

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula
canonicorum in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

For most people today, to reform generally means to improve, to make better, or to ameliorate, but in at least some historical periods, reform has literally meant “re-form,” an attempt to make over or recapture something which has been lost.¹ In the European Middle Ages, reform almost always had the latter meaning. Movements of reform throughout the medieval period generally took as their model an image, a vision, an understanding of the past. These “imagined pasts” may not have been historically accurate, but their purpose was to provide an effective inspiration and a concrete legitimacy for action in the present.² A flexible attitude toward the past and an understanding of the dynamic relationship between tradition and reform best characterizes Carolingian ideas about and efforts toward reform. Yet for the men and women of the eighth and ninth centuries, the past did not always yield up material that was appropriate for the present, and so history had to be adapted or transformed in various ways. This adaptation was rarely done frivolously,

¹ None of the six definitions of “reform” as a noun in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933) implies a restoration to a lost ideal; neither do any of those found in the second College edition of *Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language* (1982).

² The literature on reform and its concepts is vast, but the best place to start is in the magisterial studies by Gerhart B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, 1959); Ladner, “Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: A Comparison of Their Concepts of Renewal,” *Viator* 4 (1982), pp. 1–27; and Ladner, “Die mittelalterliche Reform-Idee und ihr Verhältnis zur Idee der Renaissance,” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 60 (1952), pp. 31–59; see also Kenneth W. Jones, *Socio-religious Reform Movements in British India* (Cambridge, 1989); Tobin Siebers, ed., *Religion and the Authority of the Past* (Ann Arbor, 1993); and Ronald C. White, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia, 1976). For the particulars of our period, see Giles Brown, “Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance,” in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 1–51; Hans Liebeschütz, “Wesen und Grenzen des karolingischen Rationalismus,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 33 (1950), pp. 17–44, esp. pp. 18–32; Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, 1982); Alan Thacker, “Bede’s Ideal of Reform,” in Patrick Wormald, ed., *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 130–53; Timothy Reuter, “‘Kirchenreform’ und ‘Kirchenpolitik’ im Zeitalter Karl Martells: Begriffe und Wirklichkeit,” in *Karl Martell*, pp. 35–59; and Walter Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London, 1969).

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Reform of the Frankish Church*

and was always accomplished with a great deal of study, thought, and scholarship. Above all, the Carolingian ideal of *utilitas* – usefulness, servableness, expediency – governed the use of history as the basis for reform.³

Reform movements needed a past to re-form to, and thus they had almost of necessity an intellectual side. The Carolingian kings patronized scholars whose tasks at least partly involved them in works of recovery: they sought to comprehend some normative period of the past, and to this end they spent much time and energy finding, editing, and commenting on a series of texts, often drawn from late antiquity. It was this period that at least some Carolingian thinkers deemed normative for their society: it was this period that they sought to recapture, to re-emulate, to reform to.⁴ Thus, for instance, Charlemagne supported scholars such as Alcuin and Benedict of Aniane, not just because it was something that was expected – royal or imperial patronage being an attribute of a great or legitimate king – but because these and many others were involved in discovering the norms from a past that would help him guarantee a just and righteous society in the present.⁵

Sometimes, the chosen past turned out to be less than usable. An illustrative example of this is the sacramentary that Charlemagne requested

³ See Réginald Grégoire, “L’Ordine ed il suo significato: ‘utilitas’ et ‘caritas,’” in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, Settimane 33 (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 639–97 at pp. 660–5; the essays edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger in *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); Matthew Innes and Rosamond McKitterick, “The Writing of History,” in McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 193–220; Natalia Lozovsky, “Carolingian Geography Tradition: Was It Geography?” *Early Medieval Europe* 5 (1996), pp. 25–43; Rosamond McKitterick, “Royal Patronage of Culture in the Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians: Motives and Consequences,” in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell’alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane 39 (Spoleto, 1992), pp. 93–129 at p. 117; and below.

