Introduction

Rob Meens and Els Rose

The manuscript now preserved as Prague, Archiv Pražského hradu, MS O. 83 and dated to the final decade of the eighth century is known under the title *Sacramentary of Prague* but contains much more than the prayers for Mass recited by the celebrant (priest or bishop). The book contains a variety of texts with different origin and focus. Originally it contained a sacramentary with Mass lectionary, to which parts of the penitential of Theodore of Canterbury and Gregory the Great's *Libellus responsionum* were added shortly after.[1] In addition, the manuscript as we know it today hosts a sermon on the creation of the world as well as a list of names giving evidence of the relevance of this book to certain high-placed persons — or vice versa. The book as a whole, both in its original shape and with regard to the additions made to it shortly after it was initially bound, is a mirror of cultural, social, and religious life in the final decades of the eighth century, a source, in short, whose importance and informative profusion amply exceed the domain of liturgical studies *stricto sensu*.

Precisely the fact that the manuscript presents a variegated compilation makes it difficult to grasp. The neat categories or typologies of liturgical books that liturgical scholars are so fond of are not suitable to accommodate this book. Even if we consider only the sacramentary part (edited by Dold and Eizenhöfer in 1949), it escapes both the division of liturgical sacramentary families known as 'Gelasian', 'Gregorian', and 'Eighth-Century Gelasian' and, through the presence of a large number of prayers and blessings meant for use outside the

---

[1] The articles in this volume are inspired by the analysis of the book's codicology presented by Jiri Vnoucek, not included in the volume.

ritual of Mass, the strict definition of the sacramentary as well. In addition, the codex in its entirety presents different scholarly disciplines with difficult questions. How to evaluate the scribal patterns and the linguistic peculiarities? What does the inclusion of the penitential texts and the sermon on the creation of the world disclose with regard to origin and users? How to interpret the background and meaning of the (dry-point) vernacular glosses (*Griffelglosen*) in both the original and added parts of the book? The list of names, added by the same hand as the dry-point glosses,[2] provides its own puzzle to the scholar trying to reconstruct the context of use, while in general the question as to for which or what kind of community of faithful the book was composed in the first place can only be solved by a mutual effort to open up this early medieval document from a variety of disciplinary angles.

Moreover, the list of names, also known as the *nota historica*, entered on folio 83[v], makes it possible to locate this liturgical manuscript in a particular historical, geographical, and social context. This context has been analysed in amazing detail by Carl I. Hammer in a study dedicated to 'the social landscape of the Prague Sacramentary'.[3] Hammer was able to demonstrate that the names in the list belonged to three major groups: members of the royal family, prominent Bavarian bishops, and members of the local Bavarian elite. The latter group Hammer was able to associate with the Huosi, an important aristocratic family in Bavaria with close ties to the ducal family of the Agilolfings, which had been removed from office only a few years earlier, in 788. Although affiliated with the Agilolfing family, the Huosi were able to outlive the downfall of Duke Tassilo and managed to remain an influential aristocratic faction.[4] Members of this group related to the Huosi are known from the rich Freising records where they appear as founders of churches, which they endowed with land, relics, liturgical utensils, and books such as a sacramentary.[5] On the basis of this material they can be located specifically in the western part of Bavaria in an area west of modern Munich, near the rivers Amper and Glonn.

---

[2] See Rosamond McKitterick's contribution in this volume, p. 23.

[3] Carl I. Hammer, 'The Social Landscape of the Prague Sacramentary: The Prosopography of an Eighth-Century Mass-book', *Traditio*, 54 (1999), 41–80.

[4] H. Krahwinkler, 'Huosi', in *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. by Johannes Hoops (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000), xv, 272–74.

[5] Hammer, 'The Social Landscape', p. 57; and see Thomas Kohl, *Lokale Gesellschaften: Formen der Gemeinschaft in Bayern vom 8. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert*, Mittelalter-Forschungen, 29 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010) for a reconstruction of these small worlds, without a reference, however, to the names as they are mentioned in the Prague Sacramentary.

