, illi scilicet, qui divinae inspirationis munere acti, et amore devincti in sanctae religionis propositio et habitu, adprime absque ulla refectione aut interpolatione elegerunt viriliter permanere, et in cella ejusdem majoris monasterii, postquam ceteri monasticam vitam et habitum deseruerunt, usque ad hanc nostrae demandationis sinodum habitam degere ante jam memoratos venerabiles patres venerunt, locumque pristinum, in quo promissionem fecerant, et regulariter, licet minus perfecte, vixerant, sibi et petierunt loco restitui; *Monuments Historiques*, no. 124, pp. 87-88. See also Beckonhofer, *Day of Reckoning*, pp. 13-14.

¹⁸⁵ *IC*, c. 124, p. 405, trans., pp. 154-155. This precept superseded Zachary's 747 decrees, discussed above, allowing clerics of the episcopal household to live monastic lives wearing 'woolen robes'. This letter was preserved in the *Codex Carolinus* and was therefore still of interest as late as 791. For more on this see below, Part II. 3. i.

How from infancy in that monastery [St. Denis] I was trained and educated under the canonical habit [*sub canonico habitu*]. Then, for not a short amount of time, I was educated in the palace of the lord emperor Louis. After the brothers in the monastery of St. Denis, where I had been raised, had converted to a regular life and habit [*conversis autem ad regularem vitam et habitum*], I dwelled there for a long time, fleeing the world without hope or appetite for a bishopric, or any prelateship.¹⁸⁶

Hincmar denotes the change that occurred during his lifetime, where he moved from the ‘canonical habit’ of his infancy to the ‘regular life and habit’ of his adult life. It is unclear whether Hincmar was discussing the ‘habit’ as a piece of clothing or as the practices that defined the community. What matters is that Hincmar observed a change at the monastery and, as one of the community who remained at St. Denis, he recounted his own personal conversion.¹⁸⁷ Flodoard implies that Hincmar assisted Hilduin in re-establishing monastic discipline and Hincmar may have had a hand in defining the exact nature of the community.¹⁸⁸ For Hincmar at least, the earlier practices at St. Denis were clerical as opposed to strictly monastic, an error that required correction. This is not to say that Hincmar disapproved of the way of life practised by canons, but he considered that those who professed themselves to be monks ought to live fully monastic lives. In a similar vein, as noted in Part 1, Hincmar had a slightly different concept of the canonical order than the traditions followed at Metz. For him it was crucial that canons remained within the enclosure, while the parochial clergy, unburdened by the requirements of the Divine Office, could meet the spiritual needs of the laity. Hincmar’s conception of the difference between canons and secular clerics may well reflect his upbringing at St. Denis, which he thought of as canonical, a view not shared by those ‘monks’ who opposed Hilduin’s renewal. From the abbacy of Fulrad through to Hilduin’s renewal, there was a

¹⁸⁶ *Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis epistolae*, (ed.), E. Perelp, MGH, *Epp. VIII., Teil 1* (Hanover, 1985), no. 198, p. 210; translation adapted from: R. Stone, ‘Introduction: Hincmar’s world’, in R. Stone and C. West (eds.), *Hincmar of Rheims: Life and Work* (Manchester, 2015). I would like to thank Rachel Stone for giving me an advanced copy of her chapter. For a discussion of this letter see: R. Stone, ‘Hincmar’s World’; J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, ‘History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar’, in R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard W. Southern* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 43-70.

¹⁸⁷ Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen*, pp. 32-33; See also, Beckonhofer, *Day of Reckoning*, p. 201, fn. 16.

¹⁸⁸ *Flodoard Historia Remensis Ecclesiae, Lib III*, (eds.), G. Waitz and J. Heller MGH, *SS XIII* (Hanover, 1881) p. 475; Stone, ‘Hincmar’s World’.

consistent focus on the 'Rule'. St. Denis remained monastic in principle, even while there was debate over the exact nature of the monastic and canonical lives.

II.2.vi Conclusion

The period between c. 750 and the 780s was one in which the precise nature of the life of canons was yet to be defined. Rather than the rapid spread of Chrodegang's text, the case studies discussed above suggest the continuation of a variety of approaches to the regulation of the enclosed clergy. It seems likely that Zachary's 747 decretal had some influence, but the exact nature of life within episcopal communities remained at the discretion of the individual bishop. It is of further note that the period between 769 and 787 was one of intense political and military activity. Francia was re-united under Charlemagne (771), while Aquitaine (769), Bavaria (787) and the Lombard kingdom (774) were all subjected to Frankish conquest and Carolingian domination. It is perhaps little wonder that defining the exact nature of the canonical life was not a top priority for the Frankish Church. Churchmen such as Chrodegang, Fulrad, and Wilicar, were primarily concerned with establishing their diocesan authority and supporting their royal patrons in their efforts to expand their dominion. What little we know of Wilicar's activity is certainly linked with the establishment of Carolingian authority. In 771 he led Carloman's magnates in their submission to Charlemagne, while letters 95, 96 and 97 of the *Codex Carolinus* record Wilicar's efforts to establish Frankish influence over the Spanish Church.¹⁸⁹ Following Charlemagne's military and political successes in the 770s and 780s, the Frankish Church became more actively engaged with discussing the exact nature of the canonical and monastic ways of life. As Bullough pointed out, a shift in thought and court life may be detected at the end of 780s and the start of the 790s.¹⁹⁰ It was the next generation of Churchmen, led by figures such as Angilramn, Alcuin and Theodulf, who would address these issues head on.

¹⁸⁹ Bullough, 'The Dating of the Codex Carolinus', pp. 223-230.

¹⁹⁰ Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 293-301.

Chapter 3. Regulating the Life of the Clergy c.785-813

II.3 Introduction

The late 780s and early 790s saw a new phase in the development of the Carolingian kingdom.¹ With the deaths of Fulrad (d. 784), Wilicar (d. c. 785) and Willibald (d. c. 786), a new generation of scholars and church leaders rose to prominence at the Frankish court. First amongst these new figures was Angilramn of Metz (d. 791), who as archchaplain of the palace played a crucial political and religious role until his untimely death in 791.² Other ‘new faces’ at court included Alcuin (d. 804), who was resident in Francia by 786, and Theodulf of Orléans (d. 821), who arrived in Septimania around 780 and entered the court milieu soon afterwards.³ A fourth figure at court, whose importance is sometimes overlooked, was Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818). The details of Hildebald’s early career are obscure, little is known of him before his appointment as bishop of Cologne in 787. In 791 he succeeded Angilramn as archchaplain and therefore became the most senior figure within palace chapel.⁴ These four figures were interested in the regulation of the canonical clergy and contributed to the continuing discussion about how the canonical clergy ought to live. This chapter will examine how these four prominent churchmen, and their episcopal associates, sought to regulate the life of the canonical clergy between 785 and 813. It will analyse key documents produced by the court including: the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), the *Codex Carolinus* (791), and the Synod of Frankfurt (794); as well as considering the documents produced at the diocesan level, such as Angilramn’s version of the Rule of Chrodegang, and Theodulf’s First Episcopal Statute.

¹ Bullough, ‘*Aula Renovata*’, pp. 293-301.

² For an overview of Angilramn’s career see: Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, pp. 4-8; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 114-134.

³ For Alcuin’s arrival at court see: Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 336-346; Bullough, ‘Men of God’, pp. 136-142. For an overview of Theodulf’s early career see: T. M. Andersson, *Theodulf of Orléans: The Verse* (Tempe, AZ, 2014), pp. 1-17.

⁴ For a discussion of Hildebald’s career see: Bullough, ‘Men of God’, pp. 142-146; Espelo, ‘Testimony of Carolingian Rule’, pp. 30-36 and pp. 54-80.

II.3.i The Archchaplains: Angilramn of Metz (d. 791) and Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818)

It is during Angilramn's episcopate that we see the first direct evidence of the promotion of Chrodegang's rule. The bishop recruited Paul the Deacon to compose the *Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus* (c. 784), which recorded Chrodegang's renewal of the Metz Cathedral community, stating:⁵

He brought the clergy together and made them live within the confines of a cloister in the image of a monastery [*instar cenobii intra claustrorum*]. He established for them a rule [*norma*] of how they should soldier in the Church.⁶

Angilramn was appointed bishop of Metz in 768 and may have been consecrated on the same day as Charlemagne took the throne, 25th September 768.⁷ Although an important member of the episcopate in the 770s, Angilramn's comparative lack of influence is illustrated by his treatment at the synod of Paderborn (777), where Fulrad of St. Denis' control over the monastery of Salornnes was confirmed.⁸ This immunity protected Salornnes from the interference and control of the bishop of Metz stating:

The King found that the privilege contained the provision that neither bishop Angilramn, nor his successors nor any archdeacons or *missi* from his church at Metz could exercise the bishop's right to do ordinations or bless the chrism and altars at Salornnes unless asked to do so by the abbot of St. Denis. The king asked Bishop Angilramn whether he had himself consented to this privilege, and he did not deny it. Rather he made the privilege known exactly as it had been issued by the synod where his bishops agreed to it.⁹

⁵ For the dating of the *Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus* see: Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 8.

⁶ Kempf, *LEM*, p. 86, trans., p. 87.

⁷ The late tenth-century list of bishop of Metz preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 5294 gives this date for Angilramn's accession; Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 5.

⁸ The only evidence for this synod is the Salornnes immunity; *Karl der Grosse Bestätigt der Kirche in Salornne*, MGH, Dipl. Kar. I., no. 118, pp. 164-168. For discussion see: Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 115-134, and pp. 225-226.

⁹ *Karl der Grosse Bestätigt der Kirche in Salornne*, Dipl. Kar. I., no. 118, pp. 164-168; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 225, trans., p. 116.

While the charter deploys the language of consensus and unity, its findings likely represent the conclusion of a land dispute between Fulrad and Angilramn.¹⁰

Here Angilramn's episcopal rights were eroded in favour of Fulrad's supra-diocesan role. At the synod of Paderborn (777) Angilramn may have moved in the highest eschelons of Frankish society, but he did not hold the sway or influence of either Fulrad or Wilicar.

Angilramn's influence increased rapidly during Fulrad's final illness in the 780s, and in 784 he was appointed archchaplain of the palace.¹¹ Perhaps following the death of Wilicar, and certainly by 788, Angilramn had been appointed archbishop, combining the roles previously filled by Fulrad and Wilicar.¹² The new archchaplain's status was remembered fondly at the Council of Frankfurt (794), which highlighted his central role:

'Our lord the king informed the holy synod that he had permission of the holy see, that is of Pope Hadrian, to keep Angilramn the archbishop permanently in his palace to deal with ecclesiastical matters [*utilitates ecclesiasticas*]. He asked the synod that he might be allowed to have bishop Hildebald there on the same terms as he had Angilramn, since for him also, as for Angilramn, he had the apostolic permission. The whole synod agreed, and decided that he should be in the palace to deal with ecclesiastical matters [*propter utilitates ecclesiasticas*].'¹³

Angilramn was evidently interested in Chrodegang's text. Prior to his appointment as bishop, he had served as one of the canonical clergy at St Stephen's,

¹⁰ G. Oexle, 'Die Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulf', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 1 (1967), p. 296. Rosenwein disagrees with Oexle and argues that the immunity represents 'a happy meetings of minds'. She suggests that Angilramn himself supported such extra-diocesan authority; pointing out that in 775 Angilramn had received immunity for the lands of Metz south of the Loire. [*Karl der Grosse Bestätigt der Kirche von Metz*, MGH, *Dipl. Kar. I.*, no. 91, pp. 131-132]; Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 115-134. However, there has been some debate over the authenticity of this diploma, and it may well be a later forgery that sought to emphasise the close relationship between Metz and the Carolingians. For discussion see: Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 6, no. 23; E. Magnou-Nortier, 'Étude sur le privilege d'immunité du IV^e au IX^e siècle' *Revue Mabillon* (Jul. 1984), pp. 505-507. Bachrach deals with the immunity in an uncritical manner: B. Bachrach, *Charlemagne's Early Campaigns (768-777): A Diplomatic and Military Analysis* (Leiden, 2013), pp. 424-425.

¹¹ Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, pp. 6-7; For Fulrad's last years see: J. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der Deutsche Könige, vol. 1: Grundlegung. Die Karolingische Hofkapelle*, MGH, *Schriften*, 16.1 (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 48; J. Fleckenstein, 'Karl der Große und sein Hof', in: Helmut Beumann (ed.), *Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf 1967), pp. 24-50, at p. 35.

¹² Angilramn is first recorded as both archchaplain and archbishop in: *Karl der Grosse bestätigt einen vom Erzbischof Angilramn von Metz für das Kloster Gorze mit dem Bischof Borno von Toni abgeschlossenen Tauschvertrag*. — 788 Juni 11, MGH, *Dipl. Kar. I.*, no. 161, pp. 218-219; see also Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 7.

¹³ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 62-63.

Metz. He likely played a prominent role within the community and his rank is demonstrated by his presence at the Council of Compiègne (757), where he witnessed Chrodegang's privilege for Gorze.¹⁴ Angilramn also added to Chrodegang's rule (c. 20), allowing the clergy to eat meat during Pentecost.¹⁵ Bertram has also suggested that other textual variations within Rome, BAV Pal. Lat. 555, the manuscript containing Angilramn's version of chapter 20, were additions made by the archbishop. These insertions were made to chapters 33 and 34 of the rule.¹⁶ It is possible that Angilramn was the author of the entire final section of the rule (cc. 30-34). As discussed above, this may have been composed after the main text and is much less concerned with the idealised form of life, addressing real world issues. These included: the ownership of property; alms given to the church; and the management of the *matricularii* attached to the community of canons.¹⁷ It cannot be said with any certainty that Angilramn added these chapters, but their contents have more in common with capitulary texts of the 780s and 790s, than those produced in Chrodegang's day.¹⁸

Angilramn made a concerted effort in the 780s to enhance the reputation of the city of Metz and to promote Chrodegang's Rule. His commissioning of the *Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus* was part of this process and Paul the Deacon's carefully constructed work was more than a list of the bishops of Metz. It sought to highlight the city's central role within Francia, its ties to the Carolingian dynasty, and its supposed links with Rome.¹⁹ Paul, perhaps following the instructions of his patron, wrote detailed accounts of four bishops who demonstrated these links: Clement (d. c.

¹⁴ *Councilium Compendiense*, a. 757, p. 63; Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 5.

¹⁵ *RC*, pp. 39, trans., p. 67.

¹⁶ Rome, BAV, Pal. Lat. 555 (s. ix¹); Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 81 (s. xi/xii) contains some of textual additions contained within the Vatican manuscript, although it omits Angilramn's addition to chapter 20. For discussion, see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp.34-5; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 25; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 6539.

¹⁷ *RC*, pp. 45-51, trans., 75-83; Claussen, 'Practical Exegesis', pp. 124-147; It should be noted that while Claussen suggests the final section of the text was composed after the main body of the rule, he does not suggest Angilramn as an author.

¹⁸ For instance chapter 34, which deals with the care of the *matriculi* who were cared for by the canons, fulfils the requirement of chapter 73/75 of the *Admonitio Generalis*, which requires all houses of canons and monks to establish hostels for the care of the poor. See: *RC*, pp. 49-51, trans., pp. 80-83; *Admonitio Generalis*, ed.), Mordek, et al., c. 73, pp. 226-228; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit 1*, c. 75, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 217-218.

¹⁹ Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, pp. 1-33; Kempf, 'Role of Metz', pp. 279-299.

300), the first bishop sent by St. Peter to evangelize Metz;²⁰ Auctor (d. c. 541), who witnessed both the sacking of the city by the Huns and the saving of the Cathedral through the intervention of St. Peter and Paul; Arnulf (d. 629), the saintly ancestor of the Carolingian royal house; and Chrodegang (d. 766), who was portrayed as the epitome of the bishops of Metz, a man close to Rome, the royal house and also a leading light of the Frankish Church.²¹ Paul's portrayal of Chrodegang is particularly interesting and it is notable that he fails to mention the role of Fulrad or Wilicar in escorting Stephen II to Francia in 753. According to the *Liber*, Chrodegang alone was 'especially chosen' for this mission.²² Through the agency of Paul, Angilramn enhanced Chrodegang's reputation, he was: 'a distinguished man worthy of all praises'; an eloquent writer 'fluent in Latin'; a man who was a 'nourisher of the servants of God', who imbued his clergy 'with divine law' [lege divina].²³ Such a summation of Chrodegang's achievements would also have reflected positively on his Rule for Canons, enhancing its status and authority. Although Paul did not seek to make Chrodegang a saint, he gave the archbishop a holy reputation and therefore the gravitas to compose a new regulatory text. Paul established Chrodegang's Rule as the orthodox tradition of the Metz community, the logical conclusion of Metz's Christian history.

Returning to Vatican 555, this version of Chrodegang's Rule is the earliest manuscript to contain the preface to the text.²⁴ While the main body of the preface was written in the first person, and seems to come from Chrodegang's own hand, its opening two lines were written in the third person and sought to place the rule in its historical context, adding: 'In the days of King Pippin, the most pious, the most serene, Chrodegang, Servant of the Servants of God, Bishop of the City of Metz.'²⁵ This little note is the only mention of Chrodegang within the Rule and it adds authority to what was otherwise a novel creation. This again may represent an addition made by Angilramn. Both Vatican 555 and the *Liber De Episcopis*

²⁰ It should be noted that the text directly associates Clement with Peter stating, 'the blessed apostle sent Clement there ...', [Kempf (ed.), *LEM*, pp. 48-49]. This is of course a historical impossibility, but served to emphasise Metz's Petrine links. See Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, p. 25.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1-33; Kempf, 'The Role of Metz', pp. 279-299.

²² Kempf, *LEM*, pp. 86-89.

²³ *Ibid.*.

²⁴ For details see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 34-35.

²⁵ *RC*, p. 27, trans., p. 52.

Mettensibus sought to establish Chrodegang as an orthodox writer and reflect the increasing focus in the 780s and 790s on authenticity and the use of canonical texts.²⁶

Angilramn's position as archchaplain ensured that the Metz community was placed at the heart of the political and religious affairs of the kingdom. As Nees points out, prior to the completion of the Aachen palace complex around 813, Metz may have served as a base to store the documents and liturgical instruments required by the palace chapel.²⁷ The influence of Metz can certainly be detected in the script of scribes such as Godescalc, whose minuscule hand bears a strong similarity to that produced by the Metz scriptorium.²⁸ The community may also have played a key role in the 791 campaign against the Avars. Angilramn was present on this expedition and as archchaplain may well have led the litanies, masses and fasts performed by the army during that campaign.²⁹ According to Hincmar of Rheims, supervising such ceremonies was the responsibility of the palace chaplain.³⁰ The clergy of Metz were certainly renowned for their liturgical and musical expertise and were well placed to lead these rituals.³¹ As Airlie has argued, Carolingian palaces and royal abbeys served as sites of memory.³² The way of life practised by the palatine clerics would have

²⁶ This is best expressed in c. 76 of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) which questions the validity of works of 'uncertain authorship' and requests that, 'only canonical books and catholic treatises and the words of holy authors are to be read and expounded'; *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 76, pp. 228-230; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit I*, c. 78, p. 60; trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218. For a discussion of this chapter see: D. Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 57-58.

²⁷ L. Nees, 'Godescalc's Career and the Problem of Influence', in J. Lowden and A. Bovey (eds.), *Under the Influence: The Concept of Influence and the Study of Illuminated Manuscripts* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 26-27, and p. 36. Recent dendrochronological analysis of both the piles that form the foundation of the palace and the beams used in the dome suggests the palace was built between 793 and 813. It is possible that the church was in use as early as 798. For an overview of recent archaeological work on the palace see: D. Rollason, 'Review Article: Charlemagne's Palace', *Archaeological Journal*, vol. 172, no. 2, (2015), pp. 443-448, particularly p. 446. For a detailed discussion see the essays contained in the following collections: U. Hecker and E. Beckmann (eds.) *Die karolingische Pfalkapelle in Aachen: Material, Bautechnik und Restaurierung* (Karlsruhe, 2012); T. R. Kraus (eds.), *Aachen von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Aachen, 2013).

²⁸ Nees, 'Godescalc's Career', p. 36.

²⁹ *AL*, pp. 34-35; translated, King, *Charlemagne*, p.139. The litanies are referred to in Charlemagne's letter to Queen Frastrada (791); *Epistolae Variorum Carolo Magno*, no. 20, pp. 528-529; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp.134-35. For a discussion of the letter to Fastrada see: M. McCormick, 'The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy', *Viator* 15 (1984) pp. 11-15.

³⁰ Hincmarus De Ordine Palatii, cc. 19-20, pp. 66-71; trans., Herlihy in, Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 524-525.

³¹ S. Rankin, 'Carolingian Music', in R. McKitterick (ed.) *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994) p. 276 and pp. 303-313.

³² S. Airlie, 'The palace of memory: the Carolingian court as political centre', in A. J. Minnis et al., (eds.), *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe* (York, 2000), pp. 1-21.

been seen as exemplary, something to be mirrored by communities across the realm. As leader of the palace community, Angilramn would have provided inspiration to the increasingly large body of clerics who served as part of the royal writing office, some of whom would become leading ecclesiastics in their own right.³³ Prominent figures such as: Alcuin (d. 804); Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818); Arn of Salzburg (d. 821); and Riculf of Mainz (d. 813), all had links with Angilramn. Prior to his appointment as bishop in 787, Riculf had served as a priestly member of the palace chapel. Likewise, Arn was a familiar face at the Carolingian court even after he was consecrated bishop in 785.³⁴ Hildebald is a more obscure figure, but also seems to have been a key courtier in the 780s and must have been highly thought of as he was appointed archchaplain after Angilramn's death. As archchaplain Hildebald certainly shared many of Angilramn's interests, and both figures may have been involved in compiling the *Codex Carolinus*.³⁵ Alcuin's relationship with Angilramn is implied in letter MGH 90, which reports that the archchaplain had commended Alcuin to abbot Usualdo of St. Salvatore di Rieti.³⁶ It is possible that Angilramn assisted Alcuin with certain elements of the *Admonitio Generalis*.³⁷

The late 780s and early 790s witnessed a spate of activity linked to the new generation of scholars and courtiers who advised Charlemagne on ecclesiastical matters. In particular, there was much concern with establishing religious orthodoxy and addressing the challenge posed by both the Adoptionist heresy, and the perceived Iconodulism expounded by the Second Council of Nicaea (787).³⁸ These concerns led to the creation of three related texts: the *Admonitio Generalis* (789); the *Libri Carolini*

³³ For a discussion of the royal writing office before the construction of the Aachen palace see: Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 267-301; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 204-212.

³⁴ Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', p. 280; Bullough, 'Men of God', pp. 136-151; Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 30-36 and pp. 54-80.

³⁵ Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 30-36, p. 53 and pp. 61-64; Hack, *Codex Carolinus*, pp. 78-83.

³⁶ 'Alcuin, *Ep.*, no. 90, pp. 134-135; Bullough, *Alcuin*, p. 365.

³⁷ For the *Admonitio Generalis*, see Part II. 3. ii.

³⁸ There is much literature on this subject. See amongst others: C. J. Cullen, 'Hersey and Empire: The Role of the Adoptionist Controversy in Charlemagne's Conquest of the Spanish March', *International History Review*, 24:3 (2002), pp. 505-527; Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 419-432; A. Freeman and P. Meyvaert, 'Opus Carolini Regis Contra Synodum: An Introduction', in : A. Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 1-17; A. Freeman, 'Additions and Corrections to the *Libri Carolini*: Links with Alcuin and the Adoptionist Controversy' in S. Krämer et al. (eds.), *Scrie Litteras: Forschungen zum Mittelalterlichen Geistesleben* (Munich, 1988), pp. 1-17. Hack, *Codex Carolinus*, pp. 60-69 and pp. 78-83.

(790/791); and the *Codex Carolinus* (791).³⁹ While the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), and the *Libri Carolini* (790/791), as well as their respective authors Alcuin and Theodulf of Orléans, have received much scholarly attention, the *Codex Carolinus* has sometimes been treated as a lesser document that lacked the agency and influence of the aforementioned texts.⁴⁰ Yet, as Hack, and more recently Espelo have observed, the *Codex Carolinus* should be viewed as more than an attempt to archive and preserve a decaying collection of papal letters.⁴¹ It was a consciously created compendium, which sought to express Carolingian orthodoxy. The Codex would have acted as a useful collection of canon law, combining royal and papal authority, and it may have been compiled as part of the preparations for the Synod of Frankfurt (794).⁴² Hack has suggested that Angilramn was charged with assembling the *Codex Carolinus* and the archchaplain was undoubtedly present at Regensburg (791), when Charlemagne ordered its compilation.⁴³ Such archiving and the organisation of large Church councils lay within Angilramn's purview as archchaplain.⁴⁴ The newly created codex may have been put to immediate use at the council of Regensburg in 792, when Felix of Urgel was condemned and forced to recant.⁴⁵

³⁹ *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit. I.*, pp. 52-62; *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., (eds.), pp. 179-243; *Opus Carolini Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*, (eds.), A. Freeman and P. Meyvaert, MGH *Conc. II, Supplementum I* (Hanover, 1998), pp. 97-561; CC., pp. 1-718.

⁴⁰ For the latest discussion of Alcuin's contribution to the *Admonitio* see H. Mordek et al., (eds.), *Die Admonitio Generalis* pp. 47-63; see also; Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 379-380; D. Dales, *Assessing Alcuin: His Life and Legacy* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 95-98. For Theodulf's role in the creation of the *Libri Carolini*, see: A. Freeman, 'Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*', *Speculum* 32 (1957), pp. 663-705; reprinted in: Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans*; Freeman and Meyvaert, 'Introduction', in Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans*, pp. 17-33. Bullough suggested the *Codex Carolinus* was of 'marginal importance': Bullough, 'Aula Renovata', pp. 296-297. This observation was made by Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', p. 52.

⁴¹ Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 49-80, particularly p. 58; Hack's masterful two volume study of the *Codex Carolinus* has changed the perception of this text. Hack, *Codex Carolinus*, vol. 1 and 2.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 30-36 and 61-64.

⁴³ Hack, *Codex Carolinus*, vol 1., pp. 78-83.

⁴⁴ *Hincmarius De Ordini Palatii*, c. 16, c. 20 and c. 32, pp. 62-64, 68-70 and 88-89; trans., Herlihy, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilisation*, pp. 523-525 and 529.

⁴⁵ *AMP*, p. 79; *ARF* and *ARF (rev.)*, pp. 90-93; trans., pp. 70-71. The reviser provides much more detail on the proceedings of this council than the earlier version of the annals. In particular letters 95, 96 and 97 directly deal with the Adoptionist threat and would have proved useful in the condemnation of Elipandus and Felix. See: Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', p. 61. For a more general discussion of the letters see: Bullough, 'Dating of Codex Carolinus', pp. 223-231. See also: Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 265; Chandler, 'Heresy and Empire', p. 512.

Hildebald, Angilramn's successor as archchaplain, seems to have had an interest in the *Codex Carolinus*.⁴⁶ Hildebald continued Angilramn's preparations for the Synod of Frankfurt (794) and, as noted above, chapter 55 of the synod certainly implies seamless continuity between the two archchaplains.⁴⁷ Espelo has suggested that Hildebald may have brought a manuscript of the *Codex* to his episcopal see at Cologne, and the only copy of the collection, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Ms. Lat. 449, has links to that city.⁴⁸ The *Codex* would have provided Hildebald with both a practical history of diplomatic relations with the papal court, a useful source of canon law to assist in the settlement of theological disputes.⁴⁹ This information was necessary for him to fulfill his duties as chaplain. Hildebald also had an interest in canon law and collected it throughout his life. Many of the manuscripts he amassed are inscribed with the phrase, *Codex Sancti Petri Sub Pio Patre Hildebaldo Scriptus*.⁵⁰ As discussed below, the texts he collected influenced the Church councils held under the authority of archchaplain, particularly the Synod of Frankfurt (794), Council of Mainz (813) and the Council of Aachen (816).

Given Angilramn's influence on the emergent court milieu of the late 780s and early 790s, and Hildebald's interest in the *Codex Carolinus*, it is perhaps no surprise that both Chrodegang's Rule and the *Codex Carolinus* inspired some of the findings of the Synod of Frankfurt (794).⁵¹ Notably, chapter 41 of the Synod deals with the property of the bishop in a similar manner to Chapter 31 of the Rule of Chrodegang, both emphasising the need for communal holding of land:

⁴⁶ Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 30-36 and 61-64.

⁴⁷ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 62-63.

⁴⁸ It belonged to archbishop Willibert of Cologne (d. 889), but could well be a copy of Hildebald's original, see: Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 26-30. For a facsimile of the manuscript see: F. Unterkircher (ed.), *Codex Epistolaris Carolinus*: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Codex 449, Codices Selecti Phototypice Impressi 3 (Graz, 1962); Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 7121.

⁴⁹ Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 26-36.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 32; L. W. Jones, *The Script of Cologne: From Hildebald to Hermann* (Cambridge MA, 1932), pp. 17-22, and pp. 29-58.

⁵¹ The synod addressed a number of issues covered by the wide-ranging letters of the *Codex Carolinus*. As noted above letters 95, 96 and 97 directly deal with the Adoptionist threat and would have proved useful in the condemnation of Elipandus and Felix. See: Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', p. 61. For a more general discussion of the letters see: Bullough, 'Dating of Codex Carolinus', pp. 223-231.

Synod of Frankfurt, Ch. 41	Rule of Chrodegang, Ch. 31
<p>‘The relatives or heirs of a bishop should in no circumstances inherit after his death any property [<i>propriis rebus</i>] which was acquired by him after he was consecrated bishop, either by purchase or by gift [<i>adquisitae aut per comparationes</i>]; rather, it should go in full to his church. Such property as he had before then [<i>Illas autem quam prius habuit</i>] shall, unless he make a gift from it to the Church, pass to his heirs and relatives [<i>heredibus et propinquis succedant</i>].’⁵²</p>	<p>‘If we cannot bring ourselves to renounce everything, we should confine ourselves to keeping only the income from our property [<i>sic as usum tantum nostra tenemus</i>], and ensure that, whether we like it or not, our property [<i>carnalium</i>] descends not to our earthly heirs and relations, but to the Church. It is the Church which we serve, at God’s inspiration, and from her we receive our stipend [<i>stipendium</i>], so we should bequeath our property to her as our heir [<i>loco hereditarie relinquamus</i>].’⁵³</p>

Despite the similarity between these two precepts, it is important to note the key differences: the synod of Frankfurt distinguishes between those lands held by the bishop before he took office and those he acquired during his episcopate; while the rule makes no such distinction.

Several other chapters of the Synod of Frankfurt contain possible allusions to the Rule of Chrodegang. Chapters 30, 32, 38 and 39 of the synod all discuss the conduct and discipline of the clergy and concur with the provisions of chapters 14-19 of the Rule of Chrodegang. These emphasised the authority of the bishop in matters of discipline.⁵⁴ Chapter 38 is particularly notable:

Concerning priests who have been disobedient towards their bishops: they must under no circumstances communicate with the clerics [*clericis*] who live in the king’s chapel, unless they have made peace with their bishop, lest it should happen that excommunication according to the canons [*forte canonica excommunicatio*] should come upon them as a result.⁵⁵

This provision correlates with the commands of chapter 16 of the Rule of Chrodegang:

If any brother presume, without the leave of the bishop or his delegate to consort in any way with an excommunicated cleric

⁵² *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 170; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp.61-62.

⁵³ *RC*, pp. 46-47, trans., p. 77.

⁵⁴ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, pp. 169-170; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp.61-62; *RC*, pp. 35-38, trans., pp. 63-66. For a discussion of chapters 14-19 of Chrodegang’s Rule see: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 73-79.

⁵⁵ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 170; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61.

[*clerico excommunicato*], or to converse to him, or to send him a message or letter, let him receive the like punishment of excommunication [*similem subiciatur excommunicacionis*].⁵⁶

Chapter 32 of the Synod, which discusses the guarding of the enclosure, also mirrors Chrodegang's Rule:

Synod of Frankfurt (794), Ch. 32	Rule of Chrodegang , Ch. 27 'Of the Porter'
'That monasteries [<i>monasteria</i>] should be guarded according to the provisions of the canons.' [<i>canonicam institutionem</i>]. ⁵⁷	'There should be one porter, with an assistant, who is to guard the gates and entrances of the enclosure [<i>portas claustra vel ostia custodiat</i>], for a term of one year, or longer if the bishop sees fit. This porter should be sober, patient and wise, who understands how to give and receive a message. He must keep the gates and entrances of the enclosure faithfully [<i>custodiat portas sive ostia claustra</i>], and must not presume to do anything contrary to the rule[<i>contra hanc tenorem facere non presumat</i>]: should he do so, he must be excommunicated.' ⁵⁸

While these clauses concur with Chrodegang's Rule, they also reflect the general monastic practices of the day and chapters 14-19 and 27 of Chrodegang's Rule are themselves heavily dependent on the Rule of Benedict.⁵⁹ It should be noted that chapter 32 of the synod refers to the *canonicam institutionem*, a phrase also repeated in Chapter 39:

If a priest is caught in a criminal act, he should be brought before his bishop and be dealt with according to the rulings of the canons [*canonicam institutionem*].⁶⁰

These could well be references to the Metz Rule which Chrodegang (c. 8) described as an *instituciunculam*. However, the phrase *canonicam institutionem* was ubiquitous and seems to be a byword for the canon law that governed the life of all ecclesiastics. The Canonical Institute (816) certainly distinguished between the chapters that form the first section of the text (cc. 1-114), a law book formed of a *florilegium* of

⁵⁶ RC, p. 37, trans., p.65.

⁵⁷ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 169; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61.

⁵⁸ RC, p. 43, trans., p. 73.

⁵⁹ For Chrodegang's use of the Rule of Benedict see: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 14-24; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 114-166.

⁶⁰ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61.

canonical sayings and conciliar decrees, and the *regula canonicorum* that formed the final 31 chapters of the document.⁶¹ It is also notable that the three oldest copies of the Rule of Chrodegang preserve its specific references to the city of Metz.⁶² This suggests that Chrodegang's text was not adapted for more general use but was seen as a model to work from; a commentary on canon law, and a guide to be used in conjunction with other texts and traditions. Even after Paul the Deacon's laudable portrayal of Chrodegang, his rule lacked the authority and orthodoxy of other texts, such as the Rule of Benedict. Indeed, Chrodegang had to justify his novel innovation by referring to the legitimate authority of canon law:

Were the discipline of the Three Hundred and Eighteen [Nicaea, 325] still in force, with that of the other holy fathers, were the clergy and the bishops still living according to the pattern of conduct they laid down, it would be superfluous for us, insignificant as we are, to make any further comment, or say anything, as if it were new, about a subject which has been so well treated.⁶³

At Frankfurt, Chrodegang's Rule was one of many authoritative texts and the influence of other works can be detected. Chapter 6 of the Synod, which discusses the administration of justice at both the diocesan and provincial level, again brings to mind the contents of letter 3 of the *Codex Carolinus*.⁶⁴ As discussed above, this letter was sent from Pope Zachary to Pippin III, was highly influential. Chapter 1 of Zachary's epistle discusses the authority and honour due bishops and priests. It highlighted the authority of those who held episcopal and priestly rank. Each Metropolitan was to have sole authority over their province and beneath them, 'each and every bishop should have power in their diocese'.⁶⁵ The authority of these figures was to be respected and clerics were to present themselves to their bishop 'dressed in clean robes'.⁶⁶ Such inspections were intended to ensure clerical discipline and that all remained committed to 'their way of life'.⁶⁷ Chapter 2 of the epistle is also particularly relevant to this discussion. Much like chapter 39 of the Synod of

⁶¹ For more on this see Part III.

⁶² Bern Burgerbibliothek, 289 (s. viii/ixⁱⁿ); Vat. Pal. Lat., 555 (s. ix^l); Leiden, MS. Voss. F. 94 (s.ix^{2/3}); Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 32-34; Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos., 570, 6539, 2206.

⁶³ *RC*, pp. 27-28, trans., pp. 52-53.

⁶⁴ *CC*, no. 3, pp. 479-487.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

Frankfurt this clause discusses how criminal priests and deacons should be removed from their office.⁶⁸

As Mordek, Zechiel-Eckes, and Glatthaar have shown, chapters 19-37 of the Synod of Frankfurt drew readily on the *Admonitio Generalis* (789).⁶⁹ Chapter 29 is an interesting example of this, its focus on education reflects the concerns expressed within chapter 70 of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), stating:

That each and every bishop should give good teaching and instruction to those placed in his charge, so that there will always in God's house be found men who are worthy to be chosen according to the canons [*canonice*].⁷⁰

As well as drawing inspiration from the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), this provision also reiterated the local autonomy of the bishop. Chrodegang's Rule was not overtly propagated, rather each bishop was encouraged to regulate their clergy through their knowledge of canon law, selecting the provisions that they deemed suitable for their community.⁷¹ This certainly seems to be the approach taken by Hildebald, Alcuin and Theodulf, a point which will be explored in more detail below.

In light of this, it is worth considering some of the texts bound together with the Rule of Chrodegang. There was certainly a tradition of using Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute in conjunction with Chrodegang's Rule.⁷² The Statute, along with a martyrology, were bound together with Chrodegang's Rule in Bern, Burgerbibliothek 289 (Metz, s. viii/ixⁱⁿ).⁷³ This manuscript represents the earliest recension of Chrodegang's Rule and was likely produced at Metz in the late eighth or early ninth century.⁷⁴ The fact that Theodulf's statute was united in one manuscript with Chrodegang's Rule further demonstrates no single regulatory text dominated in this

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 481; *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61.

⁶⁹ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 112-115.

⁷⁰ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 169; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61.

⁷¹ For examples of this process see above Part II. 2.

⁷² Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit Ms. Voss. Lat. F. 94 contains two texts. The first section of the manuscript is made up of a collection of canons entitled, *Capitulare Lectionem Evangeliorum* (s. ix¹), while the second section contains a copy of Chrodegang's Rule (s.ix²). Although further research is required it is clear that this combination of texts has much in common with the tradition of binding Theodulf's Statute with Chrodegang's Rule. For discussion of the codex, see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 33-34; B. Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos. 2206 and 2207.

⁷³ Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 32-33, p. 45 and p. 61 no. 82; Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularum*, pp. 77-80; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 570.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

period. At Metz, the traditions governing the clerical way of life were mixed with the other suitable collections of ‘canon law’, and Chrodegang’s Rule encourages this practice requesting:

It is required that all canonical clergy [*clerus canonicus*] come to Chapter every day, where they will hear the Word of God, and this little rule of ours [*instituciunculam nostram*], which we have written with God’s help for their own benefit and their soul’s salvation. Everyday they should read one chapter, except for Sundays, Wednesdays and Fridays when they shall read at chapter some tracts and other homilies or whatever may edify the hearers. [*tractatos et alias omelias vel quod edificet audienters ad capitulum legant*].⁷⁵

The tradition of using this combination of texts continued after the issuing of the Canonical Institute in 816 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 191, an eleventh century manuscript from Exeter (s.xi^{3/4}), also combined the Enlarged Rule with Theodulf’s Precepts.⁷⁶ These two codices, separated by 200 years, suggest that from the ninth century onwards, both Chrodegang’s Rule and Theodulf Precepts were used in conjunction to regulate the life of the canonical clergy. Theodulf’s Precepts, alongside other Episcopal Statutes will be examined below, however, as the statutes were composed as a response to the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), it is this pivotal text that will be examined next.⁷⁷

II.3.ii. Alcuin, the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and defining the Life of canons

The *Admonitio Generalis* (789) is rightly seen as a seminal text in the history of the Carolingian Church and it devotes much attention to the clergy and priests of the Frankish realm; 39 out of the 82 chapters refer to priests or clerics and their duties.

⁷⁵ RC, p. 33, trans., p. 60.

⁷⁶ Theodulf’s Capitula and a martyrology were originally bound together with the Enlarged Rule in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 191, the three texts were separated by Parker. Theodulf’s Capitula can now be found in Corpus 201 and the martyrology can be found in CCCC 196. N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 74-75 and pp. 90-91; Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 32-33, pp. 44-46, and p. 61 no. 82; See also the *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060-1220 Project*, <<<http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/mss/EM.CCCC.191.htm#ker44>>> [Accessed 12/05/2014]. CCCC 191 can viewed on Parker-on-the-Web, <<<https://parker.stanford.edu>>> [Accessed 12/05/2014].

