

Emendatio and *effectus* in Frankish prayer traditions

Els Rose

The effectiveness of worship and prayer was a principle concern of the Franks and took a central position in their interpretation and design of the Christian religion. The Carolingians in particular are known for the way they accentuated a correct practice of worship, including a linguistically correct expression of ritual texts, in order to further the effectiveness of the Eucharistic liturgy and of prayer. As Mayke de Jong phrases it so poignantly: ‘Obviously, the Carolingian God liked to be addressed only in correct Latin.’¹ The concern with a correct ritual-linguistic practice is embedded in the Carolingian programme of reform with a focus on *correctio* in a broader social sense. In the present chapter, I will focus on the Franks’ attitude towards sacred language and address the question of to what extent their concern with the effectiveness of the religious ritual is visible in their liturgical books. Since the Carolingians were not the first to focus on the *effectus* of liturgical prayer, I will draw a longer line, starting in the early eighth century and comparing a liturgical book from this period with a source dated to the period of Charlemagne’s reign.

Emendatio and *effectus*: some notes on terminology

The study of practices of correction in Frankish culture is a road that leads through a thickly grown terminological landscape. Similar concepts are indicated by a variety of terms, while one term can also refer to distinct phenomena and trends.² As Julia Barrow makes clear, early medieval documents

¹ M. de Jong, ‘Carolingian monasticism: the power of prayer’, in *NCMH*, Vol. II, 622–53, p. 630. Regarding the importance of correct Latin see also the contribution of Marco Mostert in the present volume.

² See J. Smith, ‘“Emending evil ways and praising God’s omnipotence”. Einhard and the use of Roman martyrs’, in K. Mills and A. Grafton (eds), *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Seeing and Believing* (Rochester, NY, 2003) 189–223, p. 211.

reflecting attempts at reform use the term *reformare* as such only sparingly.³ Barrow refers to epistles of Gregory the Great as an instance of reform-inclined discourse in which the terms *corrige* and *emendare* are preferred to *reformare*.⁴ For the Carolingian period she highlights *correctio* and *emendatio* as key words to describe the attempt at improvement. The object of *correctio* and *emendatio* is defined not only by renewal and reform of moral behaviour and the Christian way of life, but also by the written documents on which this way of life was based: Scripture as well as performative and adhortative texts – prayer books, homiliaries and collections of saints’ Lives.⁵

The idea of *correctio* is not new in the age of the Carolingians and the pursuit of emendation is not the prerogative of this particular group of Frankish rulers; their Merovingian predecessors were just as well concerned with the moral improvement of their people.⁶ Giles Brown suggests that the Carolingians were only relatively more focused on *correctio* and more systematic in their aims to programme their efforts in this direction.⁷ Perhaps the Carolingians were innovative in the way they connected both forms of *emendatio*, by explicitly linking the moral welfare of king and people to the correctness and, if necessary, emendation of authoritative texts. Something similar is at stake with regard to the concept of *effectus*. The concern with the effectiveness of the liturgy is not new in the Carolingian period. On the contrary, it is reflected in the earliest liturgical prayer texts of the Latin Church, where the plea *pie petitionis concede effectum* – ‘grant the effectiveness of our faithful prayer’ – echoes in a number of variants.⁸ Likewise, the notion of the necessity of powerful prayer to guarantee the welfare of the Christian community was prevalent in the Frankish understanding of religion before the Carolingians made it a focus of their reform policy.⁹ What is new in the Carolingian period, as Mayke de

³ J. Barrow, ‘Ideas and applications of reform’, in T. Noble and J. Smith (eds), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. Early Medieval Christianities c. 600–c. 1000* (Cambridge, 2008), 345–62.

⁴ Barrow, ‘Reform’, p. 353, with reference to G. Ladner, ‘Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: a comparison of their concepts of renewal’, *Viator* 4 (1973), 1–31, p. 23.

⁵ For a comprehensive overview of Carolingian *correctio*, see R. McKitterick, *Charlemagne. The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 292–380 (Chapter 5: ‘*Correctio*, knowledge and power’).

⁶ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, Chapter 5.

⁷ G. Brown, ‘The Carolingian Renaissance’, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture. Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), 1–51, p. 6.

⁸ See W. Diezinger, *Effectus in der römischen Liturgie* (Bonn, 1961), esp. pp. 50–5 (‘*Effectus des Gebetes*’).

⁹ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 295, with reference to E. Ewig, ‘Zum christlichen Königsgedanken im Frühmittelalter’, in T. Mayer (ed.), *Das Königtum*, Vorträge

Jong makes clear, is the direct link between the correctness (*emendatio*) of liturgical texts and the effectiveness (*effectus*) of liturgical prayer: 'A strong belief in the efficacy of correctly performed ritual underpinned these strenuous efforts to improve the knowledge of Latin grammar in all those concerned with liturgy.'¹⁰

The *emendatio* of sacred texts recurs as a subject in a number of prescriptive sources linked to the name of Charlemagne. The letter addressed to Abbot Baugulf of Fulda and generally known as *De litteris colendis* (c. 784) is an exhortation to encourage the education of the monks.¹¹ The document reflects Charlemagne's concern about the monks' literacy and their ability to express correct Christian doctrine in impeccable Latin.¹² The *Admonitio generalis* (789), also discussed in Marco Mostert's chapter, addresses all ecclesiastics in the realm and explicitly mentions Charlemagne's concern that the copying of service books be controlled by senior clergy and performed with all possible care.¹³ The same document urges bishops to see to it that their priests and clergy understand what they do when celebrating Mass and baptism, or when they recite the Creed or other key texts of Christian doctrine and worship:¹⁴

To *sacerdotes*. That bishops are diligently to examine the priests throughout their dioceses as to their doctrinal beliefs, baptisms and celebration of the mass, to see that they hold right beliefs and observe catholic baptism and properly understand the prayers of the mass.¹⁵

The *Epistola generalis*, or 'Letter to the lectores' ('soon after 786'), speaks of the *correctio* of the books of the Bible when it presents the Homiliary for the

und Forschungen 3 (Constance, 1956), 7–73; and J. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 94–110. See also McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 306.

¹⁰ De Jong, 'Carolingian monasticism', p. 630; cf. M. de Jong, 'Religion', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2001), 131–64, pp. 139–40; cf. A. Angenendt, *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1997), pp. 383–7.

¹¹ McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 316.

¹² *Epistola de litteris colendis*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap.* 1, 79.

¹³ As dated by McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 308; *Admonitio generalis*, c. 70, ed. H. Mordek, K. Zechiel-Eckes and M. Glatthaar, *Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Grossen*, *MGH Fontes iuris* 16, pp. 222–4.

¹⁴ *Admonitio generalis*, c. 68, p. 220.