The list of names can also be precisely dated. It must have been written in the period between September 791 and July 792, because Bishop Sintpert of Regensburg, who died in September 791, is mentioned here and not his successor Adalwin, who we know was in office at the latest in July 792.[6] In this period Charlemagne stayed in Bavaria for a considerable time, from 791 to 793, during a dangerous campaign into Avar territory and in a period of great political upheaval within his own realm.[7] After Tassilo had been removed by Charlemagne, the political situation in Bavaria must have become tense. New opportunities suddenly opened up, and well-established positions were endangered. In this period a serious dispute raged within the Huosi family about the ownership of a church dedicated to St Martin in the place called *Auuicozeshusir*, identified as Haushausen, a dispute in which Bishop Arn of Salzburg as well as two royal *missi*, the powerful prefect Gerold and the chamberlain Meginfrid, had to intervene. This was also the time in which the eldest son of Charlemagne, named after his grandfather Pippin, revolted against his father.[8] The sources about Pippin's revolt are terse, but they do indicate Bavarian participation. The list of names in the Prague Sacramentary is somehow related to all this political turmoil, although it is hard to find out in what way exactly. Remarkably, it is the only document we know that refers to Pippin, the revolting son, as king (*rex*), a title that he may have received or claimed as subking reigning in Bavaria. This list has elicited a lot of debate, which will be re-examined in the contribution by Stuart Airlie to this volume, but still it has not revealed all its secrets.

The Prague Sacramentary, therefore, is an intriguing manuscript in all kinds of ways. The character of the texts it contains, its combination of texts, the scripts used, the glosses added, and the precise social and political context in which it originated raise a lot of questions, but they also provide plenty of opportunities to probe into late eighth-century history. In order to reveal some of its secrets, the manuscript is best studied from different angles, and the results of an effort to do so are presented in this volume, a reflection of an interdisciplinary workshop held in Prague in 2008 under the aegis of the Vienna Institut für Mittelalterforschung, where historians, liturgists, and linguists brought together their respective findings. Their discussions are presented here in three parts.

[6] Hammer, 'The Social Landscape', p. 49.

[7] Stephan Freund, *Von den Agilolfingern zu den Karolingern: Bayerns Bischöfe zwischen Kirchenorganisation, Reichsintegration und karolingischer Reform (700–847)*, Schriftenreihe zur Bayerischen Landesgeschichte, 144 (München: Beck, 2004), pp. 160–78.

[8] Carl. I. Hammer, '"Pippinus rex": Pippin's Plot of 792 and Bavaria', *Traditio*, 63 (2008), 235–76.

Part I focuses on the book and its users, opening with a palaeographic analysis by Rosamond McKitterick. McKitterick presents a fresh view of the scribal work as 'creative and skilful', striking a different note from the harsh judgements with which scholars in the past dismissed the palaeographic (and linguistic) qualities of the book as the hasty work of copyists with little knowledge of Latin who were further impaired by audio-visual disabilities.[9] McKitterick's aim is to uncover trends and conventions in the layout of the type of books Prague belongs to: the sacramentary. This approach makes it possible to take the Sacramentary of Prague out of its isolated and vilified position and to evaluate it in comparison with related books of the early medieval period. Thus, a comparative palaeographical analysis is the first signpost to possible answers to the many questions prompted by this source. This signpost points inward, laying bare the methods of the scribes of the book itself, as well as outward, sketching the cultural milieu and the historical context in which the book was made and used. McKitterick makes visible that the book was not the product of a backwater community but rather a 'modern and innovative' work, employing the recently developed Caroline minuscule instead of the traditional uncial which was common for the production of liturgical codices until well into the second half of the eighth century. Innovation is also visible in the ways the scribes differentiated between text forms, such as texts to be read aloud and texts (rubrics) meant to instruct the performer alone, or between 'normal' prayers and the most 'holy' prayer in the Latin liturgy: the prayers of the *Canon Missae*. Where did these innovative and imaginative scribes carry out their assignment? This question is not as straightforward as it sounds, since scribes were mobile and scripts travelled from place to place together with the scribes' pens.[10] Moreover, it cannot be answered without taking into consideration non-palaeographical evidence. Therefore, although the sum total points in the direction of southeast Germany, McKitterick does not proceed to pinpoint a concrete place of origin as Carl Hammer, and Romuald Bauerreiß before him, did.[11]

