Seeing the Invisible in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages

Edited by
Giselle de Nie, Karl F. Morrison and Marco Mostert

BREPOLS

Amalarius's *Liber Officialis*: Spirit and Vision in Carolingian Liturgical Thought

CELIA CHAZELLE

Until about twenty years ago, historians of the early Middle Ages tended to view Carolingian scholarly literature as characterized by a recycling of ideas and modes of expression appropriated from ancient and patristic literature and mediated, through the Carolingian works, to following centuries. One of the principal goals of analysis of these writings was to identify and elucidate their ties with presumed antecedents and exemplars. Although historians realized that important shifts in western thought occurred in the Frankish empire, they typically interpreted those changes as inadvertent, the consequence of forces outside the Carolingians' control or of their inferior skills and knowledge relative to the writers they supposedly sought to emulate.[1]

Reinforcing this focus on the mediation of the past were the fixed genres to which the Carolingian texts were, and still commonly are, assigned: "the" biblical or liturgical commentary, "the" saint's life, "the" philosophical or theolo-

[1] For discussions of earlier scholarly views such as I describe, and recent departures, see C. CHAZELLE and B. VAN NAME EDWARDS, "Introduction: The study of the Bible and Carolingian culture", in: *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. C. CHAZELLE and B. VAN NAME EDWARDS (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 1-16, at pp. 6-10; J. CONTRENI, "Charlemagne and the Carolingians: The view from North America", *Cheiron: Materiali e strumenti di aggiornamento storiografico* 37 (2002), pp. 111-139, at pp. 141-153; L. NEES, *Early Medieval Art* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 9-15; J. WILLIAMS, "Introduction", in: *Imaging the Early Medieval Bible*, ed. J. WILLIAMS (University Park, PA, 1999), pp. 1-8; M. IRVINE, *The Making of Textual Culture: "Grammatica" and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 15-22; C. CHAZELLE, "Introduction: The end of the Dark Ages", in: *Literacy, Politics, and Artistic Innovation in the Early Medieval West*, ed. C. CHAZELLE (Lanham, MD, 1992), pp. 1-18.

gical tract, "the" mirror of a prince, and so on. Often these categories are traced back to antiquity and forward to the later Middle Ages, with the Carolingian literature discussed as evidence of stages more or less midway in a long-term process of evolution. There is no question this research has borne important fruit for understanding the relation of the Carolingian writings to earlier and subsequent developments.[2] Still, by their nature such approaches privilege continuities, the features that mark a text as comparable to previous or later work and a channel in the transmission of older ideas. Even when the departures from earlier texts identified with the same genres are acknowledged, continuities define the matrix within which the deviations are assessed and their significance evaluated.

In the last two decades, greater regard has been shown for the substantial evidence that, while certainly mindful of patristic and other authorities, Carolingian scholars often in fact selected and adapted materials from these sources in ways that led them to break with previous trends in thought.[3] Despite, however, this increased sensitivity to the disjunctions between pre-Carolingian and Carolingian learning, the literary categories used in our research continue to limit the comparisons we make with earlier and later writings and the judgments we reach on that basis concerning the Carolingian works' typical or extraordinary features. The fluidity of textual approaches in this era – the creation, over and over again, of both new ideas and fundamentally new literary forms for their expression – has received too little examination, and as a result the complexity, originality, and scope of Carolingian intellectual endeavour remains to some extent, even now, inadequately appreciated. Meanwhile, historians of later medieval Europe still refer to older theories about early medieval thought as they trace late medieval theological, exegetical, and other scholarship back to supposedly simpler, less sophisticated Carolingian prototypes, or to antiquity mediated through uncomprehending Carolingian agents.

[2] Exemplary of the benefits are U. ERNST, *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Cologne, 1991); J. MARENBON, *Early Medieval Philosophy (480-1150)*, 2nd edn. (London, 1988); H.H. ANTON, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit* (Bonn, 1967); E. KANTOROWICZ, *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley, 1946).

[3] See J. CONTRENI, "The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and literary culture", in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, 2, *c. 700-c. 900* (henceforth *NCMH* 2), ed. R. MCKITTERICK (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 709-757, esp. 747-757; D. GANZ, "Theology and the organization of thought, in: *NCMH* 2, pp. 758-785; C. CHAZELLE, "Originality in arts and letters", in: *Dictionary of the Middle Ages: Supplement* 1, ed. W.C. JORDAN (New York, 2003), pp. 437-439.

Any Carolingian materials that do not fit into these paradigms are (understandably) ignored.

Studies of the *Liber officialis* illustrate the historiographical methods and problems just outlined. Written by the Carolingian scholar Amalarius († *ca.* 851), sometimes known as "of Metz", this is the most detailed exegetical treatment of the liturgy to survive in early medieval Latin literature.[4] In its final (third) complete edition (abbreviated editions were also compiled), the treatise consists of four books of predominantly allegorical commentary on the major calendrical observances of the liturgical year, the daily mass, and the divine office. Not only spoken and sung texts, but ritual actions, objects, clerical grades, vestments, and other topics are discussed.[5] Amalarius, whose traditional connection with Metz is unproven, served as archbishop of Trier from 809 to 813 or 816; he lost the position just before or after his trip to Constantinople in 813-814 as an ambassador for Charlemagne. From then until 835, aside from participating in the Paris synod of 825 that discussed Byzantine iconoclasm, most of his known career was spent in the study and composition of liturgical texts, mainly commentaries.[6] The first edition of the *Liber officialis* was dedicated to Emperor Louis the Pious († 840) in the early 820s; the third edition was finished by *ca.* 835, when Amalarius was named to administer the cathedral of Lyons in the absence of its archbishop Agobard († 840), expelled for his support of Louis's sons in the rebellion of 833.[7] Soon after arriving in Lyons, Amalarius preached his interpretations of the liturgy to the clergy; arranged for the *Liber officialis* to be copied; and called for usage of an antiphonary, no

[4] *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J.-M. HANSSENS, 3 vols. (Vatican, 1948-1950: *Studi e testi* 138-140) [henceforth cited as *Amalarii opera*], 2.

[5] See *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 155-156, on the contents of the three editions.

[6] Wolfgang STECK, *Der liturgiker Amalarius: Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung zu Leben und Werk eines Theologen der Karolingerzeit* (St. Ottilien, 2000), pp. 7-11 on Amalarius's biography. Most of Amalarius's extant writings were edited in *Amalarii opera.* Amalarius's *Uersus Marini*, recalling his trip to Constantinople, is edited in: *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini (I)*, ed. E. DÜMMLER (Berlin, 1881: *MGH PP* 1), pp. 426-428. Recently discovered works are published in C.A. JONES, *A Lost Work by Amalarius of Metz: Interpolations in Salisbury, Cathedral Library, MS. 154* (London, 2001) and in H. SCHNEIDER, "Roman liturgy and Frankish allegory: Editions of fragments of Amalarius", in: *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, ed. J.M.H. SMITH (Leiden, 2000), pp. 341-379.

[7] STECK, *Der liturgiker Amalarius*, p. 9; E. BOSHOF, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon: Leben und Werk* (Cologne, 1969), pp. 262-263. The first edition of the *Liber officialis* [henceforth *LO*] contained Books 1-3 and four letters; the fourth book, new prefaces, and two more letters were added to the second and third editions. See HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 68-75, 134; JONES, *A Lost Work*, p. 18 and n. 12.

longer extant, that he had compiled after visiting Rome in 831.[8] Florus of Lyons († *ca.* 860), aided by Agobard, launched a campaign against Amalarius's teachings and books that led to their condemnation at the synod of Quierzy in 838, for which Florus wrote the sole surviving report.[9] The judgment does not seemed to have much dampened the popularity of the *Liber officialis* in Carolingian circles.[10]

Since the publication in 1948-1950 of Jean-Michel Hanssens' critical edition of Amalarius's liturgical writings,[11] a notable volume of scholarship on the *Liber officialis* has helped situate it within the evolution of early medieval Latin liturgical commentary, largely by comparing it with older and contemporary texts identified with the same genre.[12] Certain historians, observing that Amalarius was not the first Latin writer to undertake a comprehensive study of the liturgy or to be interested in its allegorical interpretation, have stressed the connections between his work, especially the *Liber officialis*, and earlier exegesis.[13] A greater number of scholars, though, while not denying these connections, have paid more attention to the ways in which Amalarius's treatise seems to depart from both previous and other Carolingian writings of this genre. The amount of emphasis on allegorical interpretation; the number of different liturgical elements discussed in this fashion; the perplexing order in which some

[8] Hanssens published what he argued to be the antiphonary's prologue: *Prologus antiphonarii, Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 359-363. Cf. STECK, *Der liturgiker Amalarius*, pp. 9, 159-162; JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 56-57 and n. 22.

[9] *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. in: *Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. A. WERMINGHOFF, 2 vols. (Hannover, 1906-1908: *MGH CONC* 2.1-2), 2, pp. 768-782. See K. ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist: Studien zur Persönlichkeit eines karolingischen "Intellektuellen" am Beispiel der Auseinandersetzung mit Amalarius (835-838) und des Prädestinationsstreits (851-855)* (Stuttgart, 1999), pp. 21-22, 27-34, 54-59.

[10] See below, at n. 109.

[11] Above, n. 4.

[12] Surveys of earlier scholarship on Amalarius are found in P.G. FERRIBY, *The Development of Liturgical Symbolism in the Early Works of Amalarius of Metz (ca. 775-ca. 850)* (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 2000), pp. 11-44; P.A. JACOBSON, Ad memoriam ducens*: The Development of Liturgical Exegesis in Amalar of Metz's* Expositiones missae (PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1996), pp. 4-10.

[13] E.g. R. SUNTRUP, *Die Bedeutung der liturgischen Gebärden und Bewegungen in lateinischen und deutschen Auslegungen des 9. bis 13. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1978), pp. 46-49; A. FRANZ, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens* (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1902; repr. Darmstadt, 1963), pp. 361-362 (linking Amalarius with Alcuin); A. KOLPING, "Amalar von Metz und Florus von Lyon: Zeugen eines Wandels im liturgischen Mysterienverständnis in der Karolingerzeit", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 73 (1951), pp. 424-464, at pp. 424-425; J.A. JUNGMANN, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 2 vols. (New York, 1950), 1, p. 88.

portions of the commentary are presented;[14] its prolix, discursive, associative prose style; the frequent lack of identifiable precedents or sources and the failure to note them for many teachings – all these features make the *Liber officialis* appear exceptional relative to other early medieval Latin liturgical commentaries.[15] Even more striking, it is thought, is Amalarius's openness about admitting that his treatise breaks new ground. Regularly in the *Liber officialis*, he announces that he discovered ideas in his own mind or soul or acquired them, not from the church fathers, but from the Holy Spirit.[16] Although the actual innovation of much Carolingian scholarship is now well recognized, such comments are still usually taken as indicative of an audaciousness – an altogether different mentality from the expressions of respect for patristic and church tradition that so frequently occur in contemporary writings.

