Abstract

The establishment of a new concept of intercessory prayer, from an activity sought of the individual holy man to an occupation characterizing an entire monastic community, has recently received much attention; historians have shown that the function of intercession had become, by the Carolingian period, the pre-eminent feature of early medieval monasticism. The role of early medieval monasteries as powerhouses of prayer has encouraged scholarly attention along two particular areas of interest: intercession within the system of medieval patronage and gift exchange, and monastic ritual elaboration. Missing in the main historiographical approaches is discussion concerning the place of intercessory prayer within the monastic ideal. This study therefore asks the central question, ‘What was the relationship between the intercessory function of monasticism and the ascetic concern for moral conversion in the time of the reforms of Benedict of Aniane, c. 750-820?’ The writings of Carolingian monastic reformers demonstrate that the chief concern of the monk was to seek and find perfection in God; it is the argument of this study that the elaborate liturgical intercession which characterized early medieval monasticism was coherent with this goal. The Introduction sets out to establish the continuity of the ascetic pursuit in the Carolingian monastic ideal with earlier monasticism. We then order our investigation by: i) proposing that monastic liturgical organization was meant to address the fundamental problem of human sin which impedes fruitful prayer, and that the additions of intercessory liturgy made by Benedict of Aniane should be seen as part of his pastoral concern for the holiness of monks (Chapter 1); ii) situating the specific intercessory performances of monastic communities – namely, the intercessory Mass and the Divine Office – within Carolingian monastic theology (Chapters 2 and 3); iii) examining how the prayer directed toward two groups of beneficiaries of intercession – fellow monks and rulers – was grounded on the the ascetic goals of moral conversion and pilgrimage toward the celestial kingdom (Chapters 4 and 5); and iv) addressing the question of what role Carolingian monastics meant for their intercessory prayers to play in society at large, and the extent to which general social concern was a priority in monastic intercession (Chapter 6). This study provides a detailed description of the ascetic ideal required for understanding the formalized ritual and patronized prayer of monasteries within its proper sphere of monastic spirituality. I conclude in particular that the increasing importance of monastic intercession was related to a heightened emphasis in Carolingian spiritual thought on the teleological theme of transformation both individual and cosmic. The intercessory function of early medieval monasticism suggests an incorporation of the spiritual pilgrimage of the wider world into the monk’s own individual discipline, and tied the monk’s ascesis to the larger story of the conversion of the world to God.
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Introduction

In 1781, Edward Gibbon had this to say about monastic history in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*:

(Monks) kindly imparted the merits of their prayers and penance [sic] to a rich and liberal sinner. Time continually increased, and accidents could seldom diminish, the estates of the popular monasteries, which spread over the adjacent country and cities.... (T)heir discipline was corrupted by prosperity: they gradually assumed the pride of wealth, and at last indulged the luxury of expense.... (E)very age of the church has accused the licentiousness of the degenerate monks; who no longer remembered the object of their institution, embraced the vain and sensual pleasures of the world which they had renounced, and scandalously abused the riches which had been acquired by the austere virtues of their founders. Their natural descent, from such painful and dangerous virtue, to the common vices of humanity, will not, perhaps, excite much grief or indignation in the mind of a philosopher.¹

A century later, the Comte Charles Forbes René de Montalembert fought back with a truly glorious description of that very activity which Gibbon had blamed for monastic corruption:

The first of all the services which the monks have conferred upon Christian society was that of praying – of praying much, of praying always for those whose prayers were evil or who prayed not at all. Christianity honored and esteemed in them, above all, that great force of intercession; these supplications, always active, always fervent; these torrents of prayers, poured forth unceasingly at the feet of God, who wills that we should supplicate Him. Thus they turned aside the wrath of God; they lightened the weight of the iniquities of the world; they re-established the equilibrium between the empire of heaven and the empire of earth.... Thanks to them, prayer existed in the character of an institution of permanent and public force, universally recognised and blessed by God and by man..... (I)n receiving perishable riches from the hand of the faithful, the monks appeared to all to return the price of them in the unmeasured and unparalleled beneficence of prayer. By their mouth the voice of the Church rose without ceasing to heaven, drawing down the dew of divine benedictions. They inundated the whole soil of Christendom with a fertilizing moisture, inexhaustible source of grace and consolation.²


Monastic intercession stands in church history as something free for interpretation: fodder for critics who would point to various doctrinal errors which encouraged it and the resulting wealth and corruption of monasteries, and simultaneously upheld by twenty-first-century movements like the evangelically-driven ‘New Monasticism’ as an example of a socially-engaged spirituality. Yet, both are superficial sketches which treat the action of intercessory prayer independently of the substantial ideals governing the monastic state. In actual fact, medieval monastic writers generally had very little to say on the specific topic of intercessory prayer alone, always discussing prayer in terms of monastic goals and discipline.

Our tendency to consider the public service of monastic ‘intercessory prayer’ with little reference to the goals of monastic life is largely due to the prevailing idea that from the Desert Fathers to the early Middle Ages, monasticism in general, and monastic prayer in particular, became ‘institutionalized’. This development – the story of the transformation of intercessory prayer from a benefit sought of individual holy heroes to an action powerfully performed by entire convents and monasteries – has received much attention in recent times, especially from scholars interested in identifying those particular moments during the course of the sixth and seventh centuries when this decisive shift occurred. When Caesarius founded his convent at Arles in 508, he imposed total seclusion on the nuns for the first time in the West, and in so doing was pinning down the purity of a convent as the basis of its collective intercessory power. Then in 515, Sigismund founded the monastery of Saint-Maurice at Agaune, with its monks organized in rotating relays in order to carry out perpetual and unceasing psalmody in intercession for the king. With its intentionally

---


4 Diem, Das monastische Experiment, pp. 154-225; Brown, Rise of Western Christendom, pp. 226-8.
militaristic imagery, the monks’ performance here signaled the fact that the monastery had become a site of important royal service in the form of intercessory prayer. Soon after in 561, Radegund founded a convent in Poitiers, the holiness of which she established not only by secluding the nuns in strict enclosure but also by bringing to it a relic of the True Cross. She taught her nuns to pray for kings and the kingdom, thereby throwing her convent into the forefront of politics as a public institution critical for safeguarding the stability of the Frankish realm. This trend was intensified with the arrival of Columbanus, whose monastic foundations were endowed and protected by powerful lay persons in exchange for the prayers of the monks. Albrecht Diem has argued that Jonas of Bobbio’s *Vita Columbani*, written between 639 and 643/4, was the textual basis for a new idea of the monastic institution. In addition to those traditional miracles confirming Columbanus’ status as a *vir Dei*, in an unusual move Jonas related a number of miracles involving the entire community of monks, thereby demonstrating not only the efficacy of one holy man’s prayer, but also that of a group of monks praying together. Miracles were wont to occur as a result of the collective prayers of the cloistered – and thus ‘the end of the holy *man*’, the title of Diem’s article. Diem argues that the transfer of this intercessory power ‘from the holy man to a monastic institution’ marks the beginning of a new monastic concept. Through this process, Marilyn Dunn has shown, the function of intercession became *the* pre-eminent feature of early medieval monasticism, so that it becomes even a *type* of monasticism (‘intercessory monasticism’) distinctive to the West. The transformation received its final shape in the

---

8 Ibid, p. 557.
9 Dunn, *The Emergence of Monasticism*, pp. 98 and 106: ‘intercessory monasticism’ and ‘intercessory type of monasticism’.
Carolingian monastic reforms’, with councils held during the reign of Charlemagne consistently declaring the duty of monastic communities to perform masses and psalms for the kingdom and the church. Thus Mayke de Jong has called Carolingian monasteries ‘powerhouses of prayer’.

The fact that early medieval monasteries functioned in this fashion has encouraged scholarly attention along two particular areas of interest: gift exchange and liturgical ritual. The first is the economic reason for monastic communities becoming expert intercessors, this line driven by a typically Maussian theory of gift exchange. Landmark works by Georges Duby, who identified the pious donations of landed property to the church as the most powerful economic currency in the Middle Ages, and by Philippe Jobert, who focused on Merovingian donationes pro anima, applied the economic language of supply and demand onto the practice of monastic prayer. Since the 1980s and 1990s, this topic has sustained a large level of interest. Penelope Johnson, Megan McLaughlin, Barbara Rosenwein, and Marios Costambeys have all studied monastic intercession from the perspective of reciprocal giving, seeing this as the critical practice governing the social meaning of monasteries and their

11 Council of Arles (813) cap. 2, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 250; Council of Bavaria (740-50) cap. 1-3, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 51; Council of Bavaria (800) cap. 5 and 36, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 208, 211; Council of Bavaria (805), MGH Conc 2.1, p. 233; Council of Chalon (813) cap. 39 and 66, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 281 and 285.
relations with the aristocracy, with the latter’s immunities, land, and other assets such as domestic animals given in exchange for by the obligatory counter-gift of prayers for the well-being of the benefactor’s life or soul after life. All these works rely on the same basic foundation also supporting Ilana Silber’s work on medieval monastic sociology and John Bossy’s sociological description of the Mass: that exchanges of gifts for prayer were ‘total occasions’, with worldly and spiritual motives, and social and legal factors, all simultaneously at work. Thus scholars have been careful to balance materialist motives (such as the consolidation or retention of aristocratic landed property through donation to monasteries) with more spiritual, social, or emotional ones. In all cases, however, the foundational principle governing the historiography on monastic intercession has been the notion of do-

ut-des: in return for intercession, a monastic community gained the benefit of property and assets.

Since monastic prayer was an important service performed for patrons, it is not surprising that studies on Carolingian liturgy (the performance of prayer) should be most interested in the transformation of liturgical prayer from an ecclesial expression into an elitist activity to be performed only by ‘specialists’ to the exclusion of laity. Liturgical studies produced during

---


the 1960s to 1980s were focused on the transformation of liturgical prayer from a eucharistic celebration to an oblation offered on behalf of someone to obtain divine appeasement. This evolution was the subject of Cyrille Vogel’s article, ‘Une mutation cultuelle inexpliquée: Le passage de l’Eucharistie communautaire à la messe privée’, in which he argued that during the course of the seventh to ninth centuries, there was a basic change in religious psychology which was radically different from that of the early church. The notion of the ‘progressive sanctification of the Christian by and in the Eucharist’, he argued, ‘was eliminated for the profit of the one cultic activity which was only an instrumentation of salvation’. It was particularly true in the sixth-century monasteries of Southern Gaul which explicitly promoted a doctrine according to which man was free to choose either good or evil, thereby encouraging the emotions of anxiety and insecurity. The Christian searched for a more ‘secure way, if possible one with an effect that was automatic and independent of the unreliable will of the sinner. And it was the Mass which was considered as one of these methods, the surest one of all’. This fundamental transformation of the Mass from a communal celebration to an individual good work (opus bonum) performed to secure salvation was manifested in the proliferation of the private mass (one performed by a single priest) and the votive mass (special mass for a particular intention), and the increasing need for ordained priests in monasteries (the ‘monk-priest’) – all developments studied in great detail by Cyrille Vogel, Otto Nussbaum, Angelus Haussling, and Arnold Angenendt. The consequences of this change in the approach to liturgical prayer included the quantification

---

20 Ibid, p. 249, fn. 25.
‘reification’) of prayer in the form of tariffed penance, elaborate ritual accretions, and increasing competition over relics, the possession of which gave a monastery a better claim to patronage over another. Because intercession was perceived as an activity to be carried out by experts, Carolingian rulers were eager to ensure that monks were using the correct language and books for their prayer – a concern which has been mirrored in the recent interest of historians on questions traditionally assigned to liturgists concerning the authorship, transmission, and development of rites, texts, and usages.

Noticeably missing in the historiographical approaches to the early medieval ‘intercessory-type monasticism’ we have just surveyed – centered as they are on gift exchange and patronage, and to liturgical development and ritual elaboration – are works which discuss the occupation of public intercession from the point of view of ascetic spirituality. This disconnect comes especially to the fore in the historiography on the figure of Benedict of Aniane (747-821), whose birth and death provide the proximate chronological book-ends for my dissertation. As the man appointed by Louis the Pious to be father-superior to all monks in the Frankish realm, Benedict’s legislative reforms have generated several studies concerning monastic legislation under his leadership at Aachen in 816/817, when he placed Frankish monasteries under the

---


sole regulation of the *Rule of Benedict*. Here, among the seventy detailed *capitula* issued to order the lives of monasteries, decrees were made which specifically underscored the intercessory function of abbeys: at least fifteen canons deal with the praying of the Office, including commands to say special psalms for benefactors and the dead, features of monastic reform which were so important that Ardo of Aniane (d. 843) reiterated them in his biography of the saint. Today, however, the nature of ‘Anianian monasticism’ is being entirely reassessed, with most recent scholarship interested in questioning how sustained Benedict’s reforms were, how involved Benedict was in drafting them in the first place, and whether he should even be considered a figure of any real significance at all. Thus, a study which centers on Benedict of Aniane in relationship to the Carolingian monastic ideal may seem to be out of touch with the general trend in contemporary historiography.

I should like to propose, however, that Benedict of Aniane remains a critical figure to the study of the Carolingian monastic ideal even if the precise nature of his involvement in the legislative reform is currently being questioned. For in him, we can begin to resolve the

---


serious problem of the distinction that is too often imposed between monasticism as an ascetic spiritual discipline, and eighth- and ninth-century Carolingian monasticism as a public institution standing at the center of a medieval topography of power with prayer as an important economic currency. Historically, studies have tended either to focus entirely on Benedict’s external legislation of uniformity and ritual accretion,\(^28\) or to speak of the interior religious life without any reference to the new intercessory emphasis.\(^29\) This condition drew Richard Sullivan to observe two decades ago:

> Whether one looks to essays of synthesis, histories of monasticism, or treatments of early medieval spirituality, a single impression emerges: their authors appear anxious to avoid Carolingian monasticism. They seem reluctant to leave behind the exhilarating world of late antiquity, with its heroic desert fathers, its prodigious ‘athletes of Christ’... And they give the impression of being anxious to get beyond Carolingian times to the heady era of monastic renewal at Cluny and Citeaux and its impact in reshaping the ethos of the entire society of the High Middle Ages, with only an obligatory glance at the dreary chasm separating two heroic ages in monastic history.\(^30\)

This, to a large extent, is due to an entrenched assumption that between the Desert Fathers and the Carolingians, monks generally lost their understanding of the monastic life as a spiritual combat and began to rely, rather, on the ascription of holiness given to them by society, a fact which made their institutions rich and powerful. In contemporary scholarship, Albrecht Diem has been the most persuasive proponent of this argument. He has depicted the evolution of monasticism from the late-antique to the early medieval period as the transition away from the ‘thought scrutiny’ of the early ascetics who strained anxiously after holiness, to

---


\(^30\) Sullivan, ‘What was Carolingian Monasticism?’, p. 257.
a more static notion of sanctity as resting within an enclosed cloister filled with monks and nuns deemed by society to be holy. Historians today tend to speak of the early medieval monastery as a *septa secretiora* or a *locus sanctus*, an inner domain unviolated by external filth and lay intrusion, where the separateness of space and the retention of purity ensured efficacy of monastic intercessions.

As Conrad Leyser has observed, however, cast as a contrast between the interior piety of late-antique ascetic combat and the ritual purity (attracting lay patronage) of the medieval cloister, ‘the latter will always suffer..., despite the invocation of Mary Douglas and her defense of the sophistication of the world of ritual’. Vauchez’s chapter on Carolingian spirituality is a case in point. His description of the ‘liturgical civilization’ of the Carolingian period, despite his warning against passing value judgments, is so filled with negative statements about penance, popular belief, the hagiographical representation of saints, and the undifferentiated sacredness of objects, rituals, and gestures that he practically reproduces Luther’s tract against the Babylonian Captivity of the church. In a sweeping conclusion on the nature of Carolingian spirituality, we read, ‘there could be no question of inner life as we understand it’. ‘Under such conditions’, he goes on to say, ‘it is hardly surprising that the Carolingian period should represent a very drab episode in the history of spiritual literature’. Astonishingly,

---

31 Diem, *Das monastische Experiment*, and several of his other publications, such as ‘The rule of an Iro-Egyptian Monk in Gaul. Jonas of Bobbio’s *Vita Iohannis* and the construction of a monastic identity’, in *Revue Mabillon* 80 (2008), 5-50.

32 See the essays in F. Theuws, M. de Jong, and C. Van Rhijn, ed., *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2001), and L. Coon on the ‘power space’ of the cloister in *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West* (Philadelphia, 2011), p. 131, and also at p. 52 where she writes: ‘Reformers looked to male and female ascetic bodies as indicators of the purity or impurity of the Frankish church. Clerical anxieties over maintaining the purity of ascetics translated into a heightened surveillance of the inner sanctum of the cloister, as the bodily integrity of individuals spoke to the spiritual intactness of an entire community’.


even Dom David Knowles had earlier come to this conclusion himself: ‘Benedict of Aniane has never been a spiritual guide for monks’.35

At least according to his biographer Ardo, such a statement is simply wrong: Benedict’s reputation rested on his role as a teacher of the way to salvation, a lamp for guiding monks.36 It was Benedict’s discouragement at seeing many of his fellow brethren ‘retrace their steps they had walked on the road of salvation’ and ‘return like a pig to the dirt and a dog to his vomit’ that prompted his work as a monastic legislator: he was deeply troubled (‘turbatus’) by their unsteady faith. Rebuffed by Atilio for abandoning his brothers, Benedict decided to apply himself to the task of monastic instruction.37 He thus zealously studied the key documents of the monastic past, producing the Codex Regularum, a collection of cenobitic rules, and the Concordia Regularum, which cited passages from ancient rules in parallel with the Rule of Benedict.38 These two compilations are often viewed simply as evidence of the Carolingian obsession with uniformity and centralization: reformers, it is said, were eager to show how the entire monastic past culminated in the RB so as to convince reluctant monks to follow it exclusively.39 But the true significance of the Codex and Concordia lies not in their being mere ‘pièces justificatives’ for a uniform submission to the Rule of Benedict.40 Rather, the compilations should be understood as an attempt to discern the essential nature of

36 Ardo, Vita Benedicti 2 and 3, MGH SS 15.1, pp. 201-3.
37 Ardo, Vita Benedicti 3, MGH SS 15.1, pp. 200-20: ‘ut sus ad coenum canisque ad vomitum in calle salutis positum retraebant pedem’.
38 The Codex is transmitted in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 28118 (c. 800), and edited as Codex regularum monasticarum et canonarum in PL 103:393–702. In its complete form, the Concordia is transmitted in Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 233 (203) and Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 60, of the ninth and eleventh centuries respectively. The authoritative edition is that of P. Bonnerue, Benedicti Anianensis Concordia Regularum, CCCM 168-168a (Turnhout, 1999).
monasticism and to collate the various bits from a monastic past into a unified statement.\footnote{On the ways Benedict of Aniane reassembled the RB and added parallel texts in order to help his contemporaries better understand their profession, see A. de Vogüé, ‘La Concordia regularum de Benoît d’Aniane: son vrai but et sa structure’, in G. Spinelli, ed., \textit{Il monachesimo italiano dall’età longobarda all’età ottoniana (secc. VIII-X): Atti del VII Convegno di Studi Storici sull’Italia Benedettina, Nonantola (Modena), 10-13 settembre 2003} (Cesena, 2006), pp. 39-45, especially 41 and 45.}\footnote{\textit{Concordia Regularum} prose preface, CCCM 168a, p. 3.}

Whereas we may question how central a figure he was to the drafting of the monastic capitularies, or how widespread his impact throughout Frankish monasteries was, what can hardly be questioned from a close examination of the \textit{Codex} and \textit{Concordia}, along with other works ascribed to him such as the \textit{Munimenta Fidei} and the \textit{Supplement} to the Gregorian Sacramentary, is Benedict of Aniane’s pastoral concern to define without ambiguity the spiritual ideals which must undergird the large, wealthy, and powerful centers of patronized intercession in eighth- and ninth-century Francia. Benedict of Aniane is therefore crucial to any study of Carolingian monastic intercession because his view of the monastic life offers evidence that the distinction made between unadulterated ascetic standards and ‘Dark Age’ ritualism is artificial.

Although monastic rules habitually borrowed from one another and frequently referred readers to patristic literature, we must recognize that Benedict’s act of compiling monastic literature was genuinely ground-breaking. For his compilations represent the first time that monastic rules from an extremely diverse array were brought together, ‘that one codex might exist out of many’.\footnote{\textit{Concordia Regularum} prose preface, CCCM 168a, p. 3.} He deemed it appropriate to bind together over twenty-five rules spanning five centuries from East and West into one solid volume: we find here the diffuse and lengthy \textit{Rule of the Master} alongside the spare and succinct \textit{Second Rule of the Fathers}; rules intended for a single monastery (e.g. \textit{Rule of Ferreolus}) alongside those intended for several (e.g. the \textit{Rule of Basil}); rules composed by a single author (e.g. Augustine’s \textit{Praeceptum}) alongside a rule decided by a synod of superiors (\textit{Rule of the Four Fathers});
letters (e.g. of John bishop of Arles) alongside the extracts forming the Regula Orientalis; the ancient Eastern Rule of Pachomius alongside the seventh-century Irish Rules of Columbanus and the Iberian Rule of Isidore. Benedict of Aniane brought together these diverse texts for the specific purpose of highlighting their similarity and fundamental unity, and to assert the existence of a coherent body of monastic literature, using the classical motif of ‘plucking off various flowers’ to state that he was weaving together one wreath. Present explicitly for the first time is the message that the wide-ranging monastic traditions were tied by a certain unity of spirit and formed in aggregate a single message, which Benedict of Aniane identified when he presented the purpose for his concordance of rules. Here, he cites the last chapter of the RB: ‘(F)or anyone hastening on to the perfection of monastic life, there are the teachings of the holy Fathers, the observance of which will lead him to the very heights of perfection’. For Benedict of Aniane, the accumulation of monastic literature was a persuasive presentation of the monastic goal – moral conversion, the heights of perfection – and instruction on how to reach it.

Once we appreciate Benedict’s point – that the purpose of consolidating a monastic heritage was to help the monk reach the ascetic goal – the intention behind Carolingian monastic reform comes sharply into focus. One of the more subtle but significant acts of Benedict of Aniane’s conciliar legislation was the re-insertion of the third element of the monastic

---


44 Concordia Regularum prose preface, CCCM 168a, p. 4 and verse preface, ibid, p. 6. Smaragdus, abbot of St. Mihiel present at the Aachen synods, also describes his Diadema monachorum in the same manner (PL 102:593).

profession, the vow of ‘conversatio morum suorum’. The original phrase as contained in the sixth-century Rule of Benedict, meaning something to the effect of ‘a way of life suitable for a monk’, had become a point of confusion for monks in Merovingian Gaul and was dropped out of the profession formula, which now consisted only of a two-fold vow of stability and obedience. In conjunction with the Aachen synods, a model petitio was issued with the phrase ‘conversatio morum’ re-inserted; this revived three-fold profession formula was also included in the commentary on the RB by Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel (c. 760-840). Yet, although the authoritative text of the RB distributed by Benedict of Aniane contained the expression ‘conversatio morum’, Carolingian scribes evidently preferred to replace it with ‘conversio morum’, suggesting that the original phrase continued to prove puzzling or even meaningless. Leaving aside Benedict of Nursia’s original meaning and the ensuing confusions over the phrase, we can get some sense, from the routine replacement of conversatio with conversio, of what the Carolingians intended when they re-inserted this

46 RB 58.17.
50 Witnessed by St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 914, in agreement with the oldest known manuscript of the RB: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 48.
element back into the monastic vow. Hildemar of Corbie (d. 850s), writing about two decades after Benedict of Aniane’s reforms, explains the full significance of the substitution.\textsuperscript{52}

It must be known what is meant by \textit{conversatio} and what by \textit{conversio}... for some books have \textit{conversio}, while others have \textit{conversatio}. It seems to me that the books which say \textit{conversio} are better than those which say \textit{conversatio}, because \textit{conversatio} refers to habit and life, whether good or bad. \textit{Conversio}, however, refers to change, whether from bad to good, or from good to bad.\textsuperscript{53}

What clearly appeals to Hildemar about the word \textit{conversio} in place of \textit{conversatio} is that it is a dynamic and pregnant term suitable for describing the passage from the sinful, mediocre life to the virtuous, glorious life.\textsuperscript{54} It was the evidence of change and growth which the Carolingians attached to the monastic profession:

The one (the genuine monk), increased by virtues, grows into something better, while the other (the spurious monk), grown lukewarm, deteriorates into something worse; the one grows strong in sacred virtues, the other grows lukewarm from the cares of the world; the one truthfully bears the name of monk, the other bears both the name and the tonsure of a false monk.\textsuperscript{55}

Smaragdus cites Isidore’s etymological definition of ‘life’ to teach that growth was the essence of monasticism and the mark of a true monk seeking eternal life: ‘Life is so called because of vigor, or because it has the power to be born and grow’.\textsuperscript{56} Inasmuch as the Carolingian

\textsuperscript{52} Hildemar’s commentary on the \textit{Rule of Benedict} was once incorrectly attributed to Paul the Deacon. For a brief survey of the authorship debate and textual transmission, see M. de Jong, ‘Growing Up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and his Oblates’, \textit{Journal of Medieval History} 9 (1983), 99-128, at p. 101.

\textsuperscript{53} Hildemar, \textit{Expositio Regulae Sancti Benedicti} 58, ed. R. Mittermüller, \textit{Vita et regula SS. P. Benedicti una cum expositione regulae a Hildemaro tradita} (Regensburg, 1880), pp. 532-3: ‘Sciendum est enim, quia aliud est \textit{conversatio} et aliud est \textit{conversio}. Conversatio enim attinet ad vitam et ad habitacionem, conversio vero est de saeculo ad Deum, sicut in hoc loco dicitur. Quidam namque libri habent \textit{conversionem}, quidam vero \textit{conversationem}, sed sicut mihi videtur, melius habent illi, qui dicunt \textit{conversionem}, quam illi, qui \textit{conversationem}, eo quod conversatio attinet ad habitacionem et ad vitam sive bonam sive malam, conversio autem ad mutationem sive de malo in bonum, sive de bono in malum...’.


\textsuperscript{55} Smaragdus, \textit{Expositio} 1, CCM 8, p. 59, trans. Barry, \textit{Commentary}, p. 120: ‘unus virtutibus actus crescit in melius, alter tepidus factus decrescit in peius; unus pollet virtutibus sacris, alter tepescit saeculi curis; unus veraciter nomen monachi portat, alius falsatoris monachi nomen gestat pariter et tonsuram’.

reformers felt that the monk’s moral growth was the common vision behind all ancient monastic rules and the very reason for the monk’s existence, Narberhaus has rightly stated that the Carolingian insistence on the vow of ‘conversio morum’ in the monastic profession ‘goes to the heart of the reform’.  

Even though the majority of monks in Carolingian abbeys had been child oblates who had had no dramatic conversion (‘conversio’) of the type experienced by an adult novice, the fact that they had been consecrated to the Lord for a life of faith and virtue meant that their monastic training fundamentally concerned the shedding of vice and the accumulation of virtue. An excerpt from the Rule of Basil included in a section of the Concordia Regularum concerning child oblates commands that oblates be thrown out whose growth in spiritual diligence and fruit is not in keeping with their growth in age. Benedict of Aniane took this point so seriously that the first document which he inserted into his Codex immediately after the Rule of Benedict itself was his tract on penance for monks who committed any of the four types of sins retarding spiritual growth. To enforce the moral conversion of all monks was a fundamental task for this reformer who had defined the ‘path of the just’ as ‘a shining light proceeding and growing until it reaches the perfect day’.

Correspondingly, the RB was promoted as the exclusive rule for the monasteries throughout the Frankish realm precisely because of its effectiveness in bringing monks through this

57 J. Narberhaus, Benedikt von Aniane, p. 60.

58 For the problem of the vow of conversio morum for those who had never known the secular life, see de Jong, In Samuel’s Image, p. 131.


process of the *conversio morum*. Smaragdus’ lengthy praise of the Rule in the metrical preface to his commentary makes one point: that everything in the *RB* is oriented toward the conversion of the monk’s habits and nature, and that it could bring monks to their goal of perfection.\(^62\) That holiness was not the presumed state of the monk but rather the goal of his struggle helps us understand why the Carolingians were absorbed as they were in producing moral treatises on the theme of the *psychomachia*, the battle between good and evil, virtues and vice, and why exhortations to the monastic life took on a heightened importance in the Carolingian period.\(^63\) As the Carolingians saw it, the purity of the cloister and its resident monk was the result of hard work and gruelling combat. Even the huts which Sturm built for his monks at Hersfeld hearkened back to the world of Egyptian hermits for whom the cell symbolized the ascetic struggle, as in the words of Paul of Tamma who called the cell the monk’s greatest tester and teacher while assuring them that ‘the labour of your cell will go with you to God’.\(^64\) The cell, the cloister, the soul of the monk was not holy by virtue of a status endowed, but was itself the battleground, the workshop where one toiled faithfully at the tasks of the spiritual craft, its holiness the result of the combat waged on the path to perfection.\(^65\)

Prayer stood at the very heart of this ascetic pursuit. Both Benedict of Aniane and Smaragdus relied heavily on Cassian’s understanding that the ascetic struggle was at once most pronounced and best surmounted in the act of prayer: prayer was where the monk must fight off the tendency to lose concentration or the urge to sleep, where tempting images will most frequently be brought before his eyes, where the devil lies waiting to snatch one away the

---


\(^{63}\) Thus the hortatory activity of Benedict of Aniane the aspect of the reformer which his biographer was most eager to showcase. Ardo, *Vita Benedicti* 19 and 24, MGH SS 15.1, pp. 208 and 210.


moment he drifts off from alert attention.66 But prayer was also the way to gain purity of heart and bring a good work to completion: because the Christian is a temple of God and the Spirit of the Lord dwells in him, he carries within himself the very One to whom he is praying and is quickly heard by the Lord who dwells there.67 The connection which Cassian and Smaragdus highlighted between the ascetic struggle and the role of prayer is the basis for my study, which concentrates on the particular duty of intercessory prayer that was the major work of the Carolingian monastery. This is a study of Carolingian intercession which places on front stage the spiritual goals of the monastic life and assumes that it was still highly relevant to early medieval liturgical ritual. In so doing, it rejects a view of Carolingian monasticism which would see in it, in the words I borrow from Richard Sullivan, ‘a kind of directionless avatar buffeted by royal and aristocratic manipulation, misdirected by ambitious and greedy lay abbots, overburdened with wealth and worldly concerns’, an institution which had lost its first love and become ‘befuddled by a tentative comprehension of the tradition defining the ascetic ideal and how to achieve it’.68 Instead, my thesis argues from the basis of an ancient monastic ideal which found new expression in the Carolingian emphasis on the public service of liturgical intercession. This thesis asks the central question, ‘What was the relationship between the intercessory function of monasticism and the ascetic concern for moral conversion in the time of the reforms of Benedict of Aniane, c. 750-820?’ Rather than being concerned with questions concerning the efficacy of monastic intercession (why and how it was sought) or the supply and demand of it (by whom and for whom), studies on which there is no shortage, it asks how an ‘intercessory-type monasticism’ was consistent with – or even

67  Smaragdus, Expositio Prologue, CCM 8, pp. 17-18, quoting Isidore, Etymologiae I.5.3 (PL 82:81).
bolstered – the monastic vocation of moral conversion. The chief concern of the monk was to seek and find perfection in God; I wish to suggest in this study that the elaborate liturgical intercession which characterized early medieval monasticism was coherent with this goal.

This is, clearly, a study about an ideal, but ideals were after all what inspired the host of reforms during the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. Eighth- and ninth-century Francia underwent a total renewal in social, political, economic, and ecclesiastical structure which influenced facets of life as diverse as the making of royal oaths, estate management policies, baptism procedures, spelling, and building construction. In particular, the Frankish kingdom was to be defined by an insistence on ordo, everybody acting rightly in their right place, and under this vision, monks were to display the highest levels of renunciation and sanctity. But the monk’s right performance was not to be an exterior one, skin-deep. Rather, monastic leaders expected the monk to perform exterior intercessions which were substantiated by his interior spiritual progress – to maintain, in other words, his integrity, so that there may be ‘no duplicity in prayer, not to be one person in the mouth and another in the heart’. In inserting this quotation, Benedict of Aniane and Smaragdus in the ninth century were only repeating a point made repeatedly in monastic rules of previous ages: Augustine’s Praeceptum in the fifth century, Caesarius of Arle’s Regula ad Virgines, the Regula Magistri, and the Regula Tarnantensis in the sixth century, and Isidore’s Regula monachorum in the seventh century all insisted that what is professed in the voice must be sung and meditated upon in the heart. A fundamental tenet of monastic thought is that no wall must

71 Augustine, Praeceptum VII.2.1 and 2.3; Caesarius Regula ad Virgines 22; Regula Magistri 48:1-4; Regula Tarnantensis 8.13; Isidore, Regula monachorum 6.2. J. Dyer ‘The Psalms in Monastic Prayer’, ed. van Deusen, The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages, p. 62.
ever be erected between what is carried out in the external arena (such as ritual psalmody for the benefit of patrons) and what goes on in the internal arena of the monk’s thought life. In this vein, Marcel Gauchet’s statements are especially insightful when he argues that the historian’s study of prayer should concentrate on ‘the common place where we are wont both to deploy “the prayer of the heart” as well as functional prayer or “prayer for”’. This intersection, the point of meeting between the interiority of prayer with its spiritual aims and the functional world of social relationships upon which intercession is based, suggests an ideal which maintained the integrity of the individual monk while emphasizing his existence within a larger system, and which held that the monk’s existence within the organism larger than himself – his monastic community, the kingdom, and the church – was only meaningful if he was true to his personal call to make progress in the ascetic struggle.

My study of Carolingian intercessory prayer begins with a rather surprising premise: the monk’s inability to pray. I argue in Chapter One that as monastic rules increasingly came to define the monastic state in the early Middle Ages, there was a fundamental re-definition of the nature of intercessory prayer, from a ‘power’ (an ability wielded by a holy man to display his sanctity and privileged status) to a ‘prescription’ (an activity established and directed by a master for his disciple for the purposes of his spiritual welfare). I demonstrate that monastic liturgical organization was meant to address the fundamental problem of human sin which impedes fruitful prayer, and suggest that it is against this crucial backdrop that the significant reforms to monastic prayer in the ninth century should be understood. The additions of intercessory liturgy made by Benedict of Aniane should be seen as his ‘prescription’ for the

---

cultivation of interior virtue and true prayer, in keeping with the pastoral concerns for the holiness of monks.

In Chapter Two, I situate the liturgical intercession of Carolingian monasteries within Benedict of Aniane’s monastic theology. Making use of little-studied theological texts written and compiled by the abbot, I describe the primary components of Benedict of Aniane’s theological system: his concern with seeing God through faith and love, and his teaching that all of monastic life should be ordered around the pursuit of perfect love. In highlighting this typically overlooked but foundational component in his monastic understanding, I refute the claims of scholars that Benedict of Aniane was mainly a legislative abbot more interested in building a liturgical and ritual civilization than on the interior dimensions of monastic life. I then study Benedict’s contribution to the rite of the Mass to show how the intercessory Mass in particular was related to the fundamental concern of his asceticism, to attain perfect love. The chapter offers the argument that the eucharistic sacrifice of monastic communities was seen as an important activity for kindling charity within the monk who wished to see God, and that liturgical intercession was part of the offering of the monk’s heart, and a way to attain the vision of the Almighty.

In Chapter Three, I turn to that other form of liturgical prayer with which monks were occupied, the psalmody of the Divine Office, and explore the spiritual purposes undergirding Carolingian intercessory accretions. Patristic psalms exegesis, and instruction about the Divine Office in early monastic rules, consistently described the inherently public function of psalmody. By examining how Carolingian writers received and emphasized this teaching, I wish to demonstrate that ninth-century church leaders believed that the Office should be characterized by an overtly social and public orientation. Monastic psalmody was a social exercise because it was offered in the voice of all, and also because it acted as a social contract
binding individuals to each other. The hours of prayer were not to be occasions for self-promotion but rather times in which monks showed deference to one another. The social dimension built into the performance and interpretation of psalmody, conceived of as an exercise in self-renunciation which gave priority to acts of submission and unity in the chorus, lent itself to a usage which could easily adopt an intercessory function.

Chapter Four concerns the obvious relationship between intercession and the ascetic goal: the support through prayer which monks offered one another in spiritual combat against the devil and in the pursuit of virtue and perfection. I start first with the basic vocabulary of fraternal intercession between two individuals as expressed through the epistolary prayer formula, noting the imagery of a friend’s prayer as a saving instrument for assisting a brother through the dangers of the world. Next, I analyze fraternal intercession within the cloister, taking as examples prayer for the traveling brother, for the brother tempted to sin, and for the various physical spaces of an abbey to demonstrate that the prayers of a monastic community were seen as efficacious for sustaining the undertakings and spiritual progress of each monk. Finally I examine the prayer confraternities which linked together discrete monastic houses and served to reassure the monk of the manifold promises of God in return for his life of sacrifice. These various modes of intercession were understood to demonstrate the key idea of cenobitic monasticism, that monastic congregations were fraternal battle-lines necessary for supporting a monk in his ascetic struggle.

Chapter Five argues that the obligatory prayer for rulers – despite its apparently this-worldly motives – was in fact for monks an expression of the belief that Frankish society was on a pilgrimage to an other-worldly, heavenly City. Early Christian apologists had long equated intercession for rulers with the desire for earthly peace. Yet, in the eighth- and ninth-centuries, new religious realities meant that monastic intercession was specifically shaped by the belief
that a type of peace could be pursued which would not only be temporal and interim, but be transferred to eternity. Monks were in a special position – in their ascetic authority as those especially focused on the progress from the earthly to the eternal, to offer prayer for those charged with ensuring that the pilgrimage of a Christian people proceed smoothly.

In Chapter Six, I address the question concerning the role Carolingian monastics meant for their intercessory prayers to play in society at large, and the extent to which general social concern was a priority in monastic intercession. Religious reform in the eighth and ninth centuries occurred as part of an intensive effort on the part of Carolingian authorities to produce social legislation for the welfare of the public and particularly the protection of the poor and vulnerable, but I suggest that Carolingian monasticism sought neither to reinforce the existing social order nor to transform it radically. By examining the uses and textual transmission of universal litanies which comprehensively itemized categories of people and needs, I argue that monks had an open-handed approach toward intercession for the world, shying away both from the suggestion that they were to be unique intercessors on behalf of all others, as well as from the concern about how to make their life of prayer socially useful or pragmatically beneficial. Rather, I propose, writers suggested that the relevance of monastic prayer lay in the wisdom which monks were uniquely positioned to attain, and in their experience of the contemplative seeking and desiring gifts from God.

Drawing conclusions about the coherence between ritualistic intercessory liturgy and the contemplative, beatific desires of the ascetic life necessitates a dependence on those sources which describe the monastic ideal. This is not a hard task, for ascetic treatises and commentaries on the monastic state dominate eighth- and ninth-century manuscripts. At least five manuscripts of Benedict of Aniane’s *Concordia Regularum* and thirteen of
Smaragdus’ *Expositio* on the *RB* survive from the ninth and tenth centuries.73 And this count does not include the copious number of manuscripts containing traditionally authoritative works on monastic theory, many incorporated into the works just mentioned, but also standing on their own in independent manuscripts and codices: the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, Cassian’s *Conferences*, important works of hagiography like Athanasius’ *Life of St. Antony* and Gregory’s *Life of St. Benedict*, and countless other works of various genres on monastic themes which found their way into Carolingian *florilegia*, such as Jerome’s famous monastic letters and Caesarius’ homilies. These ascetic works represent a necessary interpretive tool for approaching the more administrative textual products of the Carolingian reforms which describe the political obligations of prayer and new liturgical protocol required in an early medieval intercessory culture: transactional documents recording grants of land, gifts, and immunities; *ordines* and *expositiones* legislating liturgical performance; and the imperially-issued decrees related to the conciliar concerns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, foremost among them the *Admonitio Generalis* and the 816/817 Aachen decrees. These types of sources provide important information about the new intercessory obligations and ritual rigour expected of Carolingian monks, but need to be supported by the abundance of texts which give evidence of the continued spiritual aspirations behind such performance. The sources I have examined are deliberately hortatory, didactic, and prescriptive, because monasticism as traditionally understood, and as the Carolingians affirmed, was a call to correction, conversion, and growth. To learn how to pray rightly was a most basic step in the ascetic vocation; it is with this topic that my study therefore begins.

---

73 Bonnerue, CCCM 168, pp. 162-96; Spannagel and Engelbert, CCM 8, pp. xv-xx. Manuscript information on the most important early medieval monastic texts has been compiled into an online database by A. Diem in his Monastic Manuscript Project: www.earlymedievalmonasticism.org.
Chapter One:
Praying by the Rules

In his *Life of Benedict of Nursia*, Gregory the Great portrayed Benedict as a charismatic virtuoso wielding his miracle-producing powers at every turn. Gregory’s student Peter asks the question, ‘I should like to know whether he always performed these great miracles by virtue of his prayers or whether he sometimes produced them solely by means of his will?’ To this Gregory responded, ‘Those who cling to God with devotion usually produced miracles in two ways, as circumstances demand. Sometimes they perform wonderful things by means of prayer, at other times by means of their own power’. But there is a world of difference between this intercessory power of the Benedict portrayed in Gregory’s *Dialogues*, and the intercessory work of Carolingian monks bound to the rule which bears his name. In the world of Carolingian monasticism, we are indeed very far from the solo holy man wielding his mediatorial power autonomously, at his own will. On the contrary, the intercessory activity of Carolingian monks was fixed and determined according to a rigid timetable. To the daily offices prescribed in the Rule of Benedict, not a few liturgical accretions for the specific purpose of intercessory prayer made their first appearance in the time of the Carolingian monastic reforms associated with Benedict of Aniane: at least two daily Masses for special

---


intentions, the recital of the fifteen gradual psalms for rulers and the dead, the Office of the Dead, and penitential psalms for the dead.³

The ‘institutionalization’ of the ‘holy man’ in Western monasticism is a transformation that has been traced many times before, a story of evolution from the virtuosity and charisma of the desert ascete to the communal order and deliberate restraint of cenobitic monasticism.⁴ This chapter will argue that along with this development, and particularly as monastic rules increasingly came to define the monastic state, there was a fundamental re-definition of the nature of intercessory prayer, from a ‘power’ (an ability wielded to display one’s sanctity and privileged status) to a ‘prescription’ (an activity established and directed by a master for his disciple for the purposes of his spiritual welfare). This development is an important one to observe, for today scholars often have a marked fascination with the ‘power’ of monastic intercessory prayer. The difference between the intercession of late-antique monks versus early medieval monks is said to rest primarily on the distinction between the solo holy man versus the collective chorus: the power of an individual versus the power of an entire group, but power nonetheless.⁵ While the language of ‘power’ naturally emanates from the diplomatic and hagiographic sources produced by monks for the purposes of securing land, privileges, and immunities, and for transmitting the stories of famous individuals associated with an abbey, such charged language is absent from monastic legislation. In this opening chapter, I shall explore how the very nature of monastic legislation (monastic rules in particular), by virtue of their overtly pastoral concerns, transformed the function of intercessory prayer from a display of one’s holiness to an activity prescribed to further

---

³ On the attribution to Benedict of Aniane for the introduction of the Trina Oratio and the Office of the Dead, see below, p. 47, fn. 63 and p. 50, respectively.
⁴ Dunn, The Emergence of Monasticism.
⁵ See Introduction, above, pp. 2-4. As mentioned on p. 4, it has become commonplace to refer to Carolingian monasteries as ‘powerhouses of prayer’.
progress in the way of holiness.\(^6\) The additions of intercessory liturgy made by Benedict of Aniane should be seen as his ‘prescription’ for the cultivation of interior virtue and true prayer, in keeping with the pastoral concerns for the holiness of monks in the eighth and ninth centuries.

**The inability to pray**

In notable contrast to Gregory the Great’s charismatic Benedict of Nursia stands that other famous legislator of monasticism, Pachomius. The *Vita Pachomii* occupies a distinguished place in the *Codex Regularum* compiled by Benedict of Aniane, standing out as the only narrative text and taking its place near the front of the codex.\(^7\) As a sixth-century text here ascribed to Jerome and purporting to attest to the earliest monastic rule, it sets the tone for the tradition of monastic rules to come. Thus, what happens in this *Vita* and the issues about the monastic life which it raises were crucially important to Benedict of Aniane. The *Vita* tells of Pachomius’ encounter with an angel while he was still a pagan:

>(T)he angel of the Lord said to him: “Do you know the heavenly God in the highest who lives in heaven?” Pachomius said, “My lord, I do not know whether there is a God in heaven; indeed, I am a rustic and I have no wisdom...” And the angel said to him, “Pray to the Lord, and he will give you wisdom and intellect.” Pachomius said, “I do not know how to pray, I do not even know what I ought to say.”\(^8\)

---

6. On the importance of submission in the monastic life to rule and abbot, see A. de Vogüé, ‘*Sub Regula vel Abbate*: Étude sur la signification théologique des règles monastiques anciennes’, *Collectanea Ordinis Cisterciensium Reformatorum* 33 (1971), 200-41.

7. There are several versions of the Greek *Vita Pachomii*, and these have generated numerous studies. However, the earliest Latin *Vita Pachomii* (also known as the *Vita Pachomii iunioris*), included by Benedict of Aniane in his Codex (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 28118, folios 24-28) is little known. It has recently been analyzed and studied in A. Diem and H. Müller, *Vita, Regula, Sermo*: Eine unbekannte lateinische Vita Pacomii als Lehretext für ungebildete Mönche und als Traktat über das Sprechen’, in R. Corradini, M. Diesenberger and M. Niederkorn-Bruck, ed., Zwischen Niederschrift und Wiederschrift. Frühmittelalterliche Hagiographie und Historiographie im Spannungsfeld von Kompendienüberlieferung und Editionstechnik (Vienna, 2010), pp. 223-272, with edited text on pp. 258-272.

Coming from the mouth of the man renowned as the founder of cenobitic monasticism, an institution that would go on over the course of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages to hold the action of prayer as its prime sphere of duty and expertise, this is a significant – if rather surprising – start.

‘How to pray’ and ‘what one ought to say’ were persistent sources of anxiety in the eighth and ninth centuries during the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. When Charlemagne issued his *Admonitio Generalis* in 789, he ordered bishops to examine priests through their dioceses on their doctrinal beliefs, how they conducted baptisms, and how they celebrated the Mass. In particular, he ordered priests to be quizzed on whether they properly said and understood the prayers of the Mass, whether they sang the psalms in the right way, and whether they both understood the Lord’s Prayer themselves and were able to preach it properly, ‘so that they may be understood by all, *to the end that everybody know what he asks from God*.’

Charlemagne’s chief court officer Einhard wrote a letter ‘On the Adoration of the Cross’ expressly to discuss the question about how one should call upon and beseech him [God], since if he is asked otherwise than he should be or for something other than what one ought [to ask for], it is not surprising that our prayer is not heard or that what we desired to secure is not obtained. For James says, “You ask and receive not, because you ask wrongly.” The Apostle to the Romans said: “we know not what we should pray for as we ought.” Thus it seems to me that there is a pressing need for us to examine and understand what it means, according to the words of James, to ask wrongly and, according to the teaching of Paul, not to know what is to be prayed for as we ought, because it can happen that one who does not know for what or how he ought to ask asks wrongly, and thus may not receive what he asks for.

The acquisition of the correct text of the Bible and the correct text of the prayers of the Mass, the effort to improve the knowledge of Latin – these were all things Carolingian rulers and

---


10 Einhard, ‘*Quaestio de adoranda cruce*’, ed. K. Hampe, MGH Epp 5 (Berlin, 1899), pp. 146-9, at 147, trans. P. Dutton, *Charlemagne’s Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, ON, 1998), pp. 171-4 at 171-2. Einhard then goes on to discuss how prayer should be made only to God the Father and the suitability of adoring the Cross.
theologians did toward the end of teaching the Frankish people ‘how to pray’ and ‘what they ought to say’ to God.\footnote{For an overview of this fundamental concern, see Costambeys et al., The Carolingian World, pp. 142-6. It is a concern summarized in the oft-quoted command of Charlemagne in his Admonitio, ‘Correct properly the catholic books, for often, while people want to pray to God in proper fashion, they yet pray improperly because of uncorrected books’ (cap. 72, ed. MGH Cap 1, p. 60, trans. King, Charlemagne: Translated Sources, p. 217). See also Charlemagne’s Epistola de litteris colendis, MGH Cap. 1, no. 29, pp. 78-9 at 79.}

Ignorance of how to pray properly could be more or less easily resolved with the correct texts and teaching aids. But ignorance was not the chief concern of monasticism. Rather, monasticism was preoccupied with a deeper anxiety: the problem of human temptation to sin. This fundamental concern of monasticism is expressed in the 816/817 Aachen Synods, which attempted to clarify the distinction between monks and clerical canons. Benedict of Aniane may well have presided over both the discussion about rules for secular canons and that for monks, and although the Institutio Canonicorum (the body of legislation produced for secular clergy to live the common life) has traditionally been ascribed to Amalarius of Metz, it may also have been authored by Benedict of Aniane himself.\footnote{The source of the attribution to Amalarius is the Chronicle of Ademarus, stating that the Emperor ordered Amalarius the Deacon to compile a Rule for Canons to act as a parallel to that of the RB for monks. But Ardo’s Vita also tells us Benedict of Aniane was commissioned by the Emperor to help in the reform of the life of the canons, for whom, we are told, he established a specific code by which they should live. For this discussion, see 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 and Burlington, VT, 2005), pp. 93-4, and M. Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century (Cambridge, 2004).}

\footnote{Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis Prologue, MGH Conc 2:1, pp. 307–420 at 312-3.} The Institutio Canonicorum opens with a long prologue asserting that the distinction between monks and clergy rests upon the perfect renunciation of monks (in particular, the renunciation of all private property).\footnote{For an overview of this fundamental concern, see Costambeys et al., The Carolingian World, pp. 142-6. It is a concern summarized in the oft-quoted command of Charlemagne in his Admonitio, ‘Correct properly the catholic books, for often, while people want to pray to God in proper fashion, they yet pray improperly because of uncorrected books’ (cap. 72, ed. MGH Cap 1, p. 60, trans. King, Charlemagne: Translated Sources, p. 217). See also Charlemagne’s Epistola de litteris colendis, MGH Cap. 1, no. 29, pp. 78-9 at 79.} But this obvious distinction is given deeper substance in the accompanying material which shows us more clearly what the Aachen reformers believed to be the essential constitutive difference between secular clergy and monks. The Register of Chapters, a long catena of patristic and conciliar texts preceding the rules proper, includes Sermon 46 of St. Augustine, ‘On the
Shepherds’. This same patristic material is inserted by Benedict of Aniane into his *Concordia Regularum* to support *RB* 35 on the function of the Abbot. Crucially, the same text is used to make entirely opposite assertions. The *Institutio Canonicorum* uses Augustine’s sermon about the negligent shepherds chided in the book of Ezekiel to exhort secular clergy about their role in pastoral care and to make the point that they are shepherds overseeing the sheep for whom they will one day be held into account.¹⁴ The *Concordia Regularum* uses the same sermon to warn abbots that they will face the penalty of death if they do not carry out their duty to protect the weak sheep under their care. The language (based on Ezekiel 34:3-4) used to describe the monks is vivid, and it certainly does not give the impression of ‘powerful’ monks.