[9] See the contribution by Yitzhak Hen in this volume, p. 92.

[10] See also Rosamond McKitterick, 'The Scripts of the Prague Sacramentary, Prague Archivo O 83', *Early Medieval Europe*, 20 (2012), 407–27, where she presents parts of her analysis of this manuscript.

[11] Romuald Bauerreiß, 'Das Kloster Isen als Kultstätte, für die das Sakramentar geschrieben wurde', in *Das Prager Sakramentar: Cod. O. 83, fol. 1–120, der Bibliothek des Metropolitankapitels*, II: *Prolegomena und Textausgabe*, ed. by Alban Dold and Leo Eizenhöfer, Texte und Arbeiten, 38–42 (Beuron in Hohenzollern: Beuroner Kunstverlag, 1949), pp. 37–43; Hammer, 'The Social Landscape'.

McKitterick's general overview of palaeographical characteristics is followed by a close analysis of one particular addition to the text after its completion as a book: the vernacular glosses. Elvira Glaser shows the importance of the Sacramentary of Prague to the study of Old High German since the book is probably one of the oldest witnesses to the written use of this language. The well-known glosses added to the *Libellus responsionum* on folios 132ʳ–141ʳ have attracted the attention of scholars ever since they were first published at the end of the nineteenth century. In Glaser's article the focus is on the glosses occurring in the first part (the sacramentary part) of the codex (mainly fols 17–38). These glosses, not written in ink but with a dry point (*Griffelglossen*), first noticed by Bernhard Bischoff, are still largely unknown and until now unedited.[12] The presence of glosses in the first part of the manuscript is all the more relevant since sacramentaries are not among the sources most richly provided with explanatory glosses in the vernacular. The dry-point glosses in the book are therefore largely of singular nature, not attested elsewhere, which makes them an important addition to the knowledge of Old High German, particularly of the local Bavarian dialect representative of the older (*c.* 800) period. The glosses, both those in ink and the dry-point glosses, give insight into the effort to understand Latin in this region, where Latin had never been the mother tongue, an effort that is, in Glaser's opinion, complicated by the many irregularities in the Latin itself. The glosses are mostly not word-for-word translations, but interpretations of words and constituents in their syntactic context, which demonstrates their function to understand the text as such instead of contributing to glossaries.

A deeper understanding and contextualizing of the Sacramentary of Prague and its use is pursued by Maximilian Diesenberger through the study of a notably related manuscript: Munich, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 4° 3. This book, a compilation of hagiographic and doctrinal texts, was related to the Sacramentary of Prague by Bernhard Bischoff, who identified the scribe of the second part of Prague as one of the hands that worked in the Munich manuscript as well. Moreover, a connection between the two books is suggested by Carl Hammer, who mentions that the work on St Martin in the Munich codex may have somehow corresponded to the central place of this saint in the sanctoral of the Sacramentary of Prague.[13] Diesenberger's answer to Hammer's brief

---

[12] An edition by Elvira Glaser is in preparation.