⁴ For the Carolingians and late antiquity, see most famously Richard Krautheimer, “The Carolingian Revival of Early Church Architecture,” in his *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art* (New York, 1969), pp. 203–56 (but see also Robert Coates-Stephens, “Dark Age Architecture in Rome,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65 (1997), pp. 177–232 for important corrections to Krautheimer’s typology); Donald Bullough, “Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*,” in his *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 1–37; Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Bildungsreform Karls des Grossen als Verwirklichung der Norma rectitudinis* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1953); George Henderson, “Emulation and Invention in Carolingian Art,” in McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 248–73; and Armando Petrucci, “Symbolic Aspects of Written Evidence,” in his *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*, ed. and trans. Charles M. Radding (New Haven, 1995), pp. 103–31.

⁵ Fr. Brunhölzl, “Die Bildungsauftrag der Hofschule,” in Bernhard Bischoff, ed., *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben 2: Das Geistige Leben* (Dusseldorf, 1965), pp. 28–41; Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians* (New York, 1983), pp. 160–6; Innes and McKitterick, “The Writing of History,” in *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 193–220; and the essays in Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, eds., *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), especially Mary Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne,” pp. 114–61, and Matthew Innes, “Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past,” pp. 227–49.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

and received from Pope Hadrian at the end of the eighth century. This text, the so-called Gregorian sacramentary, although certainly hailing from Rome, did not fulfill the liturgical needs of the Franks, nor meet their expectations of what a Roman liturgical book should be. Benedict of Aniane, one of Charlemagne's monastic advisors and perhaps the court's liturgical expert, revised the sacramentary, adding, modifying, and deleting material to produce a book that could be promulgated throughout the empire. In other words, Benedict took a preexisting tradition – in this case, a Roman text – and changed it to produce a new text and a new kind of tradition.⁶ At other times, a usable past simply did not exist. Occasionally, there was insufficient historical information available to reformers, so that they were forced to turn to their own devices, but, more often, men and women in the early Middle Ages could face problems and situations for which the past did not supply appropriate analogues. To deal with this sort of situation, a past had to be created, a history invented, a tradition assembled. This effort could not be undertaken lightly: it demanded all the scholarly resources, intellectual verve, and spiritual discretion that a reformer might possess. The act of creation itself would often involve a sort of cobbling together of bits of the past gathered here and there, a bundling of whatever information and knowledge might be available, and a fitting of this newly made historical bricolage into a framework that the writers of the original sources might not have recognized.

Chrodegang of Metz was an expert in all these various strategies of reform. When it was available, Chrodegang drew on material from the past as the direct model for his actions. But in many of the areas in which he worked, Chrodegang found no usable history, no workable past, and so he was forced to become more inventive. This book will examine how Chrodegang sought to originate traditions throughout his life. The traditions he created all revolve around his main concern, the one that runs like a red thread throughout his whole ecclesiastical career. This was christianization: that is, how to implement the ideas and the norms associated with Christian teachings and spirituality in the areas under his care. Chrodegang, it seems clear when looking at the totality of his actions, took very seriously his duties as bishop, and brought to them the

⁶ Jean Deshusses, "Les Suppléments au sacramentaire grégorien: Alcuin ou S. Benoît d'Aniane?" *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1965), pp. 48–71, and his "Les sacramentaires: état actuel de la recherche," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 24 (1984), pp. 19–46. For a more general history of the liturgical reforms of the Carolingians, almost all of which reveal this same pattern, see Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986), pp. 61–224, and the important revisions to some of Vogel's key points by Yitzhak Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald*, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia 3 (London, 2001).

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Reform of the Frankish Church*

sort of attention that Gregory the Great outlined in *The Pastoral Care*. He also brought to them the concern that we find characterizes the spiritual responsibilities of the abbot, at least as outlined in the second chapter of the *Rule of Benedict*.⁷ Unfortunately we cannot examine all of his actions. Chrodegang has left us few written texts and therefore this study must concentrate on the longest monument he bequeathed the future: his *Regula canonicorum*, the *Rule for canons*. Along the way, we will examine what we can of his other works: his concern for the greater church in Francia, of which he was primate after 754, and his attempts to create a holy city in his see, which began, perhaps, with the *Regula canonicorum*, but extended far beyond that particular piece of legislation.

