

## *Introduction*

This book is a study of a group of early medieval texts, known today as the *ordines romani* (Roman Orders), and of the manuscripts which carry them, written across the Carolingian realms between the years 750 and 900. Though often categorised straightforwardly as ‘liturgical’ texts, the *ordines* reveal plainly the limitations of this modern category, and they have a great deal more historical value than this categorisation might, from our modern perspective, immediately suggest. First and foremost, these manuscripts reflect the sophistication of early medieval book culture: complex scribal practices of compilation and formatting, choices of individual texts and accessory material, deployment of varied scripts and languages. Evident in the manuscripts are also diverse practices of reading and ‘use’ of manuscripts once they lay in the possession of individuals and communities, which strict terms such as ‘liturgical’ limit our ability to fully grasp.<sup>1</sup> The categorisations which modern scholars have used to understand such manuscripts, including the category of ‘liturgical’ itself, are in many respects anachronistic. A ‘liturgical’ manuscript might have had many potential uses, both those conceived by its original compilers and those reenvisaged by later owners and users.<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, the manuscripts of the *ordines romani* are themselves products of widely felt imperatives to improve ecclesiastical practice and the education of clergy in the Carolingian era. They are an important source for understanding how these impulses were promulgated and shared. Initially, the texts expressed the ideals and purposes of certain circles of high-ranking and highly educated clergymen of the Carolingian Church, above all bishops who were personally familiar with Rome,

<sup>1</sup> Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton (eds.), ‘Introduction’, in *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation* (Aldershot, 2015), pp.4–7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9: ‘Medieval manuscripts of liturgical rites were rarely if ever intended simply as a prescription of how service should be conducted’; Edoard Henrik Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy Became Frankish: Sound, Performance and Sublation in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries’, *Études Grégoriennes*, 40 (2013), p.85.

accustomed to reading and using liturgy in highly sophisticated ways, and eager to raise the quality of practice and understanding of ritual. The gathering of *ordines* in collections, copied in surviving manuscripts, was an important innovation accomplished by such men, a kind of liturgical book which was entirely new, and reflected their ambitious goals for their own churches and devotional lives, as well as for those whom they guided and taught. The text type *ordo* and books containing collections of *ordines* are both distinctive achievements of these Carolingian churchmen. They are expressions of genuine creativity and dynamism in an age that is often seen as derivative, and within a genre of text, the medieval liturgy, often presented as entirely uncreative.

Widespread reception and copying of these new collections, which took place in monastic communities as well as episcopal churches, demonstrate to us that the complex resonances of these texts could then be further reframed to shape ritual comprehension in new, local settings. The flexible *ordines romani* were thus perfectly suited to accomplishing such positive change in distinctly Carolingian ways, and they give us an invaluable view of the methods and results of this process. This guides us beyond the previous understanding of the texts as primarily the tool and expression of a straightforward top-down 'liturgical reform'.<sup>3</sup> According to the traditional understanding, the monarchs of the Carolingian dynasty, principally Pippin III and Charlemagne, had taken the initiative in appealing to Rome for authoritative books and texts.<sup>4</sup> The monarchs aimed for uniformity in the cultural life of the Empire, and liturgy was an important means to achieve this. They thus imposed authoritative Roman books upon their subjects in order to eliminate the diversity previously characteristic of the Western liturgy. This narrative was built upon predetermined understandings of how liturgical reform worked, through which the scanty evidence available was interpreted. It has also sometimes been argued that the *ordines romani* were, in some sense, imposed by Pippin III, though there exists no evidence of this.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Julia Barrow, 'The Ideas and Application of Reform', in Julia M. H. Smith and Tom Noble (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. III, 600–1100 (Cambridge, 2008), pp.345–362; Arthur Westwell, Carine van Rhijn and Ingrid Rembold (eds.), *Rethinking the Carolingian Reforms* (Manchester, 2023), especially van Rhijn, 'Introduction', pp.1–31.

<sup>4</sup> Cyrille Vogel, 'La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne', in Bernhard Bischoff (ed.), *Karl der Große Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. II, *Das geistige Leben* (Dusseldorf, 1966), pp.217–32; Theodor Klauser, 'Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkisch-deutschen Kirche vom achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 53 (1933), pp.169–189, on the *ordines romani*, p.176.

<sup>5</sup> Yitzhak Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)*, HBS, Subsidia 3 (London, 2001), pp.62–64.