¹⁵ 'Sacerdotibus. Ut episcopi diligenter discutiant per suas parrochias presbiteros, eorum fidem, baptismata et missarum celebrationes, ut fidem rectam teneant et baptismata catholicum observent et missarum preces bene intellegant.' *Admonitio generalis*, c. 68, p. 220; trans. P. King, *Charlemagne. Translated Sources* (Kendal, 1987), p. 216.

night office compiled by Paul the Deacon and commends it to the attention of all clergy.¹⁶

The references given here are taken from prescriptive documents. In the present article I want to explore whether practices of *emendatio*, in the sense of textual corrections, are visible in the texts where they are most expected: liturgical prayers used in the context of Mass. To this end, I study two liturgical books. The first, *Missale Bobbiense*, is dated to the early eighth century and, therefore, precedes the Carolingian period.¹⁷ The second one, the so-called Sacramentary of Prague, is dated to the 780s/790s¹⁸ and is probably closely connected to the Carolingian rulers.¹⁹ Both books contain the prayers to be recited by the priest during Mass, next to other material useful for a clergyman operating presumably in a non-urban, fairly isolated setting. They offer the opportunity to examine changes in practices of textual correction during the eighth century and to analyse the relation between *emendatio* and *effectus* from the perspective of the performance of prayer. This chapter is work in progress, and aims to contribute to the development of an approach that analyses patterns of textual correction in liturgical books, without claiming to provide definitive answers.

¹⁶ As dated by McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 308; *Karoli Epistola generalis*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap.* 1, 80–1. See also the contribution of Mostert in the present volume.

¹⁷ For general literature on the Bobbio Missal, see J. Legg (ed.), *The Bobbio Missal. A Gallican Mass-Book (Facsimile)*, Henry Bradshaw Society Publications 53 (London, 1917); E. Lowe (ed.), *The Bobbio Missal. A Gallican Mass-Book*, Henry Bradshaw Society Publications 58 (London, 1920); A. Wilmart, E. Lowe and H. Wilson (eds), *The Bobbio Missal. Notes and Studies* (London, 1924); and additional bibliography in Y. Hen, 'Introduction: the Bobbio Missal – from Mabillon onwards', in Y. Hen and R. Meens (eds), *The Bobbio Missal. Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2004), 1–18, as well as in the other contributions to the same volume.

¹⁸ See on the Sacramentary of Prague the edition with the multi-authored introduction in A. Dold and L. Eizenhöfer (eds), *Das Prager Sakramentar. Cod. O. 83 (Fol. 1–120) der Bibliothek des Metropolitenkapitels*, Vol. II: *Prolegomena und Textausgabe* (Beuron, 1949); C. Hammer, 'The social landscape of the Prague Sacramentary: the prosopography of an eighth-century mass-book', *Traditio* 54 (1999), 41–80; and the articles in M. Diesenberger, R. Meens and E. Rose (eds), *The Prague Sacramentary. Culture, Religion, and Politics in Late-Eighth Century Bavaria* (Brepols, forthcoming 2016).

¹⁹ See S. Airlie, 'Earthly and heavenly networks in a world in flux: Carolingian family identities and the Prague Sacramentary', in Diesenberger *et al.*, *The Prague Sacramentary*.

The books: *Missale Bobbiense* and the *Sacramentary of Prague*

The heritage of Latin liturgical prayer documented in early medieval manuscripts suffers from a paradox that has puzzled generations of scholars and that still stands as a pair of seemingly irreconcilable opposites. The books that I selected for this chapter are exemplary of this paradox. Both the Bobbio Missal and the Prague Sacramentary contain a collection of prayers for Mass, following the cycle of the liturgical year. These prayers combine an elevated style – poetic in the Bobbio Missal and sternly stylised in the Prague Sacramentary – with a manifest influence of the spoken language. Numerous characteristics of the kind of written Latin that is typical for the period between the Roman empire and Carolingian reforms of language appear in these books, such as orthographic and morphological shifts due to a growing influence of pronunciation in written language.²⁰ Such and similar features make the books pre-eminent examples of Latin in transition, traditionally indicated with the awkward label ‘vulgar Latin’.²¹

The characteristic features of these liturgical documents did not remain unobserved by medieval users of the books. The concerns referred to above with regard to the quality of language in the liturgical service books and the ability of priests to understand the prayers they recite at the altar resulted in the creation of new books to replace the old ones: an immediate way of emendation. This is, however, not the only shape in which the programme of emendation appears. Textual correction, one of the most concrete forms of *emendatio*, was also applied in the old books themselves and also before the Carolingian period proper. Such emendation forms a source of knowledge in a twofold way: knowledge about the language employed in the early Middle Ages to express prayer and devotion, and knowledge about the problems these documents presented to contemporary and later generations of users with different views on Latin.

An inventory and analysis of textual corrections in the Bobbio Missal and the Prague Sacramentary enable us to classify the problems the users of these books encountered as well as to indicate where problems were left unnoticed or where it was considered unnecessary to intervene.

²⁰ An exemplary study of these and related phenomena in written Latin clearly explained from the perspective of the spoken language is offered by Roger Wright in his analysis of the moral-didactic texts included in the Bobbio Missal. See C. Wright and R. Wright, ‘Additions to the Bobbio Missal: *De dies malus* and *Joca monachorum* (fols 6r–8v)’, in Hen and Meens, *The Bobbio Missal*, 79–139, esp. pp. 124–39 (‘The language of *De dies malus* and the *Joca monachorum* in the Bobbio Missal’).

²¹ See M. Banniard, ‘Acrolecte et identité culturelle en Francia carolingienne (VIII^e–IX^e s.)’, in W. Pohl and B. Zeller (eds), *Sprache und Identität im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 2012), 109–20, pp. 110–11.

The material

Bobbio Missal

Even if a complete analysis of the Bobbio Missal is not feasible within the framework of this preliminary study – I concentrate here on the prayers for Mass from the beginning (*Missa Romensis cotidiana*, fol. 9r) up to and including Easter (fol. 136v)²² – it is clear that the division of textual corrections in the sacramental part of this book is uneven. Numerous textual corrections are found in the first Mass *ordo*, *Missa Romensis cotidiana* (fols 10r–19v), but once this text is finished interventions of the corrector's hand occur only occasionally.

The diverse character of the emendations in the 209 prayers examined allows for a rough division in, on the one hand, interventions at the level of vocabulary, taking the shape of additions, deletions and replacements of groups of words and single words, and on the other, emendations related to spelling, which often affect the grammatical appearance of the text.

Vocabulary

Like all interventions in the Bobbio Missal, emendations related to vocabulary occur most frequently in the thirty prayers of the *Missa Romensis cotidiana* (4–33). They interfere with the content of the text in a variety of ways and take the shape of additions (either marginal, interlinear or over an erasure), deletions and replacements with alternative words.