These characteristics of the *Liber officialis* have encouraged some historians to judge its exegesis "extreme", "absurd", and marginal in the development of Carolingian learning.[17] Sometimes, its isolation from supposedly

[14] At various points Amalarius notes that he has chosen to comment on a portion of the liturgy he forgot to mention elsewhere, where it would have been more logical to do so, or that he is presenting new thoughts about a liturgical element on which he had already commented in a previous chapter: e.g. *LO* 1. 41, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 192-193, *LO* 3. 39, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 373; *LO* 4 *Praefatiuncula* 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 403. See HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 135-136.

[15] Most often mentioned to illustrate this point are the treatise assigned to Germanus of Paris, *Quomodo solemnis ordo ecclesiae agitur*, ed. K. GAMBER, *Ordo Antiquus Gallicanus: Der gallikanische Messritus des 6. Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg, 1965); Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. LAWSON (Turnhout, 1989: CCSL 113); Rabanus, *De institutione clericorum libri tres*, ed. D. ZIMPEL (Frankfurt, 1996); Walafrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, ed. V. KRAUSE in: *Capitularia regum Francorum*, 2, ed. A. BORETIUS and V. KRAUSE (Hannover, 1890-1897: *MGH CAPP* 2), pp. 473-516; and the various Carolingian expositions of baptism and commentaries on the mass. See JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 140-144; JACOBSON, "*Ad memoriam ducens*", pp. 1-2, with references to earlier literature; R. MESSNER, "Zur Hermeneutik allegorischer Liturgieerklärung in Ost und West", *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 115 (1993), pp. 284-319 and 415-434, esp. pp. 285, 415; P. ROREM, *The Medieval Development of Liturgical Symbolism* (Nottingham, 1986), p. 21.

[16] Most discussions of Amalarius refer to this: e.g. (as a few examples) JONES, *A Lost Work*, p. 142; E. BOSHOF, *Ludwig der Fromme* (Darmstadt, 1996), pp. 238-239; A. CABANISS, *Amalarius of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954), pp. 96-101; D.L. MOSEY, *Allegorical liturgical interpretation in the West from 800 A.D. to 1200 A.D.* (PhD diss., University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, 1985), pp. 50, 75-77; ROREM, *Medieval Development*, p. 25.

[17] See, e.g. Y. HEN, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481-751* (Leiden, 1995), p. 76; J. PELIKAN, *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)* (Chicago, 1978), p. 79; R. MCKITTERICK, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-987* (London, 1977), p. 148, and see pp. 148-153; E. BOSHOF, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon: Leben und Werk* (Cologne, 1969), p. 284.

dominant trends in this period and region is ascribed to Amalarius's exposure to Greek ideas and practices in Constantinople. Early Byzantine commentators on the liturgy stressed allegorical interpretation, and certain meanings they assigned to elements of the liturgy recur in the *Liber officialis* and other treatises by Amalarius.[18] As Christopher Jones has recently remarked, though, Amalarius does not cite any of the major Greek liturgical commentaries of the ninth or earlier centuries.[19] While I think conversations with bilingual clergy at the imperial court and his witness of the Byzantine liturgy likely had some influence on his thinking, the impact of Latin sources available in his homeland is more noticeable. Jones has linked the *Liber officialis* with several currents in Carolingian philosophical, theological, and biblical studies, in particular contemporary exegesis of scripture. The *Liber officialis*, he demonstrates, treats the entire liturgy as a book to which can be applied exegetical approaches with some parallels to those of ninth-century biblical commentaries.[20]

Jones' analyses of the *Liber officialis* have significantly advanced our understanding of the treatise and its place in the development of early medieval interpretation of the liturgy. Yet problems remain, since (having different aims than I do here) he does not give close consideration to precisely those attributes that led other scholars to see the *Liber officialis* as exceptionally daring and hence marginal in Carolingian culture. There are definite connections with contemporary scriptural exegesis, particularly with the principle of exhaustive analysis of every detail of the "text" at hand, in this case the liturgy. But Amalarius's methods of exegesis – the discursive prose of the *Liber officialis*, the apparent interruptions to the logical order of its commentary, the emphasis on allegory – cannot be entirely explained by reference to the methods of most Carolingian treatises on the Bible. In general, ninth-century Latin exegesis of scripture proceeds more methodically, indeed sometimes rather pedantically, scriptural verse by scriptural verse and chapter by chapter, carefully adhering to the Bible's organization, and in many cases with more attention to literal or historical than allegorical interpretation. The lack of patristic precedent for much of the discussion in the *Liber officialis*, and Amalarius's repeated assertions that many of his ideas came from the Spirit or were discovered in his own mind, also seem at odds with the frequent, heavy reliance on patristic

[18] See FERRIBY, "Development of liturgical symbolism", pp. 1-2; ROREM, *Medieval Development*, p. 25.

[19] JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 141-142.

[20] See JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 141-153; ID., "The book of the liturgy in Anglo-Saxon England", *Speculum* 73 (1998), pp. 659-702, at pp. 659-666, 674-675.

material in biblical commentaries, and with their authors' statements that their intention was simply to collect and transmit the wisdom of the church fathers.[21]

My principal aim in this essay is to try to clarify these apparent peculiarities of the *Liber officialis* by setting the work against the backdrop of another arena of early medieval intellectual activity beyond those so far mentioned: the practice, rooted in monasticism, of ruminative meditation.[22] Meditation is an arena that overlaps considerably with the Carolingian interest in biblical and liturgical commentary, not only Amalarius's text, but its complex relation to those forms of scholarly endeavour is rarely discussed. One result of this neglect, it seems to me, is that our overall understanding of Carolingian exegesis, of scripture and the liturgy, is generally somewhat distorted.

Monastic rules, commentaries on rules, saints' lives, and other literature make clear the importance of meditation in the devotional life of early medieval monks and clergy. Not only did they read scripture, hear it read, and read literature that might help them understand its meaning; they were expected to ponder its message on their own, drawing on the knowledge gained from those varied sources. As the Rule of St. Benedict leaves no doubt, study and meditation, *lectio* and *meditatio*, in tension yet complimentary, were the two poles of the monastic life, the former pole supporting the latter.[23]

The insights that arose from meditation were not considered original as we understand originality, since the Holy Spirit was believed to direct the mind along the path of orthodoxy laid out in scripture.[24] Yet this process of "sacral

[21] See CHAZELLE and VAN NAME EDWARDS, "Study of the Bible and Carolingian culture", pp. 10-12, and the other articles in the same volume; CONTRENI, "Carolingian Renaissance", pp. 733-734.

[22] The meditative quality of *LO* is briefly noted by JONES, *A Lost Work*, p. 6, but not discussed in depth.

[23] *Regula sancti Benedicti*, esp. c. 48; J. LECLERCQ, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, 3rd edn. (New York, 1982), pp. 12-17, 58-88; MCGINN, *The Growth of Mysticism: Gregory the Great through the 12th Century* (New York, 1994), pp. 132-146.

[24] M. CARRUTHERS, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 162-173. The relation of *lectio* and *meditatio* to orthodoxy, even in those with limited education, is evoked in the *Vita Sturmi*. Though he had a teacher, the priest Wigbert, Sturm is represented as essentially self-taught. "After he had learned the psalms by heart and mastered many books by repeatedly going over them in his mind, the boy began to understand the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures and set himself to learn the hidden secrets of the four Gospels of Christ, and, as far as he was able, to fix in his mind by continual reading the Old and New Testaments. His meditation was upon the law of God, as Scripture says, night and day. His understanding was profound, his thoughts full of wisdom, his words of prudence" (Eigil, *The Life of Saint Sturm*, tr. C.H. TALBOT, in: *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints' Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. T.F.X. NOBLE and T. HEAD (University Park, PA,

ized thought" was certainly valued as creative. Biblical verses and ideas the mind had acquired from other texts elucidating biblical doctrine, such as its patristic exegesis, were supposedly "invented" or recalled into memory. Aided by the Spirit, it was believed, the mind moved freely among these recollections or back and forth between previously learned information and the acquisitions of new reading. Brought together into new combinations and arrangements, this knowledge became the building material from which it gradually constructed a more elevated grasp of sacred truth, one that remained cognizant of the Bible's literal or historical sense but explored, as fully as possible, its more hidden, moral (tropological) or anagogical meanings.[25] Other activities involving corporeal sense perception, too, besides the direct study of sacred literature – though on this point Amalarius disagreed with Florus and Agobard – were widely assumed to induce memory of scripture's teachings and inspire inner contemplation of heavenly things. These included the seeing of works of art, pilgrimages to holy places and saints' shrines, and the liturgy.[26] The insights

1995), pp. 165-187, at pp. 167-168). For an exceptionally beautiful expression of similar ideas, from the eastern Mediterranean, see *A Letter of Philoxenus of Mabbug Sent to a Friend*, tr. G. OLINDER (Göteborg, 1950), pp. 14-15. My thanks to Peter Brown for this reference.

[25] I am very grateful to Peter Brown for clarifying this (oral communication) and suggesting the descriptive term 'sacralized thought'. Compare M. CARRUTHERS, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200* (Cambridge, 1998); R. FULTON, *From Judgment to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800-1200* (New York, 2002), 155-170; J. LECLERCQ, *Otia monastica: Études sur le vocabulaire de la contemplation au moyen âge* (Rome, 1963), esp. pp. 63-83. The integration of patristic writings into meditative thought, so that the language of the Fathers can become the inner language of meditation and prayer, is well illustrated in the *Praefatio* of Julian of Toledo's *Prognosticorum futuri saeculi* (Julian, *Opera*, ed. J.N. HILLGARTH (Turnhout, 1976: CCSL 115), p. 14); see P. BROWN, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, 2nd edn. (Oxford, 2003), p. 26.

