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ing of history in the Christian West with other regions and cultures such as the Byzantine Empire or the caliphate. These wider horizons and the alternative approaches to historical narratives will not only offer a better sense of the spectrum of possibilities. They also will help to remind us that we have to study the relationship of historiography and identity in every case based on the specific history of this relationship.

Like the second volume, this one focuses on historiography and identity in the Latin West after the dissolution of the Western Roman Empire. The second volume, however, examined the period before the Carolingian rise to power and the establishment of their rule over a significant part of Europe. It explored the diverse experiments of post-Roman historians with models and historical genres that they inherited from the classical past, and how they adopted, adapted, and continued the writing of history in the quickly and constantly changing world of the fifth to the eighth centuries. It is difficult to find a common label for the various historiographical projects of Jordanes, Isidore, Bede, Gregory of Tours, the Irish historians or later Merovingian authors. Taken together, however, their work resulted in what Peter Brown called one of the ‘great triumphs of early medieval culture’: the gradual creation of a sense of their own past in the post-Roman West. This creation of a sense of one’s own past was the result of an ongoing bricolage with models, genres, and histories from the late classical and Roman Christian world. It is this bricolage, the intensified and conscious rewriting, reframing, remodelling, and reshaping of these older resources to provide meaningful histories for a changed world that sets these Latin histories of the early Middle Ages apart from earlier Roman histories and from contemporary historical projects of the Byzantine Empire.

As the contributions of this volume show, Carolingian historians understood the difference between Roman and post-Roman histories very well. They read and studied the works of their post-Roman predecessors with the same care as they explored older histories. And they continued the experiments of their post-Roman predecessors with an ever-growing body of texts and conceptions of history. Carolingian scribes and scholars took stock of older models

2 Pohl and Mahoney, eds, Historiography and Identity, IV and Pohl, Borri, and Wieser, eds, Historiography and Identity, V.
3 Heydemann and Reimitz, eds, Historiography and Identity, III.
4 Brown, Rise of Western Christendom, pp. 7–9.
5 For a longer discussion, see my introduction to the second volume, Reimitz, ‘Historiography and Identity’, with further references, for a wider comparison in the Eurasian world see the conclusion of the fourth volume by Pohl, ‘Mapping Historiography’. 
but also developed new forms and formats of writing and arranging history. In so doing they developed new frames for the writing and reading of histories that brought old and new histories together in new ways. Not only well-known scholars such as Frechulf of Lisieux, Einhard, or Walahfrid Strabo, but also a great number of anonymous compilers and historians have left us with rich and manifold evidence. The variety of historical studies and histories impressively illustrates the care and intelligence with which Carolingian intellectuals studied an ever larger shelf of historical texts that came to occupy a prominent place in the new Carolingian libraries.

Moreover, in the context of the Carolingian *correctio*, these scholars came to develop an increasingly widely shared critical approach to the language and form of the texts. It was not least this critique that helped them to make their respective choices in view of the range of alternative historical possibilities. A good example for this critical approach is the Carolingian transmission of Gregory of Tours’s *Ten Books of History*. Carolingian compilers continued the work of their Merovingian predecessors of rearranging Gregory’s *Ten Books*, using a cut and paste system to create new and different versions of the text. Strikingly, these Carolingian manuscripts do not represent a definitive reworking of the text. The specific rearrangement varies from manuscript to manuscript, and each version presents its very own edition of Gregory’s *Ten Books*. Marginal notes in some of these extant manuscripts, however, clearly demonstrate that Carolingian readers and users checked the new editions against the complete version of Gregory’s *Ten Books* that were housed in their libraries as

---


7 For the extensive shelf of texts, see Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, pp. 20–22, on libraries see Ganz, ‘When Is a Library Not a Library’; for history in early medieval libraries and manuscripts, see Ganz, ‘Historia’, McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 186–217; and see also Becker, Licht, and Weinfurter, eds, *Karolingische Klöster*.


9 For an overview see Reimitz, ‘The Early Medieval Editions’ with further references particularly to the studies of Pascale Bourgain and Martin Heinzelmann.

well.¹¹ Such a source-critical approach was even applied to specific passages and certain textual variants (Lesarten) of the different versions.¹²

These examples of Quellenkritik illustrate the diligence and care with which Carolingian historians read earlier works of history. But it is also a good example of how well aware these historians were of alternative and competing accounts and perspectives of these earlier histories. Like in other social and political contexts, the Carolingian reforms or correctio linked the idea of truth closely to a critical approach, and this was also the case in the work of Carolingian historians.¹³ This might have been particularly important even for the writing of history. As Jörn Rüsen has observed, claims to historiographical truth are often employed as a methodological principle by which specific relationships and hierarchies between different perspectives can be established.¹⁴

The rich evidence of texts and manuscripts that has come down to us through the various historiographical workshops of the Carolingian period provides us with a particularly interesting and varied corpus to explore how Carolingian historians experimented with the integration of perspectives.¹⁵ Taken together, these interventions form a remarkably disjointed series. Yet, different though they were, they allow us to reconstruct how Carolingian historians developed their own methodological principles for studying and writing history and how these principles shaped the relationship between history and the construction of identity.

For a long time, however, this evidence has been largely neglected and hardly utilized to study the diverse and various approaches of Carolingian historians to the study of the past. Only in the last decades have early medievalists begun to explore more intensively the variants, subtle differences, and rearrangements of texts and text-ensembles in the many manuscripts that have come down to us from the Carolingian period.¹⁶ These newer studies provide us not only with a

¹¹ See already Krusch, ‘Die handschriftlichen Grundlagen: 1 Die Handschrift von Namur’.

¹² For an example from the manuscripts of Gregory of Tours where subsequent editors made different decisions about the textual variants: ullatinus and ualentinus which they had found in different manuscripts, see my History, Frankish Identity, pp. 22–23.


¹⁶ See, for instance, McKitterick, The Carolingians and the Written Word; McKitterick, History and Memory; Pohl, Werkstätte; Pohl, ‘History in Fragments’; Reimitz, ‘Ein karoling-
finer and more differentiated baseline of the methodological and textual spectrum of possibilities available to early medieval historians. They also allow us to develop a more complex and productive approach for analysing the relationship of texts and identities, as we are able to study them as part of wider debates and reflections about history and identity.¹⁷

The Carolingian reception of Gregory of Tours's *Histories* is, once again, a good example. As has been shown by a number of excellent studies in the last decades, Gregory of Tours has left his readers a complex construct of himself as author of the text, actor in his own *Histories*, as pastor of his readers as well as of his community, and as a prophet in the stories he told in his *historia*.¹⁸ Hence the question of how Gregory would have identified himself is still open to debate after many centuries of research on Gregory of Tours's *Histories*.¹⁹ This has nothing to do with the Unzuverlässigkeit — the unreliability — of Gregory of Tours as historian (as Bruno Krusch once put it).²⁰ It has more to do with the fact that Gregory leaves his readers with the task of figuring out who is speaking to them. Is it the author Gregory, the actor Gregory as he appears in his own story as bishop of Tours, the pastor, or even a greater power that speaks through history? Just like Gregory’s *Ten Books*, most histories do not construct a single identity, but balance a whole range of identifications; the narrative develops several options and explores their possibilities and limits. Gregory’s brilliance in doing just that made his *Histories* such a useful resource for later generations, even far beyond the Carolingian period.²¹ The compilers of his *Histories* continued to build upon his main outline but also shifted the balance and salience of identities and identifications in the text.

¹⁷ See Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’, and for the period between the end of the Western Roman Empire and the Carolingian period: Reimitz, ‘Historiography and Identity’.


¹⁹ See now Murray, ed., *A Companion*, with a comprehensive bibliography.

²⁰ Krusch, ‘Die Unzuverlässigkeit’.

The transmission of such conversations and debates in the manuscripts, however, should not only be understood as successive interventions. They often continue controversies that go back to the time of the original composition of the texts.\textsuperscript{22} As influential as Gregory of Tours’s works were and are for our image of the Merovingian kingdoms in the sixth century, we have enough contemporary sources that allow us to understand his narrative and its literary strategies as reacting to other possibilities of linking history to alternative visions of community.\textsuperscript{23} We should thus try to study the extant texts in the context of a polyphonic discussion from which many voices are lost, but which also can be reconstructed through the reactions in our texts. The Carolingian period has not only left us more texts and histories to reconstruct such debates, but also a much richer body of manuscript evidence that also transmits many more versions and arrangements of the different texts and histories. This does not only provide us with a more comprehensive spectrum of possibilities. The manuscripts also give us the opportunity to evaluate the potential of these histories for the creation of a shared past, their salience, their impact on later histories, and the identifications and categorial infrastructures, which these texts engendered.

It might be surprising that such rich evidence has not been used more comprehensively to reconstruct a Carolingian discourse on history and identity. One reason might lie in a scepticism about the value of histories that has become fashionable in the last decades about history and identity.\textsuperscript{24} Although this scepticism is sometimes presented as a postmodern or text-critical approach, its main approach is often surprisingly straightforward and operates rather with ideas and expectations of a (rather unfortunate) historical positivism.\textsuperscript{25} Do historical texts adequately reflect ‘real’ communities (because the texts were too biased)? Did the extant texts have any impact in creating or promoting identities or should we rather see them as random or idiosyncratic interventions with individual perspectives whose audience and influence are rarely attested? The approach of the series on historiography and identity (which is developed at

\textsuperscript{22} For the Trojan origin myth in Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries, see already Wood, ‘Defining the Franks’; Barlow, ‘Gregory of Tours’; Reimitz, \textit{History, Frankish Identity}, pp. 74–97.

\textsuperscript{23} Reimitz, \textit{History, Frankish Identity}, pp. 74–120.

\textsuperscript{24} See Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’, pp. 16–17.

\textsuperscript{25} On ‘historischen Positivismus’, or ‘positivistischer Szientismus’, see Oexle, \textit{Geschichtswissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus}; Fuchs, ‘Positivistischer Szientismus in vergleichender Perspektive’. On happy positivism, see Foucault, \textit{L’ordre du discours}, pp. 57–58, who describes his approach as a combination of a learned nonchalance and a happy positivism (\textit{positivisme heureux}).
greater length in the introduction to the whole series by Walter Pohl in the first volume\textsuperscript{26} tries to respond to this scepticism with a more productive approach.

Another reason for the neglect of the Carolingian texts, versions, and manuscripts is probably more pragmatic. Studying the singularity of manuscripts or different versions in manuscripts as part of a discourse takes a lot of time. It is painstaking work to reconstruct the care and caution with which Carolingian editors worked on the texts. Transcribing the extant texts and comparing them with other versions and transmissions, studying the codicological architecture of various arrangements of histories in manuscripts, identifying the different texts, and their role and function in the larger compendia and comparing them with alternative arrangements not only takes time but also means to take the risk of losing time.\textsuperscript{27} New technologies and tools such as databases, new ways of linking different data-sets to each other, or HTR (Handwritten Text Recognition) might help to accelerate the work and to identify with more precision and certainty manuscripts and corpora that are worth the effort. This in turn might allow us to arrive at a more comprehensive panorama of possibilities for the writing and rewriting of history in the Carolingian period.\textsuperscript{28}

The comparative neglect of the rich and various evidence of the time, however, can also be explained by the historiography of early medieval studies itself. It is connected to the notion and horizons of Carolingian historiography that had been developed early in the establishment of history as a scholarly discipline in the nineteenth century. The idea of a new truly critical edition of the sources of German history in the first half of the nineteenth century by the Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde played an influential part in defining the frame of reference for a specific and quite selective notion of Carolingian historiography.\textsuperscript{29} The first two volumes, published in the new series with the name Monumenta Germaniae Historica in 1826 and 1829 provided its readers with a set of texts that focused mainly on the ascent of the Carolingian family to the rulers of Europe.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{26} Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’.

\textsuperscript{27} An impressively comprehensive example for such an approach is the study by Matthias Tischler on Einharts Vita Karoli, for other examples, see above, n. 16.

\textsuperscript{28} For a cooperation aiming at such a more comprehensive panorama, see the upcoming research network on ‘Histories in Transition, 9th to 12th Centuries’.

\textsuperscript{29} For the early history of the MGH, see Fuhrmann, ‘Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen’, pp. 11–28, and Wood, The Modern Origins, pp. 156–61; from a different angle, but equally enlightening, see Miller, History and its Objects, in part 123–39.

\textsuperscript{30} Annales et chronica aevi Carolini, ed. by Pertz; Scriptores rerum Sangallensium, ed. by Pertz.
The reasons behind this selection were as practical as they were ideological. The Gesellschaft was founded in 1819 by Freiherr vom Stein. Its emblem made clear the philosophy of the Society: ‘Sanctus amor patriae dat animum’, ‘The sacred love of the fatherland fosters the spirit’. Vom Stein had had the idea that the act of collecting early historical texts in what were then cutting-edge critical editions, was on the one hand participation in the most modern currents of scientific inquiry, while on the other hand it was a gesture of filial piety toward the historians of the Middle Ages as forbears in the historical discipline. In this sense, it was not only history that was being commemorated, but also historical writing, as something crucial to what he conceived of as a quintessential German identity.31

The ambitious ideal of a critical reconstruction of the original documents of German history was intensively discussed from the start and was still going on when the first two volumes appeared in 1826 and 1829. As different as the multiple and various ideas and plans that were discussed and also published in the first volumes of the Monumenta’s journal (Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde) were, a common sense emerged in regard to what a truly critical edition should be.32 They needed to be based on a comprehensive comparison of manuscripts, editions, and prints, which should be fully documented in the edition’s apparatus. In order to situate the work, the editions should also discuss their Sitz im Leben: an author’s background and social class, the time of composition, the so-called Geist and Charakter of the work, its plausibility and its bias, together with a critical assessment of its language and style.33

One can hardly say that the first two volumes, published by Georg Heinrich Pertz in 1826 and 1829, met the ambitious aims of the Society. Pertz sometimes decided simply just to reprint earlier prints of single manuscripts, or worked with manuscripts that were more easily available, or accessible in better catalogued manuscript collections.34 He was clearly well aware of the fact that the survey of manuscripts was far from complete. An issue that was largely unresolved even in terms of an ideal remained the question of whether or not a text should be edited in full, or whether those passages which were taken over from other, older works should be omitted.35

31 For this see below, p. 9 with n. 37.
33 Dümge, ‘ Ankündigung’.
34 For a good example see the comments on the early history of the edition of Einhard’s Life of Charlemagne in Tischler, Einharts ‘Vita Karoli’, pp. 3–8.
35 See the discussion in Tischler, ‘Der doppelte Kontext’; Davis, Charlemagne’s Practice of
Why did the Society or Pertz publish in this state of irresolution? The answer is depressingly familiar to a modern, scholarly/academic audience. After seven years with nothing to show for themselves, the Monumentists realized it was ‘publish or perish’. The intense seriousness of their methodological debate, crucial to the self-understanding and self-perception of the Society, was inevitably in tension with the patience of the Society’s few early sponsors, and it was even harder to find new ones. The launch of the first two volumes, while critically premature, was driven by a financial imperative — in our attention to the source-critical pronouncements of volumes 1 and 2, we should not overlook the published announcement that accompanied them, with its great expectations of future patronage.

In order to meet the expectations of the early sponsors and supporters of the project, Pertz resolved the seemingly intractable concerns of the Monumentists surrounding the search for the original text by relocating them around the second pole of the Society’s self-understanding, namely the search for German origins. And this played an important role for his decision which corpus of texts he selected for the first two volumes. And the texts that were chosen to be edited in the two volumes constituted the main frame of reference through which Carolingian historiography and history would be studied through the next two centuries.

Pertz’s claim was simply this — that the earliest authentic German historians were the annalists of the eighth century. The so-called minor annals — or as Pertz called them, the *Annales Germanorum antiquissimi* — ran through and defined, in his view, a series of landscapes: the Belgian annals, the Upper Rhenish annals, the Lower Rhenish annals, and the Bavarian annals. These rivulets came to converge in the mighty waters of the high Carolingian *Annales Laurissenses maiores*, later edited as the *Annales regni Francorum*, the royal Frankish annals.

Pertz’s work amounted to a decision about where the German historical tradition began. By choosing eighth-century annals as his starting point, not only did he exclude the earlier Frankish historical traditions, such as the Merovingian historian Gregory of Tours; he also found a way to valorize a tradition of writing which could be geographically linked to a modern idea of Germany and politically to the magnetic moment in German history.

---


constituted by the reign of Charlemagne. The table of contents of the first two volumes edited by Pertz, show that it was the reconstruction of this genesis of an ‘authentic German historiography’ that guided him in his selection and edition of the texts. Their arrangement traced the development of German historiography from its poor and primitive (and independent) origins to what Pertz considered works of unrivalled literary quality, such as Einhard’s *Annals* or *Life of Charlemagne*. Pertz summarized this view as follows:

It is indeed strange that we have only faint traces of such scholarly activities (as documented in the minor annals, HR) in France and Italy. This shows that the German fatherland has received its script from its neighbours but at the same time developed its very own approach to history independently and without any foreign models. This approach has been further developed with surprising speed to the works of Einhard whose literary and historical quality remained unsurpassed for a long time.  

For Pertz, and probably more importantly for his readers and potential supporters, this process should be regarded as proof for the innate, deeply rooted drive of the German people towards the writing of history. The first two volumes of the *MGH Scriptores in folio* provided the evidentiary basis for this claim. It was, however, also an evidentiary basis that allowed a new boundary to be drawn between the Roman past of the (ancient) world and the Germanic origins of the Middle Ages. The decision to reconstruct the beginning of medieval historiography from the minor annals to ‘Einhards lange unübertroffenen Werken’ came to play an important role in the ‘modern origins of the early Middle Ages’. The power and influence of this teleological model is well documented over the next two hundred years, from Leopold von Ranke’s legendary essay, ‘Zur Kritik der Fränkisch-Deutschen Reichsannalen’ from 1854, to the edition of the *Royal Frankish Annals* of Friedrich Kurze produced at the end of the nineteenth century, to the *Kritik* of Carolingian annals in the second half

---


40 Von Ranke, ‘Zur Kritik’.

41 *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. by Kurze.
of the twentieth century, and the use of Kurze’s edition until this very day. The influence of this choice, however, lay not only in the selective choice of texts but also in framing visions of national identity in terms of source-critical questions. The invention of the early Middle Ages in the nineteenth century built to a large extent on binding together two distinct and in some ways divergent grand narratives: on the one hand, a myth of origins, both textual and national, and on the other, an idea of science as critique, a discourse of progress and emancipation.

As much as the *Sitz im Leben* of Pertz’s edition was in the first half of the nineteenth century, his choice of texts did indeed pick up a historical process documented in the sources he selected. Probably more intuitively, he took stock of a historical discourse that was passed on through the Carolingian annals from the eighth to the nineteenth centuries, a discourse which was equally selective and also a discourse of progress and emancipation. The annals that have come down to us from the Carolingian period were indeed one of the main media of this discourse whose formation went hand in hand with the Carolingian rise to power — the Carolingian usurpation of the Frankish throne and the renovation of the Roman Empire under Charlemagne.

The ordering of the past in an annalistic structure, however, was no Carolingian invention. Its model was most likely annalistic accounts written in the Roman Empire. In the Carolingian *renovatio* of the historiographical tradition, however, the years were not counted *ab urbe condita*, from the foundation of Rome. The years were counted from the beginning of the new Christian era with the birth of Christ. The historical narrative became integrated into a Calendar of Triumph, in which the triumph of Christianity was directly linked to the triumph of the Carolingian family and the Frankish people. The common history of the Franks and their Carolingian rulers was not so much defined through their past, or through the integration of different conceptions of Frankish identity and history; instead it was projected into an annalistic

---

42 See, the bibliography at Geschichtsquellen des deutschen Mittelalters, at <https://geschichtsquellen.de/werk/266> [accessed 1 June 2020].

43 On the intensification of this trend over the course of the nineteenth century, see the dissertation of Hunter-Parker, ‘Old Books, New Times’, with further bibliography. Cf. also Miller, *History and its Objects*.


vision that was knitted into the seams of an endlessly expandable story. The appeal of such a dynamic and future-oriented formation of a Carolingian-Frankish success story is already well documented for the Carolingian period. Annalistic texts came to be ‘the most influential of the contemporary narratives for the history of the Frankish kingdoms under the early Carolingian rulers.’

This is particularly true for a text that was edited by Pertz as *Annales Laurissenses maiores*, but came soon to be called *Annales regni Francorum*, the *Royal Frankish Annals*. Less than thirty years after the publication of the first Scriptores-volume of the MGH in 1826 Leopold von Ranke suggested that the text was a product of the Carolingian court itself. The blatant promotion of the Carolingian kings in the text, which describes the triumphal success of Pippin and his successors from 741 to 829, actually provides a good case for treating the text as an attempt to develop an official view of history from the perspective of the political centres of the Carolingian ruler. Thus it was no coincidence that the extant narrative starts only in 741, with the takeover of the *regnum Francorum* by the future king Pippin, leaving the Carolingian future open to connection with multiple visions of the Frankish past. The vision of community for the Carolingian rulers and their Franks should have the potential to offer a common future for all their various pasts.

The annals are extant in a variety of versions and manuscripts, and in the course of the ninth century it became a central building block of ‘history-books’ that compiled additional texts into more extensive representations of history. In the process, the annals were often combined with various works on early Frankish history: Gregory of Tours, the seventh-century *Fredegar-Chronicle*, and the *Liber historiae Francorum* written in the first decades of the eighth century. ‘The great impact of the narrative is also well documented in other historical writings of the Carolingian period. Authors of comprehensive his-

---

46 McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 31.

47 In medieval library catalogues the text is listed as *gesta Francorum*, and modern editions first called it *Annales Laurissenses maiores*, the *Greater Lorsch Annals*, because its oldest extant redaction seems to have come down to us from the Carolingian monastery of Lorsch; cf. Kurze’s introduction to his edition: *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. by Kurze, pp. v–vi, ix.


49 McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 31–33, describes the *Annales regni Francorum* as ‘the closest thing to “official history” we have from the early Carolingian period’ (p. 31), but cf. her discussion about the multifocal political system under Charlemagne at pp. 157–213, pp. 171–78.

50 On Carolingian history books cf. above, n. 16.

torical works such as the Astronomer in his *Life of Louis the Pious*, Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*, the Poeta Saxo, the authors of the *Annals of Fulda*, the *Annals of St Bertin*, or the *Annals of Xanten*: all of these worked with the text, either by continuing it or excerpting and revising it in their accounts. In this process the *Royal Frankish Annals* became an important component of a grand narrative in which the Carolingian success story stood at the start of a new age. Already early on, this new age was associated with the definitive political and social reorganization of the post-Roman West, in the Carolingian kingdoms and empire.

The Carolingian control of historical writing from the middle of the eighth century to the end of the *Royal Frankish Annals* in 829 is indeed remarkable. There is not one comprehensive narrative that has come down to us with an alternative narrative. Finding ‘traces of lost traditions’, dissident voices, and alternative views is painstaking detective work of identifying little pieces of a puzzle that might represent opposing groups or oppositional views. It thus seems all the more important to put the dominant narrative that the Carolingians have passed on to us into perspective.

There are several ways to do so. One is to acknowledge the peculiarity of this remarkable control of historiography and try to define more precisely its *Spielraum* and the possibility of the emergence of this room to manoeuvre in the eighth century. As I have argued at greater length in the second volume of this series, this *Spielraum* had been inherited from the Merovingian history of historiography. As different as the three extant histories from the Merovingian period, Gregory of Tours’s *Histories*, the *Fredegar-Chronicle*, and the *Liber historiae Francorum* are, they share at least one characteristic. They all talk to and not from the royal centres of power. The authors clearly responded to other visions of community and not least to those of the earlier histories. But one hardly gets the impression that they were writing in reaction to, or in agreement or disagreement with, an established royal narrative of Merovingian-Frankish history. Such a narrative does not even seem to have existed by the late 720s when the author of the *Liber historiae Francorum* finished the history.


55. See also Reimitz, ‘The History of Merovingian Historiography’.
This fits well to what has been called a Merovingian politics of consensus in which the Merovingian kings positioned themselves in the middle between the different groups, factions, and groupings of the kingdom. Through their equidistance from the different elites of the kingdom, the Merovingian kings guaranteed a balance of power that would otherwise have been difficult to imagine. Even in the late seventh century, their monopoly of rule was grounded in a positioning of kingship that granted elites equal access to the kingdom. When the Pippinid/Carolingian mayors of the palace increasingly monopolized access to the throne, the rules of the game began to change. Only with the rise of the Carolingians to power can we observe the first signs of a centralized writing of history.

As has been well observed, in their efforts to legitimate their rise to power and the usurpation of the royal throne, the Carolingians continued many of the strategies that they developed as members of the aristocracy. Their politics operating through monasteries, the claims of responsibility for Christian reform, their use of titles often worked with what Herwig Wolfram identified as a double strategy, a double strategy with which they constructed a political continuity in both a Merovingian as well as a Carolingian sense. The writing of history too was an aristocratic tradition in the Merovingian kingdom. It is very likely that the Pippinid ancestors of the Carolingians edited the oldest extant version of the *Fredegar-Chronicle* (from c. 660). After all, the chronicle highlights the important role of the early members of the family, such as Pippin I and Arnulf of Metz for the political cohesion of the Merovingian kingdom. When the Carolingian descendants of Arnulf and Pippin continued and rearranged the history as members of the ruling family, the aristocratic practice became a royal one. Just as the Carolingians kept their old aristocratic title *vir inluster* from the Merovingian past as part of their royal *Intitulatio*,

56 See Wood, ‘Usurpers’; for the concept of politics of consensus, see also Fouracre and Davies, eds, *The Settlement of Disputes*, in particular the contribution of Fouracre, “Placita”; and Nelson, ‘Dispute Settlement’.

57 For the historical context, see Fouracre, *The Age of Charles Martel*; Fischer, *Karl Martell*.

58 See Hummer, *Politics and Power*.


60 For the date see Fischer, ‘Rewriting History’; and his forthcoming study *Die Fredegar-Chronik*.

they also continued to promote the writing of their own history as kings. In doing so, both the adoption of the title *vir inluster*, and the writing of history became a royal prerogative.

While the Carolingians presented their rise to power as the logical continuation of a politics of consensus of all their subjects, we should not forget that they came from a very specific background. When the uncle of the first Carolingian king Pippin, Childebrand, reworked the whole *Fredegar-Chronicle* into a *Historia vel Gesta Francorum*, he also continued the history up to the coronation of his cousin Pippin.62 This continuation, however, built in style, language, and content upon a very different history from the *Fredegar-Chronicle*, the providential vision of history of the *Liber historiae Francorum*.63 While the *Chronicle* was clearly the product of a Mediterranean world view and also mapped the Mediterranean connections of the Merovingian and Frankish elites, the *Liber historiae Francorum*’s vision of history was much more anchored in a Northern cultural zone. This cultural zone, however, did not acquire its convergence through a common Germanic past or culture. It was a culture that was shaped by a common Christian matrix developed in different but loosely connected local and regional Micro-Christendoms from Ireland to Austrasia.64 It was from this cultural zone that the early Carolingians rose to power. And there are also remarkable overlaps of these regions with those identified by Georg Heinrich Pertz as the main early landscapes of annalistic texts.65

The idea and ideology of a shared history for a common future of different Frankish groups and Micro-Christendoms remained an important strategy of Carolingian legitimation throughout the eighth century. The composition of the *Royal Frankish Annals* can indeed be regarded as a culmination of Carolingian propaganda and politics from Pippin to Charlemagne. This function of Carolingian historiography and the role of the *Royal Frankish Annals* has been carefully studied in the last decades. Matthias Becher’s groundbreaking study of the oldest redaction of the annals up to the year 788 showed how strongly the extant narrative was shaped by the efforts to legitimate Carolingian author-

64 For Micro-Christendoms and their role in the cultural development of the early medieval West, see Brown, *Rise of Western Christendom*, pp. 13–23, with references to longer discussions on different but connected cultural milieux in the book.
65 Cf. above, p. 9.
ity vis-à-vis old aristocratic and regional power constellations and particularly the powerful duke of Bavaria Tassilo whom Charlemagne deposed in 788.66

Becher’s study provided considerable momentum for understanding the extant annals until their end with the entry of 829 as an ongoing historiographical project to generate consensus. It was above all Rosamond McKitterick who identified different stages of their production and suggested that they be seen as the result of ‘a collaborative piece of image making by many authors over a number of decades’.67 Following the lead of Becher, McKitterick, and others, I have suggested differentiating between two closely related but nevertheless distinct histories of the text — two histories we might tentatively call the short and the long history of the Royal Frankish Annals. The long history of the Royal Frankish Annals concerns the long-term success of the narrative after its abrupt ending in 829 when the Annals became an important component of larger historical narratives of Frankish history.68 In this process, later historians used the text as the established main narrative of the Carolingian rise to power and the extension of Frankish supremacy over half of Europe — a successful, collective undertaking of the Franks and their Carolingian rulers. However, this long history of the text — its prevalence as the central narrative of the Carolingian rise to power — has tended to hide a break between this long history and a shorter history that ended in 829. Whereas in the long history of the text, compilers built on the consensus that had been established in and through the narrative, the authors and compilers in its short history (up to 829) were primarily concerned with establishing consent about the text as the valid narrative of the Carolingian rise to power.

I hope that the short summary of more recent research on the annals helps readers to get an impression of a more differentiated and critical view than the long-held views of older research and how the efforts of scholars involved in establishing it tried to put the Royal Frankish Annals and other products of Carolingian historiography into perspective. This approach can, however, be easily misunderstood as giving too much weight to the text as ‘official propaganda’, which to be sure was written by only a few people and circulated among very small circles of court insiders. Such a rather restricted notion of Carolingian communication often goes hand in hand with the above-mentioned scepticism about the value of historiographical texts either in regard to how representative

66 See Becher, Eid und Herrschaft; McKitterick, Charlemagne, pp. 118–27; and now Ubl, Sinnstiftungen, pp. 160–63.
they are about wider notions of politics and society as well as the wider social or political impact of these texts.  

In the context of Carolingian historiography, however, such objections about the ‘actual’ Sitz im Leben of the annals also tend to reinforce the restricted history of historiography as it had been defined by Pertz and his successors in the nineteenth century. In its focus on a relatively narrow selection of texts it completely overlooked or ignored that the writing of histories that promoted the Carolingian ascent to power comprised not just the sending of messages from the ruling family to its inner court-circle. Their composition and dissemination have to be studied against a much wider spectrum of possibilities and took place in much more complex patterns of communication than just the conversations of a few insiders. As Janet Nelson observed, the authors of these texts did not promote their Carolingian rulers in some kind of an early medieval stimulus — response scheme. In writing texts like the Royal Frankish Annals the authors also ‘relayed back their story’ to Charlemagne as well as to other members of the Carolingian elite. Additionally, with their efforts to provide a central perspective, a text like the Royal Frankish Annals or Einhard’s Life of Charlemagne had to create a narrative that took into account the different expectations and hopes which were also circulating in alternative and probably sometimes competing perspectives and media. As Janet Nelson rightly remarks in her new biography of Charlemagne: ‘High status families might transmit their stories through the written word. More likely was transmission through oral tradition and social memory rooted in places and spaces’.

It is, however, not too helpful to play one medium off against the other. As Nino Luraghi observed in his contribution in the first volume on Ancient Greek historiography, a common sense of the past was shaped by a variety of media, orchestrations, rituals, or practices of cultural and collective memory. This was certainly true for Carolingian historiography as well. And as in Ancient Greece, the writing of history was also used as a tool to reflect on the variety of other forms of cultural memory in the Carolingian world. The writing of history made it possible to put other places, forms, and orchestrations of collective memory into perspective, and to suggest alternative ways of relat-

69 Cf. above, pp. 6–7.
71 Nelson, King and Emperor, p. 35.
72 Luraghi, ‘Memory and Community’, p. 107: ‘Greek historiography tended to read collective memory against the grain’.
ing oneself to the past.\textsuperscript{73} The relatively rich evidence of Carolingian histories and manuscripts thus provides us with a remarkable opportunity to appreciate how even texts like the \textit{Royal Frankish Annals} were shaped by conversations with many more histories, historical approaches, and debates in much wider and more complex circuits of communication than we often tend to assume. As different as the products of ancient history were from the ones written in the Carolingian period, the Carolingians still continued to use the writing of history as a forum that ‘made it possible to integrate this multiplicity of historical media into a web of historical claims to identity’.\textsuperscript{74}

These wider and more complex backgrounds for the more ostentatious products of Carolingian historiography are the focus of this volume. The intense work on older histories, their excerpts, and new versions, the many manuscripts that document the study of the past are still rather seen as background voices that were rather removed from the main social and political communication. The collection of essays of this volume, however, intends to focus on precisely these voices. It is no coincidence that many of the texts examined in the different contributions have been particularly poorly served by modern editions. They were often seen as mere derivatives or even distortions of original texts. Hence they were either not published at all or published only in highly abbreviated (and thus distorted) form. In focusing on precisely these texts we try to move beyond the simple and dangerous nationalistic association of history and identity, as well as the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century views of what constitutes Carolingian historiography.

As the contributions also show these texts do by no means represent some isolated or random interventions of anonymous copyists and scribes. They are often written in the main cultural centres of the Carolingian world and sometimes even by well-known Carolingian scholars and historians themselves. One outstanding example is Walahfrid Strabo. Until his premature death in the Loire in 849, Walahfrid was an avid historian and student of historical texts. He edited Einhard’s \textit{Life of Charlemagne}, and also Thegan’s \textit{Life of Louis the Pious}. We even have a manuscript with a version of the \textit{Royal Frankish Annals} (until 817) that he probably compiled as well.\textsuperscript{75} As Richard Corradini’s contribution

\textsuperscript{73} Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’, p. 14, with references to Luraghi and Hans-Joachim Gehrke (n. 26).


illustrates, however, this was only a fraction of his historical studies. As other works and above all his famous handbook shows, the study of history concerned Walahfrid throughout his whole life and was predominantly connected to epistemological questions. One of Walahfrid’s core questions was how to study and interpret history in order to reflect on the role of ‘bad news’. In so doing he took up a paradox that had already concerned Augustine four hundred years before Walahfrid: ‘the significance and justification of evil, violence and death within human history in the face of God’s ubiquitous existence as an essential part of predestination’. It is hardly surprising that Walahfrid studied his sources carefully and provided his readers with his very own selection and interpretation of the texts he was using, not least the Histories of Augustine’s pupil Orosius. However, as Corradini observes, Walahfrid’s approach counters Orosius’s progressivism that inextricably binds God to human history and its permanent process. In the arrangement of Walahfrid’s Vademecum one needs to read Orosius as part of a theoretical architecture that makes it possible to study in the history of this world its dependency on divine salvation.

As Robert Evans and Rosamond McKitterick highlight in their careful study of another Carolingian epitome of Orosius’s Histories, Walahfrid was only one of many Carolingian scholars and historians who studied the text. Here, however, the compiler did not share Walahfrid’s anxiety regarding an all-too-naive progressivism that readers could take away from Orosius. Rather, he seems to have tried to reinforce Orosius’s main message by removing the original framing of the Histories as Roman history as well as its polemics against the pagans. Both elements might well have irritated readers who lived in a different Roman Empire where a polemic against the pagans belonged to a past that was just the past. The contribution with its detailed analysis of additions as well as omissions of the epitome provides us with a model to study the many other manuscripts and versions of Orosius from the Carolingian period. Such studies might well reveal a surprisingly wide spectrum of possibilities regarding the Carolingian interpretations of Orosius’s history.

As Graeme Ward shows, Orosius was also an important source for Frechulf of Lisieux, who dedicated part of his Histories to the Empress Judith for the education of her son, the young Carolingian prince Charles the Bald. Consequently, his approach was both pedagogical and epistemological. Frechulf provided his

---

76 See the contribution of Richard Corradini, ‘Approaches to History’, in this volume.


readers with a history in which the Roman Empire, as a framework for western Christendom, faded away. Many of Frechulf’s main sources, which were written in the Christian Roman Empire, such as Eusebius, Jerome, or Orosius, could hardly imagine ‘a situation in which it would be impossible to separate what belonged to Caesar from what belonged to Christ.’79 Frechulf compiled them into a history for a time at which experiments to blur the boundaries between the religious and the profane were carried out with great ambition and confidence. Even though the aims of Frechulf’s history were pedagogical, its standards were quite high. As Graeme Ward’s contribution illustrates well, the text demanded a library for its composition as well as its consumption.80

How well-equipped Carolingian libraries must have been is illustrated by Matthias Tischler’s contribution.81 As Tischler observes, the creation of a new political culture built on all available layers of history. One of these layers that sparked the interest of Carolingian scholars and politicians was clearly the history of Theoderic the Great. The intensified study of Theoderic’s reign as the first post-Roman ruler of Italy is well documented in Carolingian histories. It is no coincidence that nearly all of the other Carolingian texts that are discussed in other contributions of this present volume are also mentioned in Tischler’s essay. What we observe, however, is not just a steady growth of knowledge. The historical learning curves developed more dynamically. Contradictions in the evidence or sources led to new questions which again demanded new research and more thorough critique. Carolingian scholars worked with a variety of sources. In order to explore the political culture and time of Theoderic, Carolingian scribes and scholars carefully studied Boethius, which might also have been connected to some reflections on the involvement of the historians and scholars themselves in the politics of their time.82

The tension between intellectuals and politics is certainly an important theme of the Epitaphium Arsenii, the funeral oration for the former abbot of Corbie, Wala, written by his former right-hand man and later successor as abbot PaschADIUS Radbertus.83 As we learn from Mayke de Jong’s contribution to this volume, in the Epitaphium history was less important as an object of study than

---

80 See the contribution of Graeme Ward, ‘Sense of an Ending’, in this volume.
81 See the contribution of Matthias Tischler, ‘Remembering the Ostrogoths’, in this volume.
82 Tischler, ‘Remembering the Ostrogoths’, pp. 87, 99.
83 See now De Jong, Epitaph for an Era; and the recent English translation by De Jong and Lake, Confronting Crisis in the Carolingian Empire.
as a rhetorical strategy to speak truth to power in the guise of biblical figures and historical characters of the Roman Empire. That does of course not mean that Paschasius did not concern himself with history. On the contrary, not only did he playfully employ historical parallels and allusions. He also expected his readers to understand them. In her contribution to this volume, De Jong also shows that the text reflected larger trends of a specifically Carolingian history of historiography and identity. While Paschasius emphatically highlights the Frankish or ethnic identity of his protagonists in the 820s, he instead ignored this aspect of their identity when he was writing his second book in the 850s. This is precisely the time between the two histories of the *Royal Frankish Annals* — from the short to the long history of the text — during which we might also detect a break or turning point in the affirmative use of Frankish identity in Carolingian historiography. It is not very likely that Paschasius was one of the authors of the *Royal Frankish Annals*. This makes De Jong’s observations on traces of wider historiographical trends in his work even more important, as it illustrates the vivid interaction, interdependence, and exchange between different intellectuals, authors, texts, and genres in the Carolingian world.