[13] Hammer, 'The Social Landscape', p. 66. On St Martin in the Sacramentary of Prague, see the contribution by Els Rose to this volume.

remark on the possible relation between the contents of the two manuscripts consists of an extensive exploration of the transmission of the three texts under discussion: Gennadius's *Liber de definitionibus dogmatum ecclesiasticorum*, Rufinus's *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, and Sulpicius Severus's *Vita sancti Martini*. Athough these texts were well known in the early medieval period and transmitted in large numbers of manuscripts, Diesenberger demonstrates how the history of their transmission can shed a clearer light on the manuscripts that pass them down. The close analysis of the texts' manuscript transmission of Gennadius and Sulpicius Severus points in the direction of northern Italy as the origin of the particular tradition represented by Munich, UB, MS 4° 3, while the redaction of Rufinus's *Historia monachorum* points in the direction of Freising. These conclusions encourage Diesenberger to look for further relations between Freising and northern Italy, which he finds in both religious (episcopal as well as monastic) and secular centres. He finds the most conclusive evidence for the two manuscripts' place of origin in the *cella* of Isen, which has a plausible connection with the Sacramentary of Prague because of the rare occurrence of St Zeno of Verona in Prague's sanctoral cycle and in the monastery, whose chapel was dedicated to the saint and whose abbots, Joseph and Arbeo, demonstrated a special devotion for him. Although Diesenberger links both books to Isen, he suggests that the abbey of Freising was the place where both manuscripts were copied — Isen itself is not known to have had a scriptorium. Diesenberger underlines the links between both places by examining particular individuals and their family relations. The two Bavarian places form a triangle with northern Italy where bishops and monks as well as members of the ducal families travelled and acquired their manuscripts. The earlier suggestions in favour of Isen and Freising, which Hammer and Bauerreiß based primarily on the contents of the Sacramentary of Prague, are thus substantiated by a reconstruction of the channels of transfer of persons, goods, and knowledge that may have contributed to the cultural, social, and religious context in which the Sacramentary of Prague and the Munich codex came into existence.

Part II concentrates on the religious contents of the book as a whole, both the liturgical material and the sermon on the creation of the world. It opens with Yitzhak Hen's endeavour to position the Sacramentary of Prague in the liturgical landscape of the late eighth century. His contribution is an attempt to present the Sacramentary of Prague as a central piece of evidence against the tenacious views that liturgy in the early medieval West was centred on Rome and that liturgical practice in the medieval period in general was traditional and 'backward-looking'. After a brief introduction of the complex development of liturgical books in eighth-century Francia, Hen sketches the singularities

of the Sacramentary of Prague as a liturgical book or sacramentary (including the undivided sequence of masses for the temporal and the sanctoral cycle, the number of prayers given for one mass, and the content of the prayer *formulae*), which does not resemble any of the various families of liturgical books that developed and/or were influential in the eighth century. While liturgical scholars in the past have expressed themselves rather indignantly about the book's singular character, Hen takes this feature as a point of departure to achieve a better understanding of liturgy and religious culture in late eighth-century Bavaria. His central perspective is the creativity *in liturgicis* in the early medieval period, which permits him to think of the Sacramentary of Prague as an archetype of local Bavarian liturgical practice, and as a Bavarian parallel to the Frankish so-called Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary, which developed in the second half of the eighth century and whose first exemplar is known to be a manuscript from Flavigny composed under the royal patronage of Pippin III (751–68). His hypothesis is supported by other, albeit fragmentary evidence of proper Bavarian liturgical compositions in the form of (series of) prayers and whole sacramentaries. What then, more specifically, is the community that the Sacramentary of Prague aimed to serve? Hen compares the book with other compilations of similar kind, books that have long puzzled scholars but that now come to form a pile of evidence indicating that little parish communities and travelling (missionary) priests had books at their disposal that offered the material they needed in a handy shape: prayers and a lectionary to celebrate Mass, a penitential handbook, some catechetical material. Such handbooks for priests, enjoying an ever increasing scholarly interest, are suggested by Hen as the category the Sacramentary of Prague most closely resembles.