[26] CARRUTHERS, *Craft of Thought*, pp. 42-44, 61, 266-268; LECLERCQ, *Love of Learning*, pp. 236-254. The focus seems to be sight and hearing; both were conceived as feeding into meditation or contemplative vision, even while the corporeal and inner activities are clearly differentiated. See D. APPLEBY, "The priority of sight according to Peter the Venerable", *Mediaeval Studies* 60 (1998), pp. 123-157, at pp. 145-149; and the discussion of Bernard of Clairvaux in Bernard MCGINN, *The Growth of Mysticism*, p. 187. On the assimilation of words/hearing to sights/seeing and the roots in classical comparisons of painting to language, see also K.F. MORRISON, *"I Am You": The Hermeneutics of Empathy in Western Literature, Theology, and Art* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 63-66, 270-295. On spiritual seeing and its relation to corporeal, in connection with artistic imagery, see H.L. KESSLER, "Real absence: Early medieval art and the metamorphosis of vision", in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo*, 2 vols. (Spoleto, 1998: *Atti delle Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 45), 2, pp. 1157-1211 and Plates, reprinted in ID., *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 104-148.

formed by means of such activities or by biblical studies were emotional as well as intellectual, encompassing not only doctrinal insights but heightened feelings of fear of and love for God or contrition for one's sins.[27]

Although other Carolingian writers besides Amalarius gave thought to the theoretical relation between study of the Bible or other literature and meditative contemplation,[28] historians have shown little interest in what the traditions of meditation may mean for understanding the dynamics of Carolingian exegesis, the eighth- and ninth-century writings that have probably most suffered, in modern assessments, from the view that their authors were uninterested in intellectual originality.[29] I cannot explore this issue at length here. Still, it is important for evaluating the *Liber officialis* to keep in mind the broad-reaching desire among Carolingian monks and clergy to meditate on Christian dogma and aid others to do the same, to move from the "letter" of scripture and sources that might shed light on its contents toward fuller comprehension of the infinite wealth of its wisdom.

A few Carolingian treatises of biblical commentary show the influence of this goal on their exegetical approach. In the commentaries of Paschasius Radbertus, for example with whom Amalarius must have interacted during his stay at Corbie in the early 830s, borrowings from the fathers are interwoven with Radbertus's own words into discursive streams of thought that go beyond the teachings of the sources cited in order to stress the possibility of the soul's conversion to the mystical ascent toward God.[30] In other Carolingian exegetical

[27] See FULTON, *From Judgment to Passion*, pp. 155-157. The discussion refers to the *Opusculum de passione Domini* ascribed to Rabanus Maurus (ed. in: *PL* 112, cols. 1425-1430). The attribution is problematic, but this does not diminish the value of Fulton's subtle account of meditative practice.

[28] E.g. Alcuin's *Disputatio de vera philosophia*, ed. in: *PL* 101, cols. 849-854; see M. ALBERI, "The better paths of wisdom: Alcuin's monastic 'true philosophy' and the worldly court", *Speculum* 76 (2001), pp. 896-910, esp. pp. 900-904. Similar concerns, though with a different conception of the role of scriptural studies, are evident from the *Opus Caroli regis* or *Libri Carolini*: Theodulf of Orléans, *Opus Caroli Regis contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*, ed. A. FREEMAN (Hannover, 1998: *MGH CONC* 2, *Supplementum* 1). On this treatise, notice should be taken of the recent work by A. OMMUNDSEN, "The liberal arts and the polemic strategy of the *Opus Caroli Regis Contra Synodum (Libri Carolini)*", *Symbolae Osloenses* 77 (2002), pp. 175-200.

[29] E.g. the classic work by B. SMALLEY, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd rev. edn. (Oxford, 1983). Although this book did much to inspire interest in medieval exegesis, it devotes little space to the Carolingians because of the supposedly derivative nature of their work: see pp. IX, 37-44.

[30] See esp. Radbertus, *Expositio in Lamentationes Hieremiae libri quinque*, ed. B. PAULUS (Turnhout, 1988: *CCCM* 85); ID., *Expositio in Psalmum XLIV*, ed. B. PAULUS (Turnhout, 1991: *CCCM* 94). Also see (using sources in a similar fashion) Hincmar of Reims, *De cavendis vitiis et*

writing, the methodology of the commentary – the more overt reliance on patristic literature, such as the direct quotations that dominate the scriptural commentaries of Rabanus Maurus – seems further removed from the principles of meditative thought.[31] Yet no matter how dependent on the fathers a commentary appears to us, we should remember that the materials compiled in it might themselves assist the *meditatio* believed to follow from *lectio divina*. The patristic sources excerpted and arranged in such treatises, and the expositions developed from them, provided foundations for the Carolingian authors' own meditative prayer and the similar intellectual efforts of their pious readers. Against the notion that Carolingian exegetes or other scholars were uninterested in intellectual creativity, the freely formed thought of meditation, albeit rooted in scripture and the fathers and directed by the Holy Spirit, was an inextricable part of their search to understand Christian orthodoxy. Somewhat paradoxically, the practice of meditation belonged to their inherited orthodox tradition as much as did patristic literature. As such, it, too, tied them to the past and future as to the present, rendering them members of a single community that embraced not only the living faithful but earlier and later generations.

Recognition of this fundamental aspect of Carolingian piety is crucial to understanding the intellectual context in which the *Liber officialis* was written. From this perspective, Amalarius's treatise is exceptional less for the meditative processes of thought revealed there, than for the extent to which its structure and contents make them explicit. More directly and thoroughly than other early medieval liturgical commentaries, it reflects a conviction that every detail of the liturgy's textual records or of the ceremonies in which he participated might inspire meditation, and it records the results of that intellectual process.[32]

virtutibus exercendis, ed. D. NACHTMANN (Munich, 1998: *MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* 16). My ideas about Radbertus owe a great deal to the monograph in preparation by D. APPLEBY, *Present Absence: The Monastic Humanism of Radbert of Corbie*. I am grateful to Professor Appleby for allowing me to read a draft of his study. The parallels between Radbertus's thought and that of Amalarius are also suggested by the analysis of the former in K.F. MORRISON, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, 1982), pp. 121-135. On Amalarius's visit to Corbie in the early 830s, around the time that Radbertus was composing his treatise on the eucharist, see STECK, *Der liturgiker Amalarius*, pp. 8-9. One may wonder what conversations took place then between these two scholars of the liturgy.

[31] Only one of Rabanus's commentaries has been published in a modern critical edition: *Hrabani Mauri Expositio in Matthaeum*, ed. B. LÖFSTEDT, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 2000: *CCCM* 174-174A). His commentaries on other biblical books must be read in *PL* 107-112.

[32] In the *praefatiuncula* to *LO* 1 (*Amalarii opera* 2, p. 26), Amalarius states that his exegesis is based on liturgical texts: "... *id est de officio quod continetur in sacramentario et antiphonario, quae pene omnibus rusticis nota est*". But it is also apparent he drew on recollections of his own witness of and participation in liturgical ceremony. See, e.g., concerning the *Adoratio crucis*, *LO*

Meditation is a critical mental activity, one of the main "sources", underlying Amalarius's written exegesis. Guided by the Holy Spirit, he believed, his mind proceeded smoothly from the thoughts produced through his corporeal experience of the liturgy's sensible facets, his reading of its texts, and his familiarity with patristic literature, to new, creative exploration of the liturgy's spiritual meaning. The knowledge gained from his meditation was then communicated to his audience, in conformity to the doctrine of both Augustine and Gregory I that those who receive insight directly from heaven should teach other faithful.[33] As already noted, it is conceivable that Amalarius's exegesis of the liturgy was influenced by his trip to Constantinople. Still, the very qualities of the *Liber officialis* seen as evidence of its marginality in Carolinian thought – the stress on allegorical interpretation, the discursive nature of the exegesis, the claims that ideas were found in Amalarius's mind or came from the Spirit – are those that best reveal its debt to traditions central to early medieval Christian devotion.

Furthermore, although the *Liber officialis* is more "meditative" in style than most of the commentaries with which it is usually linked, it is less unusual than these connections make it appear, since it breaks through the boundaries by which the genres of early medieval Latin commentary on the Bible and the liturgy are normally defined. Amalarius's work is as comparable to early medieval literature of meditative thought and prayer as to writings more commonly regarded as exegetical. Thus it invites us to be more sensitive to the fluidity of the categories to which we assign Carolingian writing, more aware of the frequency with which other authors, too, besides Amalarius, drew together modes of discourse that we have tended to identify with different literary genres.[34]

Most striking, in my opinion, for the comparison it offers to the *Liber officialis*, is the Carolingian meditative exegesis of the Bible and the liturgy written in verse. Again, I cannot discuss this in depth, but one such work that merits

1. 14. 5-7, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 100-101. It is noteworthy that Walafrid Strabo implies that liturgical commentary, per se, depends primarily on spiritually inspired meditation: "*De ministris ecclesiae et ministeriis ipsorum necnon et de multiplicibus sacramentorum, officiorum et observationum rationibus multi multa dixerunt, ita ut pauca vel paene nulla remanserint, quae non iam per inluminationem Spiritus sancti sint demonstrata, non solum qualiter debeant fieri, verum etiam quomodo singula mystice debeant vel possint intellegi diligenti examinatione discussa*" (*Libellus de exordiis et incrementis*, ed. KRAUSE, p. 475).

[33] See Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana, Prooemium* 8, ed. J. MARTIN (Turnhout, 1962: CCSL 32), p. 5; Gregory, *Règle pastorale* 2. 11, ed. B. JUDIC (Paris, 1992: *SC* 381), pp. 252-257.

[34] For an excellent analysis of the treatise, *In honorem sanctae crucis* by Rabanus Maurus that explores this characteristic, see M.C. FERRARI, *Il "Liber sanctae crucis" di Rabano Mauro: Testo – immagine – contesto* (Bern, 1999).

notice here is the *In honorem sanctae crucis*, the collection of *carmina figurata* honouring the cross completed by Rabanus Maurus in 813 or 814.[35] Like Amalarius's treatise, this is a complex work that can be analyzed from several angles and does not fully conform to any previously attested literary genre;[36] but what is significant for my purposes is that it presents a series of meditative expositions, in verse, inspired by the liturgy of the cross, particularly the *Adoratio crucis* of Good Friday.[37] As Rabanus praises and contemplates the cross and its cruciform shape (and therefore representations of the cross), his thoughts are led toward new understanding of their spiritual meaning. Both the verses and the figure or image of each *carmen figuratum* set forth his insights. While based on scripture and its patristic interpretation as well as on the liturgy of the cross, the language moves beyond the specific contents of any of Rabanus's sources. A more systematically organized *declaratio figurae* or prose explanation of each poem with discussion of its figure appears on the opposite page. The liturgical focus of the *In honorem sanctae crucis* is narrower than that of the *Liber officialis*. But the two treatises are similar insofar as Rabanus' collection, too, is a work of exegesis that starts from study of the liturgy together with the Bible and patristic literature, yet also depends on its Carolingian author's spiritually directed meditation on the allegorical significance of a material component of church ceremonial. In one sense, indeed, his treatise is as comprehensive as the *Liber officialis*, since it implies that the church's entire worship of God, and therefore every liturgical ceremony, is synonymous with the cross's adoration.[38]

The Liber officialis *As Meditational Tract*

In order to understand the ideas to which Amalarius's meditation in the *Liber officialis* leads him, it is important to be aware of the optimistic cosmology, showing affinities with an Augustinianism filtered through Gregorian thought, that his teachings seem to reflect.[39] In this respect too, as I will discuss

[35] Rabanus, *In honorem sanctae crucis*, ed. M. PERRIN (Turnhout, 1997: *CCCM* 100); tr. M. PERRIN, *Raban Maur, Louanges de la Sainte Croix* (Paris, 1988).