Chrodegang based his reforms on a vision and understanding of the Christian past of Metz, and more broadly, of that of Francia and of the whole of the Latin church. But as we shall see, Metz is not rich in its ancient Christian history. It had martyrs neither from the Roman period nor from the Frankish. Its own saints, such as its seventh-century bishop Arnulf – perhaps one of the Carolingian progenitors – seem not to have inspired a great deal of devotion. The town itself did not have much of a usable past, and so holes had to be filled in, gaps spanned, with new history, which in turn spawned new kinds of traditions. So too when it came to implementing his rule, in order that he might reform the canons of his cathedral: there was only limited precedent for such legislation, and so Chrodegang drew on pre-existing monastic rules as the basis for his own work. And the same is true for his liturgical innovations: where Metz was poor, where Francia as a whole might have been lacking, Jerusalem or Rome or Constantinople were rich, good measure and flowing over. Importing the traditions of other churches, appropriating their history, and thus making it part of his own, Chrodegang's work lay at the foundation of the Carolingian spiritual revival of the later eighth and ninth centuries.

One can argue that Chrodegang was the first to incorporate into his own work all the major aspects that characterized later Frankish reform. But unlike some other Merovingian and Carolingian reformers – Willibrord and Boniface before him, Alcuin, Benedict of Aniane, Theodulf of Orléans in the generations after him, and most of those who worked during the reigns of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald, for instance – we can only know little about the man, for the main document we have regarding his reforms is his rule. Ostensibly it seeks only modest goals: to enable a cleric to “prune from himself the illicit, cast out

⁷ T. F. X. Noble, “The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious,” *Rev. Ben.* 86 (1976), pp. 235–50.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

the wicked, and abandon the unlawful long-held . . . [so that] things good and better might be grafted on.”⁸ However, the rule essays to do much more than simply keep the canons from grievous sin. It seeks to create in the Metz cathedral close a new community, one based on ideas of hierarchy and equality, love and unanimity, where before there had only been a group of men beset with “strife, scandals, and hate.” This process of community creation was very similar to what he was doing at the same time within the larger Frankish church. In the regular meetings of bishops that convened during his primacy, Chrodegang sought to unite men, drawn from the various parts of the kingdom and belonging to various factions and parties, by giving them common spiritual tasks and common spiritual goals. Since these meetings were, while regular, nonetheless infrequent, we can better understand Chrodegang’s ideas when we look to Metz. Here, in both the cathedral community and the town as a whole, Chrodegang deployed various strategies to break down structural divisions and to create something new, a town united under its bishop, where all the inhabitants shared the same goal of praising God. This work was the first comprehensive expression of a new “Carolingian” vision of reform. Chrodegang was, in the end, concerned not only with one or two groups in the church, but with the whole complex of society. He sought to separate and redefine the various orders in his town, giving each one its own unique task, but ordering them to a new and transcendent goal.

Chrodegang accomplished this not by breaking with the past, but by harnessing it, using the images and works of earlier periods in Christian and Frankish history to help him achieve his goals. The past, as he understood it, provided him with models, but they were not the sort of models that could be transplanted unchanged into his own environment. Instead, these were exemplars and norms, requiring adaptation and realignment if they were to fit into the world of mid-eighth-century Metz. Chrodegang, like a historian, understood the past through a series of texts; but unlike his modern counterparts, he felt free, and perhaps even compelled, not to stop with presenting the past as it was, but to determine its essential characteristics, the one or two things that made those earlier periods qualitatively different from his own. Once this quintessence had been discovered, Chrodegang systematically set about trying to re-create it in his contemporary context. This effort involved a manipulation of texts – most notably the *Rule of Benedict*, but also works by “Julianus” Pomerius, Caesarius of Arles, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, various Roman and other conciliar decrees, and even Scripture itself. By mimetic and

⁸ *RCan*, Prologue; Wilhelm Schmitz, ed., *S. Chrodegangi Mettensis episcopi (742–66) Regula canonicorum . . .* (Hanover, 1889), p. 1.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Reform of the Frankish Church*

intertextual strategies, Chrodegang sought to bring to birth in Metz a new creation, a *hagiopolis*, a holy city.