“What is enfeebled you have not strengthened, and what was ill you have not nursed back to health, and what has been bruised (that is, what has been fractured) you have not bandaged; and what was going astray you have not called back, and what was lost you have not sought”...

A sheep is feeble, that is to say, it is feeble in spirit and may easily yield to temptations, if they confront it when it is not being careful and not ready for them.¹⁵

Whether or not this depiction conforms with the actual self-understanding of the vast majority of monks in the early medieval period, monastic exhortatory literature relies on this most fundamental of all premises: that the monastic state exists because of human weakness and propensity for sin.¹⁶ This fundamental distinction – clergy as shepherds with the duty to

---


¹⁵ Augustine, Sermon 46, quoted by Benedict of Aniane in his *Concordia Regularum* 35.5, CCCM 168a, p. 306: “Quod infirmatum est, non confortastis, et quod male habuit, non corroborastis, et quod tribulatum est,” id est, quod confractum est, “non colligastis, et quod errabat, non revocastis, et quod periiit, non inquisistis”...

Infirmatur ovis, id est, infirmum corrigit, ut possit cedere temptationibus, incauto et inparato supervenerit’.

protect, monks as sheep in their state of weakness – was one that could be applied even in the age of frequent ordinations of monks to the priesthood. Monk-priests were still first and foremost monks; they were priests within the cloister, still to be enclosed within the sheepfold.\textsuperscript{17} This was in drastic contrast to secular clergy whose lives took them into the world.\textsuperscript{18} The distinction had significant implications for how the task of ensuring correct prayer was approached. For clergy (the shepherds) charged with the task of praying correctly and teaching their sheep how to pray correctly, the answer was relatively straightforward. Codices containing the \textit{Institutio Canonicorum} circulated along with expositions on the Lord’s Prayer, so that priests could learn the meaning of the Lord’s Prayer and be able to teach it to their congregations.\textsuperscript{19} For monks, the ‘feeble sheep’, however, the problem of ‘how to pray correctly’ was much more complicated, so much so that it gave a fundamental impetus to the development of liturgical codes of monastic rules.

\textit{Rules for praying}

Pachomius’ admission of his inability to pray drew this response from the angel:

\begin{quote}
(T)he angel took a laurel leaf and wrote in it words of prayer and gave it to Pachomius, saying: “Eat this, and it will be bitter as blood in your mouth and will fill your stomach with wise prayer and will give you the form of prayer with good doctrine.”... The same angel of the Lord touched the mouth of Pachomius, and with the bitterness of his tongue removed, he spoke wonderful things concerning God. Now the angel of the Lord said to Pachomius: “Fix your knee on the ground
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{17} J. Leclercq, ‘On Monastic Priesthood according to the Ancient Medieval Tradition’, \textit{Studia Monastica} 3 (1961), 137-55, especially his discussion of the ‘ascetical priesthood’ and ‘contemplative priesthood’ on pp. 152-5.

\textsuperscript{18} See the volumes of collected articles by R. Reynolds, \textit{Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image} (Aldershot, 1999); idem, \textit{Clerical Orders in the Early Middle Ages: Duties and Ordination} (Aldershot, 1999).

and turn your face toward the East, and the ability to pray will now be given to you from God."\textsuperscript{20}

When he opens his mouth to pray, the two prayers which he produces provides us with one of the most succinct and expressive statements (and thus far only analyzed in detail by Albrecht Diem) on the role and function of prayer in the Western monastic tradition.\textsuperscript{21} The author records his first prayer in this way:

And Pachomius placed his knees on the ground and his face toward the west, and prayer was infused into his senses. And he said: "I bless you, Lord God, King of heaven, who made those ignorant of you to know your name and effected a manifestation through our Lord Jesus Christ your son, so that he would gather a people to you adopted out of all the gentiles.... Therefore I beseech your mercy through him, that you may deign to lead me to your grace and grant the light of the word to me, a blind man constituted in shadows. \textit{For you know, Lord, that I knew nothing about speech, and you deigned to grant that I would speak to you, and you taught me with what words I should address you.}\textsuperscript{22}

After several more lines of prayer in which Pachomius recounts the nature of God’s call to conversion (‘the blind see, the deaf hear, mute tongues are loosed, the lame walk, the lepers cleansed’, etc.), the author concludes, ‘Here is the first prayer of Saint Pachomius, \textit{through which} the angel of the Lord introduced him to the required way of faith’. The instructional purpose of this first prayer for the converted Pachomius is thus made clear. When Pachomius is baptized and filled with the Holy Spirit, he then offers another reflection about the meaning of his newfound ability to pray:

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}


\textsuperscript{21} For a more thorough discussion of what follows, with reference to other contemporaneous monastic literature, see Diem’s analysis in ‘\textit{Vita, Regula, Sermo}’, pp. 223-57.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid,} emphasis mine: ‘\textit{Et posuit Pacomius genua sua in terra, faciem quoque suam ad orientem, et infusa est oratio in sensu eius. Et ait: “Benedicam te, domine deus, rex caelestis, qui ignorantibus te nomen tuum innotescere facis et per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum filium tuum efficis manifestum, ut populum tibi congregaret ex omnibus gentibus adoptivum.... Per eum ergo obsecro tuam misericordiam, ut me perduere digneris ad tuam gratiam et mihi caeco tribuas verbum luminis in tenebris constituto. Tu enim nosti, domine, quia nullum sciebam omnino sermonem, et dignatus es donare quod loquerer ad te, et docuisti me quibus te verbis rogarem”}’.
Having undergone baptism, Pachomius draws the connection between the experience of conversion and the action of prayer: in his conversion, he says, he no longer speaks out of his natural self, but out of his renovated soul. This is a willful act: he had to ‘accept the voice’. Furthermore, he sings a psalm as a result of having been ‘taught the ordinance by which I shall sing a psalm’. Crucially, these statements are foundational for our understanding of the concern driving monastic legislation that liturgical prayer be about speaking out of one’s renovated soul rather than the soul belonging to his old nature. The concern here is with ‘voice’ - a voice to reflect the fact that a monk has been consecrated to God and has begun the conversion from an old self to his new self.

Pachomius had the help of an angel to give him this voice – an angel literally taught him the ordinance by which he was to sing a psalm to God. What the angel does next in the Vita serves to make the point that monks and nuns follow in the same line as Pachomius, privy to the same angelic instruction. The angel gives Pachomius a rule for monks, which includes precepts for gatherings of communal prayer twice a day, morning and evening synaxis. By following the precepts of the Regula Pachomii, a monk accepts ‘the voice’. This is an idea continued in the eighth-century Regula Cassiani, an anonymous compilation drawn from

---

23 Ibid, pp. 263-4, emphasis mine: ‘Gratias tibi ago, dominie lesu Christe, qui per spiritum sanctum tuum reconciliare me dignatus es deo patri et redemisti me a poena aetema.... Inimicum legis tuae qui mihi in carne dominabatur subvertens a sordibus (aque) atque spiritus sancti regeneratione mundasti. Loquitur in me anima renovata, quae longo tempore inter oves perditas iacebat abiecta.... Quasi mutus accepi vocem.... Ideo confitebor tibi et psalmum dicam nomini tuo cum me docuieris ordinem quo psallam tibi et benedicam nomen tuum in aeternum et in secula seculorum’.

24 Again, on this, see Diem, ‘Vita, Regula, Sermo’, pp. 223-57.
Cassian’s *Institutes*, which Benedict of Aniane also included in his *Codex Regularum*.\(^{25}\)

Contained in this rule is the so-called ‘rule of the angel’, in which an angel is said to have set the number of psalms at twelve.\(^{26}\) The context of this angelic teaching is the rigorous debate among the Egyptian monks over how many psalms should be sung:

> Therefore when the holy fathers had gathered together, and each one judged to establish the manner of prayer based on his own desire or fervour of faith, *not considering what would be possible for the great crowd of brothers and the many weak ones*, but for the faith of the few, and certain fathers tried to fix the number of psalms as fifty, others sixty, and many even a more enormous number, and there was among them a holy diversity in their pious disagreement about the rule of religion, suddenly one sitting among them rose from the middle of all to sing psalms to the Lord.\(^{27}\)

This was the mysterious angel who, after singing twelve psalms and an *Alleluia*, disappeared from their midst, putting an end to the debate. The implied message of this episode is that the angel set the number of psalms at twelve because that was the best way to account for ‘the many weak ones’. The whole point of liturgical legislation, Cassian suggests here, is to manage and enhance the moral conversion of ‘the great crowd of brothers’ who are by nature weak and feeble – and so, for example, the recitation of psalms is to be broken up into smaller sections to prevent the mind from being overwhelmed, psalms are prayed whilst sitting to


\(^{26}\) For a discussion of the complexities surrounding this account as it relates to Pachomius, Cassian, and Palladius, see J. Dyer, ‘Monastic Psalmody of the Middle Ages’, *Revue bénédictine* 99 (1989), 41-74, esp. 47-52.

\(^{27}\) *Regula Cassiani* II.7, ed. Ledoyen, ‘La “Regula Cassiani” du Clm 28118’, p. 171: ‘Cum ergo in unum sancti patres convenissent et pro suo unusquisque desiderio vel fidei fervore tales orationum modum statui iudicaret, qui non in multitudinem fratrum et praeterea quam plurimis infirmis possibilitas esset, sed paucorum fidei conveniret, et alii quidem patres quinquagenos, alii sexagenos psalmos, multi etiam enormem amplius psalmorum numerum instituere certarent essetque inter eos pro religionis regula piae contentionis sancta diversitas, sedentibus in unum cunctis subito unus ex medio omnium psalmos domino cantaturus exsurgit’. Cassian’s *Institutiones* makes an even greater point of the ‘weakness’ of the brethren, saying that the holy fathers had been ‘unmindful of the weakness of others (*infirmitatis inmemor alienae*)’ and had ignored the fact that a ‘great proportion of weak ones is necessarily to be found (*in qua necesse est infirmorum quoque partem maximam repperiri*)’ among the crowd of brethren. Cassian, *Institutiones Coenobiorum* II.5, ed. J.-C. Guy, *Institutions cénobitiques*, SC 109 (Paris, 1965), p. 66, 68.
prevent weariness and distraction, and no sleep is permitted after the night prayer lest the monks lose through the sloth of rest the spiritual benefits they had gained.28

Attention to the competing forces within the monk – the monk’s consecration to God to pray out of his renovated soul but the ever-present danger that he will fall prey to his naturally weak and evil inclinations – would be a major driving force behind Carolingian liturgical organization. Cassian’s logic for liturgical legislation was so important to Carolingian reformers that it was repeated in both Benedict’s *Concordia Regularum* and Smaragdus’ *Commentary on the Rule*:

Although (the devil) is always hostile to us, he is most especially so when he sees us offering prayers to the Lord against him; he hastens to distract us from attention to prayer either by thoughts or by stirring up our passions. Therefore our Fathers ordered that our prayers be short, certainly, but frequent: short so that by their very brevity we may be able to avoid the ambushes of the devil lying in wait for us, especially when we are praying; frequent, so that through their very frequency we may be able to cleave to God continually in prayer.29

Monastic reformers structured prayer not only to help monks correctly give praise to God, but also and more immediately to account for and manage human weakness and sin, to assist the ‘weak and feeble sheep’ so that neither their laziness and propensity for distraction would be indulged, nor their minds and bodies so wearied that they would be rendered incapable of properly executing prayer. This basis for liturgical organization is the crucial background for understanding the significant reforms to monastic prayer in the ninth century.

---

28 *Institutiones* II.11-12; *Regula Cassiani* VI-X. For Cassian on weakness and the need for the occupation of the mind, see Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, pp. 51-55.

**Rules for monastic prayer in the Aachen reforms**

When Charlemagne requested an authentic text of the *Regula Benedicti* at the end of the eighth century, the abbot of Monte Cassino sent along with it a cover letter containing this piece of advice:

> If the division of the psalm-singing over the individual weekdays which the Blessed Father [Benedict] established seems better to a house, then he gives them permission to sing in this way that they have deemed better. But, if it please you [Charlemagne], those monks who now sing the psalms in the Roman manner should not be coerced to divide them according to the arrangement of this holy *regula*. Rather, they may, with your permission, undertake the *regula* of a more structured life, while continuing to sing in their accustomed [Roman] manner.\(^{30}\)

This is significant, revealing that at the time of Charlemagne, a distinction could be drawn between the *regula* of Saint Benedict and its *cursus*. That is, while in monasteries throughout Gaul since the beginning of the seventh century, the administrative and spiritual teachings of the Rule of Benedict had been followed, along with parts of the Rule of Columbanus, there is little evidence that the Benedictine *cursus* was actually followed. The liturgical *cursus* outlined in the *RB* was one option, but it seems that many monasteries at the time of Charlemagne followed the Roman arrangement of the psalter.\(^{31}\) This was simply to follow in the trend of the Carolingian church in general, which at the time of Charlemagne made a point of exhibiting their preference for Roman customs.\(^{32}\)

---


\(^{31}\) Robertson, *Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, p. 32.

For the monastic Office of the Hours, this all changed, at least in theory, with the Aachen synods of 816/817. The *Chronicon* of Moissac records that as early as the Synod of 802, the command had been issued that

> each bishop in the entire kingdom and in his own jurisdiction, along with his presbyters, should perform the *officium* just as the Roman church sings it.... Likewise in the monasteries which follow the Rule of Saint Benedict they should perform its *officium* just as the Rule teaches.\(^{33}\)

This distinction drawn between prayer for clergy and prayer for monks became a hard and fast rule at Aachen, in which Benedict sought to impose on monasteries a Benedictine observance along with the Office it prescribed.\(^{34}\) How successfully Benedict of Aniane implemented this turn to the *RB* cursus is questionable: the monks at Fulda famously wrote a letter requesting that their old custom of liturgical singing be continued, and at the royal abbey of Saint-Denis, the evidence suggests that the monks there did not make the final transition to the Benedictine cursus until around 1000.\(^{35}\) Yet, that Benedict of Aniane insisted on this difference is in and of itself significant, especially because the difference between the two offices were so *insignificant*. Scholars have generally agreed that the Benedictine cursus found its source largely in the Roman monastic tradition and, to a lesser extent, the Roman cathedral tradition. Thus, both structures shared the same essential components in the composition of each hour, and the differences are minor.\(^{36}\) The fact that the distinction between canonical prayer and monastic prayer should be so insisted upon has something to do, therefore, not with the cursus itself, but with the fact of following the *RB*. The critical

---


\(^{34}\) Statuta Murbacensia 3, CCM 1, p. 442; Synodi primae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica cap. 3, CCM 1, p. 458.

\(^{35}\) Supplex Libellus Monachorum Fuldensium Carolo Imperatori Porrectus, ed. Semmler, CCM 1, p. 321; Robertson, *Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, p. 44.

\(^{36}\) Robertson, *Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, pp. 32-3, provides an overview of the similarities and differences between the two.
thing here to observe is Benedict of Aniane’s insistence on the melding into one unit of the liturgical portion and the administrative/spiritual teaching of the Rule, two things which could once be held separately and independently. Now, the RB must be accepted in its entirety, including its rule for prayer.

Monastic reformers wishing to justify this development had to be clear on why the Benedictine office was now to be adopted wholesale. Hildemar, in his Commentary on the RB, tried to clarify that the RB cursus is to be followed not because it is intrinsically better than the Roman:

> Of course we know truly that the Roman Office is holy, namely in two ways: both because its words are holy and divine and saving, and because there are many holy and pious men who sing it and who by their singing please God in every way. Similarly the Regular Office is holy in all ways, both because the words which are sung are divine and holy, for the same words resonate in the Regular Office which resonate in the Roman Office, though not through the same order.\(^{37}\)

But, Hildemar continues,

> Behold, Blessed Gregory praised the rule, since he read it, and unless he had read it, he would not have praised it. And when he read it, he found there this same Regular Office, and he praised it, since he did not receive it saying, ‘What is contained in this is remarkable for its discretion, with the exception of the Office’.\(^{38}\)

The reason why the Benedictine cursus is to be followed is not because it is essentially any better than the Roman one, but because it belongs to the Rule, the whole Rule, which Gregory praised. And, crucially, to follow the whole Rule that Gregory has praised is necessary simply because the disciple must submit to his teacher:

---

\(^{37}\) Hildemar, *Expositio* 18, ed. Mittermüller, *Vita et regula*, p. 311: ‘Scimus enim veraciter, quia officium romanum sanctum est, videlicet duobus modis: sive quia ipsa verba divina et sancta sunt et salubria, sive quia multi sunt sancti et piii homines, qui illud cantant et illud cantando Deo omni modo placent. Similiter officium regulare omnimodo sanctum est, sive quia ipsa verba divina et sancta sunt, quae cantuntur; nam ipsa verba resonant in officio regulari, quae resonant in officio romano, quamvis non eodem per omnia ordine’.


38
Because he praised the Regular Office, he who wrote the Canonical Office, who are you that you dare to speak against your teacher that the Roman Office is better than the Regular? Oh how indecorous, dishonest, and arrogant it sounds, for disciples in this case not to praise and to want to relinquish what their teacher humbly praised and embraced, that is, loved. Their teacher praised, and his disciples did not wish to receive what they knew their teacher had praised and embraced, just as what has just now been said, that Blessed Gregory praised and embraced the Office of Benedict.  

Crucially, Hildemar identifies the requirement to submit to instruction as the singular reason why the Benedictine Office must be followed. The same idea also leads the anonymous author of the polemical piece about the various *cursus* of psalmody, written shortly before 767 and entitled *Ratio de cursus qui fuerunt eius auctores*, to say with some disdain that the only reason why the cursus of the *RB* has emerged to prominence is not because of any intrinsic goodness, but only because Gregory the Great had said that nothing else should be used other than what Benedict taught. This is a bit of an irony, because Gregory the Great had never tried to fashion himself into an authority of monastic legislation. But by the time of Carolingian theological scholarship, Gregory had become the preeminent authority on pastoral care, so that turning away from the *RB* – cursus included – which had been so clearly endorsed by the Pope was tantamount to an act of rebellion. Smaragdus expresses the importance of total submission when, concerning the objection of those invoking Benedict’s caveat that those who want to make an another arrangement of the psalter may do so, he writes, ‘For our part, we exhort the one who has promised to live according to this Rule to

---

39  *Ibid*: ‘Quod si ille laudavit officium regulare, qui canonicum scriptit: qui estis vos, qui audetis contra vestrum magistrum dicere, melius esse officium romanum quam regulare? O quam indecorosum et inhonestum atque superbum sonat, in his causis discipulos non laudare et velle relinquere, quod magister illorum humiliter laudavit et amplexus est, h. e. amavit. Magister enim illorum laudat, et discipuli illius nolunt recipere, quod cognoscunt magistrum laudasse et amplexum fuisse, sicuti ipse jam fatus B. Gregorius laudavit atque amplexus fuit Benedicti officium’.

40  *Ratio de cursus qui fuerunt eius auctores*, ed. Hallinger, CCM1, pp. 79-91: ‘Est et alius cursus beati Benedicti, qui ipsum singulariter pauco discordante a cursu Romano quem in sua regula repperis scriptum: sed tamen beatus Gregorius urbis Romae pontifex, quasi privilegium monachis ipsum sua autoritate in Vita sancti Benedicti in libro Dialogorum adfirmavit, ubi dixit non aliter sanctus vir docere, nisi sicut ipse beatus Benedictus vivit’.

41  C. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 151-2, where he argues that for all of Gregory’s dealings with monasteries, he is frustratingly ambivalent on rules and legislation for the monastic life.
hold firmly to it and keep it as far as he can; let him trust in the mercy of God and believe that the heavenly kingdoms will be open to those who do keep it'.\textsuperscript{42} Keeping the rule – praying by the rule precisely – had by the time of the Carolingian monastic reforms acquired the language of salvific efficacy, because the rule was the guide for keeping monks on the narrow road towards salvation and perfection.

Secular clergy, too, at the time of the Carolingian reforming councils, were urged to live according to the ‘canons’ – the primary use for the word ‘canon’ being conciliar legislation for the ordering of behaviour – and thus the title for clergy living according to those rules, \textit{clerici canonici} or \textit{clerici regulares}.

\textsuperscript{43} But the purpose of the monastic rule is in distinct contrast with rules for secular clergy, such as that composed by Chrodegang in the mid-eighth century. Having noticed that the clergy had sunk into ‘a state of neglect’, Chrodegang wrote in his Prologue to his Rule, he had decided ‘to outline a brief Rule, driven by necessity, so that the clergy can restrain themselves from what is unlawful, rid themselves of their sins, and leave off those evils which they have practiced for so long’.\textsuperscript{44} The Rule was developed to set a clear standard for clerical behaviour so that clerics could fulfill their proper function as priests and exemplars in word and deed to the flock committed to them, a purpose repeated by the leaders who drafted the \textit{Institutio Canonicorum} at the Council of Aachen in 816: ‘they framed this rule, and gave it to the canonical clergy to observe, so that whereas before they might have found it difficult to know how to live, because of their lack of education or shortage of books, now that it has been carefully brought together in the said rule, they might easily


\textsuperscript{43} Bertram, \textit{Chrodegang Rules}, p. 4.

understand it’.\textsuperscript{45} Rules for secular canons were much more immediately functional, shying away from the language of salvific efficacy which was accorded to the RB for monks. While the RB was the most important source for clerical rules (large proportions of which repeat sections of the RB verbatim), it was never imposed on clerics wholesale; rather, reformers could pick and choose only the ideas or portions they deemed appropriate and practical.

Significantly, Chrodegang’s Rule for canons makes a larger point of intercessory prayer than the RB. Chapter 32 of the \textit{Regula Canonicorum} provides instruction for regular canons receiving alms for prayers: ‘if anyone wants to give one of the priests an offering of any kind, for celebrating Mass, or hearing confession, or for help in sickness, for those dear to him, whether living or dead, the priest may accept this from the donor, and do what he likes with it afterwards’.\textsuperscript{46} This, in Claussen’s words, was Chrodegang’s ‘attempt to make cathedrals the spiritual equals of monasteries by entering the turf of what was the monastic forte – intercession – and allocating it for his own organization’.\textsuperscript{47} This Chrodegang does by asserting how much more efficacious the prayers of the whole canonical chapter are than those of any individual cleric: ‘The mercy of God on behalf of sinners is more easily invoked by many than by one, no matter how devout he may be’.\textsuperscript{48} Chrodegang instructs that intercessory prayer should be conducted by the whole cathedral community because communal prayers are more efficacious. The basis of this instruction is Matthew 18:19-20 (‘if two of you shall consent upon earth, concerning anything whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by my


\textsuperscript{47} Claussen, \textit{Reform of the Frankish Church}, p. 104, fn. 180.

Father who is in heaven. For where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them’). But when Benedict of Aniane turns to this verse to support RB 19 on the discipline of reciting the psalter, his emphasis is surprising. Using Sermon 152 of Caesarius (via Augustine), Benedict’s purpose here is to assert the internal spiritual discipline that psalmody cultivates. Caesarius/Augustine employ an entirely allegorical, individualistic interpretation, applying the verse not as an explanation of the increased efficacy of communal prayer but of a prayer that cultivates the interior piety of an individual:

I believe that [the verse ‘Where two or three are gathered together for my sake’] can be said about one individual, because he can be collected in the house of God, that is, in order to pray to God a man should enter wholly, not only with the exterior senses, but also the interior ones, with holy desires, faith, and good works.

.... (L)et him not appear one thing interiorly and be another exteriorly. Let no part of a man be absent.49

The sermon continues with vivid statements about man’s fundamental spiritual weakness:

I entreat you, brethren, look and notice carefully, because we have within ourselves a spiritual amphitheater, and the wild forest which is depicted in spectacles we daily experience in the movement of our heart.... For in our life I see the wrath of lions, in our affections the cruelty of bears, in our minds the fickleness of panthers, in avarice the greed of wolves, in lust the thirst of wild asses, in our senses the filthiness of vultures, in our memory the forgetfulness of stags, in lying the deceitfulness of foxes, in envy the poison of snakes, in fasting the slowness of oxen, in our hearts the ignorance of steers, in pride the necks of bulls, in shamelessness the boldness of rams, in frivolity the agility of roebucks...

... and so on for another several lines.50 This is by no means a depiction of ‘where two or three are gathered’ in all its efficacious power and intercessory glory!

---


For Smaragdus, Hildemar, and Benedict of Aniane, the function of the monastic rule is to discipline these wicked human tendencies, and nowhere more an intense battleground than in the discipline of prayer. In this activity, the task of the monk was to play the part of the disciple (as a feeble sheep), being taught prayer by a magister. Intercession was an act of learning, particularly so at this time when Benedict of Aniane and Smaragdus sought to reinvigorate the teaching and pastoral function of the abbatial office. Because several prominent monasteries at the time of Louis the Pious were headed by lay abbots (neither priests nor monks), several of the Aachen decrees demanded that abbots conform to the standards of ascetic discipline expected of monks, and reminded abbots that they are the pastoral overseers who must one day give account for how they have taken care of the sheep entrusted to them. The abbot, under this envisioning, had a critical responsibility in teaching their monks ‘how to pray’, a responsibility symbolized by the fact that it is he who must ring the bell to signal the hours of prayer, grant permission for monks to sing, and delegate privileged singing roles like the intoning of the psalms to worthy monks.

The fact that proper praying was to be learned was particularly the case in the time of Carolingian monasticism when child oblates, committed to monasteries by their parents as gifts and comprising the majority of new recruits, literally needed to be taught ‘how to pray’. Oblates began their educational training by learning the psalms, hymns, and canticles by heart, followed by the RB, Scripture, and patristic writings. They took an active part in the liturgical activities alongside adult monks, attending the Offices and the Mass, and if they had

---

51 e.g. Synodi primae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (816), ed. J. Semmler, CCM 1, cap. 1, 4, 6, 9, 13, 19, 20, and 23-25, ordering abbots to learn, understand, and memorize the RB along with the monks, and removing privileges previously enjoyed by abbots. On lay abbots, see F. Felten, Äbte und Laienäbte im Frankenreich. Studie zum Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche im früheren Mittelalters (Stuttgart, 1980).

52 Smaragdus, Expositio 47; Hildemar, Expositio 47.

53 Statua Murbancensia cap. 2, ed. Semmler, CCM 1, p. 442.
the ability, singing the antiphons in order to practice their singing, which at this time involved learning the early system of neumatic notations.\textsuperscript{54} Child oblates had liturgical duties during prayers for the dead and at funerary rites, carrying lighted candles, for example.\textsuperscript{55} On Sundays and feast-days, children might sing the first twelve lessons. A child was beaten privately if he refused to ask forgiveness of mistakes in singing or if he continued to make the same mistakes.\textsuperscript{56} The struggle which oblates faced in learning the psalter and singing led to the first developments in pedagogical aids. The famed hymn-writer Notker of Saint-Gall began to write Latin verses to fit melodies because he had experienced great difficulty as a young oblate in memorizing very long melismas; graffiti in the western gallery of the ninth-century abbey church of Corvey may have been aids for boys who sang there.\textsuperscript{57} Other non-oblate children in Carolingian society learned to pray and sing too: aristocrats sent their lay children to external schools attached to monasteries, where they were subject to the same educational program in the psalter and hymnody as their oblate counterparts.\textsuperscript{58} Regular canons included child oblates who were involved in liturgical activity. But the crucial distinction between the liturgical education of monastic oblates versus that of the other children was that, for monks, learning to pray was part of learning the way of renunciation, of total submission to the Rule. While secular clerical oblates could own property, get married, and eventually choose whether they wanted to remain a priest or not, this option was never


\textsuperscript{56} de Jong, 'Growing up in a Carolingian Monastery', 112-3.


\textsuperscript{58} See M. Hildebrandt, \textit{The External School in Carolingian Society} (Leiden, 1992), pp. 73-85.
open to monastic oblates. Parents offering their children to a monastery made vows that their boys would be bound by the monastic rule:

I hand him over to remain here in keeping with the rule, so that from this day on it is no longer lawful for him to withdraw his neck from under the yoke of the rule; instead he is to know that he is to observe faithfully the ordinances of the same rule and serve the Lord in a joyful spirit with the rest.

Liturgical training – learning to read in Latin, to memorize the entire psalter, and to understand with the heart and mind what one was praying – was an exercise in total self-effacement and perfect renunciation. The child oblate’s first lesson was that he did not belong to himself and that there was never to be such a thing as ‘his own will’: this was the whole point of child oblation as an offering to God, argued Hrabanus Maurus (c. 780-856) in a treatise in defence of the practice.

Adding to the Rule

This discussion is meant to demonstrate that the only appropriate background for understanding Carolingian liturgical accretions to monastic prayer is the authority of the monastic rules as a ‘teacher’ in the monk’s rejection of the old self and conversion to the new. Even when over the course of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, the intercessory aspect of monastic prayer began to gain increasing prominence as the special work of monks, it was never separated out as an action independent of the broader and fundamental aims of monastic rules. All forms of prayer within monastic practice – the Mass, fasting and vigils, veneration and adoration or petition and supplication – were uniform in their place in monastic rules as an expression of devotion and a means for moral progress. Importantly, one

---

59 Bertram, *Chrodegang Rules*, pp. 5-6.
never finds in any early medieval monastic rule a specific section dedicated to ‘intercessory prayer’ as one finds in the Rule of Chrodegang for secular clerics.

This is crucial for our understanding of Benedict of Aniane’s main preoccupation when he made additions to the Benedictine Office. Ardo tells us in his Vita that where the RB was silent, Benedict of Aniane legislated additions or clarifications – that is to say that, in all his liturgical additions to the monastic horarium with their specifically intercessory focus, he was organizing liturgy within the confines of the Rule of Benedict. Ardo’s perspective may not have matched up with fact: in reality, there were quite a few things resulting from Benedict of Aniane’s reforms that diverged from the RB (for example, relaxation on rules concerning bathing and the eating of quadrupeds, and lay abbacies) which resulted from the geographical and political circumstances of ninth-century Francia.62 The point to be emphasized, however, is Benedict of Aniane’s singular attention on the need for minute, precise, and comprehensive monastic legislation. If scholars like to give credit to (or blame, as the case may be) Benedict of Aniane as the legislator who encouraged a culture of intensive intercessory ritual, we must recognize that this was part of his scheme for the ascetic development of ‘weak sheep’, feeble monks, in keeping with the aims of all liturgical organization within monastic legislation. In Ardo’s description of his additions of intercessory psalmody, Benedict of Aniane is portrayed in the long line of liturgical organizers – Cassian, most of all – whose primary concern it was that liturgical gestures, rituals, and the timing of prayers should be characterized by discretion: that is, that some course of praying should be prescribed which should account for the natural weaknesses and lethargy of monks while raising them up to genuine fervour.

---

For example, the following is Ardo’s account of Benedict’s introduction of the so-called *trina oratio*, comprising the gradual psalms 119(120)-133(134) to be sung in choir before Matins.63

He ordered them to sing psalms: five for all the faithful living throughout the whole world, then five for all the faithful departed, and five for those who were recently departed. He decreed that the last five be sung comprehensively, for there was no reason regularly to mention specific deceased persons. When those last five psalms were completed, each was to prostrate himself in prayer, commending to God those in general for whom he sang: and only then begin to make petition for others. As one’s body lies on the earth there should be no reluctance to supplicate the eternal King in specially prescribed psalms. One should not fear to bow his head at designated words along with others able to do so, since in this manner divine grace is suitably invoked and the fervor of compunction is aroused.64

This description is notable for its precision, with Benedict the Abbot clearly taking on the role of teacher, instructing his disciples on how to pray. Exactness is valued - ‘specially prescribed psalms’, ‘designated words’ – because of the effectiveness of discipline in leading to that classically Cassianic ideal of ‘compunction (*compunctio*)’.65 Altar visits, too, in the understanding of his biographer, served the same Cassianic ends. Benedict of Aniane instructed monks to daily visit the various altars of the monastic church three times, reciting

---

63 Due to conflicting nomenclature, there has been much confusion and discrepancy in the secondary literature concerning these extra psalms. The *trina oratio* introduced by Benedict of Aniane consisted of Psalms 119(20)-133(34), the gradual psalms, sung in three parts each for a particular intention. This is not to be confused with the later *trina oratio* introduced in England after Benedict of Aniane’s time, which involved reciting the penitential psalms in three groups, each for a specific intention, followed by the ‘Our Father’ and a collect. See B. Rosenwein, ‘Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression’, *Viator* 2 (1971), 129-57 at 134; J. Tolhurst, *The Monastic Breviary of Hyde Abbey* 7 (London, 1942); T. Symons, ‘A Note on the Trina Oratio’, *Downside Review* 42 (1924), 67-83. More precise information for these two distinct practices (the *trina oratio* composed of penitential psalms versus gradual psalms) comes from the earliest monastic customary in England, the *Regularis Concordia* of 970, ed. T. Symons, *The Monastic Agreement of the Monks and Nuns of the English Nation* (Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 43-4; see J. Tolhurst, ed., *Introduction to the English Monastic Breviaries*, HBS 80 (London, 1942), pp. 57-64.


the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed at the first visit, and just the Lord’s Prayer and confession of sins at the other two.\textsuperscript{66} Ardo explains the reason for this addition:

Benedict established those three stations of prayer so that those who were sluggish, slow, or not in a mood to pray might at least do under compulsion what they did not want to do freely and not presume to abandon the appointed hours, while those who were aflame with extreme love might be restrained from indiscreetly seeking extra hours. Thus it came to pass that they were not worn away with excessive or indiscreet vigils during the course of one night and hence preoccupied at the hours when one should be intent on divine psalms, since one cannot discharge the divine requirement while sleepy.\textsuperscript{67}

A similar concern for prescribing practices characterized by discretion – prayer which would help to discipline those who were lazy while restraining those who were overly zealous – lay behind Benedict’s addition of the ten psalms after compline in the winter, five in the summer. In the Regularis Concordia of the late tenth century in England, we see that the recital of these psalms was in fact an intercessory prayer performed for the intention of the royal family, but the reason for this addition by Benedict of Aniane is clearly suggested by Ardo. Where the RB had left the use of this time after Compline up to each monk, Benedict of Aniane decreed that no one should go outside freely after compline or linger privately in the oratory, but were to recite these psalms instead.\textsuperscript{68}

The Visio Wettini, a long poem written by Walahfrid Strabo (d. 849) in the early 820s based on Heito of Reichenau’s own prose version, offers interesting evidence in support of two additional liturgical accretions made by Benedict of Aniane to the daily liturgy. In Wetti’s

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Ibid.}\textsuperscript{ }
\textsuperscript{68} Compare RB 52, where the monks are permitted either to go outside quietly or to remain for private prayer in the oratory, with Ardo, \textit{Vita Benedicti} 38, MGH 15.1, p. 217: ‘Post completorium vero, instituit, ut non pro libita quis voluntate aut egrediatur aut moretur in oratorio, sed hyemis tempore decem prius canant psalmos, aestate vero quinque...’.
\end{flushright}
deathbed vision of November 3, 824, among the things which the angel shows and teaches him is this:

(T)he angel praised Wetti’s zeal in resorting to the loving Father in prayer, and for choosing a reading from a holy work when a terrifying danger beset him. “Remember this course of action, and do not neglect it in the future,” he said. “Moreover, among many useful remedies there is an excellent psalm which describes moral virtue. It is the psalm that follows the hundred and seventeenth. Reflect on it often. When a reading is made and psalms are sung in a spirit of ingenuous and sincere faith, the offering finds favor, and it is not in vain that such devotion mounts up to God, and Christ is cheered and pleased by such a show of zeal.”

The reference to the praying of Psalm 118(119) is a specific reference to Benedict of Aniane’s introduction of the psalm to the performance of the Minor Hours throughout the week, a practice derived from Roman usage to supplement the RB which limited Psalm 118 to the Minor Hours of Sunday and Monday. The angelic sanction here is based solely on the fact of the psalm’s spiritual benefit to the monk praying it. Secondly, a while later, a vision given to Wetti from the angel shows an abbot suffering purgatorial punishment (winds, storms, rain, and other dangers). The abbot had requested prayers of intercession for him from monasteries, and a certain bishop was supposed to have helped him with his prayers. But failing to do so, he too was now being punished. The angel then summarizes the moral of the tale:

The story which the bishop refused to believe the angel now revealed to Wetti – how the bishop, when informed of their plight showed himself unbelieving to the dead, was slow to bring help to the abbot in need of prayer, and for that reason reaps his punishment without hope of reward.... This episode indicates that much is won by pious prayers.

---


70 Ardo, Vita Benedicti 38, p. 216; Kettemann, Subsidia Anianensia, p. 203, fn. 9.

71 Visio Wettini, MGH Poetae 2, lines 431-4, p. 318, trans. Traill, Walahfrid Strabo’s Visio Wettini, p. 54-5: ‘Credere quae renuit haec angelus iste resignat, / Quippe quod ammonitus functis incredulus extans /
This incident offers direct support for Benedict of Aniane’s emphasis on new intercessory rituals for the dead, such as the Office of the Dead. An early record of the practice dates from shortly before 817, when two monks from Reichenau traveled to Benedict of Aniane’s monastery at Inde to report on the customs there. Among the twelve points of practice reported is one which reads,

As soon as vespers of the day are over they immediately say vespers of the dead, with antiphons, and after compline, matins of the dead with antiphons and responsories, sung with full and sonorous voice and with great sweetness; next morning, after matins of the day, lauds of the dead.72

Although Benedict did not attempt to impose this practice on all Frankish monasteries during the Synod of Aachen in 817 (for the decrees there recommended the Office of the Dead only as an occasional occurrence), he did instruct for the performance of the psalmi speciales (seven penitential psalms to be sung for the dead).73 The Visio Wettini emphasizes the fact that the bishop was now being punished for failing to perform intercessory prayer. Thus, what is suggested by the statement, ‘much is won by pious prayers’, is not only the efficacy of prayer to release souls from punishment, but also just as – if not more – importantly, how much one wins for his own soul by his intercessory prayers. Here we find another explicit sanction of the liturgical accretions of Benedict, based on the idea that they were necessary for the spiritual health of the monk himself.

Benedict of Aniane fashioned himself in the tradition of monastic legislators who organized liturgy to account for the spiritual realities and needs of monks; this much is natural for the man who sought to be a model abbot, pastoring the feeble sheep committed to his care. As an angel had given Pachomius the ability to pray out of his renovated soul and a proper voice

---

73 Paxton, Christianizing Death, pp. 134-6.
which he could accept, and had taught him the ordinance by which he should sing psalms to
God, and as similarly an angel had given the Egyptian Fathers a rule of twelve psalms to
account for the spiritual state of the majority of monks, so too here Benedict of Aniane placed
himself in the same line, with his liturgical organization sanctioned, once again, by an angel.
Ultimately, all prayer was inseparable from complete devotion and obedience to the Rule: it
was simply another – perhaps the most important – facet of the obedience of a student to a
teacher, learning the way of submission and self-effacement. Thus it is essential to separate
out the ‘efficacious power’ of intercessory prayer as portrayed in hagiography, charters, and
letters from the actual purpose of all of liturgical prayer, whether for the basic worship of God
or as an intercession on behalf of someone. A collection of extracts from Jerome’s letters
produced at ninth-century Fleury (to which we shall return with greater detail in our final
chapter) highlights this essential point. A series of *sententiae* emphasizes the fact that spiritual
victory can never be assured so long as one lives on earth, and thus the reason for taking on
the monastic life:

This life is a race-course: we contend here, that we may be crowned elsewhere.
The devil does not seek unfaithful men, for those who are outside the fold, and
whose flesh the Assyrian king burned in the furnace, but he rushes to seize from
the church. According to the prophet Habakkuk, his meals are of the choicest.
He desired to subvert Job, and having devoured Judah, he sought the power of
the apostles.\(^74\)

Then, the *sententiae* continue, ‘If a monk falls, a priest will pray for him. But who will pray for
a fallen priest? Harm to the sheep is shame for the shepherd’.\(^75\) Monastic life (for anyone who
was a professed monk, even for monk-priests) was about the sheep’s battle for his life against

---

\(^74\) *Sententiae de opusculis sancti Hieronimi ad monachos*, PL 30:318, quoting Jerome (with slight
adaptation), *Ep.* 22.3 and 22.4: ‘*Stadium est haec vita mortalis: hic contendimus, ut alibi coronemur. Non

\(^75\) *Ibid,* quoting Jerome (with slight adaptation), *Ep.* 14.9 and 54.5: ‘*Monachus si ceciderit, orabit pro
sacerdos. Pro sacerdotis lapsu quis rogaturus? Detrimentum pecoris, pastoris ignominia est’.
the ravenous wolf. In this regard, monasteries were only ‘powerhouses of prayer’ insofar as they operated as sheepfolds where everything – including prayer – was done for the protection of souls.
Chapter Two:
Liturgical Intercession and Monastic Theology

Among the passages in Scripture that compelled the rich to give large donations to monasteries in Carolingian Francia is a certain parable describing the horrors of hell which awaited those who greedily hoarded their wealth. The Gospel of Luke tells the story of a rich man (‘dives’) who in all his feasting daily ignored the poor man Lazarus begging outside his gate. Both men died, and Lazarus was carried by angels into Abraham’s bosom, while the rich man found himself in hell. There, the flames brought such torment to his tongue that he begged for some relief with a drop of water, but none came. So horrible was his suffering that he wanted Lazarus to be sent back to warn his brothers to live rightly and give generously lest they too should end up in hell.\(^1\) Carolingian monasteries were sustained by the largess of aristocrats acting in response to warnings such as this. Yet when Benedict of Aniane referred to this passage, he – though a monastic overseer whose interest it was to expand abbatial property – was only set on making one point: ‘love is as strong as death (\textit{valida erit ut mors dilectio})’. For if even the faulty love of the wicked man for his brothers could persist in this fiery inferno, he observed, how much stronger was the pure love of the faithful?\(^2\) In his description of the strength and triumph of an unfeigned love, Benedict was obviously familiar with Bede’s commentary on the Song of Songs, parts of which Alcuin (d. 804) also inserted into his own commentary on the same text. Love is as strong as death, we read, and the lamps


of love are lamps of fire and flames: fire according to the fervor of the heart, and flames according to the efficacy of prayer.\(^3\)

That ‘efficacious prayer’ was a lamp of love which a monk should burn and shine in his heart was a key tenet which linked the performance of liturgical intercession to the ascetic goal. We tend, in imagining the monk’s work of cultivating a love of God, to consider the ‘private prayers’ of contemplation and meditation.\(^4\) But in the ninth century, monks spent much of the day not in such personal moments of sweet private colloquy with the Lord. Rather, in the Carolingian emphasis on the intercession of monks and nuns as a form of service to king and kingdom (as discussed in the Introduction), ‘efficacious prayer’ primarily denoted the public prayer in choro of the Divine Office and of the Mass. The latter in particular, as an oblation to the Lord, was believed to be the most efficacious prayer of all.\(^5\) Monks daily participated in at least two conventual Masses (those celebrated in the presence of the entire monastic community). The principal Mass, the missa maior, was held at noontime at the high altar using the proper for the day or from the preceding Sunday’s Mass. Another Mass, the missa matutinalis, was held daily in the morning at a lesser altar, such as one behind the apse, and was usually said for the King, a patron, to commemorate the dead, or for another particular need.\(^6\) In addition to these conventual Masses, private Masses were specially said for particular persons and occasions at the many side altars that were dedicated to saints. At the

---

\(^3\) Alcuin, *Compendium in Canticum Canticorum* 8, PL 100:662: ‘Ignis, propter fervorem cordis; flammarum, propter orationis efficaciam’. ‘propter orationis efficaciam’ is the reading given in some but not all of the manuscripts of Alcuin’s commentary on the Song of Songs, such as Vat. Reg. lat. 69 of the ninth century, produced at Notre-Dame de Luçon. Others have ‘propter operationis’.

\(^4\) For a warning against drawing too strict a dichotomy between private/public worship or individual/collective prayer, see S. Boynton, *Shaping a Monastic Identity: Liturgy and History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000-1125* (Ithaca, 2006), p. 89.


\(^6\) Nussbaum, *Kloster, Priestermonch, und Privatmesse*, pp. 124-32, indicates the various names used for the two daily conventual Masses: minor/maior; matutinalis/principalis; prior/solemnis. Häussling discusses the missa matutinalis, missa maior, and other Masses in *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier*, pp. 315-27.
large monastery of Saint-Riquier in the ninth century, the Mass kept monks very busy indeed. Angilbert (c. 740-814) ordered two conventual Masses to be offered every day in morning and at noon, as well as at least thirty Masses to be privately celebrated at the thirty altars holding the relics of saints, all daily performed as intercession for Pope Hadrian, Charlemagne, and his wife and children. To place this work of liturgical intercession within the context of the monastic concern to possess the ‘lamps of love’ is the subject of this chapter. Despite ‘caritas’ being the one characteristic of Benedict of Aniane to which his biographer dedicated an entire section of his *Vita*, he is not typically known as a ‘doctor of love’, so we must first understand that his theological system was founded above all on it. We shall then see this theology of love applied to the celebration of the Mass, revealing the intercessory Mass to be a specific outworking of the monastic virtue of perfect love.

**Seeing God in the ninth century**

In the late eighth to ninth centuries, Hispanic theologians in the Spanish March began to articulate the teaching that Jesus was adopted into his position as Son of God at his baptism. The ‘Adoptionist’ positions of Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo (d. 805), and Felix, bishop of Urgel (d. 818) were vehemently condemned at three councils called by Charlemagne in 792 at Regensburg, 795 at Frankfurt, and 799 at Aachen. Although Ardo makes reference to Benedict’s role in this dispute with only three sentences, in reality, the fight against Felicianism occupied him for several years. Benedict was sent, together with Leidrad of Lyons

---

10 ‘I do not think one should maintain silence when at the same time the baneful doctrine of Felicianism invaded that province. Unharmed by the noxious error of unbelief, Benedict avoided it inwardly by divine help and by his zeal rescued not only the lowliest, but also prelates of the church. Armed with javelins of debate he often joined battle against the infamous doctrine’. Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis* 8, trans. Cabaniss, *Benedict of Aniane*, p. 74.
and Nebridius of Narbonne, to Urgel to bring Felix to Aachen for an open debate; much of the anti-adoptionist literature written by Alcuin, Paulinus of Aquileia, Agobard of Lyons, and Benedict himself was produced in preparation for this encounter. It was probably in the context of this doctrinal controversy that Benedict had his widest contact with the hundreds of monasteries throughout the Frankish South, as Alcuin had given him the task of distributing a copy of his *Liber contra haeresim Felicis* to each monastery there.  

Benedict, unlike theologians of the royal court such as Alcuin and Paulinus, thus had a unique concern with how the heresy was affecting monastic communities.

Benedict’s monumental work on Christological and Trinitarian orthodoxy, the *Munimenta Fidei*, which scholars usually identify as a dogmatic treatise, was in fact a work intended primarily for a monk and written out of a pastoral burden for perseverance in the monastic way. Although Benedict touches on such doctrinal technicalities as the manner in which Christ was conceived in the Virgin’s womb, the significance of the terms *forma Dei* and *forma servi*, and the relationships among the three *personae* of the Trinity, the work is not chiefly ordered around the goal of proving orthodox Christology via technical argumentation. Rather, the *Munimenta Fidei* was written to argue that Felicianism offended everything which the true monk stood for. The work, compiled by Benedict between 800 and 814, comprises several original compositions on the formation and confession of faith, on the Trinity, and on

---

11 J. Williams, ‘The Adopted Son of God, the Pregnant Virgin, and the Fortification of the True Faith: Heterodoxy, the Cult of the Virgin Mary, and Benedict of Aniane’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Purdue University, 2009), pp. 204-5.

12 Preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 2390. Portions of the work are edited in Migne, PL 103 under Benedict of Aniane’s *opera*; the rest have been edited by J. Leclercq in ‘Les Munimenta fidei de saint Benoit d’Aniane’, *Studia anselmiana philosophia theologica* 20, *Analecta monastica* 1 (Vatican City, 1948), pp. 21-74. For the authorial ascription to Benedict of Aniane, see Williams, ‘Adopted Son of God’, pp. 211-5. The work has received little scholarly attention apart from the edition by Leclercq with introduction and the dissertation by Williams. For a list of studies which make brief comments regarding the *Munimenta Fidei*, see Williams, *Adopted Son of God*, p. 199, fn 5.
Mary,\textsuperscript{13} two specifically anti-Felician opuscula which he also composed;\textsuperscript{14} together with various confessions of the orthodox faith copied from other writers, including Alcuin’s \textit{De fide sanctae Trinitatis} and \textit{Credimus}, Gennadius of Marseilles’ \textit{De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus}, Pelagius’s \textit{Libellus fidei}, and the \textit{Fides} of Ambrose and Gregory the Great.\textsuperscript{15} We may assume from two letters, one forming the \textit{Testimoniorum nubecula},\textsuperscript{16} that the \textit{Munimenta Fidei} was Benedict’s response to his ‘son’, the monk Guarnarius, who had been charged with Felician heresy.\textsuperscript{17} In light of the immediate doctrinal controversy to which this work responds, Benedict’s message was unequivocal: the absolute equality of the persons of the Trinity, and the Lord Jesus Christ as truly God and truly man, consubstantial with the Father.\textsuperscript{18} But with every turn, Benedict expresses the truly ascetic concern undergirding his entire work: the formation of the right faith which operates by love, needed for the monk to see God. Benedict charges Guarnarius with missing the goal of his monastic vocation in his failure to embrace Trinitarian faith: without possessing the right faith, his goal of moral conversion – ‘to put on the new self’ – was entirely undermined.\textsuperscript{19}


\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Testimoniorum nubecula de incarnatione Domini, sancta et individua Trinitate et iteratione baptismatis devitanda pernicie}, PL 103:1381-1388; \textit{Disputatio Benedicti levitae adversus Felicianam impietatem}, PL 103:1399-1411.

\textsuperscript{15} See Leclercq, ‘Munimenta Fidei’ for references to editions.


\textsuperscript{17} Nothing is known about Guarnarius outside of his mention at various points in the \textit{Munimenta fidei}. It is possible that Guarnarius was one of the monks who lived at Aniane and who was eventually sent away to help establish a new monastery.

\textsuperscript{18} Benedict includes the lengthiest citation – almost the entire definition – of Chalcedon out of anyone involved in the Adoptionist controversy in any way. See PL 103:1406 and also his short citation from Leo’s tome at PL:1404. Cavadini, \textit{Last Christology}, p. 130.

Benedict’s emphasis on the primacy of faith for seeing God represents his clearest statement of ascetic theology.\textsuperscript{20} The primary requirement of faith in the search for God had been a commonplace in the writings of the early medieval period ever since Augustine declared that it was faith which led to understanding rather than vice versa: 'Unless you believe, you will not understand'.\textsuperscript{21} Beatus of Liebana and Alcuin had both quoted Augustine’s formula in their attacks on Elipandus, but Benedict devotes an entire treatise to the idea in the opening work of his Munimenta Fidei.\textsuperscript{22} The Forma fidei, which Benedict composed by abbreviating and piecing together portions of Augustine’s On the Trinity with his own occasional comment, is a tract which argues for a belief in the equality of the Trinity not via sophisticated doctrinal argumentation but by elaborating on the idea that it is good faith which readies the eyes of the heart to see God.\textsuperscript{23} This foundational theme is introduced in the Prologue and sets up the problem with which the work is concerned: the inability of humans to see God with their eyes and thus to worship Him as One whom we know, as we would know a friend we can see. Benedict’s purpose in the Forma fidei is to demonstrate that there is a faith which purifies our hearts and enables us to see and love God even if we do not know Him in a physical and bodily way: '(W)e must first love by faith, or it will be impossible for our hearts to be purified and become fit and worthy to see him.... Something can be loved which is unknown, provided

\textsuperscript{20} See Leclercq’s concluding remarks on the significance of the term ‘forma fidei’ in Benedict’s spirituality, in ‘Les Munimenta Fidei’, pp. 69-73.