[36] See above, n. 34.

[37] See *In honorem s. crucis*, *Carmen* 28, B 28.

[38] For this theme, esp. Rabanus, *Carmen* 28, B 28, C 28 (= *declaratio figurae*), D 28 (= Rabanus's prose rendition of the poetry).

[39] Carole Straw's eloquent description of Gregory's theology can be applied to Amalarius, as well: "Gregory sees the universe as an ontological continuum, flowing from pure spirituality to pure carnality. Spiritual and carnal are antithetical as are beauty and deformity, permanence

further later, Amalarius was not isolated in Carolingian intellectual circles, even though not all contemporary theologians shared the same perspective. For him, it appears, the mundane and the spiritual, though opposites, belong to an essentially continuous spectrum. The boundary between them is not sharply defined, so that the spiritual is much more diffused within the perceptible, temporal realm of the liturgy than is true for Florus or Agobard of Lyons. Any feature of the liturgy can, in principle, manifest the blessing that makes the Holy Spirit present in and through the liturgy as a whole, as long as a given feature is recorded in "authentic" documents and consequently possesses reason or a rationale (*ratio*), a quality that renders it a reflection of God, the *summa ratio*.[40] For Amalarius, the authentic texts of the liturgy include recent as well as ancient records of its words and ceremonial; in them, God has blessed not only those words taken directly from the Bible or specific liturgical actions traceable to scripture, such as baptism and the eucharist's consecration, but potentially every recorded detail: vestments, gestures, personnel, music, and others. Any facet of an ancient or contemporary ritual can be owed to "Christian industry" and, as something ordained by God, be open to mystical interpretation.[41] Although Amalarius recognizes that the rites of individual churches and regions can differ and have altered over time, his references to this variability do not imply condemnation.[42] Despite the liturgy's variety, it appears, all of it is, potentially, divinely sanctioned – a notion, it will be seen, not shared by Amalarius's opponents. The Spirit's omnipresence in the diverse ceremonies of churches, as through the tongues of flame that enabled the apostles to speak different languages, is a manifestation of divine and ecclesiastical unity.[43]

and change; but an underlying continuity unites them in the same order of comparison as complementary opposites. A mysterious unity of paradox and complementarity replaces the simpler unity of happier times in paradise" (C. STRAW, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988), p. 30). Compared with Augustine, both Cassian and Gregory were more willing to perceive meditative contemplation and prayer as growing smoothly out of *lectio*. They 'telescope' the interval between *lectio* and *meditatio* and thus understand contemplation as a more easily attained level of thought, though differentiated from the true vision of God. See R. MARKUS, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 181-197.

[40] *Epistula Amalarii ad Petrum abbatem Nonantulanum* 4-6, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 229-231, at p. 230. See JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 46, 62-64.

[41] *Epistula Amalarii ad Petrum* 4-5, *Amalarii opera* 1, p. 230.

[42] See *LO Prooem.* 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 13; *LO Praefatio* 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 19; *LO* 3, *Praefat.*, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 257.

[43] *LO* 1. 40, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 188-189.

Also suggestive of the same cosmological perspective is Amalarius's apparent assumption that, when the mind or soul adheres to the Holy Spirit, bodily sense experience can be a starting point for acquiring knowledge of the spiritual truths the liturgy signifies. The continuity of mundane and sacred within the cosmos is in a sense replicated in the individual Christian, in whom, at least when studying, witnessing, or participating in the liturgy, thoughts based on physical perception may flow into comprehension of heavenly things. Sense experience, in these contexts, opens a path to spiritual insight. As Amalarius follows this path, the Spirit assures the correctness of his exegesis, even though he often has no patristic precedent for his interpretations. His sinful nature limits his understanding, he admits,[44] yet all his teachings agree with scripture and the fathers and are therefore orthodox, so long as he adheres to the one Spirit of God potentially operative in and through every element of the liturgy.[45]

Although Amalarius's short preface (*praefatiuncula*) for Book 1 of the *Liber officialis* presents some difficulties of interpretation, it offers his most extensive analysis of the meditative process underpinning his exegesis.[46] The preface thus fulfils several possible objectives: it clarifies the intellectual route by which Amalarius believed that he arrived at the ideas set out in the subsequent chapters; it presents a guide to how, using the *Liber officialis* as a model and inspiration, the reader's own meditation on the liturgy may proceed; and, by confirming the Holy Spirit's influence on Amalarius and his desire to obey God's will, it provides evidence of his commentary's legitimacy. The section opens with an analysis of Mt 7, 12 ("All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them") and of the distinction between will (*uoluntas*) and desire (*cupiditas*) based on either Augustine's *De civitate Dei* or his *De sermone Domini in monte*, both works known in ninth-century Carolingian circles.[47] That Amalarius starts his treatise with scripture and a

[44] *LO* 1, *Praefatiuncula* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 26.

[45] Compare *LO Prooem.* 6, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 14; *LO Praefatio* 2-5, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 19-21; *LO* 3, *Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 257.

[46] *LO Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 25-26.

[47] "*Ubi sanctus Agustinus [sic] exponit evangelium illud: 'Omnia ergo quaecumque vultis ut faciant vobis homines, et vos facite eis', voluntatem separat a cupiditate, voluntatem ponit in bono, cupiditatem in malo. Non enim convenit ut quodcumque malus vult fieri sibi, hoc possit ex auctoritate evangelica praesentis loci in alium libere perpetrare. Verbi gratia, ut si ego ganeo cupio inebriari, aut nimis saturari ab alio, non oportet ut id libere in ceteris agam, sed quodcumque mihi boni cupio, id in ceteris debeo satagere*" (*LO Praefatiuncula* 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 25). Cf. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 14. 8; *De sermone Domini in monte* 2. 22. 74-76, ed. A. MUTZENBECHER (Turnhout, 1967: CCSL 35), pp. 171-175 (see for the manuscript transmission pp. XVII-XXVIII).

patristic authority is indicative of his conviction that everything he has to say is founded on these measures of orthodoxy.

The next sentences of the preface reveal his basic optimism, reminiscent of Gregorian thought, about the capacity of the mind helped by God to reach toward spiritual understanding. Clinging to the will as branches do to a stalk, Amalarius explains, the soul's appetite (*appetitus*), aided by reason or reasoning (*ratio*), naturally turns to its creator; for reason seeks to know the object of its desire.[48] Central to this quest is the "thing (*res*)" that God, the "author of all things (*auctor omnium rerum*)", and the Holy Spirit bestow on the soul, the catalyst – it seems, though Amalarius's definition of the term *res* is not entirely clear from the context – to discernment of the allegorical significance of thoughts based on bodily sense perception. To the virtuous soul, God gives "the thing that is subtlest and worthiest"; to the soul clouded by sin, as is Amalarius's, the gift is "grosser and more obvious", since "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit" (I Cor 12, 7).[49] Amalarius indicates that this spiritual gift is directed to the "eyes (*oculi*)", implying an inner or spiritual power of sight. But both in this passage and elsewhere in the *Liber officialis*, the lack of precision to the references to the eye, eyes, and vision associated with his meditation suggests a quasi-elision of physical sight with mental gaze, perhaps again indicative of his conception of the perceptible and spiritual worlds as basically contiguous.[50]

Building on a traditional analogy between ruminative meditation and digestion widely found in early medieval monastic literature, Amalarius goes on, in the *praefatiuncula*, to state that the churning of thoughts ingested in the "stomach of the mind (*venter mentis*)" produces a mental "belch (*ructus*)" that rises toward higher things.[51] Because of his own sinfulness, the "grosser thing"

[48] LO *Praefat.* 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 25. Amalarius's use of the term *ratio* here recalls Gregory's usage. See STRAW, *Gregory the Great*, pp. 42-43; compare (for Augustine and Boethius) G.-E. DEMERS, "Les Divers sens du mot '*ratio*' au moyen âge: Autour d'un texte de Maître Ferrier de Catalogne (1275)", *Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIII^e siècle*, première série (Paris, 1932), pp. 105-139, at pp. 117-119.

[49] "*Qui claro lumine pollent et sanis oculis, his proponitur subtilissima res et dignissima; qui aliquo nevo peccatorum fuscantur, his grossior et manifestior a moderatore aequissimo Deo. Unde apostolus: 'Unicuique', inquit, 'datur manifestatio spiritus ad utilitatem'* " (LO *Praefatiuncula* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 25-26).

[50] LO *Praefatiuncula* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 25. Cf. LO 1. 40 and 3 *Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 190, 257. The difference from physical sight is made clearest in LO 3. 25, p. 341, where Amalarius describes what the church 'sees' in the eucharist. See below, at n. 65.

[51] "*Stomachus est qui diversos cibos recipit, de quibus solet ructus fieri ad superiora; similiter quidam venter est mentis, qui recipit cogitationes. Si his defuerit res, non habent unde ructum faciant*" (LO *Praefatiuncula* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 26). Cf. LO 1. 27, *Amalarii opera* 2,

the Spirit bestows on Amalarius's mind allows only "exploration rather than exposition of the liturgical office (*potius ad indagandum quam exponendum, id est de officio*)", but even so, his work conforms to the divine will that all mortals devoutly employ their gifts in all humility to be worthy of eternal reward.[52] The preface ends with the comment that while Amalarius's task is arduous, his aim is to know the *ratio* in the liturgy's "marrow (*in medulla*)" as it existed in the hearts of the rites' composers.[53] The spiritual meaning with which those authors infused their texts and Amalarius's interpretation of that meaning, however imperfect, depend on the same Spirit of God. Whether or not he completely succeeds in learning those writers' intentions, his teachings, too, may harmonize with sacred wisdom.[54]

Other passages in the *Liber officialis* hint, with less clarity, at similar ideas about the mental activity behind its composition. One comment occurs near the beginning of the dedication to Louis the Pious. Amalarius recalls that his long struggle to understand the liturgy was like confinement in a dark dungeon, until the Holy Spirit granted him illumination, a shaft of brilliance cutting through the gloom, and he finally began to write.[55] The preface of the third or final edition incorporates, into comments on the eucharist and the mass, a statement from a letter by Augustine to Bishop Boniface on the signifying function of sacraments.[56] Florus, in keeping with the sharper separation he envisaged be

p. 146, quoting Gregory I; *Codex expositionis* II, c. 16. 6-7, *Amalarii opera* 1, p. 277, quoting Apc 10, 8-9.