The constant adjustment and adaptation of historiographical works can also be observed earlier and even before the composition of the oldest redaction of the *Royal Frankish Annals* around 788. As Sören Kaschke shows in his overview of the extant manuscripts of the *Chronicon universale*, the copying of the chronicle followed similar principles to those of the Carolingian versions of Gregory of Tours’ *Histories*. Bede’s *Chronica maiora* — his larger chronicle — provided a shared baseline, but the actual selection of chapters as well as the addition of passages from other authors and texts such as Orosius, Isidore whose *Chronicle* Bede used as well, the *Chronicle* of Fredegar, or the *Liber historiarum Francorum* varies from manuscript to manuscript.

The framing of the texts on Frankish history looks very much like a response to the Carolingian reworking of the chronicle of Fredegar. As briefly mentioned, the Carolingian edition of the *Chronicle* into a *Historia vel gesta Francorum* reshaped and continued the Merovingian world chronicle of Fredegar with the narrative of the *Liber historiarum Francorum*. In so doing they connected the Mediterranean horizons of the chronicle to the language and style of a more ‘Northern cultural zone’ which informed the composition of

84 See the contribution of Mayke de Jong, ‘From the Order of the Franks to the World of Ambrose’; in this volume.
86 See the contribution of Sören Kaschke, ‘Enhancing Bede’; in this volume.
the Liber. The Chronicon universale did the same with the perspective of the ‘Northern’ Liber historiae Francorum. Its authors provided their readers with a world history that included large passages from the Liber historiae Francorum into a chronicle whose horizons were strongly defined by the Mediterranean culture and connections of the Frankish world.

It also seems that the oldest redaction of this Chronicon universale was compiled soon after the Historia vel gesta Francorum ended in 768. The extant manuscripts, however, originated from various places all over the Frankish kingdoms, such as Auxerre, Fleury, Flavigny, Eastern Francia, and St Amand. They seem to document an interest in the further development of the text after the renovation of the Roman Empire when Carolingian politics of identity developed a more inclusive approach to offer wider Spielräume of integration to the different groups and peoples in the newly re-established empire. Not surprisingly the text also provided excellent historiographical resources for a Mediterranean perspective to link itself to the Carolingian imperial world. Rutger Kramer explores another history of this chronicle-tradition in his contribution on the Chronicon Moissiacense. The authors of the Chronicle of Moissac continued a version of the Chronicon universale. They obviously regarded this version of the past as an apt historical foundation for their efforts to establish their place, or the place of their community, in a Carolingian Empire that was less defined by the centrality of the Carolingian court than by the centrality of Christian universality and convergence. In doing so the compilers might well have developed an alternative to the court-centred narrative of the Royal Frankish Annals, whose compilation ended (shortly) after 829. Decentering the Carolingian Empire, it seems, allowed a community in the very south of France to present its place as equally central to communities and people who were closer to the political centres such as Aachen and Ingelheim in the north.

Ado of Vienne was another southerner who used Bede’s outline in a similar way to the various compilers of the Chronicon universale (and the Chronicon Moissiacense). His world chronicle narrated events up to the end of the 860s. As a student of one of the greatest scholars, philologists, and editors of his time, Lupus of Ferrières, he had been taught well to make use of Carolingian libraries. As Anya Sharma shows, even though Ado was above all interested in providing history as a background for the apostolic see of Vienne, the range of sources Ado used is indeed worthy of a world chronicle. However, the main strategies of orientation in the later Carolingian world had changed. The Carolingian

87 Cf. above, p. 15.
88 See the contribution of Rutger Kramer, ‘A Crowning Achievement’, in this volume.
Empire did not provide the larger social, political, or religious whole in which Ado wanted to define the place of Vienne. It was more important for Ado to trace the long past of Christian Gaul and to link Vienne to a network of apostolic histories in order to emphasize its importance in his own times. The history of the Carolingian Empire or the Frankish kingdom might well indicate a changing historiographic mood in the second half of the ninth century. This changing mood is also well documented in Eric Goldberg’s contribution. As Goldberg demonstrates in his essay the writing of history came to be used more and more to test whether the contemporary Carolingians could live up to their predecessors and the ideals of earlier times. As the increasing number of hunting accidents and other misfortunes of Carolingian rulers or members of the family in the various narrative sources indicate, by the end of the ninth century the writing of history came to be used more and more to delegitimize Carolingian rulers.

The last contribution of the volume by Walter Pohl leads us to the historiographical workshops of the Lombard duchy in southern Italy where the writing of history developed differently from how it was practised in other regions of the Carolingian world. Unlike the regions north of the Alps, ninth-century Italy was not a hotbed for the writing of history in general. The relatively sparse output ‘unfolded in the long shadow of Paul the Deacon’s History of the Lombards’ written in the late 780s or early 790s. In contrast to the more affirmative rhetoric of contemporary Carolingian historiography on the Frankish past, Paul’s history provided a much more balanced account of the Lombard past. As Pohl observes, its open end as well as ‘its wide horizons made it eminently usable for a number of different purposes’. Paul’s history was indeed widely read and used far beyond the territories that were once ruled by the Lombards. Paul’s complementary alternative to Carolingian-style historiography has come down to us in over a hundred medieval manuscripts. The history was also very important in southern Italian historiography, where Paul served as a model in many ways, was frequently referred to and quoted. But his model was also further developed in texts that began where Paul left off, which were usually much shorter and often not very well structured. They rather provided further complementary histories in fragments as Walter Pohl has called this approach.

89 Cf. the contribution of Walter Pohl, ‘Historiography of Disillusion’, in this volume.
80 See the contribution of Eric Goldberg, ‘A Man of Notable Good Looks’, in this volume.
82 Pohl, ‘History in Fragments’; Pohl, Werkstätte.
toriola of Erchempért finished by 888 is a quite radical example of such a history. Already in his prologue, Erchempért explicitly states that his is not only a history of the successful establishment and achievements of the Lombards in southern Italy after 774, but also a history of their failures and even their undoing. ‘What starts out as a history of the Lombards soon turns into a history of fragmentation, in which identities disintegrate and become ambivalent.’

In regard to the relation of the writing of history and the construction of identities Erchempért’s historiola is also an important example reminding us that positive affirmation is not the only form of identification in historical texts. The text is therefore a particularly interesting case study for how a history or its historian balances a whole range of possible identifications.93 This in turn allows us to develop a more differentiated approach to the study of identities. Instead of the simplifying question of whether a history represents a certain identity or not, we can try to explore how it constructs different forms of social identities and identifications, their relation to each other, and their respective salience. Pohl’s contribution to this volume tests this approach in regard to the construction of Lombard identity and the role of ethnicity in a history that sounds out divergent visions of community against historical events. In so doing Pohl manages to evade a simple and simplifying either/or scheme and replaces it with a more productive set of questions. What exactly were the social and cognitive uses of ethnicity and ethnic identities in comparison with other forms of social identities? How did ethnic categorization blend with religious, territorial, or military forms of identification? To what extent did they legitimize political power, and motivate political action?94 As the contribution shows Erchempért’s historiola presents us with a fascinating alternative example to the prevailing models of ninth-century Carolingian historiography. However, contemporary readers might well have been aware of this. At the time when the Carolingian emperor Louis II stayed in southern Italy in 867 the monks at Montecassino compiled a dossier of historical texts— the Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis — whose conception and style comes much closer to the expectations of a Carolingian ruler or reader of the ninth century.95

Both the Chronica Sancti Benedicti and Erchempért’s alternative history in fragments can also show that these expectations were shaped by much wider geographical and cultural horizons than we often assume. This is particularly

93 See the introduction to the series by Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’.
important for the study of identities whose formation and transformation has to be studied in circuits of communication between insiders and outsiders.96

* * *

As all the different contributions of this volume illustrate, in order to explore these circuits of communication in the histories of the Carolingian period we need to transcend more narrow notions of Carolingian historiography. Even at the time when the Carolingian family established a remarkable control of the writing of history, its production has to be understood as the result of, or the response to, wider debates and studies of the past and present in the historiographical workshops of the eighth and ninth centuries.97 The care and caution with which Carolingian scribes, scholars, and historians worked is well documented in the rich and manifold transmission of old and new histories. The different essays in this volume also show the wide range of historical texts that were read, copied, rewritten, and re-arranged in the Carolingian period. This is equally true before and after 829 and we are only just beginning to arrive at a more comprehensive overview of the range of texts, their codicological contexts, and their places in Carolingian libraries. This is even more important for the period after 829, when the Carolingian court lost control over the shaping of a shared historical narrative. In a more comprehensive image of different uses of the past and different pasts that were used in the Carolingian and post-Carolingian world we might be able to arrive at a more complex picture of the spectrum of possibilities that Carolingian culture and historiographical culture passed on to later generations for the construction of identities.

What the filter and transmitter of Carolingian historical culture passed on was less a stable canon of histories, but rather an intensification of the writing of history for political legitimation. To be sure, not one of the dynasties and states that succeeded after the Carolingian centuries were ever able to control the writing of history to a similar extent as the early Carolingians did. With the establishment of the grand narrative of Carolingian success and triumph under Pippin and Charlemagne in the long history of the Royal Frankish Annals, however, the text became a model formulation of political consensus for later generations. With that function it also passed on the instrumentalization of the writing of history to forge, promote, or even represent political consensus. This becomes particularly obvious when in the later Carolingian period histo-

97 Cf. also Gruber, ‘The Construction of Allegiance and Exclusion’.
ries were increasingly used to illustrate the failure of Carolingian rulers to meet the standards of their glorious predecessors.⁹⁸

In order to end on a more positive note we return a last time to the transmission of Gregory’s Histories. In the period after the Carolingians had been replaced by Capetian kings we hear of an example that shows how the kings themselves were working together with their scholars to investigate history. After it had rained blood in southern France in 1027 (a natural phenomenon, that was produced when European rain mingled with Saharan sand that had been transported from the desert by southern winds) the Aquitanian duke at the time, William the Great, immediately informed King Robert II of the event and urged him to consult the scholars of his realm regarding the possible meaning of this sign. The king thereupon dispatched couriers to the intellectuals of his kingdom requesting them to search for similar occurrences in the histories so as to provide him with the interpretation of this phenomenon by returning messenger.⁹⁹ One of the scholars who responded to King Robert’s request, and whose response has been preserved, was Fulbert of Chartres. Fulbert’s reply consisted of a number of extracts from different works, but he recommended especially warmly a passage from Gregory’s Historiae. Fulbert even provided the king with the full reference for this passage, namely book vi, chapter 14 of the Historiae. He moreover promised to send the king more information later, but explained that because of the urgency of the request he had first looked to Gregory for an answer ‘propter auctoritatem religionis suae’. It is very likely that Gregory would have been quite pleased with Fulbert’s use of his work. It was certainly this kind of authority that Gregory had aimed to lay a claim to with his text and Fulbert seems to have used an exemplar that was fairly close to Gregory’s original. What Gregory would probably have found less appealing was the role of the king in the interpretation of his Histories which Gregory, the pastor had written to challenge the social stratification of the earthly world. However, after the intensified instrumentalization of history in the Carolingian period, the Spielräume for the uses of the past had changed. This was not only true for the writing of history but also its interpretation which — at least in certain circumstances — belonged obviously to the responsibilities of the king.


However, we should be careful in interpreting this episode as evidence for the triumph of the Carolingian appropriation of history alone. As the examples of a historiography of disillusion in the later Carolingian period indicate the increasing politicization of history had also its risks for rulers and their legitimation. A comparable confidence and control of history to the early Carolingian efforts only emerges under the powerful Capetian successors of Robert II in the period of the *reditus regni ad stirpem Karoli Magni.* But even then, this was just one approach among many others—old and new. And as most of the contributions of this volume also show, the success and impact of Carolingian approaches to history and identity were the result of the engagement of their authors with a much wider, more diverse, and tentative work on history and memory than the more affirmative texts of Carolingian historiography seem to present. Hence, what applies to Carolingian historiography also applies to its later reception and transmission. We need to put it into perspective. This, however, will be the task of the next volume, on *Historiography and Identity towards the End of the First Millennium: A Comparative Perspective.*
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Carolingian Uses of History
Having just (in 2018) completed a book with Paschasius Radbertus's *Epitaphium Arsenii* at its heart, I realize that in all the years I worked on this text I never gave any thought to ethnic identity — unsurprisingly, for the *Epitaphium* does not contain a single reference to the most obvious ethnic identification in a funeral oration for one of Charlemagne's cousins: Franks or Frankishness. My growing familiarity with Radbert's funeral oration or epitaph for Wala, abbot of Corbie, rendered this absence all the more invisible, until recently, when it finally dawned on me how different Radbert's *Vita Adalhardi* is in this respect. This tribute to Wala's half-brother and predecessor, Abbot Adalhard of Corbie, was written shortly after the latter's death.
Having just (in 2018) completed a book with Paschasius Radbertus’s *Epitaphium Arsenii* at its heart,¹ I realize that in all the years I worked on this text I never gave any thought to ethnic identity — unsurprisingly, for the *Epitaphium* does not contain a single reference to the most obvious ethnic identification in a funeral oration for one of Charlemagne’s cousins: Franks or Frankishness.² My growing familiarity with Radbert’s funeral oration or epitaph for Wala, abbot of Corbie, rendered this absence all the more invisible, until recently, when it finally dawned on me how different Radbert’s *Vita Adalhardi* is in this respect. This tribute to Wala’s half-brother and predecessor, Abbot Adalhard of Corbie, was written shortly after the latter’s death


² On repertories of identification, see Pohl, ‘Introduction: Strategies of Identification’, pp. 32–38; see also Pohl, ‘Creating Cultural Resources’.

---

Mayke de Jong is Professor Emeritus of Medieval History, Utrecht University.
in January 826.3 Despite its title, which is original, this earlier work was also conceived of as an ‘epitaph’ or funeral oration. Like the Epitaphium Arsenii it was inspired by late antique examples, especially those provided by Ambrose of Milan, yet in the Life of Adalhard, the protagonist’s Frankishness is a prominent feature and a matter of pride. This is not just emphasized in the context of Adalhard’s illustrious origins, albeit with the assurance that he was actually a citizen of Jerusalem.4 The great man also represents a right kind of social and religious order that was characterized as essentially Frankish. When Adalhard had returned from exile in 821, having been sent off upon Louis’s accession in 814 to the island of Noirmoutier, it seemed as if ‘a new order of the Franks was reborn, and the sun of justice rose from the east’.5

Roughly ten years later, not long after Wala’s death in August 836, Radbert embarked on the first book of his Epitaphium Arsenii, a funeral oration for Arsenius, as Wala was called by his monks. This first part concentrates on the great man’s many virtues, displayed first as a youth at Charlemagne’s court, then as a monastic leader in Corbie, and finally as a dispenser of justice in Italy in the mid-820s. The second book was added about two decades later, in the mid-850s, and deals with the rebellions against Louis the Pious and Wala’s subsequent exile, with a marked focus on the first rebellion of 830. It introduces a new repertoire of identification derived from what I have loosely labelled ‘the world of Ambrose’: an imagined community defined by the historiography of the late antique Christian empire. The following is an attempt to make some sense of this disappearance of Frankishness, and to suggest a possible context for this change of perspective.

3 The best text is still the one in Migne, Patrologia latina, cxx, cols 1507–82; this is based on Dom Jean Mabillon’s edition in Acta sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti, iv.1 (1677), 308–44. The oldest manuscript is from Corbie: BnF, MS lat. 18296 with the Vita Adalhardi (fols 36–67) as a distinct codicological unit from the third quarter of the ninth century; see Ganz, Corbie, p. 145; Bischoff, Katalog, iii, no. 5047, p. 231; for a fuller discussion of the text, see Berschin, Biographie, iii, 309–18; Von Moos, Consolatio, i, 137–46; Ganz, Corbie, pp. 103–12. Von der Nahmer, ‘Die Bibel im Adalhardsleben’; Verri, ‘L’arte di ritratto’; De Jong, Epitaph for an Era, pp. 76–86.

4 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 56, col. 1537A–B.

5 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 52, col. 1535B: ‘videtur demum novus renasci Francorum ordo, et aurora justitiae quasi ab ortu surgere’.
**Before and After 829?**

My point of departure is Helmut Reimitz’s recent study of the development of Frankish identity in historiographical sources. Reimitz takes a wide-ranging view, from the mid-sixth to the mid-ninth centuries. The last chapter, entitled ‘before and after 829’ discusses the breakdown of a historiographical consensus that was exemplified by the *Royal Frankish Annals*. Whereas its earlier sections are characterized by a triumphalist affirmation of Frankishness, this was gradually toned down, to make room for a more inclusive politics of identity with a shared Christianity at its heart. The retreat of Frankish exclusivity becomes visible already in the late 780s, when religious reform and *correctio* came to define Charlemagne’s rulership, and even more so in the revised version of the *Annals* for the years 741–801, which may well have originated during the reign of Louis the Pious. In the court annals produced since Louis succeeded in 814 the *populus christianus* had become the primary focus of integration. Court historians developed a broad consensus characterized by what Reimitz calls ‘a restrained use of the name of the Franks as one important group in a Christian *regnum* whose imperial structure was also emphasised in quotations from the Roman classics’.

As Reimitz explains, this consensus was fragile. After the entry for 829 the *Royal Frankish Annals* break off abruptly; this last bit of the text starts with the ominous damage to the roof of the palace chapel in Aachen, due to an earthquake and storm shortly before Easter, and ends with Louis’s return from the autumnal hunt in Frankfurt to Aachen where he celebrated the feasts of St Martin and St Andrew as well as Christmas. The section of the court annals from 814 to 829 was widely disseminated and became an authoritative building block for later historical compendia and narratives, such as the Astronomer’s *Life of Louis*. Beyond 829, however, the earlier consensus gave way to more fragmented and contested views of recent history. There are plenty of continuations, such as the *Annals of St Bertin*, but already in their narrative of the rebellions of the 830s these texts diverge widely, and so do other accounts of the

---

6 Reimitz, *History*, see also Reimitz, ‘Nomen Francorum obscuratum’.
8 *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. by Kurze, s.a. 829, pp. 176–78.
9 Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. by Tremp, relies on the *Annales regni Francorum* from 23, p. 352 (= *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. by Kurze, s.a. 814, p. 140) up to 44 (= *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 829, pp. 177–78); on this text, see most recently Ganz, ‘The Astronomer’s Life’.
further reign of Louis and beyond, be they histories or biographies. In none of these does Frankishness play a key role. Reimitz suggests that this signals a crisis of Frankish identity, and reminds us of Agobard of Lyon’s fiery treatises, in which the archbishop maintained that scandal at the palace had brought shame on the Franks and obscured their name. Agobard’s particular brand of polemics was exceptional, but, in Reimitz’s view, ‘his negative view of Frankish identity actually reflects the general trend in the Carolingian Empire’. Only towards the end of the ninth century and thereafter pride in being Frankish made a come-back, particularly in West Francia and the French kingdom. These later authors tapped into the affirmative view of Frankish identity of the older, non-revised version of the Royal Frankish Annals, while compilers in the East Frankish Empire tended to turn to the revised annals and their restrained use of Frankishness.

This is just a brief summary of Reimitz’s views on ‘before and after 829’. He and I already discussed this issue in 2005–06 when we were working closely together. At the time I was none too keen on the idea that the sudden break of the Annals after 829 had wider implications, even with regard to the self-perception of a palace-connected elite. I was writing The Penitential State and intended to show that the moralization of political discourse had only developed gradually, first during Charlemagne’s reign and then under his son Louis; the older grand narrative of the weak and monkish son of a mighty and essentially secular father had to go, and so had the tendency to see the rebellions of the early 830s as the beginning of the end of the Carolingian Empire. In 814 a new emperor assumed a royal religious authority that was already well established, and which survived the two rebellions against Louis. If anything, the ‘sacred palace’ gained sharper contours after having been contested so fiercely during these two short-lived revolts. In other words, I was writing about continuity and trying to put the so-called crisis into this perspective, while Reimitz had a clear sense that the sudden ending of the Royal Frankish Annals after 829 was caused by the kind of upheaval that was anything but random or ephemeral.

By now I think Helmut Reimitz did have a point, even though to some extent, ‘before and after 829’ means comparing apples and oranges. The rebellions against
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10 Reimitz, History, p. 435.
11 Reimitz, History, pp. 442–43.
12 At the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in Wassenaar, in the thematic group on Carolingian identities of 2005–06 (consisting of Rosamond McKitterick, David Ganz, Els Rose, Helmut Reimitz, and myself).
13 De Jong, ‘Sacrum palatium’.
Louis in the early 830s and the struggle for succession after his death in 840 generated so much articulated reflection, by way of historiography, biography, and other genres, that the more modest corpus produced before 829 may look unified simply by default. All the same, as Rutger Kramer has pointed out recently, the first decade of Louis’s reign was characterized by great expectations concerning the possibilities of emendatio and correctio of an empire that largely overlapped with notions of the ecclesia. With hindsight, the optimism and energy with which the emperor took his religious responsibilities in hand is easily obscured.\(^{14}\) Of course such positivity did not disappear overnight in 829. A particularly strident statement about Frankish imperial rule was produced in this very year by Hrabanus Maurus, abbot of Fulda, in the context of his struggle with the Saxon monk Gottschalk who denied the validity of Frankish witnesses at his oblation to Fulda. Hrabanus countered that it was the Franks who had conquered and converted the Saxons, so theirs was the superior testimony. Just as once all the peoples (gentes) had enjoyed the dignity of Roman citizenship, they were now submitted to the Franks, who were the heirs to this lofty Roman imperial rule.\(^{15}\) Similarly, in the early 820s Agobard spoke out in favour of imposing a lex Francorum on the entire empire.\(^{16}\) Both Hrabanus and Agobard embedded these views in a Pauline vision of community in which the ecclesia transcended the divide between all the gentes, yet they also sang the praises of an emphatically Frankish empire; moreover, they did so in treatises destined for Louis and his court, trying to convince an audience they expected to be receptive to their reasoning.

Restoring the Order of the Franks: The Vita Adalhardi

Strategies of persuasion directed at Louis’s court are relevant for a better understanding of the Vita Adalhardi. In this epitaph for his beloved elder mentor, Radbert painted a portrait of the saintly Adalhard in which he hailed ‘Tullius, the king of rhetoric’ (Cicero),\(^{17}\) and sought to impress his readers by making it clear that he followed rhetorical rules of charakterismos. One of the aims of

\(^{14}\) Kramer, Rethinking Authority, p. 225.

\(^{15}\) Hrabanus Maurus, De oblatione puerorum, ed. by Migne, col. 432A–C; De Jong, ‘State of the Church’, pp. 25–26; Patzold, ‘Hraban’.

\(^{16}\) Reimitz, History, p. 434; Agobard, Adversus legem Gundobadi, ed. by Van Acker, 3, pp. 20–21; ed. by Dümmler, 3, p. 159.

\(^{17}\) Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 20, col. 1518C; ‘Scribit namque Tullius, rex eloquentiae Latinae, in libro secundo de inventione rhetoricae artis’; see also Paschasius Radbertus, Expositio in Mattheum, ed. by Paulus, prologue, 1, 6, l. 158.
all this literary brilliance was to pave the way for his patron Wala as Adalhard's successor, not just to the abbacy of Corbie, but also of Corvey, Corbie’s ‘daughter’ in Saxony. Hence, Wala is depicted as a Joshua who is waiting in the wings, ready to defend Corbie against the onslaughts of the Amalekites (Exodus 17.8–16). This suggests that Radbert was writing at a time when Wala’s leadership of Corbie was not yet a foregone conclusion. Clearly some monks were highly critical of Wala’s prominent position at Louis’s court, and the emperor himself seems to have taken some persuading as well: with some pride, Radbert made it clear in his Epitaph for Arsenius that he himself had been delegated by his community to plead the case for Wala’s succession at the palace.

First of all the Vita Adalhardi is a lament for the great man’s death, and a celebration of his many virtues, yet it is also a timely work with an immediate purpose. Although Adalhard is the chief recipient of Radbert’s fulsome praise, this is also extended to his siblings Wala, Gundrada, Bernarius, and Theodrada. All suffered some form of exile or displacement when Louis ascended to the throne, with the exception of Theodrada, abbess of Notre Dame in Soissons, the convent where the orphan Radbert was brought up. In his Life Adalhard is introduced as the scion of a royal family, the nephew of King Pippin and the first cousin of Charles Augustus, ‘raised at the palace in prudence with youths from the entire world, entrusted to masters together with the ruler of the earth’. This imperial imagery is evoked at the start of a well-known story which portrays Adalhard as a paragon of Frankish virtue. Although only a ‘novice of the palace’ the young courtier did not countenance Charlemagne’s repudiation of the daughter of Desiderius, king of the Lombards. The king had married only recently, supported by ‘the oaths of some of the Franks’, but had married a new queen with whom Adalhard could not in any way be associated. His main objection, however, was that this unlawful marriage would mean that ‘some of the Franks’ (nonnulli Francorum) would perjure themselves. He

18 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 86, cols 1551D–52A. The standard biography of Wala is still Weinrich, Wala, which relies heavily on the Epitaphium Arsenii; on Adalhard, the first port of call remains Kasten, Adalhard.

19 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, ii.5, p. 65.

20 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, t.11, p. 39.

21 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 32–34, cols 1526B–27D.

22 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 35–36, col. 1528A–D.

23 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 7, col. 1511B: ‘Qui cum esset regali prosapia, Pippini magni regis nepos, Caroli consobrinus Augusti, inter palatii tirocinia omni mundi prudentia eruditus, una cum terrarum princeps magistris adhibitus’.
resisted strenuously, for the laws of Christ should prevail over those of kinship, which only induced giving in to the flesh. Keeping one’s oath was at the heart of the *leges Christi*, for which Adalhard stood firm, like a latter-day John the Baptist had, so he entered Corbie as a monk.

The narrative of Adalhard’s entry into monastic life follows the hagiographical *topos* of the young saint who valiantly leaves the world, despite resistance on the part of parents or rulers. Yet here and elsewhere in the text, Adalhard is presented as the guardian of Frankishness, of the kind defined by the concept of Christian faithfulness (*fides*) and cemented by oaths. He persistently combated perjury and always kept his promises. ‘Recently’, so presumably not long before his death in January 826, Adalhard had admonished the Emperor Lothar on the importance of *fides* among men and the inviolability of a Christian oath sworn truthfully; a violation would imply contempt, not of man, but of God ‘as a witness and my truth’. To his relentless pursuit of justice, Francia could testify, and all the lands submitted to his authority, Italy in particular, for he became the young King Pippin’s chief counsellor and support. This elicited a story about Adalhard’s first meeting with Pope Leo III, which is obviously anecdotal, but all the more important for Radbert’s underlining of typically Frankish virtues in the *Vita Adalhardi*:

When strong with virtue, [yet] meek and mild, he arrived in the territory of the Romans, where at the time the Lord Leo was the apostolic pontiff, he was received with the kind of familiar friendship that none of the Franks before him had yet received. Hence, some of ours related that he [Leo] spoke to the other in a joking mood. ‘Frank’, he said, ‘you should know that if I find you different from whom I believe you to be, no other Frank need to come here to whom I need to lend any credence’. From this it transpires clearly how much authority this man had, whose absence/trustworthiness would prove the whole people of the Franks was not to be believed, but whose steadfastness [of faith would prove] they were to be [believed].


26 Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita Adalhardi*, ed. by Migne, 16, col. 1517A. Kasten, *Adalhard*, pp. 42–47 thinks this episode should be situated in the period between 781 and 790 but concludes that the information is only ‘schattenhaft’.

27 Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita Adalhardi*, ed. by Migne, 17, col. 1517D: ‘Atque ita virtute validus mitis et mansuetus Romanorum pervenit ad fines, ubi a domno Leone tunc temporis apostolico, tanto familiaritatis officio est suscepsit, ut neminem consititerit Francorum antea
The Adalhard of Radbert’s *Life* was above all an intrepid teller of truth to power in the best tradition of the Old Testament prophets. 28 This anecdote contributes to this image, yet it also conveys Adalhard’s easy familiarity with Rome and its pontiff, and even more so the message that the reputation of the Franks as a trustworthy people (*genus*) depended on men of his calibre. This mild yet forceful monk of illustrious birth was the embodiment of Frankish *fides* in the distant and foreign world that was Italy, at least for Radbert who had never ventured there. And this is by no means the only emphatic affirmation of Adalhard’s Frankishness. There is an intriguing remark about the five siblings, who all sprang from the seed of this one man (Bernard, son of Charles Martel). The emperor (Charlemagne) had availed himself of the familiar counsel of three of them, so together, this ‘stable square’ had ruled the empire of the Franks and furthered the well-being of the commonwealth. 29 Judging by the *Vita Adalhardi*, no assumptions can be made about Charlemagne’s three counsellors being the males of the family. After all, it was Gundrada, not Bernarius, who was portrayed as a courtier.

Louis’s accession to the throne in 814 put a temporary end to this stability, yet with Adalhard’s return from exile in 821 and thanks to his tireless labour, an ‘order of the Franks’ was reborn and justice was restored. Now that the speaker of truth was back, it was clear how all had been kept in a state of lethargy. Radbert’s depiction of Louis’s conciliatory penance in Attigny in 822 is scathing, and easily equals his polemical pronouncements about the emperor in the second book of the *Epitaphium Arsenii*:

> The glorious emperor himself undertook a public penance because of his many sins. He who as it were by royal haughtiness had been his own worst tempter was made the humblest of all, so those whose eyes he had offended by sin would be healed

suscepisse. Unde nostrorum quidam narrant sibi jocosì dixisse animo: “France, inquit, sciendo scias, quia si te aliud invenero quam te credo, non ultra necesse est Francorum aliquem hunc venire cui credere debeam.” Quo profecto patet quantum pondus habuerit idem vir, cujus evacuatio fidei Francorum genus omne probaverit non credendum, cujusve firmitatis fuerit. 30 I thank Justin Lake for his help with the puzzling final part-sentence: the only way to make sense of it is to read *firmitatis as firmitas*, equivalent to the noun *evacuatio*, yet the ninth-century manuscript (BnF, MS lat. 18296, fol. 42v) has *firmitatis*. I assume that the copyist was influenced by the preceding relative pronoun ‘cuius’.

---


by a royal satisfaction. Doubtless all were particularly intent on his willingness and clearly observed his unwillingness. 30

Only Adalhard’s presence and his clarity of vision could cure Louis’s court from its blindness. This in turn enabled the revival of the ordo Francorum that had prevailed under the august emperor, Charles. Repeatedly Radbert suggests that Adalhard and his siblings, rather than the ruling emperor, were the living representation of this order. In Vita Adalhardi they are senior members of this royal prosapia, with a superior claim to Frankish excellence. It is worth rereading the story about the repudiation of Desiderius’s daughter in this light. Adalhard’s moral indignation was not just a matter of the perjury of some Franks, but also made it impossible for him to serve Charles’s next queen. This queen, who allegedly lacked legitimacy given her husband’s prior union, was Hildegard, the mother of Louis the Pious. In 826 when Radbert wrote his Vita Adalhardi, these dark intimations concerning Hildegard may have mattered more than the actual fate of Desiderius’s daughter half a century earlier. Even more recent was the memory of the injustice inflicted by Hildegard’s son on Adalhard and his illustrious siblings.

Having completed his narrative of exile and return, Radbert asserts that Adalhard, a member of a most eminent family of Franks, nonetheless belonged to the heavenly Jerusalem. ‘Although he was born from the most noble family of the noble Franks, as I said before, he was eventually adopted as a son by God, through the fatherland of Christ.’ 31 Apart from reassuring his readers that Adalhard was part of the monastery rather than the court, this once more stresses the great man’s eminent progeny, as well as his quintessential Frankishness. There was nothing restrained about this. In the Vita Adalhardi Radbert consistently refers to the Franks, plural. As a collective, Franci still counted for something in


31 Paschasius Radbertus, Vita Adalhardi, ed. by Migne, 56, col. 1537A–B: ‘Nationale autem, quod cunctis liqueat, Francorum erat ex summorum genere; sed renatus in Christo, ubi et spir-itu versabatur, totus natione coelestis omnis renitebat. Unde et illi patria, quamvis hic carne natus esset, coelestis illa Hierusalem juxta Apostolum fuisse non dubitatur, per eum qui nos jam spe consedere fecit in coelestibus. Genere quidem nobilium nobilissimus Francorum, ut paulo ante praemisi, prosapia ortus, sed demum per Christi patriam Deo in filium est adoptatus.’
Radbert’s mind, and presumably also for those he sought to persuade of the excellence of Adalhard as an abbot, and Wala as his successor.

**Saxon Identities: The Epitaphium’s First Book**

Wala died in August 836 in Italy. Together with others he had followed Louis’s son Lothar south in 834, once the second rebellion against the emperor had failed, and together with them Wala succumbed two years later to an Italian epidemic. Lothar, who would survive until 855, had made his loyal and by then elderly counsellor abbot of Bobbio, a monastery founded in 614 by Columbanus, another exile from Francia.32 Except for some possible adaptation at the very beginning and end, the *Epitaphium*’s first book was written in the years directly after Wala’s death.33 In this dialogue between the narrator Pascasius (a transparent alias for the author) and two fellow monks, the participants in this conversation about Arsenius create a world in which they had to hold their tongues, now that Wala’s enemies had prevailed. The time would come when the truth about their beloved abbot and his motives could be spoken openly, but for the time being, silence and discretion were in order. Hence, explicit references to Wala’s leading role in the revolts of 830 and 833 and his subsequent exile are largely avoided. Instead, Radbert concentrates on an earlier phase of Wala’s life, roughly from the time when he was a youth at Charlemagne’s court to the years 822–25 when he was Lothar’s mentor and deputy in the kingdom of Italy. The discussants’ conversation revolves around their grief at the loss of their beloved abbot, yet it also conveys a sense of desertion, and yields the impression that some monks of Corbie were angry about Wala’s departure and, moreover, about his leadership of another monastic community.

Another likely grievance against the controversial abbot was the loss of Corbie’s ‘daughter’ Corvey, founded by Adalhard and Wala in Saxony in 822. A substantial section of the first book contains the narrative of this joint foundation, and ignores the fact that this enterprise succeeded with considerable support from Louis the Pious. Wala had succeeded his brother as abbot of Corvey and Corvey; Radbert celebrated the unbreakable bond between the two communities in an elegiac poem he added to his *Vita Adalhardi*.34 Yet

---

32 For the comparison between Columbanus and Wala, both driven south by the vengeance of a woman (Brunhild and Judith respectively), see Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed. by Dümmler, i.21, p. 92.

33 De Jong, *Epitaph for an Era*, pp. 7–11.

in June 833 the unity of this monastic bastion was broken, as a direct consequence of Wala’s involvement in the rebellions against the emperor. Corvey got an abbot of its own, the loyal Frankish aristocrat Warin, one of Radbert’s former pupils and the first dedicatee of his well-known treatise on the Eucharist. Furthermore, the separation also meant that Corbie lost the control of formerly joint property in Saxony. All this hurt deeply, and the traces thereof are visible in the *Epitaphium*’s first book. This was not aimed exclusively at the monks of Corvey, but Radbert mentions the younger monks of Corvey explicitly as part of his intended audience. These Saxon brethren needed a wake-up call: they had exchanged an excellent abbot for their present man in charge, the puffed-up Warin. The fraught relations with Corvey since the separation of 833 explains why the story of its foundation and Wala’s prominent part in this has such a central place in the *Epitaphium*’s first book. Given Wala’s leadership of the first rebellion, many held him responsible for the break-up: the entire community of Corbie suffered from its abbot having incurred the emperor’s wrath.

All of Radbert’s *Epitaphium* is a valiant attempt to restore Wala’s tarnished reputation in the eyes of his own monks as well as an exclusive audience of powerful outsiders. The first book, however, also targets a more specific audience, that is, the monks of Corvey who had not known their excellent abbot and now should learn all about him. This is surely the main reason why so much is made of Wala’s connections with Saxony. He was a member of the Saxon nation, so Saxony was his fatherland (*patria*). He would have preferred to wear Saxon native attire all the time, but his brother, Abbot Adalhard, forbade it. So at an assembly near Corvey Wala was dressed as a monk, but the unruly Saxons present recognized him as the charismatic magnate he really was, and were easily controlled. Outside the *Epitaphium*, however, there is nothing particularly Saxon about Wala. He may figure in a list of Saxon hostages of 805/06, yet if so,

---


37 Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed. by Dümmler, t.12, p. 40; also t.13, p. 42.


it is in his capacity as one of their Frankish guardians. In the *Royal Frankish Annals* of 811 ‘count Wala son of Bernard’ heads another list, namely of twelve men of the first rank (*primores*) from the *gens Francorum* who negotiated with Hemming and his Danes.

It is no coincidence that Wala’s Saxon identity is stressed in connection with Radbert’s audience in Corvey. He broaches the topic by having the youngest member of the confabulation in the *Epitaphium* quiz the narrator, Pascasius:

> I would like you to talk about the manner of his life under our Antony [Adalhard], for the particular benefit of our brothers living in Saxony, whose nation he belonged to, so that they might know more fully what sort of men they had as the founders of their faith.

Historians, including myself, have assumed that Adalhard had a Frankish mother and Wala a Saxon one, combining two separate statements in the *Vita Adalhardi* and the *Epitaphium Arsenii*, neither of which mentions the mother of either half-brother: all that is said is that Adalhard was born from a lineage the most eminent Franks, while Wala was from a *genus* that hailed from Saxonia.

In both texts, however, ethnicity is a situational construct. Ethnic identity is invoked in an appropriate context, and then dropped again. Whereas in 826 Adalhard’s illustrious Frankishness was an asset, some ten years later it was Wala’s Saxon identity that counted, because of Radbert’s audience in Corvey. This does not explain the absence of any Frankish identification, however. For this the narrative of the *Epitaphium*’s first book offers ample opportunity, for example at the beginning where Wala is depicted as a youth at Charlemagne’s court, or in the later section on his exploits in Italy as Lothar’s deputy in the mid-820s. Here he is the intrepid dispenser of justice in a devious world full of hardened criminals, such as the perfidious men who had robbed a defenceless widow of her possessions. Wala pursues these culprits in Italy according to the highest principles of Carolingian justice, but unlike the Saxon context just discussed, this Italian setting renders ethnic identification irrelevant. What matters is that the great man fought corruption relentlessly, and unerringly discovered the truth, despite all efforts to hide it.

---


43 Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed. by Dümmler, i.12, p. 40: ‘Novimus haec omnia, sed quomodo conversatus sit sub Antonio nostro velim edicas, maxime pro fratribus nostris Saxonia degentibus, quorum fuit ex genere, ut sciant ad plenum quales habuerint fidei suae fundatores’.

44 Paschasius Radbertus, *Vita Adalhardi*, ed. by Migne, 56, col. 1537A.
The World of Ambrose: The Epitaphium’s Second Book

The young Wala in Charlemagne’s palace is depicted as a novice in the monastery, tested by ‘Augustus’ like gold in a furnace, and surmounting the trials and challenges of this alien and dangerous world. Radbert claims that the young man quickly rose to a position similar to Joseph, which not only highlights his position as second only to Caesar, but also implicitly puts the Carolingian palace on a par with that of Pharaoh. The boundaries between cloister and court are blurred, and Wala’s abrupt change of status in 814 is obfuscated. From the most powerful lay magnate in Charlemagne’s entourage, the first signatory of the old emperor’s will, upon Louis’s accession he became a member of his brother’s community of Corbie, while Adalhard was despatched to a monastery on Noirmoutier, an island in the Atlantic Ocean off the mouth of the Loire. Most likely Wala entered Corbie not as a professed monk but as a monastic exile with a clerical status, yet all this is invisible in Radbert’s narrative in the first book, which has one overarching purpose, namely to convince his audience of Arsenius’s perfection as a monk and an abbot. I have suggested that this was also a matter of the author pleading his own cause, for Radbert had been Wala’s deputy and may have been an abbot-in-waiting who still had ambitions in this respect once his beloved master had died. However, he only made it to the abbacy of Corbie in the winter of 843–44, and managed to hold on to this high office for seven years; sometime between the spring of 849 and April 853 he had to relinquish the abbacy because of multiple conflicts and pressures, both from Charles the Bald’s court and adversarial monks in own community.