In the *Missa Romensis cotidiana*, deleted word groups are often quite lengthy, such as the phrases scored through in [11] *Memento* (2)²³ and [12] *Hanc igitur* (3).²⁴ The same Mass gives a number of instances of the replacement of one

²² *Missa Romensis cotidiana*, 4–33; *Aduentum domini*, 37–44, 47–52, 55–63; *Natale domini*, 66–70, 75–79; *Sancti Stefani*, 82–6; *Infantum*, 89–93; *Iacobi et Iohannes*, 96–100; *Circumcisio domini*, 103–7; *Epiphania*, 110–14; *Cathedra Petri*, 117–21; *Mariae solemnitate*, 124–8; *Adsumpcio Mariae*, 131–3; *Quadragesima*, 137–41; *Missa Ieiunii*, 144–8, 151–5, 158–62, 165–70; *In traditione symboli*, 189–93; *Cena domini*, 196–201; *Sabbato sancto*, 206–13; *Orationes in Vigilia Pasche*, 214–26; *Benedictio Caerei*, 227; *Ad christianum faciendum*, 228–33; *Ordo baptismi*, 234–54; *Vigilia Pasche*, 257–61; *Die Pasche*, 265–70; *Missa Paschalis*, 274–8, 282–7. Of these, I checked fols 9r–62v (nos 4–133) in the facsimile of the manuscript, and the remainder (nos 137–287) with the help of Lowe's notes in the 1920 edition.

²³ The original elaboration is only found in the Bobbio Missal; see *Canon missae Romanae*, ed. L. Eizenhöfer (Rome, 1954), p. 29. The deletion was perhaps applied in accordance with a preferred model. Figures in bold between brackets refer to the examples listed in Appendix 1.

²⁴ Cf. the versions of the *Canon missae* in the Stowe Missal and the *Missale Francorum*: Eizenhöfer, *Canon missae*, pp. 30–1.

phrasing by another. In some cases, the original layer is erased and cannot be deciphered any more (4–5). In other instances the original layer is scored through but still decipherable (6–9), such as the change of the group of saints mentioned in the [18] *Nobis quoque* (6)²⁵ or the entire rephrasing of the introduction to the [20–1] *Pater noster* (7). Additions and deletions of single words in this Mass are not very frequent and obviously not as far-reaching as the addition or deletion of word groups. Added words are mainly written above the line (12–14). Deletions are performed by erasure (18) or by scoring through (17, 19–20); in the latter case the original layer is still decipherable but in the former case this is more problematic.²⁶ The insertion of alternatives for single words occurs frequently in verbs (21, 24–5). In one case, a relative pronoun, *quae*, is replaced by a conjunction, *ut* (22). One emendation takes place in the abbreviation of a *nomen sacrum* (23).

Outside the *Missa Romensis cotidiana* emendation of vocabulary occurs less frequently but in similar categories. In the prayers checked, I found examples of the addition of single words (15–16) and of the replacement of single words (26) and word groups over erasure where the original is no longer visible (10–11). A few instances show the need to add standard formulas and closings or to complete the brief mnemonic aids given (1, 16).²⁷

Word endings: nouns

In nouns, emendation in endings first consists of the addition or deletion of word final consonants, apparently to improve the grammar of the phrase: word final -m (27–8) or word final -s (33, 35–6). Likewise, most vowel-changes in the endings of nouns and adjectives are cases of grammatical *emendatio*. Intervention in the i/e-change in *sanguis–sanguis* (31) stabilises the form of the nominative singular, as does the emendation of e/i-change in the adjective nominative plural *memoris–memores* (38), and the correction of the less common u/i-change in the gerund *creandis–creandus* (46). Similar corrections are applied in other cases to improve the morphological appearance of the word (37, 41, 43, 45). However, the situation is more confusing in cases where the original layer is more in accordance with classical grammar than the emendation (29, 32). The emendations that occur in endings on -o and -u, -os, and -us or -is all serve the purpose of bringing the orthography in line with regular grammar (34, 36, 39, 40).

In some cases it is unclear whether the emendation of a vowel change is at stake, or a conscious adaptation of case or gender based on morphological knowledge.

²⁵ For other variants in different manuscripts see Eizenhöfer, *Canon missae*, p. 41.

²⁶ In (18), for example, it is unclear whether an additional saint's name is deleted or perhaps the conjunction *et*. Eizenhöfer signals the addition of the name *Quirynti* in one Gregorian sacramentary (Ms. Rome, Bibl. Rossiana lat. 204, Bavaria, s. XI): Eizenhöfer, *Canon missae*, p. 29.

²⁷ The same occurs in [182] 'Expositio Symboli: per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum' added (fol. 87r, line 23).

Examples are the emendation *hoc–hac* in the sentence *ut quotquod ex hoc altari participationis sacrosanctum filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus* (42): this change leaves unexplained to which noun the corrector relates the pronoun (*hoc* with *altari* was correct; *hac* does not grammatically match with *participationis*). The case *te–tu* (30) seems to be a conscious emendation of the personal pronoun in the vocative, while the u/a-change in *paenum–paenam* (44) seems to be based on a different opinion on the gender of the word.

Word endings: verbs

Emendations that affect the ending of a verb occur in the *Missa Romensis cotidiana* and show attempts to repair the ending in accordance with grammatical norms (47, 48). In the emended form *audeamus* (49) the original layer has become indecipherable.²⁸ A complex emendation is the sentence *haec quociens cumque fecerites in mei memoriam faciates*, where the verb *faciates* is emended to *facietes* (50). In both forms representing the second person plural the endings on *-es* remain unchanged. This is not the only place that shows inconsistency in the patterns of correction, as I will discuss further below.

Outside the *Missa Romensis cotidiana* one emendation in verb ending is found: *tenes–tenens* (51).

Vowels within nouns and verbs

Emendations of vowels within nouns and pronouns usually apply corrections according to the regular form of the word (53, 54, 55). The uncommon a/u-change in *beutitudine* is emended (*beatitudine*) (56),²⁹ just as the e/i-change in *elictionis–electionis* (57) and the regular form *stella–stilla* (58). The latter case illustrates the strength of certain common phenomena in ‘vulgar’ Latin, in this case the trend to write *-i* for *-e* before a liquid (m, l, n, r); the spelling *stilla* for *stella* seems to have become the more common orthography.³⁰ The emendation of vowels in the stem of a verb is rare; we find one example: *bebite–bibite* (52).

Consonants within nouns and verbs

In the realm of consonants, the Bobbio Missal shows common processes in ‘vulgar’ Latin such as dissimilation and reduction (degemination),³¹ emended in *adscriptam–ascriptam* (59) and *Melchisedech–Melchisedech* (60). Other common phenomena in ‘vulgar’ Latin are the devoicing of consonants,³² such as emended in *suplimi–sublimi* (61), and the writing of *r* for an *l* between

²⁸ Lowe does not comment on this emendation.

²⁹ Lowe suggests that the form *beutitudine* is caused by a Visigothic model. Lowe, *The Bobbio Missal*, p. 27 n. 2.

³⁰ Cf. *Missale Gothicum e codice Vaticano reginensi latino 317 editum*, ed. E. Rose, CCSL 159D (Turnhout 2005), p. 40.

³¹ Cf. Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, pp. 57–9 and 54–5 respectively.

³² Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, p. 56.

two vowels or between a voiced consonant and a vowel,³³ emended in *inprorimus–inplorimus* (63).

The emendation of consonants does not always have a phonetic background; two examples are probably most convincingly explained from a palaeographic perspective: the emendation *cecis–celis* (64), as Lowe suggests,³⁴ and the emendation *adcequi–adsequi* (62),³⁵ which may be explained by the similarity of both letter forms in the uncial script.

Original layer indecipherable, and remaining cases

A number of emendations are difficult to interpret because the original layer has become indecipherable (65–72). In a number of other cases it is conceivable that the layer before correction is the result of a scribal error, for instance in the instances of diplography (74, 77) and those where the omission of a single letter cannot be explained with a phonetic argument (73). Such scribal errors were often corrected by the scribe himself.

This preliminary survey of emendations gives the impression that *emendatio* in the sense of textual correction was applied in the Bobbio Missal to serve the purpose of *effectus* in two ways. The grammatical correctness of prayers certainly mattered to the user(s) of this book, and was expressed in the emendation of orthography and morphology according to grammatical models. This first impression, however, is modified by the inconsistency with which the correcting hand(s) operated, already noted above in the context of example (50). In many instances, examples of the same orthographic or morphologic categories are sometimes corrected and in other cases neglected. I will give only three examples here.

A first example is found in the phrase *Deus qui culpam offenderis penitentiam placaris ...*: ‘God, who is offended by our failure and appeased by our penance ...’ (cf. 27). Both *culpam* and *penitentiam* are (instrumental) ablatives dependent on the passive forms *offenderis* and *placaris*. In both cases, the final -m (an abbreviation stroke in *culpam* and a written -m in *penitentiam*) is hypercorrect. The corrector intervenes in the word *penitentiam* but not in the word *culpam*. The second example is (28) discussed above, where in the ablative *totum orbem*: ‘throughout the whole world’, the noun *orbem* is corrected to *orbe*, while the adjective *totum* (for *toto*) remains unchanged. The third, most striking example is the phrase *...concedas ut in omnibus protectionis tuae muneamur auxilium* (29): ‘... and grant that we be strengthened in all things by the help of your protection’. While the intervention in the genitive *proteccionis* (*proteccionis–protecciones*, see above) is a ‘vulgarisation’ rather than an emendation in accordance with grammatical norms, the form

³³ Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, pp. 61–2.

³⁴ ‘If the copy had a “broken” form of *l*, this would explain the origin of the error.’ Lowe, *The Bobbio Missal*, p. 82 n. 4.

³⁵ Not noticed by Lowe.

auxilium, functioning as an instrumental ablative dependent on the passive verb *muneamur*, is not emended. These examples, to which a number of similar cases could be added, do not suggest that the patterns of textual correction in the Bobbio Missal worked (solely) in the direction of a more regular grammar. Obviously, for the users of this sacramentary the *effectus* of prayer was not only dependent on grammatical correctness. This conclusion is also prompted by the relatively small number of corrections throughout the book, particularly if we consider it as the possession of a priest who probably did not have access to many other books – its use must have been intensive.³⁶

The number of emendations in the prayers of the *Missa Romensis cotidiana* – particularly the prayers of the so-called *Canon missae* ([9–22]) – is much larger, and related not only to orthography and morphology but also to whole words and phrases. These emendations seem to have been modelled on an alternative version of the *Canon missae*, an assumption that is supported by Leo Eizenhöfer's critical apparatus accompanying his edition of this text.³⁷ Did the priest own another model text for these prayers? And is the number of emendations related to the qualification of the Canon as an *oratio periculosa*? Arnold Angenendt indicates that 'extensive penance would be required of anyone who spoke them [the words of Institution of the Last Supper] incorrectly'.³⁸ Here, we seem to touch most tangibly on the concern to serve the effectiveness of the liturgy with a correct wording of the prayers, particularly the prayers that accompany the most central and holy rite of Mass: the Eucharistic prayer itself.

The Sacramentary of Prague

In the Prague Sacramentary, textual corrections are much more numerous and distributed more evenly than in the Bobbio Missal. Emendations occur on practically every folio, though in some texts the correcting hand is more active than in others, for example in the second Mass for Martin (206).³⁹ I will present here in general terms the character of the textual corrections in the Prague Sacramentary. Again, I shall concentrate on the 'sacramentary part'

³⁶ See R. McKitterick, 'The scripts of the Bobbio Missal', in Hen and Meens, *The Bobbio Missal*, 19–52, pp. 50–1.

³⁷ See Eizenhöfer, *Canon missae*.

³⁸ A. Angenendt: 'Sacrifice, gifts, and prayers in Latin Christianity', in T. Noble and J. Smith (eds), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, Vol. III: *Early Medieval Christianities c. 600–c. 1100* (Cambridge, 2008), 453–71, p. 457; see R. Kottje, 'Oratio periculosa: Eine frühmittelalterliche Bezeichnung des Kanons?', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 10 (1967), 165–8.

³⁹ This Mass is left out of consideration here because I studied its textual corrections in E. Rose, 'The sanctoral cycle of the Prague Sacramentary', in Diesenberger *et al.*, *The Prague Sacramentary*.

of this composite book,⁴⁰ concentrating on the first half of the liturgical year (Christmas Vigil to Easter Vigil, Masses 1–96, fols 1r–38r).

Vocabulary

The category of added word groups comprises both brief interventions to emend a syntactic construction, such as the accusative-cum-infinitive construction in (81), and the addition of entire phrases, for example (82), where the original layer probably suffered from an *Augensprung*. In a number of cases, mnemonic aids are added or elaborated (83–6). These additions are often inserted by a later cursive hand (83–5), while one of them (86) is added in, according to Dold and Eizenhöfer, ‘beinahe unlesbarer und stark gekürzter Schnörkelschrift’ (‘an almost illegible and strongly abbreviated script with many flourishes’).⁴¹

Most cases of added single words seem to concern obviously forgotten words (87–93). Deletion of single words is found in one case of diplography (94), whereas the preposition *a* before an ablative is deleted twice (95–6). The deletion of *hominibus* in the phrase *apis caeteris quae subiecta sunt hominibus animantibus* (97) could be an unfinished emendation, where the corrector perhaps wanted to replace *hominibus* with *homini*.⁴²

Emendation in the sense of the substitution of single words replaces words with a preferred synonym or with a word of different meaning (98, 101, 103). Some examples in this category are complex, such as the phrase *cuius summus carnali consortio repeteret* → *reparati* (100). This emendation is an improvement of the grammar, although it seems to be incomplete: the corrector did not correct *summus* to *sumus*.⁴³ Did he overlook the abbreviation mark on the first *u*, or was the double *m* no problem in the understanding of this form as the auxiliary verb *sumus*? It is indeed difficult to read the layer before correction as a coherent sentence, whether *summus* was understood as the first person plural of *esse* or as the superlative adjective first person singular masculine. A similar complex case is the emendation of *muneris–muneri* (99), interpreted by Dold and Eizenhöfer as an attempt to form an infinitive passive (*muniri*) in the sentence *fac quaesumus domine [nos eius] perpetua diuinitate muneris*. The final *-s* is outdotted, but the *i/e*-change in the stem of the verb is not affected by the corrector – it was apparently overlooked or, perhaps more probably, not seen as a problem. The emendation of abbreviated *non–nos* (102) in the sentence *Caelesti lumen quaesumus domine semper et ubique non praeueni* clearly restores the coherence of the phrase and seems to correct a scribal

⁴⁰ See n. 18 above.