*Introduction*

3

Despite important critiques, reform in the sense of uniformity according to the Roman model has remained the principal means of understanding and evaluating the Carolingian period's effects on liturgy. When the actual fact of continued or even increased manuscript diversity in this period is confronted, it has led to the assumption that Carolingian liturgical reform must have failed, or even that they inaugurated a period of 'liturgical anxiety and confusion'.<sup>6</sup> But treatments of 'reform' or 'Romanisation' can be demonstrated to have the matter the wrong way round in their belief that the drive to improve liturgy was the product of, and strictly limited by, imperial and conciliar directives on the subject.<sup>7</sup>

Legal and conciliar sources were highlighted because they conformed to expectations of what was perceived as top-down 'reform', but they really give only a narrow picture of Carolingian culture.<sup>8</sup> In fact these central directives were the response from above to a movement already flourishing at every level of society, which we are better able to recognise if we begin with the manuscripts. This cultural movement went further and in many more directions than the narrow and specific purview of the legal and political interventions. This is a much more collaborative model for sharing liturgy that potentially involved many rather different, but mostly harmonious, priorities and visions.<sup>9</sup> This would also mean seeing the 'Carolingian effect' on the liturgy playing out over the whole period in many different places in different ways, rather than confined to one decisive moment of exertion on the part of the monarchs. It is in the

<sup>6</sup> Frederick S. Paxton, 'Researching Rites for the Dying and the Dead', in Gittos and Hamilton (eds.), *Understanding Medieval Liturgy*, p.49; Yitzhak Hen, 'When Liturgy Gets Out of Hand', in Elina Screen and Charles West (eds.), *Writing the Early Medieval West* (Manchester, 2018), pp.203–212.

<sup>7</sup> Marco Mostert, "... but they pray badly using corrected books": Errors in the Early Carolingian Copies of the *Admonitio Generalis*, in Rob Meens, Dorine van Espelo, Bram von den Hoven van Genderen, Janneke Raaijmakers, Irene van Renswoude and Carine van Rhijn (eds.), *Religious Franks: Religion and Power in the Frankish Kingdoms* (Manchester, 2017), pp.112–127; Daniel DiCenso, 'Revisiting the *Admonitio Generalis*', in Daniel DiCenso and Rebecca Maloy (eds.), *Chant, Liturgy and the Inheritance of Rome: Essays in Honour of Joseph Dyer* (London, 2017), pp.315–372; Raymond Kottje, 'Einheit und Vielfalt des kirchlichen Lebens in der Karolingerzeit', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 76 (1965), pp.335–340; Wolfgang Steck, "Secundum usum romanum": Liturgischer Anspruch und Wirklichkeit zur Karolingerzeit, in Christian Schäfer and Martin Thurner (eds.), *Mittelalterliches Denken: Debatten. Ideen und Gestalten im Kontext* (Darmstadt, 2007), pp.15–28.

<sup>8</sup> For example, Arnold Angenendt, 'Keine Romanisierung der Liturgie unter Karl dem Großen?: Einspruch gegen Martin Morards "Sacramentarium immixtum" et uniformisation romaine', *AfL*, 51 (2009), pp.96–108, argues for the principle of liturgical uniformity chiefly based on the writings of Boniface and the assumption that Charlemagne must have imposed the Gregorian Sacramentary, with little attention to manuscripts.

<sup>9</sup> Karl Morrison, 'Know Thyself: Music in the Carolingian Renaissance', in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane, 39 (Spoleto, 1992), pp.369–481.

manuscripts that were produced through the whole period in response to these many divergences that we actually see the trajectories and horizons of how people understood the liturgy, the wealth of what was allowed and the boundaries of what was not.

### *Ordines* and the ‘Arrangement’ of the Liturgy

The importance of the *ordines romani* for our comprehension of early medieval ritual life and the medieval understanding of what that ritual did and meant should not be underestimated. In many cases, they present the first and only detailed description of what might have occurred during the key rituals of the Christian tradition in the Early Middle Ages. But more fundamentally and perhaps more truthfully (since the translation of the written description to ritual practice remains obscure and was likely not straightforward), the *ordines* are an invaluable pointer to how those rituals were framed and understood by those who participated in them. Their setting in manuscripts is a vital part of the evidence they provide.