Only after Radbert’s deposition the second book was added. Its chronology is more straightforward than that of its predecessor: it opens with Wala in a central role at the crisis meeting in Aachen, called by Louis and Lothar in the winter of 828/29, and ends with his death in Bobbio in August 836. In between, there is the narrative of the two rebellions against Louis, with the first

45 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, i.6, p. 29; Regula Benedicti, ed. and trans. by Venarde, i.6, p. 16. On Wala (or rather Radbert) as a Benedictine abbot, see Mayr-Harting, ‘Two Abbots in Politics’. On Charlemagne’s court: Nelson, ‘Was Charlemagne’s Court a Courtly Society?’

46 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, i.6, p. 29: ‘constituitur ab augusto eehonomus totius domus, et venerabatur passim secundus a cesare, quasi putares alium Joseph sceptr regni movere’. On the Pharaoh in monastic narratives, see Kramer, “…quia cor regis”.


revolt of 830 and Walā’s subsequent exile receiving most attention and space. The
two key messages conveyed by the second book are, first, that despite appearances
to the contrary, Walā was not disloyal to his emperor, and second, that had Louis
and his co-emperor Lothar listened to his advice, the empire would not be in
such a dismal state as it was ‘nowadays’ (bodie). It is a retrospective prophecy written
from the perspective of the mid-850s, if not later, and much more outspoken and polemical than the first book. Radbert’s focus now shifted from Corbie
and Corvey to the palace and the empire at large. There is much discussion of
the needs of the re pública that is entirely absent in the first book.50 Conversely,
ethnic identification is absent, even though there is an intriguing passage about
Walā’s connection through his earlier marriage with his chief adversary, Bernard
of Septimania. Yet it is about family bonds and the anguish of seeing them bro-
ken through political strife; Frankish or Saxon identity does not come into it.51
The Epitaphium was a work planned to comprise two books, following its
main model, Ambrose’s funeral oration for his brother Satyrus.52 Although this
provides the overall framework for Radbert’s text, citations and paraphrases
of Ambrose’s epitaph mainly figure at the beginning of the first and the end of
the second book. At the heart of the work, covering the majority of the second
book, is Walā in his guise as Jeremiah, speaking truth to power.53 This power is
located in Louis’s palace, and then undermined and disordered by the em-
or’s godson Bernard of Septimania, who was appointed chamberlain in August
829. He was a military hero who had earned his reputation in Barcelona in 827,
and was meant to be a new broom who could be Louis’s loyal bastion because
he was the emperor’s godson. Soon, he incurred the enmity of all those he had
elbowed out, and became Louis’s main hazard.54 As is well known and does
not need to be rehearsed here, the courtiers who had been elbowed out by his
sudden arrival retaliated by accusing Bernard of adultery and even incest with
Louis’s wife Judith.55 The sacred palace (sacrum palatium) had been turned into

50 De Jong, ‘The Two Republics’; De Jong, ‘For God, King and Country’.
51 Paschasioius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, ii.8, p. 69; De Jong, Epitaph
for an Era, pp. 154–55. My initial interpretation was that the sister who married Walā was
William of Gellone’s and not his son Bernard’s, but I have come to see this differently; see
Confronting Crisis, p. 22 n. 61.
52 For a provisional list of citations and paraphrases, see Von Moos, Consolatio, ii, 100–01.
54 De Jong, Penitential State, pp. 41–43; Depreux, ‘Der karolingische Hof’; De Jong,
55 De Jong, Penitential State, pp. 185–213; Dohmen, Ursache, pp. 109–76.
a brothel by the empress and her lover, which became the public legitimisation of what historians have called the ‘loyal palace rebellion’, an entirely appropriate label if one swallows Radbert’s arguments in the Epitaphium’s second book hook, line, and sinker. The Carolingian palace was a competitive place, and lack of loyalty was the main and mutual accusation of those struggling for position and precedence.

In his second book Radbert attacked those who had turned a once peaceful palace upside down, with constant reference to the Christian imperial court of Theodosius the Great (r. 379–95) and Valentinian I (r. 364–75). His point of departure was Wala’s nickname, Arsenius. According to late antique and early medieval monastic tradition, Arsenius had been a courtier to Theodosius and the tutor of the emperor’s two sons Arcadius and Honorius. Wala was called Arsenius throughout the entire Epitaphium, but outside this text, this was also his nickname, just as his brother Adalhard had been called Antony, and Radbert was called Paschasius. Whether these were names for daily use we do not know, but they figured in letters and literary production. ‘Arsenius’, however, was at the centre of an eclectic web of aliases which, as far as I can see now, was entirely intra-textual. There is no evidence that Lothar was ever called Honorius in any other communication, and the same holds true for Justina (Judith), Justinian (Louis the Pious), or Gratian (Louis the German). The strongest connection in the web is the one between Lothar/Honorius and his older mentor Wala/Arsenius. The historical Honorius (r. 393–423) was Theodosius’s younger son, who was made co-emperor in 393. The Honorius of the Epitaphium voices Arsenius’s ideals of good governance, confronting his father with the values he had learned at the latter’s court, but which had been sadly ignored:

This I have always heard in your sacred assembly, and in the senate of most illustrious men; this I have always observed in your deeds; this I have learned from you; this we read about in the accounts of the deeds of the ancients: that valiant and pre-eminent, and well-deserving men should be honoured and covered in glory, rather than driven away.57

Having witnessed the goings on in his step-mother’s sinful palace, Gratian/Louis the German has lurid tales to tell on the eve of the first rebellion of 830. It was Bernard’s plan to murder Louis and overthrow the entire imperial rule,

57 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, ii.17, p. 87: ‘Hoc semper audivi in vestro sacro concilio, et in clarissimorum senatu virorum, hoc semper in vestris recognovi factis, hoc a vobis audivi, hoc legimus in gestis antiquorum, fortes viros et clarissimos, ac bene meritos honorari magis debere, et gloria illustrari quam depelli’.
and all this had been planned and plotted with the aid of divination, augury, and all of the dark arts. The alias 'Gratian' is dependent on Radbert’s more central choice of Judith’s byname. Justina was the second wife of Emperor Valentinian I (364–75), who in 385/86 unleashed an infamous campaign against Bishop Ambrose of Milan. Her bad reputation in Christian historiography originates with a letter from Ambrose himself, which cites Elijah and John the Baptist as the victims of wilful women who dominated their husbands and tempted them to do evil. Naming Judith ‘Justina’ meant revealing the empress as the instigator of her husband’s misguided choices; it also moved Ambrose more to the foreground, even though the bishop of Milan was never named in the Epitaphium’s second book as the victim of Justina’s persecution, nor as Theodosius’s trenchant critic who made the emperor perform a public penance in 392. Yet his presence makes itself felt throughout the text, and even more so because Louis is not deigned worthy of the honorific alias of Theodosius. Instead, as ‘Justinian’ Radbert turns the hapless son of Charlemagne into a non-Theodosius, possibly in reaction to authors such as his contemporary, Louis’s biographer known as the Astronomer. Writing shortly after Louis’s death in 840, this courtier-biographer had made the most of Theodosius’s penance in the context of Louis’s public atonement in Attigny in 822. According to the Astronomer, elaborating on the Royal Frankish Annals, this atonement had also served to make amends for what Louis had done to Adalhard and Wala, but Radbert would have none of it. For him, Louis was Justinian, with both positive and negative connotations I have explored elsewhere, but with the prevailing and quite literal implication that this emperor belonged to Justina and did her bidding.

58 Paschasius Radbertus, Epitaphium Arsenii, ed. by Dümmler, ii.9, p. 72: ‘Ad ultimum vero de nece patris et de totius imperii exigit subversione, qualiter auspiciis, auguriis, consiliis, atque insidiis, necnon et omnibus malignis artibus esset prefixum’.


61 On Theodosius as a model for ninth-century rulership, see Ward, ‘Lessons in Leadership’ with references to older literature.


63 De Jong, Epitaph for an Era, pp. 139–44.
Radbert’s aliases were associative and eclectic, and by no means confined to this loosely connected world of Ambrose. Naso (Ovid) for Bernard of Septimania came from classical literature. It meant to evoke associations with Ovid’s adultery and exile, and possibly also with the daringly immoral nature of his poetry. Then there was a biblical alias, Phassur, for Archbishop Ebo of Reims, who had jailed Jeremiah, like Ebo had exiled Wala. Finally, there is the still elusive alias Melanius for Pippin of Aquitaine, Louis’s middle son, which may or not come from the classical repertoire. Be this as it may, Phassur and Melanius are merely supporting roles.\(^{64}\) In the text itself the prominent figures are Arsenius and Honorius, allied in their battle against Justinia and her associates; at the background, there is Ambrose speaking truth to power, as Wala did, and Louis who is deemed too weak to be anything like Theodosius.

In recent discussions about the possible \textit{auctor intellectualis} of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, it has been suggested that Radbert’s love of nicknames, bynames, aliases, and pseudonyms show him to have the mind-set of a dissembler required to pull off such a major forgery.\(^{65}\) This is not what the use of such names in the \textit{Epitaphium} is all about. In his treatise \textit{Cogitis me}, written for the nuns of Notre-Dame of Soissons who had educated him as a child, Radbert wrote this meditation on the Assumption of the Virgin as ‘Jerome’, calling it a ‘letter from the Blessed Jerome to Paula and Eustochium’, addressing the nuns of Soissons with the names of Jerome’s patroness and correspondent Paula and her daughter. Assuming an alias of this kind did imply posturing as Jerome but honouring one of the greatest authors of an authoritative Christian past, who had become a household name in the Carolingian elite.\(^{66}\) Biblical commentary that made the works of the \textit{patres} accessible was what kings and queens commissioned from the likes of Hrabanus Maurus and Radbert.\(^{67}\) As for the naming and shaming in the \textit{Epitaphium}’s second book, this assumed a common ground of knowledge of the imperial Christian past in which heroes such as Ambrose had flourished, and provided examples for posterity. In the mid-850s, when Radbert wrote his second book, this landscape of authority was still fluid. Some biblical books such as Judith and Maccabees only became canonical in the course of the ninth century, because of Hrabanus’s wide-ranging and systematic exegesis. Hincmar’s many writings of the 850s and 860s not only addressed acute political problems but

\(^{64}\) De Jong, \textit{Epitaph for an Era}, pp. 144–45.
\(^{65}\) Zechiel-Eckes, \textit{Fälschung}. For the distinction between nicknames and aliases or pseudonyms, see De Jong, \textit{Epitaph for an Era}, pp. 132–36.
\(^{66}\) Ripberger, \textit{Pseudo-Hieronymus-Brief}.
\(^{67}\) De Jong, ‘Empire as ecclesia’.
also selected and propagated a corpus of biblical and patristic texts for future reference, adding to a growing certainty of what was canonical and what was not. But this was still contested at the time, which was why ‘Pseudo-Isidore’ could join the contestation and enter mainstream debates about canonicity.

One of Radbert’s key sources for the world of Ambrose was the Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, a translation and editorial selection from three fifth-century Greek histories by Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, made by Epiphanius and commissioned by Cassiodorus. As Zechiel-Eckes discovered, the Corbie copy of the Historia tripartita of Cassiodorus/Epiphanius was systematically excerpted by whoever put together an early version of the False Decretals. In passing, Zechiel-Eckes observed that Radbert’s naming strategy was an imaginative projection of the concerns and tensions of the present into Christian Late Antiquity. This ‘antikisierende Rückprojektion’ reminded him of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, which also used late antique Christian historiography in order to integrate past canonical texts, forged and real, into the ninth-century present. Even though it contributes less than Zechiel-Eckes thought towards identifying Radbert as Pseudo-Isidore himself, it is a perceptive remark which should be kept in mind in further research. By now, when three out of four early manuscripts of the so-called False Decretals seem to originate from Corbie, it would be counterintuitive to deny the connection with Radbert, who was, after all, the abbot of this monastery between 843 and 849/53. Yet all the evidence points to the early 850s as the period in which this mixture of authentic and forged canonical texts was launched. It is difficult to imagine that this happened without the knowledge of Corbie’s abbot.

68 For an excellent recent analysis of Hincmar’s methods, see Stone and West, trans. and ann., Divorce of King Lothar, cited under Primary Sources as Divorce of King Lothar.

69 St Petersburg, NLR, MS Lat. F v I 11; Jacob and Hanslik, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung, pp. 10–11. On the Historia tripartita in Corbie, see Ganz, Corbie, p. 143; Zechiel-Eckes, ‘Ein Blick in Pseudo-Isidors Werkstatt’; on the ninth-century history of the work, see McKitterick, History and Memory, pp. 233–34; Scholten, ‘Cassiodorus’ Historia tripartita’.

70 The two key articles are Zechiel-Eckes, ‘Ein Blick in Pseudo-Isidors Werkstatt’ and ‘Auf Pseudoisidors Spur’; the most complete recent discussion of ongoing research is offered by Ubl and Ziemann, eds, Fälschung als Mittel der Politik?


72 See De Jong, Epitaph for an Era, pp. 199–205 for an overview of the status questionis.

73 Most recently on this issue: Knibbs, ‘Pseudo-Isidore’s Ennodius’; see also Knibbs, ‘Ebo of Reims’, and Ubl and Ziemann, eds, Fälschung als Mittel der Politik?
The False Decretals, a massive and sprawling collection ascribed to ‘Pseudo-Isidore’ is another witness to the presence of the ‘world of Ambrose’ in the minds of articulate authors in mid-ninth-century West Francia. The memory of the bishop of Milan who intrepidly made Theodosius perform a public penance was of paramount importance to all those eager to give churchmen some clout in their competition with formidable royal religious authority.74 The death of Louis the Pious in 840 and the ensuing struggle for succession had concentrated minds, so to speak, and yielded some exceptionally articulate reflections on the recent past, including the second book of the *Epitaphium Arsenii*. As Reimitz said, the tension between Frankish and Christian empire was never entirely resolved,75 yet it is clear that in the 850s, when he added his polemical sequel to his epitaph for Wala, Frankish pride was no longer part of Radbert’s strategies of persuasion. The mirror he held up to his contemporaries was inspired by late antique historiography and exegesis. It was a vision of community that was very different from that of the *Vita Adalhardi*, written when he was still a young and ambitious member of his community with good prospects, and also different from the first book of the *Epitaphium* which pictures Wala as a perfect abbot with a Saxon identity nobody could fault. But then there is the second book, in a world turned upside down by the rebellions and the so-called fraternal wars of 840–43. It is then that Radbert turned to the world of Ambrose that was omnipresent in late antique Christian historiography. This was indeed an attempt to anchor a shaky present in an authoritative past. Yet it was not just any past: choices were made, with reference to what might appeal to contemporary audiences. By the mid-850s, strident statements on Frankish superiority were no longer required. By now it was the loss of a joint and unified imperial rule that was deplored, and remembered all the more in terms of a political community imagined through the prism of late antique imperial Christianity.76


75 Reimitz, *History*, p. 454.

76 Not to be confused with the territorial unity of the Carolingian Empire; see Patzold, ‘Eine “loyale Palastrebellion”’; Patzold, “Einheit” versus “Fraktionierung”.”
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The Carolingian rulers and their elites responded to the challenge by working with all the available layers of history and synthesizing them to form a new political culture. This was not only a political achievement but also involved cultural efforts of studying and recovering these layers of Italian history and not least the Italian culture of the time of Theoderic the Great. Solving these problems meant creating a new political culture, following on from the early concepts of the first Germanic realms built on Roman ground. 3

For our reconstruction of the Carolingian reception and perception of Ostrogothic political culture, we evaluate processes involved in the transfer and transformation of this heritage and its key figures such as Theoderic, Cassiodorus, and Boethius from several viewpoints. For this purpose, we analyse the Carolingian historical and paraenetic writing against the backdrop of a new empire built on a diverse post-Roman political and cultural heritage, such as the Ostrogothic one. In doing so, we ask what cultural brokerage between Ostrogothic and Frankish narratives actually meant in the new conceptual framework of Carolingian (political) culture. 4

3 Hen, Roman Barbarians, who, however, stops his analysis short of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.

4 The original version of this paper also offered a chapter on the Carolingian copies of Ostrogothic texts of the sixth century. For this purpose, I had checked Bernhard Bischoff’s four-volume catalogue of all ninth-century continental manuscripts known to him: Bischoff, Katalog, 1–11. This codicological panorama was supplemented by information on further copies documented in Carolingian library catalogues and on traces of the reception of this Ostrogothic
**Spoliation or Reintegration?**

At first glance, Ostrogothic elements in Carolingian political culture seem to reveal a picture of scattered late antique Mediterranean elements integrated into a Frankish framework.⁵ The most prominent showcase of a redefinition of Byzantine-Ravennatic models is certainly the Aachen Palace chapel. Spoliation of mosaics, marble pieces, columns, and capitals from Theoderic’s palace in Ravenna and their reintegration in the new complex at Aachen are documented from the later 780s onwards.⁶ One well-known example of this symbolic and performative act of reintegration of the signs of sovereignty over Italy is the transfer of the equestrian statue of Theoderic from Ravenna to Aachen exactly after Charlemagne’s imperial coronation (801).⁷ The Carolingian ruler associated himself with his predecessor as ruler of Italy not only through the statue itself but also through the history of its transfer, as it had originally been imported by Theoderic from Constantinople to Ravenna. Comparable to this multilayered practice of ‘translatio imperii’ seems to be a politically still underestimated act of ‘translatio studii’, i.e. the transfer of Wulfila’s Gothic Bible preserved in the famous copy of Theoderic’s time to the Aachen palace library.⁸ We cannot identify any immediate relationship between this famous Bible and the Carolingian project of revising Jerome’s Latin Bible version, a parallel work conducted by Theodulf of Orléans and Alcuin; nevertheless, the transfer of this outstanding specimen of Ostrogothic religious book culture from Ravenna, a distinguished centre of the production of de luxe manuscripts, especially of purple codices,⁹ to the very recently established Aachen court scriptorium, is more than a purely cultural issue. The reception of antique and late antique Italian book culture, its literature, scripts, and designs in Carolingian book culture in Carolingian works. For reasons of limited space, I omitted this chapter here but intend to publish its results at the next opportunity. On Ostrogothic culture now: Lozovsky, ‘Intellectual Culture’.

⁵ The two cultural techniques of spoliation and reintegration are more specific than the concept of ‘reuse’ once suggested by Hammer, ‘Recycling Rome’, pp. 309–19 (on Theoderic).


⁷ See the latest summary by Bredekamp, ‘Theoderich’.


production was a highly political affair, since it dealt with the representation of power as well.

Yet, previous scholarship was struck by the fact that explicit discussion of Theoderic only began to arise in Carolingian texts which belong to the winter of 828/29 and the following years: first in Walahfrid Strabo’s *De imagine Tetricti* with local traditions of the Aachen court, and second in Agnellus of Ravenna’s *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis* with local traditions from Ravenna (and some connections with the so-called Anonymus Valesianus II) which correspond with the information from ‘Francia’.10 In springtime 829, the Reichenau monk Walahfrid Strabo discussed in his poem *De imagine Tetricti* Theoderic the Great’s moral and political value, as represented in the aforementioned equestrian statue.11 To some historians, this poem’s courtly debate on Theoderic seems to be only a marginal note in the quarrel about the right place of using models of secular rulership in the typological thinking of Charlemagne’s and Louis’s descendants.12 This brief sparkling debate on Theoderic’s place in


12 Godman, ‘Louis “the Pious”’, p. 276, had been very negative concerning Carolingian reception of Theoderic’s importance in the early ninth century: ‘Nor is there any sign of interest either in the statue of Theoderich or in the king whom it depicted during the first three decades of the ninth century other than the testimonies of Agnellus and Walahfrid’, not taking into account Carolingian copies of earlier historiographical writing on Theoderic and their selected re-use in proper historiographical writing, see below. For the importance of the Carolingian reception of Boethius’s *De consolatione Philosophiae* as a bio-political document on Theoderic as a (anti-)model of rulership see below.
Carolingian history is, however, only the tip of an iceberg. It actually represents a much deeper stream of exploring late antique and post-Roman ‘barbarian’ rulers as models for the new Carolingian politics in the Mediterranean area, already from the key years of Italy’s history 774, 781, and 800 onwards.

We still have no succinct overview of the Carolingian reception and perception of what I would call Ostrogothic political, but also philosophical and religious culture. Especially the role of Cassiodorus, Boethius’s successor at the top of the Ostrogothic administration and of the Mediterranean Graeco-Latin culture, has not yet been systematically evaluated within Carolingian culture. It is not the place to do that here. In regard to the reception of the political models and intellectual resources I would like to focus instead on the figure of Theoderic itself. I will start with an overview of the sources on Theoderic available to and used by Carolingian authors and politicians. As we will see, the Carolingians inherited a variety of images and imaginations of the Italian ruler. In order to use these sometimes even contradictory portrayals in meaningful ways, Carolingian authors needed to do more than just copy and combine the available information. The contradictory and multilayered nature of the transmitted Ostrogothic evidence demanded further study of the Italian culture of Theoderic’s time by Carolingian intellectuals, which I will try to exemplify with the help of the reception of Boethius’s works in the final section of this article.

Facets of Theoderic’s Images in Historiographical and Biographical Writing

‘Theoderic’s image’ in Carolingian times has recently been comprehensively studied by Andreas Goltz, which provides an excellent baseline for the more specific ‘political’ uses of this image in the Carolingian historiography of the


14 Goltz, Barbar, pp. 600–07, who briefly deals with ‘images’ of Theoderic, but does not focus on their socio-political function in the historiographical culture for establishing Carolingian rule in Italy and beyond. Still valuable for a first orientation: Thorbecke, Ueber gesta Theodori; Zimmermann, ‘Theoderich der Große’. Especially on Ostrogothic historiography: Heather, ‘The Historical Culture’.
eighth and ninth centuries. In building upon this study, I will try to highlight the still understudied processes of (dis)integration of practical information about Theoderic’s Ostrogothic realm in Carolingian historiographical culture and its different forms of representation. Although we have two short studies by Fiorella Simoni on the memory of Theoderic and the Goths in Carolingian historiography, we lack detailed research on the exact political contexts and purposes of this specific flow of historiographical and biographical information and research into how this material was transformed when it was received by and exchanged between different persons and regions in the Carolingian world. We therefore assess first the non-Frankish, then the Frankish historiographical and biographical sketches of Theoderic’s image since the sixth century and their use and non-use in Carolingian historiography.


16 In contrast to this, Borgolte, ‘Langobardenreich’ deals with the social migration into the space of the later realm of the Langobards.

17 The Carolingian epoch seems to not have produced any new biographical sketch of the Ostrogothic king. Maurer, ‘Einhards nicht geschriebenes Epos’, pp. 50–53 thus speculates without any evidence that Charlemagne prompted Einhard to write an Epos of Theoderic which was then never written. Following Berschin, Biographie und Epochenstil, iii, 210 with n. 297, it is only in the high Middle Ages that several places tried to develop new independent biographies of Theoderic on the basis of the already known late antique and early medieval sources. We know at least three attempts to write a Life of the Ostrogothic king: 1) in Fulda under Abbot Rugger (1176/77): Vita Theoderici Fuldensis, ed. by Krusch. The autograph manuscript is Leiden, UB, MS Vulcan. 46, transmitting Theoderic’s Life as preface to a copy of Cassiodorus’s Variæ. The sources are Pseudo-Fredegar. ii.57–59, Paul the Deacon, Historia Romana, xv–xvi, Liber pontificalis (Vitae Symmachii, Hormisdiae et Iohannis I), and Gregory the Great, Dialogi, iv.31. The manuscript stems from the female monastery on the Frauenberg in Fulda, where Rugger was provost of the community (colophons on fol. 3r: du Bouveret, Colophons de manuscrits, iii, p. 121, no. 8388). But we should keep in mind that the Variæ-copy derives from the lost Carolingian Lorsch model (as n. 22): Stoppacci, ‘Cassiodorus Senator’, p. 95, and we therefore cannot exclude that we read here an older biographical sketch. 2) More or less at the same time another Life was written in a French monastery perhaps of the Loire Valley: Vita Theoderici ex Aimoino hausta, ed. by Krusch. The only exploited source is Aimoin of Fleuray, Historia Francorum, i.9–11 and ll.1. Three manuscripts are known: BAV, MS Reg. lat. 692, written for Saint-Maixent, twelfth c. (second half); Brussels, KBR, MS 4877–4886, Sainte-Marie de Villars, early thirteenth c.; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 264 (olim London, Ashburnham Library, appendix 101), France, fourteenth c. 3). A third biographical compilation not yet localized was drawn from Pseudo-Fredegar’s passages on Theoderic (ii.57–62) and attached to the Liber historiae Francorum: Vita Theoderici e Fredegario hausta, ed. by Krusch. For the manuscripts of this text from the twelfth century onwards: Krusch, ‘Die “Chronicae”’, pp. 319–20 and 516; Krusch, Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii, pp. 12–13; Collins, Fredegar-Chroniken, p. 130.
We may suppose that the texts written by authors in the immediate political and cultural context of Theoderic's court were not only the most reliable but also the most prolific sources for the future image of the Ostrogothic king. Yet, this does not hold true in every case, especially as Cassiodorus, Theoderic’s most important ‘minister’, found very few Carolingian readers for his comprehensive, but very personal and important notes on Theoderic’s reign in Italy, which he had inserted in his Chronica.\textsuperscript{18} The Nachleben of Cassiodorus’s Variæ (epistolae), a collection of twelve books of 468 official writings (letters, edicts, and formulars; redacted around 538),\textsuperscript{19} also seems to have been minimal in Carolingian times, despite its detailed image of Theoderic as a skilful and educated king who longs to restore crumbling Roman structures and to conserve and foster approved cultural traditions,\textsuperscript{20} and whose way of life is explicitly characterized as a model for the members of his court and for the Ostrogothic


\textsuperscript{19} Barnish, ‘Sacred Texts’; Kakridi, \textit{Cassiodors 'Variæ'}; Bjornlie, \textit{Politics and Tradition}.

\textsuperscript{20} E.g. Cassiodorus, \textit{Variæ}, ed. by Fridh, i.6, pp. 17–18 (restoration policy in Ravenna), i.10, pp. 20–22 (Theoderic and Boethius talking about arithmetic), i.12, pp. 22–23 (education policy), i.21, pp. 29–30 (restoration policy in Rome), i.25, p. 33 (ditto), i.31, pp. 37–38 (Roman culture in Rome), i.45, pp. 49–51 (Theoderic and Boethius talking about mechanics); ii.15, pp. 66–67 (education policy), ii.38, pp. 83–84 (restoration policy in Siponto), ii.39, pp. 84–87 (restoration of the thermes in Abano, near Padua), ii.40, pp. 87–91 (Theoderic and Boethius talking about music), iii.29–31, pp. 117–20 (restoration policy in Rome and other cities), iii.44, p. 127 (restoration of the city walls and towers in Arles), iii.49, p. 132 (restoration of the city walls and towers in Catania), iii.52, pp. 136–37 (geometry), iii.53, pp. 137–39 (water supply in Rome), iv.6, p. 147 (studies in Rome), iv.30, pp. 161–62 (restoration policy in Rome), iv.51, pp. 177–79 (restoration of Pompeius’s theatre in Rome), vi.6, pp. 265–67 (water supply in Rome), vii.7, pp. 267–68 (security in the city of Rome), vii.8, pp. 268–69 (security in the city of Ravenna), vi.9, pp. 269–70 (harbour of the city of Rome), vii.15, pp. 274–76 (town master mason of Rome), viii.29, p. 335 (sanitary measures in Parma), viii.30, pp. 335–36 (ditto) and ix.24, pp. 376–78 (Theoderic as king philosopher).
people as whole. In contrast to former doubts, this detailed image of Theoderic offered by Cassiodorus was available in at least one important centre of Carolingian learning with a close relationship to the Aachen court: the famous Carolingian monastery of Lorsch. The remaining question is whether this letter collection was perceived and used as a political, social, and cultural memorial of the Ostrogothic realm in the Carolingian epoch.

Much the same can be said about the world chronicle of Jordanes, the *Historia Romana*, which forms a conceptual unit with the main source on Theoderic, the *Historia Gothorum* or *Getica*, first written by Cassiodorus in Ravenna at Theoderic’s behest and later revised by Jordanes in Constantinople. Jordanes’s

---

21 Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. by Fridth, iv.3, pp. 144, l. 6–145, l. 1: ‘Moribus enim debet esse conspicuus, qui datur imitandus.’


24 Heerklotz, *Variae* (political system, judiciary, ethics, religion, sciences, arts, economy, commerce, traffic, and society); Punzi, *L’Italia* (administration, military, judiciary, financial politics, and economy); Zimmermann, *The Late Latin Vocabulary* (terminology of politics and administration); Lecce, ‘La vita economica’ (economy); Vismara, ‘Rinvio’ (legal culture); Meyer-Flügel, *Bild* (the whole society in all its facets) did not consider this possible Carolingian perspective of reception, because they read Cassiodorus’s work as a source of his own time.

25 Jordanes, *Historia Romana*: Goltz, *Barbar*, pp. 276–85. Carolingian manuscripts are (†) Heidelberg, UB, MS Pal. lat. 921, Mainz, eighth/ninth c. (Lowe, ed., *Codices latini antiquiores*, viii, no. 1224); BnF, MS Baluze 270, fols 76r–94v, Tuscany or Umbria (?), ninth c. (first third); BAV, MS Pal. lat. 920, Lorsch, ninth c. (first half); Valenciennes, BM, MS 95 (88), Saint-Amand, ninth c. (first half) (Bischoff: not Saint-Amand, ninth c. (last quarter); Ganz, ‘Carolingian Manuscripts’, pp. 267–68: Loire, ninth c. (final quarter)).

Theoderic is a rather Roman or better, Romanized Ostrogothic ruler. In his other historical work, the *Romana*, Jordanes describes Theoderic's first military actions in the Balkans, his initial steps in a Byzantine career, and his struggle against Odoacer in Italy (as 'rex gentium et consul Romanus') for continuing Roman sovereignty in the Western parts of the empire (§ 347–49); lastly, he mentions Theoderic's death and Athalaric's succession (§ 367). 27 In the *Getica*, Cassiodorus-Jordanes's image of Theoderic is much more detailed. 28 It gives a full account of Theoderic’s position in the Ostrogothic genealogy (chapter 14 § 80), his birth and education in Constantinople (chapter 52 § 269–71), his first military successes in the Balkans (chapters 55 and 56, § 282 and 285–86), and after succeeding his father (chapter 56 § 288), the beginnings of a typical Byzantine career ('consul ordinarius'), happily ending with the erection of an equestrian statue in Constantinople and his successful struggle with Odoacer in Italy (chapter 57 § 289–95). Finally, Jordanes reports Theoderic’s policy of matrimonial alliances and his creation of a confederation with neighbouring


kingdoms (chapters 57–58 § 296–99 and 303), before he concludes his short biography with Theoderic’s demise and the rule and death of his successors Athalaric and Amalasuintha (chapter 59 § 304–06).  

In contrast to these Ostrogothic and Roman sources, the perspective from Spain under Visigothic rule, developed by Isidore of Seville in the Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum, displays a specific Hispanic and anti-Byzantine tradition concerning Theoderic. Isidore shows no intertextual relationship with the already existing negative Roman images of the heretical Arian king Theoderic that were conveyed in the Liber pontificalis, in Gregory the Great’s Dialogi, and in Gregory of Tours’s Liber in gloria martyrum. The bishop of Seville is much more interested in Theoderic’s successful conflict with the Franks after the death of his son-in-law (chapter 36), in his triumphant conflict with the ‘princeps’ Gisaleicus of Narbonne (chapters 37–38), in his reign in Italy as a ‘consul et rex’ (chapter 39), and finally in his death (chapter 40).

---


31 Liber pontificalis, ed. by Duchesne, i, 104, l. 32–106, l. 2; 106, ll. 8–14 (first redaction) and l, 276, ll. 9–10 (second redaction): Theoderic’s sudden death as God’s punishment for keeping Pope John in custody until his death: Goltz, Barbar, pp. 402, 409, 424–25 (first redaction) and 455 (second redaction). On Theoderic’s negative image in this work Goltz, Barbar, pp. 334–37, 400–28, and 453–55. A copy of this work was sent by Pope Leo III between 800 and 814 to the Aachen court: Buchner, ‘Ueberlieferungsgeschichte’; Bischoff, ‘Hofbibliothek Karls des Großen’, p. 44 with n. 16. Leo III was in Aachen December 804–January 805: Courcelle, Les lettres greques, p. 377.

32 Gregory the Great, Dialogi, ed. by de Vogüé, iv.31.3–4, iii. 104, l. 16–106, l. 31: once victims of Theoderic, Pope John and the Patricius Symmachus now throw the ungirded and discaled king into the Etna volcano: Goltz, Barbar, pp. 591–95. For the ongoing Carolingian transmission of this work especially from the turn of the ninth century and in all parts of the empire: Castaldi, La trasmissione, v, 135–59.

33 Gregory of Tours, Liber in gloria martyrum, ed. by Krusch, 39, p. 63: Theoderic’s punishment by afflictions and hellfire as God’s revenge: Goltz, Barbar, pp. 588–90. Carolingian manuscripts are Bonn, UB, MS S 366, fols 34ivv and 41ivv (palimpsest), Werden, early ninth c. (Lowe, ed., Codices latini antiquiores, viii, no. 1070); BnF, MS lat. 2204, Western Francia (Tours region?), c. ninth c. (first–second quarter); Düsseldorf, Nordrhein-Westfälisches Hauptsstaatsarchiv, MS Z 4 no. 10, north-western Germany (?), c. ninth c. (final third) (chapters 83–86); Bern, BB, MS 199, fols 3v–137v, Reims region, ninth c. (final quarter).

Despite his multiple personal and political entanglements with the history of the Franks, Theoderic plays no prominent role in early Frankish historiography, which began to be written from the sixth century onwards. Gregory of Tours, for instance, delivers only few details about Theoderic’s family in book 111 of his Decem libri historiarum.35 Quite different to that is the reception of Theoderic’s history in the Frankish world chronicle of the mid-seventh century by the so-called Fredegar. Here for the first time in Frankish historiography, Theoderic is presented as an important, commendable, and relatively independent ruler (11.57–59).36 Some of Fredegar’s narrations are legendary and display clearly Byzantine provenance via southern and northern Italy.37 Besides his detailed information on Theoderic’s birth, childhood, and first steps of a typical Byzantine military and civil career as a ‘patricius’, his victory over Odoacer and the Avars, the establishment of his dominion over Italy, and his confederation with the neighbouring ‘gentes’ and his matrimonial alliances, the chronicle for the first time reports Theoderic’s quasi-imperial programme of restoring and erecting public buildings and facilities (chapter 57). After a chapter on Theoderic’s peace with the Franks and Visigoths (chapter 58), Fredegar closes his biographical sketch with Theoderic’s execution of Pope John I and the ‘patricius’ Symmachus, his own violent death, caused by his brother Gaiseric (perhaps a confusion with Theoderic’s II death); the alternative version of his death had already been reported by Pope Gregory the Great in his Dialogi (chapter 59). Someone rewrote this chronicle in Carolingian times, reorganizing and continuing it until 768.38 Yet, as far as we can see, its original

35 Gregory of Tours, Decem libri historiarum, ed. by Krusch and Levison, 111.5, pp. 100–01 (on Sigeric’s, Theoderic’s grandson and Sigismund’s son, fate) and 111.31, pp. 126–28 (on Theoderic’s wife — Chlodwig’s sister Audofleda — and their daughter Amalasuintha): Goltz, Barbar, pp. 589–90.


38 We know the following Carolingian copies of this version: Dillingen, Studienbibliothek, XV Fragm. 1, Raetia, ninth c. (first third) (iv.25–27); Montpellier, BIU, Section de Médecine, MS 158, Burgundy (?), c. ninth c. (second quarter); Troyes, BM, MS 802, Fulda, ninth c. (first half); Milan, Basilica di San Ambrogio, Archivio Capitolare, MS 13, northern Italy, c. ninth c. (third quarter); BAV, MS Reg. lat. 213, Reims, Saint-Remi, c. ninth c. (third quarter); Munich,
parts dealing with Theoderic were never used in the emerging new Carolingian universal chronicles or compilations. Another interesting fact is the existence of a new Carolingian Fredegar copy prepared around 800 in the traditionally Italy-oriented Alemannic abbey of Reichenau, thus exactly in the same period when Charlemagne transferred Theoderic’s equestrian statue from Ravenna to Aachen (801). The model of this copy and two further early Carolingian manuscripts of Fredegar belong to the Alemannic region of Lake Constance and south-western Germany as well as to the Carolingian intellectual centre of Metz under Bishop Angilram (d. 791).

The most successful world chronicle of the Carolingian period was Bede the Venerable’s *Chronica maiora*. Although his report is brief and comprises previously known information about Theoderic, namely his military expeditions in the Balkans and his occupation of Italy (§ 501–02), his responsibility for the execution of Pope John I and the ‘patricius’ Symmachus, and finally his own sudden death only one year after Symmachus’s death (§ 511–12); never-

BSB, clm 29445/1 (olim clm 29045 c) + clm 14418 (stub at fol. 1) + (†) Munich, UB, Fragm. s. n., Regensburg, St Emmeram, ninth c. (second half) (I 22–58); BL, MS Harley 3771, Eastern Francia (?), ninth/tenth c. or early tenth c.: Collins, *Fredegar-Chroniken*, pp. xiv–xv and 96–114.