⁴¹ Dold and Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 45*.

⁴² See the variants in the notes given by Dold and Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 56*.

⁴³ Dold and Eizenhöfer transcribe *sumus* without comment; Dold and Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 8*.

error. The same is valid for the emendation *implent* for *imple^ēent* (*impletent*) (104). The question of whether the emendation of *Praepare nobis quaesumus domine*–*Praepare nos quaesumus domine* (105) repairs a scribal error or confusion in the system of cases remains unanswered.⁴⁴

Word endings: nouns

Emendations in noun endings seem to aim often at grammatical improvement. Examples are the erasure of word final -m in ablatives (106, 112) and emendations like *inaestimabiles*–*inaestimabilis* (114 – a nominative singular is meant) and *archana*–*archanae* (107 – a genitive singular is meant; see further 109, 111, 113). But the intervention in noun endings is not always caused by deviant grammar. Thus, the correction *auxili*–*auxilio* (110) in the phrase *auxili a peccatorum nostrorum nexibus* might repair a reading error (*auxilia* for *auxilio*) prompted by the fact that the words are written almost continuously as *auxiliapeccatorumnostrorum nexibus*.

Word endings: verbs

The emendation of verb endings seems to be directed at grammatical improvement in (118), where *ueneramus* is corrected to *ueneramur*, perhaps in the awareness that *ueneror* is a deponent verb, while it was often treated in ‘vulgar’ texts as active.⁴⁵

Vowels within nouns and verbs

Emendations of vowels within nouns and verbs are rare: there is the addition of a (forgotten?) *cauda* in *praconium*–*praeconium* (119)⁴⁶ and the emendation of a form of u/o-change common in ‘vulgar’ Latin (120).⁴⁷

Consonants within nouns and verbs

Emendation of consonants within nouns or verbs comprises the emendation of hypercorrect *h* (121). The emendation *pecatum*–*peccatum* (125) perhaps intervenes in a tendency to simplify geminated consonants not perceived in pronunciation.⁴⁸ The emendation of *insonet* (124), where the *s* is erased, is incomplete; did the corrector want to give *intonet* instead?

Original layer indecipherable, and remaining cases

Relatively many cases of emendation are difficult to classify because the original layer has become indecipherable (127–38). In addition, there are some cases where the corrected layer is difficult to interpret (139–40). Finally, there

⁴⁴ Not noticed by Dold and Eizenhöfer.

⁴⁵ Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, pp. 89–91.

⁴⁶ Not noticed by Dold and Eizenhöfer.

⁴⁷ Cf. Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, p. 43 for many instances of u/o-change before liquida, particularly -l.

⁴⁸ Reduction or degemination: Rose, *Missale Gothicum*, p. 55.

are a number of cases where emendations are made that cannot be easily explained as grammatical improvements. Some of them seem to be the corrections of scribal errors (141–6).

Emendation after a preferred model?

In some more elaborate cases the corrector seems to adapt his text to a certain model rather than intervening in individual (grammatical) phenomena that he tries to improve. Thus, [13.3], the preface for Epiphany, is most probably adapted to a preferred model and therefore given here in full.

[13.3] Layer before correction:

VD Te laudare mirabilem *deum*
in omnibus operibus tuis,
quibus sacratissima regni tui
mysteria reuelasti. Hanc[que]
/6v/ festiuitatem index puerpera
uirginali stella processit, qui natum
in terra, caeli dominum magis
stupentibus denuntiaret ...

[13.3] Corrected layer:

VD Te laudare mirabilem *deum*
in omnibus operibus tuis, quibus
sacratissimi regni tui **miracula**
reuelasti. **Huncque enim** /6v/
festiuitatem **quae preuenimus** index
puerpera uirginali stella processit,
que⁴⁹ natum in terra, caeli dominum
magis stupentibus denuntiaret ...

The emendation in the ending of *sacratissima* does not necessarily have a grammatical background, but links the adjective to a different noun: *regni* instead of *mysteria/miracula*. The emendation in *hanc* is difficult to explain, since the corrector obviously considered *festiuitatem* feminine, given the added relative clause *quae preuenimus*. The phrase *index puerpera uirginali stella processit* also causes problems. Dold and Eizenhöfer transcribe *index puerpera uirginali*<*s*> *stella precessit* with a reference to a sermon by Augustine.⁵⁰ However, other witnesses give *puerperae uirginalis*, which can be explained by the ae/a-change that occurs more often in the Prague Sacramentary, and the overlap of word final -s in *uirginalis* and word initial -s in *stella*. Since the emendations are not all ‘improving’ the text in a grammatical way, it is more probable that the corrector followed a preferred model here.

Whereas textual corrections occur more frequently in the Prague Sacramentary than in the Bobbio Missal, there are proportionally fewer emendations that can be classified as either emendations of vocabulary or corrections of vulgar tendencies than in the Bobbio Missal. Rather, the corrector seems to follow a preferred model in more cases than in the Bobbio Missal. Here, the differences in context of production and use of both books seem to be illustrated: while the Bobbio Missal is considered the work initially of a

⁴⁹ Dold and Eizenhöfer give *que*, but I discern an abbreviation mark above the correction *que*. However, an accusative masculine here is difficult to explain. See Dold and Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 10*.

⁵⁰ Dold and Eizenhöfer, *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 10*.

single scribe and user (perhaps the same man),⁵¹ the Prague Sacramentary is seen as a co-production in a context where probably more books and, thus, more authoritative models, were available.⁵²

Conclusion

The layers of correction in two sacramentaries of different periods in the eighth century show a concern with the effectiveness of prayer. They also make clear that effectiveness, at least in the two cases I studied, is not only – perhaps not even primarily – dependent on grammatical correctness. Not only are the numbers of textual corrections aimed at the improvement of grammar (particularly orthography and morphology) rather limited in comparison with narrative sources for the liturgy, such as hagiographic collections in late-eighth-century codices (e.g. Montpellier H 55) where grammatical emendation dominates.⁵³ More striking is the inconsistency of corrective interventions, of which I gave some examples. More work needs to be done to offer a full survey of problematic passages that are *not* corrected, however difficult it is to proceed here without value judgements.⁵⁴

The patterns of correction in the Bobbio Missal and the Sacramentary of Prague, however different, have one trait in common. Both books, even if produced and used presumably in a non-urban, peripheral community of prayer, betray the importance of authoritative models and a tendency to apply textual correction in the sense of the adaptation of content (mainly vocabulary, sometimes also sentences and parts of sentences). The *Missa Romensis cotidiana* in the early Bobbio Missal is the most illustrative example of this way of *emendatio* in liturgical prayers, clearly applied in order to enlarge their *effectus*.