In their constant quest for the antecedents of great movements, historians have generally overlooked Chrodegang's influence on later Carolingian reform; or perhaps he has been overshadowed by his more visible and heroic contemporary, the Anglo-Saxon Boniface, and by the great reformers of the succeeding generations, men such as Alcuin, Benedict of Aniane, Hrabanus Maurus, and Hincmar of Rheims. These men strove toward the same basic goals – the erection of a metropolitan church structure, the regularization of religious life, the proclamation of the basic duties of Christian women and men, the christianization of the Frankish aristocracy and especially the royal family, the reform of cult. All of them had their own successes and failures, but in general, judging from what he called for in his synods and in his rule, Chrodegang must be counted among the most successful reformers of the early Middle Ages. He completed and improved upon the work of other late Merovingian churchmen, including that of Boniface, and his success was due at least in part to his ability to compromise on unimportant issues (an ability that some ecclesiastical reformers simply did not have) and his willingness to work within the bounds of a church whose leadership was drawn from the Frankish aristocracy. Chrodegang smoothed over and sought to eliminate factions, while more fervent reformers, with that prophetic zeal which characterized certain men and women in the Hebrew Bible, instead fomented them. Mainly others have monopolized the attention of historians simply because we can see them as individuals. We can know Boniface, for instance, in a way that we can know few others from the first half of the eighth century. He left us, along with conciliar acts and synodal decrees, an extraordinary letter collection, one of the largest from the early Middle Ages. Such a preponderance of evidence has helped to make Boniface a leading man to Chrodegang's bit player.

A second reason why Chrodegang has generally languished in the shadows suggests itself: he appears to have done nothing new or innovative himself. His rule seems to hew so closely to that of Benedict that it has been called a plagiarism; the canons of the councils he directed often simply repeated those of the past; his romanizing attitudes in liturgy and cult in fact first appeared in England, with the peculiar Anglo-Saxon devotion to the papacy.⁹ In fact, Chrodegang appears as a Boniface-*manqué*, without the fire, without the passion. And there is reason to

⁹ Recently disussed in Alan Thacker, "In Search of the Saints: The English Church and the Cult of Roman Apostles and Martyrs in the Seventh and Eight Centuries," in Julia M. H. Smith, ed., *Early Medieval Rome and the West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1453 vol. 28 (Leiden, 2000), pp. 247–77.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

this. Boniface does indeed seem to have been the first to undertake reforms that had the same characteristics as later efforts, especially those under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. In his unswerving devotion to Rome, his obsession with promulgating certain aspects of canon law, and even his pastoral and missionary drive, Boniface appears to have prefigured what would come in later reform movements. This is, at least in part, an illusion. While many of Boniface's ideas appear the same as later Carolingian ones, they are similar exactly in appearance, not in substance. For instance, the Carolingian devotion to Rome was radically different from Boniface's, although they might at surface appear the same.¹⁰ The Carolingians looked to Rome for norms and exemplars that would then be subject to modification and adjustment before they could usefully be implemented in Francia. That is, after all, just what the Carolingians did with the *Rule* of Benedict, and books of canon law, liturgy, and theology which at various times they requested from Rome.¹¹ Rome sometimes did not even supply the correct answers to difficult theological questions, and thus the true defense of the faith required the active intervention of the Franks themselves. We can see this attitude both in the preface to the Salic laws, which describes the Romans as slayers of saints and the Carolingians as preservers of relics, as well as in the controversies surrounding the *Opus Caroli regis*.¹² Chrodegang points to a more critical attitude toward Rome: things coming from Rome, whether they be liturgical habits, manuscripts, theological pronouncements, or political arrangements, needed, like the past itself, to be adapted to fit into Frankish ways of doing things, and to meet particularities of Frankish traditions.