39 On Frechulf of Lisieux as a negligible exception, see n. 81.


44 ‘Qui [sc. “Iohannes Romanæ ecclesiae pontifex”] dum rediens Rauennam venisset,
theless Bede’s selective exploitation of the chronicle by Marcellinus Comes, a source from Ravenna, already used by Marius of Avenches, and the papal biographies of the *Liber pontificalis* has more or less frozen the image of a politically independent Theoderic in the early Carolingian continuations of his chronicle from the last quarter of the eighth century onwards. This genealogy of historical writing shows Bede’s extraordinary influence on the early Carolingian practice of historiography. The first Carolingian world chronicle since Fredegar, based on Bede’s, Orosius’s, and Fredegar’s world chronicles, is the *Chronicon universale* (its narrative extends until 741) which was probably


47 *Chronicon universale*, partially ed. by Waitz and by Mommsen. We know at least four early manuscripts of this text with different continuations up to the ninth century: Leiden, UB, MS Scal. 28, Flavigny, c. 816 (McKitterick, *Perceptions*, pp. 24–25, fig. 3); BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 1615, Auxerre, ninth c. (first–second quarter); Munich, BSB, clm 246, Weltenburg, c. 850 (McKitterick, *Perceptions*, p. 27, fig. 4); Besançon, BM, MS 186, Eastern Francia (?), ninth c. (final third). Close, ‘Les “Annales Maximiniani”’, pp. 311 and 323–24 has shown that the copy continued up to 811, Brussels, KBR, MS 17349–17360, Antwerp, 1783, going back to a copy from 1678 that was taken from an old codex of St Maximin in Trier, does not contain any of the Bede passages related to Frankish history that are typical for the structure of the
written in the Burgundian abbey of Flavigny at the beginning of Charlemagne’s reign.\(^{48}\) It is not purely by accident that this work was redacted in a monastery within the archbishopric of Sens because the metropolitan at that time was Wilchar, the head of the Frankish ‘national church’. The two short passages dealing with Theoderic are the same as in Bede’s chronicle.\(^{49}\)

We can ascertain, moreover, the same snapshot of Theoderic in several further Carolingian chronicles which are continuations of Bede. I only mention here the \textit{Chronicon Laurissense breve}, which was written under Abbot Adalung of Lorsch and was the earliest attempt to develop the history of the Carolingian royal family beginning from 741,\(^{50}\) the \textit{Chronicon breve Alamannicum} in its first version (which extends to 814),\(^{51}\) and the \textit{Chronicon Moissiacense} (up to 818), written within the immediate spiritual and political circle of Benedict of Aniane.\(^{52}\) Another short world chronicle, also based on Bede, is the \textit{Chronica de \(v\)\(I\) aetatibus mundi}.\(^{53}\) But despite this historiographical background, the chronicle, written in 807 still in the spirit of Alcuin and then integrated in a revised form into the Aachen computistic encyclopaedia of the year 809,\(^{54}\) strikingly contains no information at all about Theoderic. Is this due to Alcuin’s ambivalent, if not negative image of Theoderic, which resulted from his reading of Boethius’s \textit{De consolatione Philosophiae}?\(^{55}\) The same holds true for the lost codex of Reginbert of Reichenau (no. XXXVI), which can be reconstructed by cop-

\footnotesize{copies of the \textit{Chronicon universale}. On this chronicle and the special case of Würzburg, UB, M. p. th. f. 46, see the contribution by Sören Kaschke in this volume.}

\footnotesize{\(^{48}\) Whereas the death of the Byzantine emperor Constantine V (14 September 775) is not mentioned.}

\footnotesize{\(^{49}\) \textit{Chronicon universale}, ed. by Waitz, p. 10, ll. 20–22 and p. 11, ll. 13–17. A third snippet is taken from Fredegar: \textit{Chronicon universale}, ed. by Waitz, p. 10, ll. 6–9.}

\footnotesize{\(^{50}\) \textit{Chronicon brevis Alamannicum}, ed. by Pertz.}


\footnotesize{\(^{52}\) \textit{Chronicon Moissiacense}, ed. by Claszen, p. 89, ll. 20–22 and p. 91, ll. 20–24. See also the contribution by Rutger Kramer in this volume.}

\footnotesize{\(^{53}\) \textit{Chronica de \(v\)\(I\) aetatibus mundi}, ed. by Mommsen.}

\footnotesize{\(^{54}\) Borst, ‘Alkuin’, pp. 69 and 72. There exists also a second revised version of the encyclopaedia from 818: Borst, ‘Alkuin’, p. 73.}

\footnotesize{\(^{55}\) See below.}
ies initiated by Konrad Peutinger in 1508. It was a historical compilation of Bede’s *De sex aetatibus mundi* (fols 144v–145r), the *Annales Laureshamenses* ad a. 703–70 (fols 145v–146r), and the *Annales regni Francorum* ad a. 771–818 (fols 146v–157r), on the one hand, and of Thegan’s *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris* (fols 3v–8r), the *Episcoporum de poenitentia relatio Compendiensis* from 833 (fols 8v–9r), and the *Divisio regnorum* from 806 (fols 9v–11r), on the other hand. This compilation offers a world history reaching from the very beginnings to the deep crisis of the Carolingian Empire under Louis the Pious in 833, but again it does not mention Theoderic in the first part, written by Bede the Venerable. There are strong arguments in favour of seeing Walahfrid as the initiator of this historical compilation, and this would fit with his negative image of Theoderic developed in *De imagine Tetrici*. In contrast to this panoramic compendium,

56 Wrocław, BU, MS Akc. 1949 KN 397, fols 144v–157r and fols 3v–11r. For detailed descriptions and evaluations of this manuscript and for the reconstruction of the original Reichenau codex: Tischler, *Einheits ‘Vita Karoli’*, 1, 870–84; Tischler, “*Divisio regnorum*”, pp. 205–07, 219, 227, 231–32, and 235–39.

57 This compilation ends with the same year as the *Chronicon Moissiacense* which belongs to the context of Benedict of Aniane: see n. 52.

58 After Pokorny, *‘Annales Laureshamenses’*, p. 26 (with question mark), I underlined this in my still unpublished paper ‘Changing Perceptions of a Carolingian Constitution: The Legal and Historiographical Contexts of the *Divisio regnorum* in the Early 9th Century’, given at the International Medieval Congress-Session 1607 ‘Law and Empire. Editing the Carolingian Capitularies II’, Leeds, 10 July 2014. The text versions of several works compiled in the original Carolingian manuscript may give plausible hints to the possible Reichenau redactor of the whole collection. On the one hand, Thegan’s biography is transmitted in Walahfrid’s new edition from 840/42 which corresponds with the dating of the Reichenau catalogue of the Reginbert manuscripts, where we find the description of the Carolingian original codex. On the other hand, the *Episcoporum de poenitentia relatio Compendiensis* and the *Divisio regnorum* are transmitted in text versions from around 840, possibly stemming from Walahfrid’s hand as well. We therefore may conclude that the author or mastermind of the redaction of this exciting compilation of historical and juridical texts was working in the Aachen-Reichenau context and was none other than Walahfrid Strabo himself. A further argument for the relationship of this text collection to Reichenau (or even Walahfrid) is the special redaction of Bede’s *De sex aetatibus mundi* going up to Louis the Pious’s death which is also transmitted in the Reichenau codex Paris, BnF, MS lat. 4860: Pokorny, *‘Annales Laureshamenses’*, pp. 12–13.

59 As n. 11 and below.
later Carolingian world chronicles written by Ado of Vienne\(^60\) and Regino of Prüm\(^61\) again transmit Bede’s passages on Theoderic.

Besides this Carolingian rediscovery of Theoderic’s history, we can also uncover traces of an Ostrogothic Renaissance in Langobardo-Carolingian Italy. The first hints of a legend of Theoderic-Dietrich are already visible in (late) Lombard times.\(^62\) King Desiderius (757–74) seems to have legitimized his position as an heir of the Ostrogothic rule by presenting himself as Theoderic’s offspring and successor,\(^63\) and already his forerunner Liutprand (712–44) saw in Theoderic a model for his own rule.\(^64\) If this is correct, Charlemagne’s interest in Theoderic could already go back to this first phase of contact with Italy. When approaching Lombard Italy, the Carolingians could discover new sources of information about Theoderic. One of the first important Lombard teachers of Charlemagne, Paul the Deacon, for instance, mentions in two short passages of his *Historia Langobardorum* the Lombard royal palaces in Pavia and Monza as the results of Theoderic’s massive building programme.\(^65\) The Anonymus Valesianus, in the second part of the so-called *Epitome Phillippsiana*, also described these and other Italian activities of the

\(^60\) ‘Mortuo Theodorico Triarii filio, alius Theodoricus, cognomento Valamer, Gothorum suscepit regnum, qui utramque Macedonian Thessaliamque depopulatus est. Plurima regiae civitatis loca igne succinctens, Italiam quoque infestum occupabant [...] Qui [sc. “Joannes Romanae Ecclesiae pontifex’] cum rediens Ravennam venisset, Theodoricus eum cum comitibus caeteris carceris afflictione peremit, invidia ductus, quia catholicae pietatis defensor Justinus eum honorifice suscepisset. Quo tempore Symmachum atque Bohemium consulares viros, pro catholicae pietate idem Theodericus occidit: quique anno sequente subita morte periit, succedente


\(^63\) Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, p. 134 with n. 94.


Ostrogothic king from a specific Veronese perspective. This short history of Theoderic was consciously recopied in Carolingian Verona in the early ninth century, so that we can say that this copy of a late Roman historiographical compilation served for the creation of a new political ideology and for the legitimation of Carolingian rule in the ‘regnum Italiae’. Yet, this Carolingian commemoration of legitimate Ostrogothic rule over Italy was consciously freed from any remembrance of the former Lombard reign, as the context of this Veronese copy strikingly shows. Therefore, it is not by chance that the Carolingian court at Verona was interested in this curious text copied in the context of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation at Rome and of the establishment of Carolingian rule over Italy in the face of Constantinople’s prerogative to rule there. The text namely describes how the Byzantine Emperor Zeno had established Theoderic, the former Ostrogothic military leader, as ‘patricius’ and ‘consul’ in Italy and how the latter then had successfully fought against Odoacer (chapter 11). After his election as king of the Goths and after having made peace with the Byzantine Emperor Anastasios I, Theoderic showed strong political, quasi-imperial competences in different fields; in the papal schism he mediated between Symmachus and Laurentius, developed a real system of matrimonial alliances, restored and built public facilities in Ravenna, Verona, and Pavia, and finally created a political confederation with the neighbouring


67 Berlin, SBB – PK, MS Phill. 1885, fols 37–49; originally forming part of a larger historical miscellany: Rose, Verzeichniss, i, 299–307, no. 136–37; Cessi, Fragmenta historica, p. v n. 1; Bischoff, Katalog, i, 93; Bischoff, Katalog, ii, 87. There is a further Veronese copy of the twelfth century (a. 1181) in BAV, MS Pal. lat. 927, fols 126–134, but its text shows on the one hand omissions and on the other hand interpolations drawn from Jordanes’ Getica: Cessi, Fragmenta historica, pp. vi n. 1 and ix–x; Bradley, ‘The “Getica”-Fragments’.


69 Neri, ‘La legittimità politica’.


71 In this political context, we must perhaps also take into consideration Theoderic’s ‘Macedonian’, thus ‘non-Greek’ origin which could have augmented for the Carolingians the attraction of this Ostrogothic king in their long-lasting conflict with Byzantium over legitimate rule over Italy and Rome. From the Frankish-Carolingian standpoint this conflict was conceived as a quarrel between true and degenerated descendants of Troia, between the Franks/Macedonians, the Romans, and the Greeks. This renewed attractive perspective on Theoderic is not taken into account in Giardina, ‘Le origini troiane’, pp. 192–95.
‘gentes’ (chapter 12). The text ends with Theoderic’s trials against Boethius (chapter 14),72 Pope John I, and Symmachus (chapter 15). In the mirror of this re-contextualized historiographical compilation, King Pippin of Italy and his father Charlemagne demonstrated their ability not only for balancing the forces between the new sovereigns, their representatives, and the native elites, but also for assuring the new transalpine reign’s stability on the local Veronese and the regional Italian level.

Much more important for the Carolingians’ interest in Theoderic and his potential for forming a new political identity in Italy, however, is the rediscov- ery of the main source of the Ostrogoths’ history, Jordanes’s Getica in Lombard Italy and the Carolingian Empire. The bridge builder between this late Roman author and the Carolingians in Lombard Italy was seemingly Paul the Deacon again.73 Already in his Historia Romana, the extracts for his biography of Theoderic dealing with his time in the Balkans and his rule in Italy are on the whole taken from Jordanes.74 Then shortly after Charlemagne’s imperial coronation and his visit to Theoderic’s former residence in Ravenna, Alcuin shows his considerable interest in obtaining a copy of the Jordanes manuscript restored in the abbey of Saint-Riquier.75 This must be seen in the immediate context of the transfer of Theoderic’s equestrian statue from Ravenna to Aachen in springtime 801.76 To the same chronological and political context

72 Here, Theoderic is more or less described as Boethius’s murderer: Schneege, ‘Theoderich der Grosse’, p. 23 with n. 3.


74 Paul the Deacon, Historia Romana, ed. by Droysen, xv.10, pp. 122; xv.12–20, pp. 122–27, xvi.4, p. 128 and xvi.8–11, pp. 129–30; Paul the Deacon, Historia Romana, ed. by Crivellucci, xv.10, p. 215; xv.12–20, pp. 216–24; xvi.4, p. 227, and xvi.8–11, pp. 229–31. ‘Jordanes’ especially means the Historia Getica, but also the Historia Romana. Further sources are i.a. Cassiodorus, Chronica, Ennodius, Panegyricus, the Anonymus Valesianus, the Liber pontificalis, Gregory the Great, Dialogi, and Bede, Chronica maiora. Rohr, Theoderich-Panegyricus, p. 139 with n. 343 and p. 170 with n. 456 even assumes direct knowledge of Ennodius’s panegyrical text at Charlemagne’s court, introduced by the historian Paul the Deacon.


76 Already suggested by Baesecke, ‘Die karlische Renaissance’, p. 180. There were personal connections between Saint-Riquier and Verona, since Abbot Angilbert of Saint-Riquier probably directed the royal chapel of Pippin of Italy in Verona: Fleckenstein, Hofkapelle, i, 67. Parallel
seem to belong the extracts from Jordanes’s *Getica* in the immediate codicological context of the above-mentioned Veronese copy of the Anonymous Valesianus, introducing Theoderic’s history in Italy and his later career there.\(^{77}\) Furthermore, some early Carolingian manuscripts of Jordanes’s work reveal a growing interest in the history of the Goths before and after 800. We mention here only the late eighth-century copy from Bobbio, discovered only in the early twentieth century in the Public Archives of Palermo,\(^{78}\) the famous Anglo-Saxon Heidelberg manuscript, written in the late eighth or early ninth century in Mainz,\(^{79}\) or the fragments of an Anglo-Saxon Fulda manuscript from a slightly later period, today preserved in Lausanne.\(^{80}\) Furthermore, if we take into account Frechulf’s possible education in Fulda under Hrabanus Maurus, it is no surprise that this author, now bishop of Lisieux, integrates Jordanes’s history of the Goths and their king Theoderic throughout what is the earliest Carolingian world chronicle that no longer was a simple continuation of Bede.\(^{81}\) Frechulf’s massive reception of Jordanes is no coincidence since the initiator of his universal chronicle was Helisachar, the abbot of Saint-Riquier, the very same monastery that Alcuin had asked in 801 to provide him with a copy of exactly this late Roman author.\(^{82}\) How relevant this fresh reception of Jordanes is for our understanding of Frechulf’s world chronicle, can be drawn from the dedication letter sent to the Empress Judith.

to Aachen, Saint-Riquier also participated in the transfer of antique columns from Rome: Binding, *Antike Säulen*, pp. 18 and 28.

\(^{77}\) McKitterick, *History*, p. 55.

\(^{78}\) As n. 26.

\(^{79}\) As n. 26.

\(^{80}\) Lausanne, BCU, MS 398, ninth c. (first–second quarter): Christ, *Bibliothek*, p. 212, no. 335; Bischoff, ‘*Paläographische Fragen*’, p. 110 n. 44. A specimen of the manuscript: Besson, *L’art barbare*, p. 217, fig. 169. Is it pure coincidence that Fulda is also the provenance of the Kassel fragment of the famous *Hildebrandslied*, counting an episode of the group of sagas on Dietrich of Bern, copied in the third or fourth decade of the ninth century: Bischoff, ‘*Paläographische Fragen*’, pp. 112–13; *Hiltibraht*? Innes, ‘Teutons or Trojans’, pp. 241–44 does not mention the Fulda-Fredegar in this context.

\(^{81}\) Frechulf of Lisieux, *Chronicon*, ed. by Allen, i.2.25–26, pp. 134–39 and 148; ii.3.6, p. 565; ii.5.5, p. 682; ii.5.14, pp. 698–700; ii.5.16–18, pp. 702 and 705–10, and ii.5.21–22, pp. 713–14 and 718: Allen, *Frechulfi opera omnia*, i, 213* and 311*–12* (detailed list of all used passages). In contrast to this panorama, Frechulf’s use of Fredegar’s chapters on Theoderic (ii.57–62) is quasi-non-existent: Allen, *Frechulfi opera omnia*, i, 291*. This important Carolingian universal chronicle is not mentioned by Goltz, *Barbar*.

\(^{82}\) As n. 75.
Here Frechulf wrote that the rule of the Roman emperors and their governors in Italy and Gaul had come to an end, even though he describes further events until the time of Pope Gregory the Great in the chronological framework of the Eastern Roman Empire. Through this Frechulf shows the Carolingian empress and her court that these events and even the history of the Ostrogoths continued to be relevant in their own age. In the mirror of his world chronicle, Frechulf analyses the political situation in the Western parts of the Roman Empire with regard to the former Ostrogothic dominion under Theoderic and its end with the Byzantine expulsion of the Ostrogoths from Italy. This perspective reveals Frechulf’s notable interest in Theoderic and may explain why he even preserved Jordanes’s passage on the erection of Theoderic’s equestrian statue in Constantinople, the same statue the political and moral values of which would be hotly debated just after the dedication of the *Chronicon* to Judith and her son Charles the Bald in 829.

At the same time when Jordanes played the decisive role in forming the Carolingian image of Theoderic, authors at the Aachen imperial court were reading anew biographical texts of the king for their debate about the role the Ostrogothic ruler could play in creating their own political identity. We have at least two further positive Italian images of Theoderic delivered by Ostrogothic biographical sources that were now used for writing new biographical literature: on the one hand the *Panegyricus* of Ennodius of Pavia, a still underestimated model for Einhard’s Charlemagne, but also for Walahfrid’s.


84 ‘Nec tantum hoc, sed et equestrem statuam ab imperatore promeruit ante regiam collocari’, Frechulf of Lisieux, *Chronicon*, ed. by Allen, II.5.18: p. 708, ll. 30–32.


86 E.g. in the latest evaluation of this biography by Becht-Jördens, ‘Einharts “Vita Karoli”: Whereas Suetonius’s riding and swimming Caesar (§ 57 and 64) seems to be Einhard’s model for his riding and swimming Charlemagne (chapter 22) instead of Ennodius’s Theoderic wading in swimming Charlemagne (chapter 22) instead of Ennodius’s Theoderic wading...
Theoderic,87 of which we know at least one contemporary copy from Saint-Vaast/Lorsch;88 and on the other hand Epistolae 1.2 of Sidonius Apollinaris,89 of which a contemporary manuscript — this time from the court of Louis the Pious itself — is also preserved90 and which could have been the source of Einhard’s curious mistake when describing Charlemagne’s body, especially his round head, believing that Sidonius was describing Theoderic the Great’s instead of the Visigothic king Theoderic II’s physiognomy.91

Boethius as a Bio-historical Source for Theoderic and Ostrogothic
Political Culture in the Carolingian Age

A much more important, yet underestimated biographical, moral, and par-aenetic model of relevance for Carolingian political culture is the image of

and swimming through the river Ulca during the battle against the Gepids (§ 29 and 31–33), Ennodius of Pavia, Panegyricus, ed. by Rohr, 29 and 31–33, pp. 218 and 220, Ennodius’s Theoderic depositing his (Gothic) dress in favour of a glorious robe for festivities, Ennodius of Pavia, Panegyricus, ed. by Rohr, 89 and 91, pp. 260 and 262, actually could have influenced Einhard in describing Charlemagne’s behaviour in comparable situations (chapter 23).


89 Sidonius Apollinaris, Epistolae, ed. by Lütjohann, i.2, pp. 2–4.


Theoderic and his reign developed in Boethius’s philosophical treatise *De consolatione Philosophiae*.\(^{92}\) The beginning of the reception of this philosophical and anthropological work in the eighth and ninth centuries obviously parallels the rediscovery of Theoderic as a model in Carolingian political culture.\(^{93}\)

Much was written in the last decades about the role that Boethius, ‘last Roman philosopher’, and his Neoplatonic thought played within Catholic Christianity and in the context of the court of the Arian king Theoderic the Great.\(^{94}\) Since the publication of Pierre Courcelle’s magisterial book on the medieval reception of Boethius’s *De consolatione Philosophiae*,\(^ {95}\) we fortunately count several studies on the transmission of Boethius’s manuscripts.\(^{96}\) What is still missing, however, is more intensive research on the social and political contextualization of these manuscripts that were constantly read and studied for more than a millennium.

We actually know that the production of manuscripts of this important philosophical and anthropological work restarted in Carolingian times; yet, what is much less known is the fact that this renaissance of Boethius came up

\(^{92}\) Goltz, *Barbar*, pp. 381–87. For Augustine’s *Dialogues* and especially his *Soliloquia* as a model for Boethius’s personification of the philosophy: Silk, ‘Boethius’s Consolatio Philosophiae’. For a literary assessment of Boethius’s work: Reichenberger, *Untersuchungen* (on the five rhetorical steps of preparing a forensic speech within *De consolatione Philosophiae*); Rhein, ‘Dialogstruktur’; Lerer, *Boethius* (on the work’s dialogic structure of inner and outer contexts and their representation of a learning progress); Pabst, *Prosimetrum*, i, 158–95 (on the relationship between prose and poems in the prosimetrum); Gruber, *Kommentar* (leading commentary); Shanzer, ‘Interpreting the “Consolation”’.\(^ {93}\) The following chapter is a revised English version of Tischler, ‘El consejero exiliado’.


\(^{95}\) Courcelle, *La ‘Consolation de Philosophie’*.

more or less in parallel with the rediscovery of another ambivalent figure of the Ostrogothic period, who intermediated between the Roman and barbarian worlds of Late Antiquity and an emerging Carolingian political culture: Theoderic the Great. We can easily explain this interrelationship by taking into account that Boethius wrote his last philosophical treatise in the thorny situation of being a ‘political prisoner’, kept under house arrest and thus obliged to reflect on the interrelationship of power and wisdom from the standpoint of a counsellor exiled from the royal court.

In any case, my central question in this final chapter goes in another direction. I wonder whether this written consolation that motivates the reader to engage in philosophical studies (προτετπτικός) was not perceived in the Middle Ages as a memorandum of right conduct between the powerful and the erudite. Actually, the treatise criticizes the abuse of power by a sovereign in a changing society and thus encourages reflection on the role of intellectuals in their specific societal situations. This is exactly the political and cultural situation of the period of the so-called ‘Carolingian Renaissance’, a movement centred on the renovation of the Church, society, and culture, initiated by Charlemagne and continued by his son Louis the Pious. Boethius’s last work offered the perfect opportunity for Carolingian savants to rediscover Neoplatonic thought in an increasingly Christianized society as well as to rediscover their own personality within this society. Through this consolation, medieval persons understood for the first time that philosophy could also be a means for Christian salvation. Yet, my following pages intend to show something else, namely that some intellectuals near to and far from the Carolingian courts perceived Boethius’s treatise as the autobiographical confession and exhortation of a Christian wise man who was removed from office and segregated from the court as a result of tensions between power and wisdom, fidelity and treachery. From this

97 Glei, “In carcere et vinculis”.
98 Wagner, ‘Boethius’.
100 On the relationship between wisdom and power: ‘atqui tu hanc sententiam Platonis ore sanxisti, beatas fore res publicas si eas vel studiosi sapientiae regerent vel earum rectores studere sapientiae contigisset’, Boethius, De consolatione Philosophiae, ed. by Moreschini, i.4.5, p. 12, ll. 15–18.
101 There are false allegations: ‘an ut tu quoque mecum rea falsis criminationibus agiteris?’, Boethius, De consolatione Philosophiae, ed. by Moreschini, i.3.3, p. 9, ll. 7–8. A prominent incriminated person is the consul Albinus: ‘Ne Albinum consularem virum praeudicatae accusationis poena corriperet’, Boethius, De consolatione Philosophiae, ed. by Moreschini, i.4.4, p. 13,
perspective, the study of the traces of the early Carolingian rediscovery of *De consolatione Philosophiae* creates unexpected new and authentic perspectives on some of the most learned Carolingian intellectuals and their self-images, intellectuals who worked exactly in the tense area between ‘political consulting’ and ‘academic teaching’ at the royal courts and religious centres.

In general, Alcuin is considered the first known Carolingian reader of Boethius who exerted great influence on subsequent thinking in the ninth century. Yet, Alcuin seems to have been also the starting point of a renewed interest in other central authors of the Ostrogothic period, which was very probably prompted by curiosity about Theoderic the Great and his dominion over Italy. I repeat here only the case of Cassiodorus, Boethius’s successor at the court of Ravenna, and Jordanes, the historiographer of the Ostrogoths who based his chronicle on a comparable, but lost work written by Cassiodorus.102 One of the most important consequences of the renewed reading of late antique Roman literature is certainly that Carolingian intellectuals understood much more than ever before that the ‘artes liberales’ — under the leadership of a Christianized philosophy — could be a reliable guide and means of illumination for human-kind searching and finding its way to God.103 Yet, Alcuin’s reception of Boethius seems to have been no more a central affair of the Aachen court than the result of his reading in the last stage of his intellectual life, when he lived amongst the community of clerics in Tours; in other words, Alcuin’s reading of Boethius was an intellectual work which maintained a certain inner and outer distance to the present sovereign, Charlemagne. Already in a poem, Alcuin qualified Charlemagne as being another ‘Anicius’, which alluded to the offspring of the Roman patricians to whom the Roman philosopher belonged.104 Alcuin’s intensified reception of *De consolatione Philosophiae*, however, cannot be

---

**Notes:**

102 As n. 26.


---

*Figurengedichte*, pp. 34 and 37–38; Jullien and Perelman, *Clavis*, ii.1, 32–33.
assessed before his philosophical treatise *Disputatio de vera philosophia*, which in many manuscripts forms the prologue to his *Ars grammatica*, and in this art itself.\(^{105}\) Finally, in 801, i.e. after Charlemagne’s coronation in Rome, Alcuin cited in his letter to the new emperor Boethius’s famous definition of the ideal state whose leader is a philosopher or a philosopher king,\(^{106}\) thus formulating a political programme that was practised in Carolingian times\(^{107}\) and afterwards.

Up to this point, we have detected only single traces of a reception of Boethius’s consolation in Charlemagne’s time. The reception profile of this philosophical work completely changes under his successor Louis the Pious. From now on, we not only find many authors who studied *De consolatione Philosophiae* intensively, but also many who wrote their own works in the political context of the imperial court. More or less at the beginning of his universal chronicle, initiated by Helisachar, chancellor of the new emperor, Frechulf of Lisieux used Boethius’s poem on the delightful ‘golden era’.\(^{108}\) In this context, we mention again the role that Helisachar, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of Saint-Riquier, played in the transmission of a Jordanes manuscript to Alcuin, who was keen to obtain more information about the Ostrogoths and Theoderic the Great immediately after Charlemagne’s imperial coronation.\(^{109}\) We may not forget either that Frechulf was Helisachar’s and Hrabanus Maurus’s disciple, which could explain a whole series of further traces of the reception of Boethius’s work in the intellectual circles between the imperial court at Aachen and the monasteries at Fulda, Reichenau, and Seligenstadt.\(^{110}\) Despite all these


\(^{108}\) Boethius, *De consolatione Philosophiae*, ed. by Moreschini, ii.metr.5, pp. 45–46 in Frechulf of Lisieux, *Chronicon*, ed. by Allen, i.1.10, pp. 38–39; Manitius, *Geschichte*, i, 665 with n. 2 (who underlines the high quality of the manuscript in use; ‘das er einer anscheinend sehr reinen Überlieferung entnahm’); Allen, *Frechulf opera omnia*, i, 202*–*04*.

\(^{109}\) As n. 75.

\(^{110}\) A reflex of this network of persons is preserved in a list of ‘nomina amicorum viventium’ of Reichenau Abbey (c. 824), interpreted by Geuenich, ‘Gebetsgedenken’, pp. 88–99. This list
details, we do not know at present if Frechulf used a copy of Boethius in Fulda or Aachen.

With the first crisis of Louis the Pious's empire, characterized by the power struggle between the emperor and his nephew Bernard of Italy and the political exile of some courtiers and supporters of Bernard, such as Bishop Theodulf of Orléans, the reception of Boethius now displays a new facet: Modoin, bishop of Autun, compares Theodulf's exile in 818 with that of Ovid and Boethius.\textsuperscript{111} This learned comparison of a counsellor of the imperial court of Aachen, responsible for its political decisions, can show how some Carolingian scholars perceived the relationship between the mighty and the learned in court circles in the historical and typological mirror of Theoderic the Great and Boethius. Modoin's comparison may indicate Theodulf's interest in Boethius, which for his part could be explained by the fact that the Carolingian transmission of \textit{De consolatione Philosophiae} obviously started in the Loire Valley. Unfortunately, we cannot substantiate our presumption that Theodulf was the owner of one of the two early copies of Boethius that come from that region and are preserved now in Orléans\textsuperscript{112} and Vatican City.\textsuperscript{113}

From the 820s onwards, we see an intensified reception of Boethius in other cultural centres of the Carolingian Empire. Despite the lack of a copy of \textit{De consolatione Philosophiae} in Corbie,\textsuperscript{114} Paschasius Radbertus used this work mentions the lay abbots Einhard and Helisachar, but also Grimald of St Gallen and Adalricus of Ferrières, the abbot of the learned monk Lupus we deal with on the following pages.

\textsuperscript{111} Pertulit, an nescis, quod longos Naso labores, | Insons est factus exul ob invidiam. | Ipse Severinus magna est deiectus ab urbe, | Consul Romana clarus ab arce procul, Modoinus of Autun, \textit{Carmen}, ed. by Dümmler, p. 571, vv. 47–50.


\textsuperscript{114} Ganz, \textit{Corbie}, p. 66. But Ganz, \textit{Corbie}, p. 50 refers to a copy of this work written in abminuscule which was in use in Corbie between c. 780 and 830. The Benedictine monk Edmond Martène found this manuscript in Murbach Abbey and published his finding in his \textit{Voyage littéraire} in the year 1717.
abundantly in his politically-charged *Vita Adalhardi* from the year 826. In fact, he not only used Boethius’s inaugural poem in his own eclogue attached to the biography of this important Carolingian descendant, but also many other passages of the treatise concerning the tensions between power and philosophical knowledge, in order to explain Adalhard’s destiny, exiled and rehabilitated several times by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious during his long lifetime. We can assert here that Paschasius’s reception of Boethius is the first in the Carolingian period with clear political aims: following Alcuin, Paschasius used Boethius’s Platonic model of the philosopher king several times, but with the intention of showing Louis the Pious’s dependence on his court councillors. Furthermore, Paschasius transferred and transformed Boethius’s capacity to distinguish between true virtues and secular honours with the purpose of developing in the course of Adalhard’s life the conception of ‘mentis honor’, independent of the world’s honours. From this perspective, it is no surprise that


118 Chapter 45: ‘Sed senex noster non tam alienis quam propriis meritorum honoribus ubique ab omnibus veneratur, ab omnibus interim dignus honore censetur. Verumtamen quia
Paschasius reread Boethius to illustrate, in his dedication letter to his exegesis of Jeremiah’s Lamentations, the tedium of life, ageing, and the transformations of human existence.\textsuperscript{119} In this context, we have to take into consideration that Paschasius’s exegesis of this great Old Testament prophet was motivated by his conviction that his brother Wala was another admonisher and political victim of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, thus a new Carolingian Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{120}

The reception of \textit{De consolatione Philosophiae} in the poem \textit{De imagine Tetrici} that Walahfrid Strabo published in springtime 829 is well known. In this work, the young Reichenau monk, freshly arrived at the imperial court at Aachen, presented the ideal of a new orthodox philosopher king\textsuperscript{121} in contrast to the old Arian tyrant,\textsuperscript{122} in order to praise the Emperor Louis and his court-

\begin{ex}
\textit{flebilis heu maestos cogor inire modos}\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Venit enim properata malis inopina senectus}\textsuperscript{123} \textit{insert et maestis saepe vocata venit!}.
\end{ex}


\textsuperscript{120} De Jong, ‘Becoming Jeremiah’, p. 191 n. 35 and pp. 192–96.

\textsuperscript{121} ‘Nunc tandem crevit felix res publica, cum sat | Et reges sapient simul et regnant sapientes’, Walahfrid Strabo, \textit{De imagine Tetrici}, ed. by Dümmler, p. 378, vv. 256–57 (at the very end of the second panegyric part of the poem).

tiers, in contrast to the ‘new Theoderic’ that was Charlemagne. The latter had ordered, after his imperial coronation, in the year 801, the transportation of the famous bronze equestrian statue of Theoderic the Great from Ravenna and its re-erection in front of his new palace in Aachen. In the context of his description of the ideal king, Boethius also described a cowardly senate betraying and condemning its chief to death. We may suspect that Walahfrid’s corresponding passage reveals a typological relationship between Theoderic the Great and Charlemagne for whitewashing Adalhard’s and other exiled counselors’ reputations. Yet, Walahfrid’s poem is all in all a continuous dialogue with Boethius’s consolation, as it also develops a reflection on the truth of human existence, on the danger of losing the human character, and of even falling below the condition of animals, like Theoderic because of his ‘avaritia’ and ‘superbia’, and on the blood and thunder caused by the tyrants of this


125 Walahfrid Strabo, *De imagine Tetrici*, ed. by Dümmler, pp. 372–73, vv. 80–88; Schneege, ‘Theoderich der Grosse’, p. 23 with n. 4. This seems to be a further bit of criticism against Louis’s father Charlemagne, the ‘novus Theodericus’.


We can base these already known observations on the hypothesis that Walahfrid used for his reflections a copy of Boethius’s consolation either in Aachen or Fulda, where he studied under Hrabanus Maurus prior to his stay at the imperial court.

We even know further traces of this important reception of Boethius in the same years that allow us to clarify the already outlined panorama of the political, moral, and philosophical thought of our Carolingian scholars. In the first place, I mention the famous copy of the first book of Boethius’s *De consolatione Philosophiae* which Lupus, monk and classicist from Ferrières, brought with him to Fulda, with the intention of finishing and revising the text there, when studying with Hrabanus Maurus between the years 829 and 836. At present, we have no studies that allow us to say with precision if this precious copy of Boethius, now preserved in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, provided the basis for Lupus’s later treatise on the metres of *De consolatione Philosophiae.*

Where did Lupus procure a model for completing his unfinished Boethius manuscript? We could already show the profound knowledge of Boethius at the imperial court of Aachen and the monasteries of Corbie and Fulda. Yet, there is another prominent place in the Carolingian Empire where a man with relations to all these cultural and political centres was primarily living: I am talking


about Seligenstadt, where Einhard, the former disciple of Fulda and courtier of Aachen, had established a community of clerics which he became increasingly reluctant to leave for service at the imperial court. Already known for a long time, there is the famous exchange of letters and manuscripts between Lupus of Ferrières in Fulda and Einhard in Seligenstadt from 829 onwards. What is much less known, are the philosophical interests of both Carolingian scholars in the political and cultural context of these years, although we know that Lupus probably asked ‘his master’ to send him a copy of Boethius, as we can learn from Lupus’s farewell letter written in summer 836 that Einhard was well acquainted with Boethius (Epistola 5). In this letter, Lupus asked Einhard for the explication of some Greek words in Boethius (and Servius). Although this request was related to some difficult passages in Boethius’s De institutione arithmetica, a treatise Lupus certainly revised in Fulda, it nevertheless testifies to Einhard’s knowledge of De consolatione Philosophiae, because the early and authentic transmission of Boethius reunites these two works, and so were they joined in Lupus’s copy as well. Yet, what happened during Lupus’s last visit to Seligenstadt in summer 836? Did both scholars study together a manuscript of De consolatione Philosophiae, perhaps Lupus’s model that enabled him to finish his own copy? My questions would be futile if there were not in Seligenstadt a Carolingian fragment of Boethius’s consolation more or less unknown. This fragment of Boethius invites us to offer new reflections on the character of this author’s reception in the light of the friendship between Einhard and Lupus, especially because Lupus deplored the decadence of contemporary culture already in the very first letter of the correspondence between both scholars, obviously influenced by Boethius’s negative spirit, and showed at the end of

134 As n. 130.
135 ‘Amor litterarum ab ipso fere inicio pueritiae mihi est innatus, nec earum, ut nunc a plerisque vocantur, superstitions vel <supervacua> otia fastidivi; et nisi intercessisset inopia praecipitum et longo situ collapsa priorum studia pene interissent, largiente deo meae aviditati satisfacere forsitan potuisset; siquidem vestra memoria per famosissimum imperatorem K<arolum>, cui litterae eo usque deferre debent ut aeternam ei parent memoriam, coepta revocari, aliquantum quidem extulere caput satisque constite veritate subnixum praecitarum Cie<ronis> dictum: “honos alit artes et acceduntur omnes ad studia gloria.” Nunc oneri sunt qui aliquid discere affectant; et velut in edito sitos loco studiosos quoque imperiti vulgo aspectantes, si quid in eis culpae reprehenderunt, id non humano vitio, sed qualitati disciplinarum
the same letter Einhard’s interest in philosophy (Epistola 1). This would mean that their common study of Boethius had already started in 829, when Lupus came to Fulda and started his scholarly contacts with Einhard in Seligenstadt.

These observations clearly show that former research erroneously saw the oldest transmission of Boethius’s consolation preserved in the Carolingian manuscripts of St Gallen and Reichenau. This impression becomes even more evident when we study the fragmentary Seligenstadt Boethius (= S), almost unknown in international codicology and classical research. Art historian and preservationist of Seligenstadt, Otto Müller, was the first discoverer of this bifolium, which he took from an old account book of Seligenstadt Abbey without, however, recording the exact provenance and date of this book. The great German palaeographer Bernhard Bischoff already knew about the existence of this precious fragment of Boethius, but never published a study on it. The fragment is preserved in the Landschaftsmuseum Seligenstadt under the shelfmark LAS 20/326.

The non-foliated and non-paginated folia served as a flexible envelope so that the outer pages are darkened and dirty (4 and 1), whereas the inner pages show the original condition and colour (2 and 3). The unfolded bifolium measures c. 21 × 36.5 cm and the space for the single column of text is c. 17.5 × 11.5–12 cm. In consequence of the cut upper margins, only twenty-two lines of the original are left; but the quantity of the lost text between the pages 1/2 and 3/4 respectively allows us to postulate at least three further lines of text. Thus, the original copy had twenty-five text lines, which allows the furt-assignant. Ita, dum alii dignam sapientiae palmam non capiunt, alii famam verentur indignam, a tam praecario opere destiterunt’, Lupus of Ferrières, Epistolae, ed. by Marshall, 1, pp. 1, l. 18–2, l. 10: Tischler, Einharts ‘Vita Karoli’, 1, 236–37.

136 ‘Plurima scribenda mihi alia mens suggessit; sed vestrum ingenium meis ineptiis ultra remorari non debui, quod scio vel exterioribus occupatum utilitatus vel circa intimas at abditas philosophiae rationes intentum’, Lupus of Ferrières, Epistolae, ed. by Marshall, 1, p. 3, ll. 9–12.