The texts categorised as *ordines* take many forms and appear in various contexts.<sup>10</sup> They differ hugely in their length and their detail, and, thus, in their exact relation to the performance of ritual. The common description of them as ‘stage directions’ for ritual is overly simplistic.<sup>11</sup> It is not true that *ordines* described (even in their earliest form) only the gestures, actions and non-spoken elements of ritual, or properly dealt with only a single liturgical event each.<sup>12</sup> They are not in any simple way the counterpart or inextricable accompaniment of a book of prayers like the Sacramentary, which equally does not ‘only’ or ‘merely’ contain the words said in ritual. A number of *ordines* interact with the spoken, sung or read elements of liturgical ceremony in various ways, and the Sacramentary is actually a significant presence in the transmission of some of the most important individual *ordines*.

The term *ordo* was applied by contemporaries to both individual texts and full books in this period. It is best to think of *ordo* in terms of an ‘arrangement’ of a liturgical rite. Indeed, the idea of ‘arrangement’ allows a better appreciation of the ambiguity of the relation of the written *ordo* to

<sup>10</sup> Aimé-Georges Martimort, *Les Ordines, les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge, 56 (Turnhout, 1991); Roger Reynolds, ‘Ordines’, in Joseph Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. IX (New York, 1987), p.269; Eric Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques: Le Moyen Âge des origines au XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1993), pp.196–197.

<sup>11</sup> Henry Parkes, *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books Music and Ritual in Mainz 950–1050* (Cambridge, 2015), pp.12, 219.

<sup>12</sup> Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986), p.135.

the performed ritual as it would be acted out. It is not at all clear that *ordines* were written as 'scripts', to be followed mechanically step by step. Many address preconditions of ritual, including the proper understanding of the ritual prior to the performance. When viewed in their manuscript context by their medieval users, they invited reflection and the participation of their readers in working out the potential of how the recorded text could guide the acted out liturgical ceremony. Thus, understanding any given *ordo* as the 'standard' guide to the performance of a ritual across the whole Carolingian Empire, or even the sufficient and complete account of how it would invariably be performed in a single church, misses the potential for a significant level of individual and dynamic involvement on the part of both compilers and readers in the use of such texts.

This is particularly visible in a subset of the texts which were edited as the *ordines romani*. *Ordines romani* are distinguished by a particular orientation towards the Roman Church, often in describing rituals as they were performed, or envisaged to be performed, by the hierarchy around the Pope and on the streets and sacred locations of the city. The terminology of *ordo romanus* goes back at least to the ninth century, and was applied then to individual texts as well as to complete books (or booklets), but was not used systematically. We can see this, for example, in ninth-century book lists from Reichenau and St Gall.<sup>13</sup> Individual texts are variously titled: *Ordo Romanorum*, *Ordo Qualiter Romanae Ecclesiae* and so on. The modern designation of this kind of text as the *ordines romani* stems from a long tradition of editorial selection. Jean Mabillon divided up and numbered a particularly influential set, and his designations were employed in some of the older treatments.<sup>14</sup> Other liturgists and historians followed suit in identifying and editing various texts from some early manuscripts, Gerbert and Duchesne among them.<sup>15</sup> When presented in this way, the conviction was held that such texts were the accurate representations of Roman norms, and had been created by Roman pens for the purposes of putting the liturgical rites so described into practice in Rome itself. Their presence and purposeful configuration in Frankish manuscripts copied from the ninth century onward were not therefore discussed in any depth.

<sup>13</sup> For example Gustav Becker, *Catologi bibliothecarum antiqui*, vol. I (Bonn, 1885), p.51: 'Ordo Romanus in duobus quaternionibus. Item aliud in quaternionibus'; p.63: 'Romanus Ordo'.

<sup>14</sup> Jean Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, vol. II (Paris, 1689), reprinted in *PL* 78, cols.851–1408; concordance in Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp.194–197.

<sup>15</sup> Martin Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris liturgiae alemannicae* (St-Blaise, 1779); Louis Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 5th ed. (Paris, 1920), pp.475–504; English translation, *Christian Worship: Its Origins and Evolution*, trans. L. McClure (London, 1919), pp.455–464, and discussion at pp.146–150.