⁵¹ See McKitterick, ‘The scripts’, pp. 50–2.

⁵² For the most recent state of the art, see R. McKitterick, ‘The work of the scribes in the Prague Sacramentary, Prague Archiv Pražkeho Hradu, MS. O 83’, in Diesenberger *et al.*, *The Prague Sacramentary*; and R. McKitterick, ‘The scripts of the Prague Sacramentary, Prague Archivio O 83’, *Early Medieval Europe* 20 (2012), 407–27.

⁵³ The correction patterns in this manuscript have been investigated by Evina Steinová in an internship within the project ‘The Dynamics of Apocryphal Traditions in Medieval Religious Culture’ (unpublished internship report, Utrecht University, 2011).

⁵⁴ Elsewhere I have studied the problematic way in which the Bobbio compiler seems to have cut and pasted his examples into abbreviated prayer forms with a sometimes inexplicable lack of coherence. Precisely in these instances the hand of the corrector is miles away. E. Rose, ‘Liturgical language in the Bobbio Missal’, in Hen and Meens, *The Bobbio Missal*, 67–78, pp. 72–6; and E. Rose, ‘Getroost door de klank van woorden: het Latijn als sacrale taal van Ambrosiaster tot Alcuin’, in G. Rouwhorst and P. Versnel-Mergaerts (eds), *Taal waarin wij God verstaan. Over taal en vertaling van Schrift en traditie in de liturgie* (Heeswijk, 2015), 63–88.

Appendix

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
I Vocabulary: word groups added	1 f. 93v, l. 4: <i>saluatur mundi</i> added on the line (189 <i>In traditione Symboli</i>)	81 f. 5r, l. 2–3: <i>fac quaesumus domine perpetua diuinitate muneris</i> → <i>fac quaesumus domine nos eius perpetua diuinitate muneri</i> (10.1) 82 f. 5r, l. 21: <i>et preputium quae etiam saluator et dominus noster</i> (10.3) 83 f. 11v, l. 21: <i>per dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum filium tuum</i> added (30.3) 84 f. 13v, l. 5: <i>dominum nostrum</i> added (35.5) 85 f. 14v, l. 21: <i>per dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum</i> added (41.1) 86 f. 29v, l. 21: <i>dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum filium tuum qui</i> added (85.1)
II Vocabulary: word groups deleted	2 f. 12v, l. 20–2: <i>qui per uniuerso mundo passi sunt propter nomen tuum domine seo confessoribus tuis</i> scored through (11 <i>Memento</i>) 3 f. 13r, l. 8–9: <i>quam tibi offerimus in honorem nominis qui deus</i> scored through (12 <i>Hanc igitur</i>)	
III Vocabulary: alternative replaces word groups	4 f. 11r, l. 10–12: <i>[po]/testates caeli caelorumque uirtutis ac beata serpahin socia exul/ [tacione]</i> over erasure (8 <i>Contestacio</i>) 5 f. 17v, l. 8–9: <i>propter magna gloriam tuam domine deus rex celestis</i> over erasure (26 <i>Gloria in excelsis</i>) 6 f. 15v, l. 10–13: <i>Perpetuae Agne Cicilia Felicitate Anastasia Agathe Lucia Eogenia</i> → <i>Felicitate Perpetuae Agathe Agne Cicilia Anastasia</i> (18 <i>Nobis quoque</i>)	

Table (cont.)

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
	7 f. 16r, l. 9–12: <i>Diuino magisterio aedocti et diuina institutione audemus dicere Pater</i> → <i>Oremus praeceptis salutaribus moniti et dina</i> (for <i>diuina</i>) <i>institutione formati audemus dicere</i> (20–1 Introduction to <i>Pater noster</i>)	
	8 f. 16r, l. 14–16: <i>omni malo preterito presenti et futuro</i> → <i>omnibus malis preteritis presentibus et futuris</i> (22 <i>Libera nos</i>)	
	9 f. 16r, l. 18–19: <i>uirgene Maria</i> → <i>uirgene dei genetrice Maria et</i> (22 <i>Libera nos</i>)	
	10 f. 113r, l. 3: <i>sub titulus</i> over erasure (229 <i>Ad Christianum faciendum</i>)	
	11 f. 114r, l. 9: <i>omnipotentis et in nomine</i> over erasure (234 <i>Ordo baptismi</i>)	
IV Vocabulary: single word added	12 f. 13v, l. 9: <i>suis</i> above the line (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	87 f. 3v, l. 3: <i>qui</i> added (5.1)
	13 f. 16r, l. 14: <i>quaesumus</i> above the line (22 <i>Libera nos</i>)	88 f. 3v, l. 6: <i>per</i> added (5.1)
	14 f. 16v, l. 4: <i>semper</i> above the line (22 <i>Libera nos</i>)	89 f. 9r, l. 14: <i>te</i> added (21.3)
	15 f. 35r, l. 20: <i>angeli</i> on the line (70 <i>Contestatio Christmas Vigil</i>)	90 f. 10r, l. 3: <i>in</i> added in <i>Deus qui nos [in] tantis periculis</i> (25.1)
	16 f. 45v, l. 4: <i>cuy me</i> → <i>cuy merito</i> on the line (93 <i>Contestatio Infantum</i>)	91 f. 15v l. 16: <i>deus</i> added in <i>Da quaesumus [deus] fidelibus tuis</i> (44.1)
V Vocabulary: single word deleted	17 f. 11v, l. 16: <i>deuotissimo</i> scored through (9 <i>Te igitur</i>)	92 f. 33r, l. 5: <i>nature</i> added (91.2)
	18 f. 12v, l. 13: erasure between <i>Crisogoni</i> and <i>Iohannes</i> (11 <i>Memento</i>)	93 f. 37v, l. 12: <i>uicem</i> added (95.7)
	19 f. 14r, l. 4: <i>sancti</i> scored through (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	94 f. 11r, l. 12: <i>Fiant tua domine tua gratia conspectui munera supplicantis aecclesiae</i> (28.2): the second <i>tua</i> is deleted ^a
	20 f. 15r, l. 8: <i>et</i> scored through (15 <i>Supplices</i>)	95 f. 22r, l. 1: <i>Quod ore sumpsimus dominus a mente capia[mus]</i> (65.3): <i>a</i> is deleted
		96 f. 31v, l. 8: <i>ut hoc idem a nobis</i> (89.3): <i>a</i> is deleted
		97 f. 37v, l. 8–9: <i>apis caeteris quae subiecta sunt hominibus animantibus</i> (95.7): <i>hominibus</i> is deleted

Table (cont.)