⁷⁷ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 33-49 and pp. 102-112; McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 52-57.

For van Rhijn, it offers the first clear distinction between monks and the canonical clergy, ‘where the rather fluid boundary between both groups had solidified’.⁷⁸

Chapter 71 of the capitulary is seen as a clear expression of this distinction:

‘It is our will that those who enter upon clerical status [*clericatum accedunt*], which we call the canonical life [*canonicam vitam*], live in all respects as canons [*canonice*], in conformity with their rule [*regulam*]; and the bishop is to rule their life [*regat vitam*], just as the abbot rules that of monks’.⁷⁹

As noted above, Barrow suggests that clause this may reflect ‘considerable interest’ in Chrodegang’s Rule.⁸⁰ However, Mordek, Zechiel-Eckes and Glatthaar point out the chapter’s similarity to clause 4 of the English Legatine Council (786), and to chapter 2 of the 781/782 Italian Council.⁸¹ The authorship of the *Admonitio* is now largely attributed to Alcuin, although some input from the other scholars at court is acknowledged.⁸² Given Angilramn’s interest in the rule, and his key position in 789, it is possible that he contributed to the text. Chapter 71 may represent Angilramn’s influence on the document and his input may be further detected in chapter 78, which stated:

To all the clergy [*omni clero*]. That they are to learn Roman chant thoroughly and that it is to be employed throughout the office, night and day in the correct form, in conformity with what our father of blessed memory, King Pippin, strove to bring to pass when he

⁷⁸ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp.13-49, at 42. For discussions of the impact of the *Admonitio* see amongst others: Mordek et al. (eds.), *Admonitio Generalis*, pp. 1-13 and pp. 112-148; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 239-241 and pp. 307-308. For the importance of *Admonitio* in Carolingian discourse see: de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp.112-148, particularly, pp. 131-142.

⁷⁹ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 71, pp. 224-227; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH *Capit.* I, c. 73, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 21.

⁸⁰ Barrow, ‘Chrodegang’, p. 202: Brooks makes a similar point in N. P. Brooks, ‘Was Cathedral Reform at Christ Church Canterbury in the Early Ninth Century of Continental Inspiration?’, in H. Sauer and J. Story (eds.), *Anglo-Saxon England and the Continent* (Tempe, AZ, 2011), p. 305.

⁸¹ Mordek et al., (eds.) *Die Admonitio Generalis*, p. 227, fn. 187; ‘Pippi Italiae Regis Capitulare’, MGH, *Capit.* I, no. 91, p. 191. *Report of the Legates*, (eds.), Hadden and Stubbs *Councils*, pp. 447-462, at 450; *Alcuin Ep.*, no. 3, pp. 19-28; for translation see: B. Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred: Two Anglo-Saxon Legal Reformers’, (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2006), pp. 99-120; For a discussion of the 786 Legatine council, see: Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 142-53; Cubitt, ‘Clergy in Early Anglo-Saxon’, pp. 273-287, at pp. 283-284; Story, *Carolingian Connections*, pp. 55-93; Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred’, pp. 17-54.

⁸² For the latest discussion of Alcuin’s contribution to the *Admonitio* see Mordek et al. (eds.), *Admonitio Generalis*, pp. 47-63; see also; Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 379-380.

abolished the Gallican chant for the sake of unanimity with the apostolic see and the peaceful harmony of God's holy Church.⁸³

The canonical clergy of St. Stephen's Metz, led by Angilramn, were liturgical experts, and the chapter itself brings to mind Paul the Deacon's description of Chrodegang's renewal at Metz:⁸⁴

He ordered that his clergy, abundantly imbued with divine law [*lege divina*] and the Roman liturgy, observe the customs and rite of the Roman Church, which until that time had hardly been done in the Church of Metz.⁸⁵

However, while Angilramn may have had a hand in the creation of the *Admonitio*, it is unclear whether the request in chapter 71 refers explicitly to Chrodegang's Rule. This is the only place within the text to allude to a specific rule for canons, and the clause is ambiguous and lacking in detail. The majority of the chapter deals with the monastic order and the importance of monks maintaining their vows. Canons are considered as an afterthought, and the only real distinction between canons and monks appears to be whether the community was led by the bishop or headed by an abbot. This may well reflect the situation at foundations such as Condat, St. Maurice, and Eichstätt, where ostensibly monastic communities were led by a bishop-abbot.⁸⁶ Such imprecision pervades the *Admonitio Generalis*, and while there were some attempts to distinguish monks and canons, these distinctions focus on dress and nomenclature, rather than on the practical differences between the two orders. For example chapter 75 states:

To clerics. It seems in all ways proper to us that those clerics who pretend, by dress or by name, to be monks, but who are not ought to

⁸³ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 78, pp. 230-231; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit I*, c. 80, p. 61; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218.

⁸⁴ Pippin's reputation for introducing and spreading the Roman rite throughout the Carolingian Church has recently been re-evaluated see: Y. Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul* (London, 2001) pp. 42-62; Y. Hen, 'The Romanization of the Frankish Liturgy: Ideal, Reality and Rhetoric of Reform', in C. Bolgia et al. (eds.), *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2011) pp. 111-123; P. Bernard, *Du Chant Romain au Chant Gregorien*, (Vie-XIII siècle) (Paris, 1996) pp. 725-729; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 248-290.

⁸⁵ Kempf, *LEM*, p. 87, trans., p. 89.

⁸⁶ See Part II. 2. iii.

be corrected and set to rights, so that they be either true monks or true canons.⁸⁷

Generally speaking, canons and monks were addressed together within the capitulary and in total there are 9 chapters that deal with both orders in similar terms.⁸⁸ Chapter 26 simply ordered that both ‘clerics and monks were to persist in their way of life and the promise which they have pledged to God’.⁸⁹ Chapter 70, famously requested schools to be established in both houses of canons and monks.⁹⁰ Likewise, Chapter 73 ordered that hostels for *peregrini* should be manned in both types of communities.⁹¹ It is of course important to note that the clerical order as a whole received much attention and a multitude of chapters specifically discuss either clerics or priests.⁹² These chapters contain a mix of precepts and focus on the importance of pastoral care and the wider duties of the clergy as a whole. Such provisions would apply to priest-monks, canons and to the diocesan clergy, but it was those who lived enclosed lives that were given additional monastic duties to the diocesan clergy. Both monks and canons were expected to train priests, to correct books and ensure the purity of the clerical order, and arguably this was the primary purpose of the school described within Chapter 70.⁹³ In short, canons in particular, were to be an example to those who lived outside the bounds of cloister.

The fact that these additional duties were monastic in nature clearly showed the blurred lines that existed between the monastic order and canonical clergy. It is significant that the *Admonitio Generalis* does not devote attention to the manner in

⁸⁷ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 75, pp. 228-229 Boretius, *Admonitio Generalis*, c. 77, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218.

⁸⁸ Chapters 14, 21, 23, 26, 27, 29, 70, 71, 73, all discuss clerics alongside monks: *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 179-243.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 196-197; *Admonitio Generalis*, Capit I, p. 56; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 212.

⁹⁰ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 222-225; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, Capit I, c. 72, pp. 59-60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 217.

⁹¹ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 226-229; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, Capit I, c. 75, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 217-218.

⁹² Chapters 4, 6, 9, 10, 17, 18, 20, 24, 27-30, 37, 38, 49, 50, 54-58, 70, 71, 77 and 78 are either directly addressed to the *Sacerdotes* and clerics or mention them within their precepts. (Chapters 32, 36, 61, 65, 67, and 76 do not explicitly mention priests or clerics but refer to preaching or the sacraments and therefore are aimed at this group.); *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 179-243.

⁹³ de Jong, ‘Imitatio Morum’, p. 58. For discussions of impact of this decree on education within the cloister see amongst others: Contreni, *Pursuit of Knowledge*, pp. 106-142; A. Diem, ‘The Emergence of Monastic Schools: The Role of Alcuin’, in L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court* (Groningen, 1998), pp. 27-45, particularly, pp. 32-44.

which canons ought to handle their property. As discussed in Part I, the fact canons did not take a vow of poverty, but held their property in common, was a defining feature of the canonical order. Thus, from the *Admonitio Generalis* alone, it is almost impossible to define any practical difference between canons and monks. Again, Paul the Deacon's description of the Metz community seems rather apt, canons were clerics who lived 'within the confines of a cloister in the image of a monastery'.⁹⁴ Given these ambiguities, even if chapter 71 contained a reference to the Rule of Chrodegang, it seems the details of this text were not included in the *Admonitio*. Rather the provision suggests it was for the bishop to define the exact nature of life within his cathedral close, and it is significant that chapter 29 of the Council of Frankfurt (794) shared this local focus.⁹⁵ The monastic bishops attested at Attigny (766) certainly seem to have adapted various monastic rules and applied them to their clergy.⁹⁶ The influence on the *Admonitio Generalis* of the recently deceased figures of Wilibald of Eichstätt (d. c. 787), Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785), and even Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784), should not be ruled out.

It is of note that Alcuin and his community at Tours were criticised in 802 as they sometimes called themselves 'monks [*monachos*], sometimes canons [*canonicos*], and sometimes neither [*neutrum*]'.⁹⁷ Such an accusation could well have drawn on chapters 70 and 75 of the *Admonitio*, and here Alcuin may have been hoisted by his own petard.⁹⁸ It would be inaccurate to claim that Alcuin lacked an understanding of the difference between the monastic and canonical forms of life, and the *Admonitio Generalis* is not the only text associated with Alcuin to make the distinction between these two orders. The report of the papal legation to England (786) also makes such a distinction:

⁹⁴ Kempf, *LEM*, p. 86, trans., p. 87

⁹⁵ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61. This relationship is suggested by Mordek in *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., p. 113.

⁹⁶ See Part II.

⁹⁷ *Alcuin*, Ep., no. 247, pp. 399-401, at p. 400; trans., S. Allott, *Alcuin of York. His Life and Letters* (York, 1974), no. 116, p. 122. For information on the context in which this letter was sent see: R. Meens, 'Sanctuary, Penance, and Dispute Settlement under Charlemagne: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans over a Sinful Cleric', *Speculum* 82 (2007), pp. 277-300; and D. A. Bullough, 'What has Ingeld to do with Lindisfarne?', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 22 (1993), pp. 93-125; S. Collins, *The Carolingian Debate Over Sacred Space* (Basingstoke, 2012), pp. 91-121.

⁹⁸ *Admonitio Generalis* (eds.), Mordek et al., pp. 228-229.

That bishops watch with diligent care that all canons live by canon law [*canonici sui canonice vivant*] and that monks and nuns abide by their rules, in diet and in dress and private property, so that there might be a distinction between a canon, a monk, and a secular person; and let them live in the habit which the Eastern monks live, and [let] canons [dress] by the Eastern example [also], and not in garments colored with Indian dyes, nor precious clothes.⁹⁹

It has been suggested by Cubitt and Carella that Alcuin was heavily involved in the production of this text, and he was certainly present at the councils that accompanied the Legatine visit in 786.¹⁰⁰ Whether or not Alcuin contributed directly to this text, he was clearly aware of these provisions and may well have drawn on them when he composed the *Admonitio Generalis*.¹⁰¹ Despite this knowledge, and the frequent exhortations within his letters for monastics to live a *regularis vita*, as discussed above, at times Alcuin was unclear about the difference between monks and canons.¹⁰² In particular he referred to the cathedral communities of York and Salzburg in monastic terms and most puzzlingly in 802 he wrote to Arn of Salzburg discussing, monks, canons and ‘the third grade, superior to the canonical but inferior to the monastic’.¹⁰³

While the charges levelled at Alcuin in 802 were likely the result of political wrangling at court, they may also have reflected reality.¹⁰⁴ Alcuin’s letter to Arn has puzzled scholars and certainly chimes with the tone of Charlemagne’s rebuke. As a nominally monastic community headed by an abbot, the congregation of St. Martin’s ought to have been fully professed monks. Yet Alcuin, the community’s abbot, was very clearly a cleric. In the late 790s he thanked Gisla for sending him a *cappa*, which

⁹⁹ *Report of the Legates*, p. 450; *Alcuin Ep.*, no. 3, p. 22; trans, Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred’, p. 104.

¹⁰⁰ Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 152-190; Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred’, pp. 17-54; Bullough opposed the idea that Alcuin was directly involved in the composition of the report of the Legatine council. See: Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 346-356.

¹⁰¹ Cubitt, *Church Councils*, p. 168; Story, *Carolingian Connections*, pp. 61-64; Mordek et al., (eds.), *Admonitio Generalis*, p. 227, fn. 187. As will be discussed below it seems likely that a copy of 786 decrees was held at Tours and the text certainly appears to have been drawn on at the Council of Tours (813). See Part II. 4. iii.

¹⁰² For Alcuin’s use of monastic language, see: Bullough, ‘What has Ingeld’, pp. 95-10 and Cubitt, ‘Clergy in Anglo-Saxon England’, p. 277

¹⁰³ *Quid canonicis, quid monachis, quid tertio gradui, qui inter hos duos variatur superiori gradu canonicis et inferiorimonachis stantes*; *Alcuin, Ep.*, no. 258, p. 416; Bullough, ‘What has Ingeld’, pp. 99-101.

¹⁰⁴ Oexle, *Forshungen zu Monastischen*, pp. 131-133.

was emerging as the standard ‘clerical street-wear’.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps more significantly, in 801 Alcuin wrote to archbishop Aethelhard of Canterbury warning him of the differences between clerical dress in England and the costume expected at the Frankish court. He advised Aethelhard to prepare his entourage: ‘especially the clerics, to respectfully attend to every aspect of religious observance [*relegione sancta*] in clothing and in ecclesiastical discipline [*ordine ecclesiastico*],’ and warned against wearing ‘gold or silk clothing in the king’s presence’.¹⁰⁶ Here, Alcuin may have been speaking from personal experience and it is clear such ostentatious clerical garb, obviously favoured by some of Alcuin’s English contemporaries, was frowned upon at the Carolingian court.¹⁰⁷ The Astronomer recorded that Louis the Pious found it ‘monstrous’ that an ecclesiastic ‘should aspire to the ornaments of worldly glory [*secularis ornamenta gloriae*].’¹⁰⁸ With its monastic traditions and a cleric abbot immersed in Anglo-Saxon custom, from an outside perspective the way of life practised at St. Martins was ill defined and confused. Much like St. Maurice, it is probable that St. Martin’s was a mixed community, manned by clerics, monks, and Alcuin’s mysterious third order.¹⁰⁹

Archbishop Wulfred’s renewal of the Canterbury community (c.813), as recorded in charter S1265, makes interesting reading when compared to the 786 synod, the *Admonitio* (789), and the 802 rebuke of Alcuin. This charter established a *constitutionem* by which the community were to live, namely: ‘according to the rule of monastic discipline [*regulam monasterialis disciplinae*].’¹¹⁰ Langefeld has argued

¹⁰⁵ Alcuin, *Ep.*, no. 84, p. 127; M. Miller, *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200* (London, 2014), pp. 21-22, p. 29 and p. 46. This garb was issued to the canons in Chapter 29 of Chrodegang’s Rule. See *RC*, p. 45, trans., pp. 74-75.

¹⁰⁶ Alcuin, *Ep.*, no. 230, pp. 374-375; trans., Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, p. 115.

¹⁰⁷ It should be noted that while Miller points out that while Charlemagne and Louis the Pious appear to have favoured ‘unadorned ecclesiastical attire’, the elaborateness of clerical garb in the early middle ages should not be overstated. See: Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, pp. 98-115. Still, Alcuin was clearly worried that his kinsmen would attend court dressed in an unacceptable, ‘worldly’ manner. For a more general discussion of clothing in Anglo-Saxon England in this period see: G. R. Owen-Crocker, *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester, 1986), pp. 166-202.

¹⁰⁸ Astronomer, c. 27, p. 378; trans., Noble, *Charlemagne*, pp. 255-256. See also, Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, p. 115.

¹⁰⁹ St. Martins had a history as a mixed community. See: L. Pietri, ‘Les Abbés de Basilique dans la Gaule au VIe Siècle’, *Revue d’Histoire de l’Eglise de France*, 68 (1983), pp. 8-12; Oexle, *Forschungen zu Monastischen*, pp. 120-134. For St. Maurice see Part II. 2. iii.

¹¹⁰ *Charters of Christ Church Canterbury, Part 1*, (eds.), N. P. Brooks and S. Kelly (Oxford, 2013), no. 47, pp. 531-536; see also: Brooks, ‘Cathedral Reform’, pp. 316-317 and S1265 on The Electronic Sawyer Database <<<http://www.esawyer.org.uk/charter/1265.html>>>[Accessed 10/09/2015].

that this implies Wulfred's community was monastic, and that their life must therefore have centred on the precepts of the Rule of Benedict.¹¹¹ Yet, as Brooks pointed out the charter was witnessed by priests and deacons, who owned property, thus, while the members of the community were monastic in name they were canons in practice.¹¹² This muddle is often seen as symptomatic of the Anglo-Saxon blurring of the monastic and clerical orders, but such confusion was also present in the Frankish Church. Wulfred's renewal may well have drawn on pope Zachary's letter (747) which had given permission for Bishops to live with their households and, 'without pause make use of the rule of monastic discipline [*regulam monachicae disciplinae*], together with the admirable traditions of the venerable fathers'.¹¹³ This letter, or one like it, may well have been influential in England as well as in Francia. 747 had been a year of great activity in the English Church, as testified by the correspondence between archbishops Ecgberht of York, Cuthbert of Canterbury and Boniface.¹¹⁴ As Ryan has pointed out the Dialogues of Ecgberht were produced either in preparation for Clofesho (747), or in response to council.¹¹⁵ In any case, the York community was actively involved in discussions regarding the nature of the monastic and clerical lives, and it was in this environment that Alcuin was raised.¹¹⁶ Much like Wulfred, Alcuin may have used monastic nomenclature to describe what others would interpret as a clerical form of life. Here there are parallels to the situation at St. Denis where Hincmar remembered those who opposed Hilduin's renewal as canons, while Hilduin's opponents clearly thought of themselves in monastic terms.

¹¹¹ B. Langefeld, 'Regula Canonicorum or Regula Monasterilais Vitae? The Rule of Chrodegang and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury', *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996), pp. 21-36; Langefeld, *The Old English Version*, pp. 16-17.

¹¹² Brooks, 'Cathedral Reform', pp. 310-315; Brooks and Kelly (eds.), *Charters, Part 1*, pp. 532-536.

¹¹³ CC. no. 3, p. 481.

¹¹⁴ For discussions of the importance of this year see: M. Ryan, 'Archbishop Ecgberht and His Dialogus', in A. Rumble (ed.), *Leaders of the Anglo-Saxon Church: From Bede to Stigand* (Manchester, 2012), pp. 41-60; H. Mayr-Harting, 'Ecgerht (d. 766)', *ODNB* <<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8580>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015]; A. Williams, 'Cuthbert (d. 760)', *ODNB* <<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6977>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015]; Cubitt, *Church Councils*, pp. 97-125.

¹¹⁵ Ryan, 'Archbishop Ecgerht', pp. 44-60.

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of Alcuin's time at York see: Bullough, *Alcuin*, pp. 165-252; Dales, *Alcuin*, pp. 28-39.

II. 3. iii **Theodulf of Orléans and the first group of episcopal statutes**

In the wake of the *Admonitio* bishops showed a heightened interest in regulating the lives of the clergy, and the condemnation of St. Martin's may well have been result of such new concerns. The creation of the first episcopal statutes demonstrated the episcopate's commitment to implementing the wishes of the court in the dioceses of the Frankish kingdom.¹¹⁷ Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute was the most successful of those issued and is worthy of closer analysis.¹¹⁸ Although the Statute was drawn up during Theodulf's time as bishop of Orléans (798-817), it is unclear precisely when the Statute was composed.¹¹⁹ Van Rhijn has suggested a date early in his episcopate, noting that the text does not draw on other statutes or the so-called Theodulf-bible, composed around 800.¹²⁰ The precepts are commonly held to target the diocesan clergy rather than those who lived within the bishop's household, however, the pastoral concerns addressed by the statute would certainly apply as much to Cathedral canons as to those clerics who lived and served in the secular world.¹²¹ Theodulf's text may be seen as an attempt to tie the diocesan clergy more closely to the enclosure and to ensure that priests maintained the virtues of cloister while undertaking pastoral work beyonds its walls. As discussed above, Bern 289 (Metz, s. viii/ixⁱⁿ) demonstrates that the statute was used in an enclosed setting soon after its inception, a tradition that continued into the eleventh century, as witnessed by CCCC 191 (Exeter, s. xi^{3/4}). Performing a similar function to the first 113 clauses of the Canonical Institute, Theodulf's precepts formed a useful manual, both for those who lived in the cathedral close and the extra-claustral clergy.¹²² As such Theodulf followed the instructions of both the *Admonitio Generalis* and the Synod of Frankfurt

¹¹⁷ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 33-49.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 24-33 and pp. 102-112.

¹¹⁹ Brommer (ed.), *Theodulf von Orléans, Erstes Kapitular (Theodulf I)*, MGH, Capit Epis. I., pp. 73-75.

¹²⁰ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 35, fn. 35.

¹²¹ As discussed in Part I, the significance of the distinction between canons and the diocesan clergy has been overstated.

¹²² For discussions of the first 113 chapters of the *IC* see Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 87; Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 211.

(794). As bishop he undertook to rule his clerics, ‘just as the abbot rules that of monks’ and to give, ‘good teaching and instruction to those placed in his charge’.¹²³

Much like Chrodegang, Theodulf placed the cathedral close at the heart of his regulation of the diocese. The importance of enclosure, as both a physical space and as a mental model, appears throughout the text. This is perhaps most notable in chapters 19-21. In chapter 19, the bishop encouraged his diocesan clergy to send boys to the cathedral church of the Holy Cross to learn under his guidance and the tutelage of his Cathedral canons:

‘If any of the presbyters [*presbyteris*] wishes to send his nephew or other relative to school, in the church of the Holy Cross [*ecclesia sanctae Crucis*], or to in the monastery [*monasterio*] of Saint Aignam or of St Benedict [Fleury], or of Saint Lifard, or in others of those monasteries [*coenobiis*] which it has been granted us to rule, we grant them permission to do so’.¹²⁴

As de Jong notes, child oblation had become ‘the accepted strategy to ensure an institutionalised *imitatio morum*’, the innocent *puer oblatus* raised and educated within the cloister could maintain the cultic purity of the priesthood.¹²⁵ Chapter 20 builds upon chapter 19 highlights the importance of implementing the norms of the canonical life, learnt in the cloister, in the wider world. The local clergy were to mirror the practices of the cathedral close and were encouraged to: ‘keep schools [*scolas*] in the villages and hamlets’ and to allow ‘small children to be taught their letters’.¹²⁶ Some of these boys may also have been sent on to the city to further their education and to join the ranks of the cathedral clergy.¹²⁷ As discussed in Part 1, the extra-claustral clergy who had been trained in the cloister remained tied to their

¹²³ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek, et al., c. 71, pp.224-227; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit I*, c. 73, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 217; *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, c. 29, p. 171; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61; van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 35.

¹²⁴ *Theodulf I*, c. 19, pp. 115-116; trans. G. E. McCracken and A. Cabaniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 110.

¹²⁵ de Jong, ‘*Imatatio Morum*’, pp. 49-81, at, p. 60; de Jong, *Samuel’s Image*, pp. 132-145.

¹²⁶ *Theodulf I*, c. 20, p. 116; trans, McCracken and Cabaniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p.110.

¹²⁷ C. van Rhijn, ‘Priests and the Carolingian reforms: The Bottlenecks of Local *Correctio*’, in R. Corradini et al., (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2006), p. 128

motherchurches, and chapters 19 and 20 of Theodulf's statute illustrates both the importance of the 'old boy network' and the porous nature of the cathedral close.¹²⁸

Chapter 21 is one of the most insightful precepts within the statute. This clause quotes extensively from chapter 4 of the Rule of Benedict (The Tools of Good Work).¹²⁹ Although Theodulf does not name the author, he ensures that his readers know the source of this dictum, stating:

It has pleased us to insert into this our prescript, the opinion of a certain father about the instruments of good works, which contains with great brevity what ought to be done and what avoided.¹³⁰

This chapter is by far the longest within the statute and Theodulf clearly saw Benedict's list of monastic ideals as suitable standards for both the clergy of the cathedral close and those who served in the secular world. The ideals of cloister were to be spread beyond its bounds. Such enclosed principles can also be detected in chapters 2 and 3 which reminded priests that they 'ought to be continually reading and constantly at prayer', and that 'idleness is the enemy to the soul'.¹³¹ These are allusions to the Rule of Benedict (c. 48) and clerics were expected to behave in a similar manner whether cloistered or not.¹³²

The cloister served as a model for all of Theodulf's clergy. Whether the priests were part of a cathedral community, a college of canons, or served the parochial needs of the laity, the same behaviours and practices were enforced. An example of this can be found in chapter 15, which stated:

This we absolutely forbid, that none of you attempt to entice over or receive a cleric subordinate to another [*alterius clericum sollicitet aut recipiat*], because there is a heavy punishment for this act in the sacred canons [*sacris canonibus*].¹³³

¹²⁸ de Jong, 'Imitatio Morum', pp. esp. pp. 58-60.

¹²⁹ *RB*, c. 4, pp. 32-37.

¹³⁰ *Theodulf I*, c.21, pp. 117-119; trans., McCracken and Cabiniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 111.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, cc. 2-3, pp. 105-06; trans., p. 107.

¹³² *RB*, c. 48, pp. 160-63.

¹³³ *Theodulf I*, c. 15, p. 113; trans., McCracken and Cabiniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 110.

This command was commonly made at Church councils and features in both the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and the Synod of Frankurt (794).¹³⁴ The provision also lay at the heart of Theodulf's dispute with Alcuin in 802, over the latter's acceptance of a fugitive cleric.¹³⁵ Here the parochial clergy, with their assistants, were to model their lives on the example of the bishop's household. The same rules that governed the bishop and the canonical clergy were also to govern local priests. Theodulf even appropriated the Divine Office for use outside the enclosure. Chapter 24 requested that:

Each Christian must come on the Sabbath day to church with lights [*cum luminaribus*]; he must come to the night vigils or to the morning office [*conveniendum est ad vigilias sive ad matutinum officium*]. He must come also with offerings for the solemnization of Masses.¹³⁶

Likewise, chapter 39 discussed how priests and the laity ought to act during times of fasting, punctuating the day via the Divine Office:

Many who think they are fasting have the habit of eating as soon as they hear the bell for nones [*horam nonam*], but they should not believe that they are fasting if they should eat before the office of vespers [*vespertinum celebretur officium*]. For one must go to Masses and hear the solemnization of Masses and office vespers [*vespertinis officiis*], and also give alms, before approaching food. If anyone should be so limited of necessity that he cannot attend Mass, he should break his fast having shown respect to the vesper hour [*aestimata vespertina hora*] and having completed his prayer.¹³⁷

It is also notable that the concluding chapter of the *staute* (c.46) focuses on the central role of the cathedral close and the bishop, instructing that on public occasions, as many clerics as possible should attend Mass in Cathedral:

On account of which care must be taken that all come together in public to the holy mother church [*ad publicam sanctam matrem ecclesiam*] to hear the solemnization of Masses and preaching [*ad missarum solemniam et praedicationem audituri convenient*].

¹³⁴ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794 c. 7, p. 75; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 58; (eds.), *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 56, p. 206; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH *Capit. I*, c. 56, p. 57; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 213.

¹³⁵ Meens, 'Sanctuary, penance, and dispute', pp. 277-300; Collins, *Debate Over Sacred Space*, pp. 91-121.

¹³⁶ *Theodulf I*, c. 24, pp. 121-122; trans., McCracken and Cabiniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 112-3.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, c. 39, p. 137; trans., p. 118.

Likewise it is decreed that in the city in which a bishop has been established [*in civitate in qua episcopus constitutus*], all the presbyters and people, both of the city and of its environs in vestments [*tam civitatis quam et suburbani, revestiti*], should stand with devout hearts at the Mass itself until the benediction of the bishop and Communion, and afterwards if they wish they may with permission revert back to their own rank [*percepta revertantur*], after the benediction and Communion have been received. And priests should diligently watch out that neither in the oratories nor the suburban monasteries [*suburbana monasteria*], nor in the suburban churches [*ecclesias suburbanas*], should they presume to celebrate masses before the second hour except with great caution, and with the doors locked, so that the people may not at all be able to absent themselves from the public solemnities, from the Mass or preaching of the bishop [*praedicatione episcopi*], but all of them, the priests of the suburbs [*sacerdotes suburbani*] as well as those assigned to the city [*urbe constituti*], and all the people, as we said above, may come together with them for the public celebration of Masses.¹³⁸

Such occasions offered the diocesan clergy an opportunity to renew their spiritual bonds with their mother church and for the bishop to offer any necessary correction.

These allusions to the cathedral close, the enclosed life, and to the Benedictine Custom are comparable to Chrodegang's Rule. Both Theodulf and Chrodegang used the Benedictine Rule as the basis for the regulation of the clergy and in particular drew chapter 48 of the Benedictine custom to warn their clerics of the dangers of idleness.¹³⁹ The two texts also share a similar concern with the Lenten fast, and

¹³⁸ The final chapter of Theodulf I survives in several versions and different editors have dealt with this precept in different ways. The version quoted above comes from *PL* 105, 208 and preserves the text found in the *Codex Suessionicus*. For translation and commentary see: G. McCracken and A. Cabisin (eds.), *Early Medieval Theology* (London, 1957), p. 398. This is the version used by van Rhijn when she discusses the final chapter of the statute. (See: van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 124-125, fn. 92.) Elsewhere she refers to Bonner's edition contained in the *MGH*. The *MGH* preserves a different version of the precept which unifies c. 45 and c. 46. (*Theodulf I*, c. 45, p. 141-2). Although this lacks the detail of the *Codex Suessionicus*, it preserves the reference to the city, and to the mother church. It also states that with the exception of nuns, all must come together to hear the bishop's preaching: *Admonendus est populus, ut ante publicum peractum officium ad cibum non accedat, et omnes ad publicam sanctam matrem ecclesiam missarum sollemniet praedicationem audituri convenient, et sacerdotes per oratoria nequaquammissas nisi tam caute ante secundam horam celebrent, ut populus a publicis sollemnibus non abstrahatur. Sed sive sacerdotes, qui in circuitu urbis aut in eadem urbe sunt, sive populus, ut praediximus, in unum ad publicam missarum celebrationem convenient exceptis deo sacris feminis, quibus mos est ad publicum non egredi, sed claustris monasterii contineri.*

¹³⁹ *RC*, c. 9, p. 34, trans., p. 61; *Theodulf I*, cc. 2-3, pp. 105-06; trans., McCracken and Cabisin, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 107; *RB*, c. 48, pp. 160-163.

Theodulf (c. 39) may have based his own order for meals to be taken after Vespers on Chrodegang's Rule (c. 20), which stated:

Let them be sparing in the amount of food and drink they take, to the extent that God gives them strength: specifically every day except Sundays from the beginning of Lent until Easter they should eat in the refectory after saying vespers [*post dictam Vesperam*], and they should abstain from certain foods and drinks according to what the bishop thinks reasonable. They should not eat anywhere else during those forty days, neither in the city [*civitate*], nor the monasteries [*monasteriis*], nor in any place at all, even their own homes [*domibus propriis*], unless they happen to be so far off that they are unable to be with their brothers to take their meal at the proper time.¹⁴⁰

Here Chrodegang addressed both the enclosed and extra-claustral clergy, and it is perhaps unsurprising to see Theodulf make use of this custom. In a similar vein, both Chrodegang and Theodulf sought to involve all clergy in the celebration of feast days within the cloister. On such occasions, both the statute (c. 46), and Chrodegang's Rule (cc. 33-34), commanded that the clergy appear before the bishop 'properly vested', and to remain in the cathedral until the bishop has completed the Mass and Benediction.¹⁴¹ Theodulf and Chrodegang may again have been drawing on Pope Zachary's decretal (747) and the parallels between the three texts are particularly striking:

¹⁴⁰ RC, c. 20) pp. 38-39, trans., p. 66; *Theodulf I*, c. 39, p. 137; trans., McCracken and Cabiniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 118.

¹⁴¹ RC, cc. 33-34, pp. 49-51 and pp. 79-83; PL 105, 208.

Zachary's Letter, (c. 747), Ch. 1. ¹⁴²	Rule of Chrodegang, (c. 750), Ch. 33. ¹⁴³	Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute, (c. 798), Ch. 46. ¹⁴⁴
<p>So that a bishop might show his rank he should wear his robes; likewise too the priests and cardinals. And if they might wish to live holding to the monastic way of life the low ranked who are subject to him [the bishop] shall pay respect to him dressed in clean robes, so that in secret they would serve their way of life in their hearts.</p>	<p>On Sundays or the feasts of Saints, or when the pontiff or his deputies determine, all the officials¹⁴⁵ should put on their vestments in the morning after Prime has been sung, including their chasubles, as church law requires. Once properly vested, they may hurry to their duties with no delay. When the first bell is heard they should all go to chapter, and hear a reading there; then they should go together to church, and when the bell has rung the second time they should sing Terce. Then seated in the proper order they should wait for the pontiff, as the custom is in the church if Rome. No one shall leave his place afterwards until everything is finished...</p>	<p>On account of which care must be taken that all come together in public to the holy mother church [ad publicam sanctam matrem ecclesiam] to hear the solemnization of Masses and preaching [ad missarum solemniam et praedicationem audituri convenient. Likewise it is decreed that in the city in which a bishop has been established [in civitate in qua episcopus constitutus], all the presbyters and people, both of the city and of its environs in vestments [tam civitatis quam et suburbani, revestiti], should stand with devout hearts at the Mass itself until the benediction of the bishop and Communion, and afterwards if they wish they may with permission revert back to their own rank [percepta revertantur], after the benediction and Communion have been received...</p>

As discussed above, Zachary's decretal influenced some of the provisions of the Synod of Frankfurt (794). Given the letter's inclusion in the *Codex Carolinus*, it is entirely possible that Theodulf and Chrodegang were making independent use of the same tradition. While Theodulf shared Chrodegang's interest in the Rule of Benedict, the two authors also approached the Rule independently. Both bishops used the

¹⁴² CC. no.3, p. 481.

¹⁴³ RC, c. 33, p. 49, trans., pp. 79-80.

¹⁴⁴ PL 105, col. 208; trans., McCracken and Cabiniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 119-120. For an alternative version see: *Theodulf I*, c. 45, p. 141-142.

¹⁴⁵ Chapter 8 of Chrodegang's Rule makes it clear that all the clergy of the city and its suburbs are to be involved in the celebration of feast days within the Cathedral close. See Part I. 1. ii and Part II. 2. i.

Benedictine Rule to illustrate the virtues required by the clergy, but drew on different chapters. Theodulf (c. 21) used chapter 4 (The Tools of Good Work) for this purpose, meanwhile Chrodegang made use of chapters 7 (Humility) and 72 (The Good Zeal Monks Should Have).¹⁴⁶

Although Chrodegang and Theodulf shared a common agenda, namely the regulation of clergy, it is significant that in the wake of the *Admonitio* (789) and the Synod of Frankfurt (794), Theodulf chose to construct a new text, taking it upon himself to regulate the clergy.¹⁴⁷ Theodulf's precepts were certainly the most successful and influential episcopal statute, but he was not alone in issuing such *capitula*. The last decade of the eighth century, and the first decade of the ninth, saw the issuing of a series of episcopal statutes, including those composed by Gerbald of Liège (c. 800- 809) and Haito of Basel (c. 806-c.813).¹⁴⁸ The statutes are a diverse group of texts. Some addressed a wide audience, including both the laity and the clergy, while others such as Theodulf's second statute (c. 798-817/818), were little more than penitential handbooks.¹⁴⁹ Nonetheless, all the statutes sought to prescribe clerical behaviour in some form. These episcopal authors took action to 'rule the life' of their clergy, both within their households and within their dioceses. While these statutes cannot be categorised as conventional rules, they expand upon the pronouncements of Church councils, papal decretals, and other authoritative texts such as the Rule of Benedict. They should therefore be seen 'canons' in the broadest sense. As van Rhijn has noted, categorising conciliar decrees and episcopal statutes as separate groups of texts is problematic and imposes a difference that 'may never have been clear-cut in the first place'. Both groups clearly represented recensions of canon law.¹⁵⁰ This view may also be applied to episcopal statutes and rules for canons. The evidence of Bern 289 and CCCC 191, demonstrate both the use of Theodulf's precepts within the enclosure and the complementary nature of this Statute and Chrodegang's Rule.

¹⁴⁶ *Theodulf I*, p. 117-21, trans., McCracken and Cabaniss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 111-112; RC, c. 1 and c. 11, p. 29, pp. 34-35 trans., p. 55 and p. 62; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 114-166.

¹⁴⁷ For discussions of the dating of Theodulf's precept and what inspired Theodulf to write, see: van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 33-48 and 102-111; Bonner, (ed.) *Theodulf I*, pp. 73-6; McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 52-57.

¹⁴⁸ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 13-39 and 102-138.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 27-29.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

The imprecision of the *Admonitio*, and the creation of the first wave of episcopal statutes, illustrates the varied approaches taken towards the regulation of the clergy at the turn of the ninth century. Just as in Chrodegang's day, the individual bishop was empowered, and indeed encouraged, to select the canons and rules that regulated the way of life practised by clerics within the household and the diocese. While certain habits appear common, the exact nature of the life of clergy varied between different dioceses. What was new in the late 780s and 790s was an emphasis, however vague, on the need to distinguish between the way of life of monks and canons. While the *Admonitio* (789) and Synod of Frankfurt (794) showed a clear preference for monks to follow the Benedictine custom, it was left up to the individual bishops to regulate the life of the clergy in their diocese according to canon law. It was for them to distinguish between the monastic and the clerical. As Alcuin and Wulfred show, what one churchman thought of as monastic, may well have been interpreted as clerical by someone else. Given the primacy of local tradition, and the varied approaches taken towards the regulation of the clergy, it is little wonder that in 811 Charlemagne asked his bishops: 'about the life of those who are called canons, what sort ought it to be'?¹⁵¹

¹⁵¹ *Capitula Tractanda*, p. 161; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', p. 86.

Chapter 4: The 813 Councils and the Regulation of the Canonical Clergy

II.4 Introduction

As discussed above Charlemagne's 811 memoranda likely formed part of the preparations for the five Church councils held in 813 at: Arles; Chalon; Mainz; Rheims; and Tours. These five councils have received much historiographical attention and they represented a highly co-ordinated effort to address the ordering of the Frankish Church.¹ As McKitterick points out, next to the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) the councils were Charlemagne's most significant attempt to enforce the principles of *correctio* across the entire kingdom.² The 813 councils addressed similar concerns and this has led scholars to make links between the findings of the five councils, drawing out the common approaches taken in the different regions.³ While such interpretations have merit, offering insights into wider trends within the Frankish Church, a focus on the common themes and on a central reform movement has meant that the local concerns addressed by the councils are sometimes overlooked.⁴ This is particularly noticable when the regulation of the clergy is discussed, and the various chapters that address the canonical clergy are often seen as expressions of Chrodegang's Rule or something akin to it.⁵ While each council addressed the nature of the life of canonical clergy, it is significant that no two synods described the life of canons in exactly the same way. These differing interpretations offer a snapshot of the way in which the bishops of the various territories of the Frankish kingdom sought to regulate the lives of their clergy prior to the creation of the Canonical Institute in 816, and certainly merit further study. The following discussion will focus primarily on the

¹ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 279.

² McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 12-15; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 307; Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 279-285; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 262-263; F. L. Ganshof, 'The Last Period of Charlemagne's Reign', in his *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971), pp. 247-248.

⁴ Recent work has started to highlight the variation between the approaches taken at the five reform councils. See: R. Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe 600-1200* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 111-123. This approach has also been taken by Rutger Krammer who has a forthcoming article on this subject.

⁵ For Tours and Rheims see: McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p. 14, fn. 1. For Mainz see: van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 44-45.

councils of Mainz, Tours and Arles. The evidence of local interests within each council will be examined, as will the manner in which the bishops sought to regulate the clergy in their particular archdioceses.