The text with which we will be most concerned in this book is the *Regula canonicorum*, the *Rule for canons*.¹³ Like many late antique and early

¹⁰ Arnold Angenendt, *Das Frühmittelalter: Die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900* (Stuttgart, 1990), pp. 275–6, argues that Boniface held that all *Heil* came from Rome, a belief very different from that of the typical religious Frank in the early or mid-eighth century.

¹¹ See Bullough, "Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*."

¹² Sections D.4 and E.3 in Karl August Eckhardt, ed., *Lex Salica, MGH Legum 1, Legum nationum germanicarum 4.2* (Hanover, 1969), pp. 6–9; Ann Freeman, ed., *Opus Caroli Regis (Libri Carolini)*, *MGH Conc. 2, Supp. 1* (Hanover, 1998); Harald Willjung, *Das Konzil von Aachen, 809, MGH Conc. 2, Supp. 2* (Hanover, 1998); and the studies by Gary B. Blumenschine, "Alcuin's *Liber contra haeresim Felicis* and the Frankish Kingdom," *FmSt* 17 (1983), pp. 222–33; John C. Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul* (Philadelphia, 1993); Ann Freeman, "Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the *Libri Carolini*," *Viator* 16 (1985), pp. 65–108; H. B. Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (Cambridge, 1976); and more generally, David Ganz, "Theology and the Organisation of Thought," in *NCMH*, pp. 758–85.

¹³ The textual history of the rule is discussed by Gaston Hoquard, "La règle de Saint Chrodegang," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 55–89; A. Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27 (1901–2), pp. 607–75; Otto Hanneman, "Die Kanonikerregeln Chrodegangs von Metz und der Aachener Synode von 816,

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Reform of the Frankish Church*

medieval works, its textual history is at times a little confusing.¹⁴ We do not have Chrodegang's autograph of the rule, and so we are at some loss. Fortunately, we do have a slightly later copy of the text, which, since its discovery, has been given the siglum **B**.¹⁵ This manuscript, written at Metz at the end of the eighth century, contains, along with most of the *Rule* (the preface and first eight chapters, and part of the final chapter, are missing), Isidore of Seville's *De viris inlustribus*, a Metz martyrology, one of the Roman *ordines*, and other material. It seems at least in part to be a theological and liturgical, or perhaps better an ascetic, compendium.¹⁶ In the absence of a critical edition of the rule, it is the best witness we have to Chrodegang's original work. A slightly later manuscript, known as **L**¹, also written at Metz but in Tironian notes, is the basis for Wilhelm Schmitz's edition of the rule, currently the best published one.¹⁷ These manuscripts belong to the Metz version of the *Regula canonicorum*, but there are two other classes of texts: the generalized version and the Aachen version. The former has had specific references to the ecclesiastical geography of Metz removed, and also contains some additions written by Angilramn. The latter was the text that was promulgated throughout the empire as normative by the 816 synod of Aachen, and served as the main rule for

und das Verhältnis Gregors VII dazu" (PhD dissertation, Greifswald, 1914); Rudolf Scheiffer, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 43 (Bonn, 1976), pp. 232–61; and Brigitte Langefeld, "Regula canonicorum or Regula monasterialis vitae? The Rule of Chrodegang and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury," *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996), pp. 21–36 at pp. 21–8.

¹⁴ On the relationships between text and manuscript, see John Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in a Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro del buen amor* (Princeton, 1994), pp. xii–29.

¹⁵ On **B** (Bern Burgerbibliothek lat. 289), see Adalbert Ebner, "Zur *Regula canonicorum* des hl. Chrodegang," *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 5 (1891), pp. 82–8; and Lowe, *CLA* 7.861. Lowe describes the script as a "well-formed Caroline minuscule by many different hands, some manifestly representing an early stage," while others represent a more advanced development. He adds that the text of the rule is written in the earlier style script. Jean-Baptiste Pelt, *Etudes sur la cathédrale de Metz: la Liturgie I (Ve–XIIIe siècle)* (Metz, 1937), pp. 7–28, provides an edition, based on that of Wilhelm Schmitz (see above, note 6), but that takes account of the text of **B** and other manuscripts.