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
VI Vocabulary: alternative replaces single word	21 f. 13r, l. 10–11: <i>accipias</i> → <i>suspias</i> (for <i>suscipias</i>) (12 <i>Hanc igitur</i>)	98 f. 3v, l. 17: <i>reseruasti</i> → <i>reserasti</i> (6.1)
	22 f. 13v, l. 1: <i>quae</i> → <i>ut</i> (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	99 f. 5r, l. 3: <i>muneris</i> → <i>muneri</i> (10.1)
	23 f. 13v, l. 4: <i>dei</i> → <i>domini</i> (abbreviation) (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	100 f. 5r, l. 4: <i>cuius summus carnali consortio repeteret</i> → <i>reparati</i> (10.1)
	24 f. 14v, l. 8: <i>aspicere</i> → <i>respicere</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	101 f. 7r, l. 8: <i>montibus</i> → <i>moribus</i> (14.3)
	25 f. 16v, l. 9: <i>mundemur</i> → <i>emundemur</i> (23 <i>Post comunione</i>)	102 f. 7r, l. 18: <i>non</i> → <i>nos</i> (15.3)
	26 f. 107r, l. 22: <i>uigiliis</i> → <i>uingoliis</i> (for <i>uinculis</i>) (215 <i>Orationes in uigiliis Pasce</i>)	103 f. 8v, l. 12: <i>expediat</i> → <i>expediat</i> (20.1)
		104 f. 14r, l. 4: <i>impletent</i> → <i>implent</i> (37.1)
		105 f. 15v, l. 19: <i>Praepare nobis quaesumus domine</i> → <i>Praepare nos quaesumus domine</i> (44.2)
VII Word endings: nouns and pronouns	27 f. 10v, l. 8: <i>Deus qui penetenciam</i> → <i>penetencia placaris</i> (5 <i>Collectio</i>)	106 f. 3v, l. 3: <i>in sanguinem</i> → <i>in sanguine</i> (5.1)
	28 f. 11v, l. 15: <i>et regere digneris totum orbem</i> → <i>totum orbe terrarum</i> (9 <i>Te igitur</i>)	107 f. 5r, l. 6 <i>archana natiuitatis</i> → <i>archanae natiuitatis</i> (10.2)
	29 f. 13r, l. 3: <i>ut in omnibus proteccionis</i> → <i>protecciones tuae muneamur auxilium</i> (11 <i>Memento</i>)	108 f. 10r, l. 4: <i>sancti fragilitatis</i> → <i>sanctis fragilitatis</i> (25.1)
	30 f. 13r, l. 17: <i>te</i> → <i>tu</i> (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	109 f. 12v, l. 13: <i>medicinalibus ... ieiunis</i> → <i>medicinalibus ... ieiuniis</i> (33.2)
	31 f. 13v, l. 3: <i>sanguis</i> → <i>sanguis</i> (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	110 f. 13v, l. 10: <i>intercessionis eius auxili</i> → <i>intercessionis eius auxilio</i> (36.1)
	32 f. 13v, l. 5: <i>qui pridie</i> → <i>pridii quam pateritur</i> (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	111 f. 23r, l. 8: <i>Da plebe tuae domine pie semper deuotiones</i> → <i>deuotionis effectum</i> (69.4)
	33 f. 13v, l. 9: <i>in celos</i> → <i>in celo</i> (13 <i>Quam oblacione</i>)	112 f. 29v, l. 10: <i>ex eam</i> → <i>ex ea</i> (85.1)
	34 f. 14v, l. 8: <i>uulto</i> → <i>uultu</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	113 f. 33v, l. 3: <i>Adesto ... plebem tuam</i> → <i>Adesto ... plebi tuae</i> (91.5)
	35 f. 14v, l. 15: <i>summus sacerdo</i> → <i>summus sacerdos</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	114 f. 37r, l. 8: <i>inaestimabiles dilectio</i> → <i>inaestimabilis dilectio</i> (95.5)
	36 f. 14v, l. 15: <i>sacerdo tuos</i> → <i>sacerdos tuus</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	
	37 f. 14r, l. 16: <i>beate</i> → <i>beatę</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	
38 f. 14r, l. 13: <i>memoris</i> → <i>memores</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)		

Table (cont.)

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
	39 f. 14r, l. 19: <i>in celos</i> → <i>in celis</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	
	40 f. 15r, l. 1: <i>in conspecto</i> → <i>in conspectu</i> (15 <i>Supplices</i>)	
	41 f. 15r, l. 1–2: <i>diuini maiestates tuae</i> → <i>diuinę maiestates tuae</i> (15 <i>Supplices</i>)	
	42 f. 15r, l. 3: <i>ut quotquod ex hac (hoc a.c.) altari participationis sacrosanctum filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus</i> (15 <i>Supplices</i>)	
	43 f. 16v, l. 7: <i>Quos celeste domine dono saciati</i> → <i>Quos celesti domine dono saciati</i> (23 <i>Post communionem</i>)	
	44 f. 16v, l. 20: <i>paenum</i> → <i>paenam</i> (24 <i>Consummatio misse</i>)	
	45 f. 58v, l. 6: <i>gaudi</i> → <i>gaudii</i> (128 <i>Contestatio Mariae sollemnitate</i>)	
	46 f. 114v, l. 9: <i>creandis</i> → <i>creandus</i> (235 <i>oracio, Ordo Baptismi</i>)	
VIII Word endings: verbs	47 f. 11v, l. 5: <i>petem[us]</i> → <i>petim[us]</i> (9 <i>Te igitur</i>)	117 f. 5r, l. 7: <i>purificate mentes...consequamur</i> (for <i>purificati mentis</i>) → <i>purificatis mentibus ... consequamur</i> (10.2)
	48 f. 14v, l. 8: <i>dignare</i> → <i>digneris</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	
	49 f. 19v, l. 9: ? → <i>audeamus</i> (32 <i>Collectio post aios</i>)	118 f. 5r, l. 10: <i>ueneramus</i> → <i>ueneramur</i> (10.3)
	50 f. 14r, l. 12: <i>faciates</i> → <i>facietes</i> (13 <i>Quam oblatione</i>)	
	51 f. 80r, l. 9: <i>tenes – tenens</i> (170 <i>Contestatio Quadragesimae</i>)	
IX Vowels within nouns and verbs	52 f. 14r, l. 2–3: <i>bebite</i> → <i>bibite</i> (13 <i>Quam oblatione</i>)	119 f. 4v, l. 17: <i>praconium</i> → <i>praeconium</i> (7.1)
	53 f. 14r, l. 6: <i>misterium</i> → <i>mysterium</i> (13 <i>Quam oblatione</i>)	120 f. 35v, l. 9: <i>famolo</i> → <i>famulo</i> (93.1)
	54 f. 14v, l. 17: <i>inmacolatam</i> → <i>inmaculatam</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)	
	55 f. 39r, l. 8: <i>debeta</i> → <i>debita</i> (75 <i>Natale domini</i>)	
	56 f. 40v, l. 10: <i>beutitudine</i> → <i>beatitudine</i> (79 <i>Contestatio in Natale domini</i>)	
	57 f. 46r, l. 14: <i>Electionis</i> → <i>Electionis</i> (96 <i>Iacobi et Iohannes</i>)	
	58 f. 52v, l. 9: <i>stella</i> → <i>stilla</i> (114 <i>Contestatio Epyphaniae</i>)	

Table (cont.)