[52] Cf. Cassian, *Conlatio* 14. 5-6, ed. E. PICHERY, *Jean Cassien, Conférences*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1955-1959: *SC* 42, 54, 64), 2, pp. 186-187: each person should persevere in his profession, pursuing the gifts received from God.

[53] *LO Praefatiuncula* 4, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 26.

[54] Note the confidence he expresses to Louis the Pious that, despite his sins and inability to be certain of the inner thoughts of the liturgy's composers, he can attain some measure of truthful insight, so long as the emperor confirms that the *LO* follows the way of charity: *LO Praefatio*, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 19-21.

[55] "*Praeterita proxima aestate videbatur mihi, quasi in crypta posito, fenestratim lucis scintillas radiare usque ad nostram parvitatem de re quam desiderabam. Longa esurie avidus, non frenum passus sum timoris alicuius magistri, sed, ilico mente gratias agens Deo, scripsi quod sensi*" (*LO Praefatio* 1-2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 19). The reference to "fear of any master" is hard to interpret. An indirect source may be Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, *Prooemium* 8, p. 5. The likely biblical source is Mt 23, 8-10; like the gospel passage, Amalarius implicitly draws a distinction between earthly pedagogy (whose masters he does not fear) and instruction directly from God or Christ. Cf. his *Codex expositionis* II, 16. 15, *Amalarii opera* 1, p. 279; Agobard, *Contra libros quatuor Amalarii* 19, ed. L. VAN ACKER, *Agobardus Lugdunensis, Opera omnia* (Turnhout, 1981: *CCCM* 52), p. 367. On Agobard's authorship of this work, ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Florus von Lyon*, pp. 47-50.

[56] "*Sacramenta debent habere similitudinem aliquam earum rerum quarum sacramenta*

tween the corporeal and the spiritual worlds (as will be discussed later), implies that the eucharist's sensible features of bread and wine do not signify the spiritual presence of body and blood. What the physical senses of the faithful perceive cannot assist the mind's awareness of the eucharist's hidden, immaterial power.[57] Amalarius, in line with the clearer continuum he seems to posit between the mundane and the spiritual, uses the passage from Augustine's letter to suggest that the external features of the mass elements and the mass ritual help the faithful recognize the sacrament's spiritual reality.[58]

Unlike Augustine writing to Boniface, however, Amalarius places this discussion of the eucharist in a discourse that begins and ends with comments on the different forms of prayer. The entire section exemplifies his own progression from *lectio* to *meditatio*. The preface opens with scripture and two church fathers: a reference to the types of prayer mentioned in 1 Timothy 2. 1 and to discussions by Augustine and Ambrose.[59] The transition to *meditatio*, whereby Amalarius shifts from reliance on other authorities to his own, spiritually guided thought that grows out of their teachings, is announced in his oft-quoted declaration that, "in everything I write, I am supported by the judgment of the true, holy and pious fathers; meanwhile, I say what I perceive (*In omnibus quae scribo, suspendor verorum, sanctorumque, ac piorum patrum iudicio; interim dico quae sentio*)".[60] Directly thereafter come the observations concerning the eucharist that include Augustine's statement (though his name is not mentioned) and then a series of loosely associated ideas, with no clear patristic source, that reveal the independent movement of Amalarius's thinking

sunt" (*LO Prooem.* 7, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 14; Augustine, *Epistola* 98. 9, ed. in: *PL* 33, col. 364).

[57] See *Flori epistola* 9, ed. E. DÜMMLER, in: *Epistolae Karolini aevi (III)*, ed. E. DÜMMLER *et al.* (Berlin, 1898-1899: *MGH EPP* 5), pp. 271-272; *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, pp. 780-781, esp. p. 781 ll. 10-15. This emphasis on the spirituality (the utter non-physicality) yet truth of the eucharistic presence sets Florus's thought in line with that of Ratramnus of Corbie and Gottschalk of Orbais: C. CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ's Passion* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 225-236. Florus and Ratramnus also supported Gottschalk in the predestination controversy, despite some differences in their doctrines: ibid., pp. 178-181.

[58] *LO Prooem.* 6-7, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 14. Cf. *LO* 2. 14. 8, p. 235 ("*Omnia haec quae extrinsecus geruntur, signa sunt rerum intimarum*"); *LO* 3. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 257-260. That this recognition of spiritual truth depends on the mind or soul being cleansed of sin is implied in *LO* 3 *Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 257: "*... prompti sumus animo ad suscipiendum Dei munus, si tamen ipse dignatur purgare et serenare oculum, in quo discamus de officio missae, quid rationis in se contineat diversitas illa quae ibi agitur ...*".

[59] *LO Prooem.* 2-5, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 13-14.

[60] *LO Prooem.* 6, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 14.

from one truth to the next, until it gradually circles back to the theme of prayer.[61]

For Amalarius, the presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist lend a unique dimension to its function as a set of signs: not only do the sacrament's visible features designate this immaterial reality, but the mass makes it truly available to the pious. His doctrine that the eucharist contains the body and blood represents the consensus in the Carolingian church,[62] yet the immediacy of the inner experience of Christ that the bread and wine provide, according to Book 3 Chapter 25 of the *Liber officialis*, is notable.[63] The thoughts inspired by Amalarius's liturgical texts and his familiarity with the mass bring the passion and the crucified Christ into the forefront of his memory as a series of vivid, mental images. Within the bread and wine as in his mind, "the passion is on display".[64] In the present, in the mass, Christ ascends the cross, just as his body lives ("*est vivum*") in the sacrament and in Amalarius's thoughts.[65] The church

> sees with its own eyes what is absent to mortals, sees what it ought to believe, even though it does not yet see this thing in truth. It believes [to be] present the sacrifice borne in the hands of angels before the lord's face, and it perceives that it must be eaten by human mouth; for it believes [the sacrifice] to be the lord's body and

[61] See *LO Prooem.* 2-10, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 13-15. This pattern is replicated in other parts of the *LO*. Compare, e.g. *LO* 1. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 26-36, which analyzes the Septuagesima. Amalarius moves from passages drawn from Jeremiah, Isaiah, Zacharias, and Jerome's commentary on Zacharias, with his own comments highlighting their moral significance, into meditation on the Septuagesima. The emphasis is on the need to abstain from earthly delights during Lent, the alienation from God caused by sin, the importance of penitence, and the role of baptism. The loosely associated sequence of thoughts brings him back to the meaning of the term 'Septuagesima', and (pp. 30-31) to additional passages from Eusebius and Augustine that become the basis of further reflection. Also worthy of note is Amalarius's striking analysis of the gospel lection in his *Codex expositionis* II. Here he speaks partly in the first person, as the soul that attains its beloved in divine contemplation thanks to the coming of the Holy Spirit (*Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 277-279); see FERRIBY, "Development of Liturgical Symbolism", pp. 194-199.

[62] CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 209-238, with references to the textual sources and earlier scholarship.

[63] *LO* 3. 25, *Amalarii opera*, pp. 340-343.

[64] "*In sacramento panis et vini, necnon etiam in memoria mea, passio Christi in promptu est*" (*LO* 3. 25. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 340).

[65] "*Sicut in superioribus Christi corpus est vivum in sacramento panis et vini, atque in memoria mea, ita in praesenti ascendit in crucem*" (*LO* 3. 25. 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 340).

blood, and from this morsel the souls of consumers are filled with heavenly blessing.[66]

Amalarius does not explicitly identify most aspects of the liturgy as signs, but it is evident he thought of them in an analogous manner, though not always with visual similitude playing a clear role.[67] The perceptible elements of the liturgy noted in his liturgical codices or seen and heard in its performance, he seems convinced, provoke thoughts which can then or later be present to the mind, allowing for meditation on their Christian meaning. What seems generally at issue, as in his analyses of the eucharist and the mass, is not memory in the sense of recalling something that remains fixed in the past, but a phenomenon by which ideas are brought back into consciousness (a frequently used phase is *ad memoriam reducens*).[68] As he contemplates these thoughts derived from sense experience and their Christian significance, and turns with the aid of reason toward God, his mind links individual ideas together, sometimes with recalled biblical passages and patristic materials, building new thoughts up from this base. Some aspects of the exegesis formulated in this fashion are based on Amalarius's discernment of visible similarities between the liturgical elements and the meanings he assigns to them. More often his commentary implies that

[66] "*Mira et magna fides sanctae ecclesiae, quae suis oculis videt quod mortalibus deest, videt quid credere debeat, quamvis nondum videat quod in specie est; credit sacrificium praesens per angelorum manus deferri ante conspectum Domini, et sentit mandendum esse ab humano ore; credit namque corpus et sanguinem Domini esse, ac hoc morsu caelesti benedictione repleri animas sumentium*" (*LO* 3. 25. 6, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 341-342). This vividness recalls the eucharist doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus. Since none of Amalarius's extant writings deals with the issues raised in the Carolingian eucharist controversy (likely a development of *c.* 850 more than the 830s), it is impossible to decide what position he would have defended there. All Carolingian theologians agreed that the bread and wine of the mass contained Christ's true body and blood; they differed on the relationship between those sacred entities and the body and blood of the incarnation, an issue Amalarius does not discuss. Still, his language is reminiscent of the quasi-physicality Radbertus attributes to the eucharistic body and blood. Note e.g. the miraculous visions the latter associates with the sacrament (*De corpore et sanguine Domini cum appendice epistola ad Fredugardum* 14, ed. B. PAULUS (Turnhout, 1969: *CCCM* 16), pp. 85-92).

[67] Cf. *LO* 1. 29. 4, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 153; *LO* 3. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 257-260.