II.4.i. The Council of Mainz (813)

Out of the five councils held in 813 the Council of Mainz offered the fullest discussion of the life of the canonical clergy. The synod held jurisdiction over the eastern territories of the Frankish empire, including Metz, and chapters 9 and 10 of the capitulary consider the regulation of the clergy in some detail.⁶ The preface to the council lists the major figures who convened the synod and guided its proceedings, these included: Archbishop Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818); Bishop Arn of Salzburg (d.821); Bishop Riculf of Mainz (d. 813); and Bishop Bernhar of Worms (d. 823).⁷ These figures were some of the most prominent ecclesiastics at court and, in particular, Hildebald's role as palace chaplain meant that he was responsible for the religious observance and the organisation of the clerical community at the Aachen palace.⁸ His position was highlighted within the council document, which describes him as 'Archbishop of the sacred palace' [*sacri palatii archiepiscopus*].⁹ Given Hildebald's official role, and the likely presence of a contingent from Metz, the detailed discussion of the regulation of the clerical order might well be expected. The gathering of these prominent courtly figures mean the findings of the council of Mainz represent the views of those at the heart of the Frankish religious life. The interpretation of the life of the canonical clergy articulated at Mainz in many ways prefigures the more detailed way of life compiled in the Canonical Institute of 816. This may in part be due to the influence of Hildebald of Cologne at both assemblies. Nonetheless, while expressing the views and opinions of those based at the court, a close examination of chapters 9 and 10 also reveals the fusion of different local traditions.

⁶ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 262-263.

⁷ *Ibid.*, preface, p. 259.

⁸ For the chaplain's role as supervisor of all clerics in the palace see: ⁸ *Hincmarus De Ordini Palatii*, c. 16, c. 20 and c. 32, pp. 62-64, 68-70 and 88-89 ;trans., Herlihy, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilisation*, pp. 523-525 and p. 529. For Hildebald see: Bullough, 'Men of God', p. 142; Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 54-64.

⁹ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 259. For a discussion of the use of this term see: de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', pp. 129-131.

Chapters 8-11 of the council of Mainz specifically address the way of life of bishops, canons, clerics and monks in turn.¹⁰ Chapter 9, ‘Concerning the life of canons’ offered a simple, yet comprehensive, definition of the way of life practised by canons:

Concerning the life of canons: Therefore with regard to all, as much as human fragility permits, we have decreed, that the canonical clergy shall live canonically, observing the doctrine of divine scripture and the instructions of the sacred fathers. And in each and every bishopric none shall dare to leave his place without the permission of his bishop or master. And likewise so that they might eat and sleep, indeed they can accept a stipend from the property of the Church. By this they will have sufficient means, and may remain in their cloister. And every day first thing in the morning let them come and hear the reading of whoever might command them. Similarly at table, in truth let them obediently listen to the reading produced by their master according to the canons.¹¹

The authority of the bishop or master was clearly emphasised and like many of the provisions of the 813 councils there are parallels between this chapter and both the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and the Council of Frankfurt (794).¹² These capitularies stressed the importance of the bishop’s authority within his diocese and his abbatial role to rule the life of his canonical clergy. It is notable that no specific regulatory text is set to govern and guide the life of canons, rather they were exhorted to observe, ‘the doctrine of divine scripture and the instructions of the sacred fathers’. In a similar vein the master was granted great autonomy to ‘produce’ [*exhibeant*] and select the canonical readings for their canons. Despite this flexibility, the fact that the chapter refers to the stipends [*stipendia accipiunt*] canons received, could well be a reference to chapter 31 of Chrodegang’s Rule.¹³ Here it is worth re-emphasising that Chrodegang states the property of all canons became property of the Church, even those canons who drew an income from their former lands, did so through a precarial

¹⁰ c. 8: De potestate episcoporum; c. 9: De vita canonicorum; c. 10: De vita clericorum, c. 11: De vita monachorum; *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, pp. 262-63.

¹¹ ‘De vita canonicorum. In omnibus igitur, quantum humana permittit fragilitas, decrevimus, ut canonici clerici vivant, observantes divinae Scripturae doctrinam et documenta sanctorum partum, et nihil sine licentia episcopi sui vel magistri eorum positi agree praesumant in unoquoque episcopatu et ut simul manducant et dormiant, ubi his facultas id faciendi suppetit vel qui de rebus ecclesiasticis stipendia accipiunt, et in suo clauastro maneant et singulis diebus mane prima ad lectionem veniant et audiant quid eis imperetur. Ad mensam vero similiter lectionem audiant et oboedientiam secundum canones suis magistris exhibeant’. Ibid., pp. 262-63.

¹² See Part II. 3.

¹³ See Part I. 1. iii.

relationship with the cathedral community. Their salary passed through the hands of the bishop and upon the canon's death their movable property was to be donated to the church and to the poor.¹⁴ Another similarity between the council document and Chrodegang's Rule is the emphasis on all accepting their allotted income with grace. The council document focuses on the need for enclosed members of the community to have sufficient means, namely enough to live on without living to excess. (A point expanded on it Chapter 10 of the capitulary.) At several points within his rule Chrodegang makes this same point, particularly when discussing canons who entered into precarial agreements with their bishop (c. 31):

If the stipend they would have received for their ministry is left in the hands of the bursar, he can give it to those who have nothing [*si ea quae accepturi erant pro eorum ordinibus de eleemosyna dispensatore reliquerint nihil habentibus conferenda*] and they (the canon) can possess their own property [*possident sua*] without blame; for they too have to some extent renounced their property [*reliquunt sua*] in that they are content with their own [*quando propriis contenti*] without thinking that they are entitled to anything more [*nihiliquae se iure debere arbitrantur recipi*]. But if they imagine they ought to receive a share of what is given to the church [*conferuntur ecclesia portionem*] and cannot do without it, unable to relinquish their own property [*non possunt sua relinquere*] because they think it would be shameful [*deforme*] to become like the poor, let them know that it is still more shameful [*deformius*] for the rich to be fed on the alms of the poor [*eleemosynis pauperum pasci*]. Care should be taken, moreover, that the mother Church be not burdened [*gravetur*], for she is obliged by agreed canon law [*canonum iussione constrictam*] to be consistently intent on the relief [*subventionem*] of the poor, of widows and orphans and all in suchlike needs.¹⁵

The influence of Chrodegang's text on this precept may well reflect the wider use of

¹⁴ c. 39: 'Then if he wishes he can receive *precaria* from the bishop in such a form that during his life he may regularly receive the income from his property, but after his death everything that remains shall revert entirely to the church or the congregation to which it had been given, without any of it being given away, or anyone having a right to expect a legacy. However during his lifetime, as a member of the congregation, he may make a donation of any of his movable property either to the poor or to the congregation itself, as and how he wishes and he may also use it for his own needs. If any movable property remains after his death, half of it shall go as alms for the poor, or for Masses for his soul, or whatever he chooses, and the archdeacon, the primicerius or whoever he appoints during his life shall be executor. The other half should be denoted to the clergy, or to the congregation itself. *RC*, pp. 47-48 trans., p. 78.

¹⁵ Bertram's translation is little free here. Nonetheless, it is clear that this section of the chapter is referring to the stipends that are mentioned earlier in the chapter: 'sed ad ecclesiam, cui Deo auctore in commune deservimus, de cuius rebus stipendium habemus, loco hereditarie erlinquamus'; *RC*, pp. 47-48 trans., pp. 77-78.

his rule, particularly within the eastern provinces of the Frankish empire. As noted above, the *Brevium Exempla* was compiled for the monastery of Wissembourg under its abbot-bishop Berhar of Worms and demonstrates that Chrodegang's model was put into practice.¹⁶ Berhar was present at the Council of Mainz and was mentioned in the preface to the council document. The contingents from various Alsatian churches, including Metz, seem to have influenced the definition of the life of canons contained within chapter 9 of the capitulary.

While the council documents produced at Tours, Rheims and Arles do not mention stipends, chapter 6 of the Council of Chalon briefly discusses them, and contains clear allusions to chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule:

Rule of Chrodegang (c. 750), c. 31. ¹⁷	Council of Châlons (813), c. 6. ¹⁸
<p>Quia, si ea quae accepturi erant pro eorum ordinibus de eleemosyna dispensatore reliquerint nihil habentibus conferenda, sine peccato possident sua, quia et ipsi quadam modo reliquunt sua, quando propriis contenti rebus nihilquae se iure debere arbitrantur recipi. Quod si putant ideo accipi debere eorum quae conferuntur ecclesia portionem nec eam viDeantur abicere, quia non possunt sua reliquere, quod eis deforme sit inter suos pauperes reddi, noverint esse deformis possessores de eleemosynis pauperum pasci. Hoc etenim providendum est, ut no gravetur mater Ecclesia quam constant cotidie subventionem pauperum viduarumquae atque orfanorum simulque egenicum canonum iussione constrictam debere esse semper intenta.</p>	<p>Ecclesia vero sancta non solum fideles spoliare non debet, quin potius in opibus opem ferre, ut debiles, pauperes, viduae, orphani et ceteri necessitatem patientes a sancta ecclesia utpote a pia matre et omnium gubernatrice subsidium accipiant, quia res ecclesiae, quibus episcopi non ut propriis, sed ut commendatis uti debent, pretia sunt peccatorum, patrimonia pauperum, stipendia fratrum in commune viventium.</p>

Both Chrodegang and the Council of Chalon (813) emphasised the importance of Church property being used correctly, to aid the poor, the widowed, the orphaned and others in need. Likewise, building on Chrodegang's Rule, the council document states: 'it is the price of sin to take the inheritance of the poor, the stipend of the brothers who live the communal life' [*pretia sunt peccatorum, patrimonia pauperum,*

¹⁶ See Part I. 1. vi.

¹⁷ RC, pp. 47-48 trans., pp. 77-78.

¹⁸ *Concilium Cabillonense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II.*, Teil I, no. 36, p. 275.

stipendia fratrum in commune viventium]. The references at both the Councils of Mainz and Chalon to the property arrangements of chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule, demonstrate the wide influence of this particular precept, and perhaps illustrate the success of Angilramn of Metz as a promotor of the traditions of his Cathedral community.

Nonetheless, it is notable that other texts were also used to regulate the life of clergy and this can be seen in chapter 10 of the Mainz council document: 'About the life of the clergy'. This chapter addressed the clerical order as a whole and its contents would apply as much to canons as to diocesan clerics.¹⁹ Here the bishops sought to extend the norms of the enclosure to those who undertook pastoral work in the diocese and it is worth examining this section of the council document in full:

About the life of the clergy: Therefore we wish and command that a distinction is made among those who say that they leave the secular world, and those who still serve it. The holy council would therefore like that a distinction is made as in the *regula clericorum*. Hence this partristic law should be heeded, that they are separated from ordinary life and abstain from the pleasures of the world. They should not attend spectacles and lay processions, they should stay away from shameful and uncouth parties. As Jerome says in his letter to Nepotian: 'We must love all families of Christians like our own, so that we can bring more comfort in bad times than a guest can during good times'. And Isidore says: 'Clerics should celebrate private feasts not just in a chaste manner, but also soberly. They should absolutely not be involved in usury, nor desire any uncouth practices of profit and fraud. They should flee from love of money, which is the root of all crime. They should give up all worldly office because of ambition, they should not accept gifts for the benefits of Godly medicine, watch out for treachery and conspiracy and steer clear of hate, spite, jealousy and envy. They should not go around with wandering eyes, an uncontrolled tongue or inordinate and inflated movements, but ceaselessly show humility and restraint of mind and simplicity of dress, and not show obscenity in word and deed. They should not visit widows and virgins too often, and not desire the company of women, but seek to keep the purity of an unblemished body forever. They should also show their superiors due respect without any wish to flatter. Finally, they should continuously devote themselves to the exercise of doctrine, reading, psalms, hymns and chants. Those who seek to show that they are devoted to the divine cult should be such, that, while they dedicate

¹⁹ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 46.

themselves to knowledge they administer the grace of doctrine to the people'.²⁰

Unlike chapter 9, this precept explicitly names Isidore of Seville and Jerome as authoritative figures who provided a definition of the manner in which clerics should live, and the virtues and behaviours expected of the clerical order. Chapter 10 is almost entirely made up of quotations from two texts, Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' (Book II, c. 2) and Jerome's letter to Nepotian and it is significant that both these texts were also used within the Canonical Institute of 816.²¹ In addition to these texts it is often claimed that the chapter refers to Chrodegang's Rule when it mentions a *regula clericorum*:²²

Therefore we wish and command that a distinction is made among those who say that they leave the secular world, and those who still serve it. The holy council would therefore like that a distinction is made as in the *regula clericorum*.²³

This hypothesis is attractive, particularly given the allusions to Chrodegang's Rule contained within chapter 9 of the text. Van Rhijn has argued that this statement cannot refer to 'anything but Chrodegang's Rule'.²⁴ She suggests that the Mainz document is referring directly to chapter 65 of Chrodegang's text. Much like Mainz,

²⁰ *De vita clericorum*. Discretionem igitur esse volumus atque decrevimus inter eos, qui dicunt se saeculum reliquisse, et adhuc saeculum sectantur. Placuit itaque sancto concilio, ut ita discernantur, sicut in regula clericorum dictum est. His igitur lege patrum cavetur, ut a vulgari vita seclusi a mundi voluptatibus sese abstineant, non spectaculis, non pompis intersint, convivia inhonesta et turpia fugiant. Tamen Hieronimus in epistola ad Nepotianum dicit: omnium christianorum domos quasi proprias amare debemus, ut consolatores nos in meroribus suis potius quam convivas in prosperis noverint. Item Isidorus: Clerici tamen convivio privata non tantum pudica, sed et sobria colant, usuris nequaquam incumbant neque turpium occupationes lucrorum fraudisque cuiusquam studium appetant. Amorem pecuniae quasi materiam cunctorum criminum fugiant, saecularia officia negotiaque abiciant, honorum gradus per ambitionem non subeant, pro beneficiis medicinae Dei munera non accipiant, dolos et coniurationes caveant, odium, aemulationem, obtreptionem atque invidiam fugiant. Non vagis oculis, non infreni lingua aut petulanti tumidoque gestu incedant, sed pudorem ac verecundiam mentis simplici habitu incessuque ostendant, obscenitatem etiam verborum sicut et operum penitus execrentur. Viduarum ac virginum visitationes frequentissimas fugiant, contubernia feminarum nullatenus appetant, castimoniam quoque inviolati corporis perpetuo conservare stuDeant. Seniores quoque debitam praebeant oboedientiam necullo iactantiae studio se adtollant. Postremo in doctrina, in lectionibus, psalmis, ymnis et canticis exercitio iugi incumbant. Tales enim esse debent, qui divinis cultibus se mancipandos student exhibere, scilicet ut, dum scientiae operam dant, doctrinae gratiam populis administrent. *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263; trans., van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 44-5.

²¹ *IC*, pp. 370-3 and pp. 377-8. For discussion, see Part III.

²² van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 45; *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263, fn. 1.

²³ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263; trans., van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 44-45.

²⁴ van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 45.

this chapter contains direct quotations from book 2 of Isidore's, *On Ecclesiastical Offices* (chapter 3). However, the parallel she makes is not to Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750), but to the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang (c. 850), a text composed some 40 years after the Council of Mainz (813).²⁵ In fact, neither this particular dictum, nor Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' as a whole, were major influences on Chrodegang when he composed his original rule (c. 755).²⁶

Van Rhijn's suggestion that the purpose of both this section of the council document (c.10), and of the enlarged rule (c. 65), was to distinguish between the life of canons and diocesan clerics is also problematic. Rather than differentiating between these groups, chapter 65 of the enlarged Rule focuses on the authority of the bishop and on the need for clerics to avoid the norms of the laity:

There are two types of cleric: one is the ecclesiastics who serve under the rule of a bishop, the other the *acephali*, in other words 'headless', who know not whom they follow. They are neither included among the laity through concern with secular business, nor among the clergy through the service to God, but they pass their days wandering and dissolute, in a life that is rootless and vile. They respect no one intent only on license to follow their own whims; like dumb beasts they are driven by their unrestrained desires; they wear the livery of the religious state without its authority. They are like centaurs neither horses nor men, but, as the poet says, 'a mingled stock of both kinds'.²⁷

In a similar vein chapter 10 of the council document, and also chapter 64 of the enlarged rule, discusses the virtues of the clergy and their need to separate themselves from the secular modes of living, there was no discussion of the separation of canons from the wider clerical order.

Van Rhijn is not alone in suggesting that chapter 10 refers to Chrodegang's Rule, and an alternative argument in favour of this proposition was made by Werminghoff who suggested that the *regula clericorum* was a reference to chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule.²⁸ This would certainly fit with both the contents of chapter 9

²⁵ *EnlR.*, c. 65, p. 218, trans., p. 272. The Enlarged Rule (c.850) is made up of 86 chapters, Chrodegang's Original Rule contained 34 chapters.

²⁶ For the texts used by Chrodegang to construct his original Rule see: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 114-206. For the dating of the enlarged rule see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 11-15; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 177-178.

²⁷ *EnlR.*, p. 218 trans., p. 272.

²⁸ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263, fn.1.

of the capitulary, and with the wider tone of chapter 10, which focused on the need to distinguish between clerics and the laity. It would also suggest that those who lived outside the enclosure were expected to tie themselves to cloistered communities by means of precarious grants, as seen within the *Brevium Exempla*.²⁹ It is possible that Berhar and others gathered at Mainz may have intended this clause to be a reference to Chrodegang's Rule and, as will be discussed below, we may see a fusion of traditions, a mixing of the ideals of Chrodegang's rule with Isidore's authoritative text. Nonetheless, a close comparison between the council document and Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' shows that chapter 10 draws exclusively on Isidore and Jerome:

Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book II, c. 2. ³⁰	The Council of Mainz (813) c. 10. ³¹ (Quotations from Isidore in bold.)
<p><u>De regulis clericorum.</u></p> <p>His igitur lege Patrum cavetur ut, a vulgari vita seclusi, a mundi voluptatibus sese abstineant; non spectaculis, non pompis intersint; convivia publica fugiant, privata non tantum pudica, sed et sobria colant. Usuris nequaquam incumbant, neque turpium occupationes lucrorum fraudisque cuiusquam studium appetant, amorem pecuniae, quasi materiam cunctorum criminum, fugiant, saecularia officia negotiaque abjiciant, honorum gradus per ambitiones non subeant. Pro beneficiis medicinae Dei munera non accipiant, dolos et conjurationes caveant; odium, aemulationem, obtrectionem, atque invidiam fugiant. Non vagis oculis, non infreni lingua, aut petulanti tumidoque gestu incedant, sed pudorem ac verecundiam</p>	<p>Discretionem igitur esse volumus atque decrevimus inter eos, qui dicunt se saeculum reliquisse, et adhuc saeculum sectantur. Placuit itaque sancto concilio, ut ita discernantur, sicut in regula clericorum dictum est. His igitur lege patrum cavetur, ut a vulgari vita seclusi a mundi voluptatibus sese abstineant, non spectaculis, non pompis intersint, convivia inhonesta et turpia fugiant. Tamen Hieronimus in epistola ad Nepotianum dicit: Omnium Christianorum domos quasi proprias amare debemus, ut consolatores nos in meroribus suis potius quam convivas in prosperis noverint. Item Isidorus: Clerici tamen convivia privata non tantum pudica, sed et sobria colant, usuris nequaquam incumbant neque turpium occupationes lucrorum fraudisque cuiusquam studium appetant. Amorem pecuniae quasi materiam cunctorum criminum fugiant, saecularia officia negotiaque abiciant, honorum gradus per ambitionem non subeant, pro beneficiis medicinae Dei munera non accipiant, dolos et coniurationes caveant, odium, aemulationem, obtrectionem atque invidiam fugiant. Non</p>

²⁹ See Part I. 1. vi.

³⁰ *PL* 83, col. 778-779.

³¹ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263.

mentis simplici habitu incessuque ostendant. Obscenitatem etiam verborum, sicut et operum, penitus exsecrentur. Viduarum ac virginum visitationes frequentissimas fugiant, contubernia feminarum extranearum nullatenus appetant, castimoniam quoque inviolati corporis perpetuo conservare stuDeant, aut certe unius matrimonii vinculo foederentur. Senioribus quoque debitam praebeant obedientiam, neque ullo iactantiae studio semetipsos attollant. Postremo in doctrina, in lectionibus, psalmis, hymnis, canticis, exercitio iugi incumbant. Tales enim esse debent, qui divinis cultibus se mancipandos student exhibere, scilicet ut dum scientiae operam dant, doctrinae gratiam populis administrent.

vagis oculis, non infreni lingua aut petulanti tumidoque gestu incedant, sed pudorem ac verecundiam mentis simplici habitu incessuque ostendant, obscenitatem etiam verborum sicut et operum penitus execrentur. Viduarum ac virginum visitationes frequentissimas fugiant, contubernia feminarum nullatenus appetant, castimoniam quoque inviolati corporis perpetuo conservare stuDeant. Seniores quoque debitam praebeant oboedientiam necullo iactantiae studio se adtollant. Postremo in doctrina, in lectionibus, psalmis, ymnis et canticis exercitio iugi incumbant. Tales enim esse debent, qui divinis cultibus se mancipandos student exhibere, scilicet ut, dum scientiae operam dant, doctrinae gratiam populis administrent.

Chapter 10's use of Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' as a regulatory text, providing a rule, or canon, for the clergy as a whole is significant. In Isidore's *Etymologiae* (book VI, c. 16) a canon, in the sense of a regulation, was defined as the same thing as a rule:

The canons of Councils: Canon is a Greek word; in Latin, 'measuring rod' [*regula*]. A measuring rod is so called because it draws a straight line [*recte*] and never goes astray. Some say a measuring rod is so called because it rules [*regere*], or because it offers a norm of living correctly [*recte*], or because it corrects [*corrigere*] anything distorted or wicked.³²

Given the popularity of Isidore and of this text in particular, the Frankish episcopate would likely have shared this understanding.³³ Again this precept suggests we should

³² *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum, libri XX*, (ed.), W. M. Lindsay, (Oxford 1911), Digitised as part of the Latin Library: <<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/isidore/6.shtml>>> [accessed 16/07/2015]; trans. S. A. Barney et al., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006), p. 143.

³³ J. Fontaine, 'La figure d'Isidore de Séville à l'époque carolingienne', in J. Fontaine and Christine Pellistrandi (eds.) *L'Europe Héritière de l'Espagne Wisigothique* (Paris, 1992), pp. 195-211; J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Seville: Genèse et originalité de la Culture Hispanique au Temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 401-431, particularly, pp. 406-412; Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 147-160; Contreni, 'Persuit of Knowledge', pp. 106-142.

look beyond Chrodegang's Rule to find the texts that were used to regulate the day-to-day life of the canonical clergy. This notion is certainly supported by chapter 10 of the Council of Mainz and by an analysis of the Canonical Institute (816) which, as will be discussed below, the latter drew on Chrodegang's Rule and the Rule of Benedict, but also made use of 'canons' such as Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' and his *Sententiae*.³⁴ Notably, within the Institute, Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' was the primary text used to define the Divine Office (cc. 126-130).³⁵ Given Isidore's heavy influence on the way of life prescribed by the Council of Mainz (813) and in the Canonical Institute (816), it is probable that 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' was used to regulate the life of canons prior to 816.

Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' was held in high esteem by the Frankish episcopate and from the early eighth century onwards this text was widely used.³⁶ This makes it difficult to assess which community, or communities, may have drawn on Isidore to regulate the life the clergy. Nonetheless, the preface to the council of Mainz may help us narrow this field. Hildebald (d. 818) was the most prominent of the figures who attended the synod and, he was both archchaplain of the palace and archbishop of Cologne. Hildebald was therefore in a key position to influence both the council of Mainz and the content of the Canonical Institute (816). The Cologne Cathedral library contains a copy of Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' and this manuscript, Köln Dombibliothek Codex 101, has been dated by Bischoff to the first or second quarter of the ninth century.³⁷ While the book cannot be directly associated with Hildebald, and lacks the inscription: *codex sancti Petri sub Pio Patre Hildebald*, the codex was created during Hildebald's lifetime, or soon afterwards, and has East Frankish origins.³⁸ As has long been noted, Hildebald was an avid book collector, who contributed many volumes to his cathedral library; in 833 a catalogue was made of the Cologne cathedral library and several works by Isidore are listed (nos. 63-68). These included his 'On Ecclesiastical Offices', 'Etymologies' and his

³⁴ For a discussion of the use of Isidore within the Canonical Institute see Part III.

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 155-157; It should be noted that chapter 131 (That canons should religiously observe the canonical Hours) and chapter 136 (That all canons should come to Compline) draw on Chrodegang's Rule and the Rule of Benedict; a point that will be discussed in more detail below.

³⁶ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 147-160.

³⁷ Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 1915. A digital facsimile is available at *Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis* (Univesität zu Köln): <<<http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de>>> [accessed 16/07/2015].

³⁸ Jones, *Script of Cologne*, pp. 17-22; Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', p. 32.

Sententiae.³⁹ While it would push the evidence too far to associate Köln101 directly with the *Officiorum* (no. 64) listed in 833, it is at least conceivable that the manuscript was circulating in the Cologne area during Hildebald's episcopacy.⁴⁰ The codex was certainly part of the cathedral's collection by the sixteenth century, when the inscription *Liber Sancti Petri* was added to its flyleaf.⁴¹

It is possible that Hildebald favoured Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' and made use of this text to regulate the canonical clergy subject to his authority. Crucially Isidore was not used in isolation. The catalogue of 833 also lists a work entitled *De regulis canonicorum* (no.95), whether this is Chrodegang's Rule, a copy of the Canonical Institute, or another text will remain a mystery.⁴² However, given Hildebald's close links to the court and with Angilramn of Metz, as well as the allusions to Chrodegang's Rule at the synod of Frankfurt (794) and at the Council of Mainz (c. 9), it is possible that this is a reference to Chrodegang's text.⁴³ The use of Chrodegang's Rule alongside Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' is certainly an interesting development, and while two different traditions may be detected at the Council of Mainz (813), they should not be viewed as mutually exclusive. At some point the orthodox traditions of the Metz community were combined with Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices', which was known in Cologne. Such a combination may represent an attempt to distil the basic virtues and practices required by 'those who are called canons'.⁴⁴ Hildebald may well be the source of this synthesis of traditions,

³⁹ While the catalogue is now lost, a copy made by Decker survives. See: A. Decker, *Die Hildebald'sche Manuskriptensammlung des Kölner Domes* (Bonn, 1895). This work is digitised: <<http://www.tertullian.org/articles/decker_cologne/decker_cologne.htm>> [accessed 16/07/2015]; For a discussion of the catalogue see also: R. McKitterick, *Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 191-192 and 261-263; For Hildebald's book collecting see: Jones, *Script of Cologne*, pp. 17-22 and pp. 28-29; Espelo, 'Testimony of Carolingian Rule', pp. 30-6 and 54-64.

⁴⁰ Decker, *Manuskriptensammlung des Kölner*: <<http://www.tertullian.org/articles/decker_cologne/decker_cologne.htm>> [accessed 16/07/2015].

⁴¹ Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 1915.

⁴² Decker, *Manuskriptensammlung*: <<http://www.tertullian.org/articles/decker_cologne/decker_cologne.htm>> [accessed 16/07/2015].

⁴³ The manuscript evidence demonstrates that Chrodegang's Rule, in its original form, retained some influence even after the issuing of the canonical institute. Two of the 4 manuscripts containing the text date from after 816: Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. Lat. F. 94 (Tours? s.ix^{2/3}); Leiden, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, BPL 81 (Orval/ Luxembourg, s. xi/xii). This last manuscript combines Chrodegang's original text with elements from the Canonical Institute and from the Rule of Augustine. For details see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 31-35; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 2207. Mordek does not list any copies of the Canonical Institute at Cologne; Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium*, pp. 1045-1061.

⁴⁴ As Choy has argued, distilling the essence of monastic practice was the aim of Benedict of Aniane's *Codex Regularum* (c. 820). See, Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', pp. 74-87. A similar approach

which likely began when he succeeded Angilramn as archchaplain. The palace chapel itself was a location where the traditions of the Metz and Cologne communities came into contact, where two local traditions were fused and informed the practices of the centre. An example of this process of synthesis can be seen in a letter from the archchancellor Helisachar (d. 840) to archbishop Nibridius of Narbonne (d. 828). The epistle (c. 814-822) recounted the time the two men spent together at Aachen, possibly referring to Christmas, 814.⁴⁵ Helisachar reported:

I think you will recall that some time ago when palace affairs constrained me to Aachen and imperial order brought you there to settle ecclesiastical matters, we were often together at the celebration of the night office. There the readings left us serene in spirit, but you were much puzzled by certain responses which were as you said lacking in authority and sense; and by verses which, as sung by my singers and yours, were in certain cases improperly accommodated. You enjoined me to use skill and ingenuity, seeking out suitable verses and fitting them appropriately to their responses.⁴⁶

This case deals with liturgy rather than relating directly to the life of the canonical clergy, but the letter illustrates the meeting of two traditions and practices in the setting of the chapel. Interestingly, it is not the archchancellor of the palace who pointed out the need to accommodate these two divergent practices, it was the visiting Archbishop of Narbonne who tasks the palace official with unifying these traditions. Thus Helisachar stated:

This work is accomplished at your direction and dedicated to your piety, and although it may not please everybody, it is necessary to my singers and yours.⁴⁷

After consultation with ‘cantors’ and ‘skilled lectors’, and the rejection of antiphons

seems to have been taken towards the regulation of the clergy at the council of Mainz and in the Canonical Institute (816). For the Canonical Institute see Part III.

⁴⁵ *Epistolae Variorum Inde a Morte Caroli Magni usque ad divisionem imperii collectae* (ed.) E. Dümmler, MGH *Epp.* V (Berlin, 1899), no. 6, pp. 307-309; Levy provides both the original text with translation and commentary: K. Levy, ‘Abbot Helisacher’s Antiphoner’, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 48.2 (1995), pp. 177-184. For the dating see: E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918).

⁴⁶ *Epistolae Variorum Inde a Morte Caroli Magni*, no. 6, p. 307; trans., Levy, ‘Helisacher’s Antiphoner’, pp. 178-179.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 308; trans., p. 182.

and responses that ‘lacked in authority and reason’, Helisacher produced a new text containing some antiphons, ‘which were not known’ to either the court clergy or Nibridius’ retinue. It seems that these were incorporated into the traditional responses used in both the palace and in Narbonne. This is alluded to by the archchancellor who stated:

For it was fitting that what was ingrained in churchly practice through the long and assiduous use of many, be approved by our silent acquiescence rather than presumptuously altered.⁴⁸

While Helisacher’s Antiphoner, recorded in this letter, represents a corrected text sent out from the court to Narbonne, it also demonstrates the incorporation of local traditions into court life. After all Nibridius, not Helisacher, had commissioned this work. The court clergy were corrected alongside those in Narbonne. This situation seems similar to the attempts to regulate the clergy. In 811 Charlemagne did not make any presumptions about the nature of the life of canons, rather he asked each church to report on their practices and offer guidance on this subject.⁴⁹ At Mainz we may detect Hildebald’s attempt to establish the practices and ideals that were to be enforced within the jurisdiction of those who attended the council. Isidore and Jerome are favoured as authors with great authority, and the practices of Metz may also be detected. Yet, the overarching purpose of chapters 9 and 10 was to produce concordance and an agreement of basics of the way of life to be practised by all canonical clergy. Thus chapter 9 makes it clear that the master or bishop had great freedom to select the readings used to regulate his canons. This focus on establishing the essentials of the life of canons, while respecting local custom may also be seen in the Council of Arles and Tours.

II.4.ii The Council of Arles (813)

Perhaps more than any of the other five synods, local interests and concerns dominate the Council of Arles. Chaired by archbishops John of Arles and Nibridius of Narbonne, the synod held jurisdiction over: Provence; Septimania; the Spanish

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ *Capitula Tractanda*, p. 161-162; *Capitula de Causis*, p. 162-164; trans., Nelson, ‘Voice of Charlemagne’, pp. 85-88.

March; and parts of Aquitaine.⁵⁰ These southern areas of the Frankish kingdom were distinct from the Frankish heartlands and both Septimania and the Spanish March had a largely Gothic population. The council emphasised the continued interest in the traditions of the Visigothic church and its lengthy preamble quoted extensively from the preface to the 16th council of Toledo (693), amending the date and location of the council, as well as the name and regnal year of monarch.⁵¹

Preface to the 16th Council of Toledo (693).⁵²

Dum anno sexto inclyti et orthodoxi domni et princeps nostri Egicanis sub die VI nones maias, aera DCCXXI, unanimatis nostrae, conventus in praetoriensi basilica, sanctorum ordinationis suae tempus in locis debitis resideret, rerum prius omnium domino devotissime gratiarum iura persolvimus pro eo alterutrae visionis contuita solari permisit, et altenae pacis osculo confovendo statuit, diffuses cordibus simulque et vocibus ei precum murmura effundentes, ut sicut nost alternorum osculorum impensione laetificos effecit, ita serenissimum ac religiosissimum praedictum Egicanem principem cuius jussu fraternitatis nostrae coetus est adunatus, fidei sua converstione stabiliat, prorogatione iustitiae muniat, pacem locupletem reddat, impensione misericordiae fuiciat, virium fortitudine roboret, quo longaevitatis muniis cluens commissa sibi regni gubernacula discreto moderamine teneat, et commisses sibi populos benigne regat, aequae disponat et jussu pietatis modifice. His devotione promptissima actis, coepit unionis nostrae numerositas de rebus spiritualibus mutual collatione inter se orsa diffundere; atque eventum rei

Preface to the Council of Arles, (813).
(Changes to the Toledan original are in bold.)

Dum anno **XL** sexto incliti et orthodoxi domni et principis nostri **Karoli imperatoris**, sub die **sexto Idus Maias**, era **DCCCLI**, unanimatis nostrae conventus **in Arelatensium urbe** in basilica **sancti Stephani martyris primi adgregatus consisteret, atque unusquisque nostrorum ex more secundum** ordinationis suae tempus in locis debitis resideret, rerum prius omnium Domino devotissima gratiarum iura persolvimus pro eo, quod nos et alternae visionis contuitu solari permisit et alternae pacis osculo confovendos statuit, diffusis cordibus simulque et vocibus precum murmura effundentes, ut, sicut nos alternorum osculorum impensione laetificos effecit, ita serenissimum ac religiosissimum praedictum **domnum nostrum Karolum imperatorem**, cuius iussu fraternitatis nostrae coetus est adunatus, fidei suae conservatione stabiliat, praerogatione iustitiae muniat, pacem ei locupletem reddat, impensione misericordiae fulciat, virium fortitudine roboret, commissa sibi regni gubernacula discreto moderamine tenere **concedat**, ut commissos sibi populos benigne regat, aequae disponat et iure pietatis modifcet. His devotione promptissima actis caepit unionis nostrae numerositas de rebus spiritualibus mutua

⁵⁰ *Concilium Arelatense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II.*, Teil I, no. 34 p. 249; For the possible jurisdictions of the 813 councils see: McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p. 217.

⁵¹ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 280.

⁵² *PL* 84, col. 557-558.

spectatione mansuetissima praestolari.

Igitur cum ea attentius agerentur, sic...

collatione inter se ora diffundere atque eventum rei expectatione mansuetissima praestolari. **Igitur cum haec attentius agerentur, sic. . .**⁵³

This may simply represent a homage to the ‘prestigious model of episcopal power’ recorded in the Visigothic councils.⁵⁴ However, the choice to adapt the Toledan council was imbued with meaning, the Gothic clergy deliberately tied their Carolingian present to the Visigothic past. Although Septimania had been incorporated into the Frankish kingdom in the sixth century, it retained its own Gothic character and culture.⁵⁵ Meanwhile, the Spanish March was a more recent acquisition, having been annexed by Charlemagne between the 770s and the 790s. This frontier zone proved difficult to govern, particularly given the proliferation of the Adoptionism within the province.⁵⁶ Adoptionism was denounced at several councils during the course the of 780s and 790s and, in conjunction with these court centred condemnations, an active preaching campaign took place in Septimania and the Spanish March.⁵⁷ This mission was co-ordinated by Alcuin and involved southern ecclesiastics including Benedict of Aniane and Nibridius of Narbonne.⁵⁸ Nibridius had cause to be particularly concerned by the Adoptionist threat, as the Spanish March lay within the jurisdiction of his archdiocese.⁵⁹ The prologue to the council document therefore emphasised Charlemagne’s legitimacy as the heir to the Visigothic kings who had once ruled Arles, Septimania, and the Spanish March. It also served as a clear statement of both the political power and the religious orthodoxy of the council.

⁵³ *Concilium Arelatense*, a. 813, pp. 248-249.

⁵⁴ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 280.

⁵⁵ Chandler, ‘Heresy and Empire’, p. 516; P. Riché, *Écoles et enseignement dans la Haut Moyen Age: Fine du Ve siècle- Milieu du XIe siècle* (Paris, 1989), p. 87.

⁵⁶ For a summary of Adoptionist belief see: Chandler, ‘Heresy and Empire’, p. 510. For a more detailed discussion see: J. C. Cavadini, *Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785-820* (Philadelphia, 1993), pp. 80-83 and pp. 107-127; see also C. M. Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian era: theology and art of Christ's passion* (Cambridge, 2001) pp. 52-90.

⁵⁷ Chandler, ‘Heresy and Empire’, pp. 505-527.

⁵⁸ For the letters between Alcuin and Nibridius see Alcuin, *Ep.*, nos. 200 and 201, pp. 330-334; For the preaching campaign see: Chandler, ‘Heresy and Empire’, pp. 524-526 and A. Cabaniss, ‘Translator’s Introduction’ in, Grabowsky and Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane*, pp.36-40.

⁵⁹ Chandler, ‘Heresy and Empire’, p. 511.

These local concerns are also expressed in chapter 1 of the text, which is an expanded version of a statement of faith issued at the 809 Council of Aachen.⁶⁰ This meeting had addressed the *filioque* controversy and reiterated that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit descending from both the Father and the Son was a central tenet of Christian belief.⁶¹ While the *filioque* debate was primarily a doctrinal disagreement between east and west, it also condemned the non-trinitarian position taken by Adoptionists.⁶² The prologue and first chapter dominate the findings of the Council of Arles, taking up nearly half of the capitulary.⁶³ Addressing the Adoptionist threat, and ensuring that the council maintained the orthodox and correct traditions of the Visigothic Church, seems to have been the primary aim of the assembly. All other concerns were of secondary importance. It may be for this reason that the way of life of the canonical clergy and monks was not addressed in great detail within the council document. Uniquely amongst the 813 councils, Arles addressed the life of the canonical clergy and of monks in the same precept (c.6), simply stating:

It is necessary for each and every bishop to make provision for the manner in which the canons ought to live and likewise also monks, so that they might strive to live according to the order of the canons or the rule; as the Apostle says, 'let each and every man live according to the vocation in which he was called'.⁶⁴

Despite its brevity, the chapter shines a light onto the process by which bishops regulated the life of their canons. This provision may well have drawn on chapter 29 of the Synod of Frankfurt (794) and again the local episcopate were granted great autonomy to prescribe the exact way of life practised within their communities.⁶⁵ As with the Council of Mainz (813), the reference to the 'order of

⁶⁰ Heito von Basel, *Testimonia de processione spiritus sancti*, (ed.) H. Willjung, *Das Konzil von Aachen, 809*, MGH, *Conc.*, II, *Suppl.* 2 (Hannover, 1998), 393-394; *Concilium Arelatense*, a. 813, pp. 249-250.

⁶¹ A Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 98-100.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 91-93.

⁶³ The first 837 words are contained within the prologue and the first chapter, while the final 1181 words are split between 26 chapters.

⁶⁴ *Providendum necesse est unicuique episcopo, qualiter canonici vivere debeant necnon et monachi, ut secundum ordinem canonicum vel regularem vivere stuDeant, ut ait apostolus: Unusquisque in qua vocatione vocatus est, in ea permaneat.* *Concilium Arelatense*, a. 813, p. 251.