\textsuperscript{22} ‘We have not known and believed, but have “believed and have come to know.” For we believed in order to understand’. Alcuin, Adversus Elipandum Libri IV 4.11 (PL 101:294) and Beatus of Liebana, Adversus Elipandum Libri II 1.20 (PL 96:905).

\textsuperscript{23} On the view of the beatific vision which was developed in the context of the Carolingian reception of Augustine’s teaching about the visio dei, see M. Cappuyns, ‘Note sur le problème de la vision bénifique au IXe siècle’, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 1 (1929), 98-107.
it is believed’. Benedict’s instruction for seeing God is clear, here quoting Augustine, who is himself quoting from Ambrose:

(B)lessed Ambrose wanted to warn human beings about what they ought to prepare if they want to see God, that is, they ought to make their heart clean by the faith that works through love by the gift of the Holy Spirit, from whom we have a pledge by which we might come to know how to desire that vision.25

The monk with a faulty faith – a belief in anything less than the full divinity of Christ and his equality within the Godhead – is no monk at all, for he does not love God truly and therefore shall never attain to God.

This is a theological method founded on a clear sequence of interior virtues to be cultivated before the final object (God) may be perceived and the beatific vision attained, and it is summed up in the pithy phrase which Benedict loved to quote: ‘faith which worketh by love (fides quae per dilectionem operatur).’26 Indeed, monastic writers of the early Middle Ages frequently repeated Galatians 5:6, such as Bede in his interpretation of the dimensions of the tabernacle. Noting that the length (thirty cubits) is a number divisible by ten and multiplied by three, he interprets this dimension to mean the virtue of those who fulfill the Ten Commandments with the faith in the Holy Trinity. The width of four cubits symbolizes the breadth of true charity. This is faith which operates through love, and it achieves in the present age what is eternal life in the future (‘in praesenti quidem fidem quae per dilectionem


26 Galatians 5:6 (King James Version).
Like Smaragdus who regularly pairs the two words ‘fides’ and ‘caritas’ together in his commentary to assert that the monk can reach God only by that ‘internal light of faith and charity’, the verse is also Benedict of Aniane’s favourite way for summarizing his monastic theology: ‘If you love faith, the eyes by which faith is seen are those eyes by which God is seen. Therefore begin to love God with the faith which operates through love’.

Yet, in order to love God with the faith which operates through love, Benedict immediately continues, ‘you will love man according to God, for unless you truly love him, you will not be able to love God’. So synonymous is the love of neighbour with the love of God, Benedict (via Augustine) observes, that Scripture tends sometimes to even emphasize the former at the expense of the latter. This is because God is love itself, so to love another person is to love and see God:

And we find many other cases in the sacred writings where only love of neighbour seems to be required of us for perfection and the love of God seems to be passed by.

---


28 e.g. Smaragdus, Expositio 4, CCM 8, p. 131 (‘internum in mente fidei vel caritatis lumen’); Benedict of Aniane, De modis amiciciarum et vera amicitia, ed. Leclercq, ‘Les Munimenta Fidei’, p. 57: ‘Si fidel amas, quibus oculis videtur fides, ipsis oculis videtur Deus. Incipe ergo amare Deum fide quae per dilectionem operatur’. The statement follows Augustine/Benedict’s example of one who loves another because ‘he is a faithful man’ and thereby demonstrates that faith can be loved. Benedict uses Gal 5:6 in this context again in his exhortatory letter to Guarinarius (MGH, Epistolae II, p. 562). In the Benedictine tradition, it is a teaching that reaches its most poetic expression with Anselm’s ‘let me find you by loving you’ (Proslogion 1).

over in silence, though the law and the prophets depend on both commandments. But this is because if a man loves his neighbour, it follows that above all he loves love itself. But God is love and whoever abides in love abides in God (1 John 4:16). So it follows that above all he loves God.\textsuperscript{30}

Smaragdus thought this theology of love so important that it merited repeating in both of his works on monastic life (the \textit{Diadema monachorum} and his Commentary on the \textit{RB}), in a complicated passage which combines together all the types of ‘love’ – the love of God, the love for God, the love for neighbour:

Therefore, O monk, open the eyes of your heart.... Hang your heart on his love; love the Lord your God, not just a little but with your whole heart and not only part of it, with your whole soul and with your whole mind, so that you do not put the love of anything before the love of your Lord.... Blessed, therefore, is the virtue of the love of Christ, which is called simply love and charity. For it cherishes everyone, and in the secret place of the mind it stores up the love of all as though they were one neighbour.\textsuperscript{31}

For Benedict, the most interesting thing about love is precisely that it has multiple references.

Repeating a famous argument by Augustine, he writes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{(L)ove means someone loving and something loved with love. There you are with three, the lover, what is being loved, and love. And what is love but a kind of life coupling or trying to couple together two things, namely lover and what is being loved? This is true even of the most external and fleshly kinds of love.... So here again there are three, lover and what is being loved, and love.}\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

Benedict teaches that the monk who desires to see God is he who has a faith which operates by love. But like Augustine, he deliberately foregoes a simple definition of ‘love’ (such as the


Christian’s love for God) and insists instead on ‘love’ as a bewildering complex of the lover, the loved, and love itself. Love is the location of a complex union:

Embrace love which is God, and embrace God with love. This is the love which unites all the good angels and all the servants of God in a bond of holiness, conjoins us and them together, and subjoins us to itself.33

As we shall see, Benedict’s understanding of the place of intercessory prayer in the monastic search for God relies heavily on this conception of love as the site of ‘coupl ing together’, of uniting, conjoining, and subjoining.

**The Mass: The mystery of faith**

Since the seventh century, the eucharistic host and wine were consecrated with the words ‘hoc est enim corpus meum’ and ‘hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti’, followed immediately by ‘Mysterium fidei’.34 Participation in the Mass was the most concrete statement of a monk’s faith, and thus Benedict’s work of great effort which became the fundamental textbook for the celebration of intercessory Masses in Carolingian monastic usage, the *Supplement* to the Gregorian Sacramentary. In response to Charlemagne’s request for an authentic sacramentary from Rome, Pope Hadrian I had sent him a copy of a Gregorian sacramentary (now known as the *Hadrianum*) which became adopted in the Frankish realm as the official liturgical book. However, court liturgists soon realized that it was missing many elements and was unsuitable for the needs of the Frankish church. The *Supplement* was Benedict of Aniane’s answer, an additional text which was copied along with the Gregorian, consisting of formularies for the liturgical year missing from the *Hadrianum*,

---


proper prefaces, and benedictions, most originating from earlier Gallican or Gelasian *libelli*, with some Visigothic influence, and some formularies from the hand of Benedict himself.35

The *Supplement* is frequently mined by historians for the information it yields about Carolingian liturgical unification, the evolution of the Roman Rite, and the development of formularies; rarely is it studied in connection with the monastic theology of its author. Yet, Benedict viewed the Mass as singularly important because it was the central expression of that love which unites, conjoins, and subjoins. This indeed was the consistent message of all the *expositiones missae* which proliferated during the ninth and tenth centuries, and even conciliar decrees can refer to the Mass and ‘*caritas*’ in the same breath.36 The understanding of the Mass as the sacred point of loving unification between man with God and with neighbour is typical of the theology of Gregory the Great. Indeed, Benedict of Aniane opened his *Preface* to his *Supplement* with a statement repeating what everybody believed to be fact – that the Sacramentary he was supplementing was authored by Gregory – and thus it is certain that Benedict was familiar with Gregory’s views on the meaning of the Mass.37 In a famous portion of his *Dialogues*, Gregory makes the fundamental statement to which all subsequent


37 Benedict of Aniane’s heavy dependence on Gregory the Great (as with that of Smaragdus), is well-documented: P. Chiesa, ‘Benedetto di Aniane epitomatore di Gregorio Magno e commentatore dei Re?’, *Revue bénédictine* 117 (2007), 294-338.
medieval theology on the Mass would refer, concerning the sacrifice of the Mass as the most potent aid to salvation, and the vehicle through which a saint's intercession is most efficacious. A wife frees her imprisoned husband from chains on the day she has the Mass offered for him; the Mass saves a bishop's ship and crew; a dumb invalid is cured when Mass is celebrated and the host is placed on his tongue; the Mass is offered for a sinful monk and sinful nuns to rest in peace. But the Mass is efficacious precisely because the eucharistic act mediates between human and divine realms, joining both halves of reality:

For who of the faithful doubt that at the very moment of the sacrifice, at the voice of the priest, the heavens open and choirs of angels are present at the mystery of Jesus Christ: the highest is united with the lowest, heaven is joined to earth, and a oneness is made from invisible and visible.

Thus, Carole Straw has observed that the Eucharist is for Gregory 'the most important and most potent form of prayer' because it indicated a healing of all divisions and was the 'pivotal point of cosmic rest', allowing man to experience harmony through union with Christ.

This power to unify and collapse all differences was precisely the work of Christ which most inspired Benedict, and which he emphasized the most in his anti-Adoptionist writings. Benedict's Christology differs from that of Alcuin and Paulinus of Aquila in his focus on what Christ achieved through the process of his descent to humanity and in his ascent back to God. Benedict's renunciation of the heretical notion of Jesus as the 'homo assumptus' is argued on the basis of Philippians 2:6-7, with Jesus' self-emptying (the Word becoming 'impoverished') emphasized over and above the Felician idea that Christ became 'rich'...
because he assumed another (divine) nature. Paralleling Christ’s descent in the continual process of self-emptying (a process which saw its climax on the cross) is Christ’s ascent, and this is the only context in which Benedict will agree to use the doctrinally-charged word *assumptus*. Benedict speaks of Jesus as our ‘assumption’ and ‘refuge’: In Christ’s resurrection, man has been assumed into the body of Christ by being taken into unity with its head.\(^{43}\) In other words, although the word ‘assumption’ does not apply to Christ’s humanity, it does denote his relationship with mortals in the body of the Church. Christ takes up his Church with his divinity, and as he became inseparably united with human nature in his descent, so in his ascent, we are inseparably united with his divinity. We see Benedict’s interest in minimizing the distance between the holy Son of God and sinful man, and highlighting the power of union between them.\(^{44}\)

That Benedict should spend such energy on studying and assembling the texts of the Mass, the act which signifies the Church’s assumption in Christ, comes as no surprise; in his interest in the Mass as an ecclesial act, he was following the exegetical tenor of the times. The use of the term ‘*ecclesia*’ in the Carolingian period was complex and merits exhaustive study; a ninth-century religious culture largely confined to the clerical and monastic orders meant

\(^{43}\) Benedict of Aniane, *Disputatio adversus Felicianam*, PL 103:1405: ‘... fiendo Deus homo ex proprietatis essentia unigenitus Filius Dei nostra assumptio et refugium, ex hac plenitudine gratiae fienter homines filii Dei adoptione... Ille... assumptio et refugium nostrum est;... veram intelligamus substantiam carnis, ubi est plentitudo divinitatis, habitatio corporalis: qua utique etiam tota repletur Ecclesia, quae inhaerens capiti corpus est Christi; propter quod Domini assumptio nostra...’. See Cavadini, *Last Christology*, p. 129.

\(^{44}\) In this depiction of Benedict’s theology, I differ from those who emphasize the emotions of distress and anxiety resulting from a theology of a remote God separated from man in a great chasm, as in Vauchez, *Spirituality of the Medieval West*, p. 32 (‘the commonly-held notion of God as sovereign judge and transcendant power favored reverent fear rather than outpourings of the heart’) and Paxton, *Christianizing Death*, p. 148 (‘Benedict refashioned the God of the Franks in an imperial mode. Relying heavily on a vocabulary of legal terms, Benedict underlined the juridical relationship between God and his people while maintaining the absolute unworthiness of those people’).
that the term could be used to refer to them alone. Yet, in spiritual and exegetical writings, we find a strict insistence on the Augustinian definition of the church as the *congregatio fidelium* gathered in Christ, and the late-antique rhetoric of the new ‘ecclesia’ of all Christian faithful replacing the old ‘ecclesia’ of the Greek city was still strongly in place in the Carolingian religious mentality despite the administrative and imperial references which the term had acquired. Nowhere is this definition of ‘ecclesia’ more prominent than in the thought of eighth- and ninth-century Latin writers regarding the meaning of the Eucharist. For early medieval theologians, the eucharistic bread was always a figure of the Church, the sacramental body always the ecclesial body. This is so because through the Eucharist, each person is placed within the one body of Christ. In this perspective of total unity, Henri de Lubac has observed, there was practically no need for any theologian to distinguish one ‘body’ (of Christ or of the Church) from the other, and the Eucharist was so closely and consistently linked with the Church that ‘if, in an explanation of the mystery of the Eucharist, we encounter the unqualified phrase “the body of Christ,” it is often not the Eucharist but the Church which is meant by the term’. For ninth-century theologians, the eucharistic host was the sign and promise of the unity of the ecclesial body: ‘Therefore he took the bread: he wanted this sacrament to involve bread since bread bears a likeness to his

---


The bread of the sacrament always led theologians directly to speak of the Mass as the mystery of unity and its work to bind the people into one alliance.\(^{49}\)

**Intercession: Faith operating through love**

Benedict’s choices of the various Masses to be included in the *Supplement* – and especially the inclusion of a large number of intercessory Masses to be said for special patrons or on special occasions – is best understood in light of his belief that in the sacrifice of the Mass, Christ assumes the entirety of the Church’s needs with himself and brings them up to God the Father. A comparison between the votive Masses Alcuin composed and those Benedict collected is useful by way of illustrating Benedict’s chief interest in the Mass as an expression of Christ’s assumption of the Church’s needs with himself. We do not wish to exaggerate the differences between the two liturgists. The two men were good friends and assisted one another in their ministries: Benedict sent twenty of his best monks to help Alcuin establish his new monastery at Cormery near Tours, and the two engaged so frequently in correspondence that their letters were collected into a volume which, unfortunately, has been lost.\(^{50}\) Both men exerted a profound influence on early medieval liturgy, such that they have often been confused with each other, with Benedict’s sacramentary having being attributed to Alcuin for many years and ongoing discussion about their mutual influence on each other’s liturgical compositions.\(^{51}\) Indeed the confusion could exist because Benedict took several of Alcuin’s Masses and inserted them into his *Supplement*.

---

\(^{48}\) Candidus of Fulda, *De passione Domini* 5, PL 106:68.

\(^{49}\) Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, p. 17 with fnn. 26-30.

\(^{50}\) Ardo, *Vita Benedicti*, 24. For extant letters: MGH Epp 4, pp. 99-101 (nos. 56, 57); also jointly to Nefrid of Narbonne and Benedict of Aniane, pp. 461-2 (no. 303).

\(^{51}\) On the influence of Alcuin upon the liturgical work of Benedict, see Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien* 1, pp. 63-7.
Yet his selections are telling. Out of the twenty-two votive Masses in Alcuin’s Missal, Benedict inserts only four: the *Missa pro amico vivente*, *Missa pro amicis viventibus*, *Missa pro salute vivorum et mortuorum*, and *Missa pro peccatis*. Among the Masses which find no place in Benedict’s *Supplement* are Alcuin’s *Missa de sapientia*; *Missa de caritate*; *missa pro petitione lacrimarum*; *De cordis emundatione per spiritum sanctum postulanda*; *Ad postulanda angelica suffragia*; *Missa de Sanctae Trinitate*; and *Missa Sanctae Mariae*. It is clear that Benedict has chosen only those votive Masses which are directed at particular humans (the dead and the living, the penitent), and he has not inserted the Masses concerned with more abstract matters of a devotional sort (the gift of tears, wisdom, love, the praise of the Trinity or of Mary). Thus, even on a shallow reading, a difference between the two liturgists is apparent: Benedict is more interested in the votive mass as something done in the service of people and their concrete needs (for health, safety, rain, for example), and not of personal virtues as in the case of Alcuin’s compositions which are overtly penitential in their subject matter.

Driving this strongly ecclesial and deliberately intercessory bent was a Christocentric faith which Benedict wished to be expressed through love. This explains the object of his great labour within the *Supplement*: the collection of prefaces, which he specifically asked to be sung with love (‘*cum caritate*’). The *praefatio* (incipit ‘Vere dignum et iustum est aequum et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte pater omnipotens’) was a

---

52 Respectively in Benedict’s *Supplement*, ed. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien 1: Missa votiva* (no. 70); *Item alia pro familiaribus* (no. 73); *Missa pro salute vivorum vel in agenda mortuorum* (no. 112); and *Missa pro peccatis* (no. 81). Alcuin’s votive Masses are published in J. Deshusses, ‘Les messes d’Alcuin’, *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 14 (1972), 7-41.


54 *Supplementum Anianense*, ‘*Hucusque*’ Preface, ed. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien 1*, p. 353, trans. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 87: ‘We ask those who like the prefaces which we have added to the end of this book to accept and sing them with love (*flagittamus ut ab his quibus placent cum caritate suscipiantur et canantur*)’.
theologically weighty component of the Mass in liturgical history, introducing (as it still does today) the canon of the mass. It had been common practice from at least the fifth century (as attested by the Verona or Leonine Sacramentary) to replace the fixed preface with proper prefaces, which were occasions for dense theological exposition. The Gregorian sacramentary, reflecting the contemporary Roman ritual, had effectively eliminated these proper prefaces, but Benedict brought them back with force, including an extensive collection of over two hundred prefaces gathered mainly from Gallican and Gelasian sources, to make up for what he felt was a defect in the Gregorian.

When we consider the markedly ecclesial significance which expositors of the Mass were accustomed to ascribe to the prefaces, we understand why Benedict would be so keen to ensure that churches had a wide array of them from which to choose. Even though it is only one man – the priest – who speaks the preface, expositors of the Mass, such as the ninth-century author of the highly popular *Dominus vobiscum* tract, were keen to point out that this is so only by way of introductory phrases which are set as a dialogue between presider and congregation: the ‘*dominus vobiscum*’ by which the priest salutes the people; ‘*Et cum spiritu tuo*’ and the ‘*Orate frатres...*’ by which the people pray for the priest; the ‘*Sursum corda*’ by which the priest exhorts the people to ready their heart; the ‘*Habemus ad Dominum*’ which is the response of the people that they have obeyed this instruction; the ‘*gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro...*’ in which the priest prepares to act according to the profession of the people. All this leads to the ‘*Dignum et justum est...*’ indicating the people’s accord with the priest, and serving as the highpoint of the hortatory exchange in which the priest commends their readiness to worship by recounting the Lord’s benefits upon them.\(^{55}\) Thus by way of this

---

introductory exchange, the preface naturally brings the corporate ecclesial body to the forefront as the subject of the liturgical action. As Walahfrid Strabo notes, the preface is that prayer which inspires the affection of the entire people toward the liturgy of thanksgiving, and asks for permission to have their prayer of devotion join with the praises of those in heaven.\footnote{Walahfrid Strabo, \textit{Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum} 23, MGH Cap 2, p. 500: ‘Praefationem actionis, qua populi affectus ad gratiarum actiones incitaturn ac deinde humane devotionis supplicatio caelestium virtutum laudibus admittetur.’} It is thus the general purpose of the preface to enumerate the titles of the Son, to recall his past benefits and promise of future ones to people in specific accordance with the proper intention of that day (a saint’s feast, Pentecost, a special mass for the sick, whatever the scenario), and thereby to declare his power to gather up the various needs of the church in union with himself.\footnote{F. Cabrol, \textit{Liturgical Prayer: Its History and Spirit} (New York, 1922), p. 172: ‘The Mass properly so called is made up of a series of prayer all ending with the prayer of intercession through the Son: \textit{Through our Lord, through Christ, through Him, with Him, in Him, be all glory to Thee, God and Father, in the Unity of the Holy Ghost.} The Preface itself is simply a long doxology – the most complete, developed, and perfect of all – which enumerates all the titles of the Son and tells of His intercessory power.’} The significance which Augustine ascribed to the portion of the Mass he called the \textit{Orationes} – beginning with the preface and concluding with the \textit{Our Father} – sums up clearly the powerful union between Christ and the Church which he felt was the prime expression of the Mass:

\begin{quote}
For everything we offer to God, especially the sacrifice of the altar, is offered as a vow. That sacrament declares that greatest vow of ours by which we vow that we will remain in Christ, that is, in the unity of the body of Christ. It is a sacred sign of the reality that we are one bread, one body.\footnote{Augustine, \textit{Epistula} 149, PL 33:637 trans. Teske, \textit{Letters} 100-155, p. 368: ‘Voventur autem omnia quae offerentur Deo, maxime sancti altaris oblatio; quo Sacramento praedicatur nostrum illud votum maximum, quo nos vovimus in Christo esse mansuros, utique in compage corporis Christi. Cujus rei sacramentum est, quod unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus’. See E. Moeller, \textit{Corpus Praefationum: étude préliminaire}, vol. 1, CCSL 161 (Turnhout, 1980), p. 10 on this passage.}
\end{quote}

It is therefore only and always in light of this belief in the indivisible union between the members of the Church and Christ that the explicitly intercessory liturgical units of the Mass must be understood. Since the fourth century, it had been common in both the East and West to recite the names of people whom the priest and assembly were to remember before
the canon of the Mass.\textsuperscript{59} In Gaul and Spain, the earliest evidence for the reading of names (in this case, for the dead) appears in the sixth century.\textsuperscript{60} The \textit{Missale Gothicum} and \textit{Missale Gallicanum Vetus} include prayers ‘post nomina’ following the recitation of names. But already in the fifth century, Pope Innocent I had derided this practice of reciting names before the canon, arguing that the \textit{orationes} of the Mass form the only appropriate context for intercessory commemoration:

(T)he oblations are to be commended first, and then the names of those whose [gifts] they are should be announced, so that they be named during the holy mysteries, and not during the other [rites] which we put before [the mysteries], so that by the mysteries themselves we might open the way for the prayers that follow.\textsuperscript{61}

Three centuries later, Charlemagne confirmed his view, appealing directly to Innocent’s authority in canon 54 of his \textit{Capitulare ecclesiasticum} (789) to prohibit the recitation of names before the prayers of the canon; again in 794, the Council of Frankfurt repeated the same decree.\textsuperscript{62} Official Carolingian instruction, then, affirmed that the commemoration of special persons should arise naturally from the mysteries of the Mass. Thus, we find the commemoration tied specifically to the prayers of oblation, beginning with the intercessory formula that would be used by monastic communities throughout the Carolingian realm to pray for their benefactors:

Remember, Lord, Your servants, men and women (N.), and all who stand around, whose faith and devotion are known to You, for whom we offer to you, or who


offer to you, this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, and pay their vows to you, the living, true, and eternal God.\textsuperscript{63}

That the phrase ‘\textit{pro quibus tibi offerimus vel} (for whom we offer to you, or)’ was added in the first half of the ninth century might be seen as evidence of an increasingly exclusivist and specialist approach to the Mass. Yet two anonymous ninth-century treatises on the Mass which emphasize not this new phrase but the rather more inclusive phrases ‘\textit{omnium circumstantium}’ and ‘\textit{pro se suisque omnibus}’, as well as the ‘\textit{cunctae familiae tuae}’ of the \textit{Hanc igitur} formula, help to balance this reading.\textsuperscript{64}

Benedict of Aniane used the intercessory \textit{Memento} portion of the Mass as a forum for expressing Christ’s assumptive power to unite the Church with himself. At the end of the \textit{orationes} of the Mass canon stands the little word ‘\textit{Per}’ which, ever since the Leonine Sacramentary (the oldest of the sacramentaries, dating from the seventh century), had been used to indicate an address to God ‘through our Lord Jesus Christ’, commonly known as the ‘mediator formula’.\textsuperscript{65} Benedict of Aniane regularly expanded and embellished this formula, inserting in several Masses the phrase ‘That he deign to answer who lives and reigns with the Father and the Holy Spirit God for ever and ever’.\textsuperscript{66} ‘That he deign to answer’ is a direct


\textsuperscript{64} Jungmann, \textit{Mass of the Roman Rite}, vol. II, pp. 167 and 204. \textit{Dominus vobiscum}, PL 147:195 (‘Iam sacerdos oravit pro omnibus qui ad audiendum missam venerunt; tunc demum orat pro his qui oblationes offerunt...’); \textit{Primum in ordine}, PL 138:1179 (‘“pro se suisque omnibus,” id est, et pro se ipsis, et pro omnibus, qui ad se pertinent’). The \textit{Hanc igitur} formula reads, ‘Hanc igitur oblationem servitatis nostrae, sed et cunctae familiae tuae’.


\textsuperscript{66} Here, the formulary ‘\textit{Orationes in agenda mortuorum},’ \textit{Supplement no. 1398} in Deshusses, \textit{Le Sacramentaire Grégorien} 1, p. 457: ‘Quod ipse praestare dignetur qui cum patre et spiritu sancto vivit et
reference to the liturgical unit which opens up the canon proper, the supplicatory prayer of 'Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus...'. In his doxological expansion of the mediator formula, Benedict was intentionally summoning the intercessory power of Christ in response to the petitionary phrases of 'supplices rogamus', 'quaesumus', 'deprecamur', 'oremus pro', or 'pro quibus offerimus' which occur so often during the course of the Mass. With this lengthened oratio-ending, the emphasis is on the transfigured God-man who has been glorified and elevated to splendour, who lives and reigns in order to make intercession to God for the people. The framing of the central portion of the mass by the petitionary Te igitur at the one end to the Christological mediator formula at the other thus underscores the intimate unity of the entire Church with Christ even at those times when intercessions were private and the Mass itself performed privately.

Ultimately, to recognize the ecclesial meaning of the Mass – even in the case of a votive or private mass – was a point of faith, an argument which Walahfrid Strabo was keen to make against those who thought they could only have a Mass said for individual persons, or that they could not have a Mass said for the living and the dead at the same time:

(W)e know in fact that One died for all, and that it is one bread and blood that the Universal Church offers. If, however, it pleases anyone to make an individual offering for individual people simply from abundant piety and delight in increasing his prayers, let him do so; but let him not be foolish enough to believe that God’s one sacrament is not a universal remedy. For he is imperfect in faith in


some way if he thinks that God cannot distinguish between one request on behalf of many when He is asked what each one needs.\textsuperscript{68}

Illuminations for sacramentaries produced in ninth-century monastic scriptoria confirm the ecclesial emphasis we have been ascribing to Benedict of Aniane’s approach to liturgical prayer. They demonstrate that there was still an insistent emphasis on the corporate gathering of the entire universal Church during those very portions of the Mass which, in the ninth century, were supposedly becoming an increasingly private affair for the purpose of securing an individual’s salvation. Next to the \textit{Te igitur} in the Gellone Sacramentary (c. 790-804), for example, is a head with long wavy hair which probably represents \textit{Ecclesia}.\textsuperscript{69} This is one of the earliest depictions of \textit{Ecclesia} next to the crucifix which would become a common motif in several later Carolingian miniatures, made no less significant by the manuscript’s association with the abbey supervised directly by Benedict of Aniane.\textsuperscript{70} The image helps to explain why Benedict would be so insistent that those who use his prefences sing them \textit{cum caritate} or else not at all, since the preface was the introductory portion to the climactic point of the Mass where the Church and Christ are joined together explicitly in love.\textsuperscript{71} In Benedict’s call to pray

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum 23, ed. and trans. Harting-Correa, \textit{Walhfrid Strabo’s Libellus}, p. 140-1 (italics mine): ‘Sed et in hoc error non modicus videtur, quod quidam putant se non posse aliter plenam commemorationem eorum facere, pro quibus offerunt, nisi singulas oblationes pro singulis offerant, vel pro vivis et defunctis non simul aestimant immolandum, cum vere Sciamus unum pro omnibus mortuum et unum panem esse ac languinem. quem universalis offert ecclesia. Quodsi cui placet pro singulis singillatim offerre pro solius devotionis amplitudine et orationum augendarum delectatione, id faciat, non autem pro stulta opinatione, quae putet unum Dei sacramentum non esse generale medicamentum. Quodam modo enim fide imperfectus est, qui putat Deum non discernere, cum una petitione pro multis rogatur, quid cui sit necesse, vel fastidire cum estimat, cum eadem oblatio nunc pro uno, nunc pro alio exhibetur’. See also the statement of an anonymous author of a tenth-century homily for the office of the dead, quoted by M. McLaughlin, \textit{ Consorting with Saints}, p. 69 from J. Leclercq, ‘Un Ancien Recueil de leçons pour les vigiles des défunts’, \textit{Revue bénédictine} 54 (1942), 16-40, at p. 34: ‘(someone) who labors for all does better (than someone who labors for one); prayer for all is always better than prayer for special needs, although both are good’.
\item Chazelle, \textit{Crucified God}, p. 86-87.
\item Ardo, \textit{Vita Benedicti} 42, MGH SS 15.1, p. 219; W. Puckert, \textit{Aniane und Gellone. Diplomatisch-kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Reformen des Benediktinerordens im IX und X Jahrhundert} (Leipzig, 1899).
\item A point recognized by several liturgists of Vatican II. See, for example, Congar, \textit{L’ecclésiologie du haut Moyen âge}, p. 93 and fn. 143: ‘il faut être dans l’unité du corps réalisée par la caritas que diffuse le Saint-Esprit, pour vivre de l’Esprit du Christ’; and Bouyer, \textit{The Meaning of Monastic Life}, p. 193: ‘The
\end{itemize}
this great statement about the unity of the Church with love, we can anticipate the literal equation of *Ecclesia*-as-*Caritas* in later illuminations of liturgical texts.\(^72\)

**Praying for the sake of attaining love**

Hrabanus Maurus’ trilogy of spiritual treatises dedicated to Abbot Hatto followed the fundamental contours of Benedict of Aniane’s monastic thought. *De videndo Deum* concerns the basic requirement of correct faith which is the requisite for seeing God; *De puritate cordis* concerns the love in our hearts which faith must necessarily produce; then follows *De modo poenitentiae*, a work about sin and the manner of obtaining forgiveness.\(^73\) At the conclusion of this last work is an excerpt from Cassian’s *Conference* 20, which Hrabanus has titled ‘The Sayings of Abbot Pinufius (*Dicta abbatis Pinophi*). Here, Pinufius teaches that for the wretched sinner, God has created many means to reach his mercy and many ways in which our sins may be forgiven: ‘You see then how much the kindness of the Saviour has opened to the help of his mercy, so that no one desiring salvation should be broken by despair when he sees that he is invited to so many remedies to life’.\(^74\) Simple repentance extinguishes our sins, as do the giving of alms, the shedding of tears, the act of forgiving someone else, a mournful spirit, the amendment of morals, and the pursuit of virtue. But Pinufius spends the most energy elaborating on the way in which the intercessory prayers which one says for another are beneficial for the salvation of his own soul:

---


\(^73\) *De vivendo Deum, de puritate cordis et modo poenitentiae*, PL 112:1261-1332.

\(^74\) *De modo poenitentiae*, PL 112:1330: ‘Videtis ergo quantos misericordiae aditus patefecerit clementia Salvatoris, ut nemo salutem cupiens desperatione frangatur, cum videat se tantis ad vitam remediis inviatur’.
But if you cannot secure perfection in goodness by the eradication of all your faults, you can show a pious anxiety for the good and salvation of another. But if you complain that you are not equal to this service, you can cover your sins by the affection of love.75

Using James 5:15 (‘And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him’), Pinufius states that one’s own sins may be purged through the mercy and faith we exhibit in praying for another’s salvation.76 The prayer of intercession is therefore an important means which God in His mercy has granted for the man seeking salvation to be saved from his own sin. For caritas covers a multitude of sins – including, Pinufius says, one’s own.77 This was Gregory the Great’s view as well, when he taught in his Morals on Job that one’s prayers for himself become ‘more powerful’ when he prays for others, and the penitent is ‘heard more quickly’ the more devoutly he intercedes for his friends through the charity that is concerned for the salvation of another.78

But if love (caritas) was not yet there, prayer was important too for producing it, for liturgical prayer kindled one’s capacity for it. Theodulf of Orléans makes this point in his Libri Carolini, as part of his refutation of the supposed Byzantine position on the worship of images, that the ‘threefold prayer (trina oratio)’ of the church – psalmody, liturgical acclamations, and entreaties – is a Trinitarian symbol, expressing orthodox faith through the liturgical action

---


76 *Ibid*.


itself, as well as through ritual and architectural symbols.\textsuperscript{79} But Theodulf is clear that these assertions of dogmatic faith serve one end: to kindle the love of a burning heart.\textsuperscript{80} Thus the rituals that accompanied much of Carolingian liturgical prayer were in place precisely to improve the state of the monk’s heart. Hrabanus Maurus made this the central point of a sermon to monks on the occasion of a dedication of a church:

...you are well met together today, dear brothers, that we may dedicate a house to God... But we do this if we ourselves strive to become a temple of God, and \textit{do our best to match ourselves to the ritual that we cultivate in our hearts}; so that just as with the decorated walls of this very church, with many lighted candles, with voices variously raised through litanies and prayers, through readings and songs we can more earnestly offer praise to God: so we should always decorate the recesses of our hearts with the essential ornaments of good works, always \textit{in us the flame of divine and communal charity should grow side by side}, always in the interior of our breast the holy sweetness of heavenly sayings and of gospel praise should resonate in memory.\textsuperscript{81}

Theologically-laden rituals in Carolingian worship were therefore often established for the primary purpose of inflaming love for God and love for neighbour. This is most evident in the ritual of censing which took on a heightened importance in the liturgy of the Carolingian age. The early Roman rite involved burning incense in fixed braziers and carrying incense about during the entrance procession, Gospel procession, and recession, but none of these practices were equivalent to the drawn-out act of censing at the offertory, both on the altar and round

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Libri Carolini} Praefatio, MGH Conc 2, Supplementum 1, p. 2, trans. Rabe, \textit{Faith, Art, and Politics}, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Ibid}, ‘decretet hanc esse orationem perfectam, quam mentis affectus ardentis inflammat’.

about, which became standard practice with the Carolingians.\textsuperscript{82} That incense should be used for its symbolic richness in the church’s most solemn act of prayer is predictable – Revelation 5:8 and 8:4 plainly refer to incense as the prayer of the church. But early medieval exegesis on these verses added another layer of meaning, interpreting the ‘golden bowls (\textit{phialas aureas})’ which hold the incense (the prayers of the people) as charity: ‘and this charity is not only for friends, but truly also knows to pray for enemies: For this reason they are called to be “full” (of incense)’.\textsuperscript{83} Haimo of Auxerre (c. 790-855) writes further about these bowls of love which hold the prayers:

The odors indeed signify pure prayers. Thus the Psalmist says: ‘Let my prayer be as incense in your sight’. Similarly, the bowls are placed after harps, since first the Lord suffered, and by his passion he showed in such a way the breadth of his charity, while he prayed for those who crucified him, saying ‘Father, do not hold this sin against them, for they do not know what they do’. Therefore those who imitate the passion of Christ have holy harps; and they have the bowls who pray not only for their friends but indeed also for their enemies, just as we read in the Acts of the Apostles of Stephen who kneeled down and prayed, saying, ‘Lord, do not hold this sin against them’. Spices are compared to these holy prayers, because there can be nothing more grateful than the prayer which is poured out for an enemy, so that the teaching of the Lord may be fulfilled which says, ‘Love your enemies, etc’.\textsuperscript{84}


\textsuperscript{83} Alcuin, \textit{Commentaria In Apocalypsin}, PL 100:1122 (re. Rev 5:8): ‘Per phialas aureas charitas intelligitur; quae non solum pro amicis, verum etiam pro inimicis novit exorare: unde plenea fuisset memorantur’.

Anticipating the offertory prayer which in the eleventh century would be added to the Roman Rite to accompany the censing of the gifts (‘Accendat in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris, et flammam aeterne caritatis’), ninth-century exegetes attached to the ritual action of censing the generation of love in the person praying, the kind of love which is so wide that it loves even an enemy.

Indeed, the fundamental reason why the RB calls the prayer for enemies an ‘instrument of good work’ is precisely because it requires the monk to cultivate the breadth of his caritas. Benedict’s contribution here is that there is a direct correlation between the intercessory prayer of the monk and his own interior cultivation of faith and love which were so necessary for progress toward perfection. Accordingly, Smaragdus writes, if a monk wants to attain perfect charity (the only means by which he will come to see God), intercessory prayer for enemies is the necessary course of action:

The Lord says in the Gospel, ‘Love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father who is in heaven’. For this is the perfect charity of which John the apostle says, ‘There is no fear in charity’; in such charity, evidently, which in imitation of the divine goodness knows how to do good even to enemies and to love them. ‘But perfect charity’, he says, ‘casts out fear’....

Praying for one’s enemies helps the monk to possess love in so perfect a form that he does his good work not out of fear but out of caritas alone – and this is the sign of a monk who has made spiritual progress.

Someone first came to the monastic habit with fear of mind and great dread. But after he has stood fast in Christ’s service for a long period, and his way of acting has been marked by continued good habit, charity takes over, and he is henceforth free from fear and dread. And what he formerly did with fear and dread he now begins to observe with a sweet love.... Many, as was said above, begin to do good from fear

---

85 RB 4.72 (‘In Christi amore pro inimicis orare’).
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of punishment, but complete it from love of Christ. They begin from fear, but going from virtue to virtue they pass over to the perfect charity of Christ.\textsuperscript{87}

To attain this perfect charity is to have climbed the steps of humility and, ultimately, to see God.

When all these steps of humility have been climbed, the monk will happily come to the vision of the Almighty, where he may enjoy with his Lord a happiness and joy that can never be taken away from him. For they shall go from virtue to virtue, that is, from one step of virtue they climb to another; and thus they will see the God of gods in Zion and the heavenly Jerusalem, with exultation and joy.\textsuperscript{88}

Significantly, we are told in the \textit{Life of Goar} that Goar was accustomed to celebrate the solemnities of the Mass with complete strangers and the poor because he recognized that this action would help him to attain ‘the perfect love which drives out fear’.\textsuperscript{89}

\textit{The gift of intercession upon the altar of the heart}

The textual witness to liturgical prayer regarding enemies is telling. In the late ninth century, the first texts of maledictory formularies against enemies appeared, a form derived from Old Testament cursing and the equivalent in monastic practice to the act of excommunication. These maledictions – such as the two used at the abbeys of Saint-Martial and Saint-Wandrille in the late ninth to tenth centuries – entered monastic practice at a time of great disorder in Latin Christian society. The prevalence of violent disruptions at abbeys and the collapse of reliable legal institutions in the late Carolingian period led to the production and

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{\textit{Ibid:} ‘Prius enim homo cum animi timore et metu formidinis ad habitum venit conversionis. Sed postquam tempore diuturno in Christi persisteret servitio, et eius in bona consuetudine perduraverit actio, succedente caritate metu caret atque formidine. Et quae antea faciebat cum timore formidinis, incipit custodire cum amore dulcedinis.... Multi ut supra dictum est, timore poenarum incipient agere bonum, sed amore Christi perficiunt illud. Inchoant a timore, sed euntes de virtute in virtutem, ad perfectam Christi transeunt caritatem’.


\footnote{\textit{Vita Goaris conf. Rhenani} 3, MGH SRM 4, p. 413: ‘Hicquae viderant, quod faciebat vir Dei sanctus Goar, sicut solebat, mane, cursum suum completum et missarum solemnia caelebrata, cum peregrinis et pauperes perfectam et Deo acceptam caritatem faciebat, iuxta quod sanctus Iohannis apostolus dixit: Qui manet in caritate, in Deo manet et Deus in eo, et: Perfecta caritas foras expellit timorem’.

87}

88}

89}
\end{footnotesize}
performance of these maledictions as the last line of defence for monks. The trend toward increasingly aggressive liturgical formulae which named enemies and prayed for victory against them (and in some cases even for ill upon them) is seen in the various Masses against enemies which also began to appear during the second half of the ninth century, such as the Mass *Contra paganos* found in the Sacramentaries of St. Vaast and Echternach. Two Tours sacramentary include the *Missa pro paganis*, more accurately described as a Mass *against* them, beseeching God for victory over the pagan nations; one of the sacramentaries also includes a Mass for *Imminent Barbarian Persecution* which prays for God to liberate his followers ‘from the present calamity of Northmen’. Significantly, these rather bellicose Masses were added onto a flyleaf or blank space, or incorporated into the votive sections, of these liturgical books from the late ninth century onward, obviously as a response to the violence of Norsemen and Saracens. A most vivid example is the Sacramentary of Arles, the main text of which was written in the first half of the ninth century near Lyons, containing one of the best and purest witnesses to the version of the Gregorian Sacramentary linked with the work of Benedict of Aniane. Tellingly, a late ninth-century hand has added onto the flyleaf a *Missa pro persecutione paganorum*, which must have been connected to the military campaign led by Archbishop Rotlandus against the Saracens in September 869.

---


92 A campaign which ended catastrophically: more than 300 soldiers of Arles died. For edition and analysis, see M. McCormick, ‘A new ninth-century witness to the Carolingian mass against the pagans’, *Revue bénédictine* 97 (1987), 68-86.
Closer to the period of the Carolingian reforms of the early ninth century, we too find a few Masses dealing with enemies included in the Anianian Supplement: the several Orationes in tempore belli which pray for protection during war, and the Missa contra iudices male agentes and Missa contra obloquentes which ask for deliverance from these enemies so that the church may do its proper work. But indicative of the overtly monastic theology of love which attempted to find its way into public liturgical ritual is the Missa pro inimicis. Migne included this in the Liber Sacramentorum which he attributed to Alcuin; while this is no longer considered an authentic Alcuinian formulary and Deshusses has not included it in his own collection of Alcuin’s Masses, it did find its way into at least one ninth-century sacramentary. The Mass for enemies reads:

God the lover and guardian of peace and charity, give to all our enemies true peace and charity, and grant remission from all their sins, and powerfully liberate us from all their evil. Through. [Secreta] Receive, we ask, these gifts offered, and rescue us mercifully from our enemies, and grant to them forgiveness of their offenses. Through our Lord. [Ad compendium] O God who gave your servants Moses, Samuel, and the Stephen the Protomartyr the virtue of patience so that they could pray for the offenses of their enemies with equanimity, give to us we ask the merits of all the saints, that we may esteem our enemies with true love, and pour forth with our whole mind assiduous prayers in the sight of your majesty for their excesses. Through.

This Mass stands in stark contrast to the aggressive liturgy of later Carolingian sacramentaries, and its intentions for loving enemies are mirrored in the Oratio quod pro

---

93 PL 101:460; Deshusses, 'Les Messes d’Alcuin’.
In its refusal to pray that ill would befall those who do evil but rather that God would give forgiveness, eternal rest, and conversion to good will to them, ‘so that I may be able to love a friend in you, and an enemy according to you’, it heeds the teaching of Smaragdus (quoting Bede and commenting on Benedict’s Rule) on prayer for enemies and blessing them rather than cursing. In the climate of early ninth-century monastic reform, prayer – whether in the form of the Mass or in private devotion – needed to be directed toward the kindling of caritas in the monk’s heart.

Even as monastic communities celebrated the Mass several times a day as a means to obtain God’s grace and favour for their rich and powerful patrons, the altar of the heart was meant to be the most important thing about liturgical performance, an equation made by Ambrosiut Autpertus: ‘Prayer is our gift; our heart is the altar’. Liturgical intercession was the offering of the monk’s heart, the monk who allowed himself to be consumed by the fire of charity, to be assumed into the body of Christ (in both its significations), and to make his heart the altar – to open himself to the uniting, conjoining, and subjoining of himself with Christ and the Church – was the way to attain the vision of the Almighty. This was Abbess Tetta’s point when she rebuked her nuns for their bitterness toward her deceased predecessor who had treated them

---


cruelly, instructing them that a fundamental principle for attaining perfection was to love one’s enemy. Accordingly, we are told, Tetta prostrated herself before the altar and, joined by her nuns, engaged in liturgical intercession to God for the soul of this dead abbess. The author of this piece of hagiography has depicted a group of nuns who, in their search for perfection, have abandoned their natural inclinations and chosen to cultivate charity through liturgical performance instead. As nuns, they could not preside over the Mass, but the hagiographer is not interested in the technicalities of intercession. He is interested, rather, in the fact that they performed their liturgical intercessions out of a desire to improve the quality of their hearts, to perfect their interior lives. Their ascetic goal had drawn them into the performance of intercessory prayer. Having focused primarily on the monastic theology underpinning the intercessory Mass, we next turn our attention to that other form of liturgical prayer with which monks were occupied: the psalmody of the Divine Office.

---


99 The Council of Aachen in 816 instructed that consecrated women could not serve at the altar: Concilium Aquisgranense cap. 82, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 367.
Chapter Three:
Liturgical Intercession through the Psalms

At the heart of Christian monastic prayer stand the one-hundred and fifty psalms which pre-modern Greek and Latin Christians believed David had composed alone. A fourth-century author described the psalmody he experienced in what has become a celebrated and widely-quoted passage:

In the monasteries there is a holy chorus of angelic hosts, and David is first and middle and last. In the convents there are bands of virgins who imitate Mary, and David is first and middle and last. In the deserts men crucified to this world hold converse with God, and David is first and middle and last. And at night all men are dominated by physical sleep and drawn into the depths, and David alone stands by, arousing all the servants of God to angelic vigils, turning earth into heaven and making angels of men.¹

According to modern liturgical scholarship, however, the plight of monastic psalmody not long after this paean appeared is a rather sad tale. Once ‘out of the desert’² and into the grand abbeys and cathedrals of the early Middle Ages, scholars have argued, psalmody was marred by departures and distortions away from the pure ideals of ancient Christian contemplative prayer, obscured by an increasingly complicated Divine Office. Prominent twentieth-century liturgists, driven by the concern to restore public prayer in the contemporary Roman Catholic church, found their model in the forms of daily prayer of the early Christian period, and were therefore highly critical of the changes which the Divine Office underwent in the centuries leading to and including the Carolingian age.³

² M. Dunn, The Emergence of Monasticism, p. vi. The working title of her book was ‘Out of the Desert’, a phrase which was to suggest the most significant development of monasticism from the fourth to the seventh centuries: its transformation into a formidable institution at the heart of society.
Typical of the critical assessment are these statements by liturgist Joseph Dyer: ‘The early monks of Egypt and the Middle East, spiritual fathers of the later Western monks, would have been hard pressed to relate their own prayer life to the opulence of festal offices in the great abbeys of the Middle Ages.’ From the simple, unceasing prayer of desert monasticism, ‘(c)enturies of elaboration finally led to an Office consisting of antiphonal psalmody, prolix responsories, and readings, controlled by complicated rubrics and solemnized with ceremonial splendor on high feasts.’ Such ritual performance – albeit impressive – would ‘surely have been repugnant to the earliest generations of monks’.4 Peter Jeffery argues that early practice had presented the psalms as a vehicle through which a monk could evaluate himself via the process of personal ruminatio, with psalms as a ‘mirror for reflection’.5 By contrast, scholars of the twentieth century Catholic liturgical renewal have asserted, the Carolingians turned monastic psalmody into a liturgical cultus, a social and public work, performed by those who could attend to its proper decorum and necessary musical precision on behalf of all others.6 With accretions to the Office and the obligation to pray the psalms for the good of rulers and patrons, the previous posture of contemplative ruminatio, hearing, reflecting, and responding to God’s Word to man through the psalter, was now replaced by a ritualistic offering of a word from man to God.7 In short, the critics charge that over the course of the early Middle Ages, the homo orans was replaced by the intercessor liturgicus –
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6 Dalmais et al., Liturgy and Time, 179-89; Taft, Liturgy of the Hours, p. 362; Dyer, ‘Monastic Psalmody’, p. 72. Once again, their interest in the renewal of prayer for the laity are the basis for their criticisms.

7 Taft, Liturgy of the Hours, p. 364.
the monk as intercessory machine working within the great ‘intercessory superstructure’ which had come to surround the monastic office. Expressions such as ‘liturgical intercession’, ‘intercessory psalmody’, ‘liturgical generosity’, and even ‘liturgical exhaustion’ have become convenient shorthands to describe the prime feature of Carolingian monastic psalmody.

This chapter argues that the narrative of a departure from some ancient standard overlooks the Carolingians’ thorough familiarity with patristic and early monastic teaching regarding the meaning and proper use of psalmody. Patristic psalms exegesis, and instruction about the Divine Office in early monastic rules, consistently described the inherently public function of psalmody. By examining how Carolingian writers received and emphasized this teaching, I wish to demonstrate that ninth-century church leaders viewed the overtly social and public orientation of the Office – and its specifically intercessory function – as a proper expression of the psalms, as well as a necessary demonstration of a monk’s renunciation of his self-will.

**The monk’s voice for the Church**

The earliest Christians appropriated the Jewish psalms by interpreting them as the voice of Christ addressed to his Father – that is, through a typological reading whereby David was a

---


9 Ibid, 98

10 Boynton, *Imperial Abbey at Farfa*, p. 86.


13 A development generally regretted by renowned liturgists such as Robert Taft: see his *Liturgy of the Hours*, p. 365.
type of Christ and his words were in fact the words of Christ. The New Testament’s use of the
psalms was entirely aimed at demonstrating that Christ had prophesied his incarnation,
death, and resurrection, and therefore the Church Fathers used the psalms to demonstrate the
divinity of Christ. In Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho, for example, it is Christ who speaks
Psalms 44, 46, 67, and 98, and Tertullian used Psalms 8, 21, and 44 to demonstrate the
divinity of Christ and his identity with God the Creator in Adversus Marcionem. The
Christian notion of a coherent and unified salvation history encouraged exegetes to view the
psalms not only as prophetic of Christ, but also as prophetic of the institution Christ came to
build, the Church. Ambrose, writing one of the earliest Latin exposition of the psalms, offered
a clear statement describing the psalms as the prayer of the whole Church, one that would
become fundamental to the Christian use of the psalms:

Indeed a psalm is the blessing of the people, a hymn of praise to God, the praise of
the people, the joyous clapping of all, the universal tongue, the voice of the church...
expressing, by means of a harp, one song out of diverse and disparate voices.

The conception of the psalms as vox Ecclesiae was written directly onto the Latin Psalter itself
through psalm titles. In the Hebrew text of the Bible, headings are prefixed to all but thirty-
four of the psalms to indicate such information as the author, the presumed occasion of
composition, or the kind of instrument to be used. The Syrian church rejected the psalm
headings as non-authentic, and the Latin church found them insufficient, replacing the
Hebrew titles with new ones which made explicit how each psalm was related to Christianity.

14 B. Fischer, ‘Le Christ dans les psaumes. La dévotion aux psaumes dans l’Eglise des martyrs’, La
Community, pp. 101-112; G. Braulik, ‘Psalter and Messiah. Towards a Christological Understanding of the
Psalms in the Old Testament and the Church Fathers’, in D. Human and C. Vos, ed., Psalms and Liturgy,

15 Ambrose, Explanatio psalmorum 1.9, CSEL 64, p. 7: ‘psalmus enim benedictio populi est, dei laus,
pembleis laudatio, plausus omnium, sermo universorum, vox ecclesiae... citharae modo ex diversis et
disparibus vocibus unam expressim cantilenam’. But note that Ambrose’s Explanatio, though likely known
in the Carolingian period, was not widely so. There are no extant manuscripts from the early medieval
period: the earliest dates from the early eleventh century.
In particular, the Christian psalm titles were written to assist the one praying in appropriating it as his own voice in connection with that of the Church. In the Latin church, at least seven series of such psalm headings (tituli psalmorum) were composed, the earliest possibly traceable to the third century, and certainly in existence by the fourth century. These titles, figuring in the psalters, breviaries, and Bibles, show a clear appreciation of the psalms as the voice of the entire Church in the manner of Ambrose’s designation. The *vox Ecclesiae* is that of all the faithful in time (apostles, prophets, martyrs, teachers, etc.) engaged in the dominant activities of church life: the praise of Christ, opposition to heresy, Jews, false believers, and the Devil, and perseverance in the face of trial and persecution.