The peculiar position of the Sacramentary of Prague among contemporary liturgical books is worked out further by Els Rose, who takes her point of departure primarily in the sacramentary's sanctoral cycle. The commemoration of the saints is often used by scholars to clarify matters of localization. The prominent position of St Martin in the book as well as the presence of the rarely venerated St Zeno of Verona has guided scholars in the past in the direction of cult centres where these saints enjoyed special veneration. There is more to say about the character of the calendar displayed by Prague's sanctoral cycle, particularly with regard to innovative trends by which the book is characterized. Thus it includes an almost full cycle of feasts in honour of the twelve apostles, of which only some were included in the sacramentaries that precede the Sacramentary of Prague. Rose draws a link between this liturgical development and the flow of manuscripts that appear in Bavaria, particularly Regensburg, from the beginning of the ninth century transmitting the *Virtutes apostolorum*, also known

as the apocryphal Acts of the apostles in their Latin transmission. Rose also pays special attention to the three masses in honour of St Martin of Tours. It is not only the large number of masses for this saint that is surprising. The close link with the older, Merovingian sacramentaries such as the *Missale Gothicum* (BAV, MS Reg. lat. 317) and the Bobbio Missal (BNF, MS lat. 13246) in the choice of prayers for this Mass of 11 November is striking, as are the linguistic similarities between the prayers in the Sacramentary of Prague and the Gothic Missal. The linguistic profile of this Mass and of the book in general seems to connect this sacramentary to sources of the late seventh and early eighth centuries, when the highly stylized nature of liturgical prayers was expressed in language that betrays a strong influence of informal spoken language.

The final contribution of part II by Richard Corradini concentrates on the *Sermo de creatione mundi*, written by one of the hands that copied the sacramentary proper but on a separate bifolium, which was added at the beginning of the codex (fols Ia/b–IIa/b) shortly after the sacramentary had been composed. The text, which is qualified a 'sermon' by modern scholars, bears no proper title but is introduced as *Dein finem saeculi hic inquirendum est*. Given the fact that little can be found about the end of the world here but much about the world's creation, it is generally referred to as *De creatione mundi*. The interpretation of the text is complicated by the fact that it is unfinished and at the same time transmitted only in this incomplete version. Richard Corradini gauges the character of the text and its background by analysing the sources from which the author drew, even if the references (to the Bible, patristic authors, apocryphal writings) remain implicit rather than explicit. This comparative approach enables him to reconstruct the text, which is at many places truncated and abbreviated, also displaying orthography and morphology that is typical for the Latin of the (early) eighth century and which presents a considerable number of problems of interpretation. A key to understanding the text and its relevance in a liturgical (sacramentary) context is found by Corradini in the extensive symbolism dealing with the tetragrammaton of Adam's name. Bringing in a variety of sources from Augustine to Bede and from biblical exegesis to apocryphal literature, he explains the insular background of this text at home in Bavaria and links the sermon to the liturgical importance of the Adam-symbolism, particularly with regard to calendars and the computational reconstruction of the creation of the world. The article concludes with an annotated edition of the text.

Just as the bifolium containing the sermon on the creation of the world is added at the beginning of the codex, an addition containing fifteen folios is added at the end (fols 131–45). This addition is dealt with in the first contribution to the final part of the volume by Rob Meens. The correspondence