¹⁶ See H. M. Rochais, "Contribution à l'histoire des florilèges ascétiques du haut moyen âge latin: le 'Liber scintillarum'," *Rev. Ben.* 63 (1963), pp. 246–91 at pp. 246–60.

¹⁷ **L**¹ = Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek, Voss. lat. 94, written mainly in Tironian notes. See the introduction to Schmitz's edition, and Albert Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27 (1901–2), pp. 605–75 at pp. 646–51. In this same class is **V** (Vatican City, Vat. pal. lat. 555). This text forms the basis of the *Regula canonicorum* that Migne published in *PL* 89.1097–1120. See Guiscardo Moschetti, "I frammenti veronesi del secolo IX delle Istituzioni di Giustiniano," in Moschetti, ed., *Atti del congresso internazionale di diritto romano e di storia del diritto, 27–29 settembre, 1948* (Milan, 1953), 1.439–509 at pp. 462–4; and *Codices palatini latini bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1886), p. 178. The main difference between **V** and **L**¹ is in the additions Chrodegang's successor Angilramn made to chapters 20, 33, and 34.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

the canonical life until the eleventh century and beyond.¹⁸ Finally, there is one last text that we can associate with Chrodegang's activities in Metz. It is a precious document that, since its discovery in the 1930s, has been much commented upon: a stational list of churches that were to be the site of episcopal services during the weekdays and Sundays of Lent and Easter Week.¹⁹

The *Regula canonicorum* is the most significant work we have by Chrodegang. It was written for the canons of his cathedral in Metz, and it was around the canons of the cathedral of St Stephen that most of his reform efforts revolved. But who were they, and where did they come from?²⁰ *Canonicus* is based on the Latin word *canon*, which in turn is simply the

¹⁸ The generalized text is represented by **L**² (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek BPL 81), written in an unknown location in the tenth century. The Aachen text is reprinted in *PL* 89.1057–96, and served as the basis for other rules for canons, including the Anglo-Saxon one edited by Arthur S. Napier, *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang together with the Latin Original* (London, 1916). See Werminghoff, "Beschlüsse," p. 646.

¹⁹ The discovery was first made by Theodor Klauser, "Une document du IXe siècle: notes sur l'ancienne liturgie de Metz," *ASHAL* 38 (1929), pp. 497–510; and his "Eine Stationsliste der Metzger Kirche aus dem 8. Jahrhundert, wahrscheinlich ein Werk Chrodegangs," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930), pp. 162–93. See below, chapter 6, for bibliography on this important find.

²⁰ Here I have relied on a number of secondary works: Jean Becquet, "Vingt-cinq ans d'études canonicales en France (1959–1984)," in *Liber amicorum: études historiques offertes à Pierre Bougard*, Revue du Nord, hors série, collection Histoire 3 (Arras, 1987), pp. 65–71; Jean Châtillon, "La spiritualité de l'ordre canonial (VIIIe–XIIIe siècle)" in his *Le Mouvement canonial au moyen-âge: réforme de l'église, spiritualité et culture*, Bibliotheca victorina 3 (Paris, 1992), pp. 131–49 at pp. 132–7; C. Dereine, "Chanoines," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1953), 12.353–405; C. Egger, "Canonici regolari," in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* (Rome, 1975), 2.46–63; William Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 90–3; H. Leclercq, "Chanoines," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 3/1 (Paris, 1931), pp. 223–48; Ernst Mayer, "Der Ursprung der Domkapitel zugleich ein Wort zu den Urkunden Drogonis," *ZRG*, kan. Abt. 7 (1917), pp. 1–33; Ferruccio Poggiaspalla, *La vita comune del clero dalle origini alla riforma gregoriana*, Uomini e dottrine 14 (Rome, 1968); Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*; Josef Semmler, "Mission und Pfarrorganisation in der rheinischen, mosel- und maasländischen Bistümern (5.–10. Jahrhundert)," in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medio-evo: espansione e resistenze*, Settimane 28 (Spoleto, 1982), pp. 813–88; Semmler, "Mönche und Kanoniker in Frankenreich Pepins III und Karls des Grossen," in *Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 68, Studien zur Germania Sacra 14 (Freiburg, 1980), pp. 78–111; Semmler, "Le monachisme occidental du VIIIe au Xe siècle: formation et réformation," *Rev. Ben.* 103 (1993), pp. 68–89 at pp. 69–74; Josef Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz vom 6. Jahrhundert bis 1160*, Studia Freiburgensia, Neue Folge 30 (Freiburg, 1962); Siegwart, "Der gallo-fränkischen Kanonikerbegriff," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 61 (1967), pp. 193–244; Leo Ueding, "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus," in Aloys Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht, eds., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg, 1953), 2.569–676; and M. Zacherl, "Die *Vita communis* als Lebensform des Klerus in der Zeit zwischen Augustinus und Karl dem Grossen," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 92 (1970), pp. 385–424.