A large number of early medieval manuscripts attest to the series of psalm titles attributed to St. Columba, which probably found its way from England to the Continent from a text used in Ireland during the sixth century. The series was used in the eighth-century *In Psalmorum librum exegesis* attributed to Bede; it was also applied to various Roman and Frankish psalters and Bibles of the eighth and ninth centuries. I give here examples of several psalm titles from this series: ‘The voice of the Church gives praise to Christ concerning the faith of all who believe’ for Psalm 8; ‘The voice of the Church in praise concerning Christ’ for Psalm

---


18 *In Psalmorum librum exegesis*, PL 93: 477-1098. The commentary on each psalm contains i) a brief *Argumentum* containing a historical/literal reading, then a mystical meaning introduced by ‘aliter’ plus the St. Columba *tituli psalmi*, and then (when present) a brief moral application; ii) an *Explanatio* dealing with the psalm in general, mostly summarizing Cassiodorus; and iii) then a *Commentarius* proper – this last is visibly inauthentic. This same series of psalm titles used here is also found in the *Codex Amiatinus*, produced around 700 at Wearmouth-Jarrow. See M. McNamara, *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church* (Sheffield, 2000), pp. 37-39; B. Fischer, ‘Bedae de titulis psalmorum liber’, in J. Autenrieth and F. Brünholzt, ed., *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff zu seinem 65 Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 90-110; B. Ward, *Bede and the Psalter*, Jarrow Lecture (Jarrow, 1991).

19 Examples: Roman psalter, eighth century (New York, Pierpont Morgan, MS 776-13); Gallican psalter from the end of the eighth century, offered by Charlemagne to pope Hadrian (Vienne, Bibliothèque nationale, MS 1861); Gallican psalter of the end of the eighth century, written for St. Riquier (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 13159); a French Bible of the ninth century (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 2 and 4).
110(111); and ‘The voice of the Church against the devil and his attendants’ for Psalm 143(144). Another series of psalm titles, attributed to St. Jerome, is found in the Frankish psalter Zürich, Stadtbibliothek, Rh. 34, produced around 820 at Saint Gall or Reichenau by the scribe Grimalt, and also in a Visigothic Bible from the ninth century from Cava, Abbaye de la Sainte-Trinité. Here, for example, the title for Psalm 9 is ‘The voice of the Church speaks now to Christ, now concerning Christ, and even now to those who believe the Jews, the devil, or Judas; that for Psalm 120(121) is ‘The voice of the Church concerning the apostles or prophets, and to the church of the apostles; and that for Psalm 139(140) is ‘The Church speaks concerning her persecutors or evil spirits’. Further evidence that this manner of voicing the psalms was known in Carolingian monasteries is the fact that Smaragdus’ commentary on the Rule of Benedict refers to Psalm 43(44) as ‘the voice of the head and of the body, that is, of Christ and of the Church’.

The two most influential Psalms commentaries in the West, setting the foundations and rules of psalm exegesis for the rest of the Middle Ages, were those written by Augustine and Cassiodorus. Augustine extended the notion of the psalms as the voice of the Church into

---

23 Smaragdus, Expositio 2, CCM 8, p. 70, trans. Barry, Commentary, p. 137: ‘Capitis enim et corporis id est Christi et vox est...’.
24 Other major psalms commentaries in the Latin patristic exegesis are those of Hilary of Poitiers (Tractatus super psalmos, CCSL 61) and Jerome (Breviarium in Psalmos, CCSL 78). The latter was considered in the Middle Ages to be Jerome’s original work, but in fact he considered it only a supplement to Origen’s commentary on the Psalms (now lost but transmitted to the West via Rufinus, Commentarius In LXXV Psalmos, PL 21:645-960). On the influence of these two commentaries in the earlier Middle Ages as evidenced by the glosses contained in Carolingian psalters, see M. Gibson, ‘Carolingian Glossed Psalters’ in R. Gameson, ed., The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration, and Use (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 78-100 at 96.
one vast synthesis about the complex nature of the Church’s prayer. In the psalms, it is Jesus
together with His church who speaks, prays, and cries together as one; it is the voice of the
mystical body of Christ which we hear, unified under one same head.25

Christ and the Church, two in one flesh.... Small wonder that we find this mystery
in the psalms. There he says many things in his own name as head and many
others in the name of his members, yet all of it is said as though one single
individual were speaking. Wonder not that there are two with one voice, if there
are two in one flesh.26

The Carolingians transmitted this sophisticated approach to the psalms. In the late ninth
century, the Enarrationes in Psalmos attributed to Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908) followed
Augustine’s statements with precision:

So whether the head speaks, or its shadow speaks, Christ is one, and indeed each
speaks as members of the head. Observe this counsel: most importantly how it is
not possible for us to speak as members if it were not for the head, for truly
observe how our head speaks in the personage of all its members.... Therefore let
us hear Christ speaking; and let each one recognize there also his own voice
clinging to Christ’s body. For this is said of the Church: There were two in one
flesh, that is in one body.27

Haimo of Auxerre also made an ecclesial reading of the psalms the primary hermeneutic for
his commentary.28 The prayer of the righteous in Psalm 52(53), for delivery in Psalm 53(54),
of praise in Psalm 71(72), of fleeing and exile in the wilderness in Psalm 62(63) – these are all
uttered by the ‘vox Ecclesiae’.29 Haimo went even further than Augustine in making the

107. Also B. Fischer, ‘Le Christ dans les Psaumes’.
p. 347: ‘Christus et Ecclesia, duo in carne una.... Non ergo miremur in Psalmis: multa enim dicit ex persona
capitis, multa ex persona membrorum; et hoc totum tanquam una persona sit, ita loquitur. Nec mireris quia
duo in voce una, si duo in carne una’.
27 Remigius of Auxerre, Enarrationes in Psalmos XLII, PL 131:134: ‘Sive enim caput loquatur, sive
umbra, unus est Christus, et capitis est proprium loqui etiam in persona membrorum. Ipsam nostram
consuetudinem advertite, primo quomodo loqui in membris nostris non potest nisi caput; jam vero caput
nostrum quomodo loquatur in persona omnium membrorum, advertite.... Sic ergo audiamus Christum
loquentem; sed unusquisque agnoscat ibi vocem suam tanquam haerens in Christi corpore. De ipso enim et
Ecclesia dictum est: Erunt duo in carne una, id est in uno corpore’.
28 Haimo of Auxerre, In omnes psalmos pia, brevis ac dilucia explanatio, PL 116:191-695, another
commentary once wrongly attributed to Haimo of Halberstadt: Iogna-Prat, ‘L’oeuvre d’Haymon d’Auxerre:
État de la Question’.
29 PL 116:374, 376, 434, 401.
psalms a book entirely about the Church, where the Church becomes the primary subject matter of any psalm. The ‘City of God’ in Psalm 45(46), the sparrow’s nest in Psalm 83(84), Jacob in Psalm 19(20), and even the entire earth which the Lord created are all taken as figures of the Church.\(^\text{30}\) Where the psalmist in Psalm 17(18) speaks of the LORD as the one who keeps his lamp burning and who turns his darkness into light, Haimo applies these statements to the Church.\(^\text{31}\) For this reason, Thomas Renna has leveled the following criticism against Haimo and the school of psalms exegesis he represents: ‘While Augustine managed to keep the personal and ecclesial elements in equilibrium, the Carolingians tilted the balance towards the Church’.\(^\text{32}\)

Because every psalm was to be chanted as the voice of all the faithful united to Christ and under Christ, Cassiodorus chose to preface his exposition of the psalms with a ‘Praise of the Church (\textit{Laus Ecclesiae})’, a preface which an anonymous ninth-century monk repeated in a work entitled \textit{Benedictio Dei}.\(^\text{33}\) Here, the psalms are the praise of the whole Church offered to the holy Trinity, the confession of a people held in the ark of Noah (that symbol of the Church), sailing through the world protected by the course of faith against the savage storms

---

\(^{30}\) PL 116:354, 482, 258, 271.

\(^{31}\) PL 116:249: ‘Protexit me Ecclesia.... “Quoniam tu illuminas lucernam meam,” id est quosdam de Ecclesia ad hoc ut illuminent alios: qui dicuntur lucerna, quia in eis lumen sancti Spiritus resplendet’.

\(^{32}\) T. Renna, ‘The Psalms in Early Medieval Theology’, \textit{Michigan Academician} 28:1 (1996), 1-10 at p. 9 and fn. 66: ‘Carolingian exegetes often identify the City of God with the present Church. The more subtle and nuanced Augustine would always be careful to qualify such statements by emphasizing the terrestrial Church as but the \textit{imago} of its heavenly archetype, either as the celestial \textit{ecclesia} or as the \textit{civitas Dei}. To equate the Church with the City of God without this extensive qualification would have undermined his complex ecclesiology’.

of heresy and floods of error. This ecclesial reading of the psalms had implications for the chanting of the monastic Office: in singing the psalter, the monk was to remember that he was never singing in his voice alone. For, as Augustine had argued, although David may have composed all the psalms as a single individual, he represented more than one individual, writing on behalf of the whole Church made up of many all over the earth. Central to Augustine’s understanding of the psalms as the vox Ecclesiae were the values of inclusivity and empathy, that every individual praying a psalm must pray it in harmony with the cries of all others belonging to the Church:

Christ’s members are very numerous, and all are united by the bond of charity and peace under one head, our Savior himself; ... they all form one person, and their voice is frequently heard as the voice of a single person in the psalms. One cries out, voicing the prayer of all, because all are one in this one person.

There is an erasing of the individual (‘the speaker is not a lone individual, but a single body: the Church’), and therefore, those singing the psalms should not think they are alone in this experience. They must believe that similar seeds have been sown widely in the Lord’s field all over the world, and that it is a single, united Christian voice which sings.

The words of the psalms do not belong to any single individual, Cassiodorus insists, ‘for just as the saints have one voice, so the words of the faithful people belong to the many’.

---

34 Cassiodorus, Expositio in Psalterium Preface, PL 70:23: ‘Per omnes quippe psalmos, per omnia cantica, praeconia sanctae Trinitatis interseris; ut cujus sunt sacrata verba quae loquimur, eis laus semper et dulcissima gloria redderetur. Quae salum saeculi hujus, et haereticorum saevissimas procellas in arcae illius Noe similitudine, quae tuam evidenter portavit imaginem, sola inoffenso fidei cursu sine periculo diluvii constanter enavigas’.

35 Augustine, Enarrationes in Psalmos LIX.1, PL 36:713: ‘David rex unus homo fuit, sed non unum hominem figuravit: quando scilicet figuravit Ecclesiam ex multis constantem, distentam usque ad fines terrae’.


Carolingian monastic legislators appropriated this manner of singing the psalms, making it clear that the words ‘belonged to the many’ and were to be the prayer of all the people, not just a special holy class of people. Benedict of Aniane’s Codex Regularum transmits the Regula Tarnantensis, written some time around the middle of the sixth century, which quotes Jerome’s famous letter on the benefits of pilgrimage to the Holy Land.\(^3^9\) There, Jerome writes, in contrast to the urban opulence of fancy porticoes, gilded ceilings, and costly mansions, was the humble cottage in which Christ was born, and ‘except for the chanting of psalms there is complete silence’:

Wherever one turns the laborer at his plough sings alleluia, the toiling mower cheers himself with psalms, and the vine-dresser while he prunes his vine sings one of the lays of David. These are the songs of the country; these, in popular phrase, its love ditties: these the shepherd whistles; these the tiller uses to aid his toil.\(^4^0\)

That such a quotation could find its way into a monastic rule indicates the awareness of monastic legislators that the psalms, even when chanted by learned monks whose special vocation it was to sing psalmody, were representative of all the people, including the ordinary farmer and shepherd of the countryside. Smaragdus, in his preface of his Expositio psalmorum, likewise emphasized the versatility of the psalms which made them easily applicable to anyone in any situation: they provide health for the heart, medicine for the soul, hope for the just, well-being for the sick, strength and refuge for those in danger, remission for sinners, refreshment for those labouring, a treasury of wisdom, etc..\(^4^1\) And so he can

\(_____


\(^{41}\) Smaragdus, Expositio psalmorum Preface, PL 129:1023. This commentary is based entirely on excerpts collected from Augustine, Prosper, Cassiodorus, and pseudo-Jerome. Only the preface has been
declare, ‘Everything in the Church begins, continues, and is perfected through the sweet singing of the psalms with praises, hymns, and spiritual songs’. At the literal level, the Church’s liturgical prayer revolves around the psalms; but more fundamentally, Smaragdus suggests, the very life of its members is sustained through the prayers expressed through the psalms, offered by all, for all.

Importantly, it is this inclusivity of the psalms which led the anonymous ninth-century author of *De psalmorum usu* to state that, by praying the psalms, one fulfills the Apostle James’ command for prayer to be made by all, for all (‘*orandum sit ab omnibus pro omnibus*’). Significant here is the author’s positing of the psalms as the very words by which one may engage in intercessory prayer for his brother:

*The apostle commands us by this word: ‘Pray’, he says, ‘for one another, that you may be saved’ (James 5:16). It is necessary for us to obey this most life-giving precept, *that all pray for all*, in order that all may be saved with all. Further, there are seven [penitential] psalms, by which if we are to be made one body, *we pray for all* in the body of the Church...*

This is the critical background for understanding the intensified use of psalmody – especially the seven penitential psalms – for various intercessory purposes during the time of Benedict

---

edited in PL 129:1021-24, with a note attributing it to one Smaragdus of Saint Maximin of Trier. A. Wilmart, ‘Smaragde et le psautier’, *Ruev biblique* 31 (1922), 350-59 views this as the work of Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel. See also Dyer, ‘The Psalms in Monastic Prayer’, p. 86, fn. 68.


43 *De Psalmorum Usu* 14, PL 101:487: ‘*Cui nos necesse est in saluberrimis praeceptis obedire, et orare omnes pro omnibus, ut salventur omnes cum omnibus. Septem sunt praeterea psalmi, ex quibus si unum corpus efficimur, pro omni prosus corpore oramus Ecclesiae*’ (italics mine). Traditionally ascribed to Alcuin, the work is now generally agreed to post-date Alcuin by several decades: A. Wilmart, ‘Le manuel de prières de saint Jean Gualbert’, *Ruev bénédictine* 48 (1936), 259-99. See Black, ‘Psalms Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin and the Preface to *De psalmorum usu*’. M. Kuczynski, in *Prophetic Song: The Psalms as Moral Discourse in Late Medieval England*, p. 66, argues that Augustine teaches his congregation to recite the great penitential psalm 50 not only for oneself, but also for those who are absent. But I do not find support for this interpretation from the passage he quotes (‘*Opportune ergo de poenitentia Psalmus Hodie cantatus est. Loquamur et cum absentibus*’), which I take to mean merely that those present should repeat what they have heard preached to those absent (Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos* I, PL 36:585). Nevertheless, Kuczynski’s analysis of Augustine’s insertion of a communal, public aspect to the private significance of David’s example is interesting.
of Aniane. Augustine and Cassiodorus had both found penitential significance in Psalms 6, 31(32), 37(38), 50(51), 101(102), 128(129), and 142(143) but Alcuin was the first to comment on the *septem psalmi poenitentiae* as a distinct group. In the ninth century, these seven penitential psalms were inserted into rites for the office of the sick and for the dead in sacramentaries produced at such monasteries as Le Mans, Chelles, Tournai, Saint-Thierry, Saint-Germain, and Saint-Denis, reflecting Benedict of Aniane’s instruction at Aachen for ‘*psalmi speciales*’ to be sung for the sick and the dead. A rescension of the Aachen monastic capitulary from the first half of the ninth century makes it clear that this was to be done for all faithful Christians (*‘omnibus catholicis fidelibus christianis’*). This particular collection of rules orders Psalms 5, 6, 114(116), 115(116), and 129(130) to be sung for all the dead faithful, in addition to Psalms 22(23), 24(25), 26(27), 142(143), and 145(146) for all dead monks or all catholic faithful. Furthermore, this collection makes clear that Psalms 50(51), 53(54), 56(57), 66(67), and 69(70) were also to be sung daily before Prime for all Christians and patrons (*‘omnibus catholicis et familiaribus et elemosinariis’*); only Psalm 19(20) was to be singled out as special prayer for the king.

---

46 Edited by J. Semmler as the *Collectio S. Martialis Lemovicensis* in CCM 1, pp. 555-62, and dated to before c. 850.
47 *Legislatio Aquisgrannis, Collectio S. Martialis Lemovicensis* cap. 77 and 78, CCM 1, p. 561: ‘Ut pro omnibus defunctis catholicis psalmi quinque canantur, id est *Verba me. Domine ne in furore tuo. Dilexi quoniam. Credidi. De profundis.*’
The penitential and intercessory use for psalmody was also seen in the continental adoption of the Irish practice of private penance. Although the chanting of psalms was not the satisfaction for sin most often prescribed, psalmody was certainly prevalent in that various other, more frequently prescribed penalties such as fasting were easily converted into psalm-singing. One of the earliest pieces of evidence for the conversion of fasts into psalms-singing comes from the Canones Hibernensis under the title ‘De arreis’. Here, one year of penance with a fast on bread and water could be replaced by such acts as three days and nights without sitting and with little sleep and the reciting of one-hundred and fifty psalms, or fifty days on bread and water as well as sixty psalms and sixty blows at each of the hourly prayers. The eighth-century Old-Irish Table of Commutations provides the following justifications for these commutations: for speedy separation from sin, for fear of adding to future sin, for fear that one will die before penance has been completed, and to enable one to receive mass again more quickly.

In Carolingian practice, intensive psalms-singing in the style of the monastic cursus was prescribed as satisfaction for sin as a replacement for more prolonged penalties of fasts spanning months and years. The Paenitentiale Remense of the ninth century offered the following equations: one day of fasting could be replaced by fifty psalms with genuflection, or seventy without; one week of fasting could be replaced by three hundred psalms with genuflection, or four-hundred and twenty without. The desire to satisfy penance quickly

---

49 L. Bieler, The Irish Penitentials (Dublin, 1963), p. 50, referring to Du Cange, explains that the term *arreum* is a latinized form of the Old Irish *arra*<sub>ie</sub>, which is the verbal noun of *ar-ren* ‘pays for, pays instead of’. The various senses in which later glossators interpret it – ‘equivalent, substitute, price, salary’ etc – are all derived from this primary meaning. The use of *arreum* for the commutation of a penance is confined to the Canones Hibernenses, II.

50 A. Angenendt et al., ‘Counting Piety in the Early and High Middle Ages’, p. 29.


through intensive psalmody led to allowances for vicarious psalmody, so that, as the Pseudo-Cummean penitential reads, ‘he who does not know the psalms and is not able to fast shall choose a righteous man [i.e. a monk or priest] who will fulfill this in his stead, and he shall redeem this with his own payment or labor’. In England, the Synod of Clofesho in 747 vigorously denounced this allowance for vicarious penance through vicarious psalm-singing, rejecting the mentality of a rich man who said that he had acquired enough penitential fasting performed by others on his behalf to live another three hundred years. On the Continent, Theodulf of Orleans objected to the penitentials and advocated a return to the patristic practice of public, canonical penance, and the synods of 813 and 829 explicitly ordered the destruction of penitentials. Thus, the practice of vicarious psalmody performed by monks or priests for private penance in Carolingian Francia has probably been overstated. Libelli poenitentialii, which reduced the performance of intercessory psalmody to a mathematic conversion, clearly had a dubious reputation among church reformers who were much more interested rather, as we have noted above, on the intercessory significance of the seven penitential psalms as a group to be sung in prayer ‘for all in the body of the Church’. If ‘liturgical generosity’ is an appropriate phrase for describing the practice of psalmody in Carolingian monasticism, it is so because it denotes the generosity of the vox monachi which reformers instructed should be offered as the vox Ecclesiae of all faithful Christians.

53 Pseudo-Cummean 1, trans. McNeill, Medieval Handbooks of Penance, p. 269. This text circulated widely on the continent during the eighth and ninth centuries and was the form in which the Irish penitentials obtained their greatest popularity there. It consists of substantial extracts from the Penitential of Cummean, and the main body of the document is entirely unoriginal. See Ibid, p. 266.


56 See above, pp. 95-6.

57 See above, p. 87.
Monastic psalmody was a social exercise not only because it was offered in the voice of all, but also because it acted as a social contract binding individuals to each other. Ambrose saw in the psalms the ‘force of the law, whose totality lies in the chain of love – “He who loves his neighbour has fulfilled the law”’. For a psalm binds those who are arguing, associates those discordant with each other, reconciles those offended by each other. For who would not forgive him, with whom he had sent out one voice to God? Truly, so great is the chain of unity, that all the numbers of people form one choir.

Most fundamentally, this is a bond of caritas. As expressed in psalmody and defined as love of God and love for neighbour (‘amor dei, amor proximi’), ‘caritas’ was for Augustine the ‘cement’ of the members of the Church; the members are ‘held together and adjoined in love and in the chain of peace’.

Early monastic rules applied to the discipline of psalmody this understanding that the psalter reflected a binding of one individual to another in a chain of love. Not to be occasions for self-promotion, instead the hours of prayer were to be times in which monks would show deference to one another: in psalmody, one monk was bound to another in mutual submission. Cassian underscored the posture of submission before others in prayer when he noted that, as soon as the presider rises from the ground to offer the conclusion after a psalm

---

58 Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmorum* I.7, CSEL 64, p. 7: ‘si quis vim legis explorat, quae tota in vinculo caritatis est...’.
59 Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmorum* I.9, CSEL 64, p. 8: ‘psalmus dissidentes copulat, discordes sociat, offensos reconciliat; quis enim non remittat ei, cum quo unam ad deum vocem emiserit? magnum plane unitatis vinculum, in unum chorum totius numerum plebis coire’.
60 Scott Hendrix has called the role of caritas in Augustine’s psalms interpretation ‘caritas-ecclesiology’. See his *Ecclesia in Via: Ecclesiological Developments In The Medieval Psalms Exegesis And The Dictata Super Psalterium (1513-1515) Of Martin Luther* (Leiden, 1974).
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and a silent time of prayer, everyone stands up at once and nobody delays, 'lest it should be thought that he has offered his own prayer independently instead of following the leader to the close'.

In a similar concern for submission, the Rule of the Four Fathers which Benedict of Aniane inserted into his Codex Regularum (fol. 19v-21v of Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 28118) states,

Let no one among those assisting at prayer presume to utter the praise of a psalm without the command of him who presides. That ordering is to be maintained, so that no one may presume to precede another of higher rank in the monastery for standing or for the order of the singing of the psalms, in accord with Solomon who says, ‘Son, do not desire to seek the first place’, 'nor should you recline at a banquet too early, lest someone greater than you come and it is said to you, “Get up!” and you suffer embarrassment'; and again it says, ‘Do not wish to be extremely wise, but fear’.

The Second Rule of the Fathers, again inserted by Benedict of Aniane into his Codex Regularum (fol. 21v-22), makes it clear that a monk who took initiative to promote himself was not acting in accord with the spirit of psalmody:

This also must be observed, that whenever any senior or anyone who precedes him in the order of singing the psalms is present, the one who follows may not be allowed to speak or to take an initiative, but only the one who precedes, as has been said. This shall be observed down to the last in order, especially in prayer, whether in work or in giving response...But let all things be done in love, not through contentiousness or any presumption.


The Rule of Paul and Stephen, composed possibly as late as 800 and placed by Benedict of Aniane near the middle of his Codex (fol. 83-86v), shows perhaps the greatest concern that monastic psalmody be characterized by a spirit of deference and yielding. All the monks are to follow the leading of the prior: if he gives the signal to raise or lower the pitch, all are to sing ‘with one mouth in harmonious voice’. Without his permission, no one should try to speed up or stylize the singing, because, ‘this often leads to bragging, conceit, and arrogant pride’. A greater crime than leaving an Office abruptly is to jump in and take the lead from the senior chanter. For if the Office were to be conducted with such ‘undisciplined boldness and without wisdom’, then the minds and mouths of the brethren ‘cannot be held together in harmony inside the oratory’. Therefore, the Rule instructs, all monks through ‘the simplicity of charity’ are to rid themselves of this fault of usurping the lead. They must also not try to learn novel and catchy tunes from a guest passing through the monastery without permission from the prior, lest they become puffed up with pride about their new knowledge and look down on everybody else.

The insistent emphasis on deference in monastic psalmody was written into the Rule of Benedict, which ordered that the two major rounds of psalms chanting each day be drawn to a close by a renewal of an agreement of prayer:

---


Let not the celebration of Lauds, or Evensong, ever terminate, unless at the end, the Lord’s prayer be said by the Prior, in the hearing of all, because of the thorns of scandal which are wont to arise; that the Brethren, being reminded by the covenant of this prayer, in which they say, ‘Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us’, may purge themselves from these faults.\(^{70}\)

Benedict’s use of sponsio in conjunction with the forgiveness clause of the Lord’s Prayer comes from Cyprian and Augustine. For Cyprian, the brotherly agreement to forgive one another is the sine qua non of prayer:

(\textit{The Lord}) has bound us by a certain condition and engagement (sponsio), that we should ask that our debts be forgiven us in such a manner as we ourselves forgive our debtors, knowing that that which we seek for our sins cannot be obtained unless we ourselves have acted in a similar way in respect of our debtors.\(^{71}\)

Augustine’s teaching on this same verse of the Lord’s Prayer is that it denotes a compact not only with our neighbour, but also with God: ‘We make an agreement (sponsio) with God, a pact and a plea’.\(^{72}\) For him, all of prayer is pointless if this compact be broken:

(O)f all those sentences in which the Lord has taught us to pray, He has judged that that one is chiefly to be commended which has reference to the forgiveness of sins.... For in no other sentence do we pray in such a way that we, as it were, enter into a compact with God: for we say, “Forgive us, as we also forgive.” And if we lie in that compact, the whole prayer is fruitless.\(^{73}\)
These two sources from which Benedict drew for his use of the word sponsio should help clarify what he meant in the word ‘conventi’ (‘ut conventi per ipsius orationis sponsionem’). Most translators favour the meaning of ‘conventi’ as ‘those who have been called together’ or ‘assembled’ – i.e. literally and practically assembled for the liturgical office. But ‘conventi’ could also be an active participle meaning ‘having agreed’. The thrust of Benedict’s command in this section makes a strong case for the latter as the preferred meaning, for his concern is with prayer rooted in brotherly agreement. So, in his commentary on this section of the Rule, Delatte has observed that ‘the children of St. Benedict must take these words to themselves, let themselves be arraigned (convenire) and tried by them...’. Hildemar’s commentary on this section makes clear that this too was how he understood the phrase, since he adds his own synonyms to clarify the meaning of conventi: ‘idest, victi, fracti, superati, compulsi’ – conquered, subdued, overpowered, compelled. In other words, this covenant of prayer has the authority to check, master, and bind the monk, so that he no longer exists as a self-asserting individual, but rather is brought into a position of humility as one in a society of members who have assented to this same agreement.

Gregory of Tours showed his familiarity with this fundamental principle of monastic prayer when he told a perplexing story of a monk chided for his ‘vainglory’. A monk who was ‘diligent in praying and reading with the others according to the rules of monasteries’ was also in the habit of secretly offering private prayers to God ‘among the thick brambles, boxwoods, and oak trees’. There, after kneeling and praying for a long time, he would lift his hands to heaven and recite several psalms. Then followed a great miracle in which a flame extended

---

74 T. Kardong, Benedict’s Rule: A Translation and Commentary (Collegeville, MN, 1996), p. 188.
75 Delatte, Commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict, p. 163 (italics mine).
77 Gregory of Tours, Gloria confessorum 37, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM 1. 2 (Hanover, 1885), pp. 294-370 at 321, trans. R. Van Dam, Gregory of Tours, Glory of the Confessors, Translated Texts for Historians 5 (Liverpool, 1988), p. 49.
from the monk’s lips above and beyond him like a rope, giving off a bright light and never burning his head despite growing into the air from his hair. Gregory himself is only concerned with the meaning of this fire (‘I think that this fire contains a mystical sacrament, but the darkness of my senses cannot understand how as it becomes visible it produces such light but does not burn anyone’), but he inserts the telling detail that the abbot who became aware of the whole affair ‘reproved the monk with many reprimands in order to discipline his vain glory’. Using the psalms as an occasion for self-initiated sensational experience was inappropriate.

Psalmody was a covenant of prayer in a much more ecclesiastical sense as well, for it was a pledge to stay within the ecclesia catholica, the one visible orthodox church. We have seen the psalms as the vox Ecclesiae, but for Augustine, those who separate from the Mother Church cannot be deluded into thinking that they may rightly sing the psalms: ‘the only petitioner who prays in God’s temple is the one who prays within the peace of the Church, within the unity of Christ’s body’. Crucially, therefore, the psalms were not just the voice of the Church, but were the voice of the Catholic church: ‘The Catholic Church says, “Unity must not be sacrificed; God’s Church must not be rent apart.”... This is the Catholic voice’. Later on, Cassiodorus would only have more sectarians to oppose, and continue to insist as Augustine had that only ‘the Catholic Church must speak these words [of the Psalms]’. The psalter was to be a means of – and a reflection of – the vincula caritatis of ecclesiastical unity. Following this patristic understanding, Haimo in his comments on Psalm 1 calls those not in communion with the Church ‘like dust, that is, unfruitful; and, not being tied down by any

---

chain of love, they are blown away by the wind, that is by the devil’s tempting, from the face of
the earth, that is from the solidity of the Church’. Remigius’ commentary on Psalm 40(41)
berates those ‘who have exited the Church, who have separated themselves from its society
and the chain of love – they have become open enemies, like Judas, against the Church, and
also therefore against the Lord’.

In monastic practice, this use of psalmody as an expression of unity was most vividly
symbolized by the rules regarding the excommunicated brother. The RB forbade brethren to
associate in any way with the excommunicated monk without the abbot’s permission;
Smaragdus was keen to clarify further that this is above all to be enforced in his exclusion
from corporate prayer. Quoting Cassian, Smaragdus writes that anyone who associates with
the excommunicated monk in prayer without the abbot’s permission not only becomes
condemned like him, but even sins more gravely,

because while giving him solace he makes his heart grow harder, not allowing him
to think about the very reason for his being segregated from the prayer—his
satisfaction and forgiveness— but he fosters for the worse the delinquent’s
stubbornness and increases the raw material of pride.

Psalmody was the ultimate expression of the monastic call to love one another in a spirit of
true fellowship. The practice of psalmody, therefore, was fundamentally conceived of as an

81 Haimo, In omnes psalmos pia, brevis ac dilucia explanatio 1, PL 116.200, emphasis mine: ‘Non sic
dico, sed tanquam pulvis, id est infructuosi, et nullo charitatis vinculo colligati “quem projicit ventus,” id est
diabolica tentatio, “a facie terrae” a soliditate Ecclesiæ. See similarly Ps 21, PL 116:266: ‘the unfaithful are
dust, because they are not joined to the bond of faith or love of the Church (qui pulvis erant, scilicet non
colligati vinculo fidei vel charitatis)’. And Psalm 118, PL 116:613: ‘the union of the Church, by which all are
joined by the chain of faith and love (intelligendam unionem Ecclesiae, qua omnes sunt ligati vinculo fidei et
charitatis)’.

82 Remigius of Auxerre, Enarrationes in Psalmos XL, PL 131:360, emphasis mine: ‘Et quia intus fuit in
do, egrediebatur foras, a societate et a vinculo charitatis exivit, et loquebatur in idipsum, scilicet in id quod
ali qui aperte erant inimici, ut Judas et alii contra Ecclesiam, vel in idipsum, id est, contra Dominum’.

83 Quoting Regula Cassiani 14:1-3 and Benedict of Aniane, Concordia Regularum 34.5. Smaragdus,
Expositio 26, CCM 8, p. 226, trans. Barry, Commentary, p. 360-1: ‘quia solatium ei tribuens cor eius amplius
facit induarari, et non permittit eum pro hoc quod ab oratione fuerat segregatus de satisfactione sua et venia
cogitare, sed maiorem superbiae fomitem et contumaciam delinquentis nutrit in peius’.
exercise in self-renunciation which gave priority to acts of deference, the repression of self-presumption and self-will, and perseverance in unity.

**On account of the choir**

Benedict of Aniane included a hymn into the so-called New Frankish Hymnal, intended for use in the canonical hours and expressing the foundational feature of medieval psalmody:84

May the high heavens sing psalms, may all angels sing them, may whatever is of any power anywhere sing psalms to praise God. May no tongue be silent and may each voice join in harmony for ages of ages....

Let the old and the young, let the choir of little children, the crowd of mothers and virgins, the simple girls let their voices in unison proclaim you in chaste harmony for ages of ages.85

Each and all, whatever and anywhere, a choir and crowd in unison and harmony: this was the spirit of psalmody as intended by ninth-century churchmen. But the particular mark of *monastic* psalmody was that monks were bound to this type of performance through their vows, which ensured that the chorus would function as intended. A common maxim in

---


85 Hymn 136 in Gneuss' numbering; Milfull, *Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, pp. 429-30:

'Psallat altitudo celi, psallant omnes angeli,
quidquid est virtutis usquam, psallat in laudem dei.
Nulla linguarum silescat, vox et omnis consonet seculorum seculis....

Te senes et te iuventus, parvulorum te chorus,
turba matrum virginumque, simplices puellule
voces concordes pudici perstrepant concentibus seculorum seculis.'
contemporary Benedictine spirituality asserts that the monastic life exists on account of, or even for the sake of, its choir: *monachi propter chorum fundati*. A phrase sometimes attributed to Benedict of Nursia, sometimes to Benedict of Aniane, and other times to the Cluniacs, it actually dates only from the nineteenth century, according to Dom Morin. While the phrase may not be indigenous to early medieval monasticism, it does express precisely the one thing about monastic psalmody which was most attractive to aristocratic patrons.

In charters endowing gifts of land or assets in return for monastic intercession, phrases which evoke the image of crowds of monks and nuns performing the liturgy in unity frequently occur, usually introduced by the word ‘ubi’ and containing words like *turma, turba, or chorus*, accompanied by the clarification that these monks live together under one rule. As early as 523, a charter of Childebert I refers to the monastery of Saint-Calais as a place ‘where the abbot himself is seen to live one with a throng of monks under a holy rule (*ubi ipse abba una cum turba monachorum sub sancto ordine conversare videtur*)’. A charter of Chilperic II in 716 uses the same phrase, referring to the monastery at St. Wandrille as a place ‘where the abbot is seen to live with a throng of monks under a holy rule (*ubi ipse abba cum turmae plurima monachorum sub sancta regula conversare videntur*)’. Chrotild conferred many gifts to the monastery for women at Bruyères-le-Châtel so that, as she explains, it may be a place

---


87 The word ‘*turma*’ found in Merovingian charters has received scholarly attention usually only in the context of studies on the *laus perennis*: The charter of Clovis II explains that the perpetual psalmody was to be carried out in ‘squadrons’ (*psallencius per turmas*), while the document attributed to King Sigismund describes the perpetual psalmody of Saint-Maurice-en-Valais in terms of ‘*norma*’ (*de psallendi institutionibus fiant VIII norme*). B. Rosenwein, ‘One site, many meanings: Saint-Maurice d’Agaune as a place of power in the early Middle Ages’, in de Jong et al., ed., *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 271-90 at 285. For further discussion of these two terms, see F. Masai, ‘La “Vita patrum iuresium” et les debuts du monachisme à Saint-Maurice d’Agaune’, in J. Autenrieth and F. Brunholzl, ed., *Festschrift Rernbard Riscbofl zu seinem 61. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1971), pp. 43-69, at pp. 64-65. Also Roberts, *Service-Books of Saint-Denis*, p. 13-15.

88 MGH *Diplomata Regum Francorum et Stirpe Merovingica* 1, no. 9, p. 35.

89 *Ibid*, no. 169, p. 420. In some manuscripts, ‘*turba plurima*’.
'where a chorus of holy virgins offers to the Lord with a pure heart the songs of their meditations (ubi chorus sanctorum virgenum jugiter medetacionum carmina devota mente Domino canuntur). The terms ‘chorus’ and ‘turma’ had thus become by the Carolingian period a shorthand for the monastic entity as a whole.

Within monastic teaching itself, the significance of being a chorus or turma was that it was precisely the description applied to the rest of the orders in the celestial hierarchy: to be part of a chorus of those singing the psalms was to be part of the saints in heaven especially close to God:

Christ, redeemer of all men, preserve your servants, placated by the holy prayers of the perpetual virgin, blessed Mary.

You also, blessed troops of celestial spirits, dispel evils past, present and to come.

You prophets of the eternal judge and you apostles of the Lord, humbly we beg to be saved by means of your prayers.

You renowned martyrs of God and resplendent confessors, convey us into the heavenly regions by your appeals.

You choir of holy virgins and all monks, let us be partakers in Christ together with all the saints.91

---


91 ‘Ymnus ad Nocturnam’, Hymn 99 in Gneuss’ numbering; Milfull, Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church, pp. 361-3 (italics mine):
‘Christe, redemptor omnium, conserva tuo famulos beatae semper virginis placatus sanctis precibus.

Beata quoque agmina caelestium spirituum, preterita, presentia, futura mala pellite.

Vates aeterni iudicis apostolique domini, suppliciter exposcimus salvari vestris precibus.
This anonymous hymn, used in the early ninth century during the monastic Divine Office, demonstrates the desire of monks to be part of the heavenly crowd of intercessors who were characterized by their existence not as individuals but by their membership among the celestial choruses. Fundamentally, the public and intercessory orientation of monastic prayer which had emerged by the Carolingian period was grounded on an understanding of psalmody which emphasized the chorus made up of those who had given up their individual wills in order to join in a covenant of prayer, together with the troops in heaven. Thus, the insistently social dimension built into the performance and interpretation of psalmody lent itself to a usage which could easily adopt an ‘intercessory superstructure’. The concept of the psalms and prayer as a social contract was a particularly forceful one driving relations between monks within a monastery; in the following chapter, we turn to the prayer between brethren.

Martyres dei incliti
confessors lucidi,
vestris orationibus
nos ferte in celestibus.

Chorus sanctarum virginum
monachorumque omnium,
simul cum sanctis omnibus
c Consortes Christi facite’.
Chapter Four: Intercession for Monastic Brethren

A story in the Vitae Patrum, read regularly in early medieval monasteries, tells of a monk assailed by lust who, owing to his desire to marry the daughter of a pagan priest, had renounced God, his baptism, and his monastic vows. Filled with regret, he sought help from a great hermit. The hermit said to him, 'Stay with me in this cave, and fast for three weeks, and I will pray to God for you.' The hermit laboured with great effort in prayer on behalf of the brother, begging God, 'Grant me this soul, and accept his penitence'. God heard the hermit’s prayer, and at the end of the third week, the dove which had flown out of the monk’s mouth when he had renounced his faith and vows re-entered it. The hermit thanked God and exhorted the brother to holy living.¹

A fixture of the monastic mindset was that the spiritual life necessarily consisted of a struggle in which demonic foes threatened to drag one away from the path to righteousness: 'no contest, no crown’, Columbanus had told his monks at Luxeuil.² The road to the City of God was narrow and dangerous, and foes lurked on all sides. Its travellers were surrounded by adversities, the possibilities for making slips and stumbles too numerous to count. Indeed, there would be little chance of successfully completing the course, if not for the fact that just as real as the demons bringing one down were the brothers holding him up in prayer. This idea provided the basis for the endorsement of coenobitic monasticism as the necessary

² Columbanus, Epistula 4, ed. G. Walker, Sancti Columbani Opera (Dublin 1956), pp. 26-36, at 34: 'si tollis pugnam, tollis et coronam'. Drawing on 2 Timothy 2:5, this was a common phrase for summarizing the purpose of the monastic life – e.g. also in Smaragdus, Expositio 1, CCM 8, p. 57: 'Nullus enim absque certamine coronabitur'.
context for making spiritual progress. The cenobitic life, Benedict wrote, was the ‘fraternal battle-line (acies fraterna)’, the line of soldiers drawn up to wage war against the devil.\(^3\) For Hildemar, this spiritual battle-line which frightens the devil receives its strength from fraternal charity, and is described in the Song of Songs as a ‘terrible army set in array’\(^4\). Surely, those who do not take the time to learn the techniques of fighting from his fellow troops but goes out to fight against the enemy alone will lose, just as the story told in ‘pagan books’ of enemies trying to capture a certain city. The enemies, having failed to take the city by force, made an agreement with the dwellers of the city that each side should send one representative to fight; the side of the man who wins will also win. So the city sent one man out to fight, and the enemies sent another, and they met on a bridge. The man from the enemy side shouted to his rival from the city with these words of blatant deceit, ‘Was not our agreement to send one man each to fight? Why then have you come with so many others? See how many people follow you!’ So the man from the city turned around to look back, at which point his enemy immediately moved in and killed him.\(^5\)

The point of the story, Hildemar explains, is that the man who went out alone was not prepared for the deceptive tricks of the enemy; so too the monk who has not learned the ways of the devil from his Abbot and been prepared for combat by his brethren will surely lose.\(^6\)

\(^3\) RB 1.5, ed. Fry, RB 1980, p. 168: ‘et bene exstructi fraterna ex acie ad singularem pugnam eremi’.

\(^4\) Hildemar, Expositio 1, ed. Mittermüller, Vita et regula, p. 77: ‘Ita etiam acies illa timetur a diabolo, quae est stipata fraterna caritate et habet fortes bellatores, sicuti est ecclesia, ad quam in Canticis canticorum dicitur: “Pulchra es, amica mea, et suavis et decora sicut Jerusalem, terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata”’. Hildemar has ‘instructi fraterna ex acie’ where Benedict has ‘exstructi fraterna ex acie’ – that is, where Benedict says that the fraternal battle line is that from which the monk goes out, progressing onto single combat in the desert, Hildemar, having replaced ‘exstructi’ with ‘instructi’, takes this statement as occasion to focus on the pastoral instruction which the monk receives from the Abbot and his brethren inside the battle line.

\(^5\) Ibid, p. 78.

\(^6\) Ibid: ‘Vide modo, quia iste incautus nescivit ingenia bellandi, ideo periiit. Ita et monachus; monachus eunici quasi cum multis pugnat contra diabolum, cum in monasterio contra diabolum pugnat; cum vero in eremum vadit, quasi ad singulare certamen pergita contra diabolum; deinde si minus cautus
This was the reason, Hildemar writes, why the Desert Fathers had warned that the temptations of the devil against monks was so great that none of the monks dared to sleep all at once. Rather, some would stay awake to pray on behalf of those who were sleeping. In Hildemar’s understanding, ‘when the monk fights against the devil in the monastery, if he be wounded or cut by the devil, he is aided by brethren, i.e. through prayer, consolation, and exhortation’.

Thus, while we are accustomed to equating prayer in the monastic life with either the public corporate prayer of the daily office or with private contemplative prayer, I will focus in this chapter on another fundamental aspect of prayer within the cloister: the prayer of monks for one another in the posture of spiritual combat, directed to God in the form of a petition on behalf of another brother. This chapter argues that while intercessory prayer for rulers and patrons took an increasingly prominent place in Carolingian monastic prayer, the prayer of monks for each other was of basic and foundational importance, for it was the thing which saw them safely through the dangers of the earthly journey en route to the celestial city. This conception of the defensive function of monastic intercession – of prayer as the outworking of the fraternal battle-lines – was central to, and anchored developments in, the practice of prayer in Carolingian monasticism. I begin with the basic vocabulary of fraternal intercession between two individuals, before analyzing the function and practice of fraternal intercession within the cloister, and finally examining the intercessions which linked together discrete monastic houses.

\textit{fuerit et fortis et non cognoverit insidias diaboli sedens in monasterio, cum in eremum fugerit, superabitur a diabolo, quia multa ingenia et insidias habet.’}

\textit{7 Ibid, pp. 78-79: ‘Nam sicut legitur in collationibus patrum, magna erat nimis tentatio diaboli contra monachos, et adeo magna, ut non omnes auderent dormire, sed quidam dormiebant, et quidam pro dormientibus orabant.’}

\textit{8 RB 1.4: ‘Qui didicerunt contra diabolum, multorum solatio iam docti, pugnare’; Hildemar, Expositio 1, ed. Mittermüller, \textit{Vita et regula}, p. 77: ‘Et bene dixit, “multorum solatio,” quia sicut ille, qui inter suas vel cum alis pugnat contra hostem suum, si forte vulneratur aut perciturur, adjuvatur vel eripitur ab illis, ita et monachus, cum in monasterio pugnat contra diabolum, cum vulneratur aut perciturur a diabolo, adjuvatur a fratribus, i. e., oratione, consolatione atque exhortatione.’}
Similarity of virtue

As the immense importance and canonical status of the letters written by St. Paul to the earliest Christian communities attest, the epistolary form was embraced by Christians from the start as an ideal medium for expressing one’s spiritual concern for another. The intercessory prayer formula had long been a fixture of classical Greek and Latin letters, tied primarily to phrases of concern for the other’s health and expressed most often in the form of making obeisance to the god(s) on the recipient’s behalf (thus termed the *proskynema* formula).\(^9\) The Christianized version of this same formula in papyri texts was identifiable only by a reference to the Lord, Christ or God, instead of the gods.\(^10\) The homogeneous and predictable *proskynema* formula of classical epistolography underwent stylistic flourish and quickly became occasions for rhetorical show in letters written by the élite and the rhetorically-trained monks and bishops from the ‘golden age of Christian letter-writing’ of the fourth and fifth centuries.\(^11\) Carolingian writers, conscientiously modeling themselves after the great letter-writer saints, continued to make the intercessory prayer formula a staunch part of their correspondence, so that this cliché supplied the basic vocabulary for intercession in the monastic milieu where letters were copied, collected, and read aloud.

The eighth and ninth centuries were a significant period for the formation and dissemination of letter collections specifically within the monasteries of the West. The letters of great patristic saints such as Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great were copied and gathered


\(^10\) For example: ‘We pray for those who are with us. Greet our brothers with you. We pray for your health in the Lord, beloved Papa’ (from P.Oxy.2785) and ‘I pray for your health in the Lord God. Emmanuel is my witness Amen!’ (from P.Oxy.1162). Quoted in Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 157.

together in monastic scription: ninth-century Corbie possessed at least three separate codices containing parts of Jerome’s *Epistulae*, and two codices of Augustine’s. The Carolingian interest in the epistolary genre is also signaled by the fact that letter collections were put together and disseminated during or shortly following the lifetime of a great letter writer. The letters of Boniface were compiled into two parts (correspondence with popes, and correspondence with others) shortly after his death in 754. They were combined into one collection during the pontificate of Archbishop Hrabanus Maurus, and were already by the mid-ninth century regularly consulted by Benedictus Levita (who made use of them in his *False Capitularies*) and Hincmar of Rheims. The most renowned letter-writer of the ninth century was Alcuin, whose authentic letters (totaling around 283 to 285) considerably outnumber the surviving correspondence of Augustine and of Jerome. Alcuin began keeping copies of his letters from 790, maintaining a personal collection throughout the decade. Not later than 799, he sent Arn of Salzburg a selection of the letter-texts preserved in the main collection at Tours, which were then transcribed as a ‘school-book’ (intended for use in school, as an aid to training students in the proper way to compose a Latin letter). Around this time, a more extensive selection was made at Tours itself, possibly as a formulary book. Some two years later another comprehensive collection was made, again at Tours, intended

---


for wider dissemination. The fact of these collections, made in ninth-century scriptoria alongside letters written by figures as spread apart chronologically as Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, and Boniface, is evidence of the Carolingian reception of the epistolary mode as a literary genre in its own right, in which epistolary formuli such as requests for and assurances of prayer were perceived as fixed traditions following standard stylistic norms. I offer here a brief analysis of the use of prayer phrases in both the late-antique correspondence transmitted in Carolingian monasteries, and in the early medieval letters which imitated them.

Requests for and assurances of prayer could be occasions for great rhetorical display. Yet, they were not mere flourishes serving only as attestations to friendship and remembrance, as in classical usage. Rather, prayer phrases were often attached to vivid descriptions of spiritual fears which were to be allayed through the addressee’s prayer. Most explicit are those instances when the prayer request was made using verbs of accomplishment like *exorare*, *impetrare*, *effectare*, and *praebere*, so that prayer is seen ‘to obtain what is sought’.

---


16 Paulinus demonstrates the extremes to which the convention can be taken: after having explained his need for Florentius’s prayers for his salvation, he realizes that he has been too loquacious, and ends his letter by begging Florentius to pray for him because he has sinned in using too many words to make his request for prayer. *Epistula* 42, CSEL 29, p. 361-3.


18 ‘since your word is more efficacious in prayer and since prayer is more efficient for obtaining what is sought through suffering (*plane quia nunc vobis in precibus efficacior sermo est et ad impetrandum quod in
wrote to Theodosius and the anchorites,

I adjure you (and I know that you can do it) by your prayers to deliver me from the darkness of this world... It rests with you to give effect to my resolve. I have the will but not the power; this last can only come in answer to your prayers.  

Likewise, Gregory the Great wrote to Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria, that he needed spiritual respite from the affliction a bitter mind resulting from the devastation from the barbarians: 'I am confident that I shall obtain it through the intercession of your Beatitude'. For Eulogius, by his prayer, could do what Gregory himself could not:

[A]s I do not yet deserve to obtain this with my own prayers, I beg you, let the prayer of your Holiness provide me with the help of your intercession. Release me from the heaviness of my sin and corruption....

Using an elegant chiasm to describe the effect of Domitian’s prayer, Gregory wrote, ‘Thus I may be raised by your intercession to the heights, as I am being pressed down to the depths by the weight of my sins’. Domitian’s prayer is the rescuer which pulls Gregory out of the tumultuous waves, and precisely this image was used a century later by Boniface and his

pressuris petitur faciior oratio est’. Cyprian of Carthage, Epistula LXXVI, ed. G. Hartel, CSEL 3.2 (Vienna, 1871), p. 833. This is a phrase frequently employed by Boniface, as here in Epistula 46, MGH Epp Sel 1, p. 74: ‘praecibus pietatis vestrae impetrare’ (obtain by your holy prayers).  

Jerome, Epistula 2, CSEL 54, p. 11, trans. Fremantle et al., Letters and Select Works, p. 4: ‘obsecro, quia vos impetrare posse non ambigo, ut me ex istius saeculi tenebris vestro liberetis oratu... nunc vestrum est, ut voluntatem sequatur effectus. meum est, ut velim; obseccionum vestrarum est, ut et velim et possim’.  


As Martyn observes, Gregory often expresses the distress he feels at spiritual temptation and burdens using the shipwreck simile. After extended descriptions of the foaming waves, raging storms, and the impossibility of reaching port, rescue by ‘the hand of your prayer’ and by the ‘plank of your intercession’ is usually his closing image. That is, the prayer of a friend is endowed with the ability to rescue Gregory from the storm. See Martyn, Letters, I, pp. 160-1, fn. 223, and see also his notes on Gregory’s nautical imagery in pp. 106-7. Note also a similar use by Jerome: ‘The seas around, and all around the main. I find myself in mid-ocean, unwilling to retreat and unable to advance. It only remains that your prayers should win for me the gale of the Holy Spirit to waft me to the haven upon the desired shore (superest, ut oratu
correspondents. ‘(T)he vessel of my mind, tossed by the recurrent storms of the various Germanic tribes’, wrote Boniface to Nothelm, ‘may by your prayers be brought into a safe and rock-bound harbor’.24 As a ‘storm-tossed sailor’ plunged into the depths of despair by the weight of her own sins, Abbess Egburg asked Boniface, ‘set me upon the rock of your prayers’. It was likewise because of Boniface’s prayers that Abbess Bugga ‘reached the haven of a certain peace’.25 Tumultuous waves battered the human soul, but these waves could be lessened and one pulled from the brink of death by a friend’s prayer.