⁶⁵ *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 169; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 61. See above, Part II. 3. i.

canons' may represent any number of authoritative regulatory texts, traditions and practices. The chapter likely reflected the vibrant, varied and well-established monastic practices of Provence, Septimania and the Rhone valley. The Southern rules and institutes produced in these regions were well represented in Benedict of Aniane's *Codex Regularum* (c. 820), which included: the Rule of Ferreolus; The Rule of the Four Fathers; The Second Rule of the Fathers; and The Life and Rule of the Jura Fathers (*Vita patrum*).⁶⁶ As discussed above, in the early ninth century the Burgundian monastery of St. Maurice d'Agaune was in the process of moving from a monastic to a canonical form of life, and thus its monastic traditions were amended to meet the needs of an increasingly clerical community.⁶⁷ It is possible that the adaption of The Rule of Four Fathers for clerical use, as recorded in Bern Burgerbibliothek MS. AA.90.11, occurred at St. Maurice during this period, and it is likely that other customs and traditions from the Rhone valley and Provence were also drawn on to regulate the life of the clergy. This would mirror the process detected in the above analysis of the council of Mainz, with local bishops selecting the texts used to regulate their communities.⁶⁸

In a similar vein it is worth returning the example of Benedict of Aniane. Benedict may well have been present at the Council of Arles as his foundation of Aniane was located only 60 miles from the city.⁶⁹ While Benedict of Aniane was a proponent of the Benedictine Rule, he also drew on other local customs and traditions to regulate the life of his monks. His *Codex Regularum* represented an attempt to 'discern the essential nature of monasticism', to find commonalities in the variety of approaches taken towards the regulation of the monastic order.⁷⁰ Ardo also related that Benedict of Aniane considered other rules to be superior to the rule of Benedict, at least for those with the necessary zeal:

Declaring the Rule of blessed Benedict was for beginners and weak persons, he [Benedict of Aniane] strove to climb up to the precepts of blessed Basil and the rule of blessed Pachomius. However much the Benedictine Rule might regulate possible things for paltry

⁶⁶ *Concordia Regularum*; Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', pp. 76-77.

⁶⁷ See Part II. 2. iii.

⁶⁸ For a discussion of this manuscript and the confraternity it describes see Appendix.

⁶⁹ It is also possible that he was at Aachen with Charlemagne and Louis and Pious.

⁷⁰ Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', p. 76.

people, our Benedict explored more impossible things. Dedicating himself wholly to penance and lamentation, he could not be imitated by anyone or only by a few. But divine favour decreed that he was to become an example of salvation for many and would be inflamed with love for the Rule of Benedict, and like a new athlete just back from single combat enter the field to fight publicly.⁷¹

Despite the hagiographic hyperbole within this tale, it is clear that Benedict of Aniane held other traditions in high esteem. He settled on the Rule of Benedict, not because it was superior to the Rules of Basil and Pachomius, but because it would provide a necessary standard that was achievable to all.⁷² Ardo expands on this process, relating how Benedict selected the texts and traditions that governed the monasteries he established:

He [Benedict of Aniane] gave his heart to studying the Rule of Benedict. To be able fully to understand it, he visited various monasteries and inquired of experienced persons what he did not know. He assembled the rules of all the holy insofar as he could locate them. He became acquainted with a useful standard and wholesome customs for monasteries which he transmitted for his own monks to be observed.⁷³

Here the Benedictine Custom was the preferred text, but Ardo implied that Benedict of Aniane examined the various ways the Rule was interpreted in different places. That local abbots interpreted the Rule on their own terms is demonstrated by Smaragdus of St. Mihiel's commentary on the Rule of Benedict which drew on Rule Fructuosus to solve certain problems thrown up by the Benedictine custom.⁷⁴ Benedict of Aniane therefore appeared to select the rules, traditions and customs used to regulate his community from those monasteries he had visited. As already noted, Benedict may also have compiled texts for use by canons, a notion supported by the posthumous description of Benedict offered by the monks of Inde: 'He had the greatest concern for the entire ecclesiastical order, whether monks, canons or layfolk' [*monachorum, canonicorum atque laicorum*].⁷⁵ This approach to the regulation of

⁷¹ *Vita Benedicti*, p. 202; trans., Cabaniss, *Benedict of Aniane*, pp. 68-69.

⁷² For a discussion of this passage of the text see: Grebowsky and Radl, 'The Second Benedict', pp. 8-9.

⁷³ *Vita Benedicti*, pp. 206-07; trans., Cabaniss, *Benedict of Aniane*, p. 79

⁷⁴ Ponesse, 'Smaragdus of St. Mihiel', pp. 380-81 and pp. 388-89.

⁷⁵ *Vita Benedicti*, p. 219; trans., Cabaniss, *Benedict of Aniane*, p. 104.

monks and canons was favoured by those gathered at Arles and Nibridius in particular may have followed the example of his monastic tutor (Benedict of Aniane). Nibridius was interested in the opinions of other ecclesiastics about the correct conduct of the liturgy, yet he also favoured the traditions of his community.⁷⁶ Along with Helisachar he sought to implement the best liturgical practices in his own cathedral and also in the palace. Here the interplay between local traditions is clear, both the practices of the palace and of Narbonne were in some way corrected, but there was also respect for long-standing and orthodox local customs. It should be noted that liturgy was intimately linked to the way of life of any enclosed community. As discussed above, the implementation of the Rule of Benedict at St. Maurice (c.820) was resisted in part because it interfered with the *laus perennis*, the liturgy that dominated the life at the monastery. Instead the community was allowed to follow a more flexible Rule for Canons that respected their way of life and the time-honored liturgical practices.⁷⁷

Chapter 6 of the council of Arles, represents one of the most influential precepts issued in 813 and had interesting afterlife. The chapter was included in the *Capitula e Canonibus Excerpta* that collated and summarized the findings of the five councils. This text may have been produced after the Aachen assembly in September 813.⁷⁸ While the *Capitula e Canonibus Excerpta* is often written off as a trivial compilation, it survives in three of the largest collections of capitulary texts: Rome, BAV. Pal. Lat., 289 (s. ix¹); Paris, BNF Lat. 9654 (s. xi); and Rome, BAV, Pal. Lat., 582 (s. x¹).⁷⁹ The inclusion of the *Excerpta* in these codices illustrates that the text was deemed significant well after 813. Interestingly, the 847 council of Mainz repeated and expanded upon chapter 6 of the council of Arles (813).⁸⁰ While the council of Mainz (847) gives more detail of monastic or clerical way of life, the approach taken is the same as at Arles. The local bishop ultimately controlled the

⁷⁶ *Epistolae variorum inde a morte Caroli Magni*, no. 6, pp. 307-9; Levy, 'Helisacher's Antiphoner', pp. 177-84.

⁷⁷ Zuffrey, *St-Maurice D'Agaune*, pp. 50-51; L. Ripart, 'Temps Séculiers', pp. 137-141.

⁷⁸ *Karoli Magni Capitula e Canonibus Excerpta*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II, Teil I*, no. 38A, p. 295; Both the Royal Frankish Annals and Moissac Chronicle report that the findings of the Five Councils were collated at Aachen in 813: RFA, p. 138; trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, pp. 95-96; *Chronicon Moissiacense*, (ed.), G. Pertz MGH, *SS I*, (Hanover, 1826), p. 283; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 148.

⁷⁹ McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p. 22, fn. 22; C. de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne*, (Leuven, 1936), p. 171; Bischoff, *Katalog*, nos. 6523, 6549.

⁸⁰ *Councilium Moguntium*, 847, MGH, *Capit. II, Teil II*, no. 248, p. 179.

exact traditions and texts used to regulate the life of his canonical clergy.

II.4.iii The Council of Tours (813)

While Those gathered at Arles offered the clearest expression of the local bishop's autonomy to regulate the life of his canons, the Council of Tours also addressed the clergy in a similar manner. Identifying the council's jurisdiction and who attended the synod is difficult. Unlike the Councils of Mainz, Arles and Rheims, the preface to the council of Tours does not list the major figures who chaired the proceedings:

So that they might have dedicated themselves, acted eminently and rightly laboured to unite in word and model and construct the rules [that govern the Church]. Laid down accordingly in this place and time when and where the metropolitans with the other bishops and some chosen from the clergy were briefly and comfortably united so they might be able to do great work, that which we had been charged [to do] by the great king we accomplished by meeting at that appointed place. Accordingly, the bishops, abbots and venerable clergy having assembled in the city of Tours, due to the meagreness of our number, we attended those things pertaining to the great work and we noted such things by chapters, as needed to be amended according to the canonical rule [*canonicam regulam*], to be shown to our most serene emperor.⁸¹

From this it can be inferred that several Metropolitans and bishops were present, however, the author of the preface also suggests that the council was a small-scale affair. It is likely Archbishop Joseph of Tours led the council as it took place in the capital of his province. Little is known of this elusive figure, aside from his involvement in the dispute between Alcuin and Theodulf over a fugitive cleric (801/802), a dispute that was in part over the correct application of law and penance.⁸² As well as Archbishop Joseph, it seems likely that a contingent from the monastery of St. Martin's led by their Abbot Fredegis (d. 833), also attended the council. Fredegis was a more prominent figure, in 800 he was appointed archdeacon

⁸¹ Ut operam darent et actibus eminent, quibus et se bene operando et sibi commissos verbis et exemplis instruendo regerent. Diffinitum itaque de locis et tempore, quando et ubi coadunari commodius et compendiosius metropolitani cum caeteris episcopis et electis quibusdam e clero possent ad tantum opus, quod a tanto principe nobis iniunctum est, ad statuta loca convenimus. Siquidem urbe Turonis congregati episcopi, abbates et venerabilis clerus pro parvitate nostra pauca, quae ad tantum opus pertinere animadvertimus et quae secundum canonicam regulam emendatione indigent, distincte per capitula adnotavimus, serenissimo imperatori nostro ostendenda. *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II.*, Teil I, no. 38, p. 286.

⁸² Alcuin, *Ep.*, nos. 245 and 246, pp. 393-399; Collins, *Debate Over Sacred Space*, pp. 91-121, fn. 60; Meens, 'Sanctuary, Penance and Dispute', pp. 277-300; Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe*, pp. 115-122.

of the palace and had close links to the royal family, having served as tutor to Charlemagne's daughters.⁸³ Fredegis had also been Alcuin's student in York before following his master to the Carolingian court.⁸⁴ Alcuin even involved his pupil in the 801/802 dispute over the fugitive cleric, asking both Fredegis and Witto (addressed as Nathanael and Candidus) to intervene with Charlemagne on his behalf.⁸⁵ The attendance of Theodulf of Orléans at the council of Tours is also a distinct possibility.⁸⁶ Tours was the closest of the five council to Orléans, located just over 60 miles down the Loire. It has been argued that Theodulf of Orléans' voice may be heard in the findings of the council of Chalon (813), particularly in its condemnation of pilgrimage as the sole means to purge sinners of their guilt (c. 45), but such statements are difficult to prove.⁸⁷ As Meens points out Theodulf's association with the Council of Chalon cannot be firmly established as the preface to the council of Chalon also does not list those who attended the assembly.⁸⁸

The interests of Joseph, Fredegis and Theodulf may be detected in the council document particularly in the precepts that address the root cause of the dispute between Alcuin and Theodulf. In Chapter 22, the delegates sought guidance from the palace on which handbooks should be used by priests in the application of penance, and on how penitents should be judged.⁸⁹ As Meens has noted given the context of the 801/802 conflict this is perhaps unsurprising and, chapter 45 of council of Chalon also contains a similar request for guidance from the palace on this issue.⁹⁰ The legacy of the fugitive cleric dispute may also be seen in Tours (c. 23) which directly addresses the life of canonical clergy. Here bishops were ordered to provide victuals and vestments for their canons, so that poverty would not cause their clerics to

⁸³ M. Garrison, 'Fredegis (d. 833)', *ODNB* <<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61648>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015 2015].

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ *Alcuin, Ep.*, no. 245; Allott, no. 114, pp. 120-121.

⁸⁶ McKitterick suggests the Council of Tours held jurisdiction over Nantes, Angers, Le Mans, Paris and Orléans. See McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p. 217.

⁸⁷ E. Dahlus-Berg, *Nova Antiquitas et Antiqua Novitas: Typologische Exegese und Isidorianisches Geschichtsbild Bei Theodulf von Orleans*, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 23 (Cologne, 1975) pp. 169-235; J. L. Nelson, 'Opposition to Pilgrimage in the Reign of Charlemagne?', in V. Garver and O. Pheln (eds.), *Rome and Religion in the Medieval World: Studies in Honour of Thomas F.X. Noble* (Farnham, 2014) pp. 77-78; *Concilium Cabillonense*, a. 813, p. 243-244.

⁸⁸ Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe*, pp. 116-117; *Concilium Cabillonense*, a. 813, p. 274.

⁸⁹ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 289.

⁹⁰ *Concilium Cabillonense*, a. 813, pp. 282-283; Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe*, p. 115.

become wandering vagrants, who lived without discipline.⁹¹ Finally, the input of Fredegis may be detected in Chapter 17 of the Tours document, which famously reminded bishops of the need to give homilies and requests that these sermons be translated ‘into the rustic *Romanam linguam* or *Thiotiscam*, [the vernacular] so that all may more easily understand things which are said’.⁹² Here the council repeated the instruction of the 786 Legatine synod held in Northumbria and attended by Alcuin, later abbot of St. Martins from 796-804.⁹³

Before examining the manner in which Tours dealt with the life of the canonical clergy it is important to highlight that the preface to the council mentions a *canonicam regula*.⁹⁴ While a *canonicam regulam* is usually interpreted as an explicit text intended for the use of an enclosed community of canons, in this case the use of phrase seems more holistic and the 51 precepts issued by the synod address the entire body of the Church including: bishops; clerics; monks; nuns; and even everyday Christians. The use of this term seems to be deliberate and raises interesting questions about the concept of a canonical rule in the ninth century. As discussed above, the council of Mainz quoted from the *De regulis clericorum* of Isidore’s ‘On Ecclesiastical Offices’. This listed the virtues and general behaviours expected of the clergy. Isidore envisaged a world where the clergy were morally and spiritually set apart from the laity, yet by their very function were to interact with secular folk ‘so that as they give effort to knowledge, they may administer the grace of their learning to the people’.⁹⁵ Such sentiments also formed the basis for the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and Theodulf’s First Episcopal Statute (c.798), which took a general approach to the regulation of clergy.⁹⁶ Those gathered at Tours shared this approach, and may

⁹¹ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 289.

⁹² *Ibid.*, c. 17, p. 288; trans., E. C. Dargen, *A History of Preaching* (New York, 1905), pp. 165-166. Wright is strongly in favour of seeing Alcuin’s posthumous influence at the Council of Tours R. Wright, ‘Late Latin and Early Romance: Alcuin’s *De Orthographia* and the Council of Tours (AD 813), in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 3* (Liverpool, 1983), pp. 353-359. For a more general discussion of this chapter see amongst others: Mckitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 84-85.

⁹³ Report of the Legates’, in Hadden and Stubbs (eds.), *Councils*, p. 460; ‘Georgius episcopus Ostiensis Hadriano I papae renuntiat’, *Alcuin Ep.*, no. 3, c. 20, p. 28; For translation see: Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred’, pp. 118-119. For discussion of the 786 synod and Alcuin’s role see: Story, *Carolingian Connections*, pp. 55-92; Cubbit, *Church Councils*, pp. 153-191; Carela, ‘Alcuin and Alfred’, pp. 17-54.

⁹⁴ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 286.

⁹⁵ *Isidore of Seville: De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, Book 2, c. 2, PL 83, col. 777-779; trans., T. L. Knoebel, *Isidore of Seville: De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (Mahwah, New Jersey, 1989), p. 69.

⁹⁶ See Part II. 3. iii.

have thought of a canonical rule as an all-encompassing text that governed the life of all orders who served in the Church. While this approach in some sense mirrored that taken at Mainz, the idea that the findings of the Council of Tours were a canonical rule is unique. This broad approach to the regulation of the clergy may well have influenced the structure of the Canonical Institute (816), which contained a list of general precepts to guide all clergy, a rule for canons, and a rule for canonesses.⁹⁷ Much like the Canonical Institute (816), the first section of the Council of Tours (cc. 2-22) focused on pastoral care and the general rules of behaviour expected of bishops and their cleric. Similarly, a second section (cc. 23-31) specifically addressed on those who lived in the enclosure (canons, monks and nuns). Despite this, much like Chrodegang and Theodulf the council document makes it clear that the diocesan clergy were intimately linked with enclosed communities of canons. Chapter 17 illustrates this point, as discussed above the precept addresses the need for homilies to be translated into the vernacular. It is difficult to imagine how this task would be achieved without training within the cloister, nor could such texts be easily distributed without close contact between extra-claustral clerics and their motherhouses.⁹⁸

Chapter 11 of the capitulary does not seem to fit this proposed model. It is located within the first section of the capitulary but, rather than dealing with pastoral concerns, addresses the enclosed clergy that form the *familia* of the bishops household. This clause also contains a reference to a canonical institute:

It is lawful for the bishops, priests and deacons to give from the treasure of the church *familia* and to pay paupers of the same church and equally to any who may be in need according to the Canonical Institute [*canonicam institutionem*].⁹⁹

It is conceivable that the *Canonicam Institutionem* mentioned here is again another reference to chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule which stated that the community should provide for pauper clerics.¹⁰⁰ Likewise, as will be discussed below, chapter 11 also corresponds with clause 23 of the capitulary where bishops were tasked with providing for their physical needs of their clerics, so that they would not be driven

⁹⁷ See Part III.

⁹⁸ This again supports the model proposed by Thacker. Thacker, 'Priests and Pastoral Care', pp. 187-209.

⁹⁹ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 288.

¹⁰⁰ *RC*, pp. 46-48, trans., pp. 76-79.

into poverty.¹⁰¹ Alternatively, the Tours document could have drawn on the practices of chapter 34 of Chrodegang's Rule, which deals with the *matricularii* and poor who relied on the charity of the bishop. This states that the rations provided for these dependants will be:

A charge on our revenue and that of our successors or whoever looks after it; so too will be the buying of wood to bake the bread: the bishop should give two and half ounces in cash on the first of May. If there is anything left over of what we have allotted above, the archbishop or primicerius should distribute it to other poor people as he sees fit.¹⁰²

As Claussen has argued, this chapter seeks to expand the Rule to encompass the entire Christian community of the city of Metz.¹⁰³ This approach would certainly fit with the pastoral duties expressed within this section of the capitulary. Additionally the fact that priests and deacons, as well as the bishop, are listed as almsgivers suggests that this precept was universal. Here *familia* may be interpreted to mean church estates rather than the bishop's household. This interpretation is supported by the contents of Chapter 10 of the council document, which commanded the bishop to show 'maximum concern' [*maximam curam*] for the poor of their diocese.¹⁰⁴ Chapter 11 builds upon this provision, expanding the norms of the cathedral close to the wider diocese. Just as in the city, where the bishop was to care for his household and for the urban poor, so in the countryside the diocesan clergy were to care for the poor of their parishes. While the traditions of Chrodegang's Rule may be detected, they are applied to the diocesan clergy as well as those who lived in the enclosure. Here the interpretation of a canonical institute appears to be holistic, applying to those both inside and outside the enclosure.

Although the first section of the Tours capitulary offers some insights into the nature of life of the canonical clergy, only chapters 23 and 24 of the council document address this group head-on. Chapter 23 discusses those canons who lived in the city as part of the bishop's household:

¹⁰¹ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 289.

¹⁰² *RC*, pp. 49-51, trans., pp. 82-83.

¹⁰³ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 93-94, pp. 107-112 and pp. 248-290.

¹⁰⁴ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, c.10, p. 287

We considered the canonical clergy of the city, who dwell in the bishop's household. As they live in the the cloister, where they will easily be able to perform the canonical hours, likewise may they all sleep in one dormitory, and similarly may they dine in one refectory, and regarding the other occurrences that concern their life, they are admonished and taught their way of life [*conversatione sua*]. May they receive vituals and vestments by the bishop, lest by the pretext of poverty they may be compelled through adversity to wander and may think to disgrace themselves through [temporal] activity, and disband from their ecclesiastical office beginning an indisciplined life serving their own pleasure.¹⁰⁵

Meanwhile chapter 24 discusses those canons who lived in the monasteries, perhaps referring to sub-urban and rural communities such as the monastery of St. Martin's:

In a similar manner also the abbots of the monasteries in which the canonical life has existed from antiquity or can now be seen [*in quibus canonica vita antiquitus fuit vel nunc videtur esse*]. May they with anxious care provide for their canons, so that they [the canons] may live in the cloister and dormitory, in which they also sleep and also eat. May they keep canonical hours. May they have vituals and vestments by the abbot's power [*victum et vestimenta iuxta quod poterit abba habeant*]. There together may they ably serve God with ease, and may the abbots subordinate themselves to the good life. You shall lead and demonstrate their way, where you will walk in virtue to the good life, may they come with strength.¹⁰⁶

Much like the description of the life of canons contained within the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), both of these clauses do not provide much detail on the nature of the life of canons, but seek to enforce the basics of the enclosed life. Canons were to reside together in one cloister, share one dormitory, one refectory, and were to celebrate the Divine Office.¹⁰⁷ The council presents a similar approach to that taken at the council of Arles and no single Institute or Rule is suggested as the source for the

¹⁰⁵ Canonici clerici civitatum, qui in episcopiis conversantur, consideravimus, ut in claustris habitantes simul omnes in uno dormitorio dormiant simulque in uno reficiantur refectorio, quo facilius possint ad horas canonicas celebrandas occurrere ac de vita et conversatione sua admoneri et doceri. Victum et vestitum iuxta facultatem episcopi accipiant, ne paupertatis occasione compulsi per diversa vagari ac turpibus se implicare negotiis cogantur dimissoque ecclesiastico officio incipiant in discipline vivere et propriis deservire voluptatibus. Ibid., p. 289.

¹⁰⁶ Simili modo et abbates monasteriorum, in quibus canonica vita antiquitus fuit vel nunc videtur esse, solliciti suis praevident canonicis, ut habeant claustra et dormitoria, in quibus simul dormiant simulque reficiantur, horas canonicas custodiant, victum et vestimenta iuxta quod poterit abba habeant, quo facilius ad Dei servitium possint constringi, sintque abbates sibi subditis bene vivendo duces et praeiviaviamque demonstrent, qua recte gradiendo ad meliorem vitam pervenire valeant. Ibid., p. 289.

¹⁰⁷ See above, Part II. 3. ii.

life of the canons. What mattered was the authority of the bishop in his abbatial role as leader of the community. The bishop or abbot appeared to be free to select the exact texts and traditions that governed the day to day running of the cathedral close, and was tasked with enforcing the basics of enclosed life, as defined by the Rule of Benedict and canon law.

Within chapters 23 and 24 it is notable that the cathedral close was placed at the heart of the diocese, much as in chapters 10 and 11 of the council document, the bishop and his community was addressed first, and other communities were to model themselves on the life in the episcopal household. In the cathedral close the bishop ensured ecclesiastical discipline and provided the victuals and clothing for his community. Meanwhile in the monasteries, the analogues for the future colleges of canons, the abbot, as the bishop's representative, was to lead by example and was to supply the victuals and vestments for the community of canons. The fact that the bishop or abbot was to provide the provisions and clothing for his congregation is worthy of further comment; this may refer to practices of Chrodegang's Rule (c. 29: Of the clothing and shoes of the Clergy, and on their firewood), or directly to Chrodegang's model, namely, the Rule of Benedict (c.55: The Brother's Clothing and Shoes).¹⁰⁸ The capitulary seems to suggest that it was for the bishop or the abbot to decide the amount of provisions and clothing required by their communities. This has more in common with the Rule of Benedict than Chrodegang's Rule. Chrodegang gives specific details of the clothing to be dispensed to his congregation, but Benedict devolves this power, offering advice but stating that 'this consideration is the abbot's concern'.¹⁰⁹

While neither chapter 23 or 24 refers to an explicit rule or institute upon which the life of the canonical clergy was to be based, this is certainly not the case when the capitulary turns to the monastic order in chapter 25. Here the centrality of the Rule of Benedict to the monastic life was emphasised, and the council calls for the Rule's reinstatement in places where it had lapsed.¹¹⁰ Thus much like chapters 11 and 12 of 811B the Rule of Benedict served as an authoritative text, regulating the life of monks, but no single and centrally produced document served the same purpose in

¹⁰⁸ *RC*, p. 45 trans., 74-75; *RB*, pp. 178-181.

¹⁰⁹ 'Haec ergo consideratio penes abbatem est'; *RB*, p. 178, trans., p. 179

¹¹⁰ *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 289.

houses of canons.¹¹¹ Just as in the case of the *Admonitio Generalis*, it is difficult to distinguish between life of canons and the life of monks from the Tours capitulary (813) alone. Clearly chapter 25 sought to emphasise the more disciplined form of life practised by the monastic order, but it is clear canons and monks were to live similar lives and all enclosed groups were addressed together in chapter 31 of the capitulary which discusses the overcrowding of monasteries.¹¹²

II.4.iv Conclusion

This discussion of the councils of Arles, Mainz and Tours has demonstrated some common approaches taken towards the regulation of the clergy but, in their own way each synod highlighted the autonomy given to the bishops and abbots who led communities of canons. The leaders of these houses were tasked with ensuring the basic discipline of life in the enclosure, traits most clearly listed in chapters 23 and 24 of the Council of Tours. Linked to this autonomy there is also great respect for local custom and tradition, particularly in the South, with its strong monastic heritage. Such deference towards local custom may also be seen at Mainz, which drew on both the traditions of Metz and Cologne to regulate the clergy. Despite this common approach it is clear each of the councils had a slightly different understanding of the meaning of the canonical rule. While Mainz addressed the clergy in two precepts and set specific texts to help guide the life of the clergy, Tours took a holistic approach, setting a rule for the entire ecclesiastical order. These approaches were not mutually exclusive and were unified in the Canonical Institute of 816. Despite the increased interest in defining and regulating the life of the canonical clergy that occurred between 780 and 813, there was yet to emerge a single approach, tradition or text that could be applied to the entire order of canons. Yet, despite this plurality, there was no request for guidance from the sacred palace. Unlike the question of penitential handbooks, it appeared that the local bishops felt they understood what was required of them, and that their local approaches to the regulation of the clergy were appropriate. After all, such approaches were not static. As the cases of Angilramn, Hildebald and Nibridius show, bishops consistently sought to improve the liturgy and way of life practised by their communities. There was a clear exchange of ideas and customs. In short, while

¹¹¹ *Capitula de Causis*, p. 164; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', p. 88.

¹¹² *Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, p. 290.

the exact regulation of the clergy remained the purview of the local bishop, these ecclesiastics sought to distil the essence of the canonical life from the varied practices of their colleagues, drawing inspiration from both authoritative texts and exemplary communities such as Metz, or indeed Rome itself.

Part III: *Concordance*

Chapter 5: The Canonical Institute (816): establishing concordance from local traditions.

III.5 Introduction

Part II of this thesis focused on the variety of local traditions used to regulate the clergy during the reigns of Pippin III (d. 768) and Charlemagne (d. 814). As Charlemagne's memoranda of 811 demonstrates, towards the end of his reign the emperor showed an interest in establishing a definition for the way of life practised by the canonical clergy.¹ Yet, the 813 councils could agree on only the most basic principles of the canonical life. This diversity was a key factor in Louis the Pious' decision to convene a council at Aachen in August 816, and to compose a 'Canonical Institute' establishing the norms of the clerical life. As the prologue to the Institute stated:

The emperor [Louis the Pious] also desired that, because the definition of the way of life of the canonical clergy was dispersed in many places among the sacred canons and the sayings of the holy Fathers, the Council should confer, and agree to extract from the said sacred canons and writings of the holy Fathers a pattern for that way of life, for the benefit of the simple and less educated.²

The Council of Aachen (816) therefore brought to completion the process of consultation about the definition of the life of canons that Charlemagne had begun in 811. While this element of continuity must be acknowledged, the creation of the Canonical Institute represented something new in the history of the regulation of the canonical clergy. Previous Frankish Church councils had discussed the life of the clergy in the most general terms, admonishing the clerical order to live 'according to the canons', for the first time the Canonical Institute specified which canonical precepts, and which 'holy fathers', provided the norms for the canonical way of life. As will be discussed below, quotations from conciliar decrees and the works of thinkers such as Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville and Julian Pomerius, dominate

¹ *Capitula Tractanda* and *Capitula de Causis*, pp. 161-164; trans., Nelson, 'Voice of Charlemagne', pp. 85-8. These memoranda are discussed above, in Part II.

² *IC*, p. 312; trans., 'Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 132.

the Institute (cc. 1-113). Drawing on the work of these eminent thinkers, the authors of the Institute constructed a specific, and original *regula* (cc. 114-145), to be applied to all canonical clergy within the empire. In so doing the assembled bishops drew on the variety of texts and traditions that hitherto had served as regulatory texts in key episcopal households within Francia. The relationship between these various traditions and the Canonical Institute will be the primary focus of this chapter.

Before beginning this analysis, it is important to point out that the creation of the Canonical Institute was not an inevitability. As noted in Part II, while the 813 councils sought guidance from the palace on issues such as the administration of penance, they did not seek guidance on the exact nature of the canonical life.³ Undoubtedly the bishops were happy to provide the emperor with the clarification he sought, and their conciliar activity was a holy undertaking. But the Council of Aachen (816) also served a political end; it emphasised Louis' successful 'conquest of the palace', and gave him the means to present himself as 'a moral paragon'.⁴ For the emperor, the council was a clear expression of his power, where he could perform on the imperial stage and create a 'carefully staged ritual of consensus' within the bounds of the palace.⁵ It was not coincidental that a month after the Council of Aachen Louis was re-crowned by Pope Stephen IV at Rheims.⁶ The importance of these two events is clear; the imperial Church council and second coronation granted Louis a new mandate, overriding his dynastic obligations towards his siblings, and his nephew Bernard of Italy.⁷ The new emperor was now free to re-order the succession in favour of his own progeny, and in 818 Louis forced his brothers Drogo and Theodoric into

³ Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe*, pp. 115-117.

⁴ Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, p. 201; de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 19-24.

⁵ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 296. See also: de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 19-31; Costambeys et al., *Carolingian World*, pp. 194-205; For the importance of Aachen as an imperial stage see J. L. Nelson 'Aachen as a Place of Power' in Theuvs et al., *Topographies of Power*, pp. 217-241; de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', pp. 129-131.

⁶ *ARF*, 816, p. 144; trans., Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* pp.100-101; Astronomer, c. 26, pp. 362-368; trans., T.F.X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious*, pp. 251-253.

⁷ Costambeys et al., *Carolingian World*, pp. 194-205; M. Innes, 'Charlemagne's Will: Piety, Politics and the Imperial Succession', *EHR*, Vol. 112, (Sept. 1997), pp. 833-55.

For Louis' treatment of his sisters see: J. L. Nelson, 'Women at the Court of Charlemagne: A Case of Monstrous Regiment?', in her *Frankish World* (London, 1996) pp. 223-242; A. Scharer 'Charlemagne's Daughters', in S. Baxter (ed.), *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald* (London, 2009), pp. 269-282. For Bernard of Italy see: T. F. X. Noble, 'The Revolt of King Bernard of Italy in 817: Its Causes and Consequences', *Studi Medievali* XV, (1974) pp. 315-326; Costambeys et al., *Carolingian World*, pp. 202-205.

houses of canons. Here they would be subjected to the Canonical Institute (816), which of had been issued in the imperial voice.⁸ Likewise, the publication of the *Ordinatio Imperii* (817), successfully sidelined Louis' nephew Bernard of Italy.⁹ These political concerns should not overly detract from the undisputed piety expressed by the creation of the Canonical Institute, but illustrate that the text must not be interpreted solely in the light of the religious developments of Charlemagne's reign. Rather, the Canonical Institute must be examined on its own terms, as an original creation that served both a political and religious purpose. As Barrow has pointed out, Church reform is often discussed as a positive and progressive process, and such views have led to teleological interpretations of reform movements.¹⁰ Such teleological perspectives have led scholars to overstate the Institute's reliance on texts such as Chrodegang's Rule.

III.5.i. The purpose of the Canonical Institute, and its Historiography

Without question the Canonical Institute (816) was the most significant regulatory text created in the Carolingian era. As Mordek and others have shown, this capitulary inspired the form of life practised by canons in all sections of the Frankish Empire until the Gregorian Reform of the eleventh century, and 25 manuscript copies of the Institute survive from the ninth century alone.¹¹ The 816 council of Aachen formed part of a series of grand councils held in the palace between 816 and 820. This series of councils produced a number of highly significant texts, all created at the command of the emperor. In 816 the Canonical Institute was issued, in 817 a new monastic customary, based on the Benedictine Rule, was produced, and around 820

⁸ For the use of the Carolingian practice of forcing opponents into the cloister see: M. de Jong, 'Monastic Prisoners or Opting Out? Political Coercion and Honour in the Frankish Kingdoms', in F. Theuvs et al., *Topographies of Power*, pp. 291-329.

⁹ *Ordinatio Imperii*, Capit I., pp. 270-273; trans., B. Pullan, in Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 199-203; For discussion of these events see: Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 194-205; de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 19-31; Innes, 'Charlemagne's Will', pp. 833-55; Noble, 'King Bernard', pp. 315-326.

¹⁰ Barrow, 'Applications of Reform', pp. 345-362.

¹¹ For details of the manuscripts see: Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium*, pp. 1045-1058. For more general discussion of the impact of the Canonical Institute see: Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 81-85; Schieffer, *Domkapiteln*, pp. 250-260; M. Gaillard, *D'une Réforme à L'Autre (816-934): Les Communautés Religieuses en Lorraine à L'Epoque Carolingienne* (Paris 2006), pp. 124-147.

the capitulary on discipline in the palace was published.¹² This last text sought to bring a new sense of order to the palace, ridding it of undesirables and instituting a more spiritual aura, perhaps imitating a monastery or episcopal household.¹³ The unitary aspects of these councils have long been identified, henceforth there was to be one prescribed rule for monks, one for canons and a text to guide secular behaviour at court.¹⁴ Such principles with their focus on the emperor as a lawgiver suited Louis' dynastic agenda.

Although the Canonical Institute is often discussed as a 'rule' for canons, the texts created by the bishops gathered at Aachen in 816 took a holistic approach to the regulation of the Church. Two capitularies, the Canonical Institute and the *Institutio Sanctimonialium*, were issued after the council. The Canonical Institute dealt with male clerics while the *Institutio Sanctimonialium* created a rule for the women who lived 'according to the canons'.¹⁵ The bishops clearly intend canonesses to be dealt with 'in another document', but considered the Rule for women as an addendum to the wider process of regulating the clerical order. Thus the women were also addressed in the prologue to the Canonical Institute.¹⁶ The *Institutio Sanctimonialium* was intended to be disseminated alongside the Canonical Institute, and Louis sent instructions to those who had been unable to attend the council, ordering them to enforce both documents within their dioceses.¹⁷ This letter concludes with the instruction that the new 'standard weight and measure', issued by the council, should

¹² For a summary of the texts produced by these councils see: Grabowsky and Radl, 'Second Benedict' pp. 10-15; de Jong, 'Carolingian Monasticism', pp. 622-653; For the Canonical Institute see: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 84-96. For the capitulary on discipline in the palace see: Nelson, 'Place of Power', pp. 217-243; The various texts produced between 816 and 820 were examined by Semmler see: J. Semmler, 'Zur Überlieferung der monastischen Gesetzgebung Ludwigs des Frommen', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 16, (1960), pp. 309-399; J. Semmler, 'Benedictus II: una regula, una consuetudo', in W. Lourdeaux and D. Verhelst (eds.), *Benedictine Culture, 750-1050* (Louvain, 1983), pp. 1-49.

¹³ Nelson, 'Place of Power', pp. 217-243; For the impact of monastic and episcopal ideals on Louis the Pious' ruler ideology see: P. R. McKeon, 'The Empire of Louis the Pious: Faith, Politics and Personality', *Revue Bénédictine*, 90 (1980), pp. 50-62; T. F. X. Noble, 'The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious' *Revue Bénédictine*, 86 (1976) pp. 235-250; de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 14-24; Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 286-314; Innes, 'Charlemagne's Will', pp. 833-855.

¹⁴ See for instance: Hen, *Patronage of Liturgy*, p. 98; Semmler, 'Benedictus II', pp. 1-49; de Jong, 'Carolingian Monasticism', pp. 632-634; Grabowsky and Radl, 'The Second Benedict', pp. 10-15; Nelson, 'Aachen as a Place of Power', pp. 217-243.

¹⁵ *IC*, p. 313; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 134.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 456-464; trans., pp. 171-174.

be used to distribute ‘bread and drink’ to both ‘clerics and sisters in an equitable manner.’¹⁸ Such a universal approach mirrors that taken at the Council of Tours (813), where a canonical rule was issued for the entire ecclesiastical order.¹⁹

A full examination of the *Institutio Sanctimonialium* lies beyond the scope of this study, however, the creation of this text alongside the Canonical Institute must be born in mind when examining the intent of the ecclesiastics who gathered at Aachen in 816.²⁰ The Canonical Institute and the *Institutio Sanctimonialium* must be interpreted as sibling documents, written with the same purpose, and as part of the same conciliar process. This can be seen in the general prologue to the Canonical Institute which uses similar language when discussing the creation of the two institutes:

General Prologue: description of the Canonical Institute	General Prologue: description of the <i>Institutio Sanctimonialium</i>
<p>The emperor also desired that because the definition of the way of life of the canonical clergy was dispersed in many places among the sacred canons and the sayings of the holy Fathers, the council should confer, and agree to extract from the said sacred canons and the writings of the holy Fathers a pattern for that way of life, for the benefit of the simple and less educated.</p> <p>In this way the conduct of both superiors and subordinates could be described, so that everyone who claims to follow the canonical rule may proceed on the path he has undertaken without stumbling, and live together in the service of Christ, with greater devotion and unanimous concord.²¹</p>	<p>In another document, and at the instruction of the same devout Emperor, the same sacred synod carefully constructed a short rule, out of the writings of the holy Fathers brought together briefly but adequately, and intended for the observance of holy women who live according to the canons. In this was contained how the abbesses are to be appointed, how the canonesses are to live within the monastic enclosure, what stipend should be given them by the bishops, and which readings and documents will guide them to the adornment of virtue.</p> <p>Thus after reading this rule of life, they may, with the assistance of God, humbly accept it and carry it out diligently, so that, with the lamps of their good works, they may be found worthy to attend the Bridegroom on his arrival, and so enter into his chamber.²²</p>

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 464; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 174.

¹⁹ see above, Part II. 4. iii.

²⁰ This point was recently made by Rutger Krammer.

²¹ *IC*, pp. 312-313; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 132.

²² *IC*, p. 313; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 134.

These descriptions also provide useful insights into both the aims of those tasked with regulating the clerical order in 816, and the process by which the Canonical Institute and the *Institutio Sanctimonialium* were created. Both passages focus on the variety of texts and traditions that had been used to regulate the life of the canonical clergy and canonesses. The assembled churchmen were tasked with compiling a rule from these diverse sources and, much like Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia Regularum*, there was a clear focus on bringing unanimity and concord out of these divergent traditions and practices. Choy's argument regarding the intent of Benedict's *Concordia* may also be applied to the Canonical Institute.²³ The Churchmen who congregated at Aachen in 816 sought to determine the essential nature of the canonical form of life, drawing on the various traditions practised across the empire.

Despite the description offered in the prologue, and the holistic approach taken towards the regulation of the Church in 816, there has been a tendency to link Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750) directly with the content of the Canonical Institute (816). Claussen is perhaps the most prominent proponent advocate of this hypothesis and he sees little difference between the Institute and Chrodegang's Rule.²⁴ Claussen is part of a well-established academic tradition, and scholars such Morhain also interpreted the Canonical Institute as a great homage to Chrodegang's text.²⁵ Such firm statements about the relationship between Chrodegang's Rule and the Canonical Institute are in part due to the existence of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang which was compiled around 850. The author of the Enlarged Rule drew on the provisions of the Canonical Institute (816) and combined them with Chrodegang's original text (c. 750).²⁶ Claussen confuses the Enlarged Rule and the Canonical Institute, and van Rhijn also misidentifies the Enlarged Rule, confusing it with Chrodegang's original.²⁷ The confusion between the enlarged form of the rule and Chrodegang's text is long-standing. D'Achéry (d. 1685) was the first to make this error and he published his

²³ Choy, 'Deposit of Monastic Faith', pp. 74-86.

²⁴ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 61-62; M.A. Claussen 'St. Chrodegang', in R.E. Bjork (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2010), p. 393.

²⁵ Morhain, 'Origine et Histoire', pp. 180-181; G. Brown, 'Carolingian Renaissance' in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 11-28.

