

my copy 2

October 12, 2008

Dear Ron,

Thank you for your patience. I read Hen's chapter on "Pippin III and the Illusion of Liturgical Reforms" and what I understand him to be arguing is that Pippin is not responsible himself for initiating liturgical reform, but had an interest in the liturgy and supported reforms going on. I think Hen contradicts himself on what he says about the introduction of Roman *chant*, in particular (on pp. 47-54 he argues why Charlemagne's and Walahfrid Strabo's statements that Pippin introduced Roman plain-chant are probably false, written under Charlemagne to "cast Pippin as a reformer", but then on p. 56 Hen seems to go along with the sources, saying "Furthermore, as our sources specifically report, Pippin made an effort to introduce the Roman chant into Francia"). Nevertheless, Hen comes out saying Pippin did not take the first "official" steps towards the Romanisation of the liturgy (p.56-57), the key word being "official". Thus, in answer to your question, I would say that Hen does not think the Roman chant nor the Roman liturgy were officially instituted or pushed by Pippin. In his closing lines of the chapter, on p. 64, he says that it is possible, according to later sources, that Pippin "played a certain role in the promotion of the cantus Romanus in Francia", but that this should not be seen as the initiation of an official reform movement, which did happen under Charlemagne. (This is not that Romanisation and uniformity of the liturgy was actually "accomplished"; see p. 88.) Thus, you might want to soften what you say on p. 24, last paragraph (simply say "According to..."), and add Hen's view to footnote 67.

On p. 22-23 you say that "the liturgy of the Frankish church had become a rich mixture of Gallican, Roman, Gelasian, and Gregorian practices". This might seem a little confusing, because the Gelasian and Gregorian could be said to be a mixture of Gallican and Roman, depending on whether you are talking about Old Gelasian, preGelasian, Gelasian of the Eighth Century, and Hadrianum or preHadrianum. I would at least footnote Hen on all this, p. 57-81. Klaus Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores*, in his index, p. 9-10, categorizes the liturgical books according to Celtic, Gallican, Mozarabic, Campanian and Beneventan, Ambrosian, Roman (= preGregorian [Gelasian], Gregorian, mixed Gelasian, mixed Gregorian).

Your entire chapter is intriguing and important to me for a number of reasons. I deal with the hundreds of Carolingian manuscripts that are collection volumes, compiled for bishops and parish priests for their instruction in the faith and the liturgy and in Christian morals, in order to be able to instruct the people under their care. Most of these collection volumes I label "schoolbooks" or "clerical instruction readers" or "study books" on the basis of their contents, which, of course, raises the whole question of schools and

precisely where and how and by whom these hundreds of manuscripts were used. Some questions that your chapter raised for me were:

1) P. 75, regarding the *scholae cantorum*, did the choir boys ever become local pastors? Or did potential local pastors join their school temporarily? How was the bishop to see to it that he would have an educated diocesan clergy? Maybe the *scholae cantorum* served as an elementary school for the diocese?

2) P. 75 you also say “by the second half of the century *a few* cathedrals, particularly favored by royal support or by a relationship with a nearby monastery, joined the intellectual movement.” I do not know who, in fact, compiled many of the texts in my collection volumes. Traditionally, Carolingians have not been noted for their originality or creativity, but for being good copyists. I think, however, that they were extremely creative in the way they selected and edited their sources. Who are these creative editors, with diocesan pastors in mind? Monks? Canons? Some one with access to a library and scriptorium. On p. 75 I might put more weight on the intellectual activity of bishops in their cathedral complex, although it is true they were often abbots as well, and worked with monasteries.

3) What is the relationship between schools and scriptoria? You say in footnote 145, p. 109, that monasteries produced as well as stored most of the mss. I wonder if some discussion of transalpine scriptoria, and how they fit into the whole picture of education, seeing that cathedrals had scriptoria as well as monasteries, might extend to the regnum. Would it be logical to assume that where there was a scriptorium there was a school?

4) Frequently Tironian notes pop up in my “schoolbooks”, in glosses above the text or in the margins. Who is it that has learned this shorthand and also is composing, copying or editing schoolbooks? Pp. 64-66 are important to me, but could you clarify if you are talking about the situation in the regnum or generally in the Carolingian empire when you talk about the presbyter, subdiaconus, or diaconus serving bishops as notaries?

As I noted at footnote 71 on p. 91, you might also want to footnote Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement*, p. 176, on the connection between music and basic education. Also on p. 29 I wondered if at some point in Section 3 you might want to footnote Bullough, pp. 236-238 on the connection between *scholae cantorum* and schools of education in the liberal arts. (Maybe you cited him elsewhere.)

Pp. 15-16: Coming at the subject of educational reform from the grass roots perspective of local clergy, I have tended to separate that effort from the kind of intellectual activity allowed to happen through Charlemagne’s “imports” from northern Italy and other highbrows at court or connected to the court. I don’t know if this needs more distinction. Maxentius of Aquileia and Odilbert of Milan were archbishops who responded in 812 to Charlemagne’s circulatory letter on baptism, aimed at promoting the education of their clergy on this subject. In Charlemagne’s view, clearly they were expected to take part equally with northern bishops in the intense effort to educate the lower clergy, however they would do this (through cathedral schools? Monastic schools?).

I would have to go back and look at Bischoff's "Die europaische Verbreitung der Werke Isidors von Seville" in M.C. Diaz y Diaz, ed., *Isidoriana* Leon, 1961, p. 317-344, but I wonder if it would allow you to say something about schools of basic learning in northern Italy, seeing how Isidore was such standard material for beginner clerical schooling. Would mss of Isidore coming from a cathedral scriptorium indicate, or suggest, a school there? (I ask this from my limited knowledge working with mss of a study-book character from northern Italy.)

(Throughout the entire chapter and notes, where I caught typos I made a mark in the margin, but you probably, or your editor, plan to take care of all that. Occasional other remarks in the margins are just my musings.)

I hope I haven't misread you or caused more confusion by my remarks. You probably didn't want all my thoughts, but you gave me quite a few. Thanks for letting me read this!

Best,

Susan