So strong was the belief in the power of a praying friend that it was a stylistic norm to equate it with the grace of God itself. The qualifier \textit{dei gratia} and all its variants occur commonly in Christian literature of all kinds and hardly needs mention, but we must not fail to observe that, in epistolary literature specifically, it is usually just one in a pair, accompanied by another qualifier, \textit{tuis orationibus}. Boniface wrote to Pope Zacharias that his missionary activity was ‘upheld by your prayers and led by God’s grace’.26 Lul wrote to Boniface that he would be refreshed ‘through the favouring grace of Christ and the intercession of your prayers’.27 Hrabanus Maurus wrote to Bishop Humbert, ‘I especially need your prayer and the mercy of the omnipotent God’ for protection against trial and temptation.28

\footnotesize

\begin{flushright}


\footnote{Hrabanus Maurus, \textit{Epistula} 27, MGH Epp 5, pp. 441–2: ‘Ac ideo vestra oratione atque omnipotentis Dei misericordia maxime indigeo, ne deficiam in tribulationibus, in necessitatibus, in periculis et in temptationibus diversis’.}
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friend was placed alongside the powerful activity of God, and if God acted, it was equally in
response to the prayer uttered by a friend as to His own grace and kind will.

While the prayer formula relied on notions of basic exchange, transaction, and reciprocity
(e.g. 'Love me and pray for me, since I love you', wrote Ambrose\(^{29}\)), it was more often phrased
so as to emphasize the benefits that would come to the person who prayed for the other.
Gregory, writing to Leander, bishop of Spain, about his spiritual distress and employing his
usual storm-at-sea imagery, wrote:

> So if you love me, my very dear brother, stretch out the hand of your prayer to me
in these waves, so that as you aid me in my troubles, you may stand stronger in
your own troubles also, by way of payment in exchange.\(^{30}\)

Similarly, he asked John, abbot of Mount Sinai ‘to stretch out the hand of your prayer to us as
we cross the sea, or rather suffer shipwreck, and as we try to reach the land of the living, help
us with whatever prayers you can, so that you may have an eternal reward, not only for your
way of life but also for rescuing us’.\(^{31}\) Here again we find the spiritual emphasis of the
intercessory prayer formula, as writers based their requests for prayer not only on the notion
of a fair exchange, but more so on the real gain that is to be had for the person who is praying
for the other. Notably, the apparatus which gave definition to the request for prayer was not a
theology of God to whom prayer was addressed, but the fact of the two individuals who made

\(^{29}\) Ambrose to Segadius and Delphinus, Epistula 87, PL 16:1284: ‘diligite nos, et orate pro nobis; quia
ego vos diligo’. Similarly, Augustine writes to Antonius, ‘Many more thanks still shall be yours, if you not
only claim an interest in my prayers, but also cease not to pray for me (si non solum te commendes
orationibus nostris, sed etiam pro nobis orare non praetermittas)’. Epistula 20, CSEL 34.1, p. 48, trans. J. G.

\(^{30}\) Gregory the Great, Registrum Epistolarum I.41, MGH Epp 1, p. 57, trans. Martyn, Letters, I, p. 160:
‘Si ergo me, frater karissime, diligis, tuae mihi orationis in his fluctibus manum tende; ut quo laborantem
me adiuvas, ex ipsa vice mercedis in tuis quoque laboribus valentior exista’.

736-7: ‘nobis navigantibus aut potius naufragantibus orationis vestrae manum tendite et conantes ad terram
viventium pergere quantis potestis precibus adiuvate, ut non solum de vestra vita, sed etiam de erceptione
nostra mercedem in perpetuum habere valeatis’.}
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up a praying relationship – a contract and covenant of prayer. Nowhere is this more evident than in the distinct and frequently employed benediction by which the letter writer essentially prays to God that his addressee will pray for him. Gregory I had many versions of this benediction, as he wrote for example, ‘(M)ay the Holy Trinity guard you with its protection as you pray for us’ and ‘May almighty God... inspire you to pray for me more earnestly, so that as my own sins depress me, your prayers may raise me up before our almighty Lord’. Both Merovingian and Carolingian writers picked up the unique benediction of earlier writers: for example, Desiderius of Cahors wrote, ‘May the power of our Lord Jesus Christ deign to keep you praying for us’, and Alcuin wrote, ‘May the Lord Christ keep you in continual well-being as you pray for us, beloved lords, fathers, brothers, sons and friends’. The requests for and assurances of prayer that were such a central part of the patristic and medieval letter-writing practice expressed the belief that a covenant of prayer was a powerful tool by which individuals within the personal bonds of friendship could withstand the onslaught of temptation and progress along the path to perfection. This contract of prayer between two individuals was based fundamentally on a shared religious spirit which Cassian had described as a ‘similarity of virtuousness’ (*parilitas virtutum*) and ‘similarity of behaviour (*parilitas morum*)’. In his well-known Conference 16 on friendship, Cassian drew attention to

---

32 See J. Altman’s influential study on epistolary fiction, in which she speaks of the ‘pronominal relativity’ of epistolary discourse that distinguishes it from all other literary genres: ‘The most distinctive aspect of epistolary language is the extent to which it is colored by not one but two persons and by the specific relationship existing between them. … [T]he interpersonal bond basic to the very language of the letter (I–You) necessarily structures meaning in letter narrative’. J. Altman, *Epistolarity: Approaches to a Form* (Columbus, OH, 1982), p. 118.


the distinction between *agape* and *diathesis*. While *agape* was the love to be shown to all, *diathesis* was the affection between true friends, ‘shown to very few, to those who are linked by a similarity of behavior and the fellowship of virtue’.36 Here, Cassian repeated and emphasized his idea that it is *similarity* which binds together two individuals. Only a friendship founded upon ‘similarity of virtuousness (*virtutum parilitate foederatur*)’ is indissoluble, and a friendship in its fullness ‘can only survive among perfect men of like virtue’, for ‘their similar will and their common chosen orientation’ keep them in close agreement about the things that pertain to spiritual progress.37

Practically, this meant that friendships of *diathesis* were formed among the religious élite (bishops and abbots in particular); those who had the resources to write and send letters of friendship to one another (and whose letters were subsequently collected, circulated, and copied) were necessarily of the aristocratic and educated class. McGuire has argued that for all the interest of the Carolingians in ideas of friendship, there was little correlation between their optimistic descriptions of friendship between equals and the institutional setting of the monastery.38 Benedict of Aniane, for example, whose correspondence with Alcuin was renowned and gathered into a now-lost epistolary collection, was obviously interested in spiritual friendship, but he did not try to integrate the ethic and practice of spiritual

---


38 B. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1988), pp. 132-33. McGuire’s thesis is that not until monastic rules and lives came to emphasize a union of love and discipline with Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century would it be possible to unite the requirement of community with the desire for personal friendships; his thesis about the flowering of friendship within a specifically monastic institutional setting is entirely focused on the twelfth century as the ‘Age of Friendship’.
friendship into the monastic life. Though his choice of title may suggest otherwise, his *De modis amiciciarum et vera amicicia* is not a tract about friendship but rather about the love of and love for God. Yet, it is important to remember that the ideal of aristocratic friendship was often played out before all other brothers and sisters in a monastic community. At the practical level, the *Rule of Benedict* had ordered that all letters be submitted to the Abbot, whose duty it was to protect the community from unlimited and unwarranted communication with the outside world, and approved letters were read in front of everyone. Secondly, when letter writers asked their recipient for prayer, the expectation was that this prayer would be made be not just privately, but also through the mentioning of one’s name in the corporate times of monastic prayer. Alcuin, for example, asked his brothers at York to have him ‘continually in your hearts and on your lips in your hours of common prayer and in your private intercessions’. Additionally, as discussed above, the ancient patristic letter collections have come down to us through transmission by mostly Carolingian monastic scribes; letters, in other words, were public documents and part of the literary corpus of the monastic tradition. Thus, the friendship between two individuals was never a private affair within a monastic community. The language of patristic and medieval letters – read, written, and heard, copied and re-copied, was a strong force shaping the monastic worldview. In particular, the intercessory prayer formula contributed to the spiritual expectations and

39 See above, p. 67.
40 See above, p. 60.
41 As articulated rather romantically by H. Malleson and M. Tuker in the *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome*, vol 3 (London, 1897), p. 86: ‘The middle ages have been called magna parens virum; the defects of the age left untouched some of the greatest character-making qualities, and among these we may count magnanimity. Round these great characters, especially in the cloisters, gathered the great historic friendships’. On friendship and monasticism, in addition to McGuire, *Friendship and Community*, see A. Fiske, ‘Cassian and Monastic Friendship’, *American Benedictine Review* 12 (1961), 190-205; and idem, *Friends and Friendship in the Monastic Tradition* (Guernavaca, 1970).
experiences of those who used, read, and heard it. It offered important vocabulary for expressing the notion that though the Christian is necessarily tossed about in the sea of temptations, a friend’s prayer was a rock, a safe harbour, a saving hand which was powerful to deliver a brother from drowning.

**The prayer of all shared with the one**

While the deep covenant of prayer possible within the bonds of *amicitia* rested fundamentally on the notion of exclusivity of affection and parity of virtue in friendship described by Cassian, the cenobitic ideal, particularly as it developed in the *RB*, brought to the fore a sense of inclusivity and mutual reliance among precisely *unequal* individuals and groups: the strong and weak, the old and the young, the healthy and the sick. The *RB* expressly established a monastic lifestyle which would abolish any class distinctions, with the abbot bestowing goods upon the brothers not according to their family descent but in accordance with their spiritual need.  

Central to coenobitic monasticism was the idea of the ‘one body’, and while monastic writers could disagree about what precisely the word ‘*monos*’ (‘monk’, and ‘one’) signified, all agreed that the basic ideal of cenobitism was that growth in virtue could only be successfully accomplished within the training grounds of communal living with many different brethren striving toward oneness. The ‘oneness’ was that of a monastic *familia* and *fraternitas*, as expressed in Hildemar’s commentary which stressed the fact that monks are joined by their common profession and their common goal, no matter what their fleshly variations:

> It is well that he [Benedict] ordered them to be called *fratres* because they have been reborn in the same sacred font of Baptism, they have been sanctified by the

---

44 *RB* 34.

45 *monos* as distinctive lifestyle and seclusion from the world (as in Smaragdus, *Expositio Prologue*, CCM 8, p. 50), vs. *monos* as a group of men united in charity with one heart and one soul (Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalms* CXXXII.6; see Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, p. 11).

same Spirit, they have pledged the same profession, they hope to attain to the same reward, and are all sons of Holy Mother Church. It is to be noted that this spiritual brotherhood is greater than that of the flesh.\textsuperscript{47}

United by the goal of the same reward and the same way of life, prayer could be made for an entire monastic community as a single unit, Smaragdus wrote.

Thus the apostle as he prays for us says: We pray ‘that you may walk worthily of God, being pleasing in every way, bearing fruit and growing in every good work’. Each day the monk, new and made new, ought to grow from virtue to virtue... until he reaches the appointed prize of the heavenly call of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.\textsuperscript{48}

The entire monastic community could be prayed for with an identical prayer to encapsulate what the community and each member within it stood for. The following prayer for the monastic community found in the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, for example, was inserted by Benedict of Aniane later into his \textit{Supplement} for use among the reformed Frankish monasteries:

God, you who have prepared a mansion in heaven for those renouncing the world, enlarge the temporal habitation of this holy congregation with heavenly goods, so that the brothers may be held by the joint of love, may as one body, sober, simple, and quiet guard the precepts of continence; let them know the grace given freely to them, let their life agree with their name, let their profession be felt in their work.\textsuperscript{49}


The prayer existed as part of the rite for the dedication of a monastery because it could not be presumed that its members would always live in unity and chastity. Monastic literature constantly reminded monks and nuns that the very business of the devil was to introduce disorder and vice into a congregation. He had tried to do this when unhappy about the spiritual progress which the disciples of Abbess Leoba were making: ‘He therefore attacked them constantly with evil thoughts and temptations of the flesh, trying to turn some of them aside from the path they had chosen,’ efforts which ultimately failed by virtue of their prayers.\textsuperscript{50} Thus the Gelasian Sacramentary contains a prayer for God to ‘surround this holy sheepfold with the wall of your protection, so that with all adversity having been repelled, it may always be a house of safety and peace.’\textsuperscript{51} As I have already discussed in Chapter One, the image of the monastery as a ‘holy sheepfold (sanctus ovile),’ drawn directly from the Rule of Benedict, is used to designate the monastery as a place in which one’s spiritual health is protected by other brethren and supervised by the Abbot; to not be enclosed within it is to leave oneself open to danger and death.\textsuperscript{52} Without their support, the monk was left alone to deal with the ravenous wolves. But within the holy sheepfold, he was watched over and kept safe by the shepherd, and his fellow brethren had a duty to assure his victory in the battle.

It was in this spirit that prayers for monks going on a journey were made, not so much as a purging of worldly dirt which threatened to contaminate some sort of material holiness in the cloister, but as a petition to God for the sake of his continued progress in virtue and protection from harm. The prayer of his brethren prepared a monk to face the dangers of the


\textsuperscript{52} Above, pp. 30-1.
outside world, held him up in safety while he was exposed to them, and sought forgiveness on his behalf for any sins he might have committed while outside the gaze of concerned brothers. Columbanus’ monastic rule highlights the importance of intercessory prayer for each other in the context of leaving the safety of the enclosure and returning back to it having been exposed to danger: traveling outside a monastery without first asking for the prayer of brethren was an offense punishable by beating. The act of sending a brother off with prayer and receiving him back with prayer upon his return is one of highest solemnity and solidarity according to Smaragdus’ description: the traveling monk, while lying prostrate on the floor before the altar, ‘asks prayers from all’, and the priest and brethren perform their prayers for him antiphonally. This is a strict service of prayer by all the brethren for the comings and goings of each other, the focus being on the spiritual battles that are waged against those who leave the protective fold, not on the contamination of the sacred space by the brother who leaves and returns.

53 RB 67.1-4.
54 Columbanus, Regula Coenobialis 3, ed. Walker, Sancti Columbani Opera, p. 146-8, trans. ibid, p. 147-9: ‘Qui egrediens domum ad orationem poscendam non se humiliaverit et post acceptam benedictionem non se signaverit, crucem non adierit, XII percussionibus emendare statuitur. Similiter qui orationem ante opus aut post opus oblivus fuerit, XII percussionibus. Et qui comederit sine benedictione, XII percussionibus. Et qui regrediens domum orationem petens non se curvaverit intra domum, XII percussionibus emendetur’. The impact of Columbanus on Frankish monasteries as centers of intercessio has been extensively analyzed by Albrecht Diem. The author focuses on the system of rigid control of speech, thought, and dreams, and intensive daily confession and penance acting as a purging mechanism which, he argues, ensured the purity of the cloister as a sacred space for intercession. While Diem emphasizes the anxiety over protecting the monastery as a place of prayer, I emphasize here a different aspect: prayer as a mechanism for protecting sanctity itself. See Diem, Das monastische Experiment throughout, but especially at pp. 55-66. See also M. de Jong, ‘Monastic prisoners, or opting out? Political coercion and hounour in the Frankish kingdoms’, in de Jong et al., ed., Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages, pp. 291-328, esp. at 299-301, and idem, ‘Imitatio morum. The cloister and clerical purity in the Carolingian world’, in M. Frassetto, ed., Medieval Puirty and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform (New York and London, 1998), pp. 49-80.

55 The content of the actual prayers said may differ. Smaragdus’ commentary has different content than the sacramentaries that have come down to us: Compare Smaragdus, Expositio 67, CCM8, pp. 326-7 with the Gregorian Sacramentary (Supplement), ‘LXXVI Orationes pro fratribus in via dirigentibus’ and ‘LXXXVII Oratio pro redeuntibus de itinere’, ed. Deshusses, Le Sacramentaire Grégorien 1, pp. 437-8.
This concern for the spiritual protection of each individual brother is most evidently displayed in the prayers which are made for the brother who is weak or tempted to sin. The Rule of Macarius, included in Benedict of Aniane’s Codex, states that intercessory prayer for the wayward brother is, in conjunction with beating with rods, sufficient intervention to allow for his reception back into the community.\(^{56}\) It is again an act of greatest solemnity: according to the Rule of the Master, the confrontation of a weak brother in his temptation must be done with care (‘in the spirit of gentleness’) and fear (‘you who think you are safe must be careful that you do not fall’), ‘with one heart’ and ‘for a very long time’\(^{57}\). For Benedict, the prayer of an entire monastic community is the most powerful of actions to bring back a fallen brother, the sure thing which can produce a result when nothing else can:

After (the abbot) has applied compresses, the ointment of encouragement, the medicine of divine Scripture, and finally the cauterizing iron of excommunication and strokes of the rod, and if he then perceives that his earnest efforts are unavailing, let him apply an even better remedy: he and all the brothers should pray for him so that the Lord, who can do all things, may bring about the health of the sick brother.\(^{58}\)

The prayer of the monastic congregation for a tempted or fallen brother can do what fear of punishment cannot:

But if he is not broken by fear of excommunication or the punishment of stripes, let compassion be fuelled and augmented, with the result that the whole community


\(^{58}\) RB 28.3-5, ed. and trans. Fry, RB 1980, pp. 224-5, emphasis mine: ‘si exhibuit fomenta, si uNguenta adhortationum, si medicamina scripturarum divinarum, si ad ultimum uStationem excommunicationis vel plagarum virgae, et iam si viderit nihil suam praevalere industriae, adhibeat etiam – quod maius est – suam et omnium fratrum pro eo orationem, ut Dominus qui omnia potest operetur salutem circa infirmum fratrem’. 
beseeches our common Master on his behalf in dutiful prayer, that the one held enmeshed in the devil’s snare may be cured by the Lord’s mercy and compassion.\textsuperscript{59}

All these statements lay emphasis on the power of the whole community to deliver a brother from danger and death, a dimension of monastic life of which monks and nuns were frequently reminded in their hagiographic readings. Constantius of Lyon’s influential fifth-century \textit{Life of Saint Germanus of Auxerre}, of which more than one hundred manuscripts survive, many from the ninth century, tells a vivid story to make such a point.\textsuperscript{60} Demons had begun to trouble some monks in anticipation of Germanus’ visit to their monastery, intended as it was as an occasion for exhortation in the way of perfection. One monk was particularly gripped in the demonic attack, shouting and crying out in fury. When Germanus arrived, he fell down in prayer for this monk, and encouraged his brethren to kneel down and do likewise. The demon departed from the monk, leaving behind a heavy stench.\textsuperscript{61}

The medium of prayer, then, vividly displayed the cenobitic ideal of monks assisting one another in spiritual progress. The idea of watching out for one another in a defensive posture through prayer was in fact also practiced on a much more mundane, day-to-day level: the prayer between members of a monastic house enabled, grounded, and sustained the functional operations of the entire monastery. As is well known, the \textit{Rule of Benedict} stipulated ‘daily manual labour (\textit{opera manuum cotidiana}) as an antidote against idleness.\textsuperscript{62}

Prayer was an important part of manual labour, giving regular rhythm to the cycle of work, so that even one who was in the midst of work and unable to join the brethren at the times of

\textsuperscript{59} Waldebert, \textit{Regula (cuiusdam) ad virgines} 20, quoted in Benedict of Aniane, \textit{Concordia Regularum} 37.13, and Smaragdus, \textit{Expositio} 28, CCM 8, p. 232, emphasis mine: ‘Et si nec excommunicationis metu nec flagelli poena frangitur, augetur adhuc pietatis fomes ita \textit{ut ab omni congregacione pro ea communis dominus orationum officio deprecetur}, ut qui laqueo diaboli inrestitus tenetur, domini misericordia ac peitate curetur’.

\textsuperscript{60} Noble, \textit{Soldiers of Christ}, p. 76.


\textsuperscript{62} \textit{RB} 48.
corporate prayer was instructed to stop and say the office where he was. Benedict of Aniane has historically been characterized as a legislator who added so many accretions to the monastic horarium that the original simplicity and rhythm of Benedict of Nursia’s vision was lost, with little room left for manual labour. In fact, however, monastic reformers at the Synod of Aachen did affirm that manual labour was an integral part of the monastic life to be performed by the monks themselves, and that it should not be sacrificed or replaced by perpetual prayer. With the possible exception of scribal activity, manual labour was regarded as agricultural, physically-intensive labour. Ever since the origins of Christianity, spiritual symbols were often taken from the sphere of labour (for example, the vine, winepress, plow, sickle, axe, fish, trowel), and Paul’s statements in 2 Thessalonians 3:10 (‘if any would not work, neither should he eat’) offered the pattern for Christian work and devotion. In monastic culture, the activity, tools and implements of work provided the setting for rich spiritual encounters: in striving to bless others through their work, saints often experienced miracles related to the task at hand. With Jesus’ miracle of turning water into wine at Cana as an exemplum, the hagiographer of Sadalberga, abbess of Laon, devotes four continuous

63 RB 50.


67 LeGoff, Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages, p. 78.


69 This to balance the argument of LeGoff that the meaning of monastic labour was above all penitential and that monks were trying to satisfy penance through their labour (Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages, p. 80).
chapters to the miracles she performed in the midst of everyday menial tasks: filling up a vessel with beer in the cellar, making the ceiling bend down to the fire to help sisters with the washing of clothes, her secret command to a monk to bring lettuce for the nuns, the provision of a huge fish for a meal during her turn as the kitchen cook.\textsuperscript{70} In these miracle stories, the benefits – both material and spiritual – are experienced by all the sisters concretely within the daily, operational infrastructure of the monastery.

The significance of manual work thus lay most crucially in its existence as the site where monastics could, in striving to serve one another, be blessed by God with profound spiritual encounters, an idea which Willibald makes explicit in his \textit{Life of Saint Boniface}:

\begin{quote}
Such obedience as befits a monk was given by the saint [Boniface] to all the members of the community, and particularly to the abbot, and he applied himself assiduously, according to blessed Father Benedict’s prescribed form of proper arrangement to the daily manual labor and the regular performance of his duties. In this way he was an example to all both in word, deed, faith, and purity. \textit{All could profit by his good deeds, while he on his side shared in their common eternal reward.}\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

Attention must be drawn specifically to this language of ‘all for one’ and ‘one for all’ in the context of manual labor, which seems to be inspired by two passages (nearly identical with one another) in the \textit{Regula Magistri} regarding the characteristics of the cellarer (quoted below) and the remembrance of those not present in the oratory at the times of prayer.

\begin{quote}
And if the cellars are near the oratory, let the cellarer himself with his own voice ask that he be remembered in the prayers. Even so, when he is busy doing something, he too should softly recite the Work of God by himself, following the words and verses being said in the oratory. And it is right and proper that \textit{he be remembered by everyone in the oratory, because he is engaged in caring for the needs
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{Vita Sadalberga abbatissae Laudenensis} 20-23, MGH SRM 5, pp. 61-3.

of all. Thus, just as the one looks after the general welfare of all, so the prayer of all should be shared with the one." The Master articulates the idea that just as one works for all the brethren, so all the brethren should pray for the one, possibly relying on Julianus Pomerius’ statement that the progress which clerical brothers are able to make as a result of being freed from working should be attributed also to him who provides for them. The covenant of prayer within a monastery is here drawn out in explicit terms: while one works for all the rest, all the rest must pray for the one who works, commending the worker to the Lord, and just as one’s work is covered by another’s prayer, so one’s prayer covers another’s work. In this spirit, the RB thus commands the weekly incoming and outgoing kitchen servers to prostrate themselves at the feet of all in the oratory and ask their prayers. Smaragdus, quoting Cassian, comments that this is done so that ‘the prayer uttered by all the brothers together may accompany them as they carry out Christ’s command, and may also commend their completed service to God as a devout sacrifice’. This passage from Cassian’s Institutes is also quoted by Benedict of Aniane in his Concordia to clarify the significance of the Benedict of Nursia’s instruction. For, Smaragdus writes, ‘in all things that monks have to do, the prayer of the brothers must constantly precede’. The nature of prayer within a monastery is such that it literally sustains and gives life to the physical operations of monastic life: as each monk goes about his own work, the

---


73 Julianus Pomerius, De vita contemplativa II.16.1 and 4.

74 RB 35.


76 Benedict of Aniane, Concordia Regularum 44.5 and 44.6, CCCM 168a, p. 370.

prayers of all the brethren prepare the way, and all must remember one another as they work. It is the prayer of all the monks which commends the work of one's hands to the Lord; equally, it is the work of a monk which frees everyone up for prayer. Such is the way in which monastic prayer is an expression of the fraternal concern for the undertakings and spiritual progress of one another.

Our referencing of Smaragdus’ comments on the work of the monks here is worthy of mention, for he writes two centuries after the Rule of Benedict was first set down, though one would not know it from the lack of referents to the physical environment and operations of a large monastery typical of his day. Smaragdus writes almost atemporally, as if nothing had changed in the external monastic institution. The truth was that while the authors of the RM and RB operated within a simple farming economy, a great Carolingian abbey such as that over which Smaragdus presided in the ninth century was an imposing establishment that often housed several hundred monks and owned large estates on which serfs worked. While both the Master and Benedict could envision only vowed brothers living within the monastic precincts, chapter 5 of the Statutes of Murbach produced following the first synod at Aachen in 816 explains that houses for the workmen and craftsmen should be placed within the monastic walls rather than outside as was the custom of the past. The Plan of St. Gall does indeed place the Great Collective Workshop and the House of Coopers and Wheelwrights

78 The survey of the land holdings of the abbey of St. Wandrille around the year 787 listed 1,313 full mansei, 238 half mansei, 18 mansei for handiwork services, 39 mills, plus more than 2,400 mansei and 28 mills occupied by tenants of fiefs. See A. Verhulst, The Carolingian Economy (New York, 2002), p. 39, quoting ed. F. Lohier and R. Laporte, Gesta Sanctorum Fontanellensis coenobii (Rouen, 1936), pp. 82-3. Adalhard evidently considered his abbey as consisting of four concentric operations: 1, the cloister; 2, the compound, equivalent with the area visualized in the St. Gall plan; 3, the domain, made up of seven adjacent villas and twenty more at a distance not exceeding sixty kilometers; and 4, a total feudalty of indeterminate bulk, in allegiance to the abbot, spreading across a considerable sector of empire, embracing not only the domain, but also distant tenures involving a wide variety of rights and obligations, to which he does not allude. See Horn and Born, The Plan of St. Gall, vol. 3, ‘Appendix II: The Customs of Corbie’, p. 91-128 at 95.

79 Statuta Murbacensia 5, CCM 1, p. 444: 'Instruendi sunt fullones, sartores, suatores, non forinsecus sicut actenus, sed intrinsecus, qui ista fratibus necessitatem habentibus faciant...'. 
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immediately to the south and west of the Monks’ Cloister, which Horn and Born interpret to be a direct implementation of this directive.\textsuperscript{80} The Plan’s creator designated many other facilities for laymen of low status within the walls of the monastic precinct, such as the building designated ‘the hall of the serfs who come with the services’ (probably meaning quarters for serfs belonging to the monastery’s external estates who had come to the monastery from a distance to render service), living quarters for servants attached to the abbot’s house, and living quarters for those serving the mill, mortar, drying kiln, and other workers in charge of the fowls and animals.\textsuperscript{81} Modern estimates of the number of laymen within the monastic precinct envisaged on the Plan of St. Gall range from 80 to 150.\textsuperscript{82} This surprising allowance for infiltration from the secular environment is what allowed Sullivan to forward his argument that the central message of the Plan ‘is a call... to give order and structure to a space within which the sacred and the profane must intersect’, a ‘reformulation of the traditionally negative ascetic view of the world in ways that envisaged positive consequences flowing from interaction between the cloister and the world’.\textsuperscript{83}

Even so, monastic writers appear remarkably disinclined to adapt the practice of prayer to reflect their ever-widening experience of ‘daily manual labour’. In stark contrast to

\textsuperscript{80} Horn and Born, \textit{The Plan of St. Gall}, vol. 1, p. 23, and vol. 2, p. 189. But there continues to be debate over Horn andBorn’s argument that the Plan functioned as a ‘Reformplan’ mirroring the Aachen reforms. See in particular doubts raised by W. Sanderson, ‘The Plan of St. Gall Reconsidered’, \textit{Speculum} 60 (1985), 619-23; and A. Zettler, ‘Der St. Galler Klosterplan. Überlegungen zu seiner Herkunft und Entstehung’, in P. Godman and R. Collins, ed., \textit{Charlemagne’s Heir} (Oxford, 1990), pp. 655-687. Generally, scholars today do not to see the Plan as a visual model for the reforms implemented at the 816/817 Aachen synods, preferring to date the Plan either to the last years of Charlemagne’s reign or to around 830.

\textsuperscript{81} However, Hildemar’s commentary on the \textit{RB} indicates that although lay help was employed in the care of guests and the poor, in the garden and in other outside work, monks themselves within the monastery proper had to perform the services like the laundry, cleaning, and kitchen service (Schroll, \textit{Benedictine Monasticism}, p. 52).

\textsuperscript{82} Sullivan, ‘What was Carolingian Monasticism’, p. 275.

\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Ibid}, p. 283, 284.
polyptychs or charters which detailed inventories of land holdings and other assets,\textsuperscript{84} monastic commentaries speak of prayer and work while largely ignoring the revolution in labour and production, and the expansion of monastic property, that was happening right before their eyes. Historians have long debated whether manorialism was of Merovingian or of Carolingian origin. While many set the second quarter of the ninth century as the highpoint and ‘classic form’ of the system due to the wealth of evidence produced by the polyptychs of the period, others have argued that the formation of monastic estates goes back to the seventh century due to crucial indicators of the development of agrarian production, such as mills and wine-presses, and agrarian specialisms such as salt-making.\textsuperscript{85} Regardless, none of the new laymen who were now to live within a monastery’s walls according to the dictates of Haito at the Council of Aachen and the Plan of St. Gall figure in Smaragdus’ commentary, remarkable because Smaragdus was certainly one of the leaders of the monastic reform and present himself at the Council. Equally notable is the lack of new prayers in Benedict’s Supplement to reflect the incorporation of more laymen and new spaces of living and working within the monastic compound: sacramentary prayers for work places remain only the ones found in the eighth-century Gelasian, the traditional locations of a monk’s work (the scriptorium, cellar, larder, bakehouse, and kitchen). There appears to be no interest in praying for the workspaces of the coopers and wheelwrights, shoemakers and saddlers, sword-makers and blacksmiths. In spite of the natural desire for monasteries to produce wealth, and the corresponding increase in the importance of production sites in the monastic compound such as the mill and the skilled artisan’s workshops, the economic importance of these spaces and workers do not get reflected in monastic prayer. Prayer is said only for those parts of the monastic space frequented by the monks themselves, and the content of the

\textsuperscript{84} See for example the famous polyptych of St-Germain-des-Prés composed in the early ninth century by abbot Irmino: D. Hägermann, ed., Das Polyptychon von St-Germain-des-Prés (Cologne, 1993).

prayer is absolutely focused on the function of the room not in the operation of the monastery, but in the spiritual progress of the professed monks. Thus, prayer is made over the vestment room that the monks who are clothed there with exterior garments may be judged equally virtuous in their interior selves and merit to dwell with God, and prayer is made over the warming room that those who enter it may no longer suffer the coldness of heart through being warmed by the heat of the fire of the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{86}

The rather conservative position toward prayer in the monastery is especially apparent in the monk-abbot Adalhard’s customs of Corbie, written in 822 for the express purpose of bringing the Rule of Benedict up to date for the new time and circumstances of the great manorial estate.\textsuperscript{87} Adalhard was aware that, unlike Benedict, he had to address the transitional area between the monastic compound and the rest of its vast domain, and that monks who were charged with extra-claustral responsibilities needed a rule: the portions of the customs he wrote in response to this need which have survived are those for the magister pauperum, the custos panis, the hortolanus, the cellararii, iuniores et senior, and the portarius.\textsuperscript{88} Out of the surviving text, only one section has any relevance to prayer within the monastery, and it betrays where Adalhard’s interests in prayer lie. In regulating the service of monks in the kitchen lying outside the monastic precincts serving lay guests (i.e. those who were not able to


\textsuperscript{88} Horn and Born, Plan of St. Gall, vol. 3, p. 97. A fragment suggests that Adalhard may have extended the RB by issuing directives for some internal officials too, possibly the bibliothecarius, cantor, hospitalarius religiosorum.
partake of corporate psalmody in the church), Adalhard’s main concern is with describing how they may best carry out continual psalmody while attending to their duties. So, for example, he orders that if one cook needs to leave the kitchen and is unable to begin the proper psalm, as soon as he returns he should join in at the place at which he finds the others chanting. Adalhard includes detailed instructions for what should happen in the case that everyone is so preoccupied with their tasks that no one is able to chant, or in the case that no one remembers which part of the psalm to resume singing. 89 Adalhard’s concern is the proper execution of psalmody while monks work. Thus, while the intention of his customs is to extend the RB to cover regulations newly required for Corbie’s expanding manorial estate and duties, he appears to have no corresponding concern for extending the RB’s regulations on prayer to cover the new jobs and workers related to the operations of the monastic compound. The practice of prayer for him remains, as in the RB, the assistance which one monk must offer each other to commend their work to the Lord and execute it properly in a spirit of praise and silence. Even during a time of great amassing of wealth through the manual and skilled labour of a large numbers of servicemen, the prayer offered within a monastery did not come to reflect the incorporation of new workers, new sites, or new forms of production within the cloister.

Fraternal prayer was thus grounded in a sameness of spiritual goal. The comings and goings of laymen and servants and serfs, the making of new products, the growing number of villas held by the estate – these were all incidental and even irrelevant to the life of prayer within the monastery, as far at least as the written evidence shows. Prayer within a monastery remained a contract between those who had made monastic professions, similar to Hildemar’s remarks

that laymen should not fill the office of the infirmarian. How, he asks, could a layperson who is not a member of the monastery serve a monk any more than an eye or a foot can serve the body if it is not part of it? No temporal thing should get in the way of fraternal concern of one brother for another.\textsuperscript{90} Because vowed members shared a concern for the increase in sanctity and virtue, and a desire for protection from spiritual failing, they represented a distinct entity of prayer, a \textit{societas orationum}. In this regard, McLaughlin has argued that the use of the word \textit{societas} underwent a significant development during the course of the early Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{91} While the word had long been used since earliest Christianity to refer to the community of the elect in heaven and on earth (‘\textit{societas sanctorum}’ and ‘\textit{societas electorum}’), Florus of Lyons (d. 860) in the mid-ninth century applied the word more concretely to refer to the local community of Christians united in the Mass and, specifically, the clerical community.\textsuperscript{92} Whereas Carolingian writers could still use the word ‘\textit{ecclesia}’ in a typically Augustinian manner to embrace the entire body of confessing Christians, ‘\textit{societas orationum}’ came to frequently denote a specific clerical or monastic community and those associated with it. The practice of prayer for brethren within the monastery was thus concerned with holding up to the Lord the spiritual welfare of comrades who had professed to the same way of life and same goals. Prayer within a cloister was a manifestation of the fraternal battle-line closing ranks around the brother who would be exposed to the world while on a journey, who was tempted, and who was engaged in various forms of service for the Lord.


\textsuperscript{91} McLaughlin, \textit{Consorting with Saints}, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{92} Florus of Lyons, \textit{De expositione missae}, 68 (PL 119:61).
The hundred-fold promise

While the vast establishment of a great Carolingian abbey allowed for the intramural presence of lay workers and other non-monastic individuals, Carolingian monastic reformers were very concerned with regulating the enclosure of the monks and nuns themselves. For example, the Council of Aachen (789) forbade monks to leave their monasteries to occupy themselves with temporal affairs or to be involved in activities for monetary gain. Those who had only recently been admitted to monastic life were not to be sent outside to fulfill a mission. Monks were not to appear in secular assemblies or meetings. At least a dozen separate pieces of legislation from around 750 to 850 mandated much stricter, total claustration for nuns, including abbesses. For example, the Council of Friuli in 796/97 legislated total enclosure for all monasteries of women, and abbesses and nuns were prohibited from leaving the cloister on the pretext of a pilgrimage to Rome or other sacred sites. All this legislation presumes the monastic compound to be a self-sufficient entity able to meet all the needs – spiritual and physical – of those enclosed within, and makes explicit the understanding that there was no reason whatsoever to seek relations and engagements outside the cloister. In light of this strong message, the concurrent establishment of inter-claustral confederations of prayer in the early ninth century is most remarkable. The confraternity book of Reichenau, compiled by the monks in 826, contains around 40,000 names of living monks, nuns, and canons to be commemorated at the Mass. This alliance of prayer was impressive not only for its numerical scope (more than one hundred abbeys, canonries, and nunneries) but also its geographical reach: the thousands of names bound together in one volume represent sites from all over the Frankish realm, from Bremen in the North to


Benevento in the South, from Jumièges in the West to Mondsee in the East. The existence of this prayer confraternity indicates to us that the intramural prayer between members of the same monastery was viewed as not being entirely sufficient; there was a certain impulse pushing a congregation to seek links of prayer beyond the confines of its own cloister.

In fact, despite the RB’s principle of *stabilitas* and the enclosure legislation, there were many aspects to everyday monastic living which consistently served to suggest to each congregation that it did not exist in isolation but relied on the existence of other similar communities. For example, monastic houses served as resting-places for monks on a journey, thus giving opportunity for members of various monastic houses to interact with one another. Trade and scholastic pursuits linked various monastic communities together. As monasteries became repositories of culture and patristic learning, the brightest monk-scholars were given leave under the authority of abbots, bishops, and kings to engage in *transitus*, visiting renowned monastic libraries to exchange manuscripts and ideas. Bernhard Bischoff was able to identify distinct ‘script provinces’ which had developed by Charlemagne’s time precisely because a common and uniform calligraphic script had been taught and shared among different monastic ateliers lying within a certain region. Not only manuscripts and scripts traveled between monastic houses, but also relics. Angilbert, the abbot of St. Riquier, catalogued saints’ relics which had traveled to his abbey ‘from the various regions of the whole of Christendom’, ‘from Italy, Germany, Aquitaine, Burgundy, and Gaul’ and ‘from Constantinople and Jerusalem’. For him, St. Riquier was a veritable showplace of monasticism in all its glory because it gathered together the holy treasures of the religious communities.

---

95 Hildebrandt, *The External School*, pp. 30-3.
throughout Francia and the Holy Land. These were all daily reminders of the connectedness of one's own cloister with others.

But out of all the avenues for inter-claustral interaction, it was prayer which emerged as the one medium to make loose ties between monasteries official. The interest of historians in the official arrangements of mutual prayer in the form of confraternities has generally revolved around the practice of memoria (commemoration) which German scholars have termed the Totenbund (‘a society of men bound to recite so many masses and psalms for the death of any one of them, their communities being equally bound to participate’). The registering of names in libri memoriales, concern for continual prayer for the soul of the dead, the enumeration of requisite offices and masses for the dead, its possible late-antique origins in the mention of the dead within the canon of the mass, and so on have been studied extensively with regard to early medieval ideas about penance and death. Commemoration, as the stated raison d’être of the confraternities of prayer, was a crucial dimension of intercessory prayer in monastic tradition. But it was by no means the whole meaning of prayer confraternities.


Firstly, prayer confraternities were established not just for the dead, but also ‘for the salvation of the living’ – that is, prayer was said for members to live in a manner which would merit entry into eternal glory.\textsuperscript{100} Most important is the question of the immediate social motives for the drafting of these agreements among the various houses. The social significance of the Synod of Attigny in 762, in which five archbishops, twenty-two bishops, and seventeen abbots from all across Francia signed an agreement of mutual intercessory prayer, whose precedence was followed by monastic congregations such as Reichenau and St. Gall, was its legal force and contractual nature.\textsuperscript{101} For one of Chrodegang’s most pressing objectives for gathering together the bishops for the Synod of Attigny was to unite the dioceses in Francia that had been experiencing tense relations for the previous few decades due to ideological and political differences between secular aristocrats and the prelates.\textsuperscript{102} The occasion of the synod drew together church leaders from a wide region within Francia including those as far south as Novalese and St-Maurice at Agaune. The resulting agreement of mutual prayer at Chrodegang’s initiative was an expression of his concerns for the synod: uniting the old Frankish heartland, the zones of Bonifatian and Pirminic influence, and Burgundy.\textsuperscript{103} A contract of prayer was, in other words, important most basically for reason of its immediately unifying potential, for its being, literally, a contract between discrete parties. The value of a confraternity of prayer in the immediate time was that it existed as witness to the unity of a particular group of people in a society – in Chrodegang’s case, bishops, and then later on at the time of Benedict of Aniane, monks. Whether or not we can any longer attribute to


\textsuperscript{101} Schmid and Oexle, ‘Voraussetzung und Wirkung’, p. 85; Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz, p. 57.

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.

Benedict of Aniane success in establishing an ordo sancti Benedicti whereby all monasteries within Francia were united by the capitula of Aachen and a single bloc of legislation, it is undeniable that he desired to link distinct monastic congregations with one another. Ardo tells us Benedict of Aniane took twelve monasteries under his special supervision, and assumed the right to transfer monks from one place to another, as a basic component of the ordo monasticus which he envisioned.

Why prayer should be selected as that monastic activity which should most intensely bind one monastery to another is suggested in Eigil’s Life of Sturm, which, like so much of the hagiographical literature of the time goes out of its way to emphasize the remote isolation (desertum, solitudo, or vasta) of individual houses. The entire first half of the Life describes Sturm’s attempt to find a suitable site for a monastic foundation in the midst of ‘the frightful wilderness’, ‘wild beasts’, ‘birds flying, enormous trees, and the rough thickets of the forests’. The landscape fashioned by Eigil, however, is largely an imagined one, and the region’s true character is betrayed from time to time in the narrative: the hermits travel along

---

104 Knowles in his Monastic Order in England, p. 28, wrote: ‘The age of Charlemagne therefore marks an epoch in monastic history. It would not ben an exaggeration to say that between 800 and 820 the monastic way of life, the ordo monasticus, became officially, at least within the Empire, the ordo sancti Benedicti, and that the monks felt for the first time an esprit de corps, together with a persuasion, shared by all, that they had in St. Benedict a common father and protector.... The individual who had the greatest share in this transformation was Benedict of Aniane, and it is this that gives him his unique position in monastic history’. As noted in the Introduction, scholars are no longer so keen to ascribe such success to the unifying efforts of Benedict of Aniane.

105 Ardo, Vita Benedicti 42, SS 15.1, p. 219, trans. Cabannis, Benedict of Aniane, p. 104: ‘He had under his governance twelve monasteries: Aniane, Gellone, Casa Nova [Goudargues], Il-Barbe, Ménat, Saint Savinus, Saint Maximin, Massay, Cormery, Celleneuve near Toulouse, Marmoutier in Alsace, and Inde. The last was erected by the emperor’s authority for Benedict and his students and endowed from the royal treasuries. For all these Benedict dispatched monks and superiors of his own discipline.’


well-known merchant routes, cross bridges over the River Fulda, and admire Buchonia’s acclaimed fountains, springs, and arable lands.\textsuperscript{108} The ‘\textit{horrendum desertum}’ in which Sturm is described as founding Fulda in 743 was in actuality a fiscal estate, the center of which was occupied by a monumental Merovingian complex based on the model of a Roman \textit{villa}.\textsuperscript{109} Why should Eigil so deliberately exaggerate the desolate character of Sturm’s new settlement? Lynda Coon has argued that the ‘desert’ allowed the monks at Fulda to understand the legend of Sturm as a ‘western corollary to an eastern, anchoritic tradition’, so that the \textit{Vita} of Fulda’s founder could become ‘part of the classic corpus of desert lore’.\textsuperscript{110} But the desert/wilderness also forms the backdrop against which Eigil wishes to make an important statement about the nature of monastic prayer. Eigil writes that when Sturm, together with two brothers set out to find a place for their hermitage and had ‘reached a wild and uninhabited spot and could see nothing except earth and sky and enormous trees’, they stopped to pray, and a little while later, came to another spot ‘on which the monastery [Hersfeld] now stands’. There, having made ‘small huts roofed over with the bark of trees’, they stayed for a long time, ‘serving God in fasts, watching, and prayer’.\textsuperscript{111} A little later on, this process is repeated in nearly identical manner with the founding of Fulda. Eigil writes that the brothers, venturing deep into the wilderness, approached ‘the spot where the monastery now stands’ and there, having cut down trees and cleared the site with their own hands, began to ‘serve Him day and night in fasting, watching, and prayer’.\textsuperscript{112}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{108} Coon, ‘Collecting the Desert’, p. 145.
\textsuperscript{110} Coon, ‘Collecting the Desert’, p. 145.
The setting of the wilderness is a necessary backdrop for the depiction of groups of monks keeping watch in constant prayer and vigil, clearly referencing Jesus’ statements to his disciples in Gethsemane, ‘Stay you here, and watch (sustinet e hic et vigilate)’, and his reproach upon finding them asleep, ‘Couldst thou not watch one hour (non potuisti una hora vigilare)?’113 The disciples in Eigil’s *Life of Sturm* are, unlike the disciples rebuked by Jesus, not heavy with sleep, but alert in watch and constant vigil: after several days’ journey away, Sturm arrives back at Hersfeld ‘where he found his brethren engaged in prayer’.114 For Eigil, the act of keeping watch in prayer and fasting is the tie which binds together monastic communities across vast distances and the spread of the wilderness, and in his narrative, this steady theme of keeping vigil comes to a climax at the moment of Sturm’s greatest need. Upon his forcible exile, ‘all the monasteries and convents in the eastern parts... joined in continual prayer’ with the brethren at Fulda for Sturm’s return. Eigil then paints a picture of all the brothers and sisters spread over these parts waiting in vigilant prayer for good news, upon the receipt of which ‘wherever the monks and nuns heard of it they gave thanks to Christ’.115 The setting of the heavily-forested wilderness amplifies with great effect the fact that over vast stretches of land, faithful disciples keep watch for one another just as Jesus had commanded his disciples to do. The attractiveness of prayer as a unifying agent, then, was this idea of keeping vigil with keen alertness whilst in separation and isolation, of labouring for one another amid the darkness and bleakness of the wilderness. No other expression of the bonds between monastic

orationibus die noctuque famulant es, silvas caedere et locum mundare proprio labore, in quantum praevaleverunt, studebant’.

113 Mark 14:32-40.


houses (the sharing of relics, scripts, and traded goods) had this important dimension of vigil-
keeping and spiritual defence on behalf of others.

In an age before scientific cartography, the accurate mapping of lands, and aerial
photography, how exactly did monks and nuns ‘in the eastern parts’ imagine Sturm and his
abbot-less monks at Fulda when they prayed for them? While the most élite monks with royal
or other civil duties could be a part of embassies and travel frequently, the vast majority of
monks such as the bulk of the six-hundred monks in Fulda never traveled very far, if at all,
having little sustained contact with other abbeys. For monks and nuns receiving news from
leaders and legislators about the ‘multitude of monks at its greatest’,\footnote{Ardo, \textit{Vita Benedicti} 6, MGH SS 15.1, p. 204: ‘maxima monachorum extat multitudo’.} it would have been
difficult to mentally visualize the fact of monasteries spread throughout the Frankish realm.
Indeed, the visualization of geographical relations presented itself as a constant problem for
scholars in this age. In describing the friendship between two individuals separated by space,
Walahfrid Strabo had to resort to the imagery of the moon: look up at the moon, he writes,
and you will be able to visualize your brother far away.\footnote{Walahfrid Strabo, ‘Ad amicum’, MGH
When Gregory the Great described
Benedict of Nursia’s vision of seeing the entire world, the deacon Peter’s first response was to
say that he could not conceive of how the whole world could be seen by any one man. The
Plan of St. Gall shows a similar desire to resolve the problem of how to visualize the entire
world: it includes a plan for two towers, the northern one specifying ‘ascent through a
staircase for surveying the universe (\textit{ascensus per cocleam ad universa super inspicienda}).’\footnote{Horn
and Born’s translation reads ‘Ascent by a spiral staircase to survey the entire orbit [of the
monastery] from above’ (parenthetical additions theirs). I do not think the Latin original necessitates the
clarification ‘of the monastery’, and rather think that by this tower, the Creator of the Plan reveals a desire
to be able to imagine the entire world. The purpose of the two detached towers of the Plan has been the
subject of a considerable amount of controversy. See Horn and Born, \textit{The Plan of St. Gall}, vol. 1, pp. 129-31.}

For monastics, the question of how large regions of the earth could be visualized was not
trivial but a genuine concern, for in return for relinquishing their families, Cassian had promised that they would gain back an infinite number of brothers and sisters in a true corpus fraternitatis extending throughout the world. Wherever a monk may go, he finds brethren ready to welcome and serve him. It is the fulfillment of the ‘hundredfold’ promise of Jesus: in exchange for the broken ties of family, the monk sees bestowed on him a hundred times as many fathers and brothers, and affections incomparably deeper and more lasting. ‘Whoever has rejected one house for the sake of Christ’s love’, Cassian explained, ‘will possess innumerable dwellings as his own in monasteries everywhere in the world, and they will be his own houses as if by right’. 

As concrete expressions of this promise, confraternities and the confraternity books themselves served a very practical purpose for monks and nuns in facilitating the visualization and imagination – and indeed providing evidence – of Cassian’s description that a monk may count monasteries everywhere in the world as his own family. The St. Gall fraternity book, which originally recorded at least forty-eight religious communities bound to the monastery by agreements of prayer, was a rich visual tool to help the monk in his geographical visualization: each abbey is represented in a separate drawing as the columns of a church, with the names of each monk of that monastery inscribed within it. The visual

---

<sup>119</sup> A fact of the monastic vow constantly repeated in monastic conciliar literature and hagiography alike. See, for example, Willibald, *Vita S. Bonifati* 1, MGH SS 2, p. 335, and *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis* cap. 114, MGH Conc. 2.1, p. 394.


<sup>121</sup> Cassian, *Collationes* XXIV.26, SC 64, p. 199-200.


representation in the form of a Confraternity book was indeed the real concrete evidence of the hundreds of kindred brothers and sisters ‘everywhere in the world’. It was, in fact, consistent with the idea in monastic thought that prayer should be the medium for holding within the ‘mind’s eye (oculus mentis)’ those not otherwise visible.\(^{125}\)

According to Gregory the Great, this was exactly what had happened to Benedict of Nursia, who saw the world in one ray of sunbeam precisely whilst he was standing at the window in his tower, engaged in contemplative prayer ahead of the night office. The tower depicted in the Plan of St. Gall ‘from which the whole universe may be surveyed’ may, in fact, have been a direct reference to this incident.\(^{126}\) In response to Peter’s inquiry about how such a feat was possible, Gregory replies,

\[(T)o a person who sees the Creator, every creature looks narrow by comparison. No matter how little divine light she sees with, everything created seems small. For the capacity of the mind is expanded by the light of interior contemplation. It is so enlarged by God that it becomes greater than the world.... When it is said that the whole world was collected before his eyes, this does not mean that heaven and earth were shrunk, but that the soul was expanded. Swept up into God, it can easily see whatever is beneath God. Thus to that light that lights things for the exterior eyes, there corresponds an interior light in the mind.\(^{127}\)\]

---


\(^{125}\) Gregory the Great, *Dialogorum* II.35, SC 260, pp. 236-42.