²⁶ Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 11-21 and pp. 35-55; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 175-183.

²⁷ Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 208; Claussen, *Reform*, p. 18; van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 45.

transcription of Paris, BNF, lat. 1535 as Chrodegang's eighth-century text. The manuscript in fact contains a copy of the Enlarged Rule.²⁸ Migne (d. 1875) reprinted d'Archery's transcription and thus perpetuated the idea that the Enlarged Rule was composed by Chrodegang (d.766).²⁹ While other scholars make more cautious statements about the relationship between the Canonical Institute and Chrodegang's Rule, the Institute is still often seen as an expanded version of the rule created by Chrodegang. Schieffer, Drout and Langefeld have all suggested that the ecclesiastics assembled at Aachen in 816 incorporated large parts of Chrodegang's Rule into the Canonical Institute.³⁰ Rather more prudently, Semmler stated that Chrodegang's text formed an important precursor to the Canonical Institute of 816.³¹

More recently Bertram has questioned the notion that the Canonical Institute was heavily dependent on Chrodegang's Rule. He points out that the Canonical Institute had only 'verbal echoes' of Chrodegang's text.³² He attributes these echoes to the use of common sources such as the Rule of St. Benedict, the Bible, and pseudo-Prosper (Julian Pomerius).³³ Bertram takes this argument further by claiming that the Canonical Institute shows 'remarkably little awareness of Chrodegang's Rule', suggesting that the text was influential in an indirect manner.³⁴ Thus he presents the antithesis of Claussen's argument.

While some have focused on Chrodegang's influence on the Canonical Institute, others such as McKitterick, Barrow, and Moore have all emphasised the encyclopedic nature of the capitulary, which essentially sought to create a *florilegium* out of the various traditions and texts used to regulate the canonical clergy in the early

²⁸ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 175. For a discussion of this manuscript, see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 37-39; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 4024; Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium*, pp. 414-417.

²⁹ PL 89, col. 1057; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 175; As Langefeld observes, Mordek, perhaps following d'Achéry, misidentifies the Rule contained within the Paris, BnF. Lat. 1535. See Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitularium*, pp. 414-417; Langefeld, *Old English*, p. 39.

³⁰ Langefeld, *Old English*, p. 11; M. Drout, 'Re-Dating the Old English Translation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang: The Evidence of the Prose Style', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 103, no. 3 (2004) p. 341; Schieffer, *Domkapiteln*, pp. 232-260.

³¹ Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237.

³² Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 84-86.

³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 84-86.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

ninth century.³⁵ Barrow points out that both the Institute and Chrodegang's Rule addressed similar issues, seeking to apply monastic principles to the life of the canonical clergy.³⁶ She also notes that the Institute was a significantly different text to Chrodegang's Rule, omitting some practices and adding others.³⁷ Likewise, Moore observes that as a law book the Canonical Institute demonstrated the 'flexibility of Carolingian conciliar authority'.³⁸ These arguments certainly fit with the prologue to the Canonical Institute which, as discussed above, took a holistic approach to the governance of the Church. Concord and unanimity were the crucial themes guiding the bishops in August 816 and in the prologue to the Institute no tradition was singled out as superior. An excessive focus on Chrodegang's Rule, and its impact, has perhaps obscured the importance of other traditions included in the *florilegium* produced at Aachen in 816. The following analysis will examine the structure of the Canonical Institute and the texts and traditions used to regulate the canonical clergy and assess the influence of texts such as Chrodegang's Rule and Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices'.

III.5.ii The Structure of the Canonical Institute

The Canonical Institute is a long document comprising 145 chapters. These are divided into two main parts. The first section of the text (cc.1-113) is made up of general provisions and has been interpreted as a useful educational manual for the clerical order.³⁹ Meanwhile, the second section of the Institute (cc. 114-45) contains a *regula canonicorum*, delineated by its own sub-heading in some manuscripts.⁴⁰ This rule contained a new prologue and explicitly addressed those clerics who lived in the enclosure. The first part of the text, the manual (cc. 1-113), was itself sub-divided. The first 38 chapters form an introduction to the clerical order and was made up of quotations from the works of various patristic authors including: Isidore of Seville;

³⁵ McKitterick, *Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 112-120; Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, 294-298; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 81-83; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 92; I would like to thank Rutger Krammer for sharing his thoughts on this topic.

³⁶ Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 81-83; Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 203; Story, *Carolingian Connections*, p. 206.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, p. 296.

³⁹ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 87; Barrow, *Chrodegang*, p. 211.

⁴⁰ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 88-93; It should be noted that not all manuscripts contain this sub-title. For details see: *IC*, p. 394.

Jerome; Gregory the Great; Pseudo-Prosper (Julian Pomerius); and St Augustine.⁴¹ These precepts share a common theme, outlining the different grades of cleric and their function (cc. 1-9, taken from Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices'), before discussing the role of bishops, provosts and high priests (cc. 10-38). This introduction to the manual may have served as a canon law handbook for bishops and the other superiors who led communities of canons.⁴² Next, chapters 38-113 are delineated by a sub-heading: *Capitula Canonum*.⁴³ The precepts in this section of the text are drawn from various conciliar rulings and papal decretals (cc. 39-93) and may have been taken from the *Dionysio-Hadriana*.⁴⁴ To this collection of conciliar canon law, the authors of the Institute added more patristic quotations (cc. 94-113); once more making use of the works of Isidore of Seville, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Pseudo-Prosper (Julian Pomerius), and St. Augustine. While not a discreet rule, this second section of the text (cc. 39-113) provided a discussion of the basic norms to be followed by all clerics, and its precepts would apply jointly to the extra-claustral clergy and canonical clergy. As such it should be viewed as a book of canon law.

The distinction between the canon law manual that forms the first section of the text and the rule, which was intended to guide the day-to-day life of canons, is the most significant cleavage point within the Institute. The *Regula Canoniorum* is a related, but different, type of text to the canon law manual that forms the first 113 chapters of the Institute. Not only does the *regula* have its own prologue, but it also deals with its subject matter in a significantly different way. The manual is essentially a block of useful quotations on a variety of matters related to the life of clerics and their superiors. These quotations have been carefully selected and edited to form useful sub-sections, for instance the first nine chapters of the Institute are made up of quotations from Isidore's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices'. They address the different grades of the cleric. However, Isidore's ordering of the different grades is re-arranged to fit with the established hierarchy favoured within the Frankish Church.⁴⁵ Despite this, the manual contains no over-arching commentary to guide the reader on how

⁴¹ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 86-87; Barrow, *Clergy*, p. 82.

⁴² Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 87.

⁴³ *IC*, p. 360.

⁴⁴ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 87.

⁴⁵ Reynolds, 'Hierarchies and Functions', pp. 25-31; For more on the different grades of cleric see: Barrow, 'Grades of Ordination', pp. 41-67; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 27-70; Barrow, 'Who served at the Altar'.

these canonical precepts should be applied to the real world Church. By comparison, while the *regula* contains many quotations from the patristic material used in the manual, these quotations are explained by commentaries that apply both biblical and patristic works to the life of the clergy in a practical manner.

As Bertram has pointed out, the commentary and practical guidance provided in the *Regula Canonicorum* meant this document could serve as a stand-alone text, and in some cases it was separated from the rest of the Institute and used in its own right.⁴⁶ However, while the Institute is divided into a manual and a rule, it was also intended to be read as a whole. The provisions contained within the rule often alluded to the precepts contained within the manual, and frequently made direct references to the works included in this section of the Institute. Notably, the prologue to the *Regula Canonicorum* forms a useful bridge between the two parts of the Institute, serving as both an epilogue to the manual and a preface to the rule:

It is clear that the Holy Church is bound to follow the example of the Fathers we have quoted, whose writings show that she flourished abundantly under the teachings of the apostles; superiors are therefore bound to take pains always to imitate the Fathers, as subordinates are to obey, for it is by following their example and their teaching that they may attain to that blissful joy where the Fathers have gone before. Those who follow the teaching and example of the Fathers with great devotion will enter into eternal bliss, just as those who refuse to follow them will be handed over for eternal punishment. Therefore anyone who professes to live the canonical life must carefully read and diligently observe the teachings of the said Holy Fathers, by which the order of clerics is instructed in holy living. Whoever has studied these writings properly will surely find that he must live a life not of decadence but of devotion.⁴⁷

Here the authors suggest that the rule was to be read in conjunction with the canonical precepts of the manual. This cross-referencing is repeated elsewhere within the Rule.

⁴⁶ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 88-89; Examples of manuscripts containing only the rule section of the Institute include: Laon, Bibliothèque Municipale ms. 201 (s. ix²) contains excerpts (cc. 115, 116, 125 and 131) from the rule section of the Institute; Sankt Paul im Lavanttal, Archiv des Benediktinerstiftes 12/1 (s. xi) contains the preface to the Institute and cc. 114-41; Livorno, Biblioteca Comunale Labronica s. n. (olim 10) (s. xi/xii) contains cc. 122-45. For full details see: Mordek, *Bibliotheca Capitulorum*, pp. 1045-1057; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 2091.

⁴⁷ *IC*, p. 394; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 141.

Chapter 116 of the Institute ('What constitutes the possessions of the Church') is a prime example and opens with the following statement:

The possessions of the Church, as we have learned from the holy Fathers, and as is stated in the preceding chapters, are the free will offerings of the faithful, the compensation for sins, and the patrimony of the poor.⁴⁸

This refers back to chapter 35, which quoted from Pseudo-Prosper (Pomerius', *De Vita Contemplativa*, Book II, c. 9), and stated how 'high priests' should not own private property.⁴⁹ A theme also expanded on in chapter 66: 'On those goods which are bestowed for the use of the poor', which quotes from chapter 8 of the Council of Gangra (340).⁵⁰

This interlinking between the *Regula Canonorum* and the manual that forms the first part of the Institute is highly significant. While the manual would have served as a useful canon law book for both educational and disciplinary uses within the diocese, it was also cited as the very foundation of the *Regula Canonorum*. The council not only wrote a new rule to regulate the life of the canonical clergy, but also demonstrated the sources of that rule. There could be no opposition to this novel creation as it was grounded firmly in patristic and conciliar tradition. In effect the bishops had shown their working, following the correct conciliar procedures as well as presenting their new solution to the problem of the ill-defined regulation of the canonical clergy.⁵¹

There was one notable exception to this model, the authors of the Institute drew on the Rule of St. Benedict at several points within the *Regula Canonorum*, yet the Benedictine Custom is not included in the manual. At first glance this decision not to include the Benedictine Rule within the canon law manual seems odd, it was after all the most authoritative of the monastic rules and formed the basis for life within the enclosure. Benedict was an esteemed author, Chrodegang's Rule was heavily dependant on Benedict's precepts, and Theodulf also used the custom within

⁴⁸ *IC*, a. 816, p. 398; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 145.

⁴⁹ *IC*, pp. 356-357.

⁵⁰ *IC*, p. 365; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 136.

⁵¹ For the importance of Conciliar procedure and the relationship between conciliar decrees and canon law, see, Halfond, *Frankish Church Councils*, pp. 174-179.

his First Episcopal Statute.⁵² As discussed in Part II, the Rule of Benedict was widely adapted for clerical use during the late eighth and early ninth century. This blurring of the monastic and canonical forms of life was addressed at the Council of Aachen, and the separation of these two orders was one of the main aims of the councils held in 816 and 817.⁵³ The importance of the distinction between monks and canons was the subject of several important chapters within the Institute. Notably both the manual and the *Regula Canonorum* open with statements distinguishing the monastic order from the clerical. Chapter 1 quoted from Isidore's discussion of the clerical tonsure and explained the priestly origins of this sign of office.⁵⁴ Likewise chapter 114: 'Which precepts are specifically to be applied to monks and which to Christians in general', provided a commentary based on the work of Augustine and explained the additional requirements expected of the monastic order.⁵⁵ This theme is continued in chapter 115, which concisely stated the difference between monks and canons:

It is permissible for canons to wear linen, to eat meat and receive private property and to possess church property in humility and righteousness, since we do not find that the sacred canons prohibit these things; on the other hand they are strictly forbidden to monks, who lead a stricter life according to the provisions of their rule.⁵⁶

Chapters 97 and 125 of the Institute also dwelled on the difference between the monastic and clerical groups.⁵⁷ These precepts imply that clerics should no longer live according to explicitly monastic principles and that the Rule of Benedict could no longer serve as a primary source for the clerical way of life. This point was emphasised by the Rule of St. Benedict's conspicuous absence from the manual, and the interlinking between the manual and the *Regula Canonorum*. Through this

⁵² For Chrodegang's use of the Rule of Benedict see: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 114-166; c. 21 of Theodulf's statute is made up of an extensive quotation from c. 4.

⁵³ While the primary focus in 816 was the regulating the life of canons the bishops also prepared regulatory texts for use in a monastic setting and the so called *acta praeliminaria* paved the way for the issuing of a new monastic custom. For details see: Grabowsky and Radl, 'The Second Benedict', p. 11.

⁵⁴ *IC*, a. 816, pp. 318-319; For useful discussions of clerical tonsures see: Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 29-34; de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 254-257; C. Cubitt, 'Images of St. Peter', in P. Cavill (ed.), *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 41-54.

⁵⁵ *IC*, pp. 394-397; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 141-144, for analysis, see p. 89.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 397; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 145.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 375 and 405.

rhetorical device the bishops stressed that the source of clerical life lay in canon law not in the monastic customary.

III.5.iii The Canonical Institute: a Concordance of Canonical Practices

Despite this deliberate departure from the well-established tradition of using the Rule of St. Benedict as a stand-alone source to regulate the life of the clergy – a practice authorised by Pope Zachary in 747 – the fact that certain aspects of the Benedictine Custom were used within the *regula* demonstrates the inclusive agenda taken by the bishops at Aachen in 816.⁵⁸ The focus on concord and unanimity within the text suggests that the authors of the Institute were working in committee to unify the different approaches taken towards the regulation of the clergy.⁵⁹ Such attempts to harmonise the practices of the Frankish Church were not new and, as McKitterick has shown, efforts to bring unity out of diversity were part and parcel of the Carolingian process of *correctio*.⁶⁰ Both the regional councils of 813, and the correspondence between Helisachar and Nibridius, demonstrate such attempts to establish the best practices from different traditions. As Barrow has argued, the Institute's encyclopaedic contents may imply that it was intended to offer general guidance rather than to create a strict rule to be applied with rigid uniformity.⁶¹ This inclusive approach may be seen in the *regula*; in what follows the various traditions and texts used by the authors to construct their new uniform custom will be examined. Four key sections will be analysed, including the chapters dealing with stipends, the Divine Office, Canonical Officials, and the epilogue.

III.5.iii(a) The Treatment of Stipends within the Canonical Institute: Julian Pomerius and the Rule of Chrodegang

Before examining the descriptions of the Divine Office and of the Canonical Officials it is worth returning to the manner in which the Institute (cc. 120–1) and

⁵⁸ CC., no. 3, pp. 480–481. For the influence of Zachary's decrees see above, Part II.

⁵⁹ For discussions of the authorship of the text see: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 93–94; Barrow, *Clergy*, p. 82; Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln*, pp. 238–239; A. Werminghoff, 'Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Concils in Jahre 816', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27 (1901–1902), pp. 605–45.

⁶⁰ R. McKitterick, 'Unity and Diversity', pp. 59–83.

⁶¹ Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 204.

Chrodegang's Rule (c. 31) dealt with the stipends that a canon might receive. This was discussed in Part I of this thesis, however, the relationship between the contents of chapters 120–1 of the Institute and chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule merits further comment.⁶² The relationship between these sibling precepts provides insights into the perception of Chrodegang's Rule by those who compiled the Institute. As has already been noted the Institute and Chrodegang's Rule both took a similar approach to the funding of the canonical clergy, drawing on Julian Pomerius' *De Vita Contemplativa* (misidentified as Prosper in both texts). The *De Vita Contemplativa* was composed in the sixth century, but was popularised by Boniface and Chrodegang; consequently Pomerius became one of the most readily cited authors in the ninth century.⁶³ Chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule makes extensive use of the *De Vita Contemplativa* work and almost the whole of Book 2, chapter 12 is quoted within this section of the Rule.⁶⁴ Similarly, chapters 19, 26, 28, 32, 35, 106-111 and 120 of the Canonical Institute are also made up of excerpts from Pomerius' *De Vita Contemplativa*.⁶⁵ Given that Chrodegang and the Institute make use of Pomerius' work in a very similar manner, drawing on it as a model for the communal holding of property, it is likely that the authors of the Institute made use of the traditions expressed within chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule. The commonalities between the Institute and Chrodegang's Rule are clear to see when the texts are placed side by side, both referred to the practices espoused by Pomerius (Prosper), and permitted wealthy canons to live at their own expense, rather than drawing on the property of the Church. The two texts do not share the same wording, but do share the same sentiment and objective:

⁶² See Part I. 1. iii.

⁶³ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 184-203; J. Devisse, 'L'Influence de Julien Pomère sur les Clercs Carolingiens: de la pauvreté aux Ve et IXe siècles' *Revue d'Histoire de L'Eglise de France* 157 (1970) pp. 285-295; M. L. W. Laistner, 'The Influence during the Middle Ages of the Treatise, 'De Vita Contemplativa' and a Survey of Manuscripts', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, (Rome, 1946), pp. 344-358. For the text of the *De Vita Contemplativa* see, *PL* 59, 415-520.

⁶⁴ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 195-203; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 46-8, trans., pp. 76-79.

⁶⁵ *IC*, pp. 342-343, 347-348, 351, 353-354, 356-357, 381-385, 399-400; Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 134-139.

The Rule of Chrodegang, c. 31:
How one who intends specially to join this Order of Canons in this congregation, may make a solemn donation of his property in person, to the Church while reserving the use of it for the duration of his life.

The Canonical Institute, c.120:
Which clerics who are aggregated into the congregation of canons should receive a stipend from the Church

St Prosper [Pomerius] and other holy fathers have told us, on divine authority, that clerics who wish to live on the goods of the Church should make over their own property by a legal deed, to God and to the church in which they serve; thus they will more legitimately and without great fault be able to draw on the goods of the Church. **As the clergy are able to enjoy the goods of the church, so the church may rejoice that she and her poor are improved and enriched by the goods of those clerics ... They can be sure that because they do not draw on the property of the Church as other canons do, they will receive a special reward from God, for they serve him at their own expense.**⁶⁶

We have thought it relevant to quote certain passages of **Prosper [Pomerius]** to illustrate this point. Among them we read, ‘Those who serve the Church, and are eager to accept or to demand things of which they have no need are too worldly in their thoughts. It is shameful, indeed, if clergy who were faithful and fruitful come to despise their eternal reward for the sake of an earthly profit. Also, if anyone is unwilling to give up his own property, so that he may have the means to live, how can he accept property he will need to account for? Why multiple your sins with the sins of others?’⁶⁷

Taking account, therefore, of these and other writings of the holy Fathers, it is necessary for the clergy to stay clear of this peril in accepting the goods of the Church. **Those who have their own property, as well as that of the Church, and confer some benefit on the Church either within the enclosure or outside, should receive food, drink and a share of the donations to the congregation.**⁶⁸

Despite the common approach of these two passages, there are key differences. While Chrodegang makes use of book 2, chapter 12 of the *De Vita Contemplativa*, the Institute quotes from book 2, chapter 10 to make the same point. Book 2, chapter 12 of Pomerius’ text is not used in any section of the Institute. This must have been a conscious decision by the bishops in 816 and represents a rejection of certain aspects of Chrodegang’s interpretation of the *De Vita Contemplativa*. While the Institute

⁶⁶ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 47, trans., p.77.

⁶⁷ *Julianus Pomerii, De Vita Contemplativa*, Book II, c. 10; *PL* 59, col. 454-455.

⁶⁸ *IC*, pp. 399-400; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 148.

accepted the general principles espoused by chapter 31 of Chrodegang's rule, in chapter 121 they were openly critical of Chrodegang's practice of allowing the rich to receive a larger stipend than those who lacked private means. A side-by-side comparison of the two texts best illustrates the opposing relationship of these two provisions:

<p>Rule of Chrodegang, c. 31: <i>How one who intends specially to join this Order of Canons in this congregation, may make a solemn donation of his property in person, to the Church while reserving the use of it for the duration of his life.</i></p>	<p>Canonical Institute, c. 121: <i>How an equal measure of food and drink should be allotted in the congregation of canons.</i></p>
<p>If the stipend they would have received for their ministry is left in the hands of the bursar, he can give it to those who have nothing, and they can possess their property without blame; for they too have to some extent renounced their property in that they are content with their own without thinking they are entitled to more.⁶⁹</p>	<p>It can happen that in a number of congregations of canons certain clerics who are well endowed with riches, and confer little or no benefit on the Church, receive a greater stipend than others, who are actively engaged in the work of God. This is quite unreasonable and unacceptable; it should never happen, and you can find no warrant whatsoever for it to be allowed, either in scripture or in the traditions of the holy fathers. Since this practice is backed by no authority, but has obviously arisen through gluttony and avarice, it remains for us to cut it away with the scimitar of justice, and the sentence of judgment, so that it may be utterly eradicated from any places where it occurs.⁷⁰</p>

This demonstrates the complex relationship between Chrodegang's Rule and the Canonical Institute. The bishops gathered at Aachen were familiar with Chrodegang's text, and the very concept of composing a specific rule for the canonical clergy may represent Chrodegang's greatest legacy.⁷¹ However, for those who compiled the Institute it was Chrodegang's sources, rather than the rule itself, that was the key to defining the life of canons. Authors such as pseudo-Prosper (Julian Pomerius) represented the authoritative sources of the canonical life. Chrodegang's Rule was bypassed by the authors of the Institute, who grounded their work solidly on the

⁶⁹ RC, p. 47, trans., p. 77.

⁷⁰ IC, p. 400; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 149.

⁷¹ As Semmler observed Chrodegang's Rule formed an important precursor to the Canonical Institute of 816; Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', p. 237.

foundations of the canon law manual that formed the first section of the Institute (cc. 1-113). In 816 while certain practices advocated by Chrodegang's Rule were accepted and justified according to canon law, other parts of the rule were in need of correction or were deemed no longer appropriate for the canonical clergy. Thus, rather than using Chrodegang as a direct model, the authors of the Canonical Institute went back to the drawing board, and this is noticeable in the dissimilar structures of the *regula* within the Institute and Chrodegang's Rule:

Table 2: The Structure of the Rule of Chrodegang and the Canonical Institute

Type of Provision	Chrodegang's <i>Regula Canonorum</i>	<i>Regula Canonorum</i>, within the <i>Institutio Canonorum</i>:
Humility/ virtuous behaviour	Chapter 1	Chapter 114
Liturgical	Chapters 4-8	Chapters 126-33
Discipline	Chapters 2- 3 and 12-19	Chapter 117 and 134-6
Diet	Chapters 21-4	Chapters 121-2
Definition of Officials and their duties	Chapters 25-7	Chapters 137-44
Admittance to the order and the importance of the Apostolic community as a model	Chapter 31	Chapter 115-16 and 118-20
Provisions for the poor and the <i>matricularii</i>	Chapters 32-4	Chapter 143

Perhaps the most obvious structural difference between the two rules is in the placement of chapters concerning admittance to the order. These are dealt with at the end of Chrodegang's Rule, whereas the Institute deals with this matter at the start of the *regula*. These structural differences, alongside the way in which the two rules deal with stipends, demonstrates that the relationship between Chrodegang's Rule and the Canonical Institute is far from the straightforward model proposed by Morhain and Claussen. The older rule was both used and corrected by those who compiled the Canonical Institute. This dichotomy, drawing on old traditions while also correcting them, was a central theme within the Institute and in many ways represented the very

raison d'être of the text. The following case studies will provide further analysis of this process.

III.5.iii(b) The Divine Office and the Canonical Institute

In total a third of the *regula canonicorum* within the Canonical Institute discuss the Office in some form (cc. 126-33 and cc. 136-7). The variety of sources used to instruct the canons on the manner in which they should perform the Daily Office are listed in the table below, which also shows whether the chapter takes the form of an extensive quotation or a commentary based around short extracts:

Table 3: Sources for the Divine Office within the Canonical Institute

Canonical Institute	Main Sources and Traditions. ⁷²	Quotation / Commentary
c. 126: <i>An Extract from St. Isidore's Book of Offices, on the authority for celebrating the canonical hours, which canons should know and observe religiously</i>	• Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book I, c. 19	Quotation
c. 127: <i>On Vespers</i>	• Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book I, c. 20	Quotation
c. 128: <i>On Compline</i>	• Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book I, c. 21	Quotation
c. 129: <i>On the Antiquity of Vigils</i>	• Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book I, c. 22 • Isidore of Seville, <i>Etymologies</i> , Book V, c. 5	Quotation
c. 130: <i>Matins</i>	Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book I, c. 23	Quotation
c. 131: <i>That Canons Should Religiously Observe the Canonical Hours.</i>	• Rule of Chrodegang, cc. 6-7 • Synod of Rome (743), c. 13 • Rule of Benedict, c. 43 • Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i> , Book 2, c. 3	Commentary
c. 132: <i>How Angels are Present to Protect Those Who Sing and</i>	• Bede, <i>Homilies</i> , Book II. (On Luke 24) • Rule of Benedict, c. 19 • Rule of Chrodegang, c. 7	Quotation and Commentary

⁷² Many of these sources are identified in: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 155-160 and 163-165. Biblical Quotations are ubiquitous and for this reason have been excluded from the table. The table is not exhaustive, but focuses on the main text and traditions detectable within the chapters of the Institute that focus on the Divine Office.

<i>Psalmody to the Lord</i>		
c. 133: <i>Who Should be Ordained to Read or Sing in Church</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule of Benedict, c. 38, c. 47 • <i>Admonitio Generalis</i>, c. 70 • Isidore of Seville, <i>Sentences</i>, c. 16, c. 20, c. 23, c. 25, c. 29 	Commentary
c. 136: <i>That All Canons Should Come to Compline</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule of Benedict, c. 22, c. 42 • Rule of Chrodegang, c.3, c. 4 	Commentary
c. 137: <i>On the Cantors</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isidore of Seville, <i>On Ecclesiastical Offices</i>, Book I, c. 12 • Rule of Chrodegang, c. 1 • <i>Admonitio Generalis</i>, c. 70 • Rule of Benedict, c. 22 	Commentary

Within these chapters several traditions have been synthesised to produce a text that explains the origins of the Office, its importance to the life of canons, and the behaviours expected within the choir. Unusually for the *regula* section of the Institute, cc.126-30 are made up exclusively of quotations from Isidore, and it is this description of the Daily Office that dominates. The canons were instructed in chapter 126 that they should ‘know and observe religiously’ the Isidorean Office.⁷³ Here we might see the guiding hand of Hildebald, the palace chaplain, who favoured Isidore’s ‘On Ecclesiastical Offices’ at the Council of Mainz (813).⁷⁴

At first glance the decision to promote Isidore’s description of the Office seems odd. Much like the account of the Office in his *Regula Monachorum*, Isidore’s ‘On Ecclesiastical Offices’ does not provide a detailed description of the manner in which the liturgy should be performed.⁷⁵ Rather, the text explains the biblical origins of the Office and highlights the symbolism of the Canonical Hours which represent both the Trinity and four corners of the earth:

c. 126: In this symbolic way the perfection of the Trinity is both praised in our worship and besought in our prayers, at the three set times with intervals of three hours. If you count the offices

⁷³ IC, p. 406; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 155.

⁷⁴ See Part II.

⁷⁵ For a discussion of the office in Isidore’s *regula monachorum* see: R. F. Taft, *The Liturgy of Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office* (Collegeville, 1985), pp. 115-119; For a comparative approach see: J. Dyer, ‘Observations on the Divine Office in the Rule of the Master’, in M. E. Fassler and R. A. Baltzer (eds.) *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 74-77.

throughout the day, there are four intervals up to vespers and this foursome symbolises the four corners of the earth, saved by the Holy Trinity. Moreover the military watches of the night are divided into four watches of three-hour duration, so that even in the night watches of this world, the mystery of the Trinity can be worshipped.⁷⁶

As such, these chapters offer ideological guidance rather than a practical description of the liturgy. It was the canon's understanding of the spiritual meaning of the Office and its biblical roots that was key. Furthermore, much like chapter 1 of the Institute, with its description of the origins of the clerical tonsure, the use of Isidore's description of the Office highlighted the difference between the clerical and monastic orders. Clerics made use of the Isidorean Office, while monks used the Office described in the Benedictine Rule. The authors of the Canonical Institute implicitly rejected the Benedictine Office and thus the description of the Office provided by Chrodegang's Rule.⁷⁷ Here Chrodegang's text was seen as too close to its monastic exemplar, the Benedictine Custom. As discussed in Part II, a monastic interpretation of Chrodegang's Rule may be seen in Paul the Deacon's description of the bishop's renewal of Metz: 'He [Chrodegang] brought the clergy together and made them live within the confines of a cloister in the image of a monastery.'⁷⁸

Despite the apparent rejection of the Benedictine Office and of Chrodegang's Rule, it is notable that cc. 131-133 provided a commentary on additional aspects of the Office. These chapters were based on some of the practices of Chrodegang's Rule and the Rule of Benedict, however, the compilers of the Institute refrained from quoting these texts at length, and instead offered a new interpretation of the practices prescribed within these works. Thus Chapter 131: 'That the canons should religiously observe the canonical hours', clearly drew on chapters 6 and 7 of the Rule of Chrodegang and contained the same prohibition against staves being brought into the choir (this clause itself drew on c.13 of the Synod of Rome, 743).⁷⁹ Significantly, the authors of the Institute reworked these clauses. In its original form c. 7 of

⁷⁶ IC, p. 406; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 155.

⁷⁷ For a discussion of the Divine Office in Chrodegang's Rule see: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 16-24; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 69-71.

⁷⁸ Kempf, *LEM*, pp. 86, trans., p. 87.

⁷⁹ IC, pp. 408-409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 158-159; RC, p. 33, trans., pp. 59-60; *Concilium Romanum*, a. 743, MGH *Conc. II.*, Teil I, p. 18; see also: Claussen, *Reform*, p. 128.

Chrodegang's Rule was primarily made up of quotations from cc. 19-20 of the Rule of Benedict, but the authors of the Institute removed the Benedictine content, and only the ban on staves remains.⁸⁰ Likewise, Chrodegang's (c.6) and Benedict's (c. 50) clauses allowing a monk or canon who worked away from the cloister, to perform the Office on their own, were omitted.⁸¹ While this content has been removed, chapter 131 retained the Benedictine exhortations (c. 43) contained within chapter 6 of the Rule of Chrodegang. Canons were requested to gather promptly upon hearing the signal denoting the beginning of the Office.⁸² Interestingly Chrodegang was bypassed and the Institute returned to the Benedictine model (c.43), ordering that latecomers to the Office were to be separated from the rest of the choir. This clause was not included in Chrodegang's Rule (c. 4) which commanded that anyone late for Compline should not be admitted into the church until Vigils.⁸³ The authors of the Institute drew out the essential and practical details used by Chrodegang and Benedict to regulate behaviour within the choir, but omitted anything that might blur the distinction between canon and monk. To this they added their own exhortations, often dealing with the real world issues faced by the communities of canons. The Institute admonished clerics who were too intimately involved in secular affairs and who revealed lay characteristics, such as a crude sense of humour:

There are certain types of cleric who are absolutely tireless as they spend the whole day on worldly business and litigation, but as soon as they come into church to celebrate the Divine Office they are so exhausted that they are unable to attend to their prayer, or to stand through the psalmody. They have to sit down and give themselves to conversation that is more profane than divine, talking of worldly affairs, and even, I am ashamed to add telling each other indecent jokes. This abominable practice must be absolutely eradicated, both from those who already act thus, and from any who may be tempted to imitate them, for according to the word of the Lord, his house shall be called the house of prayer.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ *RC*, p. 33, trans., p. 60; *RB*, pp. 90-93.

⁸¹ *RC*, p. 33 trans., p. 59; *RB*, pp. 166-167.

⁸² *IC*, pp. 408-409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 158-159; *RC*, p. 33 trans., p. 59; *RB*, pp. 146-147. The command that the congregation gathers quickly upon hearing the signal for the Divine Office is contained in c. 43 of the Rule of Benedict. It should be noted that this clause was quite common in monastic customs and was also used by Isidore in c. 6 his *Regula Monachorum*. For discussion, see, Taft, *Liturgy of Hours*, pp. 115-119.

⁸³ *RC*, pp. 31-32, trans., p. 58; *IC*, a. 816, pp. 408-409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 158-159; *RB*, pp. 146-147.

⁸⁴ *IC*, pp. 408-409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 158.

Given the administrative function of some clerics, particularly those who served in the palace, this clause likely reflected reality.⁸⁵ It also built on the sentiments of chapter 101 of the Institute:

There are two types of cleric: one is the ecclesiastics who serve under the rule of a bishop, the other the *acephali*, in other words ‘headless’, who know not whom they follow. They are neither included among the laity through concern with secular business, nor among the clergy through the service to God, but they pass their days wandering and dissolute, in a life that is rootless and vile. They respect no one intent only on license to follow their own whims; like dumb beasts they are driven by their unrestrained desires; they wear the livery of the religious state without its authority. They are like centaurs neither horses nor men, but, as the poet says, ‘a mingled stock of both kinds’.⁸⁶

Chapter 101 is an extract from Isidore of Seville’s discussion of the two types of cleric (On Ecclesiastical Offices, Book 2, c. 3), and while this author was not invoked in c. 131, his influence is clear. The compilers of the Institute carefully intertwined the different traditions used to regulate the clergy into a practical commentary. They composed a precept which was widely applicable to communities who had used a variety of different traditions to govern the life of their clergy. This process of adapting and mixing local traditions with the new guidance found within the Institute can be seen in Chapter 24 of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang which combined c. 131 of the Institute with c. 6 of Chrodegang’s Rule.⁸⁷

Chapters 132: ‘How Angels are present to protect those who sing and psalmodise to the Lord’, is more firmly based on the Benedictine Custom and builds on chapter 19 of that rule, emphasising the omnipresence of God and his angels.⁸⁸ Chapter 19 of Benedict’s Rule was also used by Chrodegang in chapter 7 of his rule.⁸⁹

⁸⁵ For clerics as administrators see: Bullough, ‘*Aula Renovata*’, pp. 267-301; Airlie, ‘Palace of Memory’, p. 21; Barrow, ‘Grades of Ordination’, pp. 41-61; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 27-70 and pp. 236-268.

⁸⁶ *IC*, p. 378; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 272.

⁸⁷ *EnlR.*, p. 199, trans., p. 247.

⁸⁸ *IC*, p. 409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 159-160; *RB*, pp. 90-91; For a discussion of Angels within the Rule of Benedict and other monastic texts, see: C. Leyser, ‘Angels, Monks and Demons in the Early Medieval West’, in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.), *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2001) pp. 9-22.

⁸⁹ *RC*, p. 33 trans., p. 60.

As can be seen in the following table, the authors of the Institute have reworded the precepts of Benedict but maintained the wider interpretation offered in the rule:

Rule of Benedict, c. 19: <i>Discipline in Psalm-Singing</i>	Canonical Institute, c. 132: <i>How Angels are present to protect those who sing and psalmodize to the Lord</i>
<p>We believe the divine presence is everywhere and ‘the eyes of the Lord observe the good and the wicked in every place’. Let us believe this most of all, without a trace of doubt, when we are present at the Divine Office.</p> <p>Therefore let us always remember what the prophet says: ‘Serve the Lord in fear’ and again, ‘Sing psalms sagely’ and ‘I will sing to you in the sight of the angels’. So let us consider how we ought to behave in the sight of the divinity and his angels and stand to sing psalms in such a way that our spirits and voices are in harmony.⁹⁰</p>	<p>For those who recite the psalms in the Church of the Lord, the understanding should be in accordance with the voice, so as to fulfil what the apostle said, ‘I will sing with the spirit, I will sing also with the understanding’. Although we know that the Lord is present everywhere, by the power of his divinity, we believe that he is present to us in a particular manner, through grace, when we take part in the Divine Office ...</p> <p><i>[Here the authors of the Institute have inserted a lengthy quotation from Bede, discussed below.]</i></p> <p>Whenever, therefore, we enter the church either to offer praises we owe to God, or to celebrate the Holy Mass we should be at pains to remember the presence of the Angels, and to perform the Divine Office with fitting fear and reverence, lest which God forbid, we celebrate it with negligence and shameful indifference, being perfunctory in its observance, so as to fall miserably under the sentence, ‘Cursed be he that doth work of the Lord deceitfully’. We must, then be careful not to do anything in the Church of God carelessly, or wrongly, nor to do anything unseemly in thought or word or deed, so that in the sight of the angels we may be made worthy, and when the Lord comes he may find in us, not matter for condemnation, but rather that which deserve reward.⁹¹</p>

⁹⁰ *De Disciplina Psallendi*: Ubique credimus divinam esse praesentiam et oculos Domini in omni loco speculari bonos et malos. Maxime tamen hoc sine aliqua dubitatione credamus, cum ad opus divinum adsistimus. Ideo semper memores simus quod ait propheta: ‘servite domino in timore’ et ‘iterum Psallite sapiente’ et ‘in conspectu angelorum psallam tibi’. Ergo consideremus qualiter oporteat in conspectu divinitatis et angelorum eius esse et sic stemus ad psallendum ut mens nostra concordet voci nostrae; *RB*, pp. 90-91

⁹¹ *IC*, p. 409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 159-160

While this Benedictine advice is repeated and paraphrased, the authors of the Institute deliberately avoided quoting from the rule and instead cite Bede's commentary on Luke as the source of the precept:

That venerable priest Bede writes of this manner in his commentary on the gospel of St. Luke: 'It has not escaped our notice that a multitude of angels are present invisibly to the chosen, to defend them from the assault of their subtle foe, and to sustain them with a greater grace in their longing for heaven. The apostle bears witness saying: 'Are they not all ministering spirits sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?' We can believe that the angelic spirits are more particularly close to us when we devote ourselves to the worship of God, that is when we enter the church, give our attention to the holy readings, and apply ourselves to singing the psalms or to prayer, or indeed when we celebrate the Holy Mass. Therefore the prophet says, 'In the sight of the angels will I sing to thee.' None can we doubt that when the mysteries of the Lord's Body and Blood are in process, that the citizens of heaven are assembled there.⁹²

Bede is the only writer referred to within this chapter, and drawing on his commentary served two purposes. Firstly, it directly linked the practices of the Divine Office to those described in the Bible, and secondly it allowed the compilers of the Institute to draw on the practices of the Benedictine Custom through the prism of another authoritative writer. Thus, rather than being applied in raw form to the life of the clergy, the monastic rule was interpreted for the canons. Here there was a significant departure from chapter 7 of Chrodegang's Rule, which, was primarily formed of quotations from the Benedictine Rule. These were applied directly to the life of the clergy with little interpretation:

We believe that God is present everywhere and that 'the eyes of the Lord behold the good and evil; but let us especially believe this without any doubting when we are performing the Divine Office. Therefore let us ever remember the words of the prophet: 'Serve ye the Lord in fear: and rejoice unto him with trembling' and again, 'sing ye wisely'; and, 'In the sight of the angels will I sing to thee'. For if we wish to prefer a petition to men of high station, we do not presume to do it with humility and respect; how much more ought we to supplicate the Lord of all things with all humility and purity.⁹³

⁹²IC, p. 409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 159-160; my thanks to Zachary Guilliano for sharing his thoughts on this extract.

⁹³RC, p. 33, trans., p. 60; Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 126-128.

As Claussen observes this precept, ‘really does not show Chrodegang at his most original’.⁹⁴ This chapter’s heavy dependence on the Rule of Benedict as a source for the canonical life would certainly have been frowned on by those tasked with distinguishing the canonical life from the monastic in 816.

With its firm grounding in Benedictine tradition it is perhaps difficult to identify a synthesis of traditions within chapter 132, as with many of Bede’s homilies, his commentary on Luke 24 also served as an exegetical work on the Rule of Benedict.⁹⁵ Likewise, the belief in an angelic presence during the Divine Office was widespread, and was a core tenet of early medieval monasticism. Such notions were popularised by Gregory the Great and even pre-dated the Benedictine Rule.⁹⁶ Chapter 132 therefore distils an essential feature of the monastic life for a clerical audience, alluding to several inter-linked traditions including: the Rule of Benedict; Chrodegang’s Rule; Bede’s homily; and perhaps also the works of Gregory the Great. More importantly chapter 132 must be read in light of the contents of the preceding chapters (cc. 126-31). It provided a homiletic text offering an ideological backing to the practical advice contained in chapter 131, but also presented spiritual insights that were lacking in Isidore’s description of the Office.