137 Schneege, ‘Theoderich der Grosse’, p. 27 (without quoting a source).

138 Krämer, Bibliographie Bernhard Bischoff, p. 195; Bischoff, Katalog, III, 347, no. 5979.

139 I myself have known the fragment’s existence since my letter exchange on Einhard with Dr Hermann Schefer (Lorsch) during the 1990s, when I prepared my Heidelberg PhD on the transmission and reception of Einhard’s Vita Karoli. After my academic posts in Bamberg (since 1999) and Frankfurt/Main (since 2001), I used the opportunity to see this fragment for the first time in 2001. Some weeks before going to Barcelona in 2013, I studied and described it again and made digitized photographs of it on 4 December 2012. Despite knowledge of this story appeared Allen, ‘Aus fuldischen Handschriften’.
ther assumption that the original manuscript showed a more or less square format, the typical size of classical text editions.140

The result of the text identification is that we hold some passages of book III of *De consolatione Philosophiae* in our hands, namely the paragraphs 6–8 and 10.141 Because of a lacuna between the pages 2 and 3, our bifolium cannot be the midmost bifolium of the layer; however, the quantity of the lost text between these two pages allows us to deduct the loss of two further bifolia of a regular quaternion of which our bifolium originally was the second one.

The text collation with the critical editions of Boethius’s consolation shows that the copy offers only minor variants and thus a text of the highest quality.142 Yet, on pages 1 and 2, the copy shows a Carolingian peculiarity, i.e. the double headings on the metres in III.6 and III.7, written in red classical Capitalis: ‘DACTILICVM ALCMANICVM . | TRIMETRVM YPERCATALECTVM’ and ‘IAMBICVM ANACREONTIVM . DIMETRVM . ACALECTICVM’. These headings do not belong to the original text, but were added only in the Carolingian period. They identify the metres in a manner we can also find in the already mentioned treatise on the metres of *De consolatione Philosophiae* by Lupus of Ferrières,143 and which are the product of his or another author’s pen.

Yet, where should we locate the exact place of production of the Seligenstadt Boethius? An answer to our question can be derived from the characteristics of

---

140 About the design of the Carolingian manuscripts of this work: Troncarelli, *Boethiana aetatis*, pp. 36–38; Troncarelli, *Cogitatio mentis*, pp. 28–36.
the Carolingian minuscule used by the main scribe and several further hands glossing the manuscript. The text is written in a round minuscule with an elaborated ‘a’ and a ‘g’ with a large lower loop. Other features are the extremely long bar (in its right part) of the letter ‘t’ in the ‘ampersand’ (i.e. the ligature ‘et’, e.g. p. 2, ll. 11 and 15) and the conscious avoiding of the ligature ‘st’ in ‘est’ (e.g. p. 3, l. 3). Special abbreviations are, on the one hand, the letter ‘e’ with an upper bar and between two points for ‘est’ (e.g. p. 2, ll. 7 and 17) and, on the other hand, the letters ‘ee’ also with an upper bar and between two points for ‘esse’ (e.g. p. 2, ll. 9 and 19). The paragraphs are marked by small initial letters or slightly enlarged majuscules. The majuscule ‘Q’ shows on some occasions Anglo-Saxon influence (from the model (?), e.g. p. 2, ll. 5 and 20). In contrast to the script of the Boethian text, the glosses, written in a slightly acute Carolingian minuscule, show in the two main hands some characteristics from Fulda: the one hand is still more influenced by the Anglo-Saxon minuscule that can be seen in the sharp-edged ‘a’, the round ‘d’, the sharp-edged, large, and slightly opened ‘f’, ‘p’, ‘r’, and ‘y’, and especially the still unfolded ‘g’ (e.g. p. 2, marginal glosses); the other hand, already younger, using a darker ink and supplementing the glosses, is distinguished by a round ligature ‘ct’, a sharp-edged ligature ‘rt’ and a further ligature ‘ni’ with the letter ‘i subscripta’. These features, found in a manuscript certainly not of Fuldan origin, show the close collaboration of two glossators, educated in different periods at this abbey (or another centre of Anglo-Saxon culture), who wrote their comments on the Boethian text at the same or slightly different time. These glosses of two directly sequential generations of writing show the well-known panorama of different styles of handwriting used more or less in parallel, known from the Fulda manuscripts in the phase of cultural transition during the 820s and 830s.

Much more important, however, is the localization of the main hand that wrote the Boethian text. The comparison with related contemporary manuscripts achieves the astonishing result that we see a hand that is similar to Walahfrid Strabo’s, identified by Bernhard Bischoff, but especially with the characteristic handwriting of some manuscripts of the imperial court under Louis the Pious. Hence, we may localize the Seligenstadt Boethius in the area of text transmission between the imperial court of Aachen and the monasteries of Fulda and Seligenstadt. This result leads us again on the path of the prominent protagonists of the contemporaneous reception of Boethius: Walahfrid Strabo, Lupus of Ferrières, and Einhard. We therefore may ask the question:

144 Bischoff, ‘Sammelhandschrift Walahfrid Strabos’.
145 Bischoff, ‘Hofbibliothek unter Ludwig dem Frommen’.
If our new Boethius is not preserved in Seligenstadt merely by chance, did it owe its very existence to Einhard himself? Did Einhard find, in the last years of his life, especially after the passing of his wife Imma in 836, his consolation with Lady Philosophy? In other words: if the Seligenstadt Boethius is actually Einhard’s personal copy, its existence could shed new light on his perception of the imperial court at Aachen in the years between 829 and 840. Although Einhard did not face, like Boethius did through Theoderic, exile, arrest, and capital punishment, the Carolingian intellectual nevertheless lived in a comparable situation during the last stage of his life, keeping distance from the political machinations of the court. Hence, this Seligenstadt Boethius could provide new evidence for Einhard dissociating himself from the Aachen court since the last years of the third decade of the ninth century.

Our panorama of the Carolingian reception of Boethius shall be concluded by the short presentation of another contemporaneous fragment, recently found in the Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars of Fulda. This piece contains the text of book iii.9 of De consolatione Philosophiae, but is not one of the missing bifolia of the Seligenstadt copy, because of its different page design and script. Following the palaeographic expertise of the German historian Hartmut Hoffmann, this new copy was produced in Fulda during the second third of the ninth century. In contrast to the Seligenstadt copy, the glosses of the Fulda fragment are less legible and have been dated to the fifteenth century. The quasi-non-existing variants betray another excellent Carolingian copy of this work of Boethius. The Fulda manuscript thus more or less parallels the Seligenstadt copy, which shows, that also Fulda, the old training centre of other Carolingian connoisseurs and readers of Boethius, such as Einhard and Lupus of Ferrières, possessed the main work of the ‘last Roman philosopher’.

Conclusion

This investigation of the early Carolingian renaissance of Boethius has shown that future research must be much more aware of the central role played by him in Carolingian political culture under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. The

146 Fulda, Bibliothek des Bischöflichen Priesterseminars, MS Fragm. 9: Sorbello Staub, ‘Ein unbekanntes Boethius-Fragment’.

147 Sorbello Staub, ‘Ein unbekanntes Boethius-Fragment’, p. 319 mentions the correct text ‘mica tu namque’ in verse 26 of Boethius, De consolatione Philosophiae, ed. by Moreschini, iii. metr.9, p. 80, which cannot be evaluated in contrast to the varia lectio ‘micat unamque’, already corrected in Lupus’s copy (= L).
renaissance must be seen in the greater panorama of the Carolingian memory of Ostrogothic culture, which was an important driving force for the establishment of a new Romanized empire, based on arts, historiography, biography, and philosophy. In general, the paper has shown that the Carolingian focus on Ostrogothic culture was multifaceted insofar as it was not only centred on Theoderic the Great but also on his most important court members and their cultural activities. In this framework, historical writing was only one form of cultural expression beside the wider Carolingian interest in late Roman Ostrogothic biographical, philosophical, and theological literature. The multi-layered cultural reception and perception of this work for Charlemagne’s new policy in Italy and his empire finally offered the basis of a sophisticated interpretation of Theoderic and his time under Charlemagne’s son Louis the Pious.
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A Carolingian Epitome of Orosius from Tours: Leiden VLQ 20

Robert Evans and Rosamond McKitterick

Introduction, by Rosamond McKitterick

Orosius’s Historiarum adversum paganos libri vii (Seven Books of History against the Pagans) was a ‘standard reference work of antiquity’, widely circulated throughout the Middle Ages.¹ It was one of the texts to be translated into Old English in the translating enterprise associated with King Alfred of Wessex.² It was incorporated into many histories during the early Middle Ages, especially by Carolingian authors.³ Its characterization by modern scholars as ‘Christian apologetic’, its specifically Christian perspective on the history of the world, the narrative history of the Roman Empire incorporated into a history of the world since the Creation, and episodes such as the sack of Rome by the Visigoth Alaric in 410, have all ensured its fame.⁴

¹ Orosius, Seven Books of History, trans. by Fear, p. 24.


⁴ Van Nuffelen, Orosius; Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister and Histoires, ed. by Arnaud-Lindet.
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The influence the text exerted on many historians in the Middle Ages has been amply documented and explored. There has been much very valuable work on Orosius in the contexts of the cultural transformations in Late Antiquity, and of late antique historiography and the creation of Christian historiographical forms and traditions. Several recent essays, which were originally delivered as papers at the same conference from which the present chapter emerged, discuss the composition and compilation of many historical texts from Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, and have been especially concerned with what these texts reveal of their immediate political and cultural contexts and possible motives for writing at all, let alone the inclusion of particular emphases, themes, or even single incidents in their narratives. A number of themes have emerged that are particularly pertinent when considering new Carolingian historical writing and its reception. One of these is the reworking and use of older histories, as well as the invocation of older historiographical exempla. Scott Johnson’s notion of interdependent and competing communal identities across the Mediterranean and Mesopotamian worlds is one of these. He has explained how a text, even if addressing a more distant past, needs not only to be considered in the political context of its own time, but may be designed to address particular contemporary issues. Another example, as Stefan Esders has argued, is the use Procopius made of the consequences of Vandal occupation of land in Africa in order to comment obliquely on Visigothic Spain’s conquest by Justinian. We have seen too how historiography could function as polemic as well as offering particular visions of community and understandings of empire. The historiography of empire, the relevance of biblical typology, and how divine favour might manifest itself have been further themes to emerge. History’s didactic function and the exempla, oral or admonitory, offered by humans in the past could provide, as Jamie Wood’s stress on the role of history in education indicated, not just a way of inculcating facts in the Gradgrind spirit, but also inspiring and shaping an imaginative understanding of, and sympathy with, the past. All of this provides a crucial context for assessing the Carolingian understanding of Orosius.

It is self-evident that readers and writers of history in the eighth and ninth centuries could potentially be in dialogue with the pasts of many different

5 See, for example, Blaudeau and Van Nuffelen, eds, L’historiographie tardo-antique.
6 Johnson, ‘Convergence and Multiplicity in Byzantine Historiography’.
7 Esders, ‘Procopius of Caesarea’.
9 Wood and Leonard, ‘History-Writing and Education’.
ancient and early medieval peoples as well as the history of Christianity and the champions of the Christian church, given that so many antique, early Christian, and earlier medieval historical texts were available in the Frankish kingdoms. The creation of an epitome of Orosius in Francia in the ninth century, therefore, would present Orosius in a different political and social context for correspondingly new purposes. Peter Van Nuffelen has suggested that historiography is a distorting mirror of society. How such distortion might work, what particular works of history might achieve when translated to a new cultural context, or how precisely a representation of a distant past can contribute to the creation of a particular identity, are amply illustrated, for example, in Helmut Reimitz's studies of the construction of a Frankish church history, and of Frankish historical identity, with particular reference to the work of Eusebius-Rufinus and Gregory of Tours.

The popularity and wide dissemination of Orosius, moreover, was charted in the famous 'check-list' of 245 manuscripts (including many fragments) containing the text of Orosius compiled by Janet Bately and David Ross in 1961. This represented a substantial augmentation of the initial survey carried out by Karl Zangemeister when preparing for his edition. This has since been extended in a checklist and studies of the transmission history by Lars Boje Mortensen, with particular reference to the twelfth-century copies, and with further isolated studies of a particular codex or groups of codices, such as that by Yann Coz. Since their work, Bischoff's monumental inventory of ninth-century manuscripts has been completed, which has added further precision.

The most useful survey of extant Orosius manuscripts to date remains that of Mortensen, whose early medieval items I list for convenience below, albeit reordered by date but with his categorizations retained. Eleven full manu-

---

10 I discuss some of these in McKitterick, History and Memory and Perceptions of the Past. See also Deliyannis, ed., Historiography in the Middle Ages, and Scharer and Scheibelreiter, eds, Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter.

11 Van Nuffelen, 'Introduction', p. 11.

12 Reimitz, 'The Social Logic', Reimitz, 'Transformations of Late Antiquity', and Reimitz, History.

13 Bately and Ross, 'A Checklist of Manuscripts'.

14 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister.

15 Mortensen, 'The Diffusion of Roman Histories'; Mortensen, 'Working with Ancient Roman History'; Mortensen, 'Orosius and Justinus in One Volume'; and Mortensen, 'Change of Style and Content'.

16 Coz, 'Quelques interprétations'.

17 Bischoff, Katalog der festländischen Handschriften, I, II, and III.
scripts and one abbreviated version of Orosius are extant from before 800 (one sixth- and one seventh-century copy, seven eighth-century copies), and a further twenty-three full texts, sets of fragments, compilations of excerpts, and abridged versions from the ninth century. I list only those that can be dated before or written at roughly the same time as Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. Lat. Q. 20 (hereafter VLQ 20) and therefore exclude those dated by Mortensen to the turn of the ninth century and later. I have added an asterisk (*) to the copies that appear to be Frankish epitomes of the text created from the second half of the eighth century onwards and the symbol † indicates that the manuscript was destroyed in World War II.

s. vi


s. vii


s. viii


4. Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, MS 19609 + Hanover, Kestner-Museum, MS CUL. i. 42 London, British Library, MS Add 24144(d) + Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 10399 (e), s. viii/1 N. Italy (uncial), *CLA*, ii, 171, v. p. 22, x, p. 31, FRAGMENTS.


18 To this can be added the more recently discovered fragment Düsseldorf, ULB, MS M0041, See Zechiel-Eckes, *Katalog*, pp. 64–65, and McKitterick, 'Werden im Spiegel seiner Handschriften', p. 352.
7. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 6308 s. viii Freising, books i–iv. 22 CLA, ix, 1271, FRAGMENT.

8. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 29416 (a) + 6315 (b) 8 ff. s. viii/1 ?Bobbio CLA, ix, 1274, FRAGMENTS.


10. 1Bamberg, Staatsarchiv + Sankt Paul in Kärnten, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 2/8 S. Italy, FRAGMENTS.

11. Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 9 (20) † s. ix3/3 Chartres.

12. *Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS VLQ 20, Tours, s. ix 2/4 and 3/4 ABRIDGED

13. Metz, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 187, s. ix Orosius + Dares Phrygius and Dictys Cretensis.


15. St Petersburg, Rossiĭskaya Natsional’naya Biblioteka (Publichnaia biblioteka imperatorskaia M.E. Saltykova Shchedrina), MS Fv.i.9 s. ix/1 ?Corvey.

16. St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 621, s. ix St Gallen.

17. *St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 878 s. ix2/4 s. Germany pp. 380–91 (i.7.3–iii.3.3). Walahfrid Strabo’s selection/abridgement in his vade mecum.19

18. Trier, Stadtbibliothek, Fragment-Mappe iii, s. ix Trier St Maximin, FRAGMENT.

19. Valenciennes, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 545, s. ix in Saint-Amand.


21. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 296 s. ix/1 ?Brittany.

22. Città del Vaticano, * Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 342, fols 104–28, s. ixin Tours. ABRIDGED.20

---

19 See Bischoff, ‘Eine Sammelhandschrift’ and Corradini, ‘Pieces of a Puzzle’.

20 I have not seen Ebbesmeyer, ‘The Epitome of Orosius in reg. lat. 342’, reported by
23. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 3852, fols 31r–50v, s. ix, i–vi.11 + Bede, *Chronica*, Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, etc.  

24. Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, MS Zanetti lat. 349 (1830).

25. Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare Eusebiana, MS 159 s. ix.

26. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS lat. 366, s. viii/ix Salzburg, *CLA*, x, 1476.

27. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS lat. 15318 s. ix, FRAGMENT.

28. † (? ) Wrocław, Biblioteka Universytecka, MS R 108 s. ix2/4 Halberstadt + *Severi epistolae*.

29. Zürich, Staatsarchiv, MS A.G. 19 No. xxi, s. viii/ix Chur. *CLA*, vii, 1011, FRAGMENT.

30. ‘Private collection’, s. viiex France (Corbie region), s. viiex + Solinus, *CLA*, vii, 1178 (this was the Donaueschingen Fürstlich-Fürstenburgische Hofbibliothek, MS 18, sold at Sotheby’s in 1982; bought by H. P. Kraus, sold again and now in another private collection).  

31. Albi, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 29, s. vii/ix Spain or S. France ‘collections of excerpts’.

32. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 396, s. ixex British Isles or Brittany ‘collections of excerpts’.

In addition to the abbreviated versions from the eighth and ninth centuries recorded above, Mortensen’s full list also contains twelve such condensations made in the twelfth century and a further seventeen in the fifteenth century. The obvious question is whether the abridged versions that surface as a consequence of his survey are all related descendants of one that gained currency, or whether the abridgements are independent, and each done to answer particular Mortensen. The text starts at book i but breaks off at fol. 128v in the middle of book vii.40.4; it would merit closer attention.

---

21 See Lozovsky, ‘Roman Geography’.

22 Sotheby’s, *Catalogue of Western Illuminated Manuscripts from the Library of Donaueschingen*. 
interests. Our impression so far of the early medieval abridgements at least, though without detailed confirmatory study as yet, is that the latter appears to be the case. That is, a number of independent epitomes were created. There is also a question mark over those described as incomplete, or as ‘extracts’ or ‘collections of excerpts’, for they would also merit further investigation in order to determine the nature of the incompleteness, or whether a rationale for the excerpts can be discerned. This is not the place to pursue such a comprehensive enquiry, but we hope the analysis of one of the abridgements or epitomes here will serve to indicate how revealing a study of them could be. Excerpts and epitomes of course raise the questions of their function, and whether the full text was to be read beside the distillation in the epitome, or whether an epitome represented a substitute. The codicological context of each epitome suggests that the answers to these questions will vary.

Excerpts and fragments, therefore, are valuable evidence, in their own right and do more than simply offer evidence of the existence of a full copy of the narrative from which the abridgement was made. Above all it needs to be emphasized that Orosius was not merely copied in the early Middle Ages. In the processes of compilation, excerpting and, above all epitomizing, the principal message of the text was adapted by readers and users in ways that throw a particular light on the understanding of Orosius in the Middle Ages. It is on one of these epitomes, that in Leiden, VLQ 20, therefore, that we have chosen to focus.

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. Lat. Q 20

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20 is a substantial and generously proportioned corpus of historical texts. The codex comprises two codicological units, both of which were written in a proficient Tours minuscule dated to the second and third quarter of the ninth century. The first, fols 1–8, consists of one quire containing texts relating to the history of the Franks. Written a few decades later than the second portion it was bound with the second portion at a later stage, though it also witnesses to the compilation of different historical texts and excerpts in Carolingian Tours. The second portion of the book comprises what can be described as an ‘Alexander dossier’. It contains, besides the Historia Alexandri Magni of Quintus Curtius Rufus already men-

23 Bischoff, Katalog der festländischen Handschriften, ii, no. 2215, p. 57.
tioned, the texts of the letter to Aristotle attributed to Alexander the Great, the purported exchange of letters between Alexander and Dindimus, king of the Brahmans, the epitome of Orosius’s *Seven Books of History against the Pagans*, and extracts from the *Chronicle* of Isidore of Seville. I have discussed elsewhere the significance of the dossier as a whole, as well as the particular treatment accorded Alexander and the different readings of his career represented by Curtius, Orosius, and in the letters in this codex.  

VLQ 20 has received most attention in the past simply as one of the earliest copies of Q. Curtius Rufus’s *History of Alexander*. This copy of Curtius’s *Historia Alexandri magni* is one of five extant from the Carolingian period alone, three others of which come, like the Tours codex, from the Loire region and belong to the same branch of the text family. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 451 from Ferrières may have been designed as an historical corpus as well, for it includes the *Notitia provinciarum*, sometimes entitled the *Notitia Galliarum*, a list of the bishoprics of Gaul ordered according to the ecclesiastical provinces to which they belonged.  

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5716 belongs to a different and uninterpolated tradition though it too is from the Loire region, and is famous for having been written for a Count Conrad by the scribe Haimo.  

The Orosius epitome needs to be set against the background of the survival and transmission of copies of Orosius’s *Seven Books of History against the Pagans* indicated above, in order to understand the specific context for the inclusion of this text in the codex, four hundred years after the composition of the original text. The company kept by the Orosius epitome in the Tours codex also needs to be borne in mind, not least when we come to consider the emphasis emerging in it. Hitherto not investigated, this epitome, occupying fols 129–140, and presenting Orosius’s history from Ninus the Assyrian to Alaric the Visigoth, that is, from Babylon to the sack of Rome, offers an individual Carolingian distillation of the text. It is entitled: ‘OPUSCOLA DE LIBRO HISTORIARUM OROSII EXCERPTA ET IN UNU(M) BREVIARIU(M) COLLECTA’. If one wonders about such questions as what Carolingian readers did with the facts and figures of ancient Roman history, how great their knowledge might have been about the history of the Roman Empire, or what prompted them to reproduce, circulate, and

---

25 McKitterick, ‘Ancient History at Carolingian Tours’, I repeat some of the information in this paper in the following paragraph.


reshape this information, then VLQ 20 may indicate answers at least as far as early Carolingian Tours is concerned.

The responses to the text can be seen from the following schematic summary of topics and episodes included in VLQ 20, and from the omissions. Full discussion of the implications of these inclusions and omissions as far as the degree to which Orosius’s principal theme and concerns are maintained is in Robert Evans’s section below.

A: VLQ 20. The Epitome

I. 4 (4.1, 4.4, 4.5) The conquests of Ninus of Assyria and of his wife Semiramis; 5 (5.1–2) Sodom and fate compared to Rome; 7 (7.3) Flood in Achaea; 8 (8.1) Glut and famine in Egypt; 9 (9.1) Flood in Thessaly and some took refuge on Mt Parnassus; 10 (10.19) The great heat in Egypt; 11 (11.4) Perseus gives his name to Persians; 12 (12.2, 12.9) Oedipus and incest; 13 (13.4) Mounted Thessalians believed to be centaurs; 15 and 16 (15.1–5, 15.7; 16.1) The Amazons; 19 (19.1, 19.6, 19.9, 19.10) Fall of Sardanapalus. Assyria and rise of Medes.

II. 2–3 (2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.9, 2.10; 3.2, 3.5, 3.6) Some of the theory of the four kingdoms; 4 (4.1) Foundation of Rome; 6–7 (6.1, 6.2, 6.4, 6.5; 7.1, 7.6) Cyrus’s capture of Jerusalem; 8–9 (8.1, 8.4, 8.5; 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4–8 summary, 9.9, 9.10) Persian attacks on Greece, Spartans, Leonidas and Pass of Thermopylae; 12 (12.2, 12.3) Plague in Rome; 13 (13.8) Earthquakes in Italy; 18 (18.6 Earthquake and volcanic eruption in Sicily).

III. 3 (3.1, 3.2, 3.3) Earthquake in Achaea; 5 (5.1) Fragment on plague at Rome; 7 (7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6–9, 7.10) Treaty with Carthage. Birth of Alexander the Great; 10 (10.2, 10.3) Fragment on wars in Italy; 13 (13.2) Fragment on Philip of Macedon; 16–20 (16.1, 16.2, 16.4, 16.5, 16.6, 16.8, 16.9, 16.10–12, 16.14; 17.1, 17.3–4 [paraphrase], 17.5–7, 17.8, 17.9; 18.5–6, 18.8–11; 19.1–11; 20.1–4) ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

IV. 4–5 (4.1–5; 5.1–2) Rome’s wars in Italy and plague at Rome; 6 (6.11) Carthage; 7, 8, and 11 (7.12; 8.10–12, 8.15; 11.5–6, 11.8) Episodes from Punic war; 13 (13.12–14) Rome’s war against the Gauls; 15–19 (15.1–2; 16.4–5, 16.18–19; 17 end of 2–3) Episodes from Second Punic War; 20–22 (20.29; 22.4–6) Rome’s wars in East and in Spain; 23 (23.1, 23.3–6) Episodes from Third Punic War.
v. 6 (6.1–4 some lines omitted) Prodigies such as boy born in Rome with four hands and feet, etc.; Mt Etna erupts; wheat grows on trees in Bononia; Slave rebellion in Sicily; 9 (9.4–5) Tiberius Gracchus; 11 (11.2–3) Plague of locusts in Africa; 16 (16.1, 16.3) Marius's political career; 18 (18.3–8, 18.8–10) The social war.


vii. 3 (3.4) Christ redeemer of the World; 4 (4.1, 4.11) Tiberius succeeding as emperor and collapse of amphitheatre in Rome; 5–7 (5.1, 5.9, 5.10; 7.1–4, 7.6, 7.8–9, 7.13) Julio-Claudian emperors; 8 (8.1, 8.3); The Year of the Four Emperors; 9–10 (9.13; 10.1, 10.2–5, 10.7) The Flavian dynasty; 12–14 (12.5, 12.8; 13.1–3; 14.1, 14.2) brief notes on the Emperors Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian and Christians; 15–16 (15.1, 15.3, 15.4, 15.11; 16.1, 16.5, 16.6) The 'adoptive' emperors; 17–18 (17.1, 17.4; 18.1–4, 18.6, 18.8) Severan dynasty. 19–24 (19.1, 19.3, 20.1; 21.2–4; 22.1, 22.4–5, 22.13–14; 23.3; 24.1, 24.2–4) The third century; 25 (25.1, 25.13, 25.14, 25.15–16 [summarized]); Diocletian and the Tetrarchy; 28–30 (28.1; 29.2–5, 29.7; 30.1–2, 30.4) Rule of Constantine and his sons; 31–33 (31.1; 32.1, 32.4, 32.6) The emperors Jovian, Valentinian, and Valens; 34–35 (34.1 [one phrase], 34.2 [end of sentence only], 34.7; 35.23) The rise, rule, and death of Theodosius the Great. 36 (36.2–4 summary, 36.5, 36.7, 36.13) War in Africa; 39 (39.1, 39.3, 39.5–9, 39.11, 39.14, 39.15) Alaric's sack of Rome; 40 (40.2–7, 40.7, 40.9–15, 40.17, 40.18) Barbarian incursions into the empire.

B: VLQ 20. The Omissions

i. 1 Consensus of when history begins; 2 The geography of the world; 3 the Flood; 10 all the plagues of Egypt and story of Phaeton; 12 Eteocles and Polinices. Medea. Crete versus Athens; 14 Egypt’s war against the Scythians; 19 the Trojan War; 20 the crimes of Aremulus king of the Latins; 21 Spartan wars and the Athenian Empire.

ii. 1 Some of theory of four kingdoms; 5 Brutus, establishment of Roman Republic, and Rome’s early wars; 14 the troubles of Sicily and expedition to the Peloponnesian War; 15–17 the last stages of the Peloponnesian war;
liberty at Athens restored by Thrasybulus; 18 most of the civil war in Persia; 19 Rome’s siege of Veii, death of the Fabii, sack of Rome by the Gauls.

III. 1–2 Artaxerxes and Greece. Wars caused by Sparta; 4 plague at Rome; 6 Gallic invasion of Italy; 8–11 wars in Italy; 12–14 career of Philip of Macedon; 21–22 Rome’s wards in Italy; 23 wars of Alexander’s successors.

IV. 1–3 Rome’s war against Pyrrhus and the Tarentines; 9–10 First Punic War episodes; 12 Lament for the ills of the period; 14 Second Punic War episodes.

V. 1–2 Comparison of the past with the present; 3–5 Rome’s wars in the East and Spain; 8 Tiberius Gracchus; 12 Gaius Gracchus; 13 Rome’s capture of Balearic Islands, eruption of Mt Etna; 14 Rome’s wars with Gauls; 15 Jugurthine Wars, rise of Marius; 17 end of Marius’s career; 19 Rome’s war against Mithridates; 20–21 rise and reign of Sulla; 22 Lament for the ills of the periods; 23 Rome’s wars across the world; 24 Spartacus’s uprising and lament for the ills of the period.

VI. 1 Nature of divine providence; 2–5 Rome’s wars with Mithridates; 6 Catiline’s conspiracy; 8–12 Caesar’s Gallic Wars; 13 Crassus’s defeat in Parthia; 14 Varied fortune of Rome; 15 Civil war between Caesar and Pompey; 16 Caesar’s rule; 18 Continued rise of Octavian; 19 Career of Octavian.

VII. 1–2 Theology of history; 3 Omits phrase that Christ was enrolled as a Roman citizen; 6 Career of Emperor Claudius; 26 Rise of Constantine; 27 Allegorical treatment of ten plagues of Egypt; 33 Part of careers of Valentinian and Valens; 37–38 War and intrigues in Europe; 41 Incursions of barbarians into empire; 42–43 Imperial recovery; 43 Goths as allies of Rome; 43 Valedictory address to Augustine.

Thus the epitomizer has omitted Orosius’s geographical introduction, even though, as Andrew Merrills has made clear, this introduction was emulated by many different history writers in the early Middle Ages. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm 396, for example, extracted Orosius’s geographical introduction as a complement to portions of Isidore’s *De natura rerum*. A further interest in the geographical elements is reflected in St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 621 studied by Natalia Lozovsky. The VLQ 20 epitome makes brief refer-

---

28 Merrills, *History and Geography*.

29 Lozovsky, ‘Roman Geography’. See also Eisenhut, *Die Glossen Ekkeharts IV* and Szerwiniack, ‘Un commentaire hiberno-latin’ (on BAV, MS Vat. lat. 1650).
ences to many of the themes of the full work, but the details are omitted, such as almost all the plagues and invasions of Egypt, many regional wars, and even the Fall of Troy. On the other hand all the details of the cruelty of Semiramidhis are included. From book ii, many details about the very early history of Rome and the civil wars in Greece and Persia are omitted, and in book iii a few short incidents serve simply to introduce the history of Alexander the Great. That is, the pages Orosius originally devoted to Philip of Macedon, the Roman wars in Italy, and the wars of Alexander’s successors are all omitted. Book iv is essentially an abridged account of the Punic Wars, whereas book v retains very little about wars and is more interested in prodigies and the political history of Rome. The importance of book vi in Orosius’s original full text is maintained, for it preserves the information on Caesar, Octavian-Augustus, and signals the birth of Christ. The abridged version of book vii is, as in the full text, far longer and more detailed than those of books i, ii, iv, v, and vi. Nevertheless it creates a mechanical effect in the gallop through time, emperor by emperor, with one simple phrase for each. Yann Coz drew attention to the interest in various misfortunes suffered during the imperial era in the epitome.\textsuperscript{30} I should like to add the emphasis placed on the persecution of Christians and Orosius’s enumeration of these, according to the epitome at least, in eight phases rather than Orosius’s original ten.

This Leiden epitome, therefore, contrives to give Orosius’s original history a different character. It would seem that this particular Carolingian interpretation of Orosius neither read nor wished to present it primarily as Roman history. There are no dates to regulate the chronology, only the succession of rulers from east to west and the comparisons made between Babylon and Rome, even though Orosius himself used the \textit{ab urbe condita} dating system. The portents and curiosities are retained as if to underscore the idea of the world of nature and human affairs disrupted therewith over which men had no control. They include the Amazons, the baby with two heads, earthquakes, heat, blood from fountains, the disastrous floods in Thessaly, the vision of the gaping mouth of hell after an earthquake in Rome, women filled with poison in Rome, incidents of unnatural marriages, and the excesses of some rulers, earthquakes, heat, blood from fountains, milk falling as rain. There are some ‘origin stories’ preserved, such as that of Perseus and the Persians, the origin and foundation of Rome and of Constantinople. Some omissions may reflect disagreement. Orosius had commented at the end of his \textit{Histories} that the many wars against the barbarians he had recounted had defeated them ‘minimo sanguine, nullo certamine ac

\textsuperscript{30} Coz, ‘Quelques interprétations’.
paene sine caede’ (with minimal bloodshed, no battles and hardly any killing), but the epitomizer omitted those phrases.

Nevertheless, the narrative it does present reflects the historical imagination and understanding of a place in time, and communicates a sense of being heirs to a past peopled by men and women who behaved both nobly and very badly. Too much concentration on the facts and figures of the past and the particular stories may detract from the original function in a sense as mnemonic devices to remember the past as a whole, but more crucially might cause us to forget the relationship with the past that these texts served. Understanding the study of the past, whether as a rise or fall of empires or as a series of exemplars and awful warnings in a long story of mankind, was part of the imaginative conceptualization of a community, an understanding of a place in history that all Christians in the early medieval world, from Britain to Iraq, had in common. In general, however much of the pagan and biblical past was filtered, it formed part of a shared past because history compilers and composers present it as the foundation of all their own historical writing. Different aspects of this shared inheritance were developed, registered, used, and incorporated into larger works. The manifestations we see of that understanding in so many Carolingian manuscripts are what texts such as the Tours epitome of Orosius help us to understand.

As far as the layout and copying process of the text is concerned, the epitome of Orosius is presented without any indications of books or chapters, and almost all indications of chronology are omitted apart from the reigns of the emperors in book vii. The scribe, although a skilled calligrapher, also had many problems with the Latin terminology and especially personal names and proper nouns, so that many names of individuals, for example, are mangled. For example, ‘pleni collo et pectus’ is a phrase written instead of the names ‘Plynos et Scolopetius’ (1.15.1) (fol. 130r). Other names were presumably so unfamiliar to the scribe that they were rendered almost unrecognizable. Thus Buccephalen in most full texts becomes Bechesalam in the epitome. Some of these oddities may be due to the difficulties of the exemplar presented to the scribe when he was making his abridgement. The exemplar itself may have been corrupt and full of errors which the scribe lacked the expertise or confidence to correct. It seems certain that the exemplar, whatever its origin and date, lacked word division or much punctuation, for neither is a prominent feature of Latin manuscripts before the eighth century.31 There are many places in the text where the lack of a clear

31 On the history of word separation see briefly Bischoff, Paläographie, pp. 218–19; English trans. Latin Palaeography by Ó Crónin and Ganz, p. 173, and the painstaking survey by Saenger, Space between Words; Parkes, Pause.
word division also occasions problems for the reader and can distort the sense. Misreadings of the script, whether the uncial, half uncial, or insular half-uncial like those in the earliest extant copies, or possibly unfamiliar ligatures or abbreviations, could also explain some of the VLQ 20 scribe’s errors. A further possibility is that the method of transcription might have been from dictation, and the scribe was therefore at the mercy both of the speaker’s pronunciation, not least of unfamiliar words, and the speaker’s decisions about the presentation of the grammatical units and prompts for punctuation. All the same, it is difficult to imagine what led to the substitution of ‘toga’ for ‘tuba’ on fol. 140r line 17, even if one is reminded of Monty Python’s ‘Blessed are the cheesemakers’ in the Life of Brian! Very little work has been done on the processes of copying and how far dictation might have been employed in any early medieval writing office, and thus on the written forms recording oral delivery. The Carolingian period was one in which many efforts were made to regularize Latin grammar and orthography, not least at Tours itself. Franz Unterkircher proposed dictation as one way to account for the wild orthography he discerned in the famous Vienna manuscript of the Lorsch annals. Many early medieval charters and letters may also have been a consequence of dictation, and further research may be able to posit survivals of speech patterns in these texts and their orthography. All in all, despite its peculiarities, this epitome offers a glimpse of how the text was received and adapted in a Carolingian context, to a fuller discussion of which the rest of this article is devoted.

32 Some of these copying problems were addressed by Brunhölzl, ‘Zu den sogenannten archetypii’, pp. 16–31 and ‘Die sogenannten Afrikaner’. See also Lowe, ‘The Script of the Farewell and Date Formulae’, reprinted in E.A. Lowe Palaeographical Papers, ed. by Bieler, and Bischoff, Paläographie, pp. 57–60; Bischoff, Latin Palaeography, pp. 41–43.

33 Alcuin, De orthographia, ed. by Bruni. On pronunciation reforms see the comments by Wright, Late Latin and Early Romance.

34 Unterkircher, Das Wiener Fragment der Lorscher Annalen.

35 For discussions of the relation between orality and literacy see, for example, Banniard, Viva voce, Green, Medieval Listening and Reading, Doane and Braun Pasternak, eds, Vox intexta, Clayton and Rothstein, eds, Influence, Reichl, ed., Medieval Oral Literature, and O’Brien O’Keeffe, Visible Song.
Adapting Orosius’s Historiae for a Carolingian Context,
by Robert Evans

Carolingian authors made considerable use of late antique Christian texts and Orosius’s Historiae were no exception.36 The impact of Orosius on early medieval historiography has long been acknowledged.37 Frechulf of Lisieux explicitly based many passages of his own history on Orosius’s accounts.38 The Historiae also informed political advice and biblical exegesis. Sedulius Scottus, for example, used various Orosian exempla to illustrate his De Christianis rectoribus (although without naming Orosius himself).39 Paschasius Radbertus, Hrabanus Maurus, Christian of Stavelot all pointed their readers to Orosius in their commentaries on Matthew.40 Hrabanus also added the marginal note OROS in his commentary on Jerome.41 Orosius was, therefore, being read and used in ninth-century intellectual circles. As Rosamond McKitterick has suggested above, the Orosius epitome in VLQ 20 allows us to observe this process of reading and adaptation in greater detail.

VLQ 20 provided, as McKitterick has argued elsewhere, ‘a fluent Epitome [...] with some very clever cutting and summarizing to create a distinctive brief history’.42 Although its history of Alexander the Great made it conform to the overall subject matter of the manuscript, the epitome took the reader from Ninus the Assyrian to Alaric the Goth, just as Orosius had originally done. The choices about what to cut and how to summarize allows us to see how a Carolingian scribe (or possibly whoever was dictating to the scribe) went about reading earlier Christian histories. Orosius had written in the distinct context of the early fifth century, probably addressing the Roman elites fleeing the sack

36 McKitterick, eds, Carolingian Culture; Gantner, McKitterick, and Meeder, eds, The Resources of the Past.
37 Werner, ‘L’historia’, p. 137; Smalley, Historians, pp. 44–45. For Orosius, compare the full text in Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister; trans. by Fear. The most recent discussion is Van Nuffelen, Orosius.
38 E.g. Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, 1.2.17, p. 116.
39 Sedulius, De rectoribus Christianis, ed. and trans. by Dyson, 14, p. 139; 17, pp. 167, 169.
40 Paschasius Radbertus, Expositio in Matheo libri XII, ed. by Bede, xii, p. 1381, l. 3722; Hrabanus Maurus, Expositio in Matthaeum, ed. by Löfstedt, preface, p. 2; Christian of Stavelot, Expositio in Matthaei, ed. by Huygens, 24, p. 434.
41 A lovely example of this can be found at St Gallen, Stibi, MS Cod. Sang. 282, p. 92. I am grateful to Graeme Ward for drawing my attention to this.
of Rome and whom he believed to have received an education that was still largely pagan. Although Orosius has often been denigrated as Augustine’s ‘henchman [...] [who] didn’t understand a tithe of what [Augustine] said to him,’ Van Nuffelen has shown the coherence of the Historiae’s overall apologetic strategy. For the scribe in ninth-century Tours, we must consider how far this apologetic strategy, especially in the sense of being anti-pagan, remained relevant and how much the epitome adapted Orosius’s message for contemporary audiences.