By cataloguing the manuscripts which carried *ordines*, Michel Andrieu's monumental edition made significant strides to making that discussion possible.<sup>16</sup> Andrieu identified and selected a particular selection of fifty *ordo romanus* texts. Each one was given a number, which this book will continue to use. His editions in five volumes have a lucid commentary that presents a pertinent 'state of the question' for liturgical research on the many different rituals which the texts address. In general, the focus is on Rome and what we can know about the Roman Church's practices, from the *ordines* and complementary sources such as papal letters and councils. But Andrieu also made it clear for the first time how many of the texts that had been previously published as *ordines romani* showed a significant level of Frankish adaptation. Details in the language used and the rituals described reveal that, even where the rites ostensibly are depicted as taking place in Rome, they were still written by Frankish authors. Among these, a number still maintain accurate descriptions of real and historical Roman practice so far as Andrieu could tell.<sup>17</sup> But many others introduce rituals and elements of rituals that were not, or could not, have been undertaken in the Roman Church.<sup>18</sup> Andrieu made great efforts to distinguish one from another, but his method was to draw a sharp distinction between 'authentically' Roman elements and what he deemed to be 'tendentious' Frankish fraud in a way that does not seem to capture the roles which the texts can be shown to play in their complex manuscripts.<sup>19</sup> He based this on his particular conception of what receiving Roman liturgy would have meant. In his view, any adaptations of Roman liturgy had to be an unwilling compromise on the part of 'reformers' to the sensibilities of greater part of the people and clergy, rather than an intrinsic and valid response that was quite normal and expected in the period's liturgical culture.<sup>20</sup> He wrote, for example, of one *ordo* (*Ordo* 15) and of its author (the 'zealous romaniser'):

It represents a sort of compromise between the Roman and the Gallican mass . . . to suppress abruptly the Gallican tradition would have been too difficult. The void thus created would have disconcerted most of the faithful and the majority of the clergy. The latter were all the more attached to their traditional customs as their lack of education and their lack of an overarching view made them less sensitive to the state of anarchy of the Gallican liturgy

<sup>16</sup> *Les Ordines*; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp.135–197.

<sup>17</sup> For example, *Ordo* 1, 2, 14, 20, 34, 40, 42.

<sup>18</sup> For example, *Ordo* 3, 5, 9, 10, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, etc.

<sup>19</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, pp.153–154: 'une contrefaçon tendancieuse'.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.xlvii–xlvi: '[Collection B] témoigne d'une sorte de compromis. On n'avait pas voulu heurter trop brusquement les vieilles coutumes indigènes.'

*Ordines and the 'Arrangement' of the Liturgy*

7

and the need for reform. Also, our zealous romaniser, after having proposed to the bishops, whom he considered enlightened enough to adopt it and powerful enough to impose it, a quite strictly Roman model of the Mass, had believed it necessary to compromise in order to win to his cause the lower clergy.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, the 'reformers' really wanted a complete adoption of the 'Roman rite' wholesale, exactly as the modern Catholic Church would require, but were forced to make compromises that were not in line with their real goals by the parlous state of clerical education. This was a common perspective on the reception of Roman liturgical forms in Francia, closely linked to the modern idea of 'reform': for example, Andrieu also viewed the Mass Book known as the Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century in the same terms, not as a real act of Frankish creativity and individuality but as an unsatisfactory compromise made out of necessity.<sup>22</sup> It is unclear, however, if Carolingian liturgists really understood the 'Roman rite' as unitary, in the way the printing press and centuries of consolidation have made it today.

It is also true that even more of the texts than Andrieu suspected were in fact created by Frankish hands, and his defence of their Roman origin does not in every case convince.<sup>23</sup> His singular focus on the reconstruction of an 'original' form tended to allow less attention on the new forms they took in the surviving manuscripts, which were evidence of ongoing creativity in adaptation beyond the initial act of writing the 'original' text. Notably, such later adaptations also belie his presentation of much of the Carolingian Church as poorly educated, hopelessly traditional and unable to accept change. Seeing 'anarchy' in the so-called Gallican liturgy

<sup>21</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.79: '[Ordo 15] une sorte de compromise entre la messe romaine et la messe gallicane . . . La supprimer brusquement eut été trop hardi. Le vide ainsi créé eût déconcerté le commun des fidèles et la majeure partie du clergé. Celle-ci était d'autant plu attachée à ses coutumes traditionnelles que son peu d'instruction, son manque de vues générales lui rendaient moins sensibles l'état d'anarchie de la liturgie gallicane et la nécessité d'une réforme. Aussi notre zélé romanisant, après avoir proposé aux évêques, qu'il estimait assez éclairés pour l'adopter et assez puissants pour l'imposer, un modèle de messe assez strictement romaine, a-t-il cru nécessaire de transiger pour gagner à sa cause le clergé inférieur.'