\(^{126}\) Gregory, *Life of Benedict of Nursia*, Dialogues II:35.6, SC 260, p. 240, trans. T. Kardong, *The Life of St. Benedict by Gregory the Great: Translation and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN, 2009), pp. 132-3: ‘animae videnti Creatorem angusta est omnis creatura. Quamlibet etenim parum de luce Creatoris aspexerit, breve ei fit omne quod creatum est, quia ipsa luce visionis intimae mentis laxatur sinus, tantumque expandidur in Deo, ut superior existat mundo.... Quod autem collectus mundus ante ejus oculos dictitur, non caelum et terra contracta est, sed videntis animus est dilatatus, qui, in Deo raptus, videre sine difficultate potuit omne quod infra Deum est. In illa ergo luce, quae exterioribus oculis fulsit, lux interior in mente fuit...’.
Interestingly, the idea which Gregory expresses here – that the ability to see the entire world comes from the expansion of the heart – is dependent on a statement from Benedict of Nursia’s own rule about the joy experienced by monks as they run ‘on the path of God’s commandments, with hearts enlarged’ *(dilato corde... curritur via mandatorum)*. And this, in turn, comes directly from Psalm 118:32: ‘I have run the way of thy commandments, when thou didst enlarge my heart *(viam mandatorum tuorum curram quoniam dilatasti cor meum)*’. Augustine had stated that this enlargement of heart signifies the expansion of love which Christians feel, and while this could mean particularly love for God which would allow one to run through the way of His commands, Remigius also applied it to love for one another, relating this verse to Paul’s statements about the love shared between him and the Corinthians. “I have run the way of thy commandments, when thou didst enlarge my heart,” that is, when you enlarged my heart in charity’, Remigius writes. ‘Whence the Apostle says, “Our heart is enlarged. Be ye also enlarged”’. Carlingian monastic writers were ever aware of Paul’s idea of a love for other brothers which abounds evermore *(‘caritas vestra magis ac magis abundet’)*. The maturity of the monk is to be attested to by his ‘growth and perfection, that is charity’, a love which is overflows from one’s heart to God, neighbour, and enemy. Fundamental to the act of praying for brethren beyond one’s own cloister was

---

129 See the important discussion on the theme of ‘painting in the heart’ in monastic meditation in Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought*, pp. 133-5.
132 Philippians 1:9.
133 Haimo of Auxerre, *In Epistolam Pauli ad Philippenses* 1, PL 117:736: ‘Et hoc hoc or ut charitas vestra, et caetera, id est, sicut fides habet initium, habet incrementum et perfectionem, ita charitas. Oro, inquit, ut non solum in Deum et proximum, sed etiam ad inimicos extendatur charitas vestra...’.
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Benedict’s notion that the monastic life of prayer and obedience brings about the enlarging of one’s heart, so that there is a superabundance of love which flows outside of oneself. Prayer confraternities made between cloisters were a practical demonstration of this expansion of the heart and soul. And, in this agreement of prayer, one could potentially begin to hold in his mind’s eye the proliferation of monasteries throughout Francia, and with it, the reality of the ‘hundredfold promise’.

Cassian chose to discuss the ‘hundred-fold promise’ in his instructions regarding the monk’s life of mortification (‘de mortificatione’), and it was in this context of the dying to self, of the struggle against vice in the quest for perfection, that the culture of intercession in the monastic practice of prayer had its true meaning. Nowhere is there a stronger and more moving witness to the ascetic, self-mortifying basis for fraternal intercession than in the letters written by monastic founders to their congregations to exhort them to remain faithful despite the warfare unceasingly waged against them. ‘The gate is narrow, and few trod the highway of perfection’, Columbanus wrote to his monks at Luxeuil. ‘Observe the many dangers; learn the cause of war’. But do not lose heart in the face of the enemy’s strength, he states:

For whatever you ask with faith and complete agreement, shall be given to you; but look to it that you be one heart and one mind, so that you may receive as a present reward whatever saving grace you seek from the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the common Father of us all, in accordance with our Lord’s promise when He said, “If two of you agree upon earth concerning anything that they seek, it shall be done for them by My Father Who is in heaven.”

Similarly, when Alcuin warned the monks at Lindisfarne and Wearmouth-Jarrow of visible and invisible enemies, he assured them that despite the difficulty of the combat and the ‘massing of arrows and the gathering of arms’, they need only ‘remember how many enemies

---

King Hezekiah laid low by one prayer’, ‘what a mighty Assyrian host perished through one prayer of a righteous king who was dear to God!’\textsuperscript{136} Finally, both writers closed their letters with the phrase ‘pray for me’. The pleas for prayer in epistolary correspondence, the prayers offered for brethren within a single cloister, the confraternities of prayer established between houses – all these modes of intercession found their most powerful definition in the notion that monastic congregations were fraternal battle-lines upholding a brother in combat against the devil and in his pursuit of virtue and perfection. What impulse shaped intercessory prayer offered for those who were not members of the fraternal battle-line of cloistered monks? We next turn our attention to monastic intercession for secular rulers.

\textsuperscript{136} Alcuin, \textit{Epistula} 21 and 19, MGH Epp 4, pp. 59 and 55, trans. Allott, p. 38 and 40: ‘sagittarum collectio... armorum congregatio’; ‘Memento Ezechiam regem quantos hostes una prece prostererit’; ‘Quanta multitudo exercitus Assyriorum propter unam iusti regis et Deo dilecti orationem perierat’.
Chapter Five:
Intercession for Rulers

Not one of the over twenty-five rules Benedict of Aniane included in his massive *Codex Regularum* discusses prayer for secular rulers. When the word ‘king’ or ‘kingdom’ is mentioned, it is invariably with reference to Christ the king and the kingdom of God. Yet, over the course of the sixth to ninth centuries, intercessory prayer for rulers and royal families emerged as the particular work and a primary service of monastic communities throughout Francia, and the raison d’être of royal abbeys. Monasteries sat on vast estates of lands and riches which rulers had given them in order to secure their intercessions, and monks and nuns performed them in the daily office and votive masses.

The discussion of monastic prayer for kings in the secondary literature has generally proceeded from the perspective of the rulers who sought those prayers; we are used to asking why founders and benefactors of monasteries desired and expected the prayers of their beneficiaries.¹ This is natural, for the story of monasticism’s period of rapid expansion in the Frankish heartlands during the course of the sixth and seventh centuries is that of intense initiative on the part of rulers, aristocrats, and their courts to found monastic communities, a situation which Ewig termed ‘Balthild’s Klosterpolitik’.² In the sixth century, Radegund

---


founded the convent of the Holy Cross, Childebert I a xenodochium in Lyons, Guntramn the house of St. Marcel at Chalon, and Brunhild the monastery at Autun, a practice followed into the seventh century when Dagobert and Balthild founded and provided land for such monasteries as Solignac, Eno, Rebais, Chelles, and Corbie.\(^3\) The Merovingian queen Balthild provides us with one of our earliest indications that the royal court held such interest in monasteries because of the prayers that could be offered for it: in exchange for their intercessions, she granted an immunity to six ‘seniores basilicas sanctorum’, the holy places of the realm.\(^4\) Pippin III continued this Merovingian practice by confirming the various grants made to Saint-Denis so ‘it may please them (Abbot Fulrad and his monks) all the more to beseech God’s mercy more attentively for the stability of our kingdom and for all our men’.\(^5\)

In another charter to the abbey of Flavigny, he urged the monks to pray earnestly for himself and for his family, present and future, and to chant psalms daily.\(^6\)

We find royal interest in prayers during Charlemagne’s period not only in the king’s many royal foundations, confirmations, and the various immunities he granted to monasteries for

---

Columbanus-style monasticism established many monastic foundations, and increasingly over the course of the seventh century, they also began to view it as advantageous to place their monastic estates under the protection of the mayors of the palace and refer to political rulers for the guarding of their monastic estates. de Jong, ‘Charlemagne’s Church’, in Story, ed., Charlemagne, pp. 103-35, at 120. For the continuation of royal involvement in Carolingian monasticism, see J. Semmler, ‘Episcopi potestas und karolingische Klosterpolitik’, in A. Borst, ed., Mönchum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau, Vorträge und Forschungen 20 (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 305-95.


\(^5\) Pippini, Carolomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata no. 6, MGH Diplomata Karolinorum 1, p. 10: ‘ut eis melius delectet pro stabilitate regni nostri vel pro cunctis leudis nostris domini misericordia adtencius deprecare’.

their intercession, but also in legislation which made prayer for the king and kingdom obligatory for monasteries. At the first of the five church councils (the so-called 'Reform Councils') held in 813, Charlemagne's missi (two archbishops) announced that the emperor had ordered masses for him and his children to be celebrated on a daily basis in all episcopal sees and their dioceses. In response to Charlemagne's decree, decisions were made at the councils of Arles, Rheims, Chalon, and Tours to offer royal masses, psalms, and litanies in monasteries throughout the entire territory under Frankish rule (with the possible exception of a few politically-volatile parts of Aquitaine and Bavaria). A recension of the 817 Aachen monastic capitulary produced during the first half of the ninth century ordered that monasteries sing the penitential Psalm 19 daily for the king. In 819, Louis the Pious at the Council of Aachen issued the *Notitia de servitio monasteriorum*, which provided a list of Carolingian monasteries owing services to the crown. In addition to the fourteen monasteries which were to provide gifts and military service (*dona et militiam*) and the sixteen monasteries which were to provide only gifts (*sola dona sine militia*), fifty-four abbeys were ordered to offer prayers for the safety of the emperor and his sons and for the stability of the empire (*solas orationes pro salute imperatoris vel filiorum eius et stabilitate imperii*).
The witness of royal charters and legislation to such an outpouring of imperial interest in
monastic prayer has led to the depiction of monastic intercessory prayer for king and
kingdom as a rather passive act of obedience performed by gift-receiving monks in response
to top-down initiative.\footnote{12}{Garipzanov's summary regarding the course of development over the
Merovingian and Carolingian centuries is telling:}

\begin{quote}
(T)he monastic prayer for a ruler, originating from the close relations between a
few prominent monasteries and the Frankish ruler on the basis of his donations,
had become a required part of monastic routine expected at the majority of
Carolingian abbeys.\footnote{13}{Garipzanov, \textit{The Symbolic Language of Authority}, p. 46.}
\end{quote}

In this statement, Garipzanov suggests that the prayer performed by monks for rulers was
little more than the by-product of the ties between monasteries and rulers, a response to
donations, a required activity, and a fulfillment of the expectations of that '\textit{voice of authority}',
as he titles his study.\footnote{14}{Garipzanov calls the prayers which monastic communities said for rulers both in the daily office
and in special votive masses the 'liturgy of authority'.}

Such a depiction underestimates the distinctive dimension of monastic
spiritual understanding, and it was in fact monks who did the most to interpret kingship and

Early medieval monks took much interest in written reflections about
the political order and its relationship to the divine plan for human history, fervently
transmitting the universal chronicles of Orosius, Eusebius (through the intermediary of
Jerome), Isidore, and Bede, and the histories of, among others, Sulpicius Severus, Sozomen,
Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, and Paul the Deacon. Interest in such monumental works of
historiography reveal that monks were closely engaged with questions about the relationship
between the secular and heavenly kingdom, the place of earthly politics in the eschatological
scheme, and the destiny of that City which had come to symbolize imperial and religious triumph – Rome.¹⁶ In this chapter, I attempt to reverse the flow of value attributed to the ruler-monastery equation which has often made it sound as though prayers for rulers would not have been offered if not for the conferral of gifts and privileges or the directive of imperial edicts. I seek, instead, to identify the ideas which motivated early medieval monastic prayer in the service of king and kingdom, and the role which monks themselves believed their prayers played in the progress of the Frankish kingdom under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.

For the king and peace

The biblical text forming the basis for the entire practice of intercessory prayer for rulers offers a glaringly spiritual rationale: ‘I desire therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men: For kings, and for all that are in high station: that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life in all piety and chastity’.¹⁷ One should pray for those in authority so that he can cultivate a pious and holy life in peace and freedom. But it was not this idea alone that most excited the imaginations of the earliest writers commenting on this command. More accurately, it was the opportunity for a powerful apologetic before pagans which Christian writers saw in this verse: the fact that Christians sought peace through seeking good for the king. In the early second century, Polycarp wrote to the Philippians, ‘Pray also for kings and potentates, and princes, and for those that persecute and hate you, and for the enemies of the cross, that your fruit may be manifest to all, and that ye may be perfect in Him’.¹⁸ He equated kings and rulers with persecutors and


¹⁷ 1 Timothy 2:1-12 (King James Version).

¹⁸ Letter to the Philippians 12:3, trans. A. Roberts and D. Donaldson, Apostolic Fathers, ANF 1 (1885; repr. Peabody, MA, 1994), p. 36. See also Justin, Apology I. 17; Theophilus, To Autolycus XI.
enemies, who were all to be prayed for in order that they might marvel at this illogical action. Tertullian expressed this sentiment most powerfully and famously at the end of the second century in his Apology. Here, he accused pagan Roman emperors not only of forcing Christians to make sacrifices which were inefficacious for securing benefits on their behalf, but also of killing ‘those who know where to seek for it, and who, knowing where to seek for it, are able as well to secure it’.19 For Christians ‘offer prayer for the safety of our princes to the eternal, the true, the living God, whose favour, beyond all others, they (the rulers) must themselves desire’ since their authority derives from this God.20 But the pagan emperors were foolish enough to kill those who knew how to secure benefits for them:

> With our hands thus stretched out and up to God, rend us with your iron claws, hang us up on crosses, wrap us in flames, take our heads from us with the sword, let loose the wild beasts on us,—the very attitude of a Christian praying is one of preparation for all punishment. Let this, good rulers, be your work: wring from us the soul, beseeching God on the emperor’s behalf.21

The powerful message Christians offered was that they, even in the midst of intense suffering and persecution, sought peace through praying for the welfare of their rulers.

When the persecution of Christians ended, seeking peace became one of the most negotiable of obligations which society expected of monks. The Council of Chalcedon pronounced that those wishing to sincerely lead a monastic life should be honoured, if they are subject to the proper authorities in each city and country area and ‘seek peace’.22 It was a

---


decree cemented in monastic tradition through its inclusion in the prologue of the RB: ‘seek after peace and pursue it’. In the early Middle Ages, the requirement that monks pursue peace had an overtly political component: to pray ‘pro rege et pace’ became a standard formula in charters of privileges to monasteries. Thus, though centuries removed from Christian persecution, Tertullian’s statement that Christians in the midst of the worse suffering sought for the peace and good of their emperors still somehow found resonance with Carolingian monastic audiences. His Apology was a mainstay of patristic literature in the Carolingian period, copied in monastic scriptoria more than any other one of his works, with two of the most important manuscripts coming from Corbie, royal abbey and significant center of prayer for Frankish rulers.

We need to ask what appealed to Carolingian monastic thinkers about this notion of seeking peace, as if it were something not yet (as in the days of Christian persecution) achieved. This question – which Paul Kershaw began to address in his monograph – is an important one in light of the fact that the eighth- and ninth-century theological concern with ‘peace’ was entirely different from the early patristic one. Tertullian had been convinced that Christians ‘had another and a greater need to pray for the Emperors’ other than basic Christian witness, for he foresaw ‘that a mighty shock impending over the whole earth – in fact, the very end of all things threatening dreadful woes – is only retarded by the continued existence of the

vera et sincere singularem sectantur vitam, competenti honore digni habeantur.... Monachos vero per unaquamque civitatem aut regionem subiectos esse episcopo et quietem diligere et intentos esse tantummodo ieiunio et orationi, in locis, quibus renuntiaverunt saeculo, permanentes’.


As in Vita Sancti Balthildis 9, in Fredegarii et aliorum chronica. Vitae sanctorum, MGH, SRM 2, p. 494: ‘ut melius eis delectaret pro rege et pace summi regis Christi clementiam exorare’.

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1623 and St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, MS lat. Q v I 40, produced in the ninth and tenth centuries. D. Ganz, Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance, pp. 63, 147, and 155-56.

Roman empire’.27 Rome had, since the time of Josephus, long been identified as the last of the Four Empires mentioned in Daniel 2. Tertullian had argued that as long as the Empire stood, it was restraining the Antichrist, and with him, the universal and catastrophic end of all things.28 Prayer for the ruler – the Roman ruler – was thus tied inseparably to the delay of the eschaton. When Constantine legalized Christianity and made the Roman Empire a Christian Empire, theologians saw in this event an even more significant reason to draw a connection between Rome and the continuation of Christianity. Prosper of Aquitaine’s The Call of All Nations consistently relied on the topos of Rome reborn and renewed as a Christian version of its old self under the patronage of its apostles Peter and Paul, now as an even more far-reaching empire with an everlasting destiny.29 Pope Leo I repeated this theme of a Christian renovatio of Rome in a sermon preached in 441 on the feast day of Saints Peter and Paul, when he spoke of the city as

a holy nation, an elect people, a priestly and royal city, which by reason of Saint Peter’s see established there has become the head of the whole world, ruling more widely now through divine religion than [it] ever did by worldly dominion..... It was highly fitting to the disposition of the divine work that many regna be allied to the one empire, so that the universal message might quickly reach all the peoples united under the rule of one city.30

The universal Christian pax had arrived because the ‘one empire’ and ‘one city’ stood, and in His eternal plan of salvation, God had given Rome the power to endure until the end of time. Prayer for ruler was thus, as Tertullian had written, synonymous with prayer for the very kingdom of God itself.

27 Apologeticus adversus gentes 32, PL 1:447, trans. ANF 3, p. 43: ‘Est et alia major necessitas nobis orandi pro Imperatoribus, etiam pro omni statu imperii rebusque romanis, qui vim maximam universo orbi imminentem, ipsamque clausulam saeculi acerbitates horrendas comminantem Romani imperii commeatu scimus retardari’.
Three centuries after Pope Leo I delivered these words, when the Roman Empire had long ceased to exist and its territories now largely ruled under a Germanic people, another pope, Paul I (757-767) used the same phrase ‘a holy tribe, a royal priesthood’ to describe the role of an empire in the salvation plan of God. This time, however, the people referred to were the Franks, who had now become ‘St. Peter’s peculiar people’.\(^{31}\) On Christmas Day, 800, the idea of a Roman imperial revival was made explicitly manifest when Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne ‘Imperator Romanorum’ at St. Peter’s Basilica in the city of Rome itself. Charlemagne inscribed his imperial seal with the phrase ‘Renovatio romani imperii’.\(^{32}\) For several contemporary observers, this event proved that the ancient scheme described in the book of Daniel of the four monarchies was still relevant: the Roman empire had simply been ‘translated (translatum est)’ to the Carolingians, who now carried forward a divinely-ordained power and place in human history.\(^{33}\) Chroniclers now eagerly sought to demonstrate that the Carolingian empire was the Roman empire continued. For example, an abbreviation of Bede’s world chronicle, composed in the years 807-809 as The Chronicle of the Six Epochs of the World, rearranged and updated Bede’s material to construct an imperial genealogy showing the smooth descent of Carolingian emperors from Christian Roman emperors. While Bede’s world chronicle lists Roman and early Byzantine emperors up to the year 705, the Carolingian


\(^{32}\) Nelson, ‘Kingship and Empire in the Carolingian World’, p. 70.

continuation interrupts at the point of Justinian II in 685 in order to move directly to the Pippinids followed by Charles Martel, Pepin the Short, and Charlemagne.\(^{34}\)

The eager adoption of Roman imperial symbolism by Frankish rulers was intended to communicate the message that their reign was divinely sanctioned in accord with the best kings throughout the biblical history of salvation and primitive Christian history. In the seventh century, Balthild’s hagiographer had eagerly portrayed the queen as an inaugurator of a new era of peace where there had once been only war.\(^{35}\) In the same manner, Charlemagne became known as ‘pacificus’, and the rhetoric of ‘pax’ was central to Carolingian claims to power.\(^{36}\) As Pope Hadrian styled him in 778, Charlemagne was a ‘New Constantine’, for he was chosen by God to bring peace and concord to the Church and nations.\(^{37}\) Such highly-symbolic language has clearly gone into Walter Ullmann’s depiction of the overriding political theme of the ninth century, that

> what had hitherto been conceived as a mere conglomeration of families, tribes, conquered peoples, became in the course of the ninth century ideologically and conceptually transformed into one body public, the Church, which au fond disregarded the natural, linguistic and tribal differences of peoples and regions.\(^{38}\)

---


\(^{37}\) *Codex Carolinus* no. 60, MGH Epp 3, p. 587.

\(^{38}\) W. Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London, 1969), p. 8. Yet, frontiers were at the very forefront of Charlemagne’s concerns. Carolingian mayors of the palace at the beginning of the eighth century had sought to consolidate the recently-established Frankish kingdom out of the heartlands of Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy. But beyond these were a host of foreign peoples with whom no formal relationship existed: Aquitaine in the south, Brittany in the west, Frisians and Saxons in the north, Thuringians, Alamans, and Bavarians in the east. During Charlemagne’s reign, these were brought into a suzerainty treaties whereby the Carolingians became overlords, and counts, prefects, and dukes controlled defensive organization. For Alcuin, this fact did not mean that the Franks were now a homogeneous group united under the one *imperium*. ‘Empire’ for him meant overlordship of a number of gentes divided by language and race, now brought under the superior authority of the Frankish ruler (see Nelson, ‘Kingship and Empire’, p. 69). See also J. Smith, ‘*Fines Imperii*: The Marches’, in McKitterick, ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History, c.700-c.900*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 169-89 and various relevant essays in W. Pohl, I. Wood, and H. Reimitz, ed., *The Transformation of Frontiers: From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians* (Leiden, 2001). As the many terms used for ‘frontier’ attest (*marca*, *limes*,...
There has been a tendency to see Carolingian monastic intercession in light of this deliberate political rhetoric of a divinely-bestowed era of peace. Some have seen in Charlemagne’s command for monasteries to pray for him and his family little more than a political maneuver on his part to show the extent of his kingdom’s imperial and religious domination, whereby monastic prayer would serve as a symbol of the fidelity of formerly unruly gentes and pagani now brought under the dominion of the one true political and spiritual empire. The famous case of the abbey of San Vincenzo al Volturno, located on the borderlands of the realm, is frequently cited as an example. When the abbot, a Lombard named Potho, left Mass early in an apparent act of defiance to avoid having to chant the customary Psalm 53 for the Frankish king, Pope Hadrian quickly set him right and brokered a resolution which saw the monks collectively reaffirm their duty to pray for him. According to this perspective, monks in the eighth- and ninth-centuries prayed for peace not so much as an actual thing to be sought, but as something akin to an apologetic performance, a gesture of fidelity, a symbol designed from Aachen to demonstrate that all the conquered had now been brought together into a state of harmonious peace.

**Seeking after peace and pursuing it**

Yet, one observation suggests that monastic intercession ‘for the king and peace’ was more sophisticated in the eighth- and ninth-centuries than a symbolic show of loyalty and royal duty. Tertullian had described prayer for the king as arising from a ‘chaste body, an unstained soul, a sanctified spirit (de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam)’ and a faithful eagerness to pray for ‘whatever, as man or Caesar, an emperor would wish

---


40 *Codex Carolinus* no. 67, MGH Epp 3, pp. 594-7. For an extensive bibliography on this incident, see Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority*, pp. 44-5, fn 4.
(quaecumque hominis et Caesaris vota sunt). While the first part of the description would surely have resonated with early medieval monks at prayer, an unmistakable feature of their historiography stands in stark contrast with the second part: their insistence that the holy men of God do not pray for whatever rulers want, whenever they want. This is an important observation to make of the monastic historiographical reflection on the role of intercessory prayer during the long centuries of conflict over dynastic rule between the Merovingians and Carolingians.

Kings and their courtiers were often depicted in Merovingian Vitae as suffering from a fundamental lack of understanding about how the prayer of monks and bishops work, thinking them to be magical incantations to be performed on demand. Hagiographers were eager to correct this error. Gregory of Tours tells the story of Sigivald, the chief advisor of king Theuderic, who forces Abbot Portianus to enter his tent, say a prayer of blessing for him, and have a cup of wine despite the abbot's desire to sing the office first. When Sigivald physically forces the abbot to take the cup, it immediately splits in two and the wine, spilling to the ground, becomes a huge serpent. Another famous example occurs in the Vita Columbani. When Brunhilda demands that Columbanus bless the king's three sons, he refuses because 'they were begotten in sin'. Despite the persecution of Columbanus' monastic communities and his own exile resulting from this action, he is vindicated when Brunhilda and her son perish in ensuing political struggles. Withholding prayer from a powerful person was a way for monks and nuns to present themselves as independent actors following

---

41 Apologeticus adversus gentes 30, PL 1:442-43, trans. ANF 3, p. 42
43 Jonas of Bobbio, Vitae Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius libri duo 1.19, MGH SRM 4, p. 87.
their own principles of prayer rather than the directives of others. Such a depiction in monastic hagiography becomes highly significant when we recall that the Merovingian centuries were a time when monastic institutions were inextricably tied to royal involvement, and consequently also necessarily responsive to and impacted by the constantly changing political scene. Nivelles, for instance, was founded by Pippin the Elder’s wife Itta, and their daughter Gertrud served as its abbess. Her hagiographer in the early 670s reports that the mayor Wulfoald’s faction then holding the power in Austrasia, ‘out of hatred of her father’ and the Pippinids, forcibly removed Gertrud and took over the monastery. In another instance, construction on Sadalberga’s monastery at Langres had just neared completion when the civil wars of 675-79 between Theuderic and Dagobert II caused so much disruption that she had to relocate her community to Laon.

The fact that the fortunes of monastic communities were so tied to political events and alliances makes it especially important for us to be clear about what precisely prayer for rulers does – and does not – achieve. Against the backdrop of bloody dynastic conflicts and lurid civil wars of the eighth century, the prayer ‘for the stability of the kingdom’ which monastic communities were to offer is to be expected. But this prayer is at the same time surprising for its generalized, indefinite expression and detachment from political details. Indeed, monastic historiography in all forms (annals, historiography, charters) presents the idea that the drama of the rise and fall of rulers is not propelled forward by the agency of monastic prayer. Certainly, the political inclinations and affiliation of the authors are clearly discerned by the way historical details are cast and characters are portrayed, as in the Vita Austrebertae which depicts Dagobert I as the last effective monarch before the do-nothing kings (rois fainéants).

---

44 Vita Geretrudis 6, MGH SRM 2, p. 455, trans. Fouracre, Late Merovingian France, p. 324.
45 Vita Sadalbergae 13, MGH SRM 5, p. 57.
contemporaneous with the writer’s own time. But monastic authors never render prayer as an agent in a political cause, but prefer to focus on its impartiality instead. Baudonivia, describing the life of Radegund, stresses that whenever the various kingdoms warred with one another, ‘she prayed for the lives of all the kings, for she loved them all’ (quia toto diligebat reges, pro omnium vita orabat). When a bloody war breaks out between Columbanus’ supporter Theudebert and his enemy Theuderich, Columbanus’ attendant Chagnoald approaches him ‘presumptuously (temerario)’ to ask for his prayers for Theudebert, so that the enemy Theuderich may be defeated. Columbanus answers that such a request was ‘foolish and irreligious, for God, who commanded us to pray for our enemies has not so willed’. Even for someone as completely intertwined with the Neustrian court and Merovingian politics as the bishop Audoin, his monastic hagiographer states only that when conflict broke out among the kings and mayors of the palace, he exerted himself night and day in vigils and fasting in ‘constant prayers for harmony among them’. And even when it is a political enemy who is directly to blame for the harm which befalls a monastic community, as with the case of Gertrude, the hagiographer links the ‘prayers of the holy men’ only with her physical protection and the restoration of the monastery to her, and not with any specific political outcome.


The conservatism of monastic writers in tying intercessory prayer to political events or factions is all the more striking as we approach that critical moment of transition between Merovingian and Carolingian rule. Monasteries surely had their individual loyalties: the importance of the abbess Gertrude as a saint is directly tied to the fact that she was a Pippinid, and the connection of her cult with the Carolingian family helped to solidify their rise and supplanting of the Merovingians. But as we have seen in the account of her life, prayer is no indication of the hagiographer’s otherwise open alliance with the Pippinids. The Earlier Annals of Metz is an overtly pro-Carolingian text, likely written by a monk at the monastery at Saint-Denis, Chelles, or Metz, which is interested both in the details of the rise of the dynasty and also, unlike the Liber Historiae Francorum, in the religious factors leading to it. With its eagerness to emphasize the unfolding of God’s plan in leading the Carolingians to power, and its authorship within a monastic setting, this text would have been a natural choice for documenting the contribution of monastic prayer for rulers to these important events. The silence in this regard is not to be missed. Although the writer is eager to describe Pippin II’s own devotional prayer life and his own leading of his army in prayer before the battle of Tertry in 687 against Theuderic III, the prayer of monastic communities themselves is of no concern. If there was a difference between how the late Merovingian kings exhibiting weak rule (‘desidiam regum’ ) and Pippinids in all their charisma were to be prayed for by monastic communities, the author of the Earlier Annals of Metz certainly did not see it significant enough to merit any mention. Even in these critical years, monastic prayer is a poor indicator of political alliances and outcomes. Monastic writers seem

52 McNamara, Sainted Women, p. 222.
55 Ibid, p. 4.
unanimously to avoid any suggestion that prayer for rulers and those in authority should be
directed toward specific political outcomes or show any hint of factionalism.

To ‘seek peace’, to pray for the king and stability, was therefore profoundly more nuanced in
Carolingian monastic thought than bowing to imperial visions of conquest and concord. Our
most important point of entry into eighth- and ninth-century ideas regarding the connection
between prayer for rulers and prayer for peace is perhaps also the most obvious: Augustine’s
*City of God*, making the crucial dissociation of the Christian Church from the Roman Empire
and liberating salvation history from the fortunes of a secular political kingdom, was staple
reading in Carolingian monasteries – and one of Charlemagne’s favourite texts.\footnote{According to Einhard, Charlemagne had *City of God* read to him during his meals. Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni* 24, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRG 25, p. 29.} In the early
medieval Augustinian worldview, Christian people saw themselves as a pilgrim society on the
way to another world. Kings and other secular aristocrats were pilgrims along with the holiest
and humblest of men; their distinctive duty lay merely in controlling a people prone to sin, to
prevent them from following their evil instincts and helping the pilgrimage to continue along
well. The ‘*Roma renovata*’ would therefore be characterized not by being a perfected Christian
society, but by its journey toward the new Jerusalem. The Palatine Chapel at Aachen possibly
looked, in addition to San Vitale in Ravenna, to the Anastasis rotunda of the Church of the
Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem: measuring 144 feet (8x18 feet on each side), the precise
dimension of the celestial Jerusalem according to John 21:16, it anticipated the heavenly
heavenly Jerusalem and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Carolingian iconology and monastic
architecture.} For this reason, the Carolingians generally saw little problem with lay
abbacies, the granting of monasteries to laymen who were a part of, or had close connections,
to the royal court. For the secular proprietorship of monasteries was a visible sign that those with worldly power, too, were pilgrims among those had otherworldly aspirations, seeking the heavenly city of God. Jerome had surveyed the vast numbers of monks and nuns on Rome’s Aventine Hill and asserted that they turned the city of the empire into a ‘new Jerusalem’. Monasteries – in a place of such special prominence in Carolingian Francia – provided clear and visual evidence in the eighth and ninth centuries that the ‘new Rome’ with all its imperial triumph was characterized by its progress toward the celestial Jerusalem.

Monks were in a special position – in their ascetic authority as a people especially focused on the journey toward the celestial City – to offer prayer for rulers who had been charged with ensuring that the spiritual pilgrimage proceed along smoothly.

Augustine’s dissociation of Christianity from the fortunes of the Roman Empire was based on the strict distinction he drew between the City of God (as typified by Jerusalem) and the City of Man (as typified by Babylon), neither of which was to be identified with a temporal institution or definable body, but which would only appear visibly as mutually exclusive societies at the last judgment. But, he had argued, as long as the two cities were mingled together (‘Quamdiu permixtae sunt ambae civitates’), one must pray for the peace of Babylon, the secular sphere. This argument supplied Carolingian writers with a source of exegesis on the instructions in 1 Timothy 2 for Christians to pray for rulers, as in Florus of Lyon’s commentary which quoted from Augustine verbatim:

And when the prophet Jeremiah predicted to the ancient People of God the coming captivity, and bade them, by God’s inspiration, to go obediently to Babylon, serving God even by their patient endurance, he added his own advice that prayers should be offered for Babylon, ‘because in her peace is your peace’,

58 Lay abbacies were not a prominent concern of conciliar reforms until the mid-ninth century under Charles the Bald: de Jong, ‘Carolingian Monasticism’, p. 635.
59 Markus, Saeculum, pp. 45-71.
60 Ibid, p. 59.
meaning, of course, the temporal peace of the meantime, which is shared by good and bad alike.61

Despite Babylon’s existence as the very antithesis of the city of God and the symbol of impiety, lust for power, and all that will perish, its peace was to be sought for the benefits it would bring temporally (which Augustine/Florus describe rather tentatively as the ‘interim’) to the citizens of the true, heavenly city.62

Yet, it has been widely observed that, far from aligning with sinful Babylon, both Merovingian and Carolingian rulers saw themselves as the earthly supervisors of the true Israel in the style of the most righteous Old Testament kings.63 Gregory of Tours viewed the baptism of Clovis, that first unifier of the Franks, in typological association with the Old Testament David, Chlothar II and Dagobert I drew comparisons with David and Solomon among Merovingian bishops.64 Pippin III was compared by Pope Stephen II with Solomon and David in at least


62 See also Haimo of Auxerre, Explanatio in Epistolam I ad Titum 2, PL 117:78: ‘And let no one strongly assert: Let us not pray for irreligious kings or judges or dukes since they are pagans. Rather, the Apostle orders us to pray for all people, having been inspired by the same Holy Spirit by whom the prophet Jeremiah, who sent a letter to the Jews who were in Babylon that they might pray for the life of the king Nebuchadnezzar and his sons, and for the peace of the city to whom they had been led away captive, saying “Therefore you ought to pray for them, because your peace will be in their peace” (Jer 29:7) (Et ne forte diceret aliquis: Non debemus orare pro regibus infidelibus et judicibus ac ducibus, quia pagani sunt, praecepit Apostolus pro omnibus hominibus orare, eodem Spiritu sancto aﬀlatus, quo et Jeremias propheta, qui misit epistolam Judaeis qui erant in Babylone ut orarent pro vita regis Nabuchodonosor filiorumque ejus, et pro pace civitatis ad quam ducti erant captivi, inquiens: Ideo debetis orare pro eis, quia in pace illorum erit pax vestra).

Modern historians have frequently referred to the ‘New Israel’, but recent studies demonstrate that the expression was never used by the Franks themselves. The point is important: novus Israel in exegetical terms referred to the end of times and the consummation of all things; the Franks saw themselves rather as the contemporary embodiment of the authoritative, historical Israel – the people of God carried forward. See de Jong, ‘Charlemagne’s Church’, p. 113 and M. Garrison, ‘The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne’, in Y. Hen and M. Innes, ed., The Use of the Past in the Early Middle Ages (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114-62.

five letters, Charlemagne was given the name David by his courtiers and modeled himself after Josiah, and Louis the Pious was called a second Solomon. The use of such exempla and titles did not mean that the City of God had materialized and been made wholly manifest in the Frankish people. But what it did mean was that God’s laws were to reign supreme in the land. More importantly, the identification of the Frankish kingdom with Israel was to suggest that the Franks were not living in exile under a Babylonian king, but on the contrary, lived in a land which was solidly under the sway of God, defined by its special relationship to Him. The Franks thus saw the potential for real virtue and piety to flourish in their time and in their realm. A strong impulse to pray for the king in this context thus stands in stark contrast to prayer for a merely temporal, superficial, stand-in sort of peace which Augustine had expected. For in this age, kings were not the wicked Nebuchadnezzars of a Babylon, but were the righteous kings over a land defined by its faithful pursuit of God. Rather than praying for a temporal peace under a Nebuchadnezzar, monks and nuns in this age could pray for real, lasting, eternal virtue under their kings.

The critical distinction between the search for peace in earlier centuries and that of the eighth and ninth is that Carolingian monastic thinkers were able to draw a straight line between the temporal interim peace, and eternal peace: good could be sought and achieved on earth which would carry forward without contradiction into heavenly beatitude. Smaragdus’ comments

---


66 The literature on Carolingian kingship is vast, but for a start is J. Nelson, The Frankish World, 750-900 (London, 1996), pp. 99-132 (The Lord’s Anointed and the People’s Choice: Carolingian Royal Ritual’). On notions of sanctity in rulership, see idem, Politics and Ritual, pp. 69-74. Nelson suggests a problem with the term ‘sacral kingship’: the realm of the ‘sacral’ belonged to the clergy, who consecrated the king and conferred upon him the capacity through grace to fulfil his royal function.

67 This dimension is not emphasized in the discussion by Kershaw, Peaceful Kings. Kershaw tends to see in the Carolingians a consistent Augustinian pessimism and an entirely ‘conventional distinction between earthly and heavenly peace’ (p. 152): for example, see p. 68 on Augustine, p. 152 on Alcuin, pp. 190-1 on Agobard, and pp. 198-203 on Florus of Lyons.
on the phrase ‘inquire pacem’, quoting Cassiodorus’ exposition of Psalm 33(34):15, express this new attitude regarding an old monastic tenet:

‘Seek peace’, so that although they [the faithful] do not have it here, yet they should always be seeking it most earnestly. But he gives the order, ‘Follow it’, as though it goes ahead of us. Therefore let us seek it sedulously, let us follow it intently, because we cannot find it there unless we seek it more diligently here.68

In this conception, to seek a temporal peace and to enjoy heavenly peace are not two distinct and unrelated states: the peace that is sought here will contribute to the peace that is found in the future. Hildemar restates this idea in his own commentary:

‘Seek after peace and pursue it’. Man seeks the thing which he does not have in full and loves, or the thing which he has in part and loves; for that which he has in full he does not seek. Indeed, as Benedict has well said, ‘Seek peace’ and not ‘seek whatever’, because although it is not possible to have perfect peace in this present life, yet nevertheless it is sought, so that it may be had in the future.69

Worthy of note in both quotations is how the two points of time – the present and the future – are linked together. The idea is not that an interim peace should be temporarily sought with the expectation that it will eventually be replaced by a future lasting and perfect peace, but that the interim peace actually anticipates the future peace. The optimism that a peace sought temporally will achieve a peace to be enjoyed eternally captured the Carolingian monastic imagination.

**Multiplication in number and virtue**

For Hrabanus Maurus, then, to ‘seek peace’ did not mean what it did for Balthild’s hagiographer, who had used Ezekiel 37 to speak of a new era of peace, meaning political

---

68 Smaragdus, *Expositio* Prologue, ed. CCM 8, p. 33: ‘“inquire pacem,” ut quamvis eam hic non habeant, tamen semper ab eis studiissimi perquiratur; sed imperat “sequere eam,” quasi praeceidentem. Quaeramus ergo seduli, sequamur intenti, quia illic eam invenire non possimus, nisi hic diligentius inquiramus’.

concord between once warring kingdoms. Commenting on the same passage via a quotation from Jerome, Hrabanus suggests a much more dynamic way of understanding peace:

(T)he Saviour said to the apostles: 'My peace I give to you, my peace I leave with you.' And the prophet says: 'His place is made in peace'. He will establish and stabilize those who are with the Church, so that they may be able to say: 'He set my feet upon a rock', and then they will be multiplied both in terms of the number of believers and in the multiplication of virtue. 'And I will set', he says, 'my sanctuary in their midst forever'. All these things ought to refer to the Church and to the time of the Saviour, when his dwelling is placed in the Church, where He is our God and we His people.

Hrabanus is eager to clarify that the ‘peace’ he speaks of refers to the work of God within his Church. For certain modern historians focused on the concept of the Church in relation to Carolingian rulership, this emphasis on the Church in eighth- and ninth-century thought was the very ‘conceptual handle’ of Carolingian governmental policy. ‘Ecclesiology had become an integral part of the governmental outlook, programme and plan: ecclesiology had been absorbed into the governmental system itself’, Ullmann wrote.

By this, he meant that notions of the Church were critical to Carolingian formulations of kingship in several ways, not least that the ruler had a divinely-appointed charge to be responsible for the health, stability, and salvation of a kingdom of people characterized only by their membership within the Christian faith. By implication, Carolingian religious prayed for their rulers to govern

---


72 Ibid, p. 59.
justly, rightly, and wisely because, as clerics were eager to emphasize, this was their God-given function which they must fulfill through divine grace.\textsuperscript{73}

But monastic writers like Hrabanus were not only interested in the just and peaceful governance of the Christian body public, but also in the idea of growth in the Church, ‘both in terms of the number of believers and in the multiplication of virtue’. Charlemagne himself had turned to the idea that the Church would grow in number through the prayers of the religious in one of the most famous letters of the Middle Ages, sent through Abbot Angilbert of St. Riquier to Pope Leo III in 796:

\begin{quote}
It is for us, in accordance with the help of divine goodness, outwardly to defend by force of arms the Holy Church of Christ in all places from the incursions of pagans and the ravages of infidels, and inwardly to fortify her with our confession of the Catholic faith. It is for you, most holy father, raising your hands to God with Moses, to aid our armies, and to that end with you as intercessors and with God as guide and giver our Christian people may in all places have the victory over the enemies of its holy name, and the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be renowned throughout all the world.\textsuperscript{74}
\end{quote}

Abbey churches of royal monasteries built during the reign of Charlemagne for which archaeological evidence exists reveal that they deliberately imitated Roman basilicas. Such imitation appears to be a direct reference to the role of Rome as the spiritual intercessor for a growing Christendom. Merovingian monastic churches had been consistently small and followed simple plans: single-aisled, rectangular buildings, occasionally with a small


hemispherical, rectangular, or polygonal apse. But the reign of Charlemagne saw the magnificent elaboration of royal abbey churches – Saint-Denis, Lorsch, Saint-Alban in Mainz, Saint-Maurice d’Agaune, Saint-Riquier, and Fulda – all built in conscious imitation of the famous basilicas in Rome of St. John Lateran, St. Peter’s, St. Paul’s, and Santa Maria Maggiore. Their ‘T-style’ basilica shape, long and continuous transepts, and ring crypts had never before been seen in church architecture north of the Alps; now, the abbey churches of these Carolingian royal monasteries made a strong statement through their form and scale that they were the setting of the same liturgical prayer offered in the main basilicas of the Holy City itself. Like the Pope at prayer in the city of Rome, royal monasteries by means of their prayers would be agents in a religious expansion that meant a growth on earth which would carry over into eternity. As the Anglo-Saxon monk-priest Cathwulf wrote in a letter to Charlemagne, for monks and nuns to seek the welfare of the king was to pray that ‘you and the members of Christ with you will reign here and in the future with angels and archangels without end and will remain with all the saints in joy into the ages of ages’.

---

77 Krautheimer and W. Jacobsen had both interpreted the T-shaped basilica in Carolingian abbey churches as a conscious revival of the early Christian, specifically Constantinian, model. I follow the recent re-interpretation of Judson Emerick, who has observed that by the third quarter of the eighth century, not Constantine but rather Rome’s contemporary leaders, the popes, were the ones who invested the basilicas with associations and meanings which the Carolingians sought to imitate. The eighth-century Frankish leaders who built at Saint-Denis focused on the contemporary, early medieval, papal monuments, striving to imitate the form, function, and significance of a basilica under contemporary popes (and not, as previously argued, the ancient churches of Constantine). See with references J. Emerick, ‘Building more romano in Francia during the third quarter of the eighth century: the abbey church of Saint-Denis and its model’ in Bolgia et al., ed., Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c. 500-1400 (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 127-200.
Also at the heart of monastic concerns was the multiplication of virtue on earth, with lasting consequences into the future age, which intercession for rulers would accomplish. Several writings of ninth-century monastic leaders are revealing for their melding of the eternal concerns typical of ascetic theory with the pursuits expected of an earthly king. One example is the long-sought book of extracts from patristic homilies which Ardo listed among the works of Benedict of Aniane, now identified as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 12770.79

Though Ardo specifies that the work was ‘for the exhortation of monks’, and though the entire florilegium evinces the monastic preoccupation with the control and confession of evil thoughts, the dedicatory prologue is addressed to a ‘triumphator’ which, along with other overtly majestic and imperial epithets, points to Louis the Pious as the intended recipient.80

Similarly, in 814, Smaragdus dedicated a treatise to either Charlemagne or, more likely, Louis the Pious, called the Via Regia.81 This, together with his commentary on the RB and his Diadema Monachorum, both didactic treatises for monks, are revealing for their startling demonstration of a conflatio of monasticism and kingship. The Via Regia is considered one of the earliest among the genre of Fürstenspiegel (or the speculum principis, or mirror-of princes) of the medieval period, treatises addressed to rulers exhorting them to pious and just rule.82 But the term ‘via regia’ itself was a monastic one with a very long history, and it is arresting that Smaragdus should have it serve as the title to this treatise for a king.


80 See Dolbeau’s arguments concerning authorship and recipient in ibid, p. 52-4. The term ‘cogitatio’ is the common link between the extracts of this florilegium, drawn from Gregory the Great’s Moralia, various monastic rules, Gennadius, Isidore of Seville, the Vita Antonii, the Vitae Patrum, and Cassian.


The term ‘via regia’ comes from Numbers 20:17 (‘We will go along the King’s Highway. We will not turn aside to the right hand or to the left until we have passed through your territory’). Though it had been used by Hellenic writers such as Philo as a description for the ascension of the soul, Origen developed the analogy at length and it soon took on a distinctly Christian meaning.\(^8^3\) The expression referred to state roads which were straight and direct and led unfailingly to the capital of the kingdom where the king resides.\(^8^4\) When Cassian used the ‘royal road’ in his *Conferences* to describe both the moderation between extremes and the determination to stay on the path which is required of the spiritual life and which alone would lead to the celestial kingdom of God, the *via regia* became entrenched as a term synonymous with the monastic life.\(^8^5\) Smaragdus naturally found use for this image in his commentary on the Rule. In the metrical preface of the commentary, he writes:

This sublime Rule admonishes all monks
to do without things
and seek the supernal realms,
to let go of what is theirs,
that with their companions
they may have as theirs
the abiding kingdom of heaven.
In the sacred song of the law
our fathers call this way

---


\(^8^4\) For the meaning of ‘via regia’ in Christian, and specifically monastic, tradition, see J. Leclercq, *Love of Learning and Desire for God*, p. 103, and also his ‘La voie royale’, *Supplément de la Vie Spirituelle* 7 (1948), 338-52. The phrase is found in monastic literature as early as the *Apophthegmata Patrum*: e.g. Poemen 31, where Poemen illustrates the ‘royal way’ in relation to fasting, to eat a little each day rather than to fast several days at a time. See also *Life of Saint Lupicinus* 77 in *Lives of the Jura Fathers* concerning the ‘royal way’ as ascetic moderation.

\(^8^5\) *Collationes* II.2.4, where ‘via regia’ describes the virtue of discretion (avoiding excesses of ascetic exercise while not having weakness for pleasure); IV.12.5, where it describes the dangerous extremes of an unreasonable desire for virtue and unrestrained vice; VI.9.3, to be neither elated by prosperity nor dejected by adversity but to always remain calm; XXIV.24.5, that our sins make rough the otherwise straight and smooth ‘via regia’.
‘a royal way’ for those who walk uprightly.\textsuperscript{86}

That Smaragdus chose to employ this way for monks as the title for his royal \textit{speculum} is remarkable enough.\textsuperscript{87} But the conflation between monasticism and kingship becomes even more evident. Smaragdus remarks that ‘holy men’ (those living the monastic life) may be called kings (‘not strictly but loosely’, for Christ is the true King), quoting Gregory the Great:

\begin{quote}
Therefore holy men are kings because they know how not to yield to the movements of their temptations, but to direct them and so remain in control. They are kings because, being set over all the movements of the flesh, at one time they rein in the urge to live riotously, at another they temper the heat of avarice; now they abase the glory of pride, now they overwhelm the suggestions of envy or extinguish the fire of fierce anger.\textsuperscript{88}
\end{quote}

Smaragdus also inserted \textit{verbatim} an entire passage from the \textit{Via Regia} (addressed to a king) directly into the prologue of his commentary on the Rule (addressed to monks!), simply replacing ‘\textit{O rex}’ with ‘\textit{O monache}’ where necessary.\textsuperscript{89} The parallels between the \textit{Via Regia} and the \textit{Diadema Monachorum} (for example, their shared chapter titles) have already been examined by various scholars and have led some to conclude that the ethic of the \textit{Via Regia} was an essentially monastic one.\textsuperscript{90} Although some scholars have questioned the extent of the so-called ‘monastic turn’ in the early medieval idea of kingship, the fact that monastic ideals gave definition to royal virtues in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Smaragdus, \textit{Expositio} Metrical Preface, CCM 8, p 3, trans. Barry, \textit{Commentary}, pp. 43-44: ‘Admonet haec monachos sublimis regula cunctos, / Ut rebus careant, regna superna petant. / Propria dimittant, habeant ut propria cuncta / Prospera quae sociis caelica regna manent. / Patribus a nostris in sacro carmine legis / Regia rectigradis dicitur ista via’.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Theodulf of Orléans had also applied the phrase ‘\textit{via regia}’ to indicate approval of the Carolingian position on the use of images: see the end of his preface to his \textit{Opus Caroli regis}.
\item \textsuperscript{89} \textit{Via Regia} 3, PL 102:940-41; \textit{Expositio} Prologue, CCM 8, p. 28. Wallace-Hadrill, \textit{Early Germanic Kingship}, pp. 74 and 136.
\end{itemize}
Carololingian period cannot be doubted, since not only the authors of the treatises but kings themselves and their courtiers were often educated in cloisters.  

Crucially, the mutual borrowing from the monastic and royal spheres we have observed was only possible because of the belief on the part of the monastic community that kings were capable of pursuing the path of real, Christian virtue. Smaragdus demonstrates this confidence when he asks of the king:

> Follow the royal way, king: depart neither to the right nor to the left: Indeed hold the way of humility and peace, that you may not depart from the zeal of righteousness. Hold onto humility and peace, I beg of you, O king; as when David shouted to God and said: ‘The zeal of your house has consumed me’.…. And therefore, mildest king, let the zeal of the house of the Lord reasonably consume you, in which house of the Lord even you are a member of Christ: for indeed the members must follow the head.

The ‘zeal’ which Smaragdus summons here is reminiscent of the ‘zelus bonus’ which the Rule of Benedict indicated monks must have, the very zeal which prevents the monk from leaving the royal path leading to God and everlasting life. But most important to note here is Smaragdus’ idea that the king must pursue zeal for the house of the Lord because he is a member himself of this house, a ‘membrum Christi’, literally, one limb of a body. We have come a long way from the Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon or the pagan emperors of Rome for whom prayer had to be made for a temporal peace; monastic writers of the ninth century perceived their

---


92 *Via Regia* 18, ‘De zelo rectitudinis’, PL 102:958, italics mine: ‘Viam regiam perge, rex; ne declines ab ea neque ad dexteram, neque ad sinistram: sic enim tene viam humiditatis et pacis, ut a zelo non declines rectitudinis. Tene, inquam, rex, humiditatem et pacem; et ad Deum cum David clama, et dic: Zelus domus tuae comedit me (Ps. 68:9)…. Et te ergo, mitissime rex, zelus domus Domini rationabiler comedat, in qua domo Dei et tu membrum es Christi: debent etenim caput sequi membra’.