The epitomizer was interested in a wide range of details. Although shortened, Orosius’s narratives of Ninus (i.4.1–7), the Amazons (i.15.1–7), Cyrus (ii.6.1–5), Thermopylae (ii.9.1–8), Alexander (iii.7.5–17.9), and the Roman general Regulus’s battle with a giant snake (iv.8.11–15) received generous treatment in the pre-incarnational narrative. Julius Caesar’s career was condensed to half a page, with the epitomizer interested primarily in the details of the Gallic tribes he conquered (vi.7.12–13) and then the civil war following his assassination (vi.7.16, 17.1, 4). Large sections of Orosius’s history were simply ignored, such as the wars of the Didachoi (iii.21–23). Others were summarized in a single line. Although the epitomizer was ruthless in what he cut, it is nonetheless striking that most of Orosius’s own interjections into the narrative were also omitted. Most of Orosius’s editorial comments about how he was writing were removed while surrounding detail was kept. For example, at i.12.1, Orosius told the reader that he would himself need to omit various details in order to cover all times, but the epitomizer moved straight onto the account of Assyria at i.12.2 (fol. 130v). This muted Orosius’s own authorial identity within the text.

Similarly, Orosius’s editorial explanations of history were largely ignored. The epitome began with Ninus (i.4.1), omitting Orosius’s account of God’s rule of history. Similarly, the epitomizer cut the prefaces to books II, III, V, and VII, where Orosius set out his so-called ‘theology of history’ in greatest detail. This suggests an epitomizer concerned with details and events rather than the framework in which they were presented. This extended to omitting Orosius’s many attempts to demonstrate Christianity’s superiority to pagan-
ism. The epitomizer, for example, cut an anecdote about Alexander in Egypt which proved that Alexander believed the gods ‘to be both deaf and dumb,’ but kept the sentences which introduced and concluded the anecdote, about invading Egypt and the foundation of Alexandria. The epitomizer may have simply wanted brief historical details (rather than anecdotes) or may have been deliberately stripping the *Historiae* of their apologetic language. The latter is suggested by the epitome’s account of the miraculous hailstorm which prevented Hannibal taking Rome (iv.17.3–7). This omitted the following demand by Orosius: ‘now let the critics of the true God reply to me in this place: whether Roman fortitude or divine mercy prevented Hannibal capturing and sacking Rome?’ This shows that the epitomizer could pay close attention to the detail of the *Historiae* but nonetheless chose to cut Orosius’s conversations with his imagined pagan audience. Without a pagan audience of his own, these imagined conversations would have had little relevance for a scribe in Carolingian Tours. This removal of apologetic material can be found in how various Carolingian authors, such as Frechulf and Hrabanus, used patristic material, including Orosius.

One passage, however, suggests that the epitomizer’s intentions were more complex. The epitomizer carefully replicated Orosius’s juxtaposition of Babylon and Rome’s similar histories (ii.3.3) while emphasizing how Rome had survived where Babylon had fallen (ii.3.5). Orosius had explained that God had mercy on Rome on account of its Christian population (ii.3.7) and called on his pagan readers to ‘stop scourging the religion and provoking God’s patience.’ The epitomizer cut these statements, apparently continuing to remove apologetic language in the way we have seen so far. The epitomizer, nonetheless, included two of Orosius’s theological interpretations of this juxtaposition:

I show from the fact that all the ancient histories begin from Ninus, all Roman histories from Procas, that all these things came to pass through the ineffable mysteries and the deepest of God’s judgements and not by human powers or uncertain causes.

---


51 Orosius, *Historiae*, ed. by Zangemeister, ii.3.8–10, p. 87: ‘desinant religionem lacerare et lacesere patientiam Dei propter quam habent’.

52 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 130v, ‘Ut autem omnia haec ineffabilibus mysteriis
Further on, the epitomizer wrote: ‘These things deserve to be recorded, so that [his readers] might understand by this partial revelation of the great mystery the ineffable judgements of God that the One God has ordained these events.’

For the first time, the epitomizer claimed for his own Orosius’s explicit theological language about God’s rule of history. This extended to the moral lesson of comparing Rome and Babylon, that people ‘might learn that it is through [God’s] clemency that we are alive and that our life is wretched through our own excesses’. The readers in question were those ‘who, being foolish, murmur about these Christian times’. This alluded to Orosius’s pagan readers, but was less explicit than other cases that were omitted. Whereas comments in Orosius’s authorial voice were often omitted along with the broader apologetic passages in which they appeared, here the epitomizer felt happy preserving them. Although Orosius’s emphasis on God’s agency and rule had been part of his anti-pagan apologetic, it remained theologically and morally relevant to a Carolingian audience long after its apologetic purpose had gone.

The epitomizer did not, therefore, seem to have been creating a simple compilation of historical facts. We must now consider whether the rest of the epitome shows similar evidence of broader moral purposes and how this aligned with the epitomizer’s emphasis on humanity’s survival through God’s clemency and suffering through its own sin. In many cases, the epitomizer’s streamlining meant that many of Orosius’s references to God’s agency were simply dropped along with the episodes which they interpreted. It is significant, however, that the epitomizer faithfully replicated so many of Orosius’s omens and portents. Such events were of great moral and theological interest to contemporary Carolingian thinkers. This epitome was different, however, since it recorded long past portents and their results rather than inquiring into...
contemporary omens. The epitome often juxtaposed these portents with later disasters. A strange birth, the eruption of Etna, and the growing of wheat on trees in Bononia were all immediately followed by a slave revolt (v.6.1–4). The epitome repeatedly implied a connection between omens and disasters.

The epitomizer at one point even viewed portents differently from Orosius. During the Punic Wars, rivers of blood and mysterious lights were followed by an earthquake (iv.13.12–13). The Roman general Flaminius fought and defeated the Gauls ‘in contempt of the auspices’.\(^{57}\) For Orosius, Flaminius’s defiance was evidence of the auspices’ failure and evidence against pagan belief. The epitomizer, however, moved straight onto more terrifying lights and shields in the sky, after which Hannibal defeated Flaminius (iv.15.2) and besieged Rome (iv.16.4–5). The epitomizer even included Orosius’s outburst of sorrow that followed these defeats, ‘shall I say more of the Roman’s wickedness or wretchedness?\(^{58}\) The contraction of Orosius’s narrative substantially increased the connection between the omens and defeat, with Flaminius exemplifying not rational scepticism but foolish contempt. The epitomizer seems to have intended his readers to understand that prodigies and portents, including natural disasters, should be interpreted as presaging further disaster.

The epitomizer could, therefore, be seen as drawing certain moral lessons from history. This implicit moral teaching continued with his portrayal of the eight persecuting emperors.\(^{59}\) The persecutions by Titus, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Maximinus, Decius, Valerian, and Gallienus were almost all juxtaposed with their deaths or other disasters. Trajan ‘deceived by error’ persecuted the Christians (vii.11.1, 3), and Nero’s Golden Palace ‘immediately’ (\textit{continuo}) caught fire (vii.12.3–4). Maximinus began the fifth persecution ‘but immediately (\textit{continuo}) […] he was killed at Aquileia’ (vii.19.1). The epitomizer’s interest in persecutions even extended to cutting all of Aurelian’s achievements, making his reign and death entirely about his persecution (vii.23.3). Hadrian, by contrast, decreed that no one could harm the Christians without evidence and ‘immediately’ (\textit{continuo}) was ‘called Father of the \textit{Patria}’ (vii.13.2–3). Although God was not explicitly mentioned, the patterns clearly reflected the moral lessons of history.\(^{60}\) The epitome was entirely consistent with Orosius’s overall judgement on the persecutors and highlighted this to the exclusion of

\(^{57}\) Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 134\(^{\text{r}}\): ‘\textit{contemptis auspiciis}’ (Orosius, iv.13.14).

\(^{58}\) Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 135\(^{\text{r}}\): ‘\textit{dicam inprobitatem magis ac miseriam romanorum}’ (Orosius, iv.16.18).

\(^{59}\) See above, p. 134.

almost everything else. The exception, oddly, was Nero, whose other crimes were listed in detail but not his persecutions.

Most of the epitome only hinted at God’s agency, since Orosius’s most explicit statements about providence were confined to his editorial summaries and preface, which had been cut. The incarnation, however, presented a significant watershed in the epitome’s religious language (as it had in Orosius’s own narrative). The epitomizer maintained Orosius’s connection between Augustus and Christ’s birth (although this had been ignored earlier, III.8.7). The epitome also repeated a portent of Augustus’s rule, miraculous oil, and within a few lines added its Christological interpretation, ‘What could be more obvious than that this sign declared that the birth of Christ would occur when Caesar ruled the whole world?’, presumably because Christ meant ‘anointed’. This was the only omen interpreted so explicitly within the epitome. The epitomizer later added that when Augustus’s affairs were settled, ‘the Lord Christ was born’ and ‘when Caesar, through God’s decree, had established […] peace Christ was born for whose coming that peace was a servant’. The repetition of Christ’s birth framed Augustus’s rule (as it had in Orosius), while the account of that rule was significantly contracted in the epitome. The synchronicity of Christ’s birth and Augustus’s reign were worth noting for the epitomizer, but most other details were not.

This was not the only synchronization of ‘Roman’ and ‘Christian’ time which the epitomizer noted. The Christian Emperor Philip’s rule coincided with Rome’s millennium, which thus ‘happened under the rule of Christ rather than that of idols’ (vii.28.2). Even without the anti-pagan apologetic, the Christian structure of time was of interest to the epitomizer. The only other details in Augustus’s reign, apart from peace and concord, were diplomatic. Indian envoys recognized Augustus with the glory of Alexander (vi.21.19), continuing the overall manuscript’s interest in Alexander.

---


62 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 136v: ‘Indiebus ipsis olei largissimus fons sicut superius expressi de taberna merituria per totum diem fluxit. Quod signum quid evidenter quam in diebus caesaris toto orbe regenti futura christi natuinitas declarata est’ (Orosius, vi.1.20).6

63 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 136v: ‘natus est dominus Christus […] pacem ordinationem dei Caesar composuit natus est Christus cuius adventui pac ista famulata est’ (Orosius, vi.17.10, 20.5).

64 For Carolingian interest in India, see Hen, ‘Alcuin’, and for the Alexander parallel, see McKitterick, ‘Ancient History at Carolingian Tours’.
Following the incarnation, Orosius’s narrative became more explicit about God’s agency, even acting as a ‘panegyrical of God’s deeds’. Although the epitomizer streamlined this book as he had the others, it is significant that so many of these statements of God’s agency within the narrative were preserved. The epitomizer summarized Julian’s reign, for example, in two sentences. Having persecuted the Church, he prepared to invade Persia ‘with God’s anger coming’, and was killed. This was not verbatim from Orosius, but adapted from Orosius’s two statements, firstly that Julian gathered his troops ‘for destined destruction’, and secondly that ‘merciful God dissolved the plans of the impious by death’. The epitomizer, therefore, simplified the account while maintaining God’s agency. Whereas Orosius’s apologetic language had been fairly consistently removed, here we see his theological language being received and adapted.

The epitomizer’s interest in God’s agency can be seen most clearly in the drastically contracted narrative from Constantius II to Adrianople (of which Julian’s reign was part). This section began with Orosius’s summary that ‘the Devil’s constant and evil hatred against the True God was disturbing the hearts of men with a diffuse cloud of errors’. The imperfect tense in Orosius reflected his phrase ‘from the beginning of time until now’, but the epitomizer cut this phrase, confining Satan’s agency to what immediately followed. The Christian emperors, the epitomizer continued, ‘were changing things for the better’, but now moved from persecution of the Church by idolatry to heresy, as the ‘Arian error’ seduced Constantius II (vii.29.3). Following Julian’s own disaster, Valens was baptized by Eudoxius the Arian (vii.32.6).

The epitomizer then cut various details to move onto why the Goths invaded the Roman Empire (vii.33.10). Within a few lines, therefore, the reader moves

---

65 Van Nuffelen, Orosius, pp. 156–57.
66 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139r: ‘Sed cum aduersum partos bellum paras ira dei insaeueniente abuit obuio quoddam hostium, equite constus ictu interiit’.
67 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister, vii.30.4, p. 510: ‘ad destinatam secum traheret perditionem’.
68 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister, vii.30.6, p. 511: ‘sic misericors Deus impia consilia impii morte dissoluit’.
69 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139r: ‘Interea maligna semper aduersus deum urum diaboli in sectatio effusis errorum nebulis rubrifica hominum corda perturbat’ (Orosius, vii.29.2).
70 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister, vii.29.1, p. 506: ‘quae ab initio mundi usque ad nunc a sincero fidei religionisque tramite’.
71 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139r: ‘Postquam christianis imperatoribus summam regiae potestatis in meliora uertentibus’ (Orosius, vii.29.2).
from Satanic attack, through Arianism, Julian’s death, to the Battle of Adrianople. The epitomizer collapsed Orosius’s lengthy account of Adrianople (chapters 15–19) into a few sentences. The epitome omitted Orosius’s report that Valens remained unburied ‘as a terrible example of divine wrath’. Nonetheless, the epitomizer followed Orosius’s explanation for Valens’s death very closely. Since Valens had allowed the Goths to convert to Arianism, ‘thus by the just judgement of God Himself, they burned the man, because of whom they would blaze when dead for their life of error’. Whether deliberately or not, this conclusion marked the end of the folio, with a new set of events recounted overleaf. The reader’s experience would have involved a pause on this awful judgement, that had begun with Satanic attack and heresy only a few lines before. The epitomizer may have found Orosius’s apologetic language irrelevant, but his theological message was carefully preserved.

Although Orosius’s emphasis on divine judgement, exemplified by Valens’s death, has long been noted, he also explored God’s mercy. For Orosius, Theodosius exemplified the value of faith, God’s mercy, and the triumph of Christianity over paganism. The epitomizer omitted almost all the details of Theodosius’s reign, apart from his treaty with ‘Athalaric’ (a misspelling of Athanaric), while combining vii.34.1 and vii.34.7. This included omitting Orosius’s careful depiction of God’s agency at the River Frigidus. Orosius’s theological enthusiasm for Theodosius did not, however, go unnoticed. The epitomizer described, following Orosius, how ‘Theodosius, having set the res publica at peace and rest, died at Milan’, but added the phrase ‘with God propping him up’. This captured the essence of Orosius’s lengthy panegyric of God’s mercy to Theodosius and summarized it in a few words for a short report of Theodosius’s reign. It was also typical of contemporary Carolingian historians to use the ablative absolute about God in this way.

72 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister, vii.33.15, p. 519: ‘quo magis testimonium punitonis eius et diei indignationis terribili posteris esset exemplo, etiam communi curiis impresur.’


74 Werner, ‘L’historia’, p. 137.

75 On this tension in Orosius and Carolingian history writing, see Evans, ‘God’s Judgement’.


77 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139v: ‘Theodosius autem composita tranquilla taque republica deo sibi adminiculante apud mediolanum constituit diem obiit’ (Orosius, vii.35.23).

God's agency, for Orosius, ought to prompt human responses, which were modelled within his narrative. The epitomizer preserved these carefully. Gallienus, for example, had been ‘terrified by God’s clear judgement’ and ‘restored peace to the Church’.79 The theological and moral lessons to be drawn from the implied judgements on his persecuting predecessors were now made explicit. Nearer the end of the epitome, Mascezel landed in Capraria ‘already knowing from Theodosius how much the prayer of man through faith in Christ might obtain from God’s mercy in such desperate matters.’80 Consequently, he took some servants of God and, ‘with these prayers, fasting, psalms, continuing day and night, merited victory without battle.’81 The epitome replicated Orosius’s lesson that faith warranted divine mercy.

The sack of Rome was the final episode where the epitomizer streamlined the theology of Orosius’s account. The epitomizer condensed Orosius’s various reports of the Goths respecting Christian piety but preserved the overall sense. A single Goth, confronted by a holy virgin, was ‘moved by fear of God and the virgin’s faith to reverence of religion’.82 Furthermore, the Goths carried the liturgical vessels to St Peter’s, and ‘with Romans and barbarians joining together publicly, hymns to God were sung’.83 The epitomizer cut further details about these vessels to repeat Orosius’s prayer of praise ‘O holy and ineffable divine discretion! How holy that river of salvation!’ 84 Whereas Orosius identified this ‘river of salvation’ with the pious virgin’s house, the epitomizer continued onto how ‘The glorious toga [sic] of Christ’s army, which, generally inviting all to life with its very sweet melody, does not wake the disobedient to salvation, but rather leaves to death, without excuses’.85

79 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 138*: ‘pacem ecclesia est trepidatus factione restituit’ (Orosius, vii.22.5, who has ecclesiis rather than ecclesia).
80 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139*: ‘igitur mascezel iam inde ad theodosium sciens quantum in rebus desperatissimis oratio hominis per fidem Christi a clementia dei impetraret’ (Orosius, vii.36.5).
81 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 139*: ‘Cum his orationibus ieiuniis psalmis dies noctesque continuas sine bellum victoriam meruit’ (Orosius, vii.36.5).
82 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 140*: ‘Barbarus uero ad reverentiam religionis timore dei ac fide virginus motus’ (Orosius, vii.39.6).
84 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 140*: ‘O sacra et ineffabilis divina discretio. O sanctum istum salutare flumen’ (Orosius, vii.39.11, who had ‘divine iudii discretio’).
85 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 140*: ‘O praecella illa cristiani militis toga [sic] quae
The epitomizer clearly found such general comments about salvation relevant. Whereas Orosius then applied this more carefully to the sack of Rome, however, the epitomizer moved straight onto Orosius’s closing sentence to this section: ‘Who is able to weigh up fully these miracles or preach them with the praises they deserve?’ As with the limited comments earlier in the epitome about God’s rule, here the epitomizer preserved a general theological premise to be drawn from the historical narrative. While many details of Rome’s sack were suspended, the general invitation to repent and praise God remained. Unlike the apologetic language of much of Orosius’s *Historiae*, this hortatory language was directly relevant to any Christian reader, whether in fifth-century Africa or ninth-century Tours.

This was reflected in the epitome’s closing lines. The epitomizer cut Orosius’s account of his commission from Augustine (vii.43.19–20). As a result, the epitomizer concluded with Orosius’s call on his readers to believe (vii.43.17–18). The epitomizer kept the reference to ‘critics’ (*obtrectatoribus*, a misspelling of *obtrectatoris*), which alluded to Orosius’s pagan audience (fol. 140r). The epitomizer, nonetheless, cut Orosius’s references to these critics’ ‘blushing’ and ‘grinding’, which might have denoted pagan embarrassment, and his command that they learn ‘that all God does, even what they think evil, is good’. Instead, the epitome moved onto Orosius’s call for readers to ‘repent, believe, fear, love, and follow’. The final line, the epitomizer’s own addition, was that this response be made to God ‘who lives and reigns as God over all, world without end, Amen’.

This called for a response applicable to a Christian audience and further suggests the moral and theological response that was expected to the text.

generaliter cunctos dulcissimo ad vitam modolamine inuitans quos ad salute inoboedientes non suscitavit inexcusabiles ad mortem reliquid. Quis haec perpendere plenis miraculis? Quis praedicare dignis laudibus quaeat?’ (Orosius, vii.39.11–12), cf. comments above at p. 136.


88 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 140r: ‘peniteat dominique uerum et solum qui potest omnia credant timeant diligent et sequantur’ (Orosius, vii.43.18).

89 Leiden, UB, MS Voss. Lat. Q 20, fol. 140r: ‘Qui uiuis et regnat deus per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen’ (Orosius, vii.43.18).
Conclusion

There is much about the epitome in VLQ 20 that continues to puzzle. The epitomizer’s interest, for example, in slave revolts under the Roman Empire seems to have been very consistent but largely unrelated to other aspects of the epitome. Many of the patterns explored were not consistently followed but rather hint at the broader interests of whoever was behind the epitome. Most significantly, this was no longer history ‘against the pagans’, but seems to have been written to edify a contemporary Christian audience. This involved removing almost every aspect of Orosius’s conversation with his imagined pagan interlocutors, which were irrelevant for an entirely Christian audience. Nonetheless, the theological and moral lessons that remained relevant were maintained and adapted in the streamlining process. The scribe found historical narrative an entirely appropriate context to communicate ideas about God. The epitomizer’s omission of Orosius’s theologically colourful prefaces might seem odd in this regard, although elements were preserved in the early parts of the epitome. What the epitomizer seems to have done, however, was to change the level at which these theological truths were communicated. Rather than using Orosius’s theoretical reflections, as found in the prefaces, the epitomizer chose to preserve the details of God’s mercies and judgements in individual episodes.

This was remarkably consistent with Carolingian historians’ own approach to God’s agency. Rather than including theoretical passages, as Orosius had done, most Carolingian historians showed God acting in the details of their narratives.90 More broadly, this reflected how Christian writing had moved from being a partly polemical and apologetic exercise to a pastoral and homiletic one. In VLQ 20, we can observe this transformation continuing to take place in the reception of the late antique heritage. It provides, therefore, excellent evidence of the central and versatile role which religion played in the early medieval use of history.

---

90 For preliminary discussion, see Evans, ‘Instructing Readers’ Minds’. For a more comprehensive treatment, see Evans, ‘God’s Agency’.
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In a vision on the night of his death, 4 November 824, the monk Wetti of Reichenau met a man during his Vergilic journey through the underworld who had once been king of Italy. An animal tore off his genitals while the rest of his body was left untouched. When Wetti expresses his disgust, the angel who accompanies him explains that the king had, during his lifetime, upheld justice, supporting the teaching of the faith and protected the *sacra plebs*. The king was punished because he had indulged in *libido turpis*. Above all, however, he had believed that he could erase his sins through good deeds — an attitude that was dangerously close to heresy. Nevertheless, he would be counted among the chosen — which proves God's grace and predestination. The narrative mentions that Wetti recounted the vision to his abbot Heito who wrote it down immediately.1

It was just one or two years later, shortly after Easter 825/26, when the young Reichenau monk Walahfrid Strabo rewrote his abbot Heito's prose version of the *Visio Wettini* in sophisticated hexameters. 2 It was composed at a

1 Heito, *Visio Wettini*, ed. by Dümmler, 24, pp. 271–74. Cf. Pollard, 'Nonantola & Reichenau'. This article was developed and written in the frame of the international network 'The Transformation of the Carolingian World. Plurality and its Limits in the Remaking of Europe' <https://postcarolingianworld.ac.at/#network> [accessed 1 May 2020].
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In a vision on the night of his death, 4 November 824, the monk Wetti of Reichenau met a man during his Vergilic journey through the underworld who had once been king of Italy. An animal tore off his genitals while the rest of his body was left untouched. When Wetti expresses his disgust, the angel who accompanies him explains that the king had, during his lifetime, upheld justice, supporting the teaching of the faith and protected the *sacra plebs*. The king was punished because he had indulged in *libido turpis*. Above all, however, he had believed that he could erase his sins through good deeds — an attitude that was dangerously close to heresy. Nevertheless, he would be counted among the chosen — which proves God’s grace and predestination. The narrative mentions that Wetti recounted the vision to his abbot Heito who wrote it down immediately.¹

It was just one or two years later, shortly after Easter 825/26, when the young Reichenau monk Walahfrid Strabo rewrote his abbot Heito’s prose version of the *Visio Wettini* in sophisticated hexameters.² It was composed at a

¹ Heito, *Visio Wettini*, ed. by Dümmler, 24, pp. 271–74. Cf. Pollard, ‘Nonantola & Reichenau’. This article was developed and written in the frame of the international network ‘The Transformation of the Carolingian World. Plurality and its Limits in the Remaking of Europe’ [https://postcarolingianworld.ac.at/#network] [accessed 1 May 2020].

time when the political crises of the Frankish Empire were becoming apparent. The *Visio Wettini* has an exegetical and moral character, exhorting clerics as well as laymen to extinguish corruption, and to promote the adherence to the law of God. The decision of the emperor in favour of justice allowed him to be assigned to the *civitas Dei* in the Augustinian sense. The whole vision seems to be inspired by the dichotomic model of the two Augustinian cities, which shows the strong influence of the political Augustinism in the Carolingian period once more.  

One can interpret Walahfrid’s account of Charlemagne as a condensed metaphor of the Augustinian programme of *predestinatio*, as well as the idea of purgatory. It exists precisely in the zone of tension between God’s grace and human free will. Charlemagne’s erroneous belief that his good deeds would outweigh his bad, assumes the argument of Augustine against the Pelagians: the Pelagians held the view that the original sin had not corrupted humanity entirely, and that good deeds could therefore guarantee salvation, whereas Augustine emphasized the necessity of God’s predestination. This tension became obvious in the early ninth century: significant struggles with heresy had just come up — first the Adoptionism of Felix of Urgell, later the iconoclasm debate, and the heresy of double predestination of Gottschalk of Orbais.  

Therefore, as Walahfrid argues, a serious pestilence afflicts mankind. Terrifying astronomical signs, accompanied by a chain of natural catastrophes, epidemics, and famine were collected in the ‘Aachen computistic encyclopaedia of 809’, of which Walahfrid copied several *argumenta* into his personal
Vademecum, or handbook, St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 878, and especially from the 820s on, in the *Royal Frankish Annals* or in Einhard’s *Vita Karoli Magni*, a text that Walahfrid redacted in the 840s. In a time of social change, where a moralistic rhetoric has been developed, signs played an increasingly important role as an instruction to interpret God’s providential history. In Heito’s *Visio Wettini*, these signs are called the ‘signa a Deo denuntiata’. The diagram of signs shows a fragile balance between human and cosmic history, between mutability and stability, transformability and providence, free will and grace.

In this respect Walahfrid’s Vademecum is a special handbook, which deals across several texts in different ways with the question of the correct interpretation of signs. The texts collected in the Vademecum thematize cosmological signs, signs of the human body, signs in human history, and embed them in the structural framework of grammar and poetology. Thus, the Vademecum is a dossier that deals with the relation between history and cosmology, between micro- and macrocosm. In the Vademecum, historiography is interwoven in a collection that includes grammatical, metrical, and theological, computistic, astronomical, and astrological texts, tracts on natural science, cosmography, agriculture, and medicine. Looking into the deep past is one possible way to meet the social challenges of a confusing present — and future. The texts copied by Walahfrid mirror efforts to create and to use resources that could help to develop a sophisticated long-distance perspective. The topic of his handbook is the Creation, well-ordered by chronology and cosmology, by *numerus* and *mensura*. Time is for Walahfrid a complex circular phenomenon. The social time of history and memory, the time of the human language and human body, and the time of feast days is interlaced with the cosmological and astronomical time, and with the temporal process of God’s permanent creation and predestination. Within this process human events are just one layer.

---


In his handbook, Walahfrid interprets signs as symbolic messages of God’s intervention in history. Thus, the theological concept provided in the Vademecum takes Roman history and late antique knowledge on board, integrating a whole distant horizon and a sample of techniques of erudition into contemporary discourse.\textsuperscript{11} It enables humans to anchor all present events in a semantic structure of time, which started with the beginning of human history and signals its end. In several sources collected in the Vademecum history is presented as an essential part within a multidimensional network of different time-relations. In a way this holistic approach of Walahfrid, which integrates history in a larger ethical context, is based on Bede’s concept of time, chronology, and history, promulgated in his \textit{De temporum ratione} and \textit{De temporibus}.

In order to characterize this specific Walahfridian concept, firstly the palaeographical and codicological condition of the handbook will be sketched, secondly the sample of historiographical texts collected in the handbook will be sketched, and thirdly the context of the excerpts taken from the \textit{Historia adversus paganos} of Orosius and the \textit{Historia ecclesiastica} of Cassiodorus will be analysed.

The compilation of the Vademecum was begun in the mid-820s, and ended in 849, the year of Walahfrid’s death.\textsuperscript{12} Bernhard Bischoff identified the main hand responsible for roughly 80 per cent of the codex as that of Walahfrid.\textsuperscript{13} His argument, although it has been, and is, challenged with some reason, is convincing.\textsuperscript{14} Albeit there is no colophon or \textit{scriptio}, the assumption seems

\textsuperscript{11} McKitterick, \textit{Perceptions of the Past}; McKitterick, Bolgia, and Osborne, eds, \textit{Rome across Time and Space}.


\textsuperscript{14} For reception and critique of Bischoff’s identification, see e.g. Schmidt, ‘Karolingische Autographen’, pp. 139–42; Hoffmann, ‘Autographa des früheren Mittelalters’. The scribe W can be identified with the hands in a few other codices, e.g. Beuron, BB, Fragment 17 (see below),
at least plausible when one combines Bischoff’s palaeographical intuition with arguments that comprise the idiosyncratic and highly scholarly text-collection of the manuscript. Bischoff has furthermore divided the codex into five codicological sections, and four palaeographical stages (WI–IV) that show a process of professionalization of the hand between 824 and 849. Especially phases WIII and IV must be divided in several subphases, and can cautiously be linked to Walahfrid’s *itinerarium*. Roughly twenty scribes helped W, the manuscript’s mastermind, to copy this remarkable handbook. Besides the palaeographical problems, the question arises whether the manuscript was intended as a book in today’s extant form. Some texts break off in the middle of a sentence, some quires are obviously missing, and some of them show that they must have been preserved separately for some time. Thus the current arrangement of the codicological sections does not entirely reflect the original process of production of the manuscript.15 Probably Walahfrid collected material on single *schedulae* and clusters of several quires, which have been combined at a later stage. Due to the cutting of the quires no original folio numbers survived, and lots of the quire numbers are missing today. The scribe who noted the surviving quire numbers that document the current order of the quires, written in dark ink, is not easy to date, but perhaps is identical with W IV.

Whether hand W is Walahfrid’s or not, codex St Gallen 878 documents on the one hand the mastermind’s wide-ranging interests; on the other it shows the inspirational integration of the *artes liberales* within Carolingian intellectual culture, and especially the importance of history and time-reckoning. The entire collection of partly very specific texts, such as Hrabanus’s *De computo*, Palladius’s *Opus agriculturae*, Columella’s *De re rustica*, or the medical treatises of Pseudo–Hippocrates, shows at least a very highly educated scholar, and fits perfectly the intellectual profile of Walahfrid Strabo. Taking this into account,

or the Weißenburg Horace codex BAV, MS Reg. lat. 1703; cf. Bischoff, ‘Sammelhandschrift’, pp. 43, 48, 50. Alternative identifications of Walahfrid’s hand include e.g. the famous St Gallen Klosterplan (St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 1092), the hand B in the Reichenau *Liber confraternitatum* (Zurich, ZB, MS Rh. hist. 27, p. 4/fol. 15), a hand in Karlsruhe, BLB, MS Aug. perg. 136, fols 2–20, a hand in the ‘Züricher Adamnan’ (Zurich, ZB, MS Rh. 73, fols 1–28), or a hand in St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 283; cf. *Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau*, ed. by Autenrieth, Geuenich, and Schmid, pp. xxxv–vi. Critique on Bischoff’s identification of the main hand of codex St Gallen 878 with Walahfrid has frequently been expressed, and recently been renewed by Tino Licht in a paper at the congress Medialatinitas 2017 at Vienna, based on grammatical mistakes in some of the texts in the Vademecum. He suggested that Bischoff’s scribe W was perhaps a student of Walahfrid.

15 Cf. Bischoff, ‘Sammelhandschrift’.
it is not easy to determine the audience which Walahfrid addressed. Most probably his polymorphous handbook was not intended for just one purpose, but proves that such collections were media which document the transfer of knowledge within a multilayered society. Some of the texts show the interests of the curious student Walahfrid, some of them were collected by the experienced teacher and highly intellectual scholar Walahfrid, some of them demonstrate the intentions of the monk and abbot, and some seem to reflect the considerations of the imperial court poet and advisor.

The second to fifth codicological sections of the Vademecum show its whole complexity. These parts contain sources concerning history, natural science, and the reckoning of time: mainly Hrabanus’s *De computo* and Bede’s *De natura rerum*, as well as his *De temporibus*.¹⁶ Later there is a *Calendarium Fuldense*, computistic *argumenta* taken from the ‘Aachen computistic encyclopaedia of 809’, texts on medicine, and Charlemagne’s letter to Alcuin on the correct days on which to fast.¹⁷ Throughout the manuscript one can find historical texts and excerpts intermingled with the chronological material. The historiographical passages, at least in today’s order of the manuscript, start with Bede’s *De temporibus*, which includes the *Chronica minora*, followed by two short world chronicles: the *Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi*, and the *Computatio ab Adam usque ad nativitatem Christi*. The *Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi* probably is an insular import which relies mainly on Bede’s and Isidore’s chronicles,¹⁸ reworked by an unknown Carolingian compiler and successfully transmitted in the context of the polymorphous compendia of the ‘Aachen computistic encyclopaedia of 809’, and of the works of Bede. These text clusters around the


¹⁸ Isidore, *Chronica maior et minora*, ed. by Mommsen; Isidore, *Chronica*, ed. by Lindsay, v.39, s.p.; Bede, *Chronica maior*, ed. by Mommsen; Bede, *De temporum ratione* [66] *Chronica maior*, ed. by Jones, pp. 462–544; Bede, *De temporibus* [16–22]; *Chronica minora*, ed. by Jones, pp. 579–611; cf. Jones, ‘Bede as Early Medieval Historian’. Isidore-manuscripts in Alemannia: Karlsruhe, BLB, MS Aug. perg. 167 (Reichenau, ninth c.); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 4860 (Reichenau, c. 900); St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 133 (St Gallen, beginning ninth c.); St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 237 (St Gallen, ninth c.).
chronicle form the backbone in Walahfrid’s compilation, as they do in many other chronological compendia.\footnote{Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi, ed. by Borst, pp. 951–1008; older editions: Laterculus Bedanus generationum regnorumque, ed. by Mommsen; Chronica de sex aetatibus mundi, ed. by Pertz; ed. by Kollár, Analecta, 1; ed by Lambeck, pp. 395–98 (403): ascribes the Chronica to Einhard; Chronicon breve a mundi exordio, ed. by Duchesne and Duchesne, pp. 125–29. Cf. Paris, BnF, MS lat. 4860 (Reichenau, c. 900), a historiographical compendium (Eusebius/Jerome, Prosper Tiro, Cassiodorus, Jordanes, Bede), Hrabanus’s De computo liber, and annalistic texts (Annales s. Albani Moguntini, Annales Augienses), computistical argumenta; Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5543 (Fleury, ninth c.); Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 387 (Salzburg, c. 818), with Martirologium excursatum cum alpha betis, tabulae paschales, and Annales Salisburgenses, ed. by Pertz, pp. 89–90 (cf. Munich, BSB, MS clm 15818, fols 97*–144*; Salzburg, c. 835); Munich, BSB, MS clm 210 (Salzburg/Regensburg, c. 820); Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 387, with Easter tables and Annales s. Emmerami Ratisponensis minores, ed. by Pertz, pp. 93–94; Annales s. Emmerami minores, ed. by Waatz, pp. 47–48; together with chronicles c.g.: Bern, BB, MSS 83 (Hautvillers/Reims, tenth c.); Brussels, KBR, MS 5413–5422 (northern France, c. 900); Montecassino, Archivio dell’abbazia, MS 3 (Benevent, c. 879); Bamberg, SB, MS Hist. 3 (Halberstadt, c. 1000); Avignon, BM, MS 175 (France?, first qu. ninth c.); Rome, BC, MS 641 (Montecassino, c. 811); cf. Verbist, ‘In duel met het verleden’, pp. 180, 269; Delisle, Les manuscrits, pp. 61–62; Saxil, ‘Verzeichnis’, pp. 79–81; Stevens, ‘Computer-Handschriften’, pp. 374–76; Brown, ‘The Preservation and Transmission of Northumbrian Culture’; Story, Carolingian Connections; McKitterick, ‘The Carolingian Renaissance’; Holtz, ‘Alcuin’.}

The Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi is extant in forty-two manuscripts, eight of which originate from the Alemannic-Bavarian region.\footnote{St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 878, pp. 277–83. The oldest extant manuscript is Rome, BC, MS 641 (Montecassino, c. 811), fols 45*–46*; parallel codices from the Alemannic-Bavarian region are: St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 732 (Freising, c. 815), pp. 142–54; St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 397 (St Gallen, c. 830–67), pp. 141–44; St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 899 (St Gallen, second half ninth c.), pp. 68–75; Paris, BnF, MS lat. 4860 (Reichenau, end of the ninth century), fol. 90*–; Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 387 (Salzburg, c. 818), fols 4*–7*; Munich, BSB, MS clm 210 (Salzburg/Regensburg, c. 820), fols 4*–7*; Wolfenbüttel, HAB, MS Helmst. 532 (Salzburg, c. 820), fol. 86*; Madrid, BNE, MS 3307 (L. 95) (Murbach/Metz/Prüm, c. 820); BAV, MS Var. lat. 645 (Saint-Quentin?, ninth c.); BAV, MS Reg. lat. 309 (Saint-Denis, ninth c.); Monza, Bibl. Cap., MS fol. 9. 176 (currently MS 68–117) (Lower Rhine region, ninth c.); Paris, BnF, MS nouv. acq. lat. 456 (Auch, twelfth c.); Geneva, BdG, MS lat. 50 (Massay, ninth c.); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 12117 (eleventh c.); BAV, MS Reg. lat. 1038 (southern France, tenth c.); excerpts in: St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 397 (St Gallen, ninth c.); London, BL, MS Harley 3091 (Nevers, ninth c.); Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 1815 (Reichenau, ninth c.); St Gallen, Stibi, MS Cod. Sang. 184 (St Gallen, ninth c.); Heidelberg, UB, MS Salemianus IX b (Reichenau, tenth c.); BAV, MS Var. lat. 644 (St Gallen, tenth/eleventh c.); BAV, MS Reg. lat. 226 (southern France, tenth c.); Karlsruhe, BLB, MS Aug. perg. 166 (Bavaria, eleventh c.); Karlsruhe, BLB, Fragmentum Aug. 91 (Reichenau, eleventh c.).} On pp. 277–83 Walahfrid copied a β-version of the chronicle under the rubrics Excerptum
Like Bede’s chronicles, the *Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi* summarizes the six ages of the world, starting with Adam, and the biblical genealogies. It continues the Hebrew genealogies of the Old Testament with those of the *series regnorum* from the Persians, Egyptians, Greeks to the Roman and Byzantine Empire, and combines them with Bede’s calculation of the *annus mundi*. The historical turning point is marked by the birth of Christ, where Old Testament history changes to Roman and Christian history. The *sexta aetas* is structured by the Roman emperors up to Justinian II, followed by a Carolingian genealogy, starting with Pippin II.