<sup>22</sup> Michel Andrieu, 'Quelques remarques sur le classement des sacramentaires', *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, II (1931), pp.46–66, at pp.55–56. For the more updated evaluation of these books: Bernard Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentaries. A Study in Tradition* (Oxford, 1976).

<sup>23</sup> Indicated already by Aimé-Georges Martimort, 'Recherches recentes sur les Sacramentaires', *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, 63 (1962), p.38; Stephen J. P. van Dijk, 'The Medieval Easter Vespers of the Roman Clergy', *Sacris Erudiri*, 19 (1969–70), pp.261–363 (on Ordo 27); Arthur Westwell, 'The Content and the Ideological Construction of the Early Pontifical Manuscripts', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Moyen Âge*, 132 (2020), pp.233–251 (on Ordo 35).



(the scholarly construction of an indigenous liturgical tradition of France) was another precondition for understanding the Carolingian age as one of reform, so that it had been necessary to correct a decadent past. The actual vitality of Merovingian liturgical life was a casualty to this understanding.<sup>24</sup>

Andrieu gave a significant and pertinent presentation of the range of manuscripts in which the texts appear. He identified a number of 'Collections', which represented the self-conscious selection and juxtaposition of a number of different *ordines* together in a single book. Two of these collections, which Andrieu designated as Collection A the 'Roman Collection' and Collection B the 'Frankish Collection', are present in a number of different manuscripts; several other Collections are only found in a single manuscript (e.g. the Collection of St Amand, the Collection of St Gall and the *Capitulare* Collection).<sup>25</sup> As the names he gave the first two imply, Andrieu read ideological function into the gathering and presentation of the sets of *ordines*. But this aspect was dealt with only cursorily in his editions. Describing the Collections as respectively 'Roman' and 'Frankish' identified these designations as wholly distinct; Andrieu saw the texts they contained as purely one or the other, when the relation to the Roman liturgy of both Collection A and B was much more ambiguous than this would suggest. Nor did Andrieu go into how the individual manuscripts of each of the Collections reinterpreted what he identified as the original content: each one contains additional *ordines*, and additional liturgical and non-liturgical texts. These additions bear witness to a complex and individualised phenomenon of individual Frankish writers using the Roman texts for their own purposes. Andrieu's understanding of wholesale 'liturgical reform' based on the *ordines* was not principally aimed at recovering this nuance.

Likewise, Andrieu's conception of what a 'liturgical book' was and how it was intended to be used meant that he imposed a further distinction between the manuscripts of the Collections. He differentiated between 'real' liturgical books, in particular an important set that were identified as precursors to the genre of the 'pontifical', and those that were not 'really' liturgical because they were not designed for use in church. In Andrieu's presentation, only a manuscript whose entire content was orientated towards liturgical use could be properly deemed liturgical. Thus, they would be without any subsidiary content which precluded a manuscript from being considered 'liturgical' in the same way (most notably the addition of *expositiones* and

<sup>24</sup> Yitzhak Hen, 'Unity in Diversity: the Liturgy of Frankish Gaul before the Carolingians', *Studies in Church History*, 32 (1995), pp.19–30.

<sup>25</sup> Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp.144–155.



study texts on liturgy).<sup>26</sup> In practice, very few manuscripts obey these rules. This understanding plainly projected the characteristics of modern liturgical books back onto medieval liturgical manuscripts which have a much more complex relationship to practice. The *ordines romani* manuscripts, in fact, allow us to mount one of the more lucid challenges to a frame of interpretation which has been assumed for study of liturgical sources. 'Using' an *ordo* as a framework for the physical performance does not seem to have been the simple transaction that has hitherto been envisaged. Unlike Mass prayers, chants or lections, the principal utility of *ordines* did not lie in their being read and used during the ceremony itself. Since they describe an 'arrangement' of how the ceremony could proceed, we come closer to their utility if we imagine them being read beforehand, pondered and rehearsed, or consulted if ever questions arose. Such nuances are important when it comes to the question of what a 'liturgical' manuscript was originally designed to do and in what other ways it may have been used over time. Both the placement of *ordines* in manuscripts and the ongoing processing of them as they were copied show that copyists did not envisage that 'using' an *ordo* simply meant replicating its instructions. Instead, 'using' an *ordo* would have involved far more of the preconditions, understanding and intentions of the people involved in setting up and enacting it, individuals who are not really a presence at all in Andrieu's reconstruction. What did they intend the rite described by a particular *ordo* to do, and what did it mean to them? Questions such as these would have strongly affected the shape the actual ritual took, with the *ordo's* text certainly contributing but likely not having the final word. In the same way, the presentation of the *ordo* in the manuscript, with other material (whether that was non-liturgical or liturgical in these strict terms) was certainly intended to help guide how the *ordo* itself was interpreted, and thus what form the 'use' of the *ordines* would take. Such presentation likewise suggests a much greater role for the user and reader, who was expected to actively interpret the text, than was assumed in the more traditional analysis of Andrieu.