Cambridge University Press

0521839319 - The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula canonicorum in the Eighth Century

M. A. Claussen

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The Reform of the Frankish Church*

transliterated Greek κανών, a word that has a maddeningly wide range of meanings, from “rod” or “straight-edge,” to “model,” “standard,” or “prototype,” to “rule,” “table,” “paradigm,” and finally, “tax assessment.”²¹ For our purposes in this study, κανών; means either list or rule. For instance, a κανών could be a list of the approved books of the Bible. It was this sense of κανών as list that allowed its meaning to be transferred from a list or table, to a tax assessment: the tax κανών listed the names and the amount owed from various individuals and groups. In Latin, this word could be rendered as both *canon* and *matricula*. κανών could also mean rule or standard. Hence the decisions of church councils were known as canons, because they presented the precepts and the dicta of the faith. In the west, κανών in this sense could be translated both as *canon* and as *regula*. This brief etymological journey brings us to the two possible meanings for the word *canonicus*: either a *canonicus* is one whose name is inscribed on a κανών/*canon*/list, or a *canonicus* is one who lives according to the κανόνες/*canones*/rules of the church.²²

While religious reformers, beginning with Cassian and including Chrodegang, would try to link the basic organization of the canonical life to the early Christian community described in *Acts of the Apostles*, there are few actual historical ties between the religious life of the primitive church and the religious organizations that developed around the time of Constantine.²³ Whether his communities of friends could be better described as monastic or canonical, Augustine found nothing in recent history to justify his creation of a community of men living the common life.²⁴ The constitutions he wrote for these communities would in the eleventh and twelfth centuries become the most popular rule for canons in western Europe, and would eventually supplant the rule of Chrodegang,

²¹ For these meanings, see Guy Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X Centuries*, Studi di antichità cristiana 2 (Rome, 1957), pp. 381–5; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961–68), s.v.; Liddell and Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), s.v.

²² Just which one it is is a matter of some debate: Poggiaspalla, *La vita comune del clero*, p. 26, and Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfrauengemeinschaften* and “Der gallo-fränkischen Kanonikerbegriff,” both argue that the κανών referred to is a list of clergy who have various privileges. DuCange, in his *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, s.v., and early medieval sources (see below for these), argue that the *canonicus* is one who follows the κανόνες, the teachings and laws, of the church. Dereine, in “Chanoines,” pp. 354–5, sensibly posits that these two derivations are not exclusive, and *canonicus* as a substantive probably drew upon both of them. For further Latin uses and derivations, see J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus*, s.v.

²³ Most famously done by Cassian in *Collationes* 18.7–8, in Dom E. Pichery, ed., *Jean Cassien: Conférences XVIII–XXIV*, Sources chrétiennes 64 (Paris, 1959), pp. 18–22. On the lack of continuity, see Leclercq, “Chanoines” pp. 223–4.

²⁴ See Leclercq, “Chanoines,” p. 224; Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, cc. 5 and 25 (*PL* 32.36 and 32.54–5); Augustine, *De moribus ecclesiae* 1.33.70–1, in *PL* 32.1309–78 at 1339–40; more generally Adolar Zumkeller, *Augustine’s Ideal of the Religious Life* (New York, 1986), pp. 24–45; and George Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule* (Oxford, 1987).