[68] E.g. *LO* 1. 1. 10, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 29; *LO* 1. 12. 33, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 78-79; *LO* 1. 13. 6, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 92-93; *LO* 1. 31. 8, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 160-161; *LO* 1. 38. 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 181; *LO* 3. 5. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 271; *LO* 3. 28. 8, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 355; *LO* 3. 30. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 359. See JACOBSON, "*Ad memoriam ducens*", pp. 275-276. The sense of 'making present' in Amalarius's thought is close to the notion of listening to an author speak through the words of his text and bringing these voices and written words into the mind, which Carruthers has so well described: *Book of Memory*, pp. 169-170. Cf. *LO* 1. 14. 6-7, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 100-101: when Amalarius adores the cross, Christ's suffering is "inscribed on [his] heart" ("*passus Christus pro me proscriptus est in corde meo*").

the resemblances are verbal or textual. The names of objects and gestures, or numbers associated with them, are associated with similar words and numbers found in other liturgical, scriptural, and patristic contexts, or with different words possessing similar meanings. Yet whether verbal or visual similarities and parallels are mentioned, the progression from bodily sense perception – of words or the liturgy's visible elements – to thoughts of spiritual things is conceived as essentially seamless. Thought and prayer flow gradually but effortlessly out of the encounter with the liturgy and its written records.

The allegorical significance Amalarius discovers in the liturgy is impressively wide-ranging. Especially noticeable, however, is the emphasis on tropological interpretation. In part, the frequent references to the moral significance of liturgical elements can be read in a straightforward manner, as reminders of the many ways, for him, the liturgy recalls the sinful mortal's distance from heaven and the value of its rituals for cleansing the soul of its sins. But in addition, I suggest as a hypothesis, Amalarius conceived of his meditation in the *Liber officialis*, moving through the different parts of the liturgy, as a penitential process or journey that could help him cleanse his soul – and that of the reader – of the sinfulness clouding its gaze mentioned in the *praefatiuncula* of Book 1.[69] Although he never states that he understood the treatise in this way, it offers a motive for the unusual choice of where in the liturgical calendar he starts his exegesis, the order in which some liturgical observances are discussed, and the attention paid, especially in Book 1, to themes of penance, sin, and moral virtue, and to the gift of the Spirit.

The liturgical commentaries by Isidore of Seville and Rabanus Maurus, who borrows from Isidore, open with discussions of *ecclesia*; the first calendrical observance to which they devote individual chapters, after dealing with other topics, is Christmas.[70] The *Liber officialis*, however, begins in Chapter 1 with the Septuagesima, the period before Lent, the season that most forcefully urges the faithful to contrition of sins.[71] The next fourteen chapters (2-15), out of a total of forty-one in Book 1, continue through the pre-Lenten and Lenten seasons, with six chapters (10-15: about fifty pages in Hanssens' edition, almost one third of Book 1) devoted to Lent's conclusion in Holy Week.[72] Five of the

[69] *LO Praefatiuncula* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 25-26.

[70] Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1. 1, 1. 26 (25), pp. 4, 29-30; Rabanus, *De institutione clericorum* 1. 1, 2. 31, pp. 291, 377-379. Walafrid, *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis* 1, ed. KRAUSE, p. 475 discusses the origins of temples and altars. Unlike Isidore and Rabanus, he does not present separate chapters on the Temporale.

[71] *LO* 1. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 26-36. The chapter divisions are Amalarius's: cf. HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 135-136.

[72] *LO* 1. 2-15, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 36-108.

next eight chapters on Easter (16-34) discuss the state of the catechumen and the rites of baptism and confirmation, when new Christians are first washed of sin and receive the Spirit.[73] The next six chapters (35-40) mainly concern Pentecost, the feast celebrating the Spirit's descent to the apostles.[74] The final chapter in the book (41) breaks with the calendrical order to discuss the Mass of the Innocents of 28 December. Amalarius asserts that he appended this chapter to Book 1 because he forgot to include it in Book 3, but this seems unlikely to be the only explanation, since as he also mentions, the chapter is a reminder that the Spirit of Pentecost makes mortals innocent.[75] The first book thus fittingly closes with a final tribute to the purgation achieved by means of the long weeks from the Septuagesima to Pentecost, and perhaps metaphorically, a tribute to the cleansing of Amalarius's and his readers' souls through their meditation on those ceremonies. Possibly there is a penitential significance, as well, to the number of chapters in Book 1: forty chapters, the number of days in Lent, plus the forty-first chapter (40+1) on the feast commemorating the Spirit's bestowal of renewed innocence.

Viewed in this light, it seems appropriate that only after this lengthy process of penitential meditation, which has taken his thoughts from contrition to the gift of the Holy Spirit, does Amalarius turn, in Book 2, to the exegesis of *ecclesia*: the grades, vestments, personnel, and material fittings of the church that the Spirit established at Pentecost.[76] From there he logically (it seems to me) moves in Book 3 to the mass, the sacrament reserved to the faithful who have received the Spirit in baptism and been restored to divine grace through

[73] *LO* 1. 16-34, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 108-170; see *LO* 1. 24-29, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 128-156.

[74] *LO* 1. 35-40, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 170-192.

[75] "*In qua posteriore parte iuxta ordinem status officiorum debui interponere de missa Innocentum, sed, quia oblitus sum tunc illud introducere, nunc estimo me invenisse congruum locum, ut post Spiritum Sanctum, qui innocentes facit, varietatem missae Innocentum introducerem; ac ideo hic habeat locum de missa Innocentum*" (*LO* 1. 41. 1, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 192-193). The theory that this arrangement was on some level planned and the feast of the Innocents not simply forgotten, contrary to Amalarius's assertion, supports the hypothesis that he was responsible for the *Retractatio prima* of the *LO*: HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 162-169. One argument against Amalarius's authorship, Jones notes, is that Hanssens' *Retractatio prima* manuscripts do not correct the 'error' by shifting the feast to its calendrical location (JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 22-23). But if Amalarius selected the location in the *Liber officialis* to stress the innocence that followed Pentecost, it made sense for him to retain this in the *Retractatio*. On the other hand, another author might have made the change because he was unaware of Amalarius's original intent.

[76] *LO* 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 195-254.

repentance.[77] At the end of Book 3, after, in a sense, having ascended from the depths of penitence to full membership in the church and reception of the eucharistic body and blood, he turns to the liturgical observances that commemorate the incarnation, beginning with the feast of John the Baptist and continuing to Epiphany.[78] The second edition completed by 831 added the fourth book, written, perhaps, once Amalarius felt that his ongoing work of meditation had raised his understanding to a higher level than he had achieved with the first edition. Here he comments on the divine office and offers new ideas on the meaning of some of the liturgical elements already discussed in previous chapters.[79]

If this interpretation of Amalarius's intentions in his treatise is correct, it encourages us to give further thought to his dedication of the first edition to Louis the Pious in the early 820's. As mentioned earlier, we do not know whether Amalarius lost the see of Trier under Charlemagne or Louis, that is before or after his trip to Constantinople in 813-814. In either instance, though, one purpose of the treatise was quite possibly to win Louis' forgiveness of the sin that had provoked this downfall. The glowing language in which the dedication hails Louis confirms Amalarius's devotion to the emperor; his reference to imprisonment may recall not only his long wait for the Spirit to inspire his exegesis, but his exile from imperial favour.[80] But it is possible Amalarius also meant the *Liber officialis* to offer Louis a model to follow in his own inner work of penance and meditation, by showing the mirror of that work in the liturgy. It is interesting that the dedication praises Louis for his pious humility and notes this to be a virtue in him emulated by others who want to proceed, "from the lowest and most corrupt things to the highest and everlasting things".[81] Even before he reads the *Liber officialis*, in other words, the emperor exemplifies the faithful striving to turn from sin to salvation required of all

[77] *LO* 3 *Praefatiuncula*-37, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 257-372.

[78] *LO* 3. 38-43, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 373-381. This brings the temporal cycle back to the starting point in *LO* 1 of the Septuagesima. Book 3 concludes with chapters on the mass of the dead and the series of appended letters.

[79] See *LO* 4 *Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 403. On the date of the second edition, HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, p. 68; see pp. 155-156 on its contents.

[80] *LO*, *Praefatio* 2, *Amalarii opera* 2, p. 19; JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 168-171, citing HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, p. 67 and O.G. OEXLE, "Die Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulfs", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 1 (1967), pp. 250-364, at pp. 333-334.

[81] "*Venit in mentem inter omnes spiritales mentes in hoc saeculo degentes vestram potissimum pollere, cui inest caritas sine livore, sapientia sine praeiudicio scientiae quae inflat, humilitas cum pietate quae nulli rectitudini resistit, quae vos cotidie exaltat ante Dominum et eos qui vestigia vestra intuentur, sequendo ab infimis et caducis ad sublimia et sempiterna erigit*" (*LO Praefatio* 3, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 19-20).

mortals. If these speculations have merit, moreover, we may wonder whether a connection exists between the treatise's penitential character and the events of the early 820s that made penance such an important court issue. Conceivably, Amalarius was influenced not only by his own state of mind, but also by the atmosphere at the court in the few years leading up to the penitence performed by Louis and his bishops, during the synod of Attigny in 822, for the punishment carried out on Bernard and his associates in the revolt of 817.[82]

The Reaction From Lyons

Florus and Agobard's opposition to Amalarius was influenced by the political situation in Lyons after the rebellion of 833 against Louis, but their arguments also reveal a more dualist cosmology than that of their adversary.[83] A broad characteristic of their thought, as indicated by both their tracts on the liturgy and some of their writings on other doctrinal matters, is a belief in the restricted possibility, for a living mortal, of contact with the spiritual. Although the entire cosmos is part of God's creation, the Bible, conciliar decrees, and patristic literature set firm boundaries dividing the heavenly sphere from that of ordinary human action. The spiritual does not descend as easily into the mundane as it does for Amalarius; rather, the emphasis is on the eternal in God, its separation from the temporal realm of variance and change, and the limited number of things on earth that can therefore assist the Christian to turn, in thought and prayer, toward divinity.[84]

[82] *Concilium Attiniacense, 822*, c. 1, ed. WERMINGHOFF, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, 2, pp. 468-472, esp. p. 471; E. BOSHOF, "Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip in der Regierungszeit Ludwigs des Frommen", in: *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, ed. P. GODMAN and R. COLLINS (Oxford, 1990), pp. 161-189, at pp. 181-182; L. HALPHEN, *Charlemagne and the Carolingian Empire*, tr. G. DE NIE (Amsterdam, 1977), pp. 169-174.

[83] For Florus against Amalarius, *Concilium Carisiacense, 838. mense Septembri*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, 2; *Epistola Flori, Amalarii epistola* 13, ed. DÜMMLER in: *Epistolae Karolini aevi (III)*, pp. 267-273; *Invectio canonica Martini papae* (probably by Florus), ed. in: *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 367-387; *Liber de diuina psalmodia*, ed. in: *PL* 104, cols. 325-330; J.-M. HANSSENS, "Un document antiamalarien", *Ephemerides liturgicae* 41 (1927), pp. 237-244. On the quarrel and the problems with the *MGH CONC* edition, see ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Florus von Lyon)*, pp. 27-61. Zechiel-Eckes is preparing a new edition of Florus's polemical writings. For Agobard, see his *De antiphonario*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 335-351; ID., *Contra libros*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 353-367.