The chronicle ends with two remarkable sentences: firstly, with the triumphalist and legitimizing phrase: ‘From Charles and Carloman until Charles there have been four years. From then on Charles held the kingdom alone, and, with the help of God, governs it happily until the present year, which is the forty-second year of his kingship, and the ninth of his emperorship’. This sentence not only takes the whole biblical and antique past on board and legitimates with its stereotypical grammar the concept of the *translatio imperii*; it also points to the year 809, the year of the Aachen computistic synod, which heavily inspired Walahfrid and is reflected by a sample of texts in his handbook. The final *annus mundi* 4761 points to Bede’s reckoning of time according to the *Hebraica veritas*: ‘Sunt autem totius summae ab origine mundi anni usque in praesentem annum IIIIDCCLXI’. The *chronica* is followed by the

---

21 Cf. *Libellus annalis* in Berlin, SBB – PK, MS Phill. lat. 1831, fols 115’–125’ (Verona, c. 793) that contains Bede, *De natura rerum* (fols 91’–99’), but does not contain the *Chronica*. *Alcuini Opusculum sextum*, ed. by Migne, cols 981–93, and Alcuin, *Calculatio Albini magistri*, ed. by Migne, cols 999–1002; cf. Springsfeld, *Alkuins Einfluß auf die Komputistik*, p. 82; *Borst, Die karolingische Kalenderreform*, p. 55; Montecassino, Archivio dell’abbazia, MS 3 (c. 874); Paris, BnF, MS lat. 7530, fols 280’–281’ (Montecassino, second half eighth c.).

22 Cf. Onashi, ‘The annus Domini’; Verbist, *Duelling with the Past*.

23 *St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 878*, p. 283; *Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi*, ed. by *Borst*, p. 1006. (‘Et a Carlo et Carломanno usque ad Carlum fiunt anni IIII. Et inde dominus Carolus solus regnum suscepit, et Deo protegentce gubernat usque in praesentem annum feliciter, qui est annus regni eius XLII., imperii autem VIII’) .


25 *St Gallen, Stibi, Cod. Sang. 878*, p. 283.
*Computatio ab Adam usque ad nativitatem Christi*, a short comparison of the competitive reckonings of *annus mundi* according to Bede (with the rubric *Nostrates*), Jerome, and the Septuaginta. These three texts provide the chronological backbone for the other historiographical texts.

After a portion of computistic *argumenta*, the historiographical programme of these two chronicles is continued by excerpts taken from the Chronograph of 354, a complex text cluster consisting of seventeen different parts that are preserved in different constellations in the extant manuscripts. The possibilities and limits of the reconstruction of this late antique source are excellently explained by the new masterly editions and analyses of Johannes Divjak and Wolfgang Wischmeyer, as well as by Richard Burgess. As the oldest manuscripts survive from the Carolingian period it is not clear which of the seventeen sections that are collected in the extant fifteen manuscripts comprise the original assemblage, when exactly they were put together, and how many different redactions were established.

There is no manuscript evidence for the Chronograph of 354 until it reappeared in Carolingian Francia. The oldest Carolingian version, the Codex Luxemburgensis (henceforth *L*), which according to older research was a copy of the original at the Aachen court library, and which then allegedly was the Carolingian master-copy, is missing. Burgess has argued that *L*, which survived in several copies from the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, has obviously not been compiled before the late ninth century. Moreover, recent research on the subject doubts the status of *L* as the single Carolingian master-exemplar. Wischmeyer and Divjak assume a polymorphic origin of this source that resulted in different redactions and shows a wide spectrum of transmission. Furthermore, even the poor manuscript transmission suggests that the Chronograph could have been copied and transmitted in the form of single parts, clusters of sections, or as excerpts, and that the Chronograph is thus the

---


result of a long process of rewriting over 1300 years.\textsuperscript{29} In any case, this compendium is a complex mosaic collected from Christian and pagan texts that do not provide a clear historiographical intention. Burgess suggests that the Chronograph is the result of a combination of two independent compilations that have been accumulated in several steps of redaction.\textsuperscript{30} The second cluster of this compendium was compiled independently. The Breviarium (part XVI) is actually a historical epitome, written between 325 and 337, that starts with the regnal years of King Picus and runs until the death of Licinius in 325. It was combined with two other texts that were produced in Rome at the same time: the Liber generationis, a Greek world chronicle written by Hippolytus of Rome in 235, and then translated into Latin and continued until 334 (part XV);\textsuperscript{31} and the Notitia regionum urbis XIllI, a list of the buildings at Rome, compiled between 337 and 357 (part XIV). This text cluster was combined with Consularia, written after 575, the compilation that Mommsen — because of the most complete version in codex Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS lat. 3416 — has called Fasti Vindobonenses priores et posteriores (part XVII).

\textsuperscript{29} Wischmeyer, ‘Die christlichen Texte im sogenannten Filocalus-Kalender’; Divjak, ‘Der sogenannte Kalender’, pp. 19–38; Binder, Der Kalender des Filocalus; Binder, ‘Der Kalender des Filocalus’; Hantos, ‘Art. Chronograph vom Jahre 354’. There is no information about L until 1560 when it was in the possession of Jean Brenner de Nalbach, a secretary of state at Luxembourg. Via his son-in-law, Remaclus d’Huart, the manuscript came to Brussels, where several copies were made, of which Brussels, KBR, MS 3558 survived. After 1620 the humanist Nicholas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, then living in Paris, used L for his editorial copy, the BAV, MS Barb. lat. 2154 (RI), via a concept-copy that he had ordered, preserved in BAV, MS Vat. lat. 9135 (R2). Peiresc then refused to return L to its owner Renon de France, president of the council of Arras. L disappeared by 1647 when the library was sold, and has not been seen since. In spite of the loss, the content of L is known quite well because it was described by Peiresc in a letter to Cardinal Girolamo Alejandro from 18 December 1620, which proves that either Peiresc selected the sections, or L did not include all sections at that time anymore. The letter is preserved in RI, fols 104–114. According to Peiresc’s letter, L contained two parts: part I: VIII. Fasti consulares 508 BC–AD 354, with epactae lunares, IX. Computus paschalis 312–58 AD, cont. a. 410/11, X. Laterculus praefectorum urbis Romae 254–354 AD, XIII. Laterculus episcoporum Romanorum: ending with Liberius 352 AD, XI. Depositiones episcoporum Romanorum 255–352 AD, XII. Depositiones martyrum; and part II: I. Dedication to Valentinus, II. Imagines urbiurn, III. Imperial Dedication and Natales Caesarum, IV. Imagines planetarum VII cum laterculo horarum noviarum communium bonarum, VII. Imagines imperatorum, VI. Calendariurn with Disticha de mensibus or Tetrasticha de mensibus. Peiresc’s edition of L in RI, however, contains just the texts of part II. Interestingly, the Notitia/Liber generationis/Epitome/Consularia-section is missing here, as well as the Effectus XII signorum, extant in Walahfrid’s handbook and in BAV, MS Pal. lat. 834.

\textsuperscript{30} Burgess, ‘Chronograph’, pp. 381–86.

\textsuperscript{31} Herzog and Schmidt, eds, Restauration und Erneuerung, pp. 182–85.
But neither the moment when the single texts nor when the two parts have been combined is determinable.

From the Carolingian period only a few witnesses of the Chronograph are extant, which document the problems of its transmission. The fragment in BAV, MS Pal. lat. 834, copied at Lorsch in the 830s, contains just the *Effectus XII signorum* on fol. 42v. In the bifolium Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. lat. Q. 79, most probably copied at Aachen or Metz in the 820s, an illustrated calendar and planisphere is integrated into a Latin version of Aratos's *Phaenomena*, but it is — as Bruce Eastwood has shown — not directly related to the Chronograph's calendar, but a separate transmission. Thus, the question is raised whether the different versions of the images and texts are the result of one single late antique transmission, or whether they depend on different branches, which influenced each other during the process of rewriting. Thus, the most extensive Carolingian version is preserved in the Vademecum of Walahfrid Strabo, who perhaps saw a copy at the Aachen court, where he stayed repeatedly from 829 onwards. Burgess states that:

> Although Walahfrid was supplied with books from Reichenauf and St Gallen while he was at court, there is no evidence of a manuscript of the Chronograph of 354 in the extant catalogues of these libraries, so it would seem that the manuscript was in the court library, whose scriptorium was a noted centre for manuscript illumination and the obvious destination for the copying of a manuscript like the Chronograph of 354.

It is all the more interesting that Walahfrid combined the excerpts from this source with his own bricolage that consists of heterogeneous texts such as Orosius, Eusebius/Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and Bede. In section III of his handbook, which is mainly chronographical, Walahfrid (phase WIV) copied several excerpts of the Chronograph: the *Disticha de mensibus/Monosticha de mensibus* (part VIa, pp. 302–03), verses on the twelve months that were copied without the appertaining images as a single block; the *Breviarium Vindobonense (= Chronica urbis Romae/Epitome chronicon)/Liber generationis* (parts XIV and XV, pp. 303, 305); and the *Consularia (Fasti Vindobonenses priores et posteri-

32 Eastwood, ‘Origins and Contents’.
33 Burgess, ‘Chronograph’, p. 364.
the two worlds is the synergy between macro- and microcosm. Human history
social/human and the cosmological world. The logic of this combination of
of human history and the history of the cosmos — in other words between the
accompanies human history. There are close connections between the events
world of signs and prodigies which is part of the divine order of the cosmos and
and death. All in all, they form an excitingly selective dossier about the other-
linked to the calamities of human history: wars, bloodshed, epidemics, famine,
eclipses), and natural catastrophes (earthquakes, floods), which are closely
mon focus: he was obviously interested in different kinds of signs and prodi-
gies: mainly astronomical constellations (celestial signs, comets, lunar and solar
excerpts taken from the Chronograph of 354, namely the Imagines planetarum
VII cum laterculo horarum noxiarum communium bonarum, and the Effectus XII
signorum (on pp. 240–41), copied by WIV roughly at the same time as the other
passages taken from this source. These parts IV and V were probably in the same
order as in the exemplar or perhaps as they were in the lost original codex Ω of
the Chronograph.

Not only the excerpts from the Chronograph, but all historical and com-
putistic passages and excerpts copied in Walahfrid’s handbook show a com-
mon focus: he was obviously interested in different kinds of signs and prodi-
gies: mainly astronomical constellations (celestial signs, comets, lunar and solar
eclipses), and natural catastrophes (earthquakes, floods), which are closely
linked to the calamities of human history: wars, bloodshed, epidemics, famine,
and death. All in all, they form an excitingly selective dossier about the other-
world of signs and prodigies which is part of the divine order of the cosmos and
accompanies human history. There are close connections between the events
of human history and the history of the cosmos — in other words between the
social/human and the cosmological world. The logic of this combination of
the two worlds is the synergy between macro- and microcosm. Human history
is interwoven with astronomical cycles, and is an intrinsic part of the cosmic

36 Chronographus anni CCCLIII., ed. by Mommsen, pp. 298–338, esp. 334–36; cf. Holder-
37 Eusebius/ Jerome, Chronica, ed. by Helm, p. 157. Concerning the Jerome-passage,
Burgess, ‘Chronograph’, p. 367, suggests: ‘This single entry suggests instead that the portent
was part of Walahfrid’s text of the Breviarium and had been added by an earlier scribe or reader
to provide an interesting historical event for the reign of Julius Caesar’. Cf. Vergil, Georgica,
1.478; Paul the Deacon, Historia Romana, ed. by Droysen, vt.25, p. 57; Helm, ‘Hieronymus und
38 Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 3416, fol. 55v.
theatre. This relationship calls humans to carefully read and correctly interpret those signs and to take them as a guideline for correct moral behaviour.

After Anthimus’s *Epistula de observatione ciborum*, copied by scribes N and O, completed by WIV with a copy of the *Conservatio fleotomiae et dies caniculares* (quire XXIII, pp. 352–67), several chapters taken from Palladius (pp. 368–70) and Columella as well as a few medical recipes (quire XXV, pp. 368–74), Pseudo-Hippocrates’ *Epistola ad Antiochum de observatione* and *Ad Antigonum regem* (most probably taken from Bede, *De temporum ratione*, 30) and *Hiems enim utpote longius*, a further chapter taken from Bede’s *De temporum ratione* 35 (quire XXV, pp. 374–77) copied by Walahfrid himself (phase WIV), the codicological section V contains a sample of historiographical excerpts, copied by WIV, too. These excerpts start with the second section of excerpts from Cassiodorus’s *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* (p. 378; without rubric) that takes seventeen lines, and is very close to Frechulf of Lisieux’s passages taken from this source in his *Historiae*. These excerpts are followed, after fifteen blank lines, by an *Excerptum ex storia ecclesiastica* taken from Eusebius-Rufinus (pp. 378–80). These blocks of blank lines that one can observe quite often in the handbook shed light on the compilation process. After four blank lines a sample of excerpts taken from Orosius’s *Historiae adversum paganos* follow, which are introduced on p. 380 with the rubric *Excerptum de libro Horosii*. On the following eleven pages Walahfrid copied excerpts from all seven books of Orosius (hereafter *WeO*) that demonstrate a very profound knowledge of this source.  

---


43 Frechulf, *Historiae*, ed. by Allen, ii.5.1–2, pp. 674–76; see the article of Graeme Ward in this volume. 


In *WeO*, as in Walahfrid’s condensed historiographical excerpts in general, the selected passages read like the bad news of the news ticker of a news channel. They form a thick description of the *historia calamitatum*. The Reichenau scholar selected fifty-one passages in a chronological order: they deal with natural catastrophes and celestial signs, with *motus terrae*, with *ictus fulminum*, with *pestes, dira prodigia*, and *certamina*, with floods, droughts, blood rain, fountains of oil, plagues of grasshoppers, and other strange signs, that — according to Orosius — had intensively shaped the process of history up to his own present days. Thus, *WeO* can be linked to the historiographical texts in section III, and especially to the excerpts taken from the Chronograph of 354.

The passages taken from the *Historiae* of Orosius form a key element of the historiographical section. The last passage of the Orosian excerpts, taken from book III, chapter 3, copied on p. 391, at first sight gets out of chronological line, as it follows the passage taken from book VII, chapter 32. But to the contrary, the passage that reports an earthquake in the year 378 BC fits perfectly with the chronology of the previous chapter, which concerns an event of 396 AD. Orosius has used the event to compare the *tempora christiana* with the times before Christ. In book III, chapter 3, copied nearly word for word by Walahfrid on p. 381, a *sevissimus terrae motus* in the region of Achaia in the year 378 BC is mentioned that totally devastated the cities Ebora and Helice (modern Helike):

*WeO*: Anno ab urbe condita trecentesimo septuagesimo | sexto sevissimo terræ motu Achaia concussa est | universa et duae tunc civitates, id est Tèbora et | Elice, abruptis locorum hiatibus devoratae sunt.

Orosius, *Historiae*, III.3: Anno ab urbe condita CCCLXXVI saeuissimo terræ motu Achaia uniuersa concussa est et duae tunc ciuitates, id est Ebora et Helice, abruptis locorum hiatibus deuoratae.48

Orosius linked this passage for 378 BC to a *terrae motus* that happened in 396 AD with the sentence: ‘But I myself, on the other hand, could have men-

---

48 Orosius, *Historiae*, ed. by Zangemeister, III.3, p. 146; ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, III.3, 1, 143; translation: Orosius, *Seven Books of History*, trans. by Fear, p. 116 (‘376 years after the foundation of the City, all Achaea was struck by a most ferocious earthquake and two cities, namely Ebora and Helice, were swallowed up as the ground gaped open’).
tioned similar events that were foretold, began, but did not reach their final end in our own times at Constantinople, which also a short time ago became a capital of the world.\(^{49}\)

The phrase ‘praedicta et facta sed non perfecta’ shows Orosius’s deep theological conviction: it is clear that there is a difference between the history before and after Christ’s incarnation, as it is argued explicitly in the following sentence, copied separately and combined with the entry for 396 AD by Walahfrid on p. 391. There was a heavy earthquake in Constantinople in the times of Emperor Arcadius that was accompanied by a fireball in the sky:

For after a terrible warning and prescient feeling of its own ills, the troubled earth trembled from its very depths below, while above there hung a flame spreading from the heavens. This continued until God, moved by the prayers of Prince Arcadius and his Christian people, turned aside the destruction that threatened them, proving that He alone is the Saviour of the humble and the Punisher of the wicked.\(^{50}\)

Whereas the earthquake in 378 BC totally destroyed the two cities, in Christian times the prayer of the Christian emperor and populus conciliated God, who spared Constantinople. Orosius explicitly highlights that on the one hand natural catastrophes have always been an integral part of God’s universal plan, but that on the other hand it becomes clear that, in the history of the saeculum, the frequency and density of disasters was far greater the further back one went from the ‘remedium verae religionis’ (i.prol.), and that the prognostic signs had become rarer and less dramatic in the centuries after the incarnation than those in the centuries before it.\(^{51}\) Moreover, he argues that the calamities were the punishment for violence, hatred, corruption, and greed (iii.8), an explanation that obviously inspired Walahfrid. In WeO this theologically argued linking passage was entirely left out, and the two passages are posed in a strictly chronological order. Nevertheless, WeO reproduces an Orosian metanarrative.

---

\(^{49}\) Translation: Orosius, *Seven Books of History*, trans. by Fear, p. 116; Orosius, *Historiae*, ed. by Zangemeister, iii.3, p. 146; ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, iii.3, i, 143 (‘At ego nunc e contrario poteram similia in diebus nostris apud Constantinopolim, acque modo principem gentium, praedicta et facta sed non perfecta narrare’).


\(^{51}\) E.g. Orosius, *Histoires*, ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, i.prol.14, i, 9.
WeO cover pp. 380–91 in the Vademecum, and use the last leaf of quire XXV, as well as the best part of quire XXVI. The context has been copied by WIV, whereas the rubric has not been copied by hand W. Due to a later rebinding of the manuscript the folia pp. 387/88 and 389/90 of quire XXVI are in the wrong place. Thus, the correct order of WeO is: pp. 380, 381, 387–90, 382–86, 391.52

WeO was originally the last text of the quire-cluster; the blank pp. 392–93 were used by scribe P to copy three medical recipes, and finally p. 394 bears an addition of twelfth-century hands.

It is not clear, however, whether Walahfrid used a florilegium or a text cluster as his exemplar, as it seems plausible for the historical excerpts in section III, or whether he selected the Orosian passages on his own. At the lower margin of p. 307 in section III that contains part I of the excerpts taken from Cassiodorus (hereafter WeCa/Fr) under the rubric Excerptum ex storia tripartita, a corrector added a note containing a characteristic asterisk with four dots: ‘require signum istud \(\times\) folio XXXVII’.53 The script of this note is a little rougher and brighter than the contextual hand WIV, but nevertheless it can be attributed to Walahfrid. Most probably the note refers to an older codicological order of the codex, and points to the continuation of WeCa/Fr on p. 378, although the reference mark ‘\(\times\)’ cannot be found on this folium. As a folium of quire XXV (before p. 378) has been cut out, the respective sign could eventually have been noted there. WeCa/FrII start on p. 378 without any rubric, so that some text passages seem to be missing (inc.: ‘Iohanne Crisosthomo ad exilium destinato, per noctem’; expl. ‘iter ut viginti diebus totidem ambulare stadia non valerent’). Adding thirty-seven folia after p. 307 one would get the now lost folium of WeCa/FrII. Furthermore, this suggests that at least when the require-nota was made, the texts starting at least with quire XXI, p. 306 (with WeCa/FrI) up to at least quire XXV (with WeCa/FrII), but probably to p. 391 (Eusebius/Rufinus, WeO), were thought to be an integrative text cluster and were possibly bound together. As mentioned above, due to the cutting of the edge of the quires most of the original quire numeration is lost. But the existence of some of the numbers is further indication for the coherence of these quires. Palaeographically, the text cluster copied on quires XVIII and XX, which includes the Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi, the Computatio ab Adam usque ad nativitatem Christi, computisti-

52 In the only surviving pagination of the Vademecum, made by Ildefons von Arx with pencil a pagina ‘383’ is missing.

cal arguments, and excerpts from several texts of the Chronograph of 354, could also have been part of this ‘historiographical-chronological-medical’ section. The passages copied by WIII (quires XXII and XXIII) could have been enlarged by WIV with further texts and corrections. If these assumptions are correct, the following coherent text cluster emerges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUIRES</th>
<th>TEXTS/PAGINAE</th>
<th>SCRIBES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVIII: IV 274–89</td>
<td>[...]</td>
<td>277–83: <em>Chronica de VI aetatibus mundi</em> 284: <em>Computatio</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 322/23 (wrong order, to quire XXIII)</td>
<td>322–23: Alcuin, <em>Disputatio de vera philosophia</em></td>
<td>322–23: L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 328 (ll. 12–32): J / J⁺ |

---

54 Quire number on p. 321.
Walahfrid, in a very specific theological sense, was deeply interested in history, as his editions of Einhard’s *Vita Karoli* and Thegan’s *Gesta Hludowici* as well as the prologue of the *Vita s. Galli* prove, where he explicitly mentions his use of Orosius. But the question which exemplar of Orosius was used by Walahfrid and which redaction it provided, is not easy to answer. In order to determine the redaction of *WeO*, the links to the parallel transmission shall be analysed in the following pages. As in many other cases the Reichenau scholar

55 Quire number on p. 367.

redacted the selected passages of Orosius intensively, especially by shortening and compressing them and providing them with introductory sentences. In the Reichenau library catalogue from 821/22 by Reginbert there are listed two Orosius-manuscripts: ‘De opusculis Orosii presbiteri. Historiae totius mundi calamitatum et miseriarum in codice I.’ and ‘Item eiusdem libri v in codice I.’\textsuperscript{57} Especially the title of the first codex shows how Orosius was read and interpreted at Reichenau. As Karl Zangemeister in his CSEL edition from 1882 used just very few of the roughly three hundred surviving manuscripts, excerpts, and fragments, and as he chose only manuscripts from his classes α and β (L, D, B, S [= class α], P, R [= class β]), it is not possible to pose WeO clearly within Zangemeister’s stemma and to define a specific transmission branch.\textsuperscript{58} Marie-Pierre Arnaud-Lindet, who fundamentally changed Zangemeister’s reconstruction of the manuscript transmission, argued that Donaueschingen, Die Fürstlich-Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek, MS 18.2 (= D, that is now in a private collection) written in Corbie at the end of the eighth century, was transferred to Reichenau in the first half of the ninth century, and then it served as model for the copies St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 621 (= G), the famous codex of Orosius glossed by Ekkehard IV of St Gallen (before 883), the dependent copy Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, cod. 1009 (Engelberg, before 1178, = Eb), and for Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 351 (= J).\textsuperscript{59} Arnaud-Lindet suggested that D probably can be identified with the first entry in the Reichenau catalogue.\textsuperscript{60} The comparison of WeO with the slightly younger G (which, as D, is in Arnaud-Lindet’s stemma a class II-manuscript) and J (a codex mixtus classes I–III) shows many similarities, but also striking differences, so that they could

\textsuperscript{57} Reichenau, Library Catalogue 821–22, ed. by Lehmann, Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge, p. 248.

\textsuperscript{58} Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Zangemeister, pp. viii–xxii: class α: L = Florence, BML, MS Plut. 65.1, fols 1′–189′ (Ravenna?, beginning of the sixth century): Leithandschrift of Zangemeister class α; = Arnaud-Lindet class III; D = Donaueschingen, FFHB, MS 18.2 (Corbie, end of eighth century; now in a private collection): Arnaud-Lindet class II; B = Milan, BA, MS D 23 sup., fols 2′–48′ (fragment, Bobbio, second half seventh c., copy of L): Arnaud-Lindet class II; S = Brussels, KBR, MS 19609 + MS 117478 + sine sign. – † + London, BL, MS Addit. 24144 + Paris, BnF, MS lat. 10399 + Hanover, Kestner-Museum, MS Cul. 1 42 (363) (fragments, northern Italy?: first half of the eighth c., copy of L); class β: P = BAV, MS Pal. lat. 829, fols 1′–113′ (Lorsch, end of eighth/beginning of ninth c.): = Arnaud-Lindet codices mixti (classis II + III); R = Wroclaw, BU, MS Rehdiger R 108 – †, fols 2′–148′ (Halberstadt, second quarter ninth c.).

\textsuperscript{59} Orosius, Histoires, ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, i, introduction; cf. Eisenhut, Die Glossen Ekkehards IV.

\textsuperscript{60} Orosius, Histoires, ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, i, p. lxxii.
have used the same exemplar probably via an intermediary version. The quoted chapter III.3 shows clear interdependencies of WeO and G, J, and Eb: e.g. the change from Orosius ‘uniuersa concussa est’ to ‘concussa est universa’ (G, J, Eb); ‘Tebora’ instead of ‘Ebor’ (G, J, Eb); whereas ‘devoratae sunt’ is close to Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 9665 (a Burgundian manuscript, probably from Luxeuil, from the end of the eighth century, = Arnaud-Lindet H). The phrases ‘Arcadii caesaris temporibus’, ‘terra tremuit’ instead of ‘flamma pependit’ instead of ‘flamma penderet’, and ‘Deus exoratus averet’ instead of ‘Deus exoratus averteret’ cannot be found in any other manuscript of Orosius and seem to be autonomous changes in WeO.

Similarly, the Zangemeister-α-manuscript D from Corbie as well as the related β-manuscripts BAV, MS Pal. lat. 829 from Lorsch from around 800 (= P), and Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, MS Rehdiger R 108 – † from Halberstadt from the second quarter of the ninth century (= R) are close to Walahfrid’s handbook, but have a lot of different variants as well.61 Especially D has lots of grammatical problems and mistakes and cannot have been an exemplar that played an important role in the transmission of Orosius. Bernhard Bischoff argued that R which Zangemeister was able to use for his edition, but which has been lost since 1945, probably relies on a codex (Zangemeister-)F* from Fulda that itself possibly goes back to a Lorsch exemplar, which could be linked to the Lorsch codex P.62 R has been corrected by using a codex (R*) that is very close to the version of Orosius that Frechulf of Lisieux used for the composition of his Historiae. Bischoff argues that Walahfrid and Frechulf both could have used a codex R* which probably was an insular import and the exemplar of R, during their stay in Fulda as students of Hrabanus Maurus.63 Unfortunately, the early Fulda library catalogues do not provide any information on the presence of manuscripts of Orosius at Fulda in the Carolingian period.64 The exemplar of WeO is most probably a version of β-codex in Zangemeister’s stemma.

In Arnaud-Lindet’s reconstruction, codices H and F (Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 137, copied at Laon, Sainte-Marie-Saint-Jean, around 750) are the Leithandschriften of class I, both of which are versions of class γ in

63 Bischoff, Lorsch, pp. 22–23; Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 214*–15*.
64 In the Fuldan library catalogues manuscripts of Orosius are just present in catalogue Ba from the fifteenth century: Basel, UB, MS F III 42: Ba 480, Ba 481, Ba 482; edition: ed. by Schrimpf, Leinweber, and Martin, p. 144.
Zangemeister's stemma. Arend-Lindet, and subsequently Heidi Eisenhut, in her detailed study on the St Gallen Orosius $G$, both argue that $WeO$ and $G(-Eb-J)$ have many parallel variants with both class I manuscripts, especially with $H$, and that Walahfrid probably used the same intermediary exemplar ($a'$. But there are lots of different variants and microvariants, too. There are also striking differences between $WeO$ and the $\gamma$-manuscript Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS clm 6308 (Freising, 764–84; = Zangemeister $C$, Arend-Lindet III) that contains excerpts from Orosius books i–iv on fols 1r–149v, so that a further intermediary version is plausible. Several variants show that $WeO$ used an Orosius version that is not identical with the transmission group $P-R-Frechulf$, but rather with group $D-G-H-V-(a')-Z$, for example p. 391, chapter vii.21: ‘vacuata’ instead of ‘vastata’.

$WeO$, thus, most probably used an exemplar of Zangemeister’s group $\gamma$, which includes $G$, $F$, and $J$. The exemplar has lots of close relations to redactions $a$ and to $\beta$, and thus to an antecedent version $\gamma'$. In Arend-Lindet's stemma, reworked by Eisenhut, there is an intermediary manuscript $\gamma'''$, a codex mixtus, that was copied at Reichenau and has elements of all three manuscript classes, and that probably served as model for $G$, and is linked via $a'$ to $F/H$, via $\gamma'$ to $L$ and $U$, via $\gamma''$ and $\gamma'''$ to $C$ and $Z$, and via $\beta'\cdot R/P$ or $\beta(-D)$ to class $\beta$. This would mean that — at least temporarily — several Orosius codices were available at Reichenau, as the Reginbert catalogue suggests, too. However, as $WeO$ shows elements and variants of all three redactions $a-\gamma/I–III$, and as it can neither be associated with a certain branch of transmission nor its model can be clearly identified, it is plausible that Walahfrid either used more than one exemplar or his exemplar itself was a codex mixtus. Moreover, it is plausible that at least some of the variants and changes can be explained by Walahfrid's own editorial work, and thus, document that he made a conscious choice and adaption.

65 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Arend-Lindet, i, introduction.


67 $V = $ Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 366 (Salzburg region, fourth quarter eighth c.); $Z = $ St Petersburg, NLR, MS Fv.1.9, fols 1r–162v (Corvey?, first half ninth c.; = Arend-Lindet class III); for the other manuscripts see n. 57.

68 Eisenhut, Die Glossen Ekkehards IV., pp. 74–75, 180, 434; Lehmann, Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge, 1, 248.

69 Eisenhut, Die Glossen Ekkehards IV., p. 75.

70 Orosius, Histoires, ed. by Arend-Lindet, i, pp. lxxx–lxxiv, xc; Eisenhut, Die Glossen Ekkehards IV., appendix 10, p. 434.
Further manuscripts of Orosius in the Alemannic/southern German region are: Munich, BSB, MS clm 14754-II, probably compiled at Reichenau or in south-eastern Germany in the ninth century, contains excerpts of Orosius on fols 83r–95r from books i, ii, and vii.71 This manuscript is related to St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 299 (second half of the ninth century, to St Emmeram at Regensburg) that contains glosses on Orosius on pp. 303–34, at the prologue and books i and vii. The manuscript of Jerome, Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, MS HB v 18 (tenth century, from the Lake Constance region) has excerpts from Historiae i.4.72 The fragments Zurich, Staatsarchiv, MS A.G. 19 No. xxi, from Chur around 800,73 and Vienna, ÖNB, MS lat. 15318 (probably from the Reichenau, first half of the ninth century, to Salzburg) can be linked to this region.

The carefully selected passages from Orosius in WeO have an interesting parallel source: in his Historiae, composed between 822 and 829/30, Frechulf of Lisieux, another advisor of Louis the Pious and a friend of Walahfrid’s, exhaustively uses Orosius. From the 460 passages in Frechulf’s Historiae taken from Orosius, thirty-five are more or less equivalent to the fifty-one selected by Walahfrid. Furthermore, Bischoff identified Walahfrid’s late hand WIV in one of the oldest surviving exemplars of Frechulf’s text, the fragment Beuron, Bibliothek der Benediktiner-Erzabtei, Fragment 17 (Be), a double folium bound into the cover of a sixteenth-century manuscript.74 According to Bischoff, Walahfrid worked together with a scribe from Orléans to copy this version of Frechulf for his monastery.75 Probably Be was copied for the library at the Reichenau.76 Thematically as well as chronologically the excerpts fit perfectly with WeO and Walahfrid’s intention to cope with the problems of a politically turbulent time.77

---

73 Mohlberg, Katalog der Handschriften, i, 311; Lowe, ed., Codices latini antiquiores, no. 1011, vii, 48.
75 Bischoff, ‘Sammelhandschrift’, p. 51.
76 Bischoff, ‘Sammelhandschrift’, pp. 50–51; Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 79*–82*.
In the Reichenau library catalogue Donaueschingen, Die Fürstlich-Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek, MS 191, fols 160v–163r from the second half of the ninth century, Frechulf’s Historiae are listed as: ‘Frecholfi chronica i cum expositione i super genesim.’ Remarkably, the only extant full version of Frechulf’s chronicle from the Carolingian period survived in the Alemannic region. In his meticulous CCCM edition where St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 622 (= G) is the idiographic master manuscript, Michael I. Allen localized its eleven main scribes to northern France, probably to Lisieux, and dated it to the second quarter of the ninth century (hereafter frG). Thus, it is slightly earlier than Be, and as WeO (on pp. 380–91), and the excerpts taken from Cassiodorus/Frechulf (WeCa/FrII) in Walahfrid’s Vademecum (on p. 378), all of which are attributed by Bischoff to WIV. Allen argues that frG came from Lisieux to St Gallen not earlier than in the time of Abbot Grimald in the third quarter of the ninth century. It provides the whole text of the versions pars I (Ω), version 1d and pars II (Ψ), version 1b with additions and updates to version 2 (= frG2), written by the same hands from Lisieux. Interestingly the corrections and additions are partly made by St Gallen scribes (= frG2), who according to Allen, used a Reichenau manuscript for their editorial work. There are close textual links between frG/frG2 and the Reichenau fragment Be, which also is true for the reconstructed pars II (= ρ) that according to Allen originate from a common exemplar of the hyparchetypus d of Ω1a (and the dependent version Ω2, pars I), and hyparchetypus b of Ψ2 (pars II). Thus, it seems plausible that the Be+ρ were used to correct frG. Allen argues: ‘The collation created an “edition” that usefully restored a very few flawed passages overlooked by G’s original correctors. By their extent, the footprints of the collation prove that Be was itself a pandect, very similar to G in all things but spelling’ and further: ‘A hallmark of scholarly life in late-ninth-century St Gallen was the practice of collating texts against other

in Richtung einer Beschäftigung des Autors mit Geschichtsschreibung in der politisch angepaßten Zeit der 830er und 40er Jahre.’

78 Lehmann, Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge, i, 265.
79 Von Scarpadetti, Die Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St Gallen, 1, 222–23; Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 58*–78*.
80 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 58*–78*.
81 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 58* and 68*.
82 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, p. 68*.
83 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 180*–81*.
84 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, pp. 69*, 81*, 180*–81*.
85 Frechulf, Historiae, ed. by Allen, p. 70*.
copies found in the neighbourhood, especially at Reichenau.\(^{86}\) Palaeographically, however, beside the Lisieux origin of the scribes of \(frG\), some of the hands seem to be at least influenced by the round minuscule with round ligatures, used in the St Gallen scriptorium.\(^{87}\)

Frechulf has used a version of Orosius that is close to \(P\) and \(R\), but also to \(D\), and is thus between Zangemeister’s redactions \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\). As mentioned above, it is possible that Frechulf and Walahfrid used the same exemplar \(R\) at Fulda. However, the fact that the Reichenau scholar helped to copy Frechulf’s chronicle can be linked thematically to his own selection of Orosius, and shows his interest in historiography in the politically tense 830s and 840s. Additionally Walahfrid copied several passages from Cassiodorus, *Historia tripartita/Frechulf, Historiae* into his Vademecum, pp. 306–07, and p. 378 (hereafter *WeCa/FrI* and *II*). The rubric *Excerptum ex historia tripartita* at p. 306 was written by hand \(W\), so it is not absolutely clear whether *WeCa/Fr* were compiled by Walahfrid with Cassiodorus at hand, or whether Frechulf’s *Historiae*, which are much closer to the Cassiodorian text, were used as a parallel editorial source. Probably, the two friends, while working on their historiographical dossiers, were reading and excerpting Cassiodorus at the same time. Textually *WeCa/Fr* are very close to Frechulf as well; several variants show that they are closer to Cassiodorus than to Frechulf, others prove that Frechulf and Cassiodorus have closer relations to each other than *WeCa/Fr* to both of them. Generally, the main text of Frechulf is much closer to Cassiodorus than *WeCa/Fr*. Some of the passages selected by *WeCa/Fr* cannot be found in Frechulf’s *Historiae*, e.g. p. 378 (Cassiodorus x.14): ‘Iohanne Crisosthomo ad exilium destinato, per noctem | terrae motus civitatem regiam invasit’.\(^{88}\) Palaeographically *WeCa/FrI* and *II* can also be ascribed to his late phase WIV, although the ink is slightly darker. WIV used seventeen lines, leaving the rest of the page blank, and used the last line for the rubric of the following excerpt taken from Eusebius/Rufinus. *WeCa/FrII* are copied without any rubric, but continue *WeCa/FrI* on pp. 306–07, as mentioned above. *WeCa/Fr* are, with some variants comparable to \(Be\), and thus, belong to the same redaction \(\Omega^2/\Psi^2\) as \(Be/p\) and \(frG\), and probably to the same time horizon. Together with \(Be, frG\) and Luxembourg, Bibliothèque nationale, MS 110, fols 45–128* (Arras, for Lorsch, second quarter of the ninth century; = *Lx*), Walahfrid’s excerpts are, thus, one of the few surviving copies of Frechulf’s chronicle dating to the ninth century.

---

87 I would like to thank my colleague Bernhard Zeller (Vienna) for his expertise on St Gallen scribes.
**WeCa/FrI-II** selected calamities and *prodigia* in the epoch from Emperor Constantine I up to Arcadius and Honorius, taken from books i, v, vi, vii, and x.\(^{89}\) Thus, they are closely related to **WeO** which end their report with the earthquake in 396 AD. **WeCa/FrI** start on p. 306 with four *visiones crucis* in the times of Constantine.\(^{90}\) In several further passages the cross appears as a sign, for example in the form of three crosses in the times of Emperor Julian, or together with an earthquake.\(^{91}\) The late antique and Roman authoritative past does not just appear in the Vademecum, but also for example in Walahfrid’s treatise *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis*, written during his exile at Speyer in the years 840–42.\(^{92}\) In chapter 4 he refers to the *inventio crucis* and the construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem by Emperor Constantine and his mother Helena.\(^{93}\)

In between the many signs presented in the Vademecum, Walahfrid copied *prodigia* and catastrophes that fit perfectly into the *series calamitatum* that he constructs in all the historical excerpts taken from the Chronograph of 354, Orosius, Cassiodorus, and Eusebius-Rufinus. On p. 378, for example, one can find the report of a heavy hailstorm in the year 404 (‘consulatu Honorii sexto et Aristenei die tricesima septembri’), taken from Cassiodorus x.20 (= Frechulf II.5.1).\(^{94}\) The reason for the catastrophe given by Cassiodorus, ‘quod dicebant Dei iracundia gestum, eo quod sine iudicio Ioannes fuerat condemnatus’, is left out in **WeCa/Fr**.


\(^{90}\) Cassiodorus, *Historia (ecclesiastica) tripartita*, ed. by Jacob and Hanslik, i.4 and v.5, pp. 15–17, 220.


The text of Cassiodorus has been redacted intensively by Walahfrid, as he did in *WeO*, so that there are lots of microvariants compared to the relatively coherent transmission of Cassiodorus. There are several common variants of *WeCa/ Fr* and Munich, BSB, MS clm 6376 (Regensburg, second quarter of the ninth century),\(^95\) e.g. Cassiodorus x.28: ‘eorumque’ instead of ‘equorumque’; and to St Petersburg, Rossiiskaya Natsional’naya Biblioteka, MS Lat. F. v. i. 11 (Corbie, 814–21; = Hanslik/Jacob C/class 7 lb). Jacob and Hanslik in their monograph on the manuscript transmission of Cassiodorus’s *Historia tripartita* divided the 138 listed codices and excerpts into six classes, and used just the witnesses of class I for their edition.\(^96\) They assigned the Munich codex to class IIIc.\(^97\) Of course, *WeCa/ Fr*, which is not listed in Jacob/Hanslik’s study, is too short to allow a precise assignment to a certain transmission group, but there are close relations to class IIIc, which is extant in fourteen manuscripts mainly in scriptoria from Bavaria and southern Germany (e.g. Freising, Regensburg, Tegernsee), and has close links to classes IIIa and IIIb from northern Italy.\(^98\) Especially clm 6376, which is the only extant version of group IIIc that dates to the ninth century, is related to Vercelli, Biblioteca della cattedrale, MS 101 (tenth century, = Jacob/Hanslik 41 IIIb).\(^99\) With Freiburg im Breisgau, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 6 (c. 850; not integrated in Jacob/Hanslik, Scholten 14) a Cassiodorus codex from Reichenau survived that possibly can be identified with an entry in Reginbert’s library catalogue II from 835–42 that lists: ‘In ix. libro continentur passiones et vitae sanctorum, id est Haimrani, Lantberti, Afrae, Magrae, Gregorii, Georgii, Malchi, Eusebii, Fileberti, Hilarii, Potiti, Columbam, Galli, Germani, Ambrosii, Servatii et viii epistolae Hieronymi et liber Cassiodori senatoris’,\(^100\) or with the entry ‘Tripertitae II’ in the Reichenau library catalogue from the second half of the ninth century.\(^101\) A further Cassiodorus manuscript from Carolingian Alemannia is the mainly hagiographical collection St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 561\(^1\) (St Gallen, ninth/tenth century; = Scholten 5, not

\(^{95}\) Munich, BSB, MS clm 6376, fols 198r–v, 200r, 201r–202r.