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
X Consonants within nouns and verbs	59 f. 13r, l. 19: <i>adscriptam</i> → <i>ascriptam</i> (13 <i>Quam oblatione</i>)	121 f. 7r, l. 13: <i>inthus</i> → <i>intus</i> (15.1)
	60 f. 14v, l. 15–16: <i>Melchisedech</i> → <i>Melchisedech</i> (14 <i>Unde</i> <i>et memores</i>)	122 f. 9v, l. 1: <i>tangis</i> → <i>tantis</i> (22.3)
	61 f. 14v, l. 32: <i>suplimi</i> → <i>sublimi</i> (15 <i>Supplices</i>)	123 f. 24r, l. 17: <i>eccesiam</i> → <i>ecclesiam</i> (74.1)
	62 f. 47r, l. 3: <i>adcequi</i> → <i>adsequi</i> (98 <i>Post nomina, Iacobi et</i> <i>Iohannes</i>)	124 f. 36r, l. 20: <i>insonet</i> → <i>in.onet</i> (95.1)
	63 f. 54v, l. 14: <i>inprorimus</i> → <i>inplorimus</i> (119 <i>Post nomina,</i> <i>Cathedra Petri</i>)	125 f. 37r, l. 10: <i>peccatum</i> → <i>peccatum</i> (95.5)
	64 f. 130v, l. 21: <i>cecis</i> → <i>celis</i> (274 <i>Missa Paschalis</i>)	126 f. 38r, l. 13: <i>regessus</i> → <i>regressus</i> (95.8)
	XI Emendations where the original layer is indecipherable	65 f. 14r, l. 7: <i>nobis^b</i> (13 <i>Quam</i> <i>oblatione</i>)
66 f. 14v, l. 9 and 10: <i>acceptum</i> <i>abere</i> (14 <i>Unde et memores</i>)		128 f. 4v, l. 18: <i>gra[.]tias</i> → <i>gra</i> <i>tias</i> (9.3)
67 f. 15v, l. 8: <i>Barnaban</i> (18 <i>Nobis quoque</i>)		129 f. 5v, l. 18: <i>inlustrat</i> (?) → <i>inlustret</i> (12.1)
68 f. 33v, l. 19: <i>tibi</i> (66 <i>In vigiliis</i> <i>natalis domini</i>)		130 f. 7v, 001: <i>tuum in</i> <i>splendore</i> (?) → <i>tuum</i> <i>splendore</i> (15.4)
69 f. 40r, l. 22: <i>salute</i> (from <i>solute</i> ?) (79 <i>Contestatio in</i> <i>Natale domini</i>)		131 f. 7v, l. 19: <i>nosque</i> (?) → <i>nosque</i> (17.2)
70 f. 46r, l. 16–17: <i>congregacionis</i> (96 <i>Iacobi et Iohannes</i>)		132 f. 19v, l. 5: <i>cons[.]ta</i> → <i>consu ta</i> (58.2)
71 f. 55r, l. 11–12: <i>plasmam</i> (from <i>plasma</i> ?) (121 <i>Contestatio, Cathedra Petri</i>)		133 f. 23r, l. 12: <i>cr[.]eatus</i> → <i>reatus</i> (69.4) ^d
72 f. 55v, l. 2: <i>reuelacionis</i> (from <i>reuelationis</i> ?) (121 <i>Contestatio,</i> <i>Cathedra Petri</i>) ^c		134 f. 24r, l. 12: <i>sub[.]tus</i> → <i>subiecus</i> (73.3)
		135 f. 24r, l. 14: <i>pro</i> <i>regenerandis</i> (?) → <i>pro</i> <i>generandis</i> (73.3)
		136 f. 28r, l. 20: <i>fonte d</i> (?) → <i>fonte</i> (84.5)
XII Emendations where the corrected layer is unclear		137 f. 36v, l. 6: <i>misericiardiam</i> [...] → <i>misericiardiam</i> (36v)
		138 f. 38r, l. 2: <i>collectis [...]</i> <i>nectar</i> → <i>collectis nectar</i> (95.7)
		139 f. 9r, l. 12: <i>sancti martyris</i> <i>Aгнаe</i> → <i>sanctae</i> (?) <i>martyris</i> <i>Aгнаe</i> (21.3)
	140 f. 16r, l. 14: <i>dispons</i> → <i>disponis?</i> (45.3)	

Table (cont.)

	Bobbio Missal	Sacramentary of Prague
Remaining emendations	73 f. 17r, l. 14: <i>diunis</i> → <i>diuinis</i> (25 <i>Dicitur post aios</i>)	141 f. 9v, l. 1: <i>tangis</i> → <i>tantis</i> (22.3)
	74 f. 18v, l. 20–1: <i>spiritum spiritum</i> → <i>spiritum</i> (30 <i>Post prece</i>)	142 f. 24r, l. 17: <i>eccesiam</i> → <i>ecclesiam</i> (74.1)
	75 f. 34v, l. 2: <i>Genia</i> → <i>Eogenia</i> (69 <i>Ad pacem in vigiliis natalis domini</i>)	143 f. 30r, l. 11: <i>sumen</i> → <i>lumen</i> (86.3)
	76 f. 67r, l. 11–12: <i>ienunancium</i> → <i>ieiunancium</i> (141 <i>Contestatio Quadragesimae</i>)	144 f. 31v, l. 17: <i>diuitionae</i> → <i>diuinationae</i> (90.1) ^e
	77 f. 77r, l. 19: <i>conconsequantur</i> → <i>consequantur</i> (166 <i>Secreta Quadragesima</i>)	145 f. 32v, l. 12: <i>mura</i> → <i>munera</i> (90.5)
	78 f. 94r, l. 21: <i>flagare</i> → <i>flagrare</i> (192 <i>Ad pacem, In traditione symboli</i>)	146 f. 38r, l. 13: <i>regessus</i> à <i>regressus</i> (95.8)
	79 f. 106v, l. 8: <i>captiuata..</i> → <i>captiuatus</i> (212 <i>Die sabbato</i>)	
	80 f. 112v, l. 17: <i>to</i> → <i>tuo</i> (228 <i>Ad christianum faciendum</i>)	

^a Dold and Eizenhöfer transcribe *tuo*: *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 17*.

^b Not noted by Lowe.

^c Lowe does not comment on the two emendations in this prayer.

^d Dold reads *creatus* after correction, but the *c* is clearly erased. Reading before correction is difficult. Dold reads *cretus*, but a letter between *cr* and *etus* has clearly been erased. Cf. Dold and Eizenhöfer (eds.), *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 36*.

^e Transcribed as *deuotione* by Dold and Eizenhöfer. Dold and Eizenhöfer (eds.), *Das Prager Sakramentar*, p. 48*.