[84] This is the general picture that emerges from the writings of Florus and Agobard noted above (previous note). Of their other theological tracts, those I have consulted which reveal a similar perspective include Florus (Pseudo-Remigius), *De tribus epistolis liber*, ed. in: *PL* 121,

These lines of thought underlie the assertions of both Agobard and Florus that only some liturgical practices in their own day are divinely sanctioned. The rituals of Christian churches are part spiritual, part mundane. Exactly how they make this distinction in practical terms is ambiguous, yet it is evident that, for them, the liturgy's mundane elements include the many features they believe to represent variations among churches and alterations over time that lack God's blessing, details that therefore do not harmonize with divine unity and immutability.[85] The liturgy puts the Christian in touch with the holy, but numerous customs have been added on top of its sacred core and do not belong to the fixed domain of spiritual truth established in the Bible and the teachings of the church. In these liturgical practices, God's Spirit is not present. Diversity is acceptable in the liturgy, it seems, only because, consisting of attributes that belong solely to this world, it cannot interfere with the invisible metaphysical unity of the Church as the body of Christ.[86] A letter by Florus against Amalarius draws on Augustine to explain this distinction between the liturgy's sanctioned and unsanctioned parts: only universal observances authorized in scripture or based on ecclesiastical tradition are venerable, he notes, whereas variable local practices have "no signification".[87] As Agobard states, the diverse liturgical texts composed by men not "driven by the Spirit of God" do not possess mystical meaning.[88] One proof of this lack of divine ordination, the attacks made by both theologians suggest, is simply the absence of biblical and patristic support for a detail's allegorical interpretation. By its very existence, a scriptural or patristic source for allegorical exegesis demonstrates the subject is

cols. 985-1068; *id.* (Pseudo-Remigius), *Libellus de tendenda immobiliter scripturae veritate*, ed. in: *PL* 121, cols. 1083-1134; Agobard, *De picturis et imaginibus*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 149-181; ID., *De quorundam inlusione signorum*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 235-243. Although the teachings of each scholar have distinctive nuances, the characteristics I note suggest, with both theologians, a dualist reading of Augustinian doctrine similar to that of Theodulf of Orléans and Gottschalk of Orbais. See CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 39-52, 122-123, 165-181.

[85] I realize this explanation is circular. To say that a spiritual element of the liturgy has God's blessing does not explain why God chooses to sanction some aspects but not others. But I find it impossible to get a more precise idea of the reasoning of Florus or Agobard beyond the limits both place on access to the spiritual.

[86] This is implied by *Epistola Flori* 6, ed. DÜMMLER, p. 270, ll. 18-22; see c. 7, p. 271, ll. 5-9.

[87] *Epistola Flori* 6, ed. DÜMMLER, p. 270.

[88] See Agobard, *Contra libros* 9, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 360-362. Agobard comments in *De antiphonario* on the need to follow the apostles' example in seeking formulae for prayer from God and the Holy Spirit: *De antiphonario* 1-2, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 337-338.

blessed by God and therefore has spiritual significance. Again, the Bible and ecclesiastical tradition decisively determine the limits of the catholic faith.

The emphatic separation between the earthly and spiritual realms evident in the writings of Florus and Agobard also elucidates their reluctance to admit a role to the physical senses in the acquisition of spiritual insight from the liturgy, except in terms of seeing or hearing the liturgy's divinely sanctioned texts. The smooth progression that Amalarius posits, from bodily sense experience of any element of the liturgy, to inner thoughts, to meditative awareness of sacred truth, seems absent from their way of thinking. Instead, the point of departure for awareness of the sacred in the liturgy (for instance, awareness of the eucharistic presence of Christ's body and blood) is implied to be itself spiritual, dependent on the soul's reception of God's Spirit and on its purely inner contemplation apart from the corporeal senses. The *expositio missae* that Florus composed in the mid-830s, during his quarrel with Amalarius, reflects this outlook.[89] Little interest is shown in allegorical interpretation of the liturgy's perceptible components. Most of the treatise consists of excerpts from scriptural and patristic sources demonstrating, Florus implies, that the prayers and few actions of the mass discussed are divinely ordained, and clarifying how they invoke the spiritual presence of Christ, the angels, and the saints.

The evidence that Amalarius had abandoned the Bible and ecclesiastical tradition by deviating from these doctrines seemed unquestionable to his opponents. In their opinion, he misinterpreted the Bible and liturgical writings to support his exegesis; included unsanctioned texts in his antiphonary;[90] and espoused erroneous theological and sacramental teachings. Florus attacked Amalarius with particular vehemence for declaring that the division of the bread of the mass into three parts allegorically refers to the triform or tripartite nature of Christ's body. For Florus, this doctrine amounted to both eucharistic and christological heresy and underscored the distance separating Amalarius from divine unity.[91]

[89] Florus, *Opusculum de expositione missae*, ed. in: PL 119, cols. 15-72. Also see his comments on the eucharist, noted above (n. 57).

[90] Agobard, *De antiphonario*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 337-351; ID., *Contra libros* 2, 9, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 355-357, 360-361.

[91] *LO* 3. 35, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 367-368; see *Epistola Flori* 4, 7-9, ed. DÜMMLER, pp. 269-272; *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, pp. 770-775, 779-781; and possibly quoting Amalarius's lost *Embolis meorum opusculorum, Invectio canonica* 31-48, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 374-378. Amalarius's doctrine and the reaction to them are discussed in JONES, *A Lost Work*, esp. pp. 153-156, with references to earlier scholarship. Hanssens argued that the *Embolis* was used in preparing the *Invectio canonica*: *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 117-118, though this cannot be proven.

What also made him dangerous, his opponents thought, was his perseverance in error despite supposedly recognizing that many of his ideas lacked scriptural and ecclesiastical foundation. The evidence that his departures from scripture and catholic tradition were at least sometimes deliberate lay in his distinction – so they believed – between the Bible and church fathers on the one hand and, on the other, ideas discovered in his mind and through the Spirit. For Amalarius, as we have seen, these sources of truth coincided: what he taught, guided as he was by the Holy Spirit, necessarily conformed to scripture and the fathers, even when he could not actually identify precedents for his ideas. But for Florus and Agobard, Amalarius's references to ideas found within himself, ones that seemed to them utterly lacking in scriptural or patristic basis, showed that the spirit in him could only be wicked; for the Holy Spirit would never separate someone from heaven and orthodoxy.[92] Some of their accusations refer to this misleading spirit as Amalarius's own prideful mind or soul. The report of the synod of Quierzy (838) describes him as "vainly inflated by the sense of his own flesh, not following the Spirit of God but his own spirit".[93] According to Agobard, those who follow their spirits as Amalarius does, abandoning the fathers and the church's sacred canons, are false prophets whose inner vision is empty.[94] But some of these and other passages elide Amalarius's "spirit" with warnings of demonic influence. His doctrines and the compositions in his antiphonary leave audiences open to evil spiritual forces; Agobard contrasts the wickedness of Amalarius's songs to David's singing which drove the spirit from Saul.[95] More directly, Amalarius is identified as himself the victim of demonic possession. A few of Florus's accusations convey a certain apocalyptic

[92] E.g. see *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, pp. 770, ll. 22-24; 772, ll. 42-43; 779-780; *Flori epistola* 6, ed. DÜMMLER, p. 270, ll. 2-4. Florus claims that Amalarius applied to himself II Pt 1, 21 ("*Non enim voluntate humana allata est aliquando prophetia, sed Spiritu sancto inspirati locuti sunt sancti Dei homines*"): *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, p. 779, ll. 24-27. This aspect of the controversy is indicative of the problem spiritually guided insight generally presented for early medieval churchmen. Malign spirits do not always reveal themselves in an obvious fashion, for instance by provoking mentally deranged behaviour or clearly 'magical' practices. See Gregory, *Dialogues* 4. 50. 6, ed. and tr. A. DE VOGÜÉ, *Grégoire le Grand, Dialogues*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1978-1980: *SC* 251, 260, 265), 3, pp. 174-177; R. KIECKHEFER, "The specific rationality of medieval magic", *American Historical Review* 99 (1994), pp. 813-836, esp. pp. 828-830.

[93] "*Audiat ergo hoc etiam iste, qui ambulans, frustra inflatus sensu carnis suae et non spiritum Dei sequens, sed spiritum suum ...*" (*Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, p. 772, ll. 42-43; on the need to test a spirit to determine its source, ll. 38-42 (quoting I Io 4, 1-3)).

[94] Agobard, *De antiphonario* 9, ed. VAN ACKER, p. 343. Cf. *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, p. 780 ll. 7-9 (quoting Ez 22, 28).

[95] Agobard, *De antiphonario* 12, ed. VAN ACKER, p. 345.

anxiety: Amalarius is allied with Satan; he is the Antichrist or a follower of Antichrist, because his spirit sends Jesus away.[96] For Florus, it appears from these charges, one of the critical risks presented by Amalarius was that exegesis of the liturgy, and therefore the liturgy itself, a preeminent tool of the church for wresting mortals from Satan's power,[97] would become instruments of the devil.

***

The divergent lines of thought espoused by Amalarius and his two opponents echo tensions among earlier Carolingian scholars traceable back as far as the court of Charlemagne. Some of Amalarius's ideas show analogies to the teachings of Alcuin, Charlemagne's chief Anglo-Saxon advisor († 804). Alcuin's notion of classical learning as a tool for progressing toward spiritual wisdom, recently analyzed by Mary Alberi, suggests a Gregorian doctrine similar to Amalarius's of the spiritual and material realms as basically contiguous.[98] The underlying concept in the *Liber officialis* of an ascent from sensory experience to meditation on spiritual things, and the employment of the term *ratio* and related words in this context, have affinities with Gregorian theology, but also with Alcuin's idea of the monastic "true philosophy" and his own usage of the vocabulary of *ratio*, for instance in his treatise, *On the reason of the soul* (*De ratione animae*).[99] The same and other aspects of Amalarius's teachings are suggestive of ideas and vocabulary in tracts by students of Alcuin,

[96] See *Invectio canonica*, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 368-372, 374; *Conc. Carisiac.*, ed. WERMINGHOFF, p. 780, ll. 5-7 (quoting Ez 13, 3), ll. 38-41; *Flori epistola* 10, ed. DÜMMLER, pp. 272, l. 43–273, l. 2.

[97] Compare K. JOLLY, "Medieval magic: Definitions, beliefs, practices", in: K. JOLLY, C. RAUDVERE and E. PETERS, *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: The Middle Ages*, ed. B. ANKARLOO and S. CLARK (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 1-71, at p. 19.