between the glosses in the sacramentary proper, the list of names on folio 83ᵛ, and the glosses in this second part of the codex indicates that the fifteen folios were added to the codex in an early stage, around the year 792. These leaves first comprise penitential rulings, known as the *Iudicia Theodori* (named after Theodore of Tarsus, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 668) but in a version usually attributed to Gregory the Great. The *Iudicia* deal with topics of ecclesiastical organization, social relations, and ritual purity that are also addressed in the second text of this part, the *Libellus responsionum* that starts halfway through folio 132ᵛ and comprises the exchange of questions and answers attributed to Theodore's first predecessor, Augustine of Canterbury, and Pope Gregory the Great. Meens's analysis of the textual transmission indicates not only that the *Libellus responsionum* was often used to clarify or complete Theodore's *Iudicia*, but also that different versions of both texts circulated in this combined transmission in Bavarian manuscripts contemporary to Prague, Archiv Pražského hradu, MS O. 83. The latter observation indicates the lively debate that existed in late eighth-century Bavaria on the topics raised in these writings. The presence of a considerable number of vernacular glosses, mentioned by Elvira Glaser,[14] adds internal evidence to this impression. The *Libellus responsionum* and the *Iudicia Theodori* concentrate on three main issues: church organization, marriage, and ritual purity. Meens relates all three themes to the situation in late eighth-century Bavaria, where bishops were confronted with far-reaching changes in political leadership and ecclesiastical (re)organization. The interest in marriage legislation in particular might be suggestive of the historical context(s) in which the 'Gregorian part' could be relevant to the patrons and/or users of the Sacramentary of Prague.

In the second contribution to part III Philippe Depreux departs from the prayer for the kings in his effort to further understand the sociopolitical context in which the Sacramentary of Prague was composed and used. Depreux examines the custom to pray for the king in a number of different contexts. He explores in particular the Mass for peace (*Missa pro pace*, a votive Mass), the Mass for the kings (*Missa pro regibus*, a votive Mass) and the prayers in times of war (*in tempore belli*), although there are other contexts in which the prayer for the king is central, such as other votive Masses, the prayers for Good Friday, and the *Canon Missae*. Depreux examines the prayers in the selected Masses and compares their contents and tenor with a capitulary issued by Charlemagne dated at the end of the 770s, where the latter prescribes the ways in which the

---

[14] See Glaser's contribution to this volume.

bishops should organize the prayer for king and army. Several appendices con-
clude the article, including a comparison with other sacramentaries and their
organization of the various contexts in which prayer for the king and on behalf
of peace is prominent.

The final article in the volume is Stuart Airlie's analysis of the famous *nota
historica* or list of names, added to a blank leaf in the codex in the year 791/92.
The *nota*, which was given its name by modern scholars, is included in the part
of the sacramentary where the material for daily Masses is given (fol. 83[v]). Two
groups of names are linked to the *Sanctus* — the part of the ordinary of the
Mass that is supposed to link the earthly with the heavenly liturgy. Various gen-
erations of scholars have racked their brains over the lists and their meaning or
relevance in the context of the sacramentary. Airlie's analysis takes place in the
same field of tension, where social relations and patterns of loyalty and perjury
are embedded in a liturgical context, even in the liturgical connection between
heavenly and earthly praise. In Airlie's analysis, the reconstruction of rivalry
and ambition between the persons named in the list is central, and he focuses
specifically on Charlemagne's eldest though possibly illegitimate son Pippin,
nicknamed the Hunchback after he had rebelled against his father and fallen
from grace in 792. Nevertheless Airlie stresses the liturgical context in which
the list of names is found, which ultimately makes the *nota* not a political 'man-
ifesto' but an incentive to prayer and, therefore, a liturgical act.

The Prague Sacramentary is a book that is peculiar in several ways. It sheds
light on many aspects of late eighth-century history and culture in Bavaria,
with ramifications into Italy, Alemannia, and the royal Carolingian court. It
therefore deserves detailed study, and the contributions to this volume make
an effort to understand this important historical document in its own right, to
put it in its historical context, and to read late eighth-century Bavarian history
through the lense of this unique manuscript. We cannot say that we solved all
the problems of this enigmatic and elusive document. Questions remain as do
differences of scholarly opinion. Yet we feel that the contributions assembled in
this study make progress in our understanding of this intriguing source and in
our reading of late eighth-century culture. In the end, however, the remarks of
Stuart Airlie when concluding his analysis of the list of names on folio 83[v] can
be extended to the whole volume. If we may rephrase his words a little: If the
sacramentary remains puzzling to us, this is entirely fitting. There are no simple
answers to our analysis. The book is thus profoundly historical.