93 RB 72.

94 As Ullmann has argued, a marked feature of Carolingian political and religious thought is ‘the elaboration of the idea of the incorporation of the Ruler qua Ruler and in his official capacity into the body of the people of God, into the Church itself. *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship*, p. 43.
kings as individuals who had not only been well incorporated into the organism of the Church, but were also even on the same spiritual journey as the righteous ascetics.

That the king belonged to the body of Christ and thus walked the same ‘royal path’ so dear to monks and nuns certainly affected how they prayed for him. We can get a sense of the gradual change in the manner in which the king was prayed for through observing the difference between two royal masses. The *Missa pro regibus* is the earliest extant votive mass for rulers. Its origins are most likely Roman (Antoine Chavasse proposed that the Mass was written by Pope Vitalian in 663), but we know that it was performed for Merovingian kings because it is preserved in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, a Mass book copied around 750 in the nunnery of Chelles and widely used in eighth-century Frankish monasteries. This votive mass continued to be performed during the earliest years of Charlemagne’s reign. Drawing on elements from the Verona collection of masses known as the Leonine Sacramentary, the *Missa pro regibus* is triumphal in its language and predictable in its request for long life and long-lasting power for the king. The first collect is a request for God to ‘expertly perfect the triumph of your virtue’ so that the rulers ‘may always be powerful (semper munere sint potentes)’. It is the virtue of God (not of the king) that is sought, with an emphasis on the triumph of it, and also seeks prolonged power for the king. In the second collect, the priest requests that after wisdom is received from God’s fountain, the rulers ‘may please you and rise above all the kingdoms (tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecellant)’. The *Infra*

---


96 The class of liturgical texts known as the eighth-century Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary was likely initially composed and produced in a monastery following the *RB*, most likely Flavigny in Burgundy, and was widely copied among Frankish monasteries and suitable for their needs. Among the most important manuscripts are the Sacramentary of Gellone, ed. A. Dumas and J. Deshusses, *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis*, CCSL 159-159A (Turnhout, 1981), and the Sacramentary of Angoulême, ed. P. Saint Roch, *Liber Sacramentorum Engelismensis*, CCSL 159C. See C. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 70-79.
**actionem** asks for God to bless the ruler with 'age and kingdom (aevo augeatur et regno)'.

Two other Merovingian Masses for kings produced in the eighth century exhibit a similar concentration on triumph and power. The prayers for the king in the *Missale Francorum* ask that the kings of Francia may 'always be victorious by your power (tua semper sint virtute victores)' and may 'excel over all kingdoms (super omnia regna praeclarent)'.

The Bobbio Missal asks that the king may be 'a victor with triumphs (esse iubeas cum triumphis victorem)' and 'prosper blessedly through innumerable years (innumerus per annus suo feliciter splendeat in regno)'. Victory, power, long life and reign, and military success for the king are the main petitions.

By way of contrast, we turn to the *Missa cotidiana pro regibus*, a new prayer composed by the monastic reformer Benedict of Aniane likely in response to the imperial decree of 813 for daily masses to be said for rulers, and placed in his *Supplement* to the Gregorian Sacramentary.

An indication of how far monastic influences had crept into the approach to prayer for kings is evident in instructions given at the Council of Arles (813): prayer should be made by monks and nuns for kings 'so that good desires may be daily multiplied in them, the efforts of the enemy may be broken by the right hand of divine virtue, forbearance and grace may be conferred to them by his mercy'. These expressions are overtly spiritual in their interests and the concern with triumphal victory present in the earlier prayers is

---


100 Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority*, pp. 72-73.

101 *Concilium Arelatense*, MGH Conc 1, p. 249: ‘ut desideria in eis bona cotidie multiplicentur, adversantium conamina virtutis divinae dextera confringantur, indulgentia et gratia eis a sua misericordia conferatur…’.
subdued. Correspondingly, Benedict of Aniane’s new daily Mass for the king has a distinctly devotional quality. God’s largess is sought that it may be ‘of benefit in everything to King N. for maintaining spiritual and bodily health and for fulfilling his assigned office (ad obtinendam animae corporisque salutem, et peragendum iniunctum officium’). The collect asks God for His aid

that your servant, who by your mercy took the government of the kingdom, may also experience the growth of all virtues, by which he is adorned with propriety, and may graciously be able to avoid the abominations of sins and come to you, who are the way, truth, and life.

As the portion of prayer which was said audibly to all present (rather than beneath the breath by the priest as in the Secret), it is significant that the things requested of God are all of a spiritual nature, making no mention of longevity or the expansion of power.

In particular, we must focus attention on the phrase ‘incrementa virtutum’. The translation of ‘virtus’ is perennially problematic for scholars: it is a word that can mean both virtue and power (along with other related traits suggesting strength, as manliness, fortitude, courage, force), and in saints’ lives is the term used for miracles. In this case, it is clear that the intended meaning is ‘increase in virtue’ rather than ‘increase in power’ (as is the case with the earlier masses for kings), for among Carolingian monastic writers, ‘incrementa virtutum’ was a favourite phrase and one used specifically to describe the monastic life. In his commentary on Matthew 5, Paschasius Radbertus (785-865) specifically applied ‘incrementa virtutum’ to monasticism:


103 Ibid: ‘ut famulus tuus ille, qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula, virtutum etiam omnium percipiat incrementa, quibus decenter ornatus, et vitiorum monstra devitare, et ad te qui via, veritas, et vita es, gratiosus valeat pervenire’.

104 Bovendeert, ‘Royal or Monastic Identity?’, p. 241-2.

105 Paschasius Radbertus, Expositio in Evangelium Matthaei, PL 120:31-994, commenting on the verse, ‘Beati qui esuriunt ac sitiunt justitiam, quorum est aeternae vitae saturitas. Et, Beati misericordes ac pacifici, quoniam ipsorum est regnum coelorum’.
Happy therefore are the monks of whom there is such an incitement to virtue. For if they truly are what is said, by that growth in virtue in their lives they shall bear the blessings of the kingdom. Even if not in the actual thing, yet in the hope of this they are daily crowned.\textsuperscript{106}

If this passage does not shed any light onto Benedict of Aniane’s specific choice of words, it does at least offer clear insight into what the monks gathered at Paschiasius’ abbey in Corbie would have been thinking when they prayed for the king ‘to experience the growth of all virtues’. In Paschiasius’ understanding, it is by his virtues that the king is to be daily crowned.

Haimo of Auxerre used the phrase ‘\textit{incrementa virtutum}’ frequently throughout his commentary on the Psalms, most notably in connection with two ideas. Firstly, that \textit{this} earthly life is the time for the growth of all virtues which are stored up and will be for one’s glorification \textit{in the next life}; and secondly, that the Church as a whole while on earth is experiencing this growth in virtues. For example, of Psalm 5 he comments, ‘‘They will be glorified, for you will bless,” that is, you will give the growth of virtue “to the just” in this life, for those who will be glorified in the next’, and on Psalm 23(24), ‘(The one who lives in God’s land) “shall receive a blessing,” that is, the growth of virtues in this life, and the reward for his merits in the next “from the Lord”’.\textsuperscript{107} On Psalm 45(46), he comments, ‘‘The most high,” that is, God himself “has sanctified” by giving “his tabernacle,” that is, the present Church, the growth of virtues: therefore it is said of this tabernacle, that it is defended by God in this present life’.\textsuperscript{108} Smaragdus also used this phrase in his \textit{Diadema monachorum} to teach that it is primarily through the love of neighbors that one could achieve the growth of all virtues necessary for obtaining the crown

\begin{footnotes}
\item[106] \textit{Ibid}, PL 120:85: ‘Felices sunt ergo monachi, quorum talia sunt incitamenta virtutum. Quia si vere sunt quod dicuntur, in eorum vita ista virtutum incrementa beatitudines parant regni. Etsi nondu in re, in spe tamen talibus quotidie coronantur.’
\end{footnotes}
of life. It is significant that the growth of virtues, a central goal of monastic living, should be requested of God in prayer for the king. This precisely Haimo of Auxerre suggests monks do in his commentary on 1 Timothy 2:1: 'It is necessary to pray for the health and life of faithful kings and rulers, so that they may be preserved for a long time, may have peace and reign, and may progress more and more in better things'. The monastic notion that this earthly life exists for the growth of virtues, together with the monastic desire that one may progress more and more in better things along the via regia, was by the time of the ninth-century monastic reforms being applied explicitly to prayer for the king.

Many centuries earlier in an age of pagan emperors, Clement of Rome had composed an extensive prayer offering an example of how rulers should be prayed for:

Grant to them, O Lord, health, peace, concord, and firmness, so that they may without hindrance exercise the supreme leadership.... Do Thou, O Lord, direct their counsels in accord with what is good and pleasing in Thy sight, so that they may piously exercise in peace and gentleness the authority Thou has granted them....

We find in this a catalogue of rather typical benefits which a king would desire: peace, health, stability, etc.. Clement was also eager to pray that the kings would find Christians favourable, asking God to help Christians ‘be obedient to Thy almighty and glorious name, as well as to our princes and rulers on earth’. This same desire for the approval of pagan emperors had led Tertullian to describe his prayers for the king in a similar manner: ‘We pray for life prolonged; for security to the empire; for protection to the imperial house; for brave armies, a faithful senate, a virtuous people, the world at rest, whatever, as man or Caesar, an emperor

\[^{109}\] Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum* 4, PL 102:598 (‘incrementum virtutis’).
\[^{112}\] 1 Clement 60:4, *ibid* p. 47.
would wish’. Driving such prayers was primarily the desire to express fidelity and civic obedience to the emperor. And indeed, into the Carolingian period, a prayer for the king could certainly be a mode of fidelity performance before an emperor in order to obtain his approval. We have an example of exactly such a prayer in Ermoldus’ In Honour of Louis, the Most Christian Caesar Augustus, within a passage about Pope Stephen’s recoronation and consecration of Louis the Pious at Rheims in 816. Ermoldus was a member of Pippin II of Aquitaine’s court and in producing this work was the first medieval author to produce a Latin epic on a secular theme. He might have been a secular priest, but probably not a monk. Indeed, Ermoldus displays no interest in traditionally monastic themes or language, as is evident in his formulation of Stephen’s intercessory prayer. The prayer asks for God to ‘keep this king for ever and ever as the leader of his people’, to ‘keep every sadness far away’, to ‘give him every good fortune’, and to ‘drive afflictions away’. God should grant that he be ‘both happy and powerful for a long time’. God, who had increased the seed of Abraham, is also requested to grant Louis children: ‘may He grant you offspring, may He double and triple your descendants, so that a rich harvest may grow from your seed, and may they rule the Franks and potent Rome as long as the name of Christian is heard in the world’. Such statements were not based on monastic language but, rather, as Gerd Tellenbach has shown, on the Roman imperial idea which, christianized, made their way into the Frankish


liturgical texts such as the earliest royal ordines and eighth-century sacramentaries.\textsuperscript{116} Along their side, the prayer of the monastic writer Smaragdus for king Louis stands in stark contrast:

\begin{quote}
For now and always we pray for you together with the Apostle [Paul], that God may by his calling deem you worthy, and fill up your will for good and work of faith in virtue, so that the name of Jesus Christ may be clarified in you, and you in it, according to the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And “we are confident in the Lord concerning you that you are doing and will do that which we have commanded. May the Lord direct your hearts in the love of God and perseverance in Christ.”\textsuperscript{117}
\end{quote}

Significantly, Smaragdus borrows here the prayer of Paul written to not to a superior but to his fellow saints: this is a prayer written in a tone of sincere fraternal affection and spiritual concern from one faithful to another, though he be a king. Here, as in the Missa cotidiana pro regibus, prayer for a king is not a civic expression of political fidelity or imperial triumphalism. In praying for the king’s virtues to increase, monks were praying what they themselves strove toward and asked of God for themselves. This was the sense that all God’s people on earth, with the king amongst them, were capable of real virtue on the journey to the heavenly Jerusalem.

\textit{The increase of time}

Monastic writers reflecting on political events had always shown a keen interest in conceptions of time, how significant events involving rulers fit backward into the story of biblical salvation history, and how it would fit forwards to the consummation of God’s promises. Smaragdus addressed the following meditation on time to both the monk and king alike, in a statement linking his present situation with future eternity.


183
Therefore, O monk ['king' in the Via Regia], fear the Lord, but with that fear which, being holy, lasts forever; with that chaste fear which to the days of this time will add eternal days, perpetual days, immortal and everlasting days. In fact, it will add one day that is without evening or ending, a day full of happiness and joy, brim full of unfailing light, supported by the company of angels, a day uninterrupted by night, unobscured by darkness, a day unclouded...

To ‘seek peace’, to pray for the king and stability, in the ninth century, was to look for the multiplication of the Church both in number and virtue, all a part of the experience of a Christian society experiencing growth on earth as it anticipated the transferral of those achievements into the everlasting heavenly reign. Next to the realities of military endeavours, revolts and rebellions, and political scandals here on earth, such a fixation on entering eternity as a church bigger and better may sound hyperbolic, but it provided a real rationale for the monastic intercession for rulers. As the Council of Chalon mandated in 813,

Among all these things the council by the most gracious deliberation has decreed, that prayers be made unceasingly by all for the life and safety of the king and his children, for the health of their soul and bodies, for the state of the kingdom, for the remission of sins and the gathering of the heavenly kingdom, as long as they live so that the observation of such things may grow always more and more through the increase of time.

As for the purpose of intercession in this terrestrial setting, to this question we now turn.

---

118 Expositio Prologue, CCM 8, p. 27, and also in Via Regia 3, PL 102:940, Diadema monachorum 6, PL102:602-03, trans. Barry, Commentary, p. 77: 'Time ergo dominum o monache ['rex' in Via Regia], sed illo timore qui sanctus permanet in saeculum saeculi; illo casto timore qui tibi ad dies temporis huiscy addiet dies aeternos, dies perpetuos, dies inmoratles et dies perennes. Immo diem unum sine vespera et infinitum, diem felici gaudio plenum, indeficienti luce refertum, angelico comitatu suffultum, diem quem nox non interpolat, tenebrae non obscurant, nubilum non obfuscat...'.

119 Concilium Cabillonense, cap. 66, MGH Conc 2.1, p. 285: 'Interea omnis iste conventus gratissima deliberatio decrevit, ut ab omnibus indesinenter orationes fiant pro vita et incolomitate, pro salute anmiae et corporis domni imperatoris prolesisque eius, pro statu regni, pro remissione peccatorum et caelestis regni collatione, ita dumtaxat ut semper magis ac magis per incrementia temporum talis crescat observatio'.
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Chapter Six:
Intercession for Society

Dominating historical writing since the late twentieth century has been the ‘new cultural history’. In its concentrated interest in the construction of cultural phenomena (rituals, textual discourse, identities, etc.), this trend in historiography has led many scholars of monasticism to focus heavily on its social impact, social meaning, and social function. Barbara Rosenwein’s *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny’s Property, 909-1049*, for example, is a study on the ways in which donations and sales of monastic lands functioned as a social glue to enforce cohesion and interrelations within a fragmented society.¹ Ludo Millis’ *Angelic Monks, Earthly Men*, by contrast, rejects the view that monasticism was a powerful social influence on medieval life, and argues instead that its intellectual, artistic, agricultural, and spiritual contributions generally had little impact on the daily life, values, and even the religion of common people.² Concern for assessing the contribution of monastic communities to society has been so central in recent historiography that it has even shaped how the fundamental features of early medieval monasticism have been described, as most clearly displayed by Richard Sullivan in his foundational article, ‘What was Carolingian monasticism?’. He expresses his main thesis in this way:

(T)he central force driving Carolingian monasticism and shaping its institutional agenda was the quest for a solution to an unresolved problem that had always been inherent in the pursuit of the ascetic ideal. Carolingian legislation for monasticism was all about finding a place for the cloister in the terrestrial setting that would allow those in the cloister to progress in their search for spiritual perfection, while at the same time taking into account and making mutually fruitful the inevitable encounter between the two spheres.³

---

¹ Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter*, pp. 125-43, 196-207 for summaries.
³ Sullivan, ‘What was Carolingian Monasticism?’, p. 282, and see also p. 283.
By arguing that Carolingian monasticism deliberately and consciously sought to make advantageous the encounter with secular society (the 'terrestrial setting'), Sullivan put the question of ‘social impact’ and ‘social relevance’ right into the very forefront of the monastic mindset, suggesting that Carolingian monks themselves believed that defining the role, function, and meaning they held for the rest of society was of crucial importance.

Prayer has held pride of place in this cultural historiography, for it has become a scholarly commonplace to assert that liturgy defines and expresses human social structure and behaviour, fulfilling a societal and not just a strictly devotional function. A classic essay by John Bossy, entitled 'The Mass as a Social Institution', argued that the historico-sociological significance of the medieval Mass lay in how it presented the ‘social universe as a concatenation of distinct parts’ while creating social fusion through its function as a peace ritual. Bossy categorized intercessory prayer for the living and the dead as a ‘social prayer’, having to do with one’s relation to his neighbour, as distinct from ‘devotional prayers’ which concern one’s relation to God or to other objects of religion. Patrick Henriet has called monastic prayer by and for the living and the dead ‘functional prayer as an instrument of social cohesion’, and asserted that the liturgical additions of Benedict of Aniane was an ‘evolution which made liturgical efficacy a necessary support of the social order’. Naturally, then, the fact that Carolingian political and religious leaders defined not just prayer generally, but intercessory prayer specifically, as the particular charge of monasteries seems to support the attractive idea that the quest to make devotional and ascetic activities socially relevant did

---

4 e.g. Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority*, p. 43 opens chapter two of his book with the statement that medieval liturgy was the form of communication that ‘sanctified a certain social order, social roles, and social functions’.


in fact drive Carolingian monasticism. Accordingly, Silber has concluded that the ‘the monasticism favored by Charlemagne was not contemplative and withdrawn, but expected to be “useful”, and that trends in the monasticism of the age denoted a ‘social involvement and “functionalization” of the monastic institution’.7

Sullivan’s argument that, for ninth-century monastic reformers, ‘to be a monk involves coping with worldly people and activity’ hinged on his observations that the Plan of St. Gall deliberately designed ‘windows’ from within the cloister out of which monks could both see and hear members of the secular society: students at the external school, noble visitors in the guest-house and guest-refectory, and in particular those of the lower classes, such as pilgrims, paupers, and agricultural peasants. A willingness to place the monastic life ‘in the presence of diverse human beings’ inserted ‘a new dimension to the vita contemplativa’: the monasticism promoted in the ninth-century was not to be introspective but socially aware, involved, and useful, acknowledging and interacting with the wide array of folks in Frankish society.8 In this chapter, I wish to evaluate this argument by addressing the question of what role Carolingian monastics expected their intercessory prayers specifically, and life of prayer generally, to play in society at large. To do this requires that we first establish how monastic communities perceived themselves within the early medieval social structure, and then to examine the role which monks intended for their prayers to have within it. Our inquiry into the extent to which general social concern was a priority in monastic intercession, and precisely how this was expressed in ritual and prayer texts, will help us to draw conclusions about what Carolingian monastic reformers taught about the social usefulness of their life of prayer.

7 Silber, Virtuosity, Charisma, and Social Order, p. 156. Similarly, Henriet, La Parole et la Prière, p. 35: ‘Si les monastères carolingiens sont utiles à l’empereur et aux chrétiens, c’est évidemment par leurs prières, quelles que soient par ailleurs leurs possibilités financières et militaires. Souligner la préoccupation du saint pour les questions liturgiques et son influence en ce domaine, c’est donc le situer au coeur du Regnum francorum et faire de lui le pivot de l’ordre social’.
8 Sullivan, ‘What was Carlingian Monasticism’, p. 278.
Monasticism and the social order

Religious and monastic reform in the eighth and ninth centuries occurred as part of an intensive effort on the part of Carolingian kings and bishops to produce social legislation for the welfare of the public and particularly the protection of the poor and vulnerable. For example, a council in 779 ordered the precise amount of alms which bishops and abbots should give for the assistance of the poor, turned by Charlemagne one year later into royal law. A Frankfurt council in 794 presided by Charlemagne ordered that bread must have equal weight throughout Francia, and the council of Arles in 813 ordered that all weights and measures must be standard. The Council of Chalon in 813 argued for the fair and just treatment of slaves by their superiors. Early medieval politics thus showed a remarkable degree of social awareness concerning the existence of the ‘pauperes (the poor)’ and ‘inermes (the weak’), those who were vulnerable to exploitation by the ‘potentes (the powerful)’ and who lacked the resources of lordship necessary for self-defense. Moralists did not argue that the powerful should work to eradicate social inequalities, but did insist that in order to save their own souls, they must protect the powerless, buy at fair prices, trade with correct measures, and give alms to the poor.

For the most part, the identity of those in society who belonged to groups in need of special charity and protection was fairly clear: the poor, widows, orphans, captives, prisoners, slaves. But where precisely monks fit into this schema was far more ambiguous. Were they rich or poor, protectors or the protected, almsgivers or alms-receivers? Carolingian monasticism was

---


full of contradiction and ambivalence when it came to fitting in within the social hierarchy of the Carolingian world. Most basically, humility and submission characterized the monastic life, and poverty in spirit and possession was a virtue that was to pierce deep into the monk’s heart in order to uproot every desire for material power and wealth.\textsuperscript{11} The concept of monastic poverty pervades Benedict of Aniane’s \textit{Codex}; nearly every rule makes a point of emphasizing it. The widely-circulated \textit{Dialogues} by Gregory the Great includes a story of the monk Justus who, having kept three coins to the end of his life, was given a defamatory funeral during which the brothers cursed the money in the grave as they quoted St. Peter’s words, ‘\textit{Pecunia tecum sit in perditione}’.\textsuperscript{12} More than renouncing personal possessions, the monastic state called into question the very existence of privilege based on social class and family relations, and monasteries were meant to be classless communities where the world’s social structures were irrelevant. So, for example, the \textit{RB} prohibits preferential treatment for freeborn monks above those who were slaves, allows no one to be excused from kitchen service, and bars the protection of kinsmen in the monastery, instructions which Benedict of Aniane reinforced in the synodal decrees concerning the regulation of portions of food and drink, the allotment of clothing, and manual house work.\textsuperscript{13} The monastic virtues of humility, submission, and poverty meant that writers frequently chose to emphasize the lowly position of monks in a society where family wealth and class meant power. Thus, Benedict of Aniane’s biographer writes that many monasteries were made to pay fees and military service to rulers and aristocrats, to the point that they were in ‘such dire poverty that the monks lacked both food and clothing’.\textsuperscript{14} In fact, of course, Carolingian monasteries were virtually noble family

\textsuperscript{11} A. de Vogüé, ‘Monastic Poverty in the West from the 4th to the 8th Century’, \textit{Monastic Studies} 13 (1982), 99-112.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid}, p. 112; Gregory, \textit{Dialogorum Libri Quatuor} IV.57.11.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{RB} 2, 35, and 69. See H. Mayr-Harting, \textit{The Venerable Bede, the Rule of St. Benedict, and Social Class}, Jarrow Lecture 1976 (Jarrow, 1977).
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possessions absorbed into the structure of a specifically aristocratic society which necessarily relied on and perpetuated class distinctions. Monasteries lay on land granted by aristocracy, making privileged treatment in the form of lay abbacies and rituals for the reception of noble guests essential. For example, both Smaragdus and Hildemar drew a distinction between important persons – kings, bishops, abbots, and other powerful persons – whom monks had to greet with full prostration on the ground, and lesser visitors – counts, priests, monks, and others – for whom a simple bowing of the head sufficed.\(^1\) While monks themselves held no individual personal property, the fact that monastic communities were landed proprietors meant that they were perceived as the very wealthy rather than the poor of Christ. Detailed polyptychs documented the dues, labour, and services owed by each peasant household dwelling on monastic land, which were designed to ensure that the estates held by the monastery were extensively exploited to meet the élite demands of the cloister and closely-related court.\(^2\)

These contradictory realities meant that the social role which monks filled in Carolingian society was far from clear – whether as the aristocratic beneficiaries of a system based on class distinction and elitism, or as advocates of the poor and an equalizing force.\(^3\) The tension was reflected in eighth-and ninth-century practice related to tithing and almsgiving. Since Charlemagne had issued the Capitulary of Herstal in 779, all Christians had been required to pay tithes to the church where they received the sacraments, thus excluding monks and

---


\(^2\) Innes, *Introduction to Early Medieval Western Europe*, p. 447.

monastic churches (which performed no parochial functions) from entitlement to tithes. But during the later reign of Charlemagne and that of Louis the Pious, monasteries themselves began to receive alms, and tithes came to play an important role in the monastic economy, amounting to a considerable proportion of monastic revenues. An imperial formula of 814 confirmed the right of the monastery at Stavelot-Malmédy to receive tithes among property, and the Statutes of Adalhard showed that Corbie in 822 forced those tenants who held at least four mansi to tithe their grain, wine, garden vegetables, etc. to the monastery in addition to their parish church. At the same time, however, legislation was clear about what the tithes were to be used for: the Aachen decree of 817 specifically instructed monasteries to give tithes ‘to the poor from everything that is given in alms both to the church and to the brothers’, and Hildemar ordered that the tithes given to the monastery (gold, silver, copper, iron, labour, wine, fruit, animals, and the rest) should be used for the poorhouse. At Corbie, the abbey’s income from tithes was used for guests and for the food distributed to the poor at the monastery gate. These almsgiving practices were never intended by monasteries to be poverty eradication strategies. At the solemn supper of Maundy Thursday, simply twelve poor old men were selected to receive a meal, in an action more suggestive of ritual symbolism than an attempt at poverty alleviation. At Saint-Denis, only five paupers each day were received and fed. The bread distributed at the gates of Corbie amounted to only fifty small rolls, and their poorhouse accommodated only twelve men at a

---

18 What follows from G. Constable, Monastic Tithes from their Origins to the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 1964), here at p. 28.
19 Ibid, p. 60.
time. These acts of charity prompted no written reflection about their wider and extended impact on society, and were not intended to resolve particular social problems.

The conclusion to be drawn from this brief discussion is that Carolingian monasticism had neither a conservative social stance nor an activist social agenda: it set out neither to reinforce the existing social order (for ideally, the monastery was supposed to be classless) nor to transform it (for monastic almsgiving did not seek to eradicate poverty and injustice). On the one hand, monastic reformers were plainly adamant that the cloister was not to be a microcosm of Frankish society whereby social distinctions were reproduced. At the same time, however, monastic reformers were clear that monasticism was must not be confused with social activism. One important goal of the Council of Aachen in 816/817, after all, was to distinguish monachi from other religious orders of a less contemplative, more active bent, and to present a codified model of monastic life characterized not by social service but by purity of the monastic state of holiness. It is worth comparing the Carolingian definition of the place of monasticism in the social order with developments in Rome, where a distinct type of monastic community, the diaconia, was established intentionally to integrate the vita activa into the cenobitic ideal. Here, a sizeable class of ‘urban working monks’ were charged by the church with dispensing charitable service to the needy, receiving needy strangers who knocked at the door, and essentially acting as social workers or civil servants. In the minds of Carolingian monastic reformers, such diaconia were fundamentally incompatible with the prescriptions of the Rule: though a few of the poor were lodged and fed, usually in an area external to the cloister or in outbuildings owned by the monastery, this execution of a basic command of Christian charity was peripheral to the spirit and operation of these foundations.

---

22 Millis, Angelic Monks and Earthly Men, p. 54.
23 This is the explicit argument of Millis: see Angelic Monks and Earthly Men, p. 61.
Eventually, the incompatibility of active social service with the monasticism as defined by ninth-century reformers was a fact which Roman religious themselves confronted in the tenth century as influence from the Carolingian reforms spread to the Italian peninsula, and diaconia eventually died out in favour of Benedictine houses. As we shall see, this ambivalence of Carolingian monasticism with regard to society at large – neither to reinforce the social order nor to radically transform it – carried over into their practice of prayer.

**Monastic prayer and the social order**

Monastic rules are clear that prayer is no medium through which to reflect existing social hierarchies. The *Regula Pachomii* and Fructuosus of Braga’s *Regula Complutensis*, in instruction quoted by both Benedict of Aniane and Smaragdus, explicitly forbid social class to play any role in the promotion of a monk to a higher role in the singing of the psalms: for the order of intoning the psalms, the only criterion is seniority, the length of time which each monk has been in the community. Prayer in the monastic chorus was to stand in deliberate contrast to the secular world’s basis for promoting and privileging individuals.

Through the lens of the early medieval system of gift exchange and aristocratic patronage, however, we have tended to see Carolingian monastic prayer as something which reinforced the existing social economy. We have, in previous chapters, already examined how prayer within monasteries was offered for specific groups of people: specifically named persons who made it into a community’s *Liber Vitae*, patrons who had given land and gifts to the monastery, and rulers who had founded and given immunities to a monastery and commanded prayer. This fact suggests that Carolingian monastic prayer reinforced social

---


26 Fructuosus of Braga, *Regula Complutensis* 23; *Regula Pachomii* Preface 3; Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia Regularum* 70.3 and 70.6; Smaragdus, *Expositio* 63. See also Mayr-Harting, *Bede, Rule of St. Benedict, and Social Class*, p. 4.
aristocratic distinctions, élitism, and local power. The latter in particular was enhanced by the special control which monastic communities wielded over the cult and relics of those specific saints who were the patrons of their specific monastery. In 801 (and affirmed again in 813), a ruling from the Fifth Council of Carthage requiring all altars lacking relics to be destroyed was imposed on the Frankish Empire.\(^{27}\) At the same time, Carolingian rulers were concerned to see the number of new saints and claims of relic possession spiraling out of control, and enacted legislation to regulate the numerous cults: the Synod of Frankfurt in 794 ordered that no new saints be venerated or invoked other than the ones already chosen.\(^{28}\) The simultaneous need for relics and the restriction over the multiplication of cults produced a situation of stiff competition between monasteries, one so fierce that the Synod of Mainz issued the decree that bodies of saints might not be transferred from place to place without the permission of a prince, bishop, and synod.\(^{29}\) More than simply objects of popular devotion, the relics of saints were objects of significance in the politics of early medieval gift exchange, patronage, and strategic alliances. Relics were symbols of affiliations between emperors, bishops, aristocrats, abbots, and the papacy, ‘traveling’, in Julia Smith’s phrase, ‘along routes of obligation, loyalty, and reward’.\(^{30}\)

In this climate, scholars have emphasized that Carolingian monastic prayer was performed not for all but for the *familia* associated with the saints whose relics they guarded. A most famous case in point is the abbey of Fleury. Though Benedict of Aniane, the legislator who did the most to promote the authority of St. Benedict in Francia, may have presided over


\(^{28}\) Geary, *Furta Sacra*, p. 38; MGH Cap 1, p. 77.

\(^{29}\) Geary, *Furta Sacra*, p. 40; MGH Conc 2, p. 272.

several large monasteries, none of them compared with the prestige of Fleury, where the
saint’s bodily remains were said to have been piously stolen from Monte Cassino. The monks
of Fleury made a large effort to demonstrate that the relics were genuine, which meant that
they had to prove that Benedict and his power no longer rested upon Monte Cassino. This is
the implicit reason for the books of miracles of St. Benedict at Fleury, the first of which was
written by Adrevald around the middle of the ninth century to demonstrate that the miracles
associated with Benedict now occur at Fleury and not at Monte Cassino.\(^{31}\) In his narration of
the conflicts over land and the possessions of the abbey, Benedict at Fleury emerges as a
protector of the local interests of the abbey, acting in power and ferocity.\(^{32}\) Thus, as Benedicta
Ward has observed, the saint is ‘now no longer the father of monks, the abbot of a monastery,
but the lord of his domains, the patron of a house and its inmates, responsible for them, as
they are also responsible to him’.\(^{33}\) Another scholar has even compared this Benedict to the
household gods of Aeneas, acting as the head of a \textit{familia}, vigorously defending the rights and
persons related to his own property at Fleury.\(^{34}\) Consequent upon such a powerful saintly
protector, the grants and privileges given to Fleury were numerous. Unlike the monastic
houses of nearby Micy, Saint-Avit, Saint-Euverte, and Meung-sur-Loire, which all remained
under episcopal control, Fleury held a royal grant of immunity and the right to elect its abbots
from at least the time of Louis the Pious in exchange for prayers at this resting place of a
powerful saint.\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\) \textit{Ibid}, p. 7.
We need therefore to explore the extent to which prayer was freely poured out not for the rich and ruling who either ordered it or had something to give in return, but for the poor and powerless who could do nothing to enhance the prestige of an abbey. Historically since the fourth century, prayer for the weak, poor, and vulnerable took place in the form of litanies of intercessions, occurring in both the corporate worship of the Mass and the daily prayer in cathedrals, in which a deacon named various groups for special prayer, to which the congregation responded simply with *Kyrie eleison* or *Domine misere*. By contrast, intercessory litanies specifying groups of people were absent from the monastic office emerging in this same period and thereafter. Caesarius and Aurelian of Arles augmented Cassian’s basic structure of the office (twelve psalms followed by silent prayer and two readings) by increasing the number of psalms and adding *capitella*, petitionary statements lifted directly from psalm-verses which were recited as a sort of psalmic litany to conclude the hour. While these *capitella* have been called ‘psalmic intercessions’, they were not ‘intercessory’ in the sense of offering prayer on behalf of others, their main function being rather to sum up the psalms of the Office. For example, Aurelian gives the following *capitellum* for terce: ‘May your mercy, O Lord, be upon us, for we have placed our hope in you’ (Ps 32:22). Later on in the sixth century, the *Rule of the Master* ends the Hours with a prayer of petition called *rogus Dei*, but the designation is vague and the litany does not appear

---

36 On the relationship of church leadership to the poor in the late-antique context, see P. Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover, NH, 2002).


39 Not to be confused with *capitula de psalmos*, which designate the Scripture readings recited at all of the hours (except for the nocturnal vigils) after the psalms. These readings (the ‘lesson’ in modern terminology) comprise one or two verses of Scripture, ordinarily from the epistles, sometimes from the prophets. See DACL II.2, ‘Capitula’ (récitatif’), col 2048-51.

40 DACL II.2, ‘Capitellum’, col 2041-42. Caesarius’ prescription for the *capitella* is found in *Regula ad monachos*, 21. At the Gallic Council of Agde in 506, he mandated that the same *capitella de psalmis* should be said during the cathedral hours. Taft, *Liturgy of Hours*, pp. 104-05.
to have been explicitly intercessory, with no evidence for the specific naming of comprehensive classes of persons to be prayed for.  

The one exception to the absence of intercessory litanies in monastic rules lies in Irish practice, which added an element into the Divine Office to make the universality and generosity of the monk’s prayer an explicit fact. Columbanus’ rule refers to capitella, a series of ‘intercessory versicles’ designed to make monastic psalmody unequivocally comprehensive in its intercessory content. The precise content of this litany of intercession is given by the Antiphonary of Bangor in what it terms the ‘Oratio communis fratrum’. In the Antiphonary, the ‘intercessory versicles’ are prayers for several groups of people, with each formula consisting of a bidding to pray, followed by an appropriate verse taken directly from a psalm, and followed by a short collect. For example, this is the prayer given ‘pro baptizatis’:

Let us pray for the baptized.
  Save your people... in this age (Ps 27:9).
  Have mercy, O Lord who reigns, on your catholic church which you have redeemed by your holy blood.

The Antiphonary specifies fifteen groups of people for whom prayer should be offered: for baptized Christians, priests, the abbot, the brothers, the peace of the people and the kings, blasphemers, the impious, those going on a journey, the thankful, alms-givers, the sick, the

41 Regula Magistri 33.30, ed. de Vogüé, La Règle du Maître, SC 106, pp. 182-3. See Taft, Liturgy of the Hours, pp. 125-6: The content of the rogus Dei is entirely unclear: it has been variously interpreted as a litany, a silent prayer, or the Lord’s Prayer.

42 Regula coenobialis 7, ed. and trans. Walker, Sancti Columbani Opera, p. 130: ‘per diurnas terni psalmi horas pro operum interpositione statuti sunt a senioribus nostris cum versiculorum augmento intervenientium pro peccatis primum nostris, deinde pro omni populo christianio, deinde pro sacerdotibus et reliquis deo consecratis sacrae plebis gradibus, postremo pro elemosinas facientibus, postea pro pace regum, novissime pro inimicis...’.


44 Antiphonary of Bangor 41, in Curran, The Antiphonary of Bangor, p. 106: ‘Oremus pro baptizatis. / Salvum fac populum tuum... in saeculum (Ps 27:9) / Misere, domine, ecclesiae tuae catholicae quam redemisti in tuo sancto sanguine, qui regnas’.
Thus even Dhuoda, whose manual of instruction for her son finds its inspiration in monastic sources and ideals, can only point to the prayers for

---

47 Benedict prescribes a letania before the missae (dismissals) of Matins and Vespers; nocturnal vigils likewise end with a ‘supplicatio litaniae, id est Kyrie eleison’; for the Little Hours, Benedict speaks simply of Kyrie eleison. The Council of Vaison II (529) presided by Caesarius orders the Kyrie eleison to be added to matins, vespers, and Mass. How the Kyrie was used – as a litanic response as in the cathedral office, or simply repeated three times as in the monastic offices of Aurelian – is not indicated. See Taft, Liturgy of Hours, p. 148.

---
the Good Friday Mass and not to any monastic practice when seeking a model of a universal, socially inclusive prayer.49

**Praying with society**

The role of Carolingian monastic prayer to serve the élite and protect an abbey’s particular *familia*, and the simultaneous absence of intercessory litanies for the general population in the monastic hours, seem to point to a situation in which monks had little social concern for public welfare in their prayer. This observation reflects a distinctive feature of Carolingian monastic prayer that it was not fundamentally conceived in terms of its function in and for society. One of the clearest pieces of evidence of this is that, for an *ordo* of monks and nuns whose main task lay supposedly in being ‘powerhouses of prayer’ on behalf of society, monastic writers themselves had very little interest in engaging in systemic and sustained reflection about what their intercessions meant for society as a whole. For example, although the figure of Moses regularly appeared in medieval literature as an exemplar of contemplative and intercessory prayer, on no occasion did any Carolingian monastic exegete actually make the particular connection between Moses ‘standing in the gap in favour of the land’ (Ezekiel 22:30, which in Psalm 105(106):23 is applied to Moses) and what monasteries achieved for society through prayer.50 Significantly, there was not yet, at the time of Benedict of Aniane’s monastic reforms, the definitive identification of monks with the proper term ‘*oratores*’.51

---
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Monks were those who prayed, certainly, but their vocation had not yet been consistently condensed to the functional occupation of *oratores*. The Anglo-Saxon king Alfred made reference to the distinction between prayer-men, army-men, and workmen in the late ninth-century; Haimo and Heiric of Auxerre’s identification of monks and priests with those who pray, as opposed to laymen divided into those who fight and those who work, appeared at a similar time. The precise tripartite scheme of *bellatores*, *laboratores*, and *oratores* is the work of Aelfric in England in the late tenth century. Back in the earlier ninth century, Carolingian monastic leaders had not so cleanly defined prayer in terms of its social function, vis-à-vis the rest of society.

This important fact was fundamentally the outcome of a vision intentionally fostered by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious about the general place of prayer in their society. ‘Carolingian civilization was on many counts a liturgical civilization’, wrote Étienne Delaruelle, by which he meant that prayer was something which *everybody* was meant and mandated to do, and that prayer *by all* was perceived as a function of a healthy society. At no time was this vision more vividly realized than at the times of collective fasting and public supplicatory prayer in which the general needs of all society were offered, equally, *by all* society to the mercy of God. These communal displays of penance were a symbol, for the Carolingians, of their being a *populus christianus*, a holy people who, like Old Testament Israel, would obey Joel’s call for a holy and solemn fast to be assembled from all levels of society, from the elderly to those nursing at the breast. Famously, Charlemagne called on all

---


the people of the Frankish realm to join together in fasting and prayer in response to the famine of 778: every bishop, monk, nun, priest, and canon was to carry out the disciplines of fasting, alms-giving, and prayer, including ‘the people who have homesteads on their estates, those who are strong enough, at least’.\textsuperscript{54} Charlemagne’s letter to Bishop Gerbald of Liège in 805 set out an elaborate system of collective fasting to avert famine, bad weather, and pagan attack: everyone was to participate unless prevented by age or illness.\textsuperscript{55} In addition to these periodic calls to solemn prayer at times of tribulation, regular periods of corporate supplication were performed by all members of society in the form of the Rogation Days, that is, the Major Litanies (\textit{litaniae maiores}) of April 25, and the Minor Litanies (\textit{litaniae minores}) on the three days before Ascension.\textsuperscript{56} These large-scale solemn fasts, described by Gregory of Tours as an assembly of all the people reciting psalms bare-footed in procession toward a church, were characterized by their penitential and public nature and, in the eighth and ninth centuries, by their increasing elaborateness.\textsuperscript{57} Frankish rogation litanies, in contrast with the sparser early Anglo-Irish litanies, contained an ever-expanding number of suffrages, growing in length by the multiplication of saints invoked, adversities to be prevented, and stations in the life of the Lord to be recalled.\textsuperscript{58}


\textsuperscript{56} For a concise and helpful description of the origins of these, see M. Lapidge, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints}, HBS 106 (London, 1991), pp. 8-13. Orders for litanic processions are found in calendars, martyrologies (e.g. Martyrology of Hrabanus Maurus), and sacramentaries of the eighth and ninth centuries (e.g. Sacramentary of Autun; Gelasian Sacramentary of St. Gall; the Hadrianum), and the Frankish-Roman Ordo 21 (‘Quando letania maior debet fieri’). See also A. Vauchez, \textit{Les Laïcs au Moyen Âge: Pratiques et expériences religieuses} (Paris, 1987), 145-55.

\textsuperscript{57} Gregory of Tours, \textit{Decem Libri Historiarum} IV:5; Hen, \textit{Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul}, p. 64.

There was nothing distinctively or exclusively monastic about these general intercessions, which were designed as public declarations representative of society as a whole. Avitus of Vienne addressed his sermon on Rogation Days to the monastic community, but what he taught – how to petition the Lord in humility of spirit with much weeping – applied equally to all members of society, a fact he made explicit when he related the Rogations to the verse ‘knock and the door shall be opened unto you’, and then proceeded to say, ‘to knock is common to all’.\textsuperscript{59} Angilbert’s order for the solemn processions on Rogations Days, part of his liturgical instruction for the monks at St. Riquier, stands out for his clear intent to include other members of society. He prescribed an elaborate three-day ritual that involved not only monks and the local people of Centula, but also participants from seven neighbouring towns, each of which was to send a procession and a cross. Lay participants and their duties are enumerated just as precisely as those for priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, porters, and monks: the lay *scolae* with seven red standards, the noble men and women, boys and girls, and finally a ‘mixed population’ of the old and infirm were to form part of the procession seven-persons wide. While monks chanted psalms, all the people sang the three creeds (Apostles’, Constantinopolitan, and Athanasian), the Lord’s Prayer, and a litany of saints.\textsuperscript{60} Walahfrid Strabo states that the Synod of Orléans ordered that people take a holiday from servile work during the Rogations to ensure that the litanies were celebrated fully by all in society.\textsuperscript{61}


\textsuperscript{60} For a full description, see Rabe, *Faith, Art, and Politics*, pp. 130-1. But see also ibid, p. 143, for her discussion about the difference between the Rogations Days liturgy of Angilbert and the later liturgy of Benedict of Aniane, which reduced the physical extent of the processions and limited the role of the laity.

\textsuperscript{61} And also his description of Paul the Deacon’s report in *The History of the Lombards*: ‘In the first group were the clergy, in the second all the abbots with their monks, in the third all the abbesses with their congregations, in the fourth all the children, in the fifth all the laymen, in the sixth all the widows, in the seventh all the married women’. Walahfrid Strabo, *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum* 29, ed. and trans. Harting-Correa, pp. 184-7.
This culture which Carolingian reformers fostered of participatory prayer, in which petitions for all society were to be offered by all of society, can be further seen from the way in which universal intercessory litanies were made accessible outside the confines of the monastery. The history of the textual transmission of universal intercessory litanies suggests that intercessory prayer for the needs of society was hardly perceived as the exclusive reserve of the monastic praying communities.\(^{62}\) In the first five centuries of the church’s public worship, the \textit{Oratio fidelium} was placed at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful, but at the end of the fifth century, Pope Gelasius (492-496) suppressed it and replaced it with a litany known as the \textit{Deprecationes Gelasii} (or \textit{Gelasianae}) containing a long list of intentions to which the people would audibly respond \textit{kyrie eleison}. During the pontificate of Gregory the Great, the petitions were omitted altogether and only the responses, the \textit{kyrie eleison}, were retained. The exception was Good Friday, on which the \textit{Orationes Sollemnes} were said, a long litany of general petitions which is considered the only remnant of the original \textit{Oratio fidelium}. Textual evidence for the ancient \textit{Oratio fidelium} of around the year 400 is thought to be found in two missals of Irish origin from the late eighth century: the Stowe Missal and a missal from Fulda, now lost but preserved in a sixteenth-century printed edition.\(^{63}\) What is most interesting, though, is a point missed in this narrative, focused as it is only on the development and disappearance of the \textit{Oratio fidelium}. This is that the supposed successor to the \textit{Orationes fidelium}, the \textit{Deprecatio Gelasii} of the fifth century, is a prayer the text for which we are entirely reliant not on contemporaneous missals but on Carolingian \textit{libelli precum}. In monastic \textit{scriptoria} of the early ninth century, these unofficial collections of diverse prayers for personal devotion began to appear which showed much interest in preserving and transmitting the universal intercessions associated with Pope Gelasius.


\(^{63}\) Lapidge, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Litany of Saints}, p. 4.
The Deprecatio Gelasii opens with ‘Dicamus omnes: Domine exaudi et misere’. It then invokes the Trinity, and proceeds to enumerate a list of petitions, including prayer for the church constituted throughout the whole earth, priests and ministers, for truth and wisdom, those who have consecrated themselves to chastity and spiritual labour, rulers, fecundity and rain and good conditions for harvest, catechumens, the weak and infirmed, those caught up in errors of the world or heresy, those making pilgrimage, for pious works, all who have gathered for worship, the rescue of souls and forgiveness of sins, and rest for faithful dead.\textsuperscript{64}

The text is preserved in three ninth-century manuscripts, all thought to have come from a common monastic source, and a brief examination of the context in which the Deprecatio Gelasii is placed in each codex raises some questions about how this general intercession was seen and used in the ninth-century monastic environment.\textsuperscript{65}

The earliest manuscript to contain the prayer is a ninth-century florilegium from Saint-Denis, combining a book of prayers wrongly attributed to Alcuin (Officia per ferias) and Isidore’s Synonyma.\textsuperscript{66} The Officia per ferias was written for a layman to practice the unceasing prayer of psalmody in the manner of monks. The work suggests several uses of the psalms as outlined by Alcuin in De psalmorum usu, and contains model prayers for each of these usages as well as an abbreviated psalter, and it is here, under the usage of ‘supplication’, that the Deprecatio Gelasii is given. The second manuscript containing the Deprecatio Gelasii was produced Saint-Martial at Limoges in the ninth century. The general intercession is not found

\textsuperscript{64} de Clerck, La ‘Prière Universelle’, inserted appendix ‘DG’.


in the clerical and instructional section of the codex containing *expositiones missae* and *ordines* for the Mass, but rather in the second part which forms a collection of prayers for private use similar to the *Officia per ferias*.67 Here again, the *Deprecatio Gelasii* is given under the section discussing psalms of supplication. Finally, the *Deprecatio Gelasii* is found in a codex produced at the abbey of Saint-Eloi in Noyon around 850.68 This codex includes a series of penitential prayers and indications of psalms uses for various days of the week, a collection of diverse prayers, especially intercessory in nature,69 a list of psalms uses of Alcuin, the *De officiis divinis* of Isidore and prayers for different moments of the day, followed by another collection of diverse prayers and psalms. At the end of this is placed the *Deprecatio Gelasii*, followed by a long alphabetic prayer, and then a litany of saints, followed finally by four hymns for the office, other diverse prayers, and prayers for the Offices of Vespers and Lauds. The interesting thing to observe in all of our first witnesses to this litany of Gelasius is that despite its noted public form and historic public use, consisting as it does of petitions followed by response, all set in the first person plural, Carolingian compilers consistently and without exception placed it in the context of personal devotional prayer. General supplication for the world had become an activity for the discipline of private, extra-liturgical prayer.

The interest of the compilers of Frankish devotional prayer books in taking general intercessions from public ceremony and adapting them for the work of lay or monastic private devotion is evident in another prayer of universal supplication, the ‘*Oratio Isidori pro omnibus Christianis*’. Beginning with ‘*Pie et exaudibilis Domine Deus noster Jesu Christe*’, it

69 This section (folios 75-84) has been edited and discussed by S. Waldhoff in ‘Memoria im privaten Beten des frühen Mittelalters: Anhand der Gebetstexte der Handschrift Paris, Bibl. Mazarine, ms. 512’, *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 38/39 (1996/97), 173-250.
begins by invoking the intercessions of Mary, angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, virgins, confessors, monks, and all the faithful in heaven, and then proceeds to pray for such matters as peace, correct teaching, remission for sins, health for the sick, reparation for the lapsed, safety for those sailing or traveling, liberation for the oppressed, joy for those suffering, charity for those in discord, faith for the unfaithful, and rest for the dead. This prayer appears in the earliest *libellus precum* known on the Continent, the so-called Fleury Prayer Book produced as early as 815 in the diocese of Passau (Bavaria), possibly at the monastery of Mondsee, but reaching the abbey at Fleury at an early date, and at the very latest by the eleventh century.70 Within this *libellus precum*, alongside primarily prayers of private penitential concern of obvious Irish and Anglo-Saxon influence, we find this general intercession of Isidore.71 The similarity of this prayer to a seventh-century Spanish liturgical formula (*Dei omnipotentis misericordiam*) suggests that a late-eighth or early-ninth-century Frankish monk adapted it for use in a personal devotional context, deliberately continuing the intercessory function and content of the ancient, public *Oratio fidelium*.72 So again in this text of universal prayer, we find a ceremonial general liturgy transmitted within a monastic scriptorum for private devotional use.