Chapter 133, ‘Who Should be ordained to read or sing in church’, maintained a focus on Benedictine tradition, and it paraphrases chapters 38 and 47 of that rule, emphasising that lectors and cantors must be well versed and able to edify their listeners.⁹⁷ Once more the bishops have avoided quoting from the monastic rule and instead have constructed their own precept. In a move away from the Benedictine Custom this chapter also highlighted the important role of teachers, as liturgical educators within the cloister. This addition may well have been taken from chapter 70 of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), which focused on the importance of education and knowledge of the psalms. The compilers of the Institute have taken the most basic elements of the monastic custom, and adapted them for clerical use by combining the

⁹⁴ Claussen, *Reform*, p. 127.

⁹⁵ Although the commentary on Luke 24 is not explicitly mentioned, the relationship between Bede’s homilies and the Rule of Benedict is explored in: A. G. P. van der Walt, ‘Reflections of the Benedictine Rule in Bede’s Homiliary’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), pp. 367-376.

⁹⁶ Leyser, ‘Angels, Monks and Demons’, pp. 9-22; S. Chase, *Angelic Spirituality: Medieval Perspectives on the Ways of Angels* (Mahwah, NJ, 2002) pp. 91-107.

⁹⁷ *IC*, p. 409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 160.

Rule of Benedict with other canonical texts. The table below illustrates the fusion of these texts and traditions:

Rule of Benedict, c. 47: <i>Signalling the hour for the work of God</i>	<i>Admonitio Generalis</i> (789), c. 70	Canonical Institute, c. 133: <i>Who Should be ordained to read or sing in church</i>
<p>They should not presume to chant or read unless they can fulfil that duty so as to edify listeners, which should be done with humility and gravity and fear by the one the abbot has commanded.⁹⁸</p>	<p>We beseech them to maintain an upright and laudable way of life, as the Lord himself commands in the gospel: ‘Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your father who is heaven’, that many may be drawn to God’s service by their upright way of life and they may gather and associate to themselves not only children of servile condition but also the sons of freemen. And let schools for teaching boys the psalms, musical notation, singing, computation and grammar be created in every monastery and episcopal residence.⁹⁹</p>	<p>The ones chosen to read, sing or intone psalms in church, must be such as are not proud, but humble in offering fitting praise to the Lord, so that they may please the learned by their harmonious reading or singing, and instruct the less learned. When they read or sing they should be more eager to edify the people than to win their empty admiration. Those who are capable of doing this well should first be instructed by their teachers and once instructed should study to perform their duties to the edification of the hearers.¹⁰⁰</p>

As noted in Part 2, chapter 70 of the *Admonitio Generalis* was hugely influential. Its contents were repeated in chapter 29 of the Council of Frankfurt (794), which placed education at the heart of the life of cathedral communities, stating:

⁹⁸ *RB*, pp. 158-159.

⁹⁹ *Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 70, pp. 222-225; *Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Capit. I*, c. 72, pp. 59-60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 217.

¹⁰⁰ *IC*, p. 409; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 160.

Each and every bishop should give good teaching and instruction to those placed in his charge, so that there will always in God's house be found men who are worthy to be chosen according to the canons.¹⁰¹

The *Admonitio* also inspired the creation of the first wave of episcopal statutes including that composed by Theodulf of Orléans. His First Statute discussed the establish of schools in the episcopal household, the monasteries and in the local parishes.¹⁰² Perhaps more significantly, towards the end of Charlemagne's reign, Archbishop Leidrad of Lyon (d. 816) sent a missive to court proudly reporting the renewal he had instigated within his archdiocese of Lyons.¹⁰³ This renewal included the establishment of both a school for cantors and a school for lectors within his cathedral. Leidrad emphasised that the cantors 'trained' within the school would in turn train others.¹⁰⁴ For the archbishop these schools were essential statements of the orthodox and corrected form of life now practised within his cathedral community, and certainly correspond with the contents of chapter 133 of the Canonical Institute. A copy of Leidrad's letter may have been stored in the palace archives and could have been consulted as part of the process of compiling the Institute. Lyon may have served as a model for others to copy.¹⁰⁵

Leidrad's letter contains an additional snippet of information, he reported that he had recruited a liturgical expert from Metz to teach his cathedral clergy. This learned individual offered a conduit by which the practices of Chrodegang's Rule could be spread to Lyon. Despite this, it is notable that Chrodegang's Rule does not contain much information on cantors or lectors, or indeed mention the importance of an episcopal school.¹⁰⁶ Nor does Paul the Deacon refer to the establishment of a school within his hyperbolic account of Chrodegang's episcopate.¹⁰⁷ By the start of the ninth century such schools were a defining feature of the canonical life, and the

¹⁰¹ *Synodus Franconofurtensis*, 794, p. 77; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Reign of Charlemagne*, p. 61.

¹⁰² Part II. 3

¹⁰³ *Epistolae Variorum Carolo Magno Regnante*, no. 30 pp. 542-544. For a discussion of this renewal see: Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen*, pp. 134-163, esp., pp. 146-157.

¹⁰⁴ de Jong 'Charlemagne's Church', pp.103-106.

¹⁰⁵ Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen*, pp. 156-157.

¹⁰⁶ It should be noted that, Chapter 5 does discuss the need for clerics to study the psalms and lessons; chapter 25 also emphasises the importance role of the Archdeacon as a teacher; The minor orders are discusses briefly in chapter 21.

¹⁰⁷ Kempf, *LEM*, pp. 86-89.

authors of the Institute felt a chapter expounding the importance of liturgical education was a necessary addition to their text. Here both Chrodegang's Rule and the Rule of Benedict were out of step with the widespread practices of the Frankish Church. While chapter 133 draws on the traditions of the *Admonitio Generalis* and combines them with Benedict's precept, an additional seven chapters (c. 16, c. 20, cc. 23-5 and cc. 28-9) within the manual section of the Institute also discuss the importance of clerical education. Five of these chapters (c. 16, c. 20, c. 23, c. 25, c. 29) were taken from Isidore's 'Sentences' and the influence of this writer is again detectable. It seems likely that chapter 133 was intended to be read in conjunction with the educational instructions found within the manual; a notion supported by chapter 60 of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang which made use of Isidore's discussion of teaching provided in chapter 20 of the Canonical Institute.¹⁰⁸

Chapters 136 and 137 discuss elements of the Divine Office in a slightly different manner to the chapters discussed above. Chapters 126-33 provided a history of the Office and practical advice on how the liturgy should be performed. Chapters 136 and 137 focused on the relationship between senior and junior members of the congregation and thus concur with the main theme of chapters 134-144, which discussed discipline within the cloister. Chapter 136: 'That all canons should come to Compline' will be dealt with shortly, however, as chapter 137: 'On the Cantors' built on the content of chapter 133, this precept will be addressed first.

Chapter 137 is a commentary loosely based around book II, chapter 12 of Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices', which described psalmists as a grade of cleric.¹⁰⁹ Although chapter 137 is an original construction the authors have included the following quotation from Isidore:

We have learnt from the holy fathers that a cantor 'should be distinguished for his voice and skill, so that he may inspire the minds of those who hear him through the attractiveness of his music'.¹¹⁰

Here there is a clear congruence with the statements made in c. 133 and the importance of knowledge and skill provided by a sound education was emphasised.

¹⁰⁸ *EnIR*, p. 215, trans, p. 267.

¹⁰⁹ *Isidore*, 'On Ecclesiastical Offices', Book II, c. 12, *PL* 83, col. 792.

¹¹⁰ *IC*, p. 414; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 164.

However, Isidore's discussion of cantors is quoted rather sparingly; this may be due to his inclusion of this group as a separate grade of cleric. By the eighth century the Hispanic model of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, with its plurality of grades, was reduced to the more symbolically pleasing septiform archetype favoured within the Roman and Frankish Churches. The Isidorean grades of cantor and psalmist were subsumed into the grade of lector.¹¹¹ The bishops at Aachen were therefore rightly reticent when drawing on Book II, c. 12 of 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' and it is notable that Isidore's chapter on Psalmists was not included in the description of the grades of cleric found in the first section of the manual (cc. 2-8).¹¹² Given this it is unsurprising to find Isidore's discussion of psalmists combined with practices advocated by the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and the rules of Chrodegang and Benedict. Cantors were reminded of the need for humility, an ideal also emphasised in chapter 133 of the Institute. Chapter 1 of Chrodegang's Rule also discussed the importance of humility as an ideal virtue of canons, and he consciously alluded to chapter 7 of the Benedictine Rule stating:

We will abbreviate here a long chapter, so that the minds of the clergy may be inspired to love humility, and shun that pride which is so detestable and hostile to God.¹¹³

Although humility was a key trait expected of his canons, Chrodegang's discussion of this virtue is deliberately rather limited when compared to his Benedictine template.¹¹⁴ As Claussen has argued, the lengthy discussion of humility provided by Benedict was deemed too monastic for Chrodegang's canons.¹¹⁵ In a similar vein although the humility expected of canons is highlighted at key points within the Institute, including in chapter 137, it is not discussed at length. This simplified approach towards the virtue of humility is part of Chrodegang's legacy to the Institute.

¹¹¹ For discussion of the development of the different grades of cleric see the work of Reynolds, particularly: R. Reynolds, 'The *De Officiis vii graduum*: Its Origins and Developments', *Medieval Studies*, 34 (1972) pp. 113-51; reprinted in Reynolds, *Clerical Orders*; see also: Barrow, 'Grades of Ordination', pp. 41-67; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 34-52.

¹¹² *IC*, pp. 318-322.

¹¹³ *RC*, p. 29, trans., p. 55; see also: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 119-21 and pp. 177-184.

¹¹⁴ *RB*, pp. 44-55.

¹¹⁵ Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 177-84.

Much like chapter 133, as well as drawing inspiration from Chrodegang's interpretation of the Benedictine approach towards humility; the authors have pulled together ideals from the Benedictine Custom and the *Admonitio Generalis*. Chapter 137 essentially repeats the contents of chapter 133:

As for those less skilled in these arts, it is better that they should keep silent until they are better trained, rather than sing music they do not know and throw everyone else off. The psalms should be recited in church in a simple and clear tone, with compunction of heart, rather than hurrying through them, or singing them to excessively complicated and abstruse settings. In this way the thoughts of those who recite the psalmody will be soothed by the gentle melody, and those who listen will be edified by the words they hear.¹¹⁶

To this more practical advice was added:

Some senior brothers should be appointed, men of approved life, who can provide a choir to alternate with the cantors, so that those who need to learn will not be left in idleness, or spend their time in empty and frivolous conversation.¹¹⁷

This sub-clause again demonstrates the synthesis of traditions created within the Canonical Institute. The description of cantors certainly draws heavily on Isidore's notion of this group as a separate grade; a cantor was more than someone who sang, they were junior members of the community and perhaps even a sub-group of trainee clerics. As such, this chapter comes perilously close to accepting the defunct Isidorean model of grades of cleric, and it may be for this reason that chapter 133 addresses cantors and lectors together, openly rejecting the Hispanic archetype. This Isidorean model was mixed with the advice that these junior members be positioned between senior members of the community. This was a practical provision that successfully implemented the *Admonitio's* request that schools be established within the cloister. However, this clause also drew on Benedict's description of the dormitory (c. 22), which requested that the young be 'interspersed amongst the seniors'.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶ IC, p. 414; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 164.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ RB, pp. 96-97.

Returning to chapter 136: ‘That all canons should come to Compline’, while this clause purports to deal with the Divine Office, in reality it addressed the sleeping arrangements of the canons, highlighting the discipline expected within the dormitory. After Compline the canons were commanded to head directly to bed, here the authors of the Institute quoted from chapter 22 of the Rule of Benedict stating: ‘let them sleep each one in a separate bed. There should be a light burning in the dormitory at night.’¹¹⁹ This chapter therefore builds on Benedictine tradition but avoids excessive quotation. Interestingly, this sub-clause regarding the night-light in the dormitory is taken directly from the Benedictine custom and is not included in Chrodegang’s Rule. This demonstrates that the authors of the Institute had independent access to the Rule of Benedict and were not solely dependant on Chrodegang’s interpretation of this text, a point worth remembering when considering the impact of Chrodegang’s Rule on the Canonical Institute.¹²⁰

III.5.iii(c) Canonical Officials

Chapters 138-44 of the Institute dealt with various canonical officials, outlining how they should be chosen, their duties and how they should conduct themselves. Once again the Institute combined a variety of traditions to create the new rule. Influences from Chrodegang and Isidore can certainly be detected, however, the majority of these precepts were drawn from the Rule of Benedict.¹²¹ While there are quotations embedded within these chapters, they tend to be brief and integrated into a wider, and original, discussion constructed by the authors of the Institute. Concordance and drawing commonalties between the various traditions used to regulate the clergy was the wider aim in this section of the text.

Chapters 138 and 139 of the Institute discussed the leaders of congregations of canons. Chapter 138 focused on the appointment of the bishop’s deputy and representative, the provost, and chapter 139 addressed the duties of this official. As Bertram notes, these chapters move away from the episcopal model of Chrodegang’s Rule.¹²² Chrodegang had envisaged heavy episcopal involvement in the life of the

¹¹⁹ IC, pp. 413-414; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 163.

¹²⁰ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 85.

¹²¹ Ibid., pp. 91-92.

¹²² Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 91.

community and the bishop was mentioned in 21 of 34 chapters that make up his rule.¹²³ In the Institute the Bishop's deputy was tasked with the day-to-day running of community and in chapter 118 it was the provost who is tasked with admitting members into the congregation.¹²⁴ The use of the title provost was also a departure from Chrodegang's Rule, which had made the archdeacon and primicerius the chief assistants to the bishop. The title of provost was drawn from the canon law manual and chapters 15-16, 18, 20-23 and 31 all refer to this official.¹²⁵

Despite this focus on the provost, chapter 138 made no explicit mention of this official, instead it discussed those who 'deputise for the bishops' and who are given the 'burden of command'.¹²⁶ It seems likely that this precept was applied to all officials including the provost and the cellarer. Tellingly, this chapter draws on chapter 21 of the Benedictine Rule which discusses 'monastic deans'.¹²⁷ Although this official was not mentioned within the Institute, from the 840s onwards this figure became a key second in command to the provost in many West Frankish communities and the origins of this role may perhaps be found in this precept.¹²⁸ However, as the dean was not explicitly mentioned within the Institute it seems that this office was felt to be strictly monastic by the majority of delegates in 816. The clerical office of dean was much slower to develop in the East Frankish territories and it is possible that the bishops from these territories objected to the adaption of this monastic office.¹²⁹ The tenets of monasticism were again simplified and very loosely applied to the clerical order, the official of the dean was not appropriated, but the method of selecting this official was taken as a model for the election of the clerical provost. In following this Benedictine template the chapter emphasised that the deputies should not be appointed due to their seniority, but 'according to their worthiness of life and the degree of their spiritual gifts'.¹³⁰ There was a subtle rejection of Benedict's (c. 63) and Chrodegang's

¹²³ For a discussion of Chrodegang's view on episcopal involvement in the life of the community and of the role of the archdeacon and *primicerius* see: Claussen, *Reform*, pp. 58-114 and 206-248.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 398-399; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 146-147.

¹²⁵ *IC*, pp. 340-1, 342, 343-345, 352-353.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 415; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 165.

¹²⁷ *RB*, pp. 94-95.

¹²⁸ For a discussion of the development of the office of the Dean within clerical communities see: Barrow, *Clergy*, p. 84 and pp. 301-307.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 301, fn. 183.

¹³⁰ *IC*, a. 816, p. 415; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 165; *RB*, pp. 94-95.

(c.2) premise that rank should be derived from the ‘order in which the clerics were ordained’.¹³¹ Despite this chapter 138 of the Institute and chapter 25 of Chrodegang’s Rule contain a similar condemnation of proud superiors:

Rule of Chrodegang, c. 25:
of the Archdeacon and Primicerius

Canonical Institute, c. 138:
who are to deputise for the bishops in the congregation of canons

If the archdeacon or primicerius be found, which God forbid, to be **proud**, pompous, argumentative or contemptuous of the canonical rule¹³² and this little rule of ours, they should be **admonished** once, and again, as the Lord commanded, and if they do not reform the extent of their fault should be judged by the bishop. **‘If he do not amend even then, let him be deposed’**¹³³ **from his orders, ‘and another who is worthy be appointed in his place’**,¹³⁴ who will fulfil the will of God and of his bishop in accordance with God’s law.¹³⁵

If they begin to become **proud** of their position as superior, taking no care for the brethren, and if they are frequently **admonished** but remain incorrigible, they should be **removed from the ministry, and others should be put in their place** who will be able to work more efficiently.¹³⁶

This command applied to all who held office within the cloister and chapters 139, 140 and 143 suggests that officials who were found wanting should be, ‘judged according to the principles set out above’ (c. 141).¹³⁷

Chapter 139 built upon the discussions of chapter 138, and in particular alluded to chapter 65 of the Benedictine Rule, stressing that the provost should ‘never neglect the canonical rule’.¹³⁸ The chapter implied that the provost should be a paragon of virtue and here the authors drew on the chapters devoted to this issue in the manual section of the Institute. In particular, the influence of Isidore’s Sentences may be seen. The provost was to be ‘humble’ and ‘of benefit to the entire congregation’. Chapter 22 of the Institute had provided a lengthy quotation from Book 3, c. 42 of Isidore’s

¹³¹ RC, p. 30, trans., pp. 55-56; RB, pp. 202-205.

¹³² This reference to the canonical rule as a separate text is intriguing and certainly supports the notion that this phrase could refer to canon law more generally.

¹³³ RB, c. 65, pp. 210-213.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ RC, pp. 42-43, trans., p. 72.

¹³⁶ IC, p. 415; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 165.

¹³⁷ IC, pp. 415-416 and p. 418; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 165-168.

¹³⁸ IC, p. 416; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 165; RB, pp. 212-213.

‘Sentences’, a precept that dealt exclusively with the humility of provosts.¹³⁹ Chapter 21 had also expounded on this theme, quoting from Gregory the Great’s ‘Pastoral Care’.¹⁴⁰ The notion that the provost should be of benefit to the entire community likely alluded to his important educational role, and this was certainly the dominant theme within the manual’s discussion of the Provost. The superior’s role as an educator is discussed in chapters: 16; 20; 23-6; 28-9; 33-4.¹⁴¹ Again, many of these precepts drew on Isidore’s Sentences, and it is of note that the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang (cc. 59-60) takes excerpts from chapters 20 and 33 of the Institute when discussing the virtues expected of teachers. These extracts are made up of quotations from the works of Isidore.¹⁴² The Institute’s discussion of the provost and his duties therefore offered a well-structured synthesis of the traditions of Chrodegang, Benedict and Isidore. Furthermore, by alluding back to the canon law manual contained at the start of the Institute, the authors successfully distinguished the provost from the monastic officials of the Benedictine Rule, such as the dean.

The Institute’s discussion of the cellarer (c. 140) draws on the Benedictine Rule, Chrodegang’s Rule, and perhaps alluded to Theodulf’s first Episcopal Statute. The selection of cellarer was based on the same criteria advocated by Chrodegang (c. 26) and his Benedictine model (c. 34).¹⁴³ However, the Institute removed the Benedictine tradition of brothers taking it in turns to serve as kitcheners and bakers and instead suggested that clerics selected to serve this purpose should be specifically trained, ‘so that they are capable of attending to the needs of the brethren appropriately, both by their skill at baking and their pure faith.’¹⁴⁴ The importance of education was once more placed front and centre. Given the bread produced by these servant clerics would serve both as physical nourishment for the congregation and also as the host in the mass, it is unsurprising that the servants were required to be of high moral standing. Such concerns were also expressed within Theodulf’s first statute (c.5) which, after discussing the importance of testing clerics knowledge of the liturgy, stated:

¹³⁹ *IC*, p. 344.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 343-344.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 341; 343; 344-348; 351-352; 354-356.

¹⁴² *EnlR*, p. 215 trans., pp. 267-268.

¹⁴³ *RC*, p. 43 trans., p. 73; *RB*, pp. 124-125.

¹⁴⁴ *IC*, p. 416; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 166.

Let the bread which you offer to God for sacrifice be baked either by yourselves or your servants in your presence, in clean and careful manner, and let it be carefully observed that the bread and the wine and the water, without which Masses cannot be celebrated, be kept very clean and handled with care, and that nothing be found in them of poor quality, nothing not approved, according to the passage of scripture which says, 'Let the fear of the Lord be with you and do everything with diligence.'¹⁴⁵

Theodulf's influence was certainly on the wane in 816, however, his statute was one of the most prominent regulatory texts produced in the wake of the *Admonitio Generalis*.¹⁴⁶ At the very least the principles expressed in the Institute correlate with those of Theodulf's precepts, and it is possible that the Institute alluded to the concerns expressed in the statute. As will be discussed below, the Institute may also have made use of Theodulf's First Statute in c. 145, which forms an epilogue to the text.

The porter was the last official discussed within the Institute and was the subject of chapters 143–4. Like the description of other officials of the enclosure, the Benedictine Custom was used as a loose model. However, the interpretation of the porter's duties draws explicitly on Chrodegang's Rule, and retained the command that the porter should return the keys of the enclosure to the Bishop's representative after Compline had been completed:¹⁴⁷

Rule of Chrodegang, c. 27:
Of the Porter

After Compline he should return the keys of the gates to the archdeacon.¹⁴⁸

Canonical Institute, c. 143:

How the gates of the canons are to be kept

Once Vespers and Compline are over, and the doors are locked, the same Porter should bring the keys to the bishop's deputy, so no one may be able to go out or come in at unseasonable times.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ *Theodulf I*, pp. 105; trans., McCracken in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilisation*, p. 108.

¹⁴⁶ For Theodulf's fall from favour and eventual involvement in Bernard of Italy's failed rebellion see Noble, 'The Revolt of King Bernard', pp. 315-326; For the influence of Theodulf's First Statute see: van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 101-139; For the use of Theodulf's First Statute within an enclosed setting. See also Part II. 3, iii.

¹⁴⁷ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 92.

¹⁴⁸ *RC*, pp. 43-44, trans., p. 73.

¹⁴⁹ *IC* pp. 417-418; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168.

Chapter 144, ‘How the enclosure of canons should be carefully guarded’, does not explicitly mention the porter.¹⁵⁰ As Bertram observes, this chapter deals with the same content as chapter 117: how the enclosures of canons are to be carefully fortified, and elements of chapter 134: what should be the nature of correction.¹⁵¹ Both of these chapters drew attention to the authoritative role of the provost. It is interesting that the authors of the Institute felt the need to repeat the themes of chapter 117 after discussing the important role of the porter in chapter 143. Chapter 144 expanded on the nature of the porter’s duties, outlining that his supervisory role extended beyond the bounds of the close. He was to admonish any canon found ‘spending his time outside in the streets and squares in idleness and foolish conversations’.¹⁵² The final section of the chapter contained an exhortation against women being allowed within the cloister, stating:

Women are not to eat or sleep in the houses of the canons or in the enclosure, not even be allowed to enter them except for the church, since this is strictly prohibited by the holy fathers.¹⁵³

This provision is not dissimilar to those found within chapter 3 of Chrodegang’s Rule, which allowed canons to maintain their own houses and banned women from the enclosure.¹⁵⁴ However, the reference to the prohibition of the holy fathers likely refers back to chapter 39, which banned female lodgers, and chapter 82, which prohibited women from entering the sanctuary.¹⁵⁵ The canon law collection that forms the first section of the Institute was used to both supply and justify the precepts contained within the Rule.

III.5.iii(d) Epilogue and Theodulf’s First Statute

As may be expected, the epilogue to the Institute provided a summary of the themes covered in the main body of the text. Interestingly, in part of the epilogue the authors drew on chapter 4 of the Rule of Benedict: The Tools of Good Works,

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 418; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168.

¹⁵¹ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168, fn 74.

¹⁵² *IC*, p. 418; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 418; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 168.

¹⁵⁴ *RC*, pp. 30-31, trans., pp. 56-57.

¹⁵⁵ *IC*, p. 360.

essentially abridging the contents of this precept.¹⁵⁶ As noted in chapter 3 of this thesis the Benedictine chapter, ‘The Tools of Good Work’ was quoted extensively in Theodulf of Orléans’ first episcopal statute.¹⁵⁷ While the authors of the Institute could have made their summary directly from the Benedictine Custom, it seems more likely that the use of this precept represented the influence of Theodulf of Orléans and his First Episcopal Statute. Both the Institute and Statute used chapter 4 of the Benedictine Rule for the exactly the same purposes highlighting its simple summary of the behaviours and virtues expected of the clergy:

Theodulf, First Episcopal Statute, c. 21	Canonical Institute, c.145: Epilogue
<p>Since therefore, the pages of all the Holy Scriptures are crammed full of the instruments of good works, and on the fields of the Holy Scriptures can be found the arms with which vices may be suppressed and virtues nourished, it has pleased us to insert into this our prescript the opinion of a certain father [Benedict] about the instruments of good works which contains with great brevity what ought to be done and what avoided.¹⁵⁸</p>	<p>There are many who are unlearned, and less capable, so we have considered it necessary to go through it [the Institute] again in concise and brief form, so that anyone who is unable to read it, or to understand it when he has heard it read by others, may carry away this little nosegay, scented like a vase full of different flowering blooms, thus he, may learn what to do and what to avoid.¹⁵⁹</p>

The correlation of intent between these two texts is telling, this common approach demonstrates that Theodulf’s statute was one of the many traditions drawn on to compile the Canonical Institute.

III.5.iv Conclusion

From this close analysis of the text it is clear that the Canonical Institute represented a grand attempt to distil, from various authoritative texts and traditions, the very essence of the canonical form of life. By so doing the Institute distinguished this canonical

¹⁵⁶ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 169, fn. 77; *RB*, pp. 32-37.

¹⁵⁷ *Theodulf I.*, pp. 117-119; trans., McCracken, in Dutton (ed.) *Carolingian Civilisation*, pp. 111-112. See Part II. 3. iii.

¹⁵⁸ *Theodulf I.*, pp. 117-9; trans., McCracken, ‘Theodulf’, in Dutton (ed.) *Carolingian Civilisation*, p. 111.

¹⁵⁹ *IC*, p. 419; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 168-169.

way of life from the monastic. The churchmen who compiled the Institute very much shared the agenda of Benedict of Aniane when he compiled his ‘Concordance of Rules’. However, the Canonical Institute goes further than this text and the authors of the Institute have self-confidently constructed an original and inclusive text that could be applied to the various communities of canons within Francia. To create a novel document the authors had to follow correct canonical procedure and justify their findings according to the established traditions of the Church. This was the primary purpose of the canon law manual which formed the first 113 chapters of the Institute. The rule within the Institute combined the traditions of a number of texts and authors including: Theodulf of Orléans’ First Episcopal Statute; the *Admonitio Generalis*; the Rule of Benedict; Chrodegang’s Rule; and the works of Isidore of Seville. From these texts the Canonical Institute made great use of Isidore of Seville’s ‘Sentences’ and ‘On Ecclesiastical Offices’, and this chimes with the Council of Mainz (813) which had also used Isidore to regulate the life of the canonical clergy. This heavy use of Isidore, and the attempt to combine his works with other traditions, including the rules of Chrodegang and Benedict, may represent the influence of the archchaplain, Hildebald of Cologne. While the Institute should be seen as the work of many hands, the archchaplain held ultimate responsibility over all ecclesiastical affairs within the palace. As noted above, re-establishing the authority of the palace under the new emperor should be seen as the key political aim of the Institute and by combining a wide range of canonical texts, the authors of the Institute ensured that their new law book and rule could be easily be fused with other local traditions, ensuring that all communities were in concordance with the practices of the sacred palace. The afterlife of the Institute demonstrates the achievement of such concordance and the text was combined with local customs, forming the basis for the canonical form of life. At St. Maurice the canonical rule was enforced in part because it allowed the community to continue to the local tradition of performing the *laus perrenis*, something not permitted by the new monastic custom issued in 817.¹⁶⁰ Likewise, by the 850s the process of combining Chrodegang’s Rule with the Canonical Institute led to the creation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang. This accord between the practices of the palace and the local customs practised in houses of canons throughout Francia was a

¹⁶⁰ Zufferey, *St-Maurice D’Agaune*, pp. 50-51; Ripart, ‘Temps Séculiers’, pp. 137-141; de Jong, ‘Carolingian Monasticism’, pp. 632-633.

key function of the Canonical Institute and had been the over-arching aim of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and the Council of Frankfurt (794). However, it was the Canonical Institute that finally and successfully produced a commentary on the basic principles of the canonical life that could be widely enforced with little local opposition.

Conclusion

By focusing on the interplay between central efforts to define and regulate the life of the canonical clergy, and local responses to such admonitions and queries, the three parts of this thesis have provided a nuanced discussion of the ways in which the canonical clergy were defined, regulated and ordered between the reigns of Pippin III and Louis the Pious. This approach has highlighted the complexities involved in establishing the norms of the canonical life, and has shown that the role of influential texts such as Chrodegang's Rule has been overstated. Chrodegang's text was one of many attempts to regulate the life of the clergy at the local level. The thesis has also shown that while centrally produced texts, such as the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), did encourage bishops to regulate the life of the clergy, the local autonomy of the bishop was maintained. Ultimately, it was the local diocesan who decided which canonical texts should be applied to regulate the life of the clergy. Such local approaches informed practices at court and archchaplains, such as Angilramn and Hildebald, each sought to establish their own preferred texts as sources of the canonical life. This process can be seen in the Canonical Institute (816), which drew widely on different local practices, establishing concordance from a plethora of texts and traditions.

Part I of this thesis focused on how Carolingian churchmen defined and categorised different types of cleric. This chapter assessed the validity of applying the term 'secular' to all clerics in the period, whether they lived in the enclosure or not. Scholars have certainly favoured this term, and it is undeniable that clerics in this period did not take full vows of poverty, often receiving an income from their family lands. As such, the clergy of the eighth and ninth centuries have been seen as analogous to the 'secular' clergy of the high middle ages, who eschewed the vows of poverty associated with the Rule of Augustine.¹ However, a close examination of texts, such as the Capitulary for the Missi (802) and Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750), show that the Carolingians themselves conceived of a distinction between the 'canonical' and 'secular' clergy. As might be expected this distinction was rooted in the fact that the canonical clergy lived enclosed lives behind the walls of the cloister, where they were unpolluted by the affairs of the secular world. Yet, it is also clear that the Rule of

¹ For a discussion of these developments see: Dickinson, *Origins of the Austin Canons*, pp. 7-59; Barrow, *Clergy*, pp. 98-114.

Chrodegang (c. 750) and Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute (c. 798) sought to involve the extra-claustral clergy in the day-to-day life of enclosed communities. This is shown most clearly in chapters 8, 21, and 30 of Chrodegang's Rule, which commanded that the extra-claustral clerics were to attend the Chapter and dine with the congregation of canons on Sundays and Feast days.² Those clerics who joined the community on such occasions were referred to as canonical clergy. Likewise, those clerics trained within the cloister to undertake pastoral work in the countryside maintained close links with their old masters and motherhouses, forming networks that transcended the walls of the enclosure. As Alcuin's letters show, such pastoral clergy not only sought guidance from their former masters, but were also expected to maintain the norms and practices they had learnt in the cloister. The walls of the clerical enclosure were seen as porous and the close relationship between the extra-claustral clergy and their enclosed brethren suggests that the division between the 'secular' and 'canonical' clergy was more than a matter of where the cleric slept.

The real mark of distinction between the 'secular' and 'canonical' clergy lay in the way they dealt with property. Chapter 31 of Chrodegang's Rule (c. 750) makes this clear; in order to join the congregation of canons, a cleric had to give his rights to immoveable property.³ They could receive a salary from the produce of their lands, but this would pass through the Church before the canon received his income as a stipend. This regulation was tightened at the 816 Council of Aachen, and chapter 121 of the Canonical Institute (816) ensured that no matter what economic assets a canon could access, henceforth all would receive an equal stipend from the bishop or provost.⁴ In order to become a canon it is clear that the individual had to enter into a precarial arrangement with an enclosed community, he would donate his lands to the Church, but maintain usufruct of them for the duration of his life. Thus, rather than holding private property, the lands of the canon became communal assets. The *Brevium Exempla* (c. 800) demonstrates that some extra-claustral clergy, including the cleric Graolf, entered into such economic relationships with enclosed communities.⁵ By associating themselves with the enclosure these clerics differentiated themselves

² RC, pp. 33-34, 40-41, 45-46; trans., pp. 60-61, 68-69, and 75-76.

³ RC, pp. 46-48, trans., pp. 76-79.

⁴ IC, p. 400; trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 149.

⁵ *Brevium Exempla*, p. 253, trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, p. 101.

from those ‘seculars’ who continued to hold private lands. This model cannot be applied universally and it is notable that Hincmar of Rheims (d. 882) opposed such practices. However, given the evidence of Chrodegang’s Rule and the *Brevium Exempla*, it certainly seems that such precarial arrangements were crucial to distinguishing canons and seculars in Austrasia and may well have been exported from this heartland of Carolingian rule to other parts of the Frankish kingdom.

Part II moved on to examine how the canonical clergy were regulated between c. 750 and 813. This analysis was divided into three sections, chapter 2 examined the period between c. 750 and c. 785, chapter 3 looked at the period between c. 785 and 813, while chapter 4 focused exclusively on the 813 councils. Through an examination of key episcopal and monastic communities chapter 2 investigated the approaches taken towards the regulation of the canonical clergy at the local level. In particular, it noted the influence of Pope Zachary’s (d. 752) letter to the Frankish court (747). This permitted bishop’s to live with their communities, ‘holding to the monastic way of life [*monachica vita*]’, advising that they should, ‘wear alike woollen robes and without pause make use of the rule of monastic discipline [*regulam monachicae disciplinae*], together with the admirable traditions of the venerable fathers’.⁶ This letter appears to have inspired Chrodegang to compose his rule, which shares many commonalities with this text. Other bishops may also have based the regulation of the clergy within their households on this decretal, and the *Hodoeporicon* suggests that Willibald of Eichstätt (d. c. 787) adapted the Rule of Benedict for use within his episcopal household.⁷ That Zachary’s epistle retained influence is demonstrated by its inclusion in the Codex Carolinus (c. 791) and the allusions to it contained within c. 46 of Theodulf of Orléans First Episcopal Statute (c. 798).⁸ For the period between c. 750 and c. 785 it was local responses to this decree that dominated attempts to regulate the life of the clergy. Prior to Angilramn’s promotion to archchaplain of the palace, there seems to have been little attempt to spread and promote the Rule of Chrodegang beyond the limits of Metz. Even at nearby Strasbourg, Heddo (d. 776) and Remi’s (d. 783) renewal of the cathedral community may have been modelled at Metz, but a close examination of Remi’s testament (778) shows that the practices of Chrodegang’s Rule

⁶ CC, no. 3, pp. 480-481.

⁷ *Vitae Willibaldi*, pp. 80-117; trans., Talbot, in Noble and Head (ed.), *Soldiers of Christ*, pp. 141-165.

⁸ PL 105, col. 208; trans., McCracken and Cabiñiss, in Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 119-120.

were not enforced.⁹ Similarly, there is little evidence to support the idea that Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784) and Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785) promoted or followed Chrodegang's Rule and both of these figures seem to have adapted the texts and traditions used in their favoured monasteries of St. Denis and St. Maurice d'Agaune.

Following the deaths of Fulrad of St. Denis (d. 784), who served as archchaplain, and Wilicar of Sens (d. c. 785), the primate of the Frankish kingdom, a new group of ecclesiastics came to the fore. Most prominent amongst these was Angilramn of Metz (d. 791). As discussed in chapter 3, Angilramn showed a clear interest in promoting both his home city of Metz and also Chrodegang's Rule.¹⁰ Angilramn's interest in the rule is clearly illustrated in Vatican 555, which contains his contribution to chapter 20 as well as several other possible additions made during his episcopate.¹¹ Serving as both archchaplain and archbishop Angilramn's key position allowed him to spread the ideals and principles of Chrodegang's Rule, and it is notable that documents such as the *Admonitio Generalis* (789) and the Council of Frankfurt (794) may have drawn on elements of Chrodegang's Rule.¹² Yet, while Angilramn undoubtedly promoted the rule produced by Chrodegang, his forebear and relative, it is clear that other traditions and interpretations of the canonical life were also prevalent. Alcuin (d. 804), who was a key contributor to the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), had his own understanding of what it meant to be a canon, or indeed a monk. He discussed three orders with Arn of Salzburg: canons, monks and 'the third grade, superior to the canonical but inferior to the monastic'.¹³ Likewise, as Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute (c. 798) shows, in the wake of the *Admonitio Generalis* (789), local bishops took it upon themselves to construct their own regulatory texts. The statute is traditionally seen as targetting the pastoral clergy, but this thesis has argued that the precepts also sought to regulate the life of those within enclosed communities. Crucially, there was a tradition of uniting Theodulf's First Statute with the Rule of

⁹ *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Strassburg*, no. 16, pp. 11-14.

¹⁰ Kempf, *Paul the Deacon*, pp. 4-8; Kempf, 'The role of Metz', pp. 279-299.

¹¹ For the contents of this manuscript see: Langefeld, *Old English*, p. 34.

¹² *Admonitio Generalis* (eds.), Mordek et al., c. 71, pp. 224-27; *Admonitio Generalis* (ed.), Boretius, c. 73, p. 60; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, p. 21; *Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, p. 170; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 61-62.

¹³ *Alcuin, Ep.*, no. 258, p. 416.

Chrodegang. This can be seen in both Bern 289 and CCCC 191.¹⁴ These manuscripts demonstrate that other texts and traditions were used alongside Chrodegang's Rule to regulate the life of the clergy, and this is all the more significant given that Bern 289 was produced in Metz at the end of the eighth century or at the start of ninth.¹⁵ It seems that despite Angilramn's promotion of the Rule of Chrodegang, this text was one of many used to regulate the clergy at the end of the eighth century. It was the local bishop who ultimately decided the texts and traditions that were to regulate the clergy within his episcopal household and diocese.

Hildebald of Cologne (d. 818), who served as archchaplain from 791-818, also demonstrates this point. He shared many of the interests and concerns of his predecessor, Angilramn of Metz (d. 791), but he also appears to have used other regulatory texts alongside Chrodegang's Rule. Chapter 4 argued that the quotations from Isidore of Seville's 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' within chapter 10 of the Council of Mainz (813) reflect the influence and interests of Hildebald of Cologne.¹⁶ This text and others by Isidore were known in Cologne and appear in the booklist of 833.¹⁷ At the very least the use of this Isidorian material, alongside the allusions to Chrodegang's Rule in chapter 9 of the council document, suggests that those gathered at Mainz were drawing on a range of texts and traditions to regulate the life of their clergy.

Chapter 4 also explored the way in which those gathered at the council of Arles (813) and Tours (813) sought to regulate the life of the canonical clergy. At Arles (c. 6) it is notable that no tradition is singled out or favoured, rather the exact form of life practiced within communities of canons was left up to the individual bishop.¹⁸ This may well be a reflection of the well-established and diverse monastic practices of Provence, Burgundy and Rhone valley, some of which may have been applied to enclosed communities of canons. Certainly the way of life practiced at St. Maurice d'Agaune, a mixed community of monks and canons, appears to have been influenced

¹⁴ For details of the contents of this manuscript see: Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 32-33 and pp. 44-46. CCCC 191 can be viewed online through Parker on the web. << <https://parker.stanford.edu>>> [Accessed 20/09/2015].

¹⁵ Langefeld, *Old English*, pp. 32-33; Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 570.

¹⁶ *Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, p. 263.

¹⁷ Decker, *Manuskriptensammlung*: <<http://www.tertullian.org/articles/decker_cologne/decker_cologne.htm>> [accessed 16/07/2015].

¹⁸ *Concilium Arelatense*, 813, p. 251.

by: The Rule of Benedict; The Life of Rule of the Jura Fathers; and the Rule of the Four Fathers. In a similar vein, at the Council of Tours (813) no tradition was singled out for use by the canonical clergy, instead, this council (cc. 23-24) requested that the basics of the enclosed life be enforced. While the authors of this document could have drawn on Chrodegang's Rule they may also have simply adapted the provisions of the Rule of Benedict for use with the clerical enclosure.