This is even more pertinent in the specific case of the *ordines romani*. It would not be simple to translate the narrative of a complex ceremonial in an *ordo romanus* set in Rome and practised by the Pope into a ceremony undertaken in a Frankish church or monastery. Rome's abundance of churches and special hierarchy are often displayed in the *ordines romani*, which revel in their presentation

<sup>26</sup> For example, *Les Ordines*, vol.I, p.476: 'Un tel volume est fait pour l'étude. On le lit dans une bibliothèque, mais on ne l'emporte pas à l'église.'

of the exotic richness of Rome's ecclesiastical resources. It would take a certain imaginative leap to see one's own Frankish cathedral as St Peter's Basilica, described in the *ordo*, for example. But rather than this being than an obstacle to the use and dissemination of the texts, the *ordines romani* seem to be designed to effect exactly such an imaginative leap. This appears to be key to understanding why the texts were widely shared and copied. The potential to see in one's own liturgical ceremonies the precious and prized enactment of such an intimate mental link to Rome and the papacy allowed the *ordines romani* to act as both a framework for a ceremony and a guide to then seeing the ceremony in progress as a physical, dynamic expression of this desirable connection to Rome. Thus, the copying of *ordines* should be considered in tandem with the other methods the Franks employed to express and embody their link to Rome: the copying of Roman architectural forms in basilica churches, the fevered search for Roman relics to found their churches upon; pilgrimage to Rome to rest at the threshold of the apostles; and the presentation of Frankish history as continuous with the history of the papal church.<sup>27</sup> As we will see, the churchmen who can be linked to the transmission of *ordines* can in almost every case also be seen to have undertaken initiatives of these other kinds. They integrated the *ordines* into their broader agendas, which made use of Rome for the sophisticated consolidation of their own authority and as a measure of their understanding of what was correct, orderly and right.

The *ordo romanus* manuscript, by acting as the 'guidebook' for such processes, would also partake of and represent a special connection to the city of Rome in the same way as a manuscript of the Roman Gregorian Mass Book did, which, in addition to its obvious liturgical function

<sup>27</sup> On architecture '*more romano*': Judson Emerick, 'Building *more romano* in Francia During the Third Quarter of the Eighth Century: The Abbey Church of Saint-Denis and its Model', in Claudia Bolgia, Rosamond McKitterick and John Osborne (eds.), *Rome Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas, c.500–1400* (Cambridge, 2011), pp.127–150; Carol Heitz, '*More romano*: problèmes d'architecture et liturgie carolingiennes', in *Roma e l'età carolingia. Atti della giornata di studio 3–8 Maggio 1976 a cura dello Istituto di Storia dell'arte dell'università di Roma* (Rome, 1976), pp.27–34; on Roman relics: Julia M. H. Smith (ed.), 'Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia', in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough* (Leiden, 2000), pp.317–340; on Roman history: Rosamond McKitterick, 'Les Perceptions Carolingiennes de Rome', in Woljciech Falkowski and Yves Sasser (eds.), *Le monde carolingien: Bilan, perspectives, champs de recherches, Actes de colloque international de Poitiers, Centre d'Études Supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 18–20 novembre* (Turnhout, 2009), pp.83–102; Rosamond McKitterick, 'Rome and the Popes in the Construction of Institutional History and Identity in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of Leiden UB Scaliger MS 49', in Valerie Garver and Owen Phelan (eds.), *Rome and Religion in the Early Medieval World: Studies in Honor of Thomas F. X. Noble* (Farnham, 2014), pp.207–234.