Furthermore, monastic scribes considered the litany of saints – used in so many rites and rituals of a clearly public sort – fit for isolation and insertion into *libelli precum* independent of its intended public usage. Litanies of saints consisted always of a list of saints, martyrs, confessors, monks, and virgins to be invoked, then a section asking for deliverance from (ab)

---


71 PL 101:1387. This prayer is also contained in the early Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 512 mentioned above, placed alongside intercessory prayers for *familiares* and *amici*. See no. 8 (folio 77), ed. Waldhoff, ‘Memoria im privaten Beten des frühen Mittelalters’, p. 8.

evil and adversities, a section of petitions for (ut) various intentions such as for peace, health, rain, forgiveness of sins, preservation of truth, etc., and a section recounting the major moments in the life of Christ by which (per) the prayers would be mercifully heard. Intentionally comprehensive in their scope, litanies of saints were fit for public displays of penance and helplessness before the Almighty God. Naturally, with the many official usages which the Carolingians had for the litany of saints, as well as the many synodal decrees mandating the praying of litanies, many litanies of saints are transmitted in early medieval sacramentaries. But these public litanies also found their way into the primarily private libelli precum. A long litany of saints is included in the above-mentioned, earliest continental libellus of Fleury. Another ninth-century libellus contains various prayer formularies, several works and confessio ascribed to Alcuin, Bede’s abbreviated psalter, and finally the litany. More famous is the Psalter of Mondsee, produced in the 780s for a local Bavarian layman but then acquired and used by a community of nuns, possibly at Soissons. The litany of saints, which here includes the earliest extant laudes regiae, enters as part of the additional material of private prayers added to the psalter around 800. Interesting too is the inclusion of the litany of saints in the Prayer Book of Saint-Emmeram, written at Regensburg early in the ninth century, in a libellus precum containing many of the other prayers shared by the Officia per ferias and the Fleury Prayer Book. Here, the prayers are inserted alongside an
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73 See the comprehensive study by A. Krüger, Litanei-Handschriften der Karolingerzeit, MGH Hilfsmittel 24 (Hanover, 2007).
74 Ibid, p. 21 for the many synodal decrees regarding the praying of litany of saints.
76 Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 184, ed. PL 101:1391-95; M. Coens, ‘Les litanies bavoroises du Libellus precum dit de Fleury’, Analecta Bollandiana 77 (1959), 373-391
78 Lapidge, Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints, p. 34-5.
ascetical tract ‘De his quae mundi amore praepediuntur’, Augustine’s sermon on Ps. 118, and various hymns including the ‘Benedictio trium puerorum’, the Te deum, and the Gloria. Clearly, this is a compilation deriving much from the monastic office, but also intended at parts for use by the laity.

Significantly, these libelli precum resist attempts at typecasting. They can be classified as existing neither solely for laity, nor solely for monks, and although their primary function as anthologies of prayer for personal use is indicated by recurring phrases such as ‘orationes peculiares’, ‘orationes privatae’, ‘orationes furtivae’, it is not always easy to distinguish between liturgical usage or private devotion because of the obviously liturgical form of many of the texts. Equally, the intercessory prayers included in Carolingian prayer books stand out for their striking diversity and defy attempts at generalization, firstly, with regard to their intended users. While the ‘Oratio Isidori pro omnibus Christianis’ included in the Fleury Prayer Book is free of rubrics and could be used equally by a layman as by a monk or nun, the same prayer in Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 512 is explicitly provided for the use of monk-priests to carry on their task of memoria in private after the corporate psalmody. Diverse too are the sources of the prayers contained. In the Fleury Prayer Book, some prayers come straight from the texts used for the Mass, as in the ‘Oratio pro familiaribus nostris et cunctis fidelibus defunctis’ and ‘Oratio pro defunctis’ derived from the eighth-century Gelasian, while others of evidently Irish provenance have more autonomous and rather

80 Vocabulary found in the prayer books of Fleury, Saint-Martial, and Saint-Emmeram, for example. See H. Barré, Prières Anciennes de l’Occident à la Mère du Sauveur (Paris, 1963), pp. 3-5.
mysterious origins, as in the various prayers ascribed to Church Fathers (‘Oratio sancti Hilarii’, ‘Oratio sancti Joannis evangelistae’, ‘Oratio sancti Martini’, ‘Oratio sancti Amrbosii’, etc.).\textsuperscript{82} Within the Mazarine codex itself, there is also notable diversity for how the intercessions are to be prayed: while certain intercessory prayers are clearly meant to follow a liturgical hour, other prayers stand alone and are not accompanied by rubrics.\textsuperscript{83} The Deprecatio Gelasii in this codex is not even found within this body of prayers, but near the end of the entire codex away from the rest of the intercessory prayers.

Crucially, then, Carolingian monasteries were responsible for the textual preservation and transmission of general intercessions and placing them within a framework notable for its diversity of users and uses. On the one hand, Carolingian monks were interested in bringing the public ceremonial practice of general intercessions into their discipline of private prayer. At the same time, this was a practice that could equally engage a layperson as a monk or nun. In other words, it was acceptable within the vision of the monastic compilers of anthologies of prayer that the activity of praying for the general needs of human society should not be defined by strict boundaries: they could be prayed out loud or under the voice, in a choral setting or a non-choral setting, by monastics or by laity. Although the monastic stamp on the prayer collections may have been strong, the intercessions for the world which they contained were seen as open property, the chosen platform for textual transmission deliberately flexible and adaptable.

The open-handed approach of those who were called specialists in intercession toward the texts of universal prayers raises an interesting question about the role of monastic

\textsuperscript{82} PL 101:1338-1416.

intercession in the Carolingian world. The Carolingian age was one in which the monastic ideal was the standard for the devout life, as we have seen in the case of lay rulers and nobility. Dhuoda tells her warrior son William to do essentially the same thing expected of monks with regard to prayer, in language thoroughly steeped in the traditions of the books we have just surveyed. She tells William to pray for all ranks within the church, for bishops and priests, for kings and magnates, for enemies, travelers, those sailing at sea, for the sick, for those in hardship, those in poverty, for those in error, for all the faithful deceased. Impressive is the idea she has that she and her son – laypersons of the warrior class – could and should pray for all mankind, as monastics did. The spread of *libelli precum* in the Carolingian age, together with the universal intercessions they contained, is a vivid symbol of the reality of the spread of the monastic ideal, characterized as it was by its intercessory function, among those who were not monks. This was a time when Alcuin could write to Gisla, the daughter of Charlemagne, about the efficacy of her prayers. To the woman who, though not a nun had compared herself to the vowed women to whom Jerome wrote many letters about the monastic life, Alcuin wrote about Jesus’ promise in the Gospel of John that he would give to those who ask in his name whatever they sought: ‘“Because I go to the Father: and whatsoever you shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do.” In these words, he promises great hope to those praying’. This is a point not to missed when speaking of an age commonly assumed to have been characterized by an insistence on strict lines of division along social occupations and responsibility. On the contrary, *bellatores* and *potentes* like Dhuoda, William, and Gisla have here access to the same texts, same practices, and same responsibility in prayer as the monastic *Dei servi*.

---


The meaning of monastic prayer in society

Charlemagne’s own reflections about the meaning of the general three-day fasts he called and the role of monks in them are revealing about how monastic prayer fitted into the larger culture of prayer in society. In December of 810, Charlemagne interpreted a famine as a sign of God’s displeasure, and commanded everyone except the infirm, very old, or very young to fast and abstain from meat and wine and beer for three days, and clerics and monks to sing fifty psalms each day.86 The following year (811), Charlemagne reflected on the significance of this event in a Capitula about Matters to be Discussed with Bishops and Abbots.87 Following the collective prayers of penance and dedication to God of all of society, he opens, this was now the year in which everyone should undertake to improve his way of life.88 Accordingly, those who had professed to have left the world should seriously examine whether they had actually done so.89 Charlemagne goes on list a number of corruptions he has observed among clerics, abbots, and monks, not least the misplaced attention and greed of those who ‘allegedly on the grounds of love of God and the saints and martyrs and confessors’ seek the bones and relics of saints in order to accumulate more property for their monasteries, and who desire to ‘have more men rather than good men’, who take pleasure ‘not so much in virtuous men but in large numbers of men’, and who make more effort to ensure that a cleric or monk ‘should chant and read well than that he should live a just and blessed way’.90 Interestingly, far from being a commentary about the exclusive privileges of monasteries which placed them in a position of spiritual superiority over the rest of society and which maximized the power of their

---

86 Riculf, Epistola, MGH Cap 1, no. 127, p. 249.
88 ‘Cap 1. Primo commemorandum est, quod anno praeterito tria triduana ieiunia fecimus, Deum orando ut ille nobis dignaretur ostendere, in quibus conversatio nostra coram illo emendari debuisset: quod nunc facere desideramus’. MGH Cap 1, no. 72, p. 162.
89 Cap. 4, ibid, p. 163.
intercessions (vast numbers and large choruses, monumental buildings, saints’ relics, liturgical perfection), Charlemagne’s capitulary is an assertion of his belief that in a Christian society, what was to set monks and nuns apart was their rigorous example of moral conversion (‘emendatio morum’). Every Christian, he wrote, ought to think seriously about what they have promised to Christ in baptism and what they have renounced: monks have a duty to offer ‘an example of that promise and that renunciation in their own lives’. Alongside all the common people who made up a praying society, monks were not set apart by virtue of their intercessions on behalf of everyone else, but most basically, by the fact of their being especially and wholly dedicated to God, their position to show more immediately, and to a fuller extent, than anyone else their promise to Christ and their renunciation of the world.

Rather than defining monasticism in terms of how a life of prayer was socially useful or beneficial, monastic writers were, instead, keen to divorce prayer from any criterion of outward orientation or functionalism. Monks at ninth-century Fleury, existing in impressively large numbers on a vast estate, renowned as the special possessors of the intercessory power associated with a particularly prestigious patron saint at a particularly prestigious abbey, produced written reflections which emphasized the need to detach their vocation from any of these external things. An early ninth-century codex produced at Fleury comprised extracts from around fifty distinct patristic and early medieval works on the topic of monastic asceticism, drawing from sources as wide-ranging as Athanasius’ Liber de observationibus monachorum, Eucherius of Lyons’ Exhortatio ad monachos, Isidore’s Sententiarum, Caesarius’ Sermones, and pseudo-Alcuin’s De psalmorum usu. In briefly

---

91 Cap. 9, ibid. ‘(If (this capitulary, no. 72)’, Janet Nelson concludes, ‘especially, sounds a shade anachronistic – a twelfth-century appeal avant la lettre? – that may be because we have yet to attune our ears to authentic tones of Carolingian spirituality, and, as ground-bass, the voice of Charlemagne’.

92 Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reginensis lat. 140, described by A. Wilmart, Codices Reginenses Latini 1-250 (Vatican, 1937), pp. 337-42. See also L. Rudge, ‘Texts and Contexts: Women’s
surveying two sets of extracts contained in the codex, we are drawn quickly to the particular theme that the identity of the monk should rest not on the fact of his title or place of residence, but on something much less external.

In a set of extracts which the compiler has titled *Sententiae de opusculis sancti Hieronimi ad monachos*, various quotations from Jerome’s letters have been strung together. The compiler has taken special interest in Jerome’s consistent teaching that what makes one a monk is not the outward things but the substantiation of his vow by his actions and disposition.

Some undertake to renounce the world only by a change of clothes and verbal profession, and not the substance. These men have changed nothing of their former way of life, and their property has increased rather than diminished. They have the same servants and the same banqueting table, among crowds and with swarms of servants, they claim for themselves the name of solitaries.

Another quotation comes from Jerome’s warning to Pammachius not to rest smugly on the fact that he, the leader of the patrician order, is an example to others by his conversion to the monastic life: ‘When a noble man has converted, it should not be for him an occasion for pride but for humility’. This danger of boasting in the honourable status of an ascetic greatly concerned the compiler, who quotes similarly from Jerome’s letter to Marcella in which he describes the virtues, fame, and prestige of the monks and nuns at his community in Bethlehem. Even in such a place, ‘the first virtue of the monks is this, that they do not flatter


themselves concerning their profession or their chastity’. The extract of Sententiae from Jerome’s letters offers the insistent message that the monk cannot define his value merely by virtue of his profession. What is apparent is the anxiety of the compiler about the profession of the monk being nothing more than a lie: ‘A perfect servant of Christ has nothing apart from Christ. If he has anything else, he is not perfect, and if he is not perfect when he has promised before God that he would be perfect, he lies. “And the mouth that lies kills the soul”’. This message is underscored by another set of extracts from Gregory the Great regarding the work of monks. Here, the compiler has taken pains to select excerpts from Gregory about the need for the monk to substantiate his vow:

Some monks flee from the action of the world, but they exercise themselves in no virtues. These, indeed, sleep from stupefaction, not from serious design, and therefore they never behold the things of the interior, because they have laid their head, not upon a stone, but upon the earth..... And thus under the likeness of Judaea the Prophet bewails the soul stupefied by indolence, where he says, “The adversaries saw her, and did mock at her sabbaths (sabbata).”

These selections of excerpts from Jerome and Gregory show an apprehensiveness at ninth-century Fleury about the monk abusing his ‘sabbata’, resting content in his superior position as a monk in contra-distinction to the rest of society without any of the interior work that should accompany it.

98 Folios 66-72v. This compilation has been edited by J. Leclercq, ‘Un centon de Fleury sur les devoirs des moines’, Studia anselmiana philosophia theologica 20, Analecta monastica 1 (Vatican City, 1948), pp. 75-90. The text is drawn mostly from Moralia in Job, Homilies on the Gospels and Homilies on the Book of Ezekiel, and the Regula Pastoralis.
100 A further ascetical treatise in all likelihood produced at Fleury during the same period and containing similar themes is Orléans Codex 233. It has been falsely attributed to Benedict of Aniane on
Prayer was thus to be defined squarely in terms of the ‘otia monastica’, an actively-cultivated interior ‘sabbatum’ of the heart ultimately oriented toward contemplation, which beginning with patristic tradition and into the Middle Ages was the essential definition of prayer. The section ‘On Prayer’ with which Smaragdus opens his Diadema monachorum is an emphatic attempt to divorce prayer from any external criteria such as words, performance, or reception by others.

If one should pray silently and the voice is mute, though it may be hidden from man, it cannot be hidden from God, who is present in knowledge. It is better to pray with silence in the heart without the sound of the voice, than only with words without focus of mind.... For prayer is more appropriately offered from a hidden place, when it is produced such that it is known to God alone. Indeed neither is the abundant speech of prayer brought to God, but rather the abundant and sincere intention of prayer. Indeed some had asked Abbot Macarius saying, ‘In what way ought we to pray?’ And the old man said to them, ‘Our work is not to speak much in prayer, but to extend our hands frequently, and to say, “Lord, as you wish, and as you know, have mercy on me.” Thus the Blessed Benedict said, “Not in many words, but in purity of heart, and compunction of tears, we know we will be heard.”

This approach to prayer was seen, crucially, to lead to the monk’s one legitimate claim to spiritual authority. For a life of genuine sabbatum, of quiet but sincere hidden prayer would generate profound wisdom. The notion of monks as the ‘true philosophers’ of the age whose life of total prayer would give them a true wisdom as opposed to the false wisdom of the world is largely derived from Origen’s commentary on the Song of Songs, known and widely disseminated in early medieval monasteries through the Latin translation of Rufinus, in what account of the fact that it was attached to Concordia Regularum. For edition, provenance, authorship, and analysis, see R. Étaix, ‘Un florilège ascétique attribué indument à Saint Benoît d’Aniane’, Revue bénédictine 88 (1978), 247-260.
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Jean Leclercq has termed the ‘Origenist revival’ of the Carolingian age. In the prologue to this commentary, Origen set out a schematic division of spiritual progress that would help monks throughout the Latin Middle Ages understand the role of their ‘sabbaths’ of prayer vis-à-vis the rest of lay society. Origen divided spiritual progress into three stages according to the three works by Solomon: Proverbs teaches ‘moral science’ (learning the rules for obedience and living, as symbolized by Abraham), Ecclesiastes teaches ‘natural science’ (learning the way of nature and how to distinguish the useless and vain from the profitable and useful, as symbolized by Isaac), and the Song of Songs teaches ‘inspective science’ (the love of divine and celestial things, leading to true communion with God, as symbolized by Jacob). Origen used this structure to argue that the desire for heavenly knowledge – divine wisdom – was a fundamental motive for the monastic life: only when one has learned the first subject (how to amend his behaviour and keep the commandments), and thereafter learned the second (how empty and transitory the world is), will he be able to contemplate and desire those things that are eternal and celestial.

Carolingian monastic writers suggested that those in the monastic state had the best potential for attaining this final state. Alcuin’s definition of monasticism relied heavily on the notion that monks have more than anybody else an experience of the beatific life, for only monks realize the highest state of ‘heavenly conversation’, ‘cling to celestial things’, and ‘always tend

---

106 Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum* 7 (‘De sapientia quae Christus est’), PL 102:604-5.
toward the celestial’. Hildemar asserted that the *Rule of Benedict* offered preliminary instruction in ethics as well as the prospect of future spiritual progress in the three stages described by Origen and exemplified by Solomon’s books. Benedict of Aniane suggested that monks read, in addition to Jerome and Gregory the Great, the writings of Origen through his master Ammonius, and his *Munimenta fidei* shows his heavy influence. This is small wonder, for Origen had asserted that ‘inspective science’ – reserved for the very few who had learned the moral and natural – was about ‘(seeking and knocking) at Wisdom’s door’, begging God to make him ‘a partaker of that Wisdom who said, “I stretched out my words and ye did not hear”’. Origen then explained that ‘stretching out his words’ meant that, in granting wisdom, God bestows a largeness of heart (‘*latitudinem cordis*’, and also ‘*dilatatur... cor*’), a phrase that surely resonated with Carolingian monastic reforms who knew so well that same phrase from the *Rule of Benedict*.

Both Alcuin and Benedict of Aniane, defining the monastic life of contemplative prayer in terms of progress toward wisdom (*sapientia*), regarded the accumulation of wisdom to be the monk’s contribution to society. Alcuin’s efforts to introduce the monastic school as part of his royal service to Charlemagne’s court was in fact based on his belief that monks, properly

---


intent on the genuine ascent of the soul and the yearning for ‘Wisdom’s house’, were the driving force of educational improvement and a revival of learning within Frankish society in general.\(^{112}\) The so-called *Epistola de litteris colendis*, probably written or edited on Alcuin’s initiative, demonstrates that even in such a practical matter as education, he believed that the appropriate monastic contribution to society lay in something much less tangible.\(^{113}\) The good grammar which monks should learn was not for the sake of good grammar. Rather, a monk should study the art of letters because it would point him to a world of grammatical categories and etymology outside of the immediate scriptural text which would allow him to understand the meaning behind the words: to understand figures of speech, tropes and other grammatical units was to penetrate deep spiritual mysteries. Thus the monk was to study grammar in order to and arrive at a higher capacity for contemplation, ‘so that whoever should desire to see you … on account of the reputation of your holy way of life may be edified as much by your wisdom [sapientia] as by your appearance’.\(^{114}\) In a similar vein, Benedict of Aniane proposed wisdom (sapientia) as the one thing possessed by monks which made the monastic life of prayer relevant to society at large. For wisdom

“is more beautiful than the sun, and above all the order of the stars: being compared with the light, she is found before it. She reacheth everywhere, by reason of her purity. For she is a vapour of the power of God, and a certain pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty God: and therefore no defiled thing cometh into her. And being but one, she can do all things: and remaining in herself the same, she reneweth all things, and through nations conveyeth herself into holy souls, she maketh the friends of God and prophets”....\(^{115}\)

---


\(^{113}\) Karoli epistole de litteris colendis, MGH Cap 1, p. 78-79.

\(^{114}\) Ibid 29, p. 79: ‘ut, quicunque vos propter … sanctae conversationis nobilitatem ad videndum expetierit, sicut de aspectu vestro aedificatur visus, ita quoque de sapientia vestra’.

Monks, wrote Benedict of Aniane in a pastoral letter to the monk Guarnarius, were especially charged with learning wisdom well in order that true wisdom may spread throughout the world:

“1, wisdom, dwell in counsel, and am present in learned thoughts; playing in the world, my delights were to be with the children of men.” ... Thus David sings, “Blessed is the man whom thou shalt instruct, O Lord: and shalt teach him out of thy law.” He is indeed blessed, since by learning the blameless law of God “they that are learned shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that instruct many to justice, as stars for all eternity.”

With the capacity of possessing true wisdom, Guarnarius (should he stay at wisdom’s door and hold onto correct faith) could by virtue of his monastic life of prayer shine brightly and bring many to salvation. This link, between the contemplative life and the cultivation of wisdom, was actively fostered during the eighth and ninth centuries as a basis of the Virgin Mary’s own intercessory efficacy. Increasingly linked to the sapiential literature and described as a ‘Wisdom’s house’, Mary had nurtured the divine seed, literally storing within her the Wisdom of God and literally giving birth to righteousness and virtue. It was for this reason, Paul the...

---


117 Remigius of Auxerre, Commentarius in Matthaeum ‘Homilia 4’ (PL 131:888), tying Mary to the ‘wisdom’ of Proverbs 9:1: ‘Haec sapientia itaque aedificavit sibi domum, vel matrem de qua sumpsit carnem, vel corpus in Virgine’. For sapiential Marian liturgy emerging during the seventh and eighth centuries, see G. Catta, ‘Sedes Sapientiae’, Benediktinische Monatschrift 34 (1958), 111-20. The epistolaries of Corbie and Murbach (c. 700) give Ecclesiasticus 24:11-13, 15-20 as a lesson for both the Nativity of Mary and her Assumption; Alcuin’s lectionary gives Wisdom 7:30-8:4 as one of the three lessons for the Assumption of Mary; Proverbs 8:22-31 became the lection for the feast of the Virgin’s Conception and that of her birthday; Haimo of Auxerre, states that Ecclesiasticus 24:14, which pertains ‘to the praise of eternal Wisdom’, has been applied ‘by learned and catholic fathers to the feast of the ever-virgin Mary...’. Alcuin famously conflated the biblical Sapientia with Mary and Boethius’ Lady Philosophy. See B. Newman, God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry and Belief in the Middle Ages (Philadelphia, 2003), pp. 194-205.
Deacon (c. 720-799) suggested, that her intercessions were especially called on, for her contemplative prayer which had nurtured sapientia had given her a place above the angels.\(^{118}\)

To describe monastic intercessory prayer as an exercise in obtaining grace for society and an attempt to make the contemplative life functionally relevant or socially useful would be to distort the precious theory of prayer as the Carolingians received it from the Fathers and repeated it themselves, and be a fundamental misunderstanding of the Carolingian monastic ideal. For monastic prayer as traditionally expressed, and as Carolingian writers affirmed, was not only about the result of securing tangible benefits, but was about the process of ‘(seeking and knocking) at Wisdom’s door’.\(^{119}\) Such entreating was the basic position of the monk at prayer, and crucially, it was what reconciled his private, contemplative prayer, with the litanic prayer performed by all society for all social concerns. Indeed, it was a fundamental and typically monastic definition of prayer that all forms of it – private, public, contemplative, intercessory, performed by oneself or in unison with all society, for oneself or for all social needs – was characterized by the humble posture of seeking from God and desiring to receive.

Thus, the same biblical image and text were used by monastic writers to describe prayer as varied as the public Rogation Days and the claustral monastic psalmody. In his *Expositio libri comitis*, Smaragdus compiled exegetical works to support the lections for the Sundays and major feasts of the liturgical year, and included a section for the Major Litanies. The lesson (Luke 11:5-12), and Bede’s commentary which is used to support it, stresses litanic prayer as the process of persistently seeking and knocking at the Lord’s door, a process which makes one ready to receive the desired gifts:


\(^{119}\) See above, p. 217, fn. 109.
“And I say to you, Ask and it shall be given, etc.” The comparison is by a minor degree. For if a human friend rises from his bed, and gives having been compelled not by friendship but by exasperation, how much more does God give, who gives what it sought most generously and without exasperation! But He wishes to be sought, so that those who seek may be made worthy of His gifts. And lest a friend coming from the road should perish from starvation, that is, lest the soul recently repentant of all the vanity of his errors dwindle away through a prolonged lack of spiritual desire, let us seek the dishes of the word by which we may be nourished, let us seek the friend who gives, let us knock on the door through which the strayed are served. Indeed, He who does not deceive in His promises has given, and gives, great hope. “For every one that asketh, receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.”

Precisely this same language is applied by Benedict of Aniane to the routine rounds of monastic psalmody. He inserted a little-known fragment of a monastic rule, which he titled Ex Regula Patrum de accedendo ad Deum, into his Codex and Concordia as support for the RB’s instructions on the discipline of psalmody:

“Come ye to him and be enlightened: and your faces shall not be confounded.” It is always necessary to approach, so that enlightenment shall follow the approach. If we do not approach, we are not enlightened.... We should be able to say this: “I sought the Lord, and he heard me.” Indeed by seeking and asking with all intention, he who exteriorly detaches himself from the desires of the world and interiorly enriches himself in all contrition of the heart through the ardour of compunction is heard. “Seek, he says, and it shall be given to you.” If “every one that asketh, receiveth,” why, with the cowardice of the flesh hindering us and the weight of our sins obstructing us, do we not seek each day what we shall possess in eternity?

---

120 Smaragdus, Expositio Libri Comitis, PL 102:306: “’Et ego vobis dico, Petite et dabitur vobis, etc.’ Comparatio est a minore. Si enim amicus homo surgit de lecto, et dat non amicitia, sed taedio compulsus, quanto magis dat Deus, qui sine taedio largissime donat quod petitur! Sed ad hoc se peti vult, ut capaces donorum ejus fiunt, qui petunt. Ne itaque de via veniens amicus inedia dispereat, hoc est, ne animus nuper ab erroris sui vanitate resipiscens, desiderii spiritualis diutius inopia tabescat, petamus epulas verbi, quibus alatur, quaeramus amicum qui det, pulsemus ostium quo servantur absconsi. Magnam enim spem dedit, et dat ille, qui promittendo non decipit. ‘Omnis enim qui petit, accipit, et qui quaerit invenit, et pulsanti aperietur’.”

Finally, this is the same language applied broadly to the entire monastic program in Benedict’s *De Modis Amiciciarum*:

> Therefore seek wisdom with persistent prayer.... Knock with perseverance in vigils, and the door of the kingdom will be opened to you... With true agreement, "Every one that asketh, receiveth: and he that seeketh, findeth: and to him that knocketh it shall be opened...". 122

Prayer, defined as the act of asking, seeking, and knocking, was what monastic writers meant by the instruction ‘*psallite sapienter* (pray the psalms wisely)’, and it was a disposition to be applied equally to public litanies performed with all of Frankish society as to private contemplative prayer offered in a monk’s more mystical moments. 123 This posture of expectancy and desire for God and His good gifts was the defining characteristic of monastic prayer, and at a time when all members of Carolingian society were expected to take up a stance of expectant supplication in the praying of litanies, it is precisely why the monk’s life of prayer was, by its very nature, socially relevant and meaningful. It is only in appreciating this basic monastic disposition that we can begin to understand why, to repeat Janet Nelson’s observation, the ‘activities of this tiny minority were credited with that capacity to benefit the vast majority: as Charlemagne declared to his people at large, “We believe the life and chastity of monks to be the source of the greatest hope of salvation for all Christians”’. 124

---

122 Benedict of Aniane, *De modis amiciciarum et vera amicicia*, ed. Leclercq, ‘Les Munimenta Fidei’, p. 62: ‘Pete ergo indefessa prece sapientiam, et accipies longitudinem dierum et annos vitae.... Pulsa vigili instantia, et aperietur tibi ianua regni.... Veritate adstipulante: *Omnis qui petit accipit et qui quaerit invenit et pulsanti aperietur*...’. See also Leclercq’s comments in relation to the Song of Songs in *Love of Learning*, p. 85: ‘(W)hat we know of eschatological desire in milieux consecrated to a life of prayer sufficiently explains their special affection for the Canticle of Canticles. What they saw in it above all is the expression of that desire. The Canticle is the poem of the pursuit which is the basis for the whole program of monastic life: *quaerere Deum*...’.

123 RB 19 and Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia Regularum 25*, giving special emphasis to the meaning of ‘*psallite sapienter*’.

Conclusion

As a preface to his collection of exegetical works supporting the church’s lectionary, Smaragdus composed a *carmen* about the beauty of the divine law which ends with the following verses:

May we do well, with the divine seed having been sown and wet with the dew of heaven, to plow the cultivations of the teachers, for the rich field of the heart to render fruit a hundred-fold.\(^1\)

Conventionally, patristic authors had used the metaphor of the seed producing fruit to distinguish the three states of female chastity, with virginity, widowhood, and marriage compared to the hundred-fold, sixty-fold, and thirty-fold fruit respectively.\(^2\) In the seventh century, Aldhelm revised this scheme to account for a new category of ‘*castitas*’, denoting one who had once been married but who had later spurned marriage for the religious life. The same metaphor was used by Anselm of Laon in the twelfth century to distinguish those of the contemplative order from the thirty- and sixty-fold fruit produced by those living the active life.\(^3\) Throughout the high Middle Ages, the image was applied to denote contemplatives as the best of the seed scattered by the heavenly sower to bring forth fruit a hundredfold, where the married do so only thirtyfold.\(^4\)

---

So it is altogether significant that, rather than applying the seed metaphor categorically to describe the status of monks vis-à-vis the non-chaste and the non-contemplative, Smaragdus was interested in the ‘rich field of the heart’, the monk’s own interior life. The metaphor runs throughout Smaragdus’ works, and we can get a clear sense of what he meant by it in his commentary to the RB. The monk obeys God, he writes, when ‘having received the seed of the word with a good, a very good heart, a heart purged from all the dregs of malice, we bring forth fruit, now thirtyfold, now sixtyfold, and now a hundredfold’. The monk ‘first purges the field of his heart and body from vices, and afterwards casts the seeds of virtues’, and through daily disciplines, meditation on Scripture, and mental vigilance, ‘which is like cultivating a field, earnestly instructs the secret places of his heart’. These ‘secret places’ of the heart were those which most concerned Origen when he wrote about the practice of prayer:

For the angels of God, as the tillers and cultivators of our hearts, assist now and search to see if there is any of us a mind of this sort, so solicitous, so attentive, which has received the word of God as divine seed, with all eagerness. They search to see if it shows fruit at once, when we rise for prayer, that is, if we collect and gather our thoughts in order to pray to God, if the mind does not wander and its thoughts fly about.... If anyone, I say, senses that his entreaty is directed and focused... this one knows by means of the angels who is assisting him that the first fruits of his offering have been brought to the great and true high priest, Christ Jesus our Lord....


6 Ibid, pp. 32 and 29, trans. Barry, Commentary, p. 85 and 80: ‘prius cordis et corporis sui agrum a vitiis purgat et postea virtutum semina iactat’; ‘arcana cordis sui per cotidiana exercitia, per legis meditationem, per vigilantiam mentis velut per agriculturam instanter erudit’.

7 Origen, Homiliae in Numeris 11.9.2-3, ed. W. Baehrens, Homélies sur les Nombres, vol. 2, SC 442, p. 66, trans. T. Scheck, Homilies on Numbers (Downers Grove, IL, 2009), p. 61-62: ‘Assistunt enim et nunc angeli Dei cultores et agricolae cordis nostri et requirunt, si est in aliquo nostrum huiuscei modi mens tam sollicita, tam intenta, quae verbum Dei tamquam semen divinum tota aviditate susceperit, si fructum statim ut ad orationem surgimus, ostenderit, id est si collectis et congregatis intra se sensibus oret Deum, si non evagetur mente et cogitationibus evolet.... Si quis, inquam, intentam et directam sensoris obsecrationem suam... hic se noverit per angelum, qui assistit altari, obtulisse immolationis suae primitias pontifici magno et vero, Christo Iesu Domino’ nostro...’. For textual transmission to the Latin West from Cassiodorus’ Variorum, see W. Baehrens, Überlieferung und Textgeschichte der lateinisch erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament (Leipzig 1916).
For Origen, a wandering mind and fleeting thoughts during prayer were evidence of an unpurged will, and were subject to scrutiny and judgment by both the angels and by Christ;\(^8\) Benedict of Aniane emphasized this sentiment in his florilegium of patristic extracts.\(^9\) Throughout this study, I have insisted that the cultivation of the heart remained an important aspect of the monk’s increasingly ritualized prayers in the eighth and ninth centuries.

It is this emphasis on the ‘secret places of the heart’ – and the careful scrutiny of Christ of the purity within these secret places – which Peter Brown has identified as heralding the ‘end of Antiquity’ over the course of the early Middle Ages. Where Christ had previously been seen as an absolute emperor wielding the severe power of judgment though tempered by acts of imperial amnesty, the image of Christ in the seventh century became increasingly one of a pastoral abbot searching the hearts of men to establish the true spiritual condition of each person.\(^10\) The seventh century marked the final stages of what Brown called ‘the “peccatization” of the world’, that is, ‘the definitive reduction of all experience, of history, politics, and the social order quite as much as the destiny of individual souls, to two universal explanatory principles, sin and repentance’.\(^11\) This development was marked by the increased concern in the early Middle Ages with impurity and purification. The exacting penitential systems of the northern Celtic regions and the introspective tradition of personal responsibility associated with the classical Greco-Roman philosophy combined in the course of the seventh century to create an ‘imaginative structure’ in which what mattered the most was to unveil and manage the ‘hidden things’ of the religious life, to penetrate the secrets of

\(^11\) Ibid, p. 58.
the individual and hold him accountable for them.\textsuperscript{12} We tend to see the role of Carolingian monastic intercession in view of this ‘peccatization of the world’. A system of detailed individual accountability and anxiety over every impurity and the constant need for confession and penance made monks – the very specialists in thought and heart scrutiny – specialists in intercession on behalf of a society consumed with concern for the ‘individual merits’ of ‘individual souls’\textsuperscript{13}

Stopping at this point would be an erroneously individualistic understanding of religious developments in the eighth and ninth centuries, however. What Peter Brown has identified as the ‘peccatization of the world’ suggests the need to relate the early medieval concern with the sin and repentance of the individual to belief about the conversion and regeneration of Frankish society as well as, no less, the entire cosmos.\textsuperscript{14} For the seed metaphor beloved by Smaragdus was used not only to describe the individual’s reception of the divine seed and the cultivation of the field of his inner heart. Augustine’s \textit{De Genesi ad Litteram}, a work of great influence in Carolingian Francia, employed the seed metaphor to describe the process of growth and transformation which God intended for all of his material creation (plants and animals), for the formation and actualization of bodily forms as well as the spiritual conversion of all the cosmos toward Him. Augustine used the idea of seminal reasons (‘rationes seminales’) as a means of explaining how creation could have occurred

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid}, pp. 55 and 58.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid}, p. 59, quoting Boniface, \textit{Epistula} 115, MGH Epp Sel 1, p. 248: ‘Et omne genus humanum et totum mundum [per] animas collectum ante conspectum suum, ut discernere, quid quisque vel boni vel mali egisset nominatim in corpore vivens ea hora et pene omnium vivorum merita narrare potuisset’.
instantaneously and yet only develop and grow over a period of time.\textsuperscript{15} ‘In the seed... there was invisibly present all that would develop in time into a tree’; likewise God through ‘seminal reasons’ endows His creation with all their potentialities.\textsuperscript{16} Although the physical world was created all at once, aspects of it existed merely in potential form and would only develop eventually through time.

Between the sixth and ninth centuries, twenty-one monasteries, including Luxeuil, St. Riquier, St. Amand, Prüm, St. Gall, and others throughout France and Italy, produced or owned a manuscript of Augustine’s \textit{De Genesi ad Litteram}, and a fresh copy of it (Berlin, MS Phillips 1651) was produced for Louis the Pious’ imperial library, suggesting that ninth-century thinkers were thoroughly familiar with this idea of the potential which God had designed as part of created order.\textsuperscript{17} Late in the ninth century, the concept would find its principal investigator in the figure of John Scottus Eriugena.\textsuperscript{18} This is a crucial theory of transformation, tied by Augustine to things as far-ranging as the life cycle of plants and animals, the maturation of faith in the mind of the believer, and the resurrection of the body in the after-life. All these things are understood in terms of their capacity to undergo dynamic

\begin{footnotes}
\item[15] For the basic literature: F-J. Thonnard, ‘Les raisons séminales selon Saint Augustin’, \textit{Proceedings of the X\textsuperscript{1}th International Congress of Philosophy}, Brussels, August 20–26, 1953 (Amsterdam, 1953), XII, pp. 146–52; J. M. Brady, ‘St. Augustine’s Theory of Seminal Reasons’, \textit{New Scholasticism} 38 (1964), 141-58; M. McKeough, \textit{The Meaning of the Rationes Seminales in St. Augustine} (Washington, 1926). The expression \textit{seminales rationes} occurs in \textit{De Genesi ad litteram} IX.17, but terms such as \textit{causales rationes} or \textit{causae primordiales} are frequently used, and the seed metaphor is especially exploited in Book V.


\end{footnotes}
progress caused by the invisible potential God had implanted at the moment of creation.\textsuperscript{19}

Crucially, then, in the ninth-century mindset, an individual’s own development – physical and moral – was tied to a cosmological process that had started at the very beginning of time, embracing all of created life. There was nothing unique about the monk’s own process of conversion and maturation, for it was part of a design for transformation that God had set in place for all the world. For early medieval religious leaders, this concept was readily applicable to matters concerning sin, penance, and purgation, for the equation between individual penance and wider cosmological events was one which Augustine had already made in his \textit{Confessions}. Again relying on Genesis 1, he wrote that sinful man is naturally ‘invisible and unordered’ like the unformed earth, but

\begin{quote}
because your Spirit was borne over the water, your mercy did not abandon our misery, and you said ‘Be light made. Do penance. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Do penance. Be light made.’\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

The individual’s penance is linked to the cosmological appearance of light which overcomes the cosmos’ formless darkness, and every work of individual penance is tied back to this work of wider cosmic significance: ‘Our darkness displeased us, and we were converted to you, and light was made’.\textsuperscript{21}

Ninth-century spiritual leaders found this idea of the relationship between an individual’s own penance, purgation, and regeneration to larger cosmic processes appealing. In his \textit{Ordo}

\begin{flushright}


\end{flushright}
Arno bishop of Salzburg quotes the speech of an anonymous author addressed to those who refuse to believe in the resurrection of the flesh.22

The very elements of the world preach to us the image of resurrection.... (T)hese people say, How can bones and marrow and flesh and hair be restored in resurrection? If they ask these things, they should look at the tiny seeds of giant trees. If they can, they should look at them and say, Where are the massive strength, the stretching branches, the multitude and greenness of leaves, the varieties of flower, the richness, the taste and the smell of fruits? Do the seeds of trees have in them the smell or the taste which the fruit gives when the tree has grown? No. And if things which are not seen in the seed can be produced from it, why worry about the dust of human flesh and whether the form which is not visible in it can be restored from it?23

The ‘seminal reasons’ which Augustine said gave the natural world their life cycles and enabled growth and regeneration were part of the same processes which enabled the regeneration of the human soul and body, and if an individual doubts the resurrection of his flesh, he need only look to the processes of regeneration and transformation in the world outside himself for proof. This was the age of optimism in the potential for renovatio, an optimism marked by the Carolingian zeal for reforms in all dimensions of society and, in the opinion of Walter Ullmann, most symbolically expressed through new interest in the rite of baptism:

According to one of the few undisputed Christian axioms, through the working and infusion of divine grace the baptism of the individual effects a new creature, in other words, baptism has always been understood to bring about a rebirth, a regeneration, a Renaissance of the individual. This individual Renaissance became during the reign of Charlemagne the pattern for a collective Renaissance, that is, the attempt at a regeneration, at a renovatio or renewal, at a rebirth of the Frankish


23 Ipsa ergo mundi elementa, imaginem nobis praedicant resurrectionis.... (D)icunt: Unde ossa et medullae, unde caro et capilli poterunt in resurrectione reparari? Haec itaque requirentes, parva semina ingentium arborum videant atque, si possint, dicant: Ubi in eis latet tanta moles roboris, tanta diversitas ramorum, tanta multitudo et viriditas foliorum, tanta species florum, tanta ubertas, sapor atque odor fructuum? Numquid semina arborum odorem vel saporem habent quem ipse post arbores in suis fructibus proferunt? Si ergo ex semina arboris produci potest quod videri non potest, cur de pulvere carnis humanae diffiditur, quod ex eo reparari forma valeat quae non videtur?
people.... The effect which this Carolingian Renaissance in the social sense was to produce in the public field was a 'baptism' on the largest conceivable scale.24

From the perspective of Carolingian legal theory, Janet Nelson disagrees:

(M)y conclusion is that the limits of the Carolingian renaissance hardly exceeded, even in the ninth century, the dimensions of a religious culture that was largely confined to the clerical and monastic orders – in other words, that the theme of individual Christian rebirth did not serve as a paradigm of a whole societal renaissance.25

And yet, in her stimulating article 'Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?', Nelson does submit that the reign of Charlemagne provided an opening for self-discovery and self-realisation through such developments as private prayer, literacy, reform-minded governance, and an emphasis on morality, and that the scale of this vision was societal:

Yes, Charlemagne had a private life... (I)n the sense of requiring and inspiring an exploration and re-formation of the self by subjects, it was radical. As that private life impacted on and intruded into public life, setting new goals and a new tone, the sum of individual conservationes became a social and cultural transformation that long outlived its impresario. Other private lives were changed.26

In other words, Charlemagne never did expect that his own growth and spiritual renewal as an individual was isolated to himself and those of his court, but rather 'required' the same of his subjects in a genuine attempt to effect a societal renovatio.

We approach here the answer to the question that has occupied us throughout this study regarding the relationship between the ascetic concern for spiritual reformation and the ritual duty of intercessory prayer in Carolingian monasticism. Jean Leclercq argued that the essential elements of monastic culture were put in place in the Carolingian period, specifically the hundred or so years embracing the second half of the eighth century and the first half of the ninth which have book-ended our study. 'It was at this time', he wrote, 'that this culture

25 Nelson, Politics and Ritual, pp. 52-3, and 66.
took on substance and acquired distinct and definitive characteristics’. Yet his work focuses on spiritual ideals without touching on the highly ritualized practice of intercessory prayer, which is conspicuously absent from his definition of ‘essential monastic culture’. How, I have asked, was the liturgical ‘intercessory superstructure’ (to borrow Marilyn Dunn’s phrase again) made a part of an ‘essential monastic culture’ defined by Carolingian religious leaders which adhered most basically to the ascetic concern for moral conversion? What we have seen in the course of this study is the incorporation into the monk’s own *conversio* of the wider process of *conversio* around him – that of his brethren, of rulers, of the greater society. Consciousness of the process of sin and repentance of the non-ascetic world was incorporated into the ascetic ideal. This was now no longer defined simply in terms of the monk’s own individual pursuit of moral transformation, but just as much in terms of the process of transformation in which society and the cosmos are engaged. In this setting whereby the monk’s own individual conversion, penance, purgation, and regeneration is seen as part of a teleological phenomenon connected with that of the world, his contemplative prayer for his own soul and his ritual intercession on behalf of others collapse into one coherent statement about the common human experience.

Belief in sanctification was, after all, the very basis for the existence of the monastic institution, even if different houses developed varying customs to facilitate its achievement. The recognition that the monk’s spiritual transformation and that of those outside of himself were part of the same divinely-willed process is therefore an important feature of Carolingian monastic culture. ‘For them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth’,

---

28 Above, p. 87.
quoted Smaragdus in a section of his *Diadema monachorum* addressed to monks, but containing a surprisingly universal focus:  

The calling to divine piety (which may be in diverse ways in diverse ages at diverse times) is not made through the merit of man, but always freely by God alone.... (The apostle) says to Timothy: ‘he who hath delivered us and called us by his holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace’. Indeed they are called, as it is said, in diverse ways, since some are called only to be healthy in the body, having been divinely inspired; however others are called to be afflicted with fleshly infirmity; and yet others to be oppressed by diverse injuries or various tribulations. And they are called in diverse ages, since some are called in infancy, others in adolescence, others in youth, yet others in old age, or even in decrepit age; and at diverse hours of the day, since some are called at the first hour, others at the third hour, others at the sixth hour, others at the ninth, and still others at the eleventh. No one out of all these people are called into uncleanliness, but all are called by the holy God into the sanctification of heart and body.

Though Smaragdus’ purpose is to instruct monks, here these statements are not about the calling to the monastic profession, but the calling of all the elect out of uncleanliness and into holiness. This concern to point out that the monastic life is in fact part of the larger work of Christ for the sanctification of all people helps to explain the Carolingians’ preference for the term *conversio* over *conversatio*, for *conversio* (indicating dynamic change and growth) designated a process open to all, while *conversatio* connoted a way of life open only to the very few and select. This is not to suggest that there were lay religious movements or notions of some sort of spiritual democracy in the early medieval West; the pre-eminence of the monastic way of life as a more holy vocation was never cast into doubt. But what did mark the

---


30 *Ibid*.: ‘Vocatio divinae pietatis (quae diversis modis in diversis aetatibus et diversis fit temporibus) non hominis merito, sed semper gratis ab ipso solo pi etoque fit Deo.... Qui et ad Timotheum dicit: “Qui liberavit nos et vocavit vocatione sua sancta, non secundum opera nostra, sed secundum propositum et gratiam.” Vocantur enim, ut dictum est, diversis modis: quia alii tantum corpore sani vocantur, divinitus inspirati; alii autem infirmitate carnis afflictii; alii vero diversis damnis, vel tribulationibus variis oppressi. Vocantur et diversis aetatibus, quia alii in infantia, alii in adolescente, alii in juventute, alii vero in senectute, vel etiam in decrepita aetate vocantur; et diversis horis diei, quia alii primo mane, alii hora tertia, alii hora sexta, alii nona, alii vero vocantur undecima. Quorum omnium nullus in immunditiisiam, sed omnes sunt vocati a sancto Deo in sanctificationem cordis et corporis’.

monasticism of this age was the constant awareness of the divine process of transformation engaging the world outside of the monk – the world’s conversio alongside that of the monk. Thus we have, in the ninth century, a new understanding of the significance of monastic history: Benedict of Aniane inserted into the New Frankish Hymnal a cento by Paul the Deacon for the feast of St. Benedict of Nursia (March 21), celebrating not what the monastic leader meant for the destiny of the individual monk alone, but for that of the whole entire world:

Now let us share in the joy of this glorious festival and sing our yearly songs to the great Benedict,

who shone like a new star, driving away the clouds of the world....

Mighty above all in miracles, for he had been touched by the Holy Spirit, he excelled in portents, prophesying of the world to come....

Glory be to the Trinity and everlasting majesty be to it, which gave this shining lantern to our world as a gift.\(^{32}\)

In this short hymn, Benedict the monastic legislator has now taken on an import of universal scale; monastic history is linked to the destiny of the world.\(^{33}\)

\(^{32}\) ‘Ymnus ad Matutinam, Hymn 64 in Gneuss’ numbering; Milfull, Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church, pp. 264-5:

\( 'Magno canentes annua nunc Benedicto cantica fruamur huius inclyti festivitatis gaudio, qui fulsit ut sidus novum mundana pellens nubila.... Miraculorum prepotens, actu sancto flamine resplenduit prodigiis venturo secolo precinens.' \)

\(^{33}\) Liturgy ‘reflect(s) the vicissitudes of an institution’s history and forms an integral part of the narrative that has come down to us. Liturgy constructs history’. Boynton, Shaping a Monastic Identity, p. 232, emphasis mine.
The consciousness of the potential for the conversion and transformation of the world alongside that of the individual ascete is behind the intercessory activities described in the chapters of the foregoing study. Chapter One opened with the fundamental problem of sin which was seen to impede fruitful prayer, and suggested that the significant reforms to monastic prayer in the ninth century should be understood in light of the pastoral strategy of monastic liturgical organization to manage the problem of sin. By his additions of intercessory liturgy, which I argued should be seen as a ‘prescription’ for the cultivation of interior virtue and true prayer, Benedict of Aniane made the spiritual progress of others part and parcel of the desired spiritual progress of the individual monk. Chapter Two argued that offering intercessory Masses on behalf of others was rooted in the monastic emphasis on correct faith in the Triune God, operating through love. The Divine Office, as explored in Chapter Three, was likewise put to intercessory purposes because psalmody was to be an exercise of the monk’s love, humility, and self-deference. Thus, the recognition of the redemptive processes in which others were engaged was incorporated, through intercessory liturgy, into the two observances of prayer which dominated the Carolingian monk’s day: the Mass and the Office. The intercessions offered on behalf of specific groups – fellow monks, rulers, and the various social categories in society at large – which I explored in the final three chapters of this study were all explicit expressions of the mindfulness of Carolingian monks toward the process of moral conversion which engaged those apart from himself. Intercession for fellow monks served the purposes of supporting the ascetic progress of those within the cloister; intercession for rulers was based on the belief that support for them would facilitate the achievement of peace and virtue on earth which would last into eternity; and intercession for society was founded on the basic Carolingian premise that all of society was capable of prayer and that the monk’s role was to experience firsthand how to seek and desire good gifts from God. In the ‘intercessory superstructure’ which had come to envelop Carolingian
monasticism, therefore, we find an inclusion of the spiritual pilgrimage of the rest of the world into the monk’s own individual discipline: intercessory prayer is the thing which ties the monk’s ascesis to the larger story of the conversion of the world back to God, to the larger process of spiritual renovation in which his fellow brethren, rulers and benefactors, kingdoms, and the church entire are engaged.

This monastic consciousness of his very un-uniqueness in the process of moral conversion provides an important area of distinction between the intercessory prayer of early desert hermits (the ‘holy man’) and that of a chorus of monks in a large Carolingian abbey. A hermit like St. Anthony did not have intercessory liturgy built permanently and routinely into his life of prayer: people went out of their way to seek him, popping in at all times at their own initiative, and it was his choice whether to descend from his holy mountain of solitude to meet them or not. The image of the late-antique monk’s role as intercessor is that of the lone man reacting sporadically to the likewise sporadic presence of people presenting themselves to him with their need for divine intervention. The picture in the eighth and ninth centuries is drastically different. Recognition of the constant and continuous process of sin and repentance, conversion and regeneration, in others meant that intercessory liturgy for the spiritual affairs of others was permanently fixed into the monastic program itself. Unlike desert ascetics, Carolingian monks were not sought out in their holy mountains for their intercessions; rather, each hour of every one of their days anticipated and incorporated the spiritual needs of others. Thus, for Hildemar, the desert symbolizes first and foremost the admission of all Christians into the Church, during which time they are fed with heavenly manna (the body and blood of Christ) and await the promised land (the joys of the heavenly

It is only after having established this fact that Hildemar continues, ‘Is it any surprise, if this relates morally to the catholic people, that is Christians generally, that it can also similarly relate morally to each and every individual monk?’ Hildemar then goes on to draw parallels between the ‘conversio’ of all Christians from slavery and the intensified ‘conversio’ of monks when they renounce the world. Notably, Hildemar has first described a process that applies to all Christian peoples in order to elucidate the specific state of the monk. The desert – which for Hildemar had come to symbolize the whole of the ‘Church’ – is no longer the special claim of ascetics; rather, the desert existed to give a sense of the movement of all confessors of Christ to the promised land.

Smaragdus’ *carmen* quoted above supplied Ardo with his closing reflections upon the death of Benedict of Aniane, with one significant revision in which ‘*nobis*’ is replaced by ‘*novos*’:

> The divine seed has been sown; may it avail for new ones,
> Drenched with dew from heaven, to plow the planting of teachers,
> And the rich field of the heart produce fruit a hundredfold.

Here, Ardo’s use of the seed metaphor follows biblical teaching about how the burial of a seed brings about both new life (‘*novos*’), as well as – if nourished by the good soil of the heart – a rich yield of fruit. Benedict of Aniane’s life and death are likened to a seed that has been sown. His instructions and reforms have aimed at the cultivation of the monk’s heart so that it may produce fruit, but it is also a part of the cosmic reality of the potential of newness, new life, new growth. The use of these verses by Ardo at a moment of a reformer’s death betrays a

---


37 *Ibid*: ‘Et quid mirum, si hoc moraliter ad populum catholicum, hoc est christianum generaliter refertur, cum etiam ad unumquemque monachorum moraliter hoc potest similiter referri?’


39 John 12:24 on the production of new seeds following the death of a seed of wheat; Matthew 13:18 on the hundredfold fruit.
preoccupation in ninth-century Carolingian monastic thought with notions of transformation both individual and cosmic: the purification of morals, the betterment of society, the conversion of nations, the extension of life after death, the resurrection of the flesh. Intercessory prayer was part of a monastic ideal which believed in the potential for newness and transformation in all of life as God had intended.
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