An interesting feature of the preface to the council of Tours (813) was its reference to a *canonicam regulam*; this does not refer to a specific text, but seems to be a byword for canon law.¹⁹ Alongside the use of Theodulf's First Statute within the cloister and the application of Isidore of Seville's, 'On Ecclesiastical Offices' at the council of Mainz (813), this raises interesting questions regarding what exactly Carolingian churchmen thought of as a distinct Rule for Canons. It opens the possibility that references to 'the canonical institute', 'the rule for canons', or admonitions to 'live according to the canons', were simply requests for bishops to ensure their clerics lived in accordance with the laws of the Church. Again the local bishop was granted the autonomy to select those precepts to be applied within his jurisdiction.

This broad understanding of the meaning of a canonical institute or rule is supported by the analysis of the structure of the Canonical Institute (816) in Part III of this thesis. Here, the relationship between the canon law manual, which forms the first 113 chapters of the Institute, and the *regula canonicorum*, which forms the last 31 chapters, was examined. These two sections of the Institute are very different in form. The canon law manual is made up of quotations and extracts from the works of key theologians and Church thinkers including: Isidore of Seville, Julian Pomerius and Gregory the Great.²⁰ To these works were added the findings of key Church councils such as precepts from the councils of Nicaea (325), Laodicea (333) and Chalcedon (451). Meanwhile, the chapters of the *Regula Canonicorum* (cc. 114-145) quoted less frequently from the works of fathers and instead form a commentary explaining the nature of the canonical life.²¹ This commentary consistently alluded to, or directly

¹⁹ *Concilium Turnonense*, 813, p. 286.

²⁰ *IC*, pp. 312-394.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 394-421, trans., Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 132-175.

mentioned, the precepts found in the canon law manual. Thus for those who compiled the Institute, the *Regula Canoniorum* was explicitly based on canon law. Prominent texts such as Chrodegang's Rule and Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute appear to have been bypassed in favour of the more authoritative texts found within the canon law manual.

It is notable that the Rule of Benedict is not included within the canon law manual. In their attempt to definitely distinguish between the monastic and clerical orders the compilers of the Institute decided that the Benedictine Custom, in its raw form, was to be used solely by monks. Here there was a move away from the advice offered by Pope Zachary in 747. Nonetheless, aspects of the Benedictine rule were incorporated into the Institute, where they were carefully interpreted for use by canons. Such precepts were often placed alongside other canonical texts deemed suitable for clerical use. This can be seen most clearly in the description of the Divine Office (cc. 126-130), which drew primarily on Isidore, but also applied aspects of the Benedictine Custom, interpreted through Bede's homily on Luke 24 (cc. 131-2). This mix of precepts not only ensured that monks and canons would have clearly delineated lives, but also illustrated another key facet of the Canonical Institute, namely a clear focus on concordance. The importance of this cannot be overstated. This thesis has argued that the authors of the Institute sought to compile a text which would be widely accepted in all canonical communities across the empire. While Chrodegang's Rule undoubtedly served as model, it was one of many texts used to compile the new rule. It was often Chrodegang's sources, rather than the rule itself, that proved important to those gathered in 816. Alongside Chrodegang's Rule a large group of other texts and traditions were incorporated into the Canonical Institute. These included: the Rule of Benedict; The *Admonitio Generalis*; Theodulf's First Episcopal Statute; and the works of Isidore of Seville. By drawing widely from both canon law and the texts and traditions created between 750 and 816, the Institute distilled the very essence of the canonical life, defining and distinguishing it from the life of monks. As the discussion of St. Maurice and St. Denis shows, here the authors of the Institute and of the monastic texts compiled in 816/17 were successful. In the wake of these provisions enclosed communities, and their abbots or Provosts, had to select which form of life they would follow. The rigid monastic form or the more flexible canonical life. However, while the new ordinances forced communities to opt for a strictly canonical or monastic form of life, at the local level the distinction between the monastic and

canonical form of life was still debated. This can be seen by the refusal of the monks at St. Denis to adopt the new form of monasticism advocated by Hilduin. Likewise, as the creation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang (c. 850) shows, local responses to central efforts to regulate the life of the clergy continued to dominate even after the issuing of the Canonical Institute (816). As this thesis has shown, to gain anything approaching a full understanding of the regulation of the clergy in this period, it is crucial to examine the interplay between central efforts to establish the norms of the canonical life, and local responses to such attempts.

Appendix

Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS. AA. 90. 11: Adapting Monastic Customs and Canonical Practices for the Clergy.

i. Introduction and Historiography

Bern Burgerbibliothek MS. AA. 90. 11, and the text it contains, presents insights into the regulation of the clergy in the early middle ages.¹ The manuscript is made up of an eight page *libellus* written in one hand, dated by Bischoff to the second half of the tenth or the first half of the eleventh century.² However, the manuscript is as a poor quality copy of an earlier work. It is notable that the manuscript draws exclusively on texts composed around or before 855. Although both Wilmart and Meereseman have suggested that the manuscript was once bound to other works, either a psalter or a *liber vitae*, the manuscript is in fact a consciously created libellus produced for use at a particular time and place. The title of the document suggests that the text was a sermon intended to be read to a group of brothers at a *convivium* or feast: *Incipit Auctoritatem Ante Fratribus Vestris Ad Prandium Vel Convivium Illorum Legere et Intellegere*.³ The *libellus* has been folded lengthways making it pocket sized, suggesting the manuscript had a practical use.⁴

The *libellus* is divided into six chapters, with each section delineated by a large decorative capital. The first four chapters take the form of a sermon reminding the brothers of their duties and of the important virtues they are expected to hold, while the final two chapters consist of litanies to All Saints. Despite this bipartite structure the text functions as a coherent whole and the litanies at the end of the sermon build on themes of chapter 4, which dealt with the treatment of the sick and the remembrance of the dead.

The sermon addressed a group of 13 clerics who elected their own leader, lived separately in their own houses, and owned their own property. Two schools of thought have emerged regarding the nature of the congregation addressed in the sermon. Wilmart, Bertram and Barrow have argued that the text contains fragments of

¹ The text was transcribed and edited in: Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', pp. 43-52.

² Bischoff, *Katalog*, no. 505.

³ Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 43. This conclusion was also made by Hagen when catalogued the manuscript: H. Hagen, *Catalogus Codicum Bernensium* (Bern, 1875), p. 113.

⁴ My thanks to David Ganz for sharing this observation; Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 43; Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternalitatis*, Vol. 1., p. 167.

a lost rule for canons, representing a tradition independent of Chrodegang's Rule.⁵ Meanwhile, Meersseman, McLaughlin, Bischoff and Meriaux have suggested that the text was part of the regulations governing a confraternity of extra-claustral clerics.⁶ In particular, Meersseman has associated the Bern MS. with the Parisian 'society of the twelve apostles'.⁷ The names of the 14 members of this society are recorded in a mid-ninth century Parisian Sacramentary (Rome, BAV Ottob. Lat. 313).⁸ Given the sermon's consistent focus on mutual charity, and on '*societas et fraternitatis*', it seems that in its current form the document addresses a confraternity rather than an enclosed community.⁹ Nonetheless, as the following table shows, the libellus combined extracts from monastic customs with material commonly used by confraternities of extra-claustral clerics:

⁵ Wilmart considered the text to date from the mid- eighth century and suggested that it may have been used by English community living in the area around Orléans: Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', pp. 37-43; Bertram and Barrow reject Wilmart's dating and suggest that the Rule was created in West Francia during the ninth century: Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 8; Barrow, 'Chrodegang', p. 203, fn. 9; Barrow, *Clergy*, p. 81.

⁶ Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp. 150-69; B. Bischoff, *Mittelalterlich Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 61-2, fn. 31; McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 67-101, at 84-85 C. Meriaux 'Orde et Hiérarchie au Sein du Clergé Rural Pendant Le Haut Moyen Âge', in F. Bougard, D. Iogna-Prat & R. Le Jan (eds.) *Hierarchie et Stratification Sociale Dans L'Occident Medieval (400-1100)*, (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 130-33.

⁷ Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp. 150-69.

⁸ For a discussion of the manuscript and the names recorded in the Sacramentary see: L. Delisle, *Memoire Sur d'Anciennes Sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886), pp. 149-151, pp. 372-389 and for the society of the twelve apostles see: pp. 149-151 and 374-389, at 376-7.

⁹ For discussions of confraternities in early middle ages see: Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp.3-35; O. G. Oxele, 'Conjuratio et Ghilde dans l'Antique et dans le Haut Moyen Age: Remarques sure la Continuité des Formes de La Vie Sociale', *Franica*, 10 (1982), pp. 151-214; McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 67-101.

Table 4: Contents of Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS. AA. 90. 11

Chapter	Theme	Sources
1	Monastic virtues.	Prologue to the Rule of Benedict.
2	Mutual Charity.	The <i>Ubi Caritas</i> hymn.
3	The selection of the Senior, details of the <i>Convivium</i> , and the behaviour of the congregation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serapion's speech, Rule of the Four Fathers. • Hincmar of Rheims, First Episcopal Statute (852).
4	Treatment of the sick and remembrance of the dead.	Biblical.
5	Litany.	Unknown.
6	Litany to All Saints.	Unknown.

This use of monastic texts suggests that the origins of the sermon lie within the cloister, and that the practices of a community of canons or monks were adapted for use by a confraternity of extra-claustral clerics. This document therefore sheds light on the processes analysed within this thesis, and illustrates the porous nature of the enclosure. The following analysis will focus on the monastic themes within the document and suggest that at their *convivium* the confraternity sought to create a sacred space in the image of the cloister, renewing their spiritual vigour by adapting the practices of canonical and monastic communities. The geographical origins of the *libellus* will also be discussed.

ii. Description and Analysis

ii.a. Chapter 1

The first chapter opens with a brief statement regarding the universality of the Church.¹⁰ This is followed by an extensive quotation from verses 8-50 of the prologue

¹⁰ Igitur cognoscat universalis ecclesiam, que per totam orbem terrarum longe latequae in pace est diffusa, quod dominus noster Jesus Christus cunctis in se credentes, et ad se fideliter venientes, omnes vult salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire. Unde ipse per semet ipsum ait: venite ad me omnes

to the Benedictine Rule, however, the author consciously erased any references to monasticism and replaced them with phrases more suitable for a confraternity of extra-claustral clerics. In verse 49 the phrase, *et fide caritas sive societas et fraternitatis* was inserted, while in verse 50 the phrase *in monasterio* was replaced with *in hac societatis*.¹¹ This combination of a statement of the universality of the Church with the prologue to the Rule of Benedict offered a clear message, that the ideals of the enclosed life should be applied to all who serve the Church. In particular, Benedict's instruction to establish, 'a school for the Lord's service' [*domici scola servitii*] may be seen as the founding principle of the confraternity.¹² By drawing on the Rule of Benedict in this fashion, the author of the sermon shared the same agenda as Chrodegang, Theodulf of Orléans and the compilers of the Canonical Institute (816), all of whom used the Rule of Benedict to establish the ideals of the clerical life both inside and outside the enclosure. While sharing the same agenda, Chrodegang, Theodulf and the author of the Bern MS. approach the Rule of Benedict independantly. They selected the precepts that best suited their needs. For the author of the *libellus*, the prologue to the Benedictine Rule also served as an ideal opening for his sermon, reminding the clerics of the idealised life practised within cloister. An image they were to reflect when they convened at the *convivium*.

ii.b. Chapter 2

The second chapter begins with the command that the congregation 'listen and understand' [*Audite et Intelligere, qui in congregatione ista*].¹³ It also instructed that this section of the sermon was to be delivered 'after the same homily or chapter.' [*Sequitur omelia vel capitulum eiusdem*].¹⁴ The chapter was therefore intended to form part of a coherent sermon. Moving away from the Rule of Benedict, the chapter focuses on charity and takes the form of an exposition on the *ubi caritas* hymn. It

qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego reficam vos. Tollite iugum super vos, et discite quia mittis sum et umilis corde, et invenietis requiem animabus vestris; Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', pp. 43-44.

¹¹ Processu vero conservationis, et fidei dilatato corde inenarrabili dilectionis **et fide caritatis sive societatis et fraternitatis**, dulcedinis curritur, viam mandatorum Dei. Ut ab ipsius numquam magisterio discidentes, in eius doctrinam usque ad mortem in **hac societatis** perseverantes, passionibus Christi per patientiam participemus ut et regno eius mereamur esse consortes; Ibid., p. 45. For the original text see: *RB*, pp. 8-9. See also: Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., p. 155.

¹² Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 45.

¹³ Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 46.

¹⁴ Ibid.

opens with an adaption of the first verse of this hymn explaining the need for mutual charity within the society. Verse one is copied below with the additions to the original hymn marked in bold:¹⁵

Congregavit **itaque** nos **frates** in unum Christi amor, exultemus et in ipso iocundemur, **ut subjecti invicem in timore Christi esse mereamur**. Timeamus et amemus **dominium** deum **verum** ex **toto** corde diligamus nos sincerae, **quia** ubi caritas est vera deus ibi est.¹⁶

After this adapted quotation, the author departs from the original structure of the text and constructs an homelitic speech around select verses of hymn. He replaced the refrain, *ubi caritas est vera, deus ibi est* with biblical and patristic quotations. The congregation were reminded of the biblical origins of the mutual charity that defined their society.¹⁷ The final section of the chapter is the most significant, it commemorated Christ's washing of the disciple's feet, and his *mandatum* given at the last supper (John 13.34). Here those dining and listening to the sermon were reminded that they were an image of the apostolic community, and it is possible that a *mandatum* ceremony took place as part of the *conviva*.¹⁸ Such rituals mirrored those experienced within the enclosure, and the Rule of Benedict (c. 35) commanded that the weekly server 'should wash everyone's feet'.¹⁹ In chapters 3 and 4 the sermon discussed the duties of the *epdomade* who was tasked with celebrating mass, and this figure may also have washed the feet of his brothers. Likewise, following the example of chapter 38 of the Rule of Benedict, *De Ebdomadario Lectore*, this weekly server was likely responsible for reading the sermon at the *convivium*.²⁰ The final lines of the chapter build on the imagery of the apostolic community and seek the intercession of St. Peter, who was the patron saint of the society: *Beato Petro interveniente eius suffragia, et intercessione in eterna beatitudine gaudere mereamur, pro cuius hic amore Christus in unum congregavit nos*.²¹ Such toasts were often part of the rituals

¹⁵ For the hymn in its original form, see: *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, (ed.), K. Strecker, MGH, *Antiquitates*, Poetae Latini Medii Aevi IV, Teil II, (Berlin, 1923), pp. 526-529.

¹⁶ Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 46.

¹⁷ Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 41; Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp. 155-160.

¹⁸ For discussions of the *mandatum* ceremony see: J. Monti, *The Week of Salvation: History and Traditions of Holy Week* (Huntington, Ind, 1993), pp. 108-117.

¹⁹ *RB*, pp. 126-127.

²⁰ *RB*, pp. 134-135.

²¹ Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 47

that accompanied the meetings of confraternities.²² The chapter explained the fundamental principles that lay at the heart of the relationship between members of the confraternity, but also invoked the practices of the enclosure. These themes continued in the next section of the sermon.

ii.c. Chapters 3

Chapter 3 of the text is the most informative part of the manuscript. It discussed the norms of the community and instructed the brothers on how they were to live and act. The chapter began with a description of how the senior was to be appointed and stressed his authority over the rest of the community, stating:

Therefore you brothers, who in fellowship live one life, and who long to venerate and obey in honour of St Peter the first apostle. In the first order we remind you that you may appoint one of the seniors to be in charge over you brothers, neither by debate or command may you remove him, but just as the master commands all obey with joy.²³

This description of the senior's election and statement of his authority was adapted from the speech of Serapion in the Rule of the Four Fathers:

Bern MS AA. 90. 11	Rule of the Four Fathers
Amonemus vos et ordo primus ut unum preesse seniorum super vos fratres constituatis, nec ab eius consilio vel imperio discedatis. Sed sicut inperio domini, com omni letitia obediatis. ²⁴	'Volumus ergo unum praeesse seniore super omnes fratres, nec ab eius consilio uel imperio quicquam sinistrum declinare, sed sicut imperio Domini cum omni laetitia oboedire. ²⁵

After this quotation the chapter provided more details of the authority of the senior who served a judicial function:

²² Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp. 157-61.

²³ 'Vobis igitur fratres, qui in hu<ni>us sotitete persistere capitis, que vos in honore beati Petri, principis apostolorum venerare obedire desideratis. Amonemus vos et ordo primus ut unum preese seniorum super vos fratres constituatis, nec ab eius consilio vel imperio discedatis. Sed sicut inperio domini, com omni letitia obediatis.' Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 47.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ J. Neufville, 'Règle des IV Pères et Seconde Règle des Pères: Texte Critique', *Revue Bénédictine*, 77, (1967), pp. 47-106.

And if it happens that there is contention or grumbling between any of you, let them come to the one who rules and any who happen to be guilty of offence against their brother, each one should confess adequately. And if any of those at fault might come seeking penance or correction under the command of your first and master, thus may you do and obey that which Paul said: ‘Obey your prelates’, and the Lord said: ‘I do not wish to sacrifice, but I obey.’ And [those] who appear to disobey and contradict, the well founded rebuke concerning what ever slanderous offence that brother did, rather concerning the time of condemnation of the guilty party, if you are unwilling to be corrected through the master’s command, and if you are unwilling to do penance you are thence liable to appear to leave and not belong to the community.²⁶

The author of the sermon once again expanded on the speech of Serapion, using the same biblical quotations (St. Paul and Matthew) found within the rule to justify the ultimate authority of the senior:

Bern MS AA. 90. 11	Rule of the Four Fathers, c.4
Paulus apostolus dixit: obedite prepositis vestris, et dominus dixit: nolo sacrificium. Sed obedientiam. ²⁷	Dicente apostolo ad Hebreos: oboedite praepositis vestris , quia ipsi uigilant pro uobis, et dominus dixit: Nolo sacrificium, sed oboedientiam. ²⁸

The use of the Rule of the Four Fathers within the manuscript has hitherto gone unnoticed, but it is significant and may well reflect the use of this rule within an enclosed community of canonical clergy. As discussed in Part II of this thesis, there is some evidence to suggest the Rule of the Four Fathers was used alongside the Rule of Benedict at St. Maurice d’Agaune. It is also notable that this precept appears

²⁶ Et si quod inter vos contentio aut murmuratio euenerit ad eius inperio qui uobis preerit a<d> satisfactionem unus quisque qui in culpam inciderit contra fratrem suum ueniat. Et si in illa culpa emendatio sive penitentia sicut principes et magister vester iusserit, sic faciatis et obedite illum sicut Paulus apostolus dixit, ‘obedite prepositis vestris’, et dominus dixit, ‘nolo sacrificium sed obedientiam’. Et qui inobediens vel contradictor extiterit, de qualcumque culpa illum frater suus increpauerit[t] sit de blasphemia, aut de dampno reum tempora, si per iussionem magistri vestri emendare noluerit, et inde reus extiterit, abitiatur a uobis extraneus si penitentiam inde facere noluerit’. Wilmart, ‘Règlement Ecclésiastique’, p. 47

²⁷ Wilmart, ‘Règlement Ecclésiastique’, p. 47.

²⁸ Neufville, Règle des IV Pères’, pp. 47-106. For translation see: T. G. Kardong, ‘The Rule of the Four Fathers: A New English Translation and Commentary’, *American Benedictine Review*, 54:2 (June, 2003), pp. 146-152.

prominently in chapter 8, *De Oboedientia*, of Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia Regularum*, again suggesting the text was used in the enclosure during the ninth century.²⁹

After discussing the authority of the senior the sermon moved on to highlight things that ought to be avoided at the *convivium*. Laymen were to be excluded and bad behaviour and vices associated with the laity were not permitted:

May there not be discord between you brothers, nor pride, nor anger, nor drunkenness, nor hatred, nor falsehoods nor blood-letting, nor grumbling, nor evil coveting, nor deceit, nor glorification. But between you may the least be the first. By this solemnity or condition you ought to come when it is the feast day, may you not be late, nor unruly, but all ought to come with cheerfulness to this house.³⁰

The exclusivity of the confraternity, and its focus on the virtuous behaviour expected by those who attended the *convivium*, expressed the ideals of the cloister. Such principles appear again later on in the chapter, where the rituals that accompanied the feast are provided. Here the text returns to the theme of the senior's authority referring to him as the dean or master:

Your dean, who in truth is the head of you, let him appoint the lector to read the reading. Verily you are urged to be silent and let no superfluous words be spoken between you. But with all silence eat, drink and listen.

Your properly named master, let him have command of the door, so that through the whole house silence may be maintained.

Your well-founded dean, let him give a small signal before [the meal], when the dean sounds the signal let the servants carry and distribute this and that. [*qualecumque*]. You are to eat and drink at the house and afterwards praise and glorify the Lord, and you are to give appropriate thanks, because he 'gives food to all flesh'.

Next you are to go to the church and with all silence, exhorting [*exorare*] the Lord, say the seven penitential psalms, chapters and prayers for your dead brothers. Then return to the house where you were, and there while your servants are among you give praise and

²⁹ *Concordia Regularum*, p. 110.

³⁰ Nulla sit inter vos fratres discordia, nulla superbia, nulla ira, nulla ebrietas, nulla invidia, nulla fasitas, nulla detractio, nulla murmuratio, nulla mal concipiscentia, nulla simulatio, nulla aelatio. Sed sit inter vos minor sicut princeps Ad illius sollemnitatem vel qualecumque diem quando ad convi<vi>um venire debetis, nullus sit tardus, nullus neglegensm sed cum omni hilaritate ad domum. Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 48.

thanks to God, and [let] peace, love, goodwill, charity and brotherhood flow between you, and each and everyone with the assistance of God [shall] go to his own house with gladness.³¹

The dean's appointment of the lector mirrors the practices of c. 38 of the Rule of Benedict and the guarding of the doors suggests that the *convivium* sought to copy the practices of enclosed communities by locking themselves into the house where they met.³² At their meetings the members of the confraternity created an exclusive spiritual space in the image of the cloister. The clerics became one community of brothers sharing the principles of the enclosed life. No laymen were permitted and the ideals of humility and virtue were espoused. When each cleric left the *convivium* they were spiritually refreshed, returning to their 'own house with gladness'. Such rituals may have provided a means of renewing the practices experienced as youthful oblates within the enclosure. Similarly, these extra-claustral clerics may have sought to reflect the practices of the episcopal motherhouse at their *convivium*.

Mériaux has also pointed out that this section of the chapter follows the requirements outlined in chapter 14 of Hincmar of Rheims' First Episcopal Statute (852).³³ Hincmar instructed that at a *convivium*, the Dean was to bless the food and one of the clerics was to read a passage of holy reading. Next, the priests were to recite a hymn, a request also made within chapter 3 of the sermon.³⁴ The Bern

³¹ Decanus vero vester qui vobis preest iubeat lectori ut lectionem legat. Silentia vero intra vos agite, et non verba superflua intra vos si<n>t locuta, sed cum omni silentio manducate et bibite aut <au>scultate.

Magister vero vester iubeat ostiariae, ut per totum domum illius silentium faciat.

Decanus vero vester signum paruum ante se habeat; et qualcumque mense ministri et afferre debeant, decanus signum sonat. Edentes et bibentes que apud vos sunt, et postea domino laudate et glorificate, et dignas gratias illic agite, quia dat escam omni carne.

Deinde ad ecclesiam pergite et cum omni silentio septem psalmos penitentiae pro fratribus vestris defunctis domino exore, et capitula et orationibus. Ad domum denique peragite ubi primus fuistis, et ibi dum ministris vestris cunctis inter vos dem laudate et glorificate, pacem et amorem et dilectionem, caritatem et fraternitatem inter vos abete, et cum dei adiutorio unusquisque ad propria cum gaudio semeat; Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', pp. 48-49.

³² *RB*, pp. 134-137.

³³ Mériaux, 'Ordre et Hierarchie', pp. 129-136.

³⁴ Quando autem convenerint presbyteri ad aliquod convivium, decanus aut aliquis prior illorum versum ante mensam incipiat et cibum benedicat. Et tunc secundum suum ordinem consequantur 66 alter alterius honorem portantes et per vicissitudines cibum et potum benedicant et aliquis de illorum clericis aliquid de sancta lectione legat et post refectionem similiter sanctum hymnum dicant ad exemplum domini et salvatoris ac discipulorum eius, sicut illum in cena fecisse legimus. Et sic se contineant omnes presbyteri in omni loco maxime in talibus, ne, sicut dicit apostolus, vituperetur ministerium nostrum; Hincmar von Reims, *Erstes Kapitular*, MGH, *Capit. Epis. II*, p. 41-42; Wilmart, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 48.

manuscript does not quote directly from Hincmar's text, but the author of the sermon seems to be familiar with the statute. He combined Hincmar's new precepts with the older principles of the Rule of the Four Fathers, and the focus on joy and harmony that defined the spirit of confraternity were the also the foundations of the communal life in the Rule of the Four Fathers:

‘Scripture says: ‘How good and pleasant it is for brothers to live together’ and again, ‘He makes people live harmoniously in a house’. Since the Holy Spirit makes this clear teaching of piety very firm, let us get on with the task of laying down a Rule for the brothers. Therefore brothers, we want you to live with harmony and joy in a house, but let us set down with God's help how this very harmony and joy may be maintained in good order’.³⁵

ii.d. Chapter 4

Chapter 4 continued to describe the relationship between members of the society but, unlike the previous chapters, this section of the text was not based around an adaption of monastic rules. It primarily discussed the practical arrangements for the care of sick brethren and deceased members of the society. All brethren were to visit any member who fell ill, and one of the congregation was to be tasked with supervising the care of the sick. Collectively, the brethren were to sing psalms, recite litanies, and offer masses for their ailing brother.³⁶ After his death the name of the deceased was to be inscribed in the *cartellum* of the society, and masses were said for him.³⁷ While these rituals were typical of early medieval confraternities, in places chapter 4 of the sermon again suggests that elements of the communal life inspired the behaviour expected of the congregation.³⁸ As Meersseman has observed, chapter 4 discussed the private property and houses of the individuals who made up the

³⁵ Kardong, ‘The Rule of the Four Fathers’, p. 147.

³⁶ Item amoneo vos fratres, ut si aliquis ex vobis fretribus infirmatur, elegite unum ex vobis qui alios nontiat et ite itaque cunctis ad domum eius, et cum omni diligentia visitae eum, ibique septem psalmos penitenciales decantate, cum letania et capitularum et orationibus, deinde aqua benedicta facite. Wilmart, ‘Règlement Ecclésiastique’, p. 49.

³⁷ Et in quacumque tempus qualis cumque ex vobis fratribus de hoc seculo migraverit, in hoc cartello dactarum eius obitu<s> et scrib<it>e in memoriam agite, ut unus quisque ex vobis qui hunc cartellum secum habverit in epdomade suae illum dactarum invenerit quo frater suus in hoc seculo transierit, missa pro eo celebrare. Ibid., p. 51.

³⁸ For the commemoration of the dead by confraternities see: McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 67-101; Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1., pp. 150-169.

society.³⁹ Clearly the confraternity did not hold communal property in the same way as a community of canons, despite this the sermon commanded rich members of the confraternity to willingly donate some of their possession to their less affluent brothers.⁴⁰ The congregation were also obligated to pay for the funeral of poorer members of the society.⁴¹ This represents a halfway house between the communal holding of property that defined the life of the canons, and the holding of private property that was the domain of the secular cleric.

Maintaining the theme of charity, chapter 4 also highlighted that every brother must take a turn hosting *convivium*:

Just as, indeed, your names were written here in turn, so do [this] each week through the year; and so let each and every one receive your brethren into his house for the festivities of St Peter, and they supply to them for the feasting bread and salt and water and fire. Do this in the same way for [the festivities of] the forerunner John [the Baptist], and minister through service.⁴²

By doing so, each member of the congregation would not only fulfil his duties to his brothers, but would replicate the model of the cloister within his own abode. As chapter 35 of the Rule of Benedict states: ‘The brothers should serve each other in turn and nobody should be excused from kitchen duty’.⁴³ By serving as host each cleric would enact Benedict’s precept.

ii.e. Chapters 5 & 6

The two litanies that make up chapters 5 & 6 of the document reflected the concern with the sick and dying expressed within chapter 4. Both prayers use the phrase ‘free us from all evil’, which was a common characteristic of litanies used in the visitation

³⁹ Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1, pp. 154.

⁴⁰ Nullus fratrem suum qui plus potest minorem pro paupertatem suam detrahit, non spernit, non blasphematur; sed cum omni mansuetudine attendite quod Paulus apostolus dicit: ‘Sollicite servate unitatem spiritus in vinculo pacis’ et iterum, ‘unum corpus et unus spiritus, sicut vocati in una spe vocationis vestrae’. Wilmart, ‘Règlement Ecclésiastique’, p. 49.

⁴¹ Si vero de suo proprio invenire positis ut communiter agapen ibi positis ducere, agite caritate. Si de suo esse non possit facere, de vestro communiter, et cum gaudio discedite. Ibid., p. 50.

⁴² Sicut vero nomina vestra hic scripta sunt per ordinem, sic facite ebdomadas vestras in anno, et sic recipiat unusquisque ex vobis fratribus suis ad domum eius in festivitatibus sancti Petri, et ministrant illis panem et sale et aqua et ignem ad manducandum. Vel similiter Iohannis precursoris, et ministrat servitio. Ibid., p. 51.

⁴³ *RB*, pp. 126-127.

of the sick and dying.⁴⁴ The litany in chapter 5 provides key information regarding the setting in which this sermon would be read, stating: *per merita et oraciones et intercessionem omnium sanctorum tuorum, quorum hodie festivitas celebratur*.⁴⁵ It seems the sermon was composed for the feast of All Saints, which may explain the description of the treatment of the sick and dead within chapter 4, as it was common practice to commemorate the dead on this feast day.⁴⁶

The litany in chapter 6 also addresses All Saints, opening with the phrase: *Omnes sancti spiritus et anime iustorum, intercedite pro nobis*.⁴⁷ The prayer sought the intercession of a plethora of saints, those included in the litany are listed in order below:

- Mary.
- Michael; Gabriel; Raphael.
- John the Baptist; Peter; Paul; Andrew; Bartholomew; James; John; Matthew; Thomas; Judas; Thaddaeus; Matthias; Barnabas; Mark.
- Stephen; Linus; Cletus; Clemens; Denis and companions; Maurice and companions; Sixtus; Lawrence; Hippolytus; Symphorian; Sebastian; Fabian; Cornelius; Cyprian; Gervase; Protase; Christopher; Exuperius; Candidus; Victor; Cosma; Damian.
- Martin; Ambrose; Jerome; Gregory; Germaine; Remi; Vedaste; Amande.
- Felicity; Perpetua; Agatha; Lucia; Agnes; Cecilia; Anastasia; Bridget; Genevieve; Margaret; Susanna; Fausta.

Both Meersseman and Bertram have used this list as a means of identifying the geographical origins of the *libellus*. Bertram notes that the litany contains many French saints, and on these grounds dismissed Wilmar's suggestion that the manuscript had links to an English community settled on the continent.⁴⁸ Meersseman also used the list to support his argument that the manuscript was associated with the

⁴⁴ Libera nos, clemens trinitas sancta, cum omnibus fratribus nostris ab omni malo.... Ab omni malo libera nos; Wilmar, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', pp. 51-52. For a discussion of the use of such litanies see: M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints* (London, 1991), pp. 44-45.

⁴⁵ Wilmar, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 51.

⁴⁶ D. Iogna-Prat, 'The Dead in the Celestial Bookkeeping of the Cluniac Monks Around the Year 1000' in L. K. Little and B. Rosenwein (eds.), *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 344-345.

⁴⁷ Wilmar, 'Règlement Ecclésiastique', p. 52.

⁴⁸ Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, p. 9

Parisian ‘Society of the Twelve Apostles’.⁴⁹ He noted that the Parisian saints St. Denis and St. Genevieve were mentioned in the litany, and that several others saints, with cults based in Northern Francia, were also listed. These included: St. Germaine, St. Remi, St. Vedaste and St. Amande. Yet, saints popular in the Burgundy and the Rhone valley also appear in the litany. Notably, St. Maurice and his companions were mentioned, as were St. Victor, St. Gervase and St. Protase. When this evidence is combined with the use of the Rule of the Four Fathers within the sermon, and allusions to that rule within the foundation charter of St. Maurice d’Agaune, a Southern origin may also be suggested. It is possible that the combination of texts found within the *libellus* could have been associated with the monastery of St. Maurice d’Agaune.

iii. Conclusion

It is highly significant that the way of life practised by this confraternity was in part governed by monastic texts adapted for clerical purposes. Equally, it is notable that the texts selected were not the authorised rules for canons, such as that produced by Chrodegang in the mid-eighth century or the Canonical Institute compiled at Aachen in 816. This may be indicative of the wider practice of adapting monastic texts for use by clerical groups, both within the cloister and outside it, highlighting the permeability of the clerical enclosure in the Carolingian era. As noted above for Chrodegang, and for the compilers of the Canonical Institue, the distinction between those clerics who lived in the enclosure and those who ministered to outside world was paper thin. As Part I of this thesis suggested the communal ownership of property was a key distinguishing feature of the canonical clergy. The confraternity described in the *libellus* did not meet this criteria, but they sought to apply many of the customs and practices of enclosed communities at their *convivium*. The enclosed life was the ideal for all who served the Church, and although more was expected of those who lived in the cloister, these norms were applied to all clerics. The Bern MS. is testament to this practice.

⁴⁹ Meersseman and Pacini, *Ordo Fraternitatis*, Vol. 1, p. 167.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Admonitio Generalis*, (eds.), H. Mordek et al., *Die Admonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usum Scholarum Separatim Editi*, XVI (Wisebaden, 2013), pp. 179-243
- Admonitio Generalis*, 789, MGH, *Capit. I*, pp. 53-62; trans., P. D. King, *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Kendal, 1987), pp. 209-217
- Alcuini sive Albini epistolae*, (ed.), E. Dümmmler, MGH, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, *Epp. IV* (Berlin, 1895), pp. 1-493; extracts trans., S. Allott, *Alcuin of York: His Life and Letters* (York, 1974)
- Annales Laureshamense* [Annals of Lorsch], (ed.), G. H. Pertz, MGH, *SS. I* (Hanover, 1826) pp. 22-39; extracts trans., P. D. King, *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Kendal, 1987) pp. 137-145
- Annales Mettense Priores* [Earlier Annals of Metz] (ed.), B. von Simson, MGH, *SRG in Usum Separatim Editi*, X (Hanover, 1905), pp. 1-98
- Annales Mosellani*, 762, (ed.) I. M. Lappenberg, MGH, *SS. XVI* (Hanover, 1859), pp. 491-499
- Annales Qui Dicuntur Einhardi* [Revised Royal Frankish Annals], (ed.), F. Kurze, MGH, *SRG in Usum Separatim Editi*, VI (Hanover, 1895); trans., B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Michigan, 1970), pp. 35-127
- Annales regni francorum* [Royal Frankish Annals], (ed.), F. Kurze, MGH, *SRG in Usum Separatim Editi*, VI (Hanover, 1895); trans., B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Michigan, 1970), pp. 35-127
- Benedicti Anianensis Concordia Regularum*, (ed.) P. Bonnerue, CCCM 168A (Turnhout: 1999)
- Bonifati et Lull Epistolae*, (ed.), E. Dümmmler, MGH, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, *Epp. III* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 215-433; trans., E. Emerton *Letters of Saint Boniface* (New York, 1940)
- Brevium Exempla Ad Describendas Res Ecclesiasticas et Fiscales*, MGH, *Capit. I*, no. 128, pp. 252-256; trans., Loyn & Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 98-106
- Capitula de Causis cum Episcopis et Abbatibus Tractandis*, MGH, *Capit. I*, no. 72, pp. 162-164; trans., J. L. Nelson, 'The Voice of Charlemagne' in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.) *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 87-88
- Capitula Tractanda cum Comitibus Episcopis et Abbatibus*, 811, MGH, *Capit. I*, no. 71, pp. 161-162; trans., J. L. Nelson, 'The Voice of Charlemagne' in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.) *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 85-86
- Capitulare De Villis*, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 32, pp. 82-91; trans., Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 64-73
- Capitulare Missorum Generale*, 802, MGH, *Capit. I*, c. 1, no. 33, p. 91-100; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 233-432
- Capitulare Vernense*, a. 755, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 14, pp. 33-37

- Carolingian Polyptyques Database* (University of Leicester):
 <<<http://www.le.ac.uk/hi/polyptyques/index.html>>>
- Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Gorze* (ed.) A. d'Herbomez (ed.), (Paris, 1898)
- Charters of Christ Church Canterbury, Part 1*, (ed.), N. P. Brooks and S. Kelly (eds.), (Oxford, 2013)
- Chronicon Moissiacense*, (ed.), G. Pertz, MGH, *SS I*, (Hanover, 1826), p. 280-313; extracts trans., King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 145-149
- Codex Carolinus*, (ed.), W. Gundlach MGH, *Epistolae Merovingi et Karolini aevi I* (Epp. III), (Berlin, 1892), pp. 476-657. Facsimile edition: F. Unterkircher (ed.), *Codex Epistolaris Carolinus*: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek *Codex 449*, *Codices Selecti Phototypice Impressi*, 3 (Graz, 1962)
- Codices Electronici Ecclesiae Coloniensis* (Universität zu Köln):
 <<<http://www.ceec.uni-koeln.de>>>
- Concilia in Monasterio Sancti Dyonisii Habita*, 829-30, MGH, *Capit. II*, nos. 52 and 53, pp. 683-694
- Concilium Arelatense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, no. 34 p. 248-253
- Concilium Attiniacense* a. 762, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, no. 13 pp. 72-73
- Concilium Cabillonense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, no. 37, p. 273-286
- Concilium Francofurtense*, 794, MGH, *Conc. II, Teil I*, no. 19, pp. 110-171; trans. Loyn and Percival, *Charlemagne*, pp. 56-63
- Concilium in Austrasia Habitu Q. D Germanicum*, 742, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, pp. 1-4
- Concilium Moguntinense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, no. 36, p. 258-273
- Concilium Romanum*, a. 743, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, p. 8-32
- Concilium Toletanum Decimum-Sectum*, PL 84, col. 557-586
- Concilium Turnonense*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II*, Teil I, no. 38, p. 286-294.
- Concilium Vernense*, 755, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 14, pp. 32-37
- Council of Clovesho*, 747, (eds.), A. W. Hadden and W. Stubbs (ed.), *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. III (Oxford, 1871), pp. 360-383; trans., J. Johnson, *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the English Church*, Vol. II (Oxford, 1851), pp. 242-263
- Councilium Moguntium*, 847, MGH, *Capit. II, Teil II*, no. 248, p. 173-84
- Decretum Compendiense*, 757, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 15, pp. 37-40
- Decretum Vermeriense*, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 16, pp. 39-42
- Die Hildebold'sche Manuskriptensammlung des Kölner Domes* (ed.), A. Decker (Bonn, 1895)
- Die Urkunden der Karolinger I: Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Großen.*, (eds.), E. Mühlbacher et al., MGH, *Diplomata Karolinorum I* (Hanover, 1906)
- Epistolae Variorum Carolo Magno Regnante Scriptae*, (ed.), E. Dümmler, MGH

- Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, *Epp. IV* (Berlin, 1895), pp. 494-567
- Epistolae variorum inde a morte Caroli Magni usque ad divisionem imperii collectae* (ed.) E. Dümmler, MGH *Epp. V*, (Berlin, 1899), pp. 299-360
- Ex Adonis Archiepiscopi Viennensis Chronico*, (ed.), G. Pertz, MGH, *SS II*, (Hanover, 1829), pp. 312-323
- Flodoard Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, Lib III, (eds.), G. Waitz and J. Heller, MGH, *SS XIII* (Hanover, 1881), pp. 405-600
- Heito von Basel, Testimonia de processione spiritus sancti*, (ed.) H. Willjung, *Das Konzil von Aachen, 809*, MGH, *Conc., II, Suppl. 2* (Hannover, 1998), pp. 385-399
- Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis epistolae*, (ed.), E. Perelp, MGH, *Epp. VIII, Teil 1*, (Hanover, 1985)
- Hincmarus De Ordine Palatii*, (eds.), R. Schieffer and T. Gross, MGH, *Fontes Iuris Germani Antiqui, In Usus Schorlaum Separatim Editi*, III, (Hanover, 1980), pp. 31-101; trans., D. Herlihy, in P. Dutton (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader* (Toronto, 2004), pp. 516-534
- Hinkmar von Reims, *Viertes Kapitular*, MGH, *Capit. Epis. II*, p. 80-86
- Imperiale De Restauratione Habitus Monachorum Beati Dyonisii*, (ed.) J. Tardif, *Monuments Historique*, no. 124 (Paris, 1866), pp. 86-9
- Institutio Canonorum Concilii Aquisgranensis* a. 816, [The Canonical Institute] (ed.), A. Werminghoff, MGH, *Conc. II.1* (Hanover, 1906), pp. 307-421; extracts trans., J. Bertram (ed. and trans.,) *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 132-175
- Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi, Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri*, (ed.), W. M. Lindsay, (Oxford 1911), Digitised as part of the Latin Library: <<<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/isidore.html>>>; trans, S. A. Barney et al., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge, 2006)
- Julian Pomerii De Vita Contemplativa*, *PL* 59, col 411-20
- Karoli Magni Capitula e Canonibus Excerpta*, a. 813, MGH, *Conc. II, Teil 1*, no. 38A, pp. 294-297
- La Donation d'Ayroenus à St. Maurice*, (ed.), M. Bisson, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclesiastique Suisse*, 3 (1909), pp. 294-296
- Le Règlement Ecclésiastique de Berne*, (ed.), A. Wilmart, *Revue Bénédictine*, 51 (1939), pp. 37-52
- Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus*, (ed. and trans.,) D. Kempf, *Paul the Deacon, Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus: Edition, Translation, and Introduction*. (Paris, 2013), pp. 48-91
- Liber Pontificalis* [Book of the Popes], (ed.), L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, Vol. I. (Paris, 1886); trans., R. Davis, *The Lives of the Eighth Century Popes* (Liverpool, 1992)
- Memoire Sur d'Anciens Sacramentaires* (ed.) L. Delisle (Paris, 1886)

- Opus Carolini Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*, (eds.), A. Freeman and P. Meyvaert, MGH, *Conc. II, Supplementum I* (Hanover, 1998), pp. 97-561
- Parker on the Web, <<<https://parker.stanford.edu>>>
- Pippi Italiae Regis Capitulare*, MGH, *Capit. I*, no. 91, pp. 191-194
- Pippini Capitulare Aquitanicum*, 768, MGH, *Capit I*, no. 18, pp. 42-43; trans., King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 202-203
- Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, (ed.), K. Strecker, MGH, *Antiquitates, Poetae Latini Medii Aevi IV, Teil II*, (Berlin, 1923)
- Regesta Alsaciae aevi merovingi et karolini, 490-918*, (ed.) A. Bruckner, (Strasbourg, 1949)
- Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, (ed.), P. Jaffre (Leipzig, 1885)
- Règle des IV Pères et Seconde Règle des Pères: Texte Critique*, (ed.) J. Neufville, *Revue Bénédictine*, 77, (1967), pp. 47-106
- Regula Longior Canoniorum seu Regula S. Chrodegangi Interpolata*, [The Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang], (ed. and trans.), J. Bertram, *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 184-286
- Regula Sancti Chrodegangi*, [Chrodegang's Rule], (ed. and trans.), J. Bertram, *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: Critical Texts with Translations and Commentary* (Aldershot, 2005) pp. 27-84
- Report of the Legates*, (eds.), A. W. Hadden and W. Stubbs (ed.), *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. III (Oxford, 1871, pp. 447-462; trans., B. Carela, *Alcuin and Alfred: Two Anglo-Saxon Legal Reformers* (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of North Carolina, 2006), pp. 99-120
- Sancti Georgii Florentii Gregorii Episcopi Turnensis Libri Miraculorum*, *PL*, Vol. 71, col. 705-800; trans., R. van Dam, *Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Martyrs* (Liverpool, 1988)
- Sancti Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, *PL* 83, col. 737-826; trans., T. L. Knoebel, *Isidore of Seville: De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (Mahwah, NJ, 1989)
- Texte du Privilège d'Etienne II d'après e MS. Lat. 2777 de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, (ed.), A. J. Stoclet, 'Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710-784), Abbé et Archprêtre de monastères "exempts"', *Le Moyen Âge*, 88 (1982), pp. 234-235
- The Electronic Sawyer: <<<http://www.esawyer.org.uk>>>
- The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060-1220 Project (University of Leicester and University of Leeds)
<<<http://www.le.ac.uk/ee/em1060to1220/index.html>>>
- The Rule of the Four Fathers: A New English Translation and Commentary* (trans.), T. G. Kardong, *American Benedictine Review*, 54:2 (June, 2003), pp. 142-180
- The Rule of Saint Benedict*, (ed. and trans.), B. L. Vernard (London, 2011)

- Theodulf von Orléans, Erstes Kapitular, (Theodulf I) MGH, Capit Epis. I., pp. 73-142*
- Traditiones Possessionesque Wizenburgenses, Codices duo cum Supplementis* (ed.), C. Zeuss, (Speyer, 1842)
- Urkundenbuch der Stadt Strassburg*, (ed.), W. Wiegand (Strasbourg, 1879)
- Vita Benedicti Abbatis Anianensis et indensis Auctore Ardone*, (ed.), W. Wattenbach, MGH, SS 15.1 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 198-220; trans., A. Cabaniss, in A. Grabowsky and C. Radl (eds), *Benedict of Aniane: The Emperor's Monk, Ardo's Life* (Kalamazoo, 2008), pp. 59-111
- Vita Hludowici Imperatoris*, [The Astronomer], (ed.), E. Tremp, MGH, *SRG in Usum Separatim Editi*, DX=IV, (Hannover, 1995), pp. 279-559; trans., T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan and the Astronomer* (Pennsylvania, 2009) pp. 226-303
- Vitae Willibaldi et Wynnebaldi auctore sanctimoniali Heidenheimensi*, (ed.), O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS XV., Tom. 1 (Hannover, 1887), no. 7, pp. 80-117; trans., see: C. H. Talbot, in T. F. X. Noble and T. Head (ed.) *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Pennsylvania, 1995), pp. 141-165
- Wolfenbütteler Digitale Bibliothek:*
 <<<http://www.hab.de/en/home/library/wolfenbuettel-digital-library.html>>>

Secondary Sources

- Airlie, S., 'The Palace of Memory: the Carolingian Court as Political Centre', in A. J. Minnis et al., (eds.), *Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe* (York, 2000), pp. 1-21.
- Amos, T. L., 'Monks and Pastoral Care in the Early Middle Ages', in T. F. X. Noble & J. J. Contreni (eds.) *Religion, Culture and Society in the Middle Ages, Studies in Honour of Richard Sullivan* (Kalazmazoo, MI, 1987), pp. 165-180
- Andersson, T. A., *Theodulf of Orléans: The Verse* (Tempe, AZ, 2014)
- Angenendt, A., 'Pirmin und Bonifatius. Ihr Verhältnis zu Mönchtum, Bischofsamt und Adel' in A. Borst (ed.) *Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau* (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 251-304
- Antonini, A., 'Archéologie du Site Abbatial (Des Origines au Xe Siècle', in B. Andenmatten and L. Ripart (eds.) *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1: Histoire et Archéologie* (Gollion, 2015), pp. 59-109
- Bachrach, B., *Charlemagne's Early Campaigns (768-777): A Diplomatic and Military Analysis* (Leiden, 2013)
- Barrow, J., *Who Served at the Altar at Brixworth? Clergy in English Ministers, c. 800-c. 1100*, 28th Brixworth Lecture 2010 (Leicester, 2013)
- Barrow, J., 'Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, c. 900- c.1200', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 30 (2007) pp. 41-67
- Barrow, J., 'Ideas and Applications of Reform' in J. M. H. Smith & T. F. X. Noble (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Christianity 3: Early Medieval Christianities, c.600- c.1100* (Cambridge, 2008) pp. 345-360
- Barrow, J., 'Review Article: Chrodegang his Rule and its Successors', *EME* 14:2 (2006), pp. 201-212
- Barrow, J., *The Clergy in the Medieval World: Secular Clerics, their Families and Careers in North-Western Europe* (Cambridge, 2015)
- Becher, M., *Charlemagne* (London, 2003)
- Beckonhofer, R. F., *Day of Reckoning: Power and Accountability in Medieval France* (Philadelphia, PA, 2004)
- Bernard, P., *Du Chant Romain au Chant Gregorien, (Vie-XIII siècle)* (Paris, 1996) pp. 725-729
- Bertram, J., *The Chrodegang Rules: The Rules for the Common Life of the Secular Clergy from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries* (Aldershot, 2005)
- Bischoff, B., *Mittelalterlich Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1967)
- Bischoff, B., 'The Epinal, Erfurt, Werden and Corpus Glossaries', in: B. Bischoff, M. Budny, G. Harlow et al (eds.), *Early English Texts in Facsimile* (Copenhagen, 1988), pp. 13-25

- Bischoff, B., 'Wer ist die Nonne von Heidenheim', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens*, 49 (1931), pp. 387-397
- Bischoff, B., *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts, Teil I: Aachen-Lambach* (Wiesbaden, 1998)
- Bischoff, B., *Katalog der Festländischen Handschriften des Neunten Jahrhunderts, Teil III: Padua-Zwickau* (Wiesbaden, 2014)
- Bischoff, B., *Katalog der Festländischen Handschriften des Neunten Jahrhunderts. Teil II: Laon-Paderborn* (Wiesbaden, 2004)
- Bishop, E., *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918)
- Blair, J., 'Debate: Ecclesiastical Organization and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England', *EME* 4.1 (1995) pp. 193-21
- Blair, J., (ed.), *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition 950-1250* (Oxford, 1988)
- Blair, J., *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005)
- Brooks, N. P., 'Was Cathedral Reform at Christ Church Canterbury in the Early Ninth Century of Continental Inspiration?' in H. Sauer and J. Story (eds.) *Anglo-Saxon England and the Continent* (Tempe, AZ, 2011), pp. 303-322
- Brown, G., 'Carolingian Renaissance' in R. McKitterick, (ed.) *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1-51
- Bullough, D. A., 'Aula Renovata: The Carolingian Court before the Aachen Palace' *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 71, (1985), pp. 267-301
- Bullough, D. A., 'Charlemagne's Men of God: Alcuin, Hildebald, Arn', in Story (ed.) *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 136-151
- Bullough, D. A., 'The Dating of the Codex Carolinus Nos. 95, 96, 97 Wilchar, and the beginnings of the Archbishopric of Sens' *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 18 (1962), pp. 223-30
- Bullough, D. A., 'What has Ingeld to do with Lindisfarne?', *Anglo-Saxon England*, Vol. 22 (Dec. 1993), pp. 93-125
- Bullough, D. A., *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2004)
- Cabaniss, A., 'Translator Introduction' in, Grabowsky and Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane: The Emperor's Monk* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2008), pp. 27-53
- Cambridge, E., & Rollason, D., 'Debate: The Pastoral Organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Review of the 'Minster Hypothesis.' *EME*, 4.1 (1995) p. 87-104
- Campbell, D., 'The *Capitulare de villis*, the *Brevium exempla*, and the Carolingian court at Aachen', *EME*, 18:3 (2010), pp. 243-264.
- Carela, B., 'Alcuin and Alfred: Two Anglo-Saxon Legal Reformers', (Un-published Ph.D Thesis, Unvierstiy of North Carolina, 2006)
- Carpe, W. D., 'The *Vita Canonica* in the *Regula Canonicorum* of Chrodegang of Metz' (Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, ILL, 1975)

- Cavadini, J. C., *Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785-820* (Philadelphia, PA, 1993)
- Chandler, C. J., 'Heresy and Empire: 'The Role of the Adoptionist Controversy in Charlemagne's Conquest of the Spanish March', *The International History Review*, Vol. 24, no. 3 (2002), pp. 505-527
- Chase, S., *Angelic Spirituality: Medieval Perspectives on the Ways of Angels* (Mahwah, NJ, 2002)
- Chazelle, C. M., *The crucified God in the Carolingian era : theology and art of Christ's passion* (Cambridge, 2001)
- Chevalley, E., and Roduit, C., 'La Naissance du Culte des Saints d'Agaune et Les Primiers Textes Hagiographiques', in B. Andenmatten and L. Ripart (eds.) *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1: Historie et Archéologie* (Gollion, 2015), pp. 33-57
- Choy, R., 'The Deposit of Monastic Faith: The Carolingians on the Essence of Monasticism', in P. D. Clarke and C. Methuen (eds.), *The Church on its Past*, SCH, 49 (2013), pp. 74-87.
- Christie, N., *The Lombards: The Ancient Langobards* (Oxford, 1995)
- Claussen, M. A., 'Practical Exegesis: The Acts of the Apostles, Chrodegang's 'Regula Canonorum' and Early Carolingian Reform', in D. Blanks et al. (eds.) *Medieval Monks and their World: Ideas and Realities* (Leiden, 2006), pp. 119-147
- Claussen, M. A., 'St. Chrodegang' in R.E. Bjork (ed.) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2010), p.393
- Claussen, M. A., *Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004)
- Collins, S., *The Carolingian Debate Over Sacred Space* (Basingstoke, 2012)
- Contreni, J. J., 'The Pursuit of Knowledge in Carolingian Europe' in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus, Ohio, 1995), pp. 106-142
- Constable, G., *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1996)
- Costambeys, M., Innes, M., and MacLean S., *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2011)
- Couser, J., 'Inventing Paganism in Eighth Century Bavaria', *EME*, 18.1 (2010), pp. 26-42
- Crook, J., 'The Enshrinement of Local Saints in Francia and England', in A. Thacker & R. Sharpe (eds.) *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 189-224
- Crook, J., *The Architectural Setting of the Cult of Saints in the Early Christian West* (Oxford, 2000)
- Cubitt, C., 'Images of St. Peter' in P. Cavill (ed.), *The Christian Tradition in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 41-54

- Cubitt, C., 'Monastic Memory and Identity in Early Anglo-Saxon England', in W. O. Frazer and A. Tyrrell (eds.) *Social Identity in Early Medieval Britain* (London, 2000), pp. 253-277
- Cubitt, C., 'The Clergy in Early Anglo-Saxon England', *Historical Research*, vol. 78, no. 201 (August, 2005), pp. 273-287
- Cubitt, C., *Anglo-Saxon Church Councils, c.650-c. 850* (Leicester, 1995)
- Cullen, C. J., 'Hersey and Empire: The Role of the Adoptionist Controversy in Charlemagne's Conquest of the Spanish March', *International History Review*, 24:3 (2002), pp. 505-527
- Dahlus-Berg, E., *Nova Antiquitas et Antiqua Novitas: Typologische Exegese und Isidorianisches Geschichtsbild Bei Theodulf von Orleans*, Kölner Historische Abhandlungen, 23 (Cologne, 1975) pp. 169-235
- Dales, D., *Assessing Alcuin: His Life and Legacy* (Cambridge, 2012)
- Dargen, C., *A History of Preaching* (New York, NY, 1905)
- de Jong, M., *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996)
- de Jong, M., 'Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer', in R. McKitterick (ed.) *New Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. II, (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 622-653
- de Jong, M., 'Charlemagne's Balcony: The Solarium in ninth century narratives' in J. R. Davies & M. McCormick (eds.) *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 277-91
- de Jong, M., 'Charlemagne's Church' in J. Story (ed.) *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 103-135
- de Jong, M., 'Imitatio Morum: The Cloister and Clerical Purity in the Carolingian World', in M. Frassetto (ed.), *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform* (London, 1998), pp. 49-80
- de Jong, M., 'Monastic Prisoners or Opting Out? Political Coercion and Honour in the Frankish Kingdoms', in F. Theuws et al., *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 291-329
- Decker, A., *Die Hildebold'sche Manuskriptensammlung des Kölner Domes* (Bonn, 1895)
- Delisle, L., *Memoire sur D'anciens Sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886)
- Dereine, C., 'Chanoines', in A. Baudrillart and R. Aubert (eds.) *Dictionaire d'Histoire et de Geographie Ecclésiastiques*, Vol. XII, (Paris, 1952), pp. 354-406
- Devisse, J., 'L'Influence de Julien Pomère sur les Clercs Carolingiens: de la pauvreté aux Ve et IXe siècles' *Revue d'Histoire de L'Eglise de France*, 157 (1970) pp. 285-95
- Devisse, J., *Hincmar, Archevêque de Reims, 845-882* (Geneva, 1975)
- Dickinson, J. C., *The Origins of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction into England* (London, 1950)
- Diem, A., 'The Emergence of Monastic Schools: The Role of Alcuin', in L. A. J. R. Houwen and A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Alcuin of York: Scholar a the*

- Carolingian Court* (Groningen, 1998), pp. 27-45
- Drout, M., 'Re-Dating the Old English Translation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang: The Evidence of the Prose Style', *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 103, no. 3 (Jul. 2004), pp. 341-68
- Dubuis, F., and Lugon, A., 'Les Premiers Siècles d'un Diocèse Alpin', *Vallensia* 47 (1992)
- Dunn, M., *The Emergence of Monasticism: From the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2000)
- Dutton, P., (ed.), *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, Ontario, 1998)
- Dyer, J., 'Observations on the Divine Office in the Rule of the Master', in M. E. Fassler and R. A. Baltzer (eds.) *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 74-99
- Emerick, J. J., 'Building 'More Romano' in Francia During the Third Quarter of the Eighth Century: The Abbey Church of Saint-Denis and its Model', in C. Bolgia et al., (eds.), *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 127-150
- Enright, M. J., *Iona, Tara, and Soissons: The Origin of the Royal Anointing Ritual* (Berlin, 1985)
- Espelo, D., 'A Testimony of Carolingian Rule: The Codex Epistolaris Carolinus as a Product of its Time', (Unpublished PhD dissertation, Universiteit Utrecht, 2014)
- Ewig, E., 'Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Fränkischen Reichskirche unter Chrodegang von Metz', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 2 (1968), pp. 67-77
- Ewig, E., 'Saint Chrodegang et la Reform de L'Eglise Franque', in *Saint Chrodegang. Communications Présentées au Colloque Tenu à L'Occasion du douzième Centenaire de sa Mort* (Metz, 1967), pp. 25-53
- Farmer, D., *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (Oxford, 1978)
- Firey, A., 'Mutating Monsters: Approaches to 'Living Texts' of the Carolingian Era' *Digital Proceedings of the Lawrence J. Schoenberg Symposium on Manuscript Studies in the Digital Age*, 2.1 (2010), pp. 1-14
- Fleckenstein, J., 'Karl der Große und sein Hof', in H. Beumann (ed.), *Karl der Große. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf 1967), pp. 24-50
- Fleckenstein, J., *Die Hofkapelle der Deutsche Könige, vol. 1: Grundlegung. Die Karolingische Hofkapelle* (Stuttgart, 1959)
- Fontaine, J., 'La figure d'Isidore de Séville à l'époque carolingienne', in J. Fontaine and Christine Pellistrandi (eds.), *L'Europe Héritière de l'Espagne Wisigothique* (Paris, 1992), pp. 195-211
- Fontaine, J., *Isidore de Seville: Genèse et originalité de la Culture Hispanique au Temps des Wisigoths* (Turnhout, 2000)
- Foot, S., 'Parochial Ministry in Early Anglo-Saxon England: The Role of Monastic Communities' in W. J. Sheils (ed.) *The Ministry Clerical and Lay, Studies in Church History* 26 (Woodbridge, 1989) pp. 43-54

- Foot, S., 'Reading Anglo-Saxon Charters: Memory, Record, or Story?' in E. M. Tyler and R. Balzaretti (eds.) *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 39-67
- Foot, S., 'The Role of the Minster in Earlier Anglo-Saxon Society', in B. Thompson (ed.) *Monasteries and Society in Medieval Britain* (Stamford, 1999) pp. 35-58
- Foot, S., *Aethelstan: The First King of England* (London, 2011)
- Foot, S., *Monastic Life in Anglo-Saxon England, c. 600-900* (Cambridge, 2009)
- Fouracre, P., *The Age of Charles Martel* (Harlow, 2000)
- Fox, Y., *Power and Religion in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2014)
- Freeman, A., 'Additions and Corrections to the *Libri Carolini*: Links with Alcuin and the Adoptionist Controversy' in S. Krämer et al. (eds.), *Scire Litteras: Forschungen zum Mittelalterlichen Geistesleben* (Munich, 1988), pp. 1-17.
Reprinted in: A. Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea* (Aldershot, 2003)
- Freeman, A., 'Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*', *Speculum* 32 (1957), pp. 663- 705
- Freeman, A., and Meyvaert, P., 'Opus Carolini Regis Contra Synodum: An Introduction', in A. Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 1-223
- Gaillard, M., *D'une réforme à l'autre (816-934): les communautés religieuses en Lorraine à l'époque carolingienne* (Paris 2006)
- Ganshof, F. L., 'Charlemagne's Programme for Imperial Government,' in his *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971), pp. 55-86.
- Ganshof, F. L., 'The Last Period of Charlemagne's Reign', in his *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971), pp. 247-248.
- Garrison, M., 'The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in Y. Hen & M. Innes (eds.) *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114-161
- Garrison, M., 'Fredegis (d. 833)', *ODNB*
<<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61648>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015 2015].
- Grabowsky, A and Radl, C., 'The Second Benedict: A Review of Recent Scholarship', in A. Grabowsky and C. Radl (eds.), *Benedict of Aniane* (Kalamazoo, 2008), pp. 1-27
- Granger-Taylor, H., 'The Inscription on the Nature Goddess Silk', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, and C. Stancliffe, (eds.) *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to c. 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 339-343
- Hack, A. T, *Codex Carolinus: Päpliche Epistolographie Im 8. Jahrhundert*, Vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 2007)
- Hack, A. T, *Codex Carolinus: Päpliche Epistolographie Im 8. Jahrhundert*, Vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 2007)
- Hagen, H., *Catalogus Codicum Bernensium* (Bern, 1875)

- Halfond, G. I., *Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils, AD 511-768*, (Leiden 2010)
- Hartmann, W., *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im frankenreich und Italien* (Paderborn, 1989)
- Hecker, U., and Beckmann, E., (eds.) *Die karolingische Pfalkapelle in Aachen: Material, Bautechnik and Restaurierung* (Karlsruhe, 2012)
- Helvétius, A., 'L'abbaye d'Agaune de la Fondation de Sigismond au Règne de Charlemagne (515-814)' in B. Andenmatten et Laurent Ripart (eds.) *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1: Historie et Archéologie* (Gollion, 2015), pp. 111-33
- Hen, Y., 'The Romanization of the Frankish liturgy: ideal, reality and the rhetoric of reform', in C. Bolgia et al., (eds.), *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 111- 123.
- Hen, Y., *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul* (London, 2001)
- Higgins, C., 'Some New Thoughts on the Nature Goddess Silk', in G. Bonner, D. Rollason, and C. Stancliffe, (eds.) *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to c. 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 329-337
- Hildebrandt, M. M., *The External School in Carolingian Society* (Leiden, 1992)
- Horn, W and Born, E., *The Plan of St. Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy of, and Life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, Vol. 1, (London, 1979)
- Hummer, H. J., 'The Production and Preservation of documents in Francia: The Evidence of Cartularies', in W. Brown, et al. (eds.), *Documentary Culture and the Laity in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 189-231
- Hummer, H. J., *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600-1000* (Cambridge, 2005)
- Innes, M., 'Charlemagne's Will: Piety, Politics and the Imperial Succession', *EHR* (1997), pp. 833-855
- Innes, M., *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400-1000* (Cambridge, 2000)
- Iogna-Prat, D., 'The Dead in the Celestial Bookkeeping of the Cluniac Monks Around the Year 1000' in L. K. Little and B. Rosenwein (eds.), *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 340-362
- Jarnut, J., 'Bonifatius und die Frankischen Reformkonzilien (743-748)', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte Kanonistische Abteilung*, 66 (1979), pp. 1-26
- Jasper, D., and Fuhrmann, H., *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, D. C., 2001)
- Jones, L. W., *The Script of Cologne from Hildebald to Hermann* (Cambridge, MA, 1932)
- Jörg, C., *Corpus Inscriptiounum Medii Aevi Helvetiae*, vol. 1 (1977)

- Kardong, T. G., 'The Rule of the Four Fathers: A New English Translation and Commentary', *American Benedictine Review*, 54:2 (June, 2003), pp. 142-180
- Kempf, D., 'Paul the Deacon's *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus* and the role of Metz in the Carolingian realm', *Journal of Medieval History*, 30:3 (2004), pp. 279-299
- Kempf, D., *Paul the Deacon: Liber de Episcopis Mettensibus: Edition, Translation and Introduction* (Paris, 2013)
- Ker, N. R., *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957)
- Kraus, T. R., (eds.), *Aachen von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Aachen, 2013)
- Krautheimer, R., 'The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture,' *The Art Bulletin*, 24 (1942), pp. 1-38
- Laistner, M. L. W., 'The Influence during the Middle Ages of the Treatise, 'De Vita Contemplativa' and a Survey of Manuscripts', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, (Rome, 1946), pp. 344-358
- Langefeld, B., 'Regula Canonorum or Regula Monasterialis Vitae? The Rule of Chrodegang and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 25 (1996), pp. 21-36
- Langefeld, B., *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang* (Frankfurt, 2003)
- Lapidge, M., *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints* (London, 1991)
- Levison, W., *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946)
- Levy, K., 'Abbot Helisacher's Antiphoner', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 48:2, (1995), pp. 171-186
- Leyser, C., 'Angels, Monks and Demons in the Early Medieval West', in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.) *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 9-23
- Limor, O., 'Pilgrims and Authors: Adomnán's *De Locis Sanctis* and Hungeburc's *Hodoeporicon Sancti Willibaldi*', *Revue Bénédictine*, 114.2 (2004), pp. 253-275
- Loveluck, C., *North West Europe in the Early Middle Ages, AD 600–1150* (Cambridge, 2013)
- Magnou-Nortier, E., 'Étude sur le privilege d'immunité du IV^e au IX^e siècle', *Revue Mabillon* (Jul. 1984), pp. 465-515
- Masai, F., 'La Vita Patrum Iurensium et Les Debuts du Monachisme à Saint-Maurice d'Agaune' in J. Autenrieth and F. Brunhölzl (eds.), *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff* (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 43-69
- Mayr-Harting, H. 'Ecgerht (d. 766)', *ODNB*
 <<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8580>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015]
- Mayr-Harting, H., *The Venerable Bede, The Rule of St Benedict and Social Class*, Jarrow Lecture (1976), pp. 1-28
- McCormick, M., 'The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crisis, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy', *Viator* 15 (1984), pp. 1-24

- McKeon, P. R., 'The Empire of Louis the Pious: Faith, Politics and Personality', *Revue Bénédictine* 90 (1980), pp. 50-62
- McKitterick, R., 'Knowledge of Canon Law in the Frankish Kingdoms before 789: The Manuscript Evidence' *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1985), pp. 97-117
- McKitterick, R., 'The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals', *English Historical Review* 115, no. 460 (2000), pp. 1-20
- McKitterick, R., 'The Scripts of the Bobbio Missal', in Y. Hen and R. Meens (eds.) *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 19-53
- McKitterick, R., 'Unity and Diversity', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, SCH, 32 (Oxford, 1996) pp. 59-83.
- McKitterick, R., *Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989)
- McKitterick, R., *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008)
- McKitterick, R., *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004)
- McKitterick, R., *The Frankish Church and The Carolingian Reforms, 789-895* (London, 1977)
- McKitterick, R., *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751-987* (London, 1983)
- McLaughlin, M., *Consorting With Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Medieval France* (London, 1994)
- Meens, R., 'Ritual Purity and the Influence of Gregory the Great in the Early Middle Ages', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, SCH 32 (1996), pp. 31-45
- Meens, R., 'Sanctuary, Penance, and Dispute Settlement under Charlemagne: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans over a Sinful Cleric', *Speculum* 82 (2007), pp. 277-300
- Meersseman, G., and Pacini, G. P., *Ordo Fraternalitatis, Vol. 1, Italia Sacra: Studi E Documenti Di Storia Ecclesiastica* (Rome, 1977)
- Mériaux, C., 'Orde et Hiérarchie au Sein du Clergé Rural Pendant Le Haut Moyen Âge', in F. Bougard, D. Iogna-Prat & R. Le Jan (eds.) *Hierarchie et Stratification Sociale Dans L'Occident Medieval (400-1100)*, (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 117-136
- Miller, M. C., *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200* (London, 2014)
- Miller, M. C., *The Bishops Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (London, 2000)
- Monti, J., *The Week of Salvation: History and Traditions of Holy Week* (Huntington, Ind, 1993)
- Moore, M. E., *Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300-850* (Washington D.C, 2011)

- Mordek, H., *Bibliotheca Capitularium Regum Francorum Manuscripta* (Munich, 1995)
- Mordek, H., et al., (eds.), *Die Amonitio Generalis*, MGH, *Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usus Scholarum Separatim Editi*, XVI (Weisbaden, 2013)
- Morhain, E., 'Origine et Historie de la <<Regula Canonicorum>> de Saint Chrodegang', in *Miscellanea Pio Paschini, Studi di Storia Ecclesiastica*, vol. 1 *Lateranum*, N.S. XIV, pp. 173-185
- Moyse, G., 'Les Origines du Monachisme dans le Diocèse de Besançon (Ve-Xe Siècles)', *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 131.1, (1973), pp. 21-104
- Munier, C., 'Le Premier Millénaire' in L. Rapp (ed.) *La Diocese de Strasbourg* (Paris, 1982), pp. 10-32
- Nees, L., 'Godescalc's Career and the Problem of Influence', in J. Lowden and A. Bovey (eds.), *Under the Influence: The Concept of Influence and the Study of Illuminated Manuscripts* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 21-43
- Nelson, J. L., 'Women at the Court of Charlemagne: A Case of Monstrous Regiment?', in her *Frankish World* (London, 1996) pp. 223-242
- Nelson, J. L., 'Aachen as a Place of Power' in Theuws et al., *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 217-241
- Nelson, J. L., 'Law and its applications' in T. F. X. Noble and J. M. H. Smith (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Vol. 3: Early Medieval Christianities c. 600- c. 1100* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 299-326
- Nelson, J. L., 'Legislation and Consensus in the Reign of Charles the Bald', in P. Wormald et al. (eds.), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society. Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 202-227
- Nelson, J. L., 'Opposition to Pilgrimage in the Reign of Charlemagne?', in V. Garver and O. Pheln (eds.), *Rome and Religion in the Medieval World: Studies in Honour of Thomas F.X. Noble* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 65-83
- Nelson, J. L., 'The Voice of Charlemagne' in R. Gameson and H. Leyser (eds.) *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 76-88
- Neufville, J., 'Règle des IV Pères et Seconde Règle des Pères: Texte Critique', *Revue Bénédictine* 77, (1967), pp. 47-106
- Nightingale, J., *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reforms: Lotharingia c. 850-1000* (Oxford, 2001)
- Noble, T. F. X., 'The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious' *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), pp. 235-250
- Noble, T. F. X., *Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal States* (Pennsylvania, PA, 1984)
- Noble, T. F.X., 'The Revolt of King Bernard of Italy in 817: Its Causes and Consequences', *Studi Medievali* XV, (1974) pp. 315-26
- Owen-Crocker, G. R., *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England* (Manchester, 1986)

- Oexle, O. G., 'Conjuratio et Ghilde dans l'Antique et dans le Haut Moyen Age: Remarques sure la Continuité des Formes de La Vie Sociale', *Franica*, 10 (1982), pp. 151-214
- Oexle, O. G., 'Die Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulf', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 1 (1967), pp. 250-365
- Oxele, O. G., *Forschungen zu monasticschen und deistlichen Gemeinschaften im westfränkischen Bereich: Bestandteil des Quellenwerkes Societas et fraternitas Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften*. (Munich, 1978)
- Page, R. B., 'The Letters of Alcuin' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Univesity of Columba, NY, 1909)
- Palmer, J., 'Defining Paganism in the Carolingian World', *EME* 15.4 (2007), pp. 402-425
- Palmer, J., *Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World* (Turnhout, 2009)
- Parisse, M., 'Chrodegango' in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* (Rome, 1976), pp. 314-319
- Parsons, D., 'Some Churches of the Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Southern Germany: A Review of the Evidence', *EME* 8.1 (1999), pp. 31-67
- Paxton, F. S., 'Bonus Liber: A Late Carolingian Clerical Manual from Lorsch (Bibliotheca Vaticana MS. Pal. Lat. 485)' in L. Mayali & S. A. J. Tibbets (ed.) *The Two Laws: Studies in Medieval Legal History Dedicated to Stephan Kuttner* (Washington, D. C., 1990), pp. 1-30
- Phelan, O., *The Formation of Christian Europe: The Carolingians, Baptism and the Imperium Christianum* (Oxford, 2014)
- Picker, H., *Pastor Doctus: Klerikerbild und Karolingische Reformen bei Hrabanus Maurus* (Mainz, 2001)
- Pietri, L., 'Les Abbés de Basilque dans la Gaule au VIe Siècle', *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, vol. 69, no. 182, (1983), pp. 5-28
- Ponesse, M. D., 'Smaragdus of St. Mihiel and the Carolingian Monastic Reform', *Revue Bénédictine* 116.2 (2006), pp. 367-392
- Raaijmakers, J., 'Memory and identity: the *Annales necrologici* of Fulda', in R. Corradini et al. (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2006), pp. 303-321
- Raaijmakers, J., *The Making of the Monastic Community at Fulda, c. 744-c.900* (Cambridge, 2012)
- Rankin, S., 'Carolingian Music', in R. McKitterick (ed.) *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 274-316
- Reuter, T., 'Assembly Politics in Western Europe from the Eighth Century to the Twelfth.' in P. Lineham & J. L. Nelson (eds.), *The Medieval World* (London, 2001) pp. 432-451.
- Reuter, T., 'Kirchenreform und Kirchenpolitik im Zeitalter Karl Martells: Begriffe und Wirklichkeit' in J. Jörg et al. (eds.), *Karl Martell in Seiner Zeit* (Sigmaringen, 1994), pp. 35-59

- Reymond, M., 'La Charte de Sigismond pour Sant-Maurice d'Agaune 515', *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, 6 (1926), pp. 1-60
- Reynolds, R. E., 'Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions' in his *Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 1-31
- Reynolds, R. E., 'The *De Officiis vii graduum*: Its Origins and Developments', *Medieval Studies* 34 (1972), pp. 113-51
- Riché, P., *Écoles et enseignement dans la Haut Moyen Âge: Fin du Ve siècle- Milieu du XIe siècle* (Paris, 1989)
- Ripart, L., 'Les Temps Séculiers (IXe- Xe siècles)', in B. Andenmatten and L. Ripart (eds.) *L'abbaye de Saint-Maurice d'Agaune, Vol. 1: Histoire et Archéologie* (Gollion, 2015), pp.135-149
- Rollason, D., 'Review Article: Charlemagne's Palace', *Archaeological Journal*, 172, (2015), pp. 443-448
- Rosenwein, B., 'One Site, Many Meanings: Saint-Maurice d'Agaune as a Place of Power in the Early Middle Ages', in M. de Jong et al. (eds.) *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 271- 290
- Rosenwein, B., 'Perennial Prayer at Agaune', in S. Farmer and B. Rosenwein (eds.) *Monks and Nuns, Saints and Outcasts: Religion in Medieval Society* (London, 2000), pp. 37-57
- Rosenwein, B., *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, NY, 1999)
- Ryan, M., 'Archbishop Ecgerht and His Dialogus', in A. Rumble (ed.), *Leaders of the Anglo-Saxon Church: From Bede to Stigand* (Manchester, 2012), pp. 41-60
- Scharer, A., 'Charlemagne's Daughters', in S. Baxter (ed.), *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald* (London, 2009) pp.269-282.
- Schieffer, R., *Die Entstehung von Dom Kapiteln in Deutschland* (Bonn, 1976)
- Schieffer, T., *Angelsachsen und Franken: Zwei Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des 8 Jahrhunderts, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 20* (Weisbaden, 1951)
- Semmler, J., 'Benedictus II: una regula, una consuetudo', in W. Lourdeaux and D. Verhelst (eds.) *Benedictine Culture, 750-1050* (Louvain, 1983), pp. 1-49.
- Semmler, J., 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz', in F. Knöpp *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764* (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 229-45
- Semmler, J., 'Die Geschichte der Abtei Lorsch von der Gründung bis zum Ende der Salierzeit (764-1125)' in F. Knöpp *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764* (Darmstadt, 1973), pp. 75-173
- Semmler, J., 'Zur Überlieferung der monastischen Gesetzgebung Ludwigs des Frommen', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 16, (1960), pp. 309-99
- Siecienski, A., *The Filoque: History of a Doctrinal Contraversy* (Oxford, 2010)

- Smith, J. M. H., '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* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 189-223
- Spiegel, G. M., 'The Cult of St. Denis and Capetian Kingship', in S. Wilson (ed.) *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 141-169
- Stoclet, A. J., 'Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710-784), Abbé et Archprêtre de monastères "exempts"', *Le Moyen Âge*, 88 (1982), pp. 210-235
- Stoclet, A. J., *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v.710-784)* (Geneva, 1993)
- Stone, R., 'Introduction: Hincmar's world', in R. Stone and C. West (eds.), *Hincmar of Rheims: Life and Work* (Manchester, 2015)
- Story, J., 'Cathwulf, kingship and the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis', *Speculum*, 74.1 (1999), pp. 1-21
- Story, J., *Carolingian Connections: Anglo-Saxon England and Carolingian Francia, c. 750-870* (Aldershot, 2003)
- Sullivan, R. E., 'What was Carolingian Monasticism? The Plan of St. Gall and the History of Monasticism', in A. C. Murray (ed.) *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History Essays Presented to Walter Goffart* (London, 1998), pp. 251-288
- Taft, R. F., *The Liturgy of Hours in East and West: The Origins of the Divine Office* (Collegeville, PA, 1985)
- Thacker, A., 'Loca Sanctorum: The Significance of Place in the Study of the Saints', in A. Thacker and R. Sharpe (eds.), *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 1-43
- Thacker, A., 'Priests and Pastoral Care in Early Anglo-Saxon England' in G. Brown and L. Voigts (eds.), *The study of medieval manuscripts of England: festschrift in honor of Richard W. Pfaff* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 187-208
- Theurillat, J., *L'Abbaye de Saint-Maurice: Des Origins á La Réforme Canoniale* (Sitten, 1954)
- van der Walt, A. G. P., 'Reflections of the Benedictine Rule in Bede's Homiliary' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), pp. 367-376
- van Rhijn, C., 'Priests and the Carolingian reforms: The Bottlenecks of Local *Correctio*', in R. Corradini et al., (eds.), *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2006), pp. 219-37
- van Rhijn, C., *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period* (Turnhout, 2007)
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., 'History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar', in R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard W. Southern* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 43-70
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983)
- Wentzcke, P., *Regesten der Bischöfe von Straßburg bis zum Jahre 1202* (Innsbruck, 1908)

- Werminghoff, A., 'Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Concils in Jahre 816' *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 27 (1901-1902), pp. 605-45
- Williams, A., 'Cuthbert (d. 760)', *ODNB*
<<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6977>>> [Accessed 27/09/2015]
- Wilmart, A. 'Le Règlement Ecclésiastique de Berne', *Revue Bénédictine*, 51 (1939), pp. 37-52
- Wood, I., 'A Prelude to Columbanus: The Monastic Achievement in the Burgundian Territories', in H. B. Clarke and M. Brennan (eds.) *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 3-32
- Wood, I., *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400-1050* (Harlow, 2001)
- Wood, S., *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2006)
- Wormald, P., *Corruption, Decline and the 'Real World' of the Early English Church: Aristocrats as Abbots*, Brixworth Lecture, 21 (Leicester, 2003)
- Wright, R., 'Late Latin and Early Romance: Alcuin's *De Orthographia* and the Council of Tours (AD 813)', in F. Cairns (ed.), *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, Vol. 3 (Liverpool, 1983), pp. 343-363
- Zufferey, M., *Die Abtei St-Maurice D'Agaune im Hochmittelalter (830-1258)* (Gottingen, 1988).