[98] M. ALBERI, "The 'Mystery of the Incarnation' and Wisdom's house (Prov. 9:1) in Alcuin's *Disputatio de vera philosophia*", *The Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 48 (1997), pp. 505-516; EAD., "The better paths of wisdom", pp. 896-910. Also see L. NEES, *A Tainted Mantle: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court* (Philadelphia, 1991), esp. pp. 112-131. Alcuin and his scholarship are now the subjects of a magisterial study by D.A. BULLOUGH, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2004).

[99] Alcuin, *De anima ratione liber ad Eulaliam virginem*, ed. in: PL 101, cols. 639-647; cf. Alcuin, *Disputatio de vera philosophia*, ed. in: PL 101, cols. 851-853. See ALBERI, " 'Mystery of the Incarnation' " and "The better paths of wisdom". Concerning Gregory's influence on Alcuin, see BULLOUGH, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation*, pp. 192, 266-267; NEES, *A Tainted Mantle*, pp. 115-117.

as well: Rabanus Maurus, as already remarked;[100] Candidus Wizo, who may have been the bishop of Trier from 804 to 809, directly before Amalarius held the position;[101] and Fridugisus, Alcuin's successor as abbot of Tours and author of *De substantia nihili et tenebrarum*.[102] These connections support, though do not prove, the hypothesis that Amalarius was himself one of Alcuin's pupils.[103]

As for Florus and Agobard, antecedents for certain of their teachings are found in writings by Theodulf of Orléans († 821), Alcuin's Visigothic contemporary and intellectual rival at Charlemagne's court. The most important of these works is the treatise on the role of artistic images known as the *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* or *Libri Carolini*, of which Theodulf was the principal author.[104] Although it has been recently argued that the doctrine of images in the *Opus Caroli regis* elucidates Amalarius's approach to the liturgy,[105] in fact the theology of the treatise written for Charlemagne has much clearer ties to that of Amalarius's adversaries. Like Agobard and Florus, Theodulf insisted that the Bible and ecclesiastical tradition distinguish the sacred from an arena of purely human, temporal action, to which he attributed the production and seeing of artistic images. Material things and physical sense experience cannot mediate spiritual insight. The Christian must turn away from ordinary mundane phenomena in order to gain knowledge of heaven, an endeavour identified in the *Opus Caroli regis* with the study of scripture as the supreme repository of divine wisdom.[106]

[100] His *In honorem sanctae crucis*, discussed above, at n. 35.

[101] JONES, *A Lost Work*, p. 82; see *ibid.*, pp. 103-105, 149-151, discussing the likely influence on Amalarius of Candidus Wizo, *Opusculum de passione Domini*, ed. in: PL 106, cols. 57-104. I mistakenly assigned this treatise to Candidus of Fulda in *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 160-164. Amalarius's terminology of reason in LO 1, *Praefat.*, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 25-26 is reminiscent of the discussion of *ratio* in one of the Munich Passages, possibly by Candidus: J. MARENBON, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 31-55, 151-166, esp. pp. 154-157.

[102] Fridugisus, *De substantia nihili et tenebrarum*, ed. C. GENNARO, *Fridugiso di Tours e il "De substantia nihili et tenebrarum": Edizione critica e studio introduttivo* (Padova, 1963), see pp. 134-135 on *tenebrae*, a passage reminiscent of Amalarius's references to the *res* in the human mind and its relation to God the *auctor omnium rerum* (LO 1 *Praefatiuncula*, *Amalarii opera* 2, pp. 25-26). Cf. M.L. COLISH, "Carolingian debates over *Nihil* and *Tenebrae*: A study in theological method", *Speculum* 59 (1984), pp. 757-795, overlooking, I think, the importance for deciphering Fridugisus's argument of his desire to reconcile *tenebrae* with the literal truth of God's status as the *conditor rerum*.

[103] JONES, *A Lost Work*, esp. pp. 52-54.

[104] Above, n. 28.

[105] MESSNER, "Zur Hermeneutik allegorischer Liturgieerklärung", pp. 425-426; JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 144-145.

[106] CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 39-52. Agobard's doctrine of

Although Amalarius's whereabouts and activities after the synod of Quierzy in 838 are obscure,[107] his scholarship continued to earn respect, the most important evidence being the sheer popularity of the *Liber officialis*. The first two editions circulated widely; mixed and abbreviated versions of the treatise were produced; and excerpts were interpolated into ninth-century *ordines*.[108] Few copies of the third edition survive, yet it is uncertain whether this indicates a decline in the work's appeal after the decision at Quierzy, as some historians have suggested. Since no significant new exegetical material was added to the third edition, a simpler explanation is that interest in the commentary had already been largely met by the diffusion of the earlier editions, which were subsequently copied and recopied. The completion of an abbreviated version (the *Retractatio prima*), possibly produced by Amalarius, possibly not long after 838, may have further eaten into the demand for copies of the third edition.[109]

It is not surprising that Amalarius's approach to the liturgy was appreciated by other Carolingian monks and clergy, even after the condemnation at Quierzy. The ninth-century Carolingian writings that discuss the veneration of the cross, images, and relics of the saints, and those dealing with certain other topics such as the nature of the eucharist and the *visio Dei*, demonstrate the general growth of interest, during the ninth century, in the relation between the physical senses and the Christian search to access the sacred.[110] Like the writings of Florus, Agobard, and Amalarius on the liturgy, these works indicate varied opinions about the nature of this relationship;[111] but considerable support

artistic images has some similarities to Theodulf's, without being identical: Agobard, *De picturis et imaginibus*, ed. VAN ACKER, pp. 149-181. See my article, "Memory, instruction, worship: 'Gregory's' influence on early medieval doctrines of the artistic image", in: *Gregory the Great*, ed. J.C. CAVADINI (Notre Dame, 1996), pp. 181-215, esp. pp. 197-198.

[107] STECK, *Der liturgiker Amalarius*, pp. 9-11.

[108] HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera*, 1, pp. 120-200; JONES, *A Lost Work*, pp. 8-9, 19-23; R.E. REYNOLDS, "Image and text: A Carolingian illustration of modifications in the early Roman eucharistic *Ordines*", *Viator* 14 (1983), pp. 59-75, at p. 64. Florus remarks that Amalarius's works are "surely dispersed almost everywhere [and] known to almost all men" ("*Certe libri ipsi fere ubique dispersi, fere omnibus noti sunt*": *Flori epistola* 3, ed. DÜMMLER, p. 268, ll. 30-31). Amalarius's continued good standing with some contemporaries, near the end of his life, is also evident from Hincmar's apparent request to him, *c.* 850, for help against the predestination doctrine of Gottschalk of Orbais. Amalarius's reply is lost: HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 81-82; CABANISS, *Amalarius of Metz*, pp. 92-93, 114.

[109] Cf. HANSSENS, *Amalarii opera* 1, pp. 120-121, 162-169. See above, n. 75.

[110] CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 119-128, 191-192, 207-208, 209-238.

[111] See D. APPLEBY, "Instruction and inspiration through images in the Carolingian period", in: *Word, Image, Number: Communication in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. CONTRENI (Florence,

can be discerned for the concept, which Amalarius shared, that under certain circumstances things perceived with the corporeal senses – such as works of art, crosses and crucifixes, holy shrines, or the bread and wine of the eucharist – inspire inner thoughts that support prayer and lead toward spiritual understanding. External sense experience is conducive to Christian meditation and devotion. The theological foundation of this outlook is rarely clarified; the *Liber officialis* is unusual for its close analysis of how the mind rises from the sensible arena of the liturgy to the inner contemplation of sacred truths. Nevertheless, it is evident that ideas paralleling Amalarius's conception of the role of sense experience, and diverging with the more restrictive theology of the *Opus Caroli regis* and Florus and Agobard, held some sway in ninth-century Carolingian intellectual circles.

In general, moreover, Amalarius's attitudes likely corresponded better to the actual devotional experiences of the majority of monks, clergy, and laity than did those of Florus and Agobard. In Carolingian monasteries, cathedrals, and parish churches, the experience most Christians had of the liturgy was probably not that conceived by Florus and Agobard of human elements interspersed with divine, but rather of an unbounded presence of the invisible Holy Spirit. Similarly, the meditative prayer of those participating in the liturgy or recalling its ceremonial most likely seemed to move smoothly from one aspect to the next. The works of art decorating churches, and their inscriptions, reminded viewers that God is always there. As clergy instructed the laity through sermons, the Spirit of God, though imperceptible to the bodily senses, perpetually attends the soul cleansed through contrition, penance, participation in the liturgy, and reception of the sacraments.[112] Probably no detail of the liturgy seemed devoid of that spiritual presence, for most Christians, no matter how much the individual practices of one church differed from those of another. The continuities in liturgical practice within any single church or monastery, the buildings that for many set the boundaries of their lifetime engagement with the rituals of their faith – the repetition of ceremonies from day to day and year to year – likely had greater impact on most of them than any notice of diversity or change.[113]

2002), pp. 85-111; H.L. KESSLER, " '*Facies bibliothecae revelatae*': Carolingian art as spiritual seeing", in: *Testo e immagine nell'Alto Medioevo*, 2 vols. (Spoleto, 1994: *Atti delle Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 41), 2, pp. 533-594 and Plates, reprinted in ID., *Spiritual Seeing*, pp. 149-189.

[112] See CHAZELLE, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era*, pp. 37, 153-154.

[113] In general on the devotional life of the Carolingian laity, see J.M.H. SMITH, "Religion and lay society", in: *NCMH* 2, pp. 654-678.

Amalarius's great achievement in the *Liber officialis* was to probe the consequences of this perspective on the liturgy more deeply than had any earlier Latin author, in a written account of the full range of mystical exegesis to which the Holy Spirit led him as he pondered liturgical texts and the scripture and patristic literature that elucidated their meaning. Yet it is important to recognize that the distinctions Florus and Agobard made between the human and spiritual elements of ecclesiastical ritual, which seem ultimately rather abstract and hard to connect with the liturgy's contemporary experience, their attacks on Amalarius's perceived deviations from scripture and ecclesiastical tradition, and their worries about the nature of the spirit directing him, partly reflect their own wish to protect the liturgy's spiritual, unified and immutable essence from any association with heterodoxy or earthly, temporal variance. As they and Amalarius clearly agreed, God's unchanging Spirit lay at the liturgy's core and behind all orthodox thought and prayer it inspired. Amalarius's teachings and the quarrel they instigated are reminders of how critical for every Carolingian churchman was the liturgy's power to put the faithful in touch with heaven.