\(^{97}\) Jacob and Hanslik, *Historia tripartita*, pp. 23–24: date 46 IIIc to the tenth century.


\(^{101}\) *Reichenau, Library Catalogue from the Second Half of the 9th Century*, ed. by Lehmann, i, 265.
integrated in Jacob/Hanslik\textsuperscript{102} with excerpts taken from the *Historia tripartita*, books 1.2–5 and xi.15–18 on pp. 95–111, together with a homily ‘In festivitate omnium sanctorum’ on pp. 193–99 that has been ascribed to Walahfrid. The climax of the first part of the excerpts is Emperor Constantine’s vision of the Holy Cross.

One of the main issues in Walahfrid’s handbook is the dialectic of *fides* and *dubitatio*. On the surface the historiographical excerpts collected in his Vademecum present a vision of Carolingian society that should be able to read and interpret the signs of God’s providence correctly in order to improve permanently its ethical standards. The basically apologetic and providential perspective of late antique authors such as Orosius, Rufinus, and Cassiodorus shines through. Especially Orosius’s *Histories* provoke humans to perceive and to interpret the signs observed in cosmic and human history. Beyond this surface Walahfrid’s compilation provides a much deeper meaning. Throughout the handbook the scholar thematizes the necessary integration of a paradox that Augustine had already been troubled with: the significance and justification of evil, violence, and death within human history in the face of God’s ubiquitous existence as an essential part of predestination.\textsuperscript{103} ‘The topic of Walahfrid’s interpretation of history, thus, is nothing less than doubt and pessimism, held against a naive progressivism that inextricably binds God to human history and its permanent process — the basic Orosian view. Orosius defined the progress clearly in several chapters of his *Histories*, e.g.:

First, we hold that if the world and man are ruled by a Divine Providence which is good and hence just, man, who by his fickle nature and through his freedom to choose is weak and insolent, must be guided lovingly, when he needs help, and must also justly be punished when he abuses his freedom to excess. Anyone who looks at himself, and through himself at mankind, will perceive that from mankind’s beginnings this world rightly has been subjected to alternating good and bad times.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{102} Scholten, ‘History’, p. 65.

\textsuperscript{103} Cf. the fundamental study by Goetz, *Geschichtstheologie*; Goetz, ‘Orosius und die Barbaren’; Herzog, ‘Orosius’; Brandt, ‘Historia magistra vitae?’; Lippold, ‘Orosius’.

\textsuperscript{104} Orosius, *Histories*, ed. by Zangemeister, t.1.9–10, p. 7; ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, t.1.9–10, 1, 11 (‘Primum quia, si diuina prouidentia, quae sicut bona ita et iusta est, agitur mundus et homo, hominem autem, qui conuerabilitate naturae et libertate licentiae et infirmitus et contumax est, sicut pie gubernari egenum opis oportet ita iuste corripi inmoderatum libertatis necesse est, iure ab initio hominis per bona malaque alternantia, exerceri hunc mundum sentit quisquis per se atque in se humanum genus uidet’); translation: Orosius, *Seven Books of History*, trans. by Fear, p. 34.
Historiographies such as Orosius’s *Historiae* with their often dichotomous providential compensation make it possible to reduce contingency, but they cannot exclude the fundamental, inherent, and provocative contradiction between the existence of God and the cruel reality of human suffering. The integration of this fundamental paradox in Walahfrid’s historiographical dossier, combined with a providential perspective creates a logic that helps to formulate, and at the same time to disarm doubt. Thus, Walahfrid developed a dialectic of *fides* and *dubitatio* in his handbook. This dialectic is not so much a narrative or rhetorical tool, but an epistemic orientation, which Walahfrid has developed by reflecting on his intellectual resources such as Augustine, Alcuin, and Bede. Alcuin’s *Disputatio de vera philosophia*, a text on the importance of language as an instrument for finding veritas that influenced Walahfrid intensely, was copied into section IV of the handbook by the assisting scribe L. As Walahfrid combined historiography with grammatical and rhetorical texts, it becomes part of its programmatic logic as a tool for searching the truth in history. The connection of historiography to cosmology, chronology, and medicine integrates history into a science of humankind, which is a part of the cosmological processes. Moreover, history is a sensitive seismograph that indicates imbalances of/within these processes.

Although Walahfrid does not integrate excerpts from Augustine into his handbook, he adopts the epistemic perspective from this great church father. The handbook provides the fundamental theological concept of Augustine, reflected by Orosius. Commissioned by Augustine, Orosius wrote his *Historiae* as a continuous series of catastrophes. Although Walahfrid copied passages of Orosius in his prosaic historiographical excerpts, he does not exclusively follow the Orosian perspective according to which history is interpreted providentially, on the basis of the tension between progressive improvement and decline. Walahfrid’s condensed excerpts are thus a reduction of Orosius’s reduction. There is no inherent logic within the excerpts that explains the skeleton of bad news. The excerpts that omit every Orosian theological explanation of the endless historia calamitatum leaves it to the reader to draw his own conclusions about the reason and significance of the evil. Thus, on the one hand Orosius’s intentional history, with its consoling and therapeutic effect which was designed to corroborate optimism in the face of a politically declining, but spiritually succeeding Roman Empire, is deconstructed in Walahfrid’s

---


106 See Ward, ‘All Roads Lead to Rome?’, who comes to a similar conclusion.
excerpts. But on the other hand, Walahfrid’s whole dossier stands in clear contradiction of the pessimistic and particular secular perspective on history, provided by the excerpted parts from the Chronograph of 354.

Together with the other historiographical texts, the excerpts of Orosius document Walahfrid’s very specific approach to history. In a deep structure they are on the one hand an adequate expression of the fragmented perception of his present day’s turbulent history. On the other hand they set history into a widespread context that reaches from the cyclical time of the calendar and computus, the time of signs, and the interpretation of the cosmos as a sensitive relationship between macro- and microcosm, to the correct use of language. Thus, the Walahfridian synthesis of historiographical passages provides a semantic of symbolism, which is the theoretical architecture of his handbook. To Walahfrid the socio-political conflicts of his own time are nothing else than one of the many signs that prove the deficiency of human history and its dependency on divine salvation.

Altogether, Walahfrid creates a panorama of the symbols of God’s action within creation, structured by mensura et numerus, which indicate the condensation of time as well as its open end. Time is for Walahfrid a polymorphous, circular phenomenon that consists of different components, such as historical time, and thereby the social time of memory, cosmological-astronomical, computistical, and calendrical time, the time of the human body, the time of language, and — above all — the time of God’s continuous grace and salvation. Human events are just an inherent part of a bigger cosmological revolution. Because of this revolution, which is a kind of parallel universe that heavily influences history, a multidimensional network of time perceptions is needed to balance the irregularities of history, and to understand these irregularities as a necessary part of divine predestination. For Walahfrid human history is on the one hand a coincidence of creation, and not the point of it, and on the other hand a chain of events, deliberately led by God’s providence. His handbook is a document of the interaction of social memory and cultural identity in the face of continuous and profound historical change. Collecting sources of the past means writing for the present and future.
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Carolinger Histories
Enhancing Bede: The *Chronicon universale* to 741

Sören Kaschke

The *Chronicon universale*, covering the six ages of the world from Creation to ad 741, ranks among the lesser known works of eighth-century historiography. 1 Like most historiographical texts from the period, there is little information about its author or his place of writing. And while the time of composition has been narrowed down to a range of thirty-five years (741–75), opinions still vary significantly on when exactly during that time the work may have been undertaken.2 Consequently, no consensus on the motivation behind the compilation has been reached to this day. In modern accounts of Frankish history the *Chronicon universale* is rarely acknowledged, 


A more technical discussion within the context of the *Moissac Chronicle* in Kats and Claszen, ‘*Chronicon Moissiacense Maius*’, i, 53–61.


The unique dating to the ninth century by Schmale, ‘Die Reichenauer Weltchronistik’, p. 127, provides no reason for that decision and is unaware of vital arguments.
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---


and if so usually in distinctly unflattering terms, with the perception of its contribution to historiography restricted to having provided a base text for the compiler of the *Chronicon Moissiacense*.

The reason for this neglect is not hard to find: fundamentally, the *Chronicon universale* is almost totally lacking original content, so much so that Bernhard Simson simply referred to it as an ‘interpolirt[e] Chronik des Beda’. At its core it is a verbatim copy of Bede’s *Chronica maior* (i.e. chapter 66 of his *De temporum ratione*), and at least to a casual reader, it would have appeared as such: as a world chronicle by Bede, with only a brief and almost annalistic continuation from 721–41.

The entire text of Bede is in fact shot through with various additions. Most of these are easy to identify for modern scholars, as the *Chronicon universale*’s compiler rarely used more than one of his models when drafting a new interpolation, and usually kept very close to his models’ wordings. The additions may be divided into two kinds. On the one hand, there are exegetical interpolations and extracts from (among others) the chronicles of Jerome, Orosius, and Isidore, i.e. from texts that Bede himself had already employed. On the other hand, extensive extracts from the *Fredegar-Chronicle* and the *Liber historiae*

---


4 On that work see now the article by Rutger Kramer in this volume, as well as the new edition by Hans Kats and David Claszen under the title ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, with vol. 1 containing the introduction (referred to in the following by prefixing the names of the two editors to the title) and vol. 11 the edition proper.

5 Simson, ‘Die überarbeitete Chronik des Beda’, p. 119; actually, with that dictum he grasped the character of the *Chronicon universale* better than various later scholars.


7 The end of Bede’s original text of chapter 66 is signalled by ‘Hucusque Beda’ (*Chronicon universale*, ed. by Waitz, p. 19). None of the preceding, much more extensive additions to Bede’s text were in any way marked, as far as can be said from the surviving manuscripts.


9 The baffling claim to the contrary by Collins, ‘The Frankish Past’, p. 316 (“That the compiler had access to a manuscript of the Continuations, and thus almost certainly [!] to the whole Fredegar corpus, also indicates that he had available a much larger amount of information on
Francorum\textsuperscript{10} were included, and from 710 onwards several reports taken from Frankish annals were inserted into the narrative.\textsuperscript{11} These latter additions are responsible for injecting a distinctly Frankish slant into the chronicle’s depiction of the sixth age, as Bede had rarely ever mentioned actors and events from Francia, while now, with these additions, some sections may devote up to 60 per cent of their space to Frankish affairs. Hence, there can be no question of the Chronicon universale having ‘side-stepped most of the Frankish past’\textsuperscript{12} — quite the contrary.

Despite the chronicle’s material deriving almost exclusively from other texts, it is not entirely unoriginal. In fact, it has one trait unique among all Carolingian historiography: it is the only work featuring two sets of annus mundi datings (i.e. the system of counting the number of years since Creation) in parallel for its main sections, based on the Vulgate and the Septuagint respectively. The basic structure implemented by Bede is retained, consisting of a brief prologue, followed by six parts, one for each of the six ages of the world.\textsuperscript{13} As it had been Bede’s main intention to demonstrate his re-calculation of the years that had passed since Creation, he had divided each age into sections for biblical generations or, eventually, secular rulers, culminating in the Roman emperors right up to his own time. Bede had prefixed each such section with the annus mundi in which the biblical figure or ruler in question had died, usually followed by a note on the number of years for each life (until the birth of the relevant person for the next generation) or reign.\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{11} The annalistic notes are conveniently listed in Waitz, ‘Zur Geschichtsschreibung’, pp. 482–83, Kurze, Die karolingischen Annalen bis zum Tode Einhards, pp. 17–18, and Close, ‘Les Annales Maximiniani’, pp. 324–25. For most of the reports, the best match with known annals is with a version of the Lorsch annals, e.g. the Annales Mosellani, and for 721 and 725 with the Annales Flaviniacenses (missed by Close).

\textsuperscript{12} As Collins, ‘The Frankish Past’, p. 316, claims.

\textsuperscript{13} For a concise summary cf. Wallis, Reckoning of Time, pp. 353–60 (cited under Primary Sources); on the underlying concept and its development up to Bede see Tristram, Sex aetates mundi, pp. 19–30; see also Landes, ‘Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled’, pp. 137–41, on the history of annus mundi dating.

\textsuperscript{14} One exception is the last section on the reign of emperor Leo III (r. 717–41). Writing
To this, the compiler of the *Chronicon universale* added a second dating for each section of each age, beginning right after the prologue with § 10, the start of the first age.\(^{15}\) For example, in the Munich manuscript (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 246, described below), the years that Adam had already lived when his son Seth was born are stated thus: ‘Secundum Hebreos annos CXXX, secundum LXX interpretes CCXXX’ — ‘According to the Hebrews 130 years, according to the Seventy 230’.

Alongside Bede’s revisionist *annus mundi*, calculated on the basis of the Vulgate, or ‘Hebrew Truth’ (i.e. Jerome’s translation of the Bible from the original Hebrew), the compiler added the corresponding *annus mundi* according to the Septuagint (i.e. the older Latin translation that repeatedly distorted the number of years for various biblical generations).\(^{16}\) As previous chroniclers, and even Jerome himself, had often used the same Septuagint-reckoning, this made it much easier to align and compare the ‘enhanced Bede’ version of the *Chronicon universale* with other works of historiography. Not least it facilitated the compiler’s own work with regard to determining the proper place at which to add any further detail from his sources to Bede’s structure.

Yet despite this unique trait interest in the *Chronicon universale* has remained patchy. In 1881, Georg Waitz restricted himself in the spirit of the time to editing only the last part of the sixth age, from the reign of emperor Honorius in 408 onwards.\(^{18}\) Everything prior to that date, except for two brief extracts on Frankish and Burgundian origin myths,\(^{19}\) was left out — two thirds of the entire text.\(^{20}\) The lack of a complete edition complicates any thorough

in 725, Bede provided the current, i.e. ninth, year of his reign. The compiler of the *Chronicon universale* failed to update this to the final number of Leo’s regnal years.

\(^{15}\) It should be noted that the division into and numbering of paragraphs is an addition by modern editors, and not to be found in any of the manuscripts.

\(^{16}\) Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246, fol. 8’. More heavily abbreviated in Besançon, BM, MS 186, fol. 115: ‘Sed Heb CXXX. Sed LXX CCXXX’. It should be noted that Bede himself already mentions a diverging Septuagint chronology on occasion, as in this case; cf. Bede, *De temporum ratione*, ed. by Jones, lxvi.10, p. 465: ‘Adam annorum CXXX genuit Seth, cui superuixit annis DCCC. Verum LXX interpretes ante natum Seth posuere annos CCXXX, postea DCC.’


\(^{18}\) Cf. Corradiini and Diesenberger, ‘Von Integritätsrigoristen’, on the inclination of nineteenth-century editors to ignore passages in narrative sources that were ‘only’ based on other known sources.


\(^{20}\) To illustrate the dimensions: in the Leiden and Munich manuscripts (on which see...
engagement with this source. Fortunately, most of the extant manuscripts are now available online. To facilitate the placing of the chronicle's interpolations within their context, in the following they will be referenced in accordance with the number of the paragraph immediately preceding or enclosing the interpolation in Bede’s *Chronica maiora*, stating that number with an alphabetic extension (e.g. § 10a for the first interpolation in or after Bede’s § 10).

Given the state of research, the scope of this article will necessarily be restricted to verifying and improving on some of the basic tenets about the *Chronicon universale*. In particular the relationship between the known manuscripts and their different versions of the text needs to be established prior to any future edition of the entire chronicle. For this purpose, a transcription of the first age was prepared for all manuscripts, together with a collation of some sections of the sixth age. The two main manuscript witnesses of the *Moissac Chronicle*, while of course related, will not be covered in what follows.\(^\text{21}\)

**Manuscripts**

With a single exception, all six extant manuscripts containing what we deem to be the *Chronicon universale* or parts thereof date from the ninth century and hence postdate the universally accepted time of compilation by at least twenty-five to sixty years. Only two manuscripts (Besançon, Leiden) contain broadly the same text, with interpolations to Bede’s original text (i.e. to chapter 66, the *Chronica maiora*) present throughout, from the prologue to the sixth age. This version has occasionally been considered a ‘first edition’ of the *Chronicon universale*, with the version in another manuscript (Munich), because of its additional layer of interpolations, in turn designated a ‘second edition’.\(^\text{22}\) Together with the three remaining manuscripts, the six codices thus display various stages of production, revision, copying, and extraction within the protracted history of the *Chronicon universale* and its reception.

Given that the archetypes of most versions of the *Chronicon universale* should date to the eighth century, the chronological order in which each manus-

\(^{21}\) On these — Paris, BnF, MS lat. 4886 and lat. 5941 — cf. Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensis’, i, 485−89 and ii, *Beilage* 2; Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i, 21−38. So far, it would appear that the *Moissac Chronicle* was not based on the most sizeable version of the *Chronicon universale*, nor on a version continued to 811, but on an earlier and shorter version.

\(^{22}\) Cf. Kaiser, ‘Chronicon universale’. 
script was produced does not, on its own, tell us anything about the sequence in which the different versions of the text came into being. Determining whether a specific manuscript (e.g. Würzburg or Paris) represents an earlier (intermediate) stage of the text, or extracts drawn from a final stage exemplar, thus requires careful study, including of sections of Bede’s surrounding text of De temporum ratione. The only manuscript not from the ninth century (Brussels) transmits only a small portion of the chronicle itself and instead features a set of annals, the Annales Maximiniani, usually accepted to be a continuation of the Chronicon universale up to 811.\textsuperscript{23} Ordered by ascending degree of divergence from Bede’s Chronica maiora, the six manuscripts are:

(1) Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 46

The manuscript was probably written in the first quarter of the ninth century at St Amand by a scribe from Salzburg, where the codex was likely transferred to no later than 828.\textsuperscript{24} It is chiefly a collection of computistical texts, including a copy of Bede’s De temporum ratione as well as an Easter table featuring several sets of annalistic notes, amongst them the sole extant version of the Annales Iuvavenses Maiores — a text that is, intriguingly, in turn also (indirectly) related to the Annales Maximiniani.\textsuperscript{25} Within De temporum ratione, a leaf and slightly later an entire quire are missing, affecting chapters 44–45 and 50–61. Bede’s slightly modified Chronica maiora is to be found on fols 95‘–137‘.

The manuscript was not used by Mommsen for his edition, and he therefore missed that in the prologue to the Chronica maiora, § 9 with its comparison of the six ages to the six days of Creation had been replaced by a much longer text (§ 9a) on the main events of the six ages and the meaning of the seventh and eighth age.\textsuperscript{26} At least as far as a collation against transcriptions of the first age

\textsuperscript{23} Edited by Georg Waitz under the heading ‘Continuatio: Annales Maximiniani’ directly following on his edition of the Chronicon universale; cf. Waitz, ‘Über Fränkische Annalen’, Wattenbach, Levison, and Löwe, Geschichtsquellen, ii, 257–58, and most recently Close, ‘Les Annales Maximiniani’, whose arguments against the annals having been compiled as a continuation to the Chronicon universale however are not convincing (see below).

\textsuperscript{24} Thus Bischoff, Schreibschulen, ii, 133–34; cf. also Bresslau, Die ältere Salzburger Annalistik, pp. 10–17; Thurn, Pergamenthandschriften, pp. 34–36. Wallach, ‘The Genuine and the Forged Oath’, pp. 61–62, argued for a date closer to the mid-ninth century. The complete manuscript is available online, see Works Cited.

\textsuperscript{25} Cf. Bresslau, Die ältere Salzburger Annalistik, pp. 35–40; Wattenbach, Levison, and Löwe, Geschichtsquellen, ii, 257; Hoffmann, Untersuchungen, pp. 13–21.

\textsuperscript{26} On that new text cf. Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i, 95–96; the
from the other *Chronicon universale* manuscripts has shown, this is the only aspect in which the Würzburg manuscript incorporates a section that is otherwise only known from manuscripts of that chronicle, or more precisely: that is present in all specimens that include the prologue to the *Chronicon universale*. While Jones groups the manuscript with seven others, two of them ‘regular’ *Chronicon universale* manuscripts,\(^{27}\) he does not seem to have noticed the replacement of § 9 either. Of the remaining five manuscripts, only two could be checked online, with both (Paris, BnF, MS lat. 16361; Geneva, BdG, MS lat. 50) containing § 9, i.e. Bede’s original version.\(^{28}\)

*(2) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS NAL 1615*

Theodor Mommsen referred to this manuscript as a ‘seltsamer Wechselbalg’ (literally: a ‘peculiar changeling’) which is even more fitting than he himself may have realized.\(^{29}\) As in the Würzburg codex, the chronicle (on fols 81–120) retains its place within Bede’s *De temporum ratione*, while the entire manuscript has been aptly characterized as another ‘computistical compilation’.\(^{30}\) Written in Burgundy, either in Auxerre or Fleury in the first half of the ninth century,\(^{31}\) it is the only manuscript to contain both the original § 9 and § 9a, its replacement. Additionally, it features twenty-seven interpolations known from the three ‘complete’ *Chronicon universale* manuscripts (Besançon, Leiden, Munich),

*Moissae Chronicle* has also replaced § 9 with § 9a.

\(^{27}\) Cf. Jones in Bede, *De temporum ratione*, p. 241, group i, subgroup (b). Even more confusingly, in his entry for the Würzburg codex (p. 255, no. 242) he claims it to be ‘Like nos 13, 82’, referring to Berlin, SBB – PK, MS Phill. lat. 1831 and Leiden, UB, Scal. 28 respectively — but not to ‘no. 28’ (= Besançon, BM, MS 186), even though that manuscript, at least with regard to its chronicle section, might be a sister manuscript of the Leiden codex.

\(^{28}\) Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i, 96 n. 314, claim that the Würzburg codex would be the only non-*Chronicon universale* manuscript to contain § 9a, which would imply that they checked all the manuscripts Jones grouped together with the Würzburg specimen.

\(^{29}\) Mommsen, ‘Zur Weltchronik’, p. 552.


\(^{31}\) Cf. Mommsen in Bede, *Chronica maior*, p. 237 (Fleury, ‘beginning’ of ninth century, pointing to a computation on fol. 172’ that fits best to 809); Jones in Bede, *De temporum ratione*, p. 251 (Auxerre, c. 830); Mostert, *Library of Fleury*, p. 243, no. BF1257–BF1258 (Auxerre or Fleury, ninth century); Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i, 46 (‘belonged’ to Fleury, written in the ninth century); Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften*, iii, 242, no. 5102 (Auxerre, first (or second) quarter of ninth century, or middle of ninth century, or ninth/tenth century). The complete manuscript is available online, see Works Cited.
all concentrated within the final section of the sixth age, from § 488 onwards. Most of these are derived from Isidore and Fredegar, but there are also two annalistic notes (for AD 712–13) amongst them. Curiously enough, only one of these interpolations touches on Frankish history, and only in passing.

In what may be just a peculiar coincidence, the *Annales Flaviniacenses*, uniquely transmitted in an Easter table from another *Chronicon universale* manuscript (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Scaliger 28), are missing reports for 712 and 713 in their otherwise unbroken line of reports from 710 to 721. And while most annalistic interpolations to the *Chronicon universale* are taken from a set of annals similar to the so-called Lorsch group of annals, two of these interpolations, for 721 and 725, are otherwise only transmitted as part of the *Annales Flaviniacenses*. The Easter table in the Paris codex (fols 12v–18r) covering the years 532–1025, has few reports on Frankish history, and in particular neither the reports for 712–13, nor any other reports present in the remaining *Chronicon universale* manuscripts.

Like the Würzburg codex the Paris manuscript does not contain the *Chronicon universale*’s unique feature of double dating, i.e. it only sports Bede’s original ‘Hebrew’ *annus mundi* datings, not those according to the Septuagint. So far, a collation of the prologue and the first age did not yield any further interpolations that Mommsen might have missed. But there is a variant in

---


35 Cf. Wattenbach, Levison, and Löwe, *Geschichtsquellen*, ii, 185–88; Kaschke, ‘Annales Laureshamenses’; Pokorny, ‘Die Annales Laureshamenses’, pp. 1–9. It should be stressed that the annals were actually only continued in Lorsch from 777 onwards, after the initial compilation of the *Chronicon universale* had already been finished.

36 *Annales Flaviniacenses*, ed. by Jaffé, a. 721 and 725, p. 686 = Leiden, UB, MS Scal. 28, fol. 17r; the latter entry is heavily, almost cryptically abbreviated: ‘a(u)g(u)s(todunum) d(estrutur) IIII f.(eria) XI k(alendas) sep(tembris)’. As mentioned above, Close, ‘Les Annales Maximiani’, p. 325, appears to be entirely unaware of the existence of these annals.

37 Wallach, ‘The Genuine and the Forged Oath’, p. 61, arguing in the context of earlier parts of *De temporum ratione*, claims that both the Paris and the Leiden manuscript (which however includes a full set of interpolations; see below) were copied ‘from the same source’.
§ 5 where the text of the Paris manuscript deviates from all other manuscripts of *De temporum ratione*, at least according to Jones’s apparatus, while agreeing with the only two *Chronicon universale* manuscripts to contain this section.\(^{38}\) Indeed a most peculiar manuscript whose scribe for unknown reasons appears to have chosen to copy only a select few of the *Chronicon universale*’s interpolations, and only from the first and last part of the chronicle.

(3) Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 186

This manuscript, despite having already been described by Léopold Delisle in 1895, has for a long time gone unnoticed in discussions of the *Chronicon universale*, not helped by Delisle erroneously providing the shelfmark 187 instead of 186 and at first failing to identify the text with the *Chronicon universale*, despite correctly recognizing its relationship to the *Moissac Chronicle*.\(^{39}\) Written perhaps in eastern France in the final third of the ninth century,\(^{40}\) it contains once more Bede’s *De temporum ratione*, alongside further computational works. This time however the chronicle (on fols 113’–157”) shows a full set of interpolations across all six ages plus the double datings characteristic for the *Chronicon universale*.

Like its possible sibling, Leiden, MS Scaliger 28, the Besançon codex has replaced the final paragraph of the chronicle’s prologue, § 9, with § 9a. After that,

\(^{38}\) Bede, *De temporum ratione*, ed. by Jones, lxvi.5, p. 463: ‘iuxta LXX translationem’ (thus also in the Würzburg codex, UB, MS M. p. th. f. 46, fol. 95’), while the Paris manuscript (BnF, MS NAL 1615, fol. 82”) has ‘iuxta LXX interpretes’, just like the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts. This poses some problems for the assumption that Paris represents a regular copy of Bede augmented with selected interpolations from the *Chronicon universale*, as suggested by Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, 1, 48. However, as Bede himself usually employs the term ‘LXX interpretes’ (e.g. in § 2, 3, 10, 19, and 23) in the first two ages, this could be an interpolation arrived at independently by different scribes, especially considering the only other instances of a similar turn of phrase within the first two ages are ‘LXX translatorum codicibus’ (§ 18) and ‘LXX translatorum editione’ (§ 23).

\(^{39}\) Cf. Delisle, ‘Note’, twice with the wrong shelfmark ‘187’ on pp. 528 and 535; Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensis’, 1, 39 n. 24, and Mouillebouche, ‘Un autre mythe’, p. 9, repeat Delisle’s mistake. However, in the *additions et corrections* to the journal’s volume, Delisle supplemented the identification with the *Chronicon universale* (‘Note’, p. 758). The complete manuscript is available online.

\(^{40}\) According to Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften*, ii, 134, no. 627; the first twenty-four fols of the manuscript have a separate origin (Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften*, ii, 133, no. 626) and contain Bede’s *Vita s. Cuthberti metrica*. Jones in Bede, *De temporum ratione*, p. 244, merely states ‘s. ix’.\(^{2}\)
there are seven more, often minor interpolations within the first age (§ 10–19), not counting the added double datings according to the Septuagint. 41 Usually they clarify or elaborate on subjects already covered by Bede. 42 To provide a rough idea about the dimension of these additions: Bede’s text of the first age (§ 10–19), as edited by Jones, runs to c. 4000 characters, which increases in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts to c. 5050, while the yet to be discussed manuscript Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246 with its additional layer of interpolations runs to c. 8800 and thus to more than twice the length of Bede’s original text. The degree to which this tendency continues across the remaining five ages can only be determined fully once the transcription of all manuscripts has progressed further. 43

41 These interpolations occur in § 10, 11 (twice), 15, 17, 18, and 19.

42 For example, after the ‘computistic’ first sentence of Bede, De temporum ratione, ed. by Jones, lxvi.19, p. 467 (‘Noe anno DC uenit diluuium mense secundo, XVII die mensis’), the Besançon codex interjects on fol. 115 v the more ‘encyclopedic’ ‘Anno D aetatis Noe archa edificatur quam refert Ioseppus post diluuium residere in montibus Armenię quę uocantur Ararath’.

43 The dimension of each age, as measured in paragraphs of the edition (593 in total), increases exponentially: after the prologue with nine paragraphs, the number of paragraphs for each of the six ages runs to 10, 18, 43, 62, 125, and 326, i.e. the last two ages together account for 76 per cent of the total.

44 Mouillebouche, ‘Un autre mythe’, argues for the report to be a pro-Carolingian fabrication of the ninth century, intended to gloss over deprivations of Burgundian churches not by Saracens but by Charles Martel; despite being aware of the Chronicon universale, Mouillebouche overlooks the fact that this story had already been included in the chronicle’s text before 775.

45 It is unclear why Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, 1, 44, nevertheless claim that ‘Scaliger 28 begins with chapter 65’ of De temporum ratione. For the manuscript’s content see Jaffé, ‘Über die Handschrift’, esp. pp. 677–79 with note ***.

46 Cf. Jaffé, ‘Über die Handschrift’, p. 682 (Flavigny, 816); Lieftinck, Manuscrits datés, i.1, no. 202, pp. 91–92 (Flavigny, 816); Landes, ‘Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled’, p. 188 (Autun [1],

(4) Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Scaliger 28

Textually closely related to the Besançon codex, Scaliger 28 is another computistic collection, featuring Easter tables (with the Annales Flaviniacenses and their unique report about an alleged destruction of Autun by Saracens in 725), 44 various chronographic extracts, and the full text of Bede’s De temporum ratione. 45 Probably written at Flavigny near Autun in Burgundy, in or around 816, the manuscript has been significantly damaged by humidity and mould. 46
Like the Besançon codex it has replaced Bede’s *Chronica maiora* with a copy of the *Chronicon universale* on fols 91r–134v, though it has retained the former’s place (and rubric) as chapter 66 of *De temporum ratione*. Missing words at different places in both the Leiden and the Besançon copy of the *Chronicon universale* show that neither manuscript can be a descendent of the other. However, the transcription of the chronicle’s prologue and the first age has shown exactly the same number and content of interpolations in both manuscripts, with only the usual minor scribal variations and mistakes separating the two texts.

Considering the possible links between the circle of Benedict of Aniane and the *Moissac Chronicle*,\(^{47}\) a text based on the *Chronicon universale* and running up to 818, another tantalizing note in the Easter table of the Leiden codex catches the eye. On the right margin besides year 816, a different, presumably contemporary hand has recorded that Louis the Pious made a grant to the monastery of St Seine, near Flavigny.\(^{48}\) Benedict of Aniane himself had spent some time in St Seine in the late 770s, shortly after the *terminus ante quem* for the compilation of the *Chronicon universale*. Presumably in 816, a copy of the *Chronicon universale* was made in Flavigny, with the resulting manuscript demonstrating a surprising interest in an imperial grant to nearby St Seine. Finally, the *Moissac Chronicle* was compiled or at least finished about two years later, in or after 818, and probably somewhere in the south of the Frankish Empire (Septimania?)\(^{49}\)

---

\(^{47}\) Cf. Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensis’, 1, 37–38 and 485–87; and see Rutger Kramer’s article in this volume.

\(^{48}\) Leiden, UB, MS Scal. 28, fol. 19r: ‘sic reddidit ludoicus noua uilla s(an)c(t)o siq(u)ano’ = *Annales Flaviniacenses*, ed. by Jaffé, a. 816, p. 688. The grant itself, extant in a thirteenth-century cartulary copy, was edited by Kölzer as D LdF 120, 1, 296–97. On the entire issue see already Kramer, ‘Great Expectations’, pp. 349–53, who kindly shared his expertise on this matter. Intriguingly, the Easter table also sports some intermittent Vulgate *annus mundi* datings on the left hand, starting on fol. 2r with AD 1 as AM 3925 [!] and ending on fol. 18v with AD 806 as AM 4760, and partly juxtaposes them on the right hand of the table with far fewer Septuagint datings, starting only on fol. 13v with AD 509 as AM 5710 and ending on fol. 18v with AD 789 as AM 5990; cf. Landes, ‘Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled’, pp. 188–89, who failed to notice that the Vulgate datings already start right at the beginning of the Easter table (instead of in the sixth century only, as he claims), and consequently also implied, erroneously, that the Septuagint datings would start together with the Vulgate datings.

\(^{49}\) Cf. Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, 1, 56–57, and Kramer (this volume) for further detail and literature.
by a person probably connected to Benedict of Aniane (who in turn was connected to St Seine), and well acquainted with the *Chronicon universale*, one of whose rare copies had been written at around the same time near St Seine in Flavigny. Unfortunately, a comparison of variants in the Leiden codex with the new edition of the *Moissac Chronicle* rules out the possibility of the copy from Flavigny having been the exemplar used for the *Moissac Chronicle*. As the codex had remained in Flavigny until 879 it was unlikely to have been intended for use in another monastery, while also ruling out Flavigny as place of redaction for the *Moissac Chronicle*. Still, it is a remarkable convergence warranting further thought.

(5) *Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS lat. 246*

Probably written at the abbey of Weltenburg in the diocese of Regensburg in the middle of the ninth century, Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246 presents on fols 8v–104v a significantly enlarged version of the *Chronicon universale*, that does still, however, stop its narrative at 741. The chronicle as extant today in the codex appears to be a defective copy in more than one respect, perhaps in part due to mistakes on a later rebinding or, slightly more likely, to thoughtless copying of an exemplar already affected by faulty binding. Alternatively, the scribe of the Munich codex may have proven himself to be singularly inept when tasked with copying texts from different manuscripts into a new codex.

50 In the section on Jared, Leiden, UB, MS Scal. 28, fol. 92v is the only manuscript to read: ‘unde illa que sub eius nomine proferuntur.’ Bede himself (*De temporum ratione*, ed. by Jones, lxvi.15, p. 466), the Besançon (BM, MS 186, fol. 114v) and the Munich (BSB, MS lat. 246, fol. 10v) manuscript, as well as the *Moissac Chronicle* (ed. by Kats and Claszen, ii, 6, l. 24) all read: ‘unde illa que sub eius nomine proferuntur.’ There are more cases of this kind within the first age.

51 Liefenck, *Manuscrits datés*, i.1, 91.

52 Cf. Bischoff, *Schreibschulen*, 1, 262–63 (Weltenburg, mid-ninth century); Jones in Bede, *De temporum ratione*, p. 248 (‘from Prühl’, ninth century, perhaps mistaking a later library — Prühl was only founded in 997 — for place of origin); Bierbrauer, *Die vorkarolingischen und karolingischen Handschriften*, p. 86 (Bavaria, start of ninth century); McKitterick, *Perceptions*, p. 23 (Weltenburg, mid-ninth century); Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften*, i, 221 (Weltenburg, mid-ninth century). The complete manuscript is available online.

53 McKitterick, *Perceptions*, p. 26, suggests that ‘one or two leaves of text’ may have been lost.

54 Bischoff, *Schreibschulen*, 1, 262, characterizes the hand of the scribe responsible for almost the entire chronicle as ‘sehr unruhig, fahrig und breit’.
Without any rubric, without preface, or even the chronicle’s prologue, the codex starts immediately with § 10–19 of Bede’s *Chronica maior*, i.e. with most of the first age, from Adam to the beginnings of Noah. However, it breaks off mid-sentence and switches to a series of three prefaces: first, the one to Jerome’s *Chronicle*, then, more fittingly, that of *De temporum ratione*, lastly the one to Isidore’s *Chronica maior*. In another abrupt switch, the scribe finally turns to announcing the *Chronicon universale*, with a rubric not to be found in the other manuscripts: ‘INCIPIT LIBER CHRONICORUM EX DIUERSIS OPUSCULIS AUCTORUM COLLECTA IN UNUM’.

This rubric shows a very slight similarity with the second part of the (much longer) rubric located in the *Moissac Chronicle* at the same place, i.e. in between the prologue and the start of the first age: ‘In Christi nomine incipit LIBER CRONICORUM BEDANE PRESBTERI FAMULI CHRISTI, collectum breviter ab auctoribus ceterisque storiografis, Iheronimo, Augustino, Ambrosio, Ysídro, Orosio’. However, the version of the *Chronicon universale* in the Munich codex was not the one used for compiling the *Moissac Chronicle*. Within the first age, none of the interpolations unique to Munich are to be found in the *Moissac Chronicle*, while conversely interpolations missing in the Munich codex but present in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts are also to be found in the *Moissac Chronicle*. If the compiler of the *Moissac Chronicle* was indeed inspired by a rubric like the one in the Munich codex, there must have been yet another stage of manuscript copying, featuring a base-text as found in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts, but with a rubric prefiguring the one from the Munich manuscript, i.e. ‘analysing’ the nature of the present chronicle as a compilation. Consequently, in that case a certain amount of time must have elapsed between the initial compilation of the *Chronicon universale* and its further extension witnessed by the Munich manuscript.

55 After ‘ubi potuit quidem accedere’, cf. Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246, fol. 2*; ll. 3–4 = Bede, *De temporum ratione*, ed. by Jones, lxvi.19, p. 467, l. 138.

56 Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246, fol. 8*, ll. 3–5.

57 *Chronicon Moissiacense Maius*, ed. by Kats and Claszen, 11, 5.

58 Cf. for example *Chronicon Moissiacense Maius*, ed. by Kats and Claszen, 11, 5 n. 1 (documenting a long interpolation in Munich, BSB, MS lat. 246), and p. 6 n. d (documenting an interpolation missing in Munich, but present in the *Moissac Chronicle* as well as in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts).

59 The relationship could feasibly also have been the other way round, with Munich ‘summarizing’ the longer rubric from the *Moissac Chronicle*, or rather from an exemplar of the *Chronicon universale* used by the Moissac compiler, as Munich stops with 741 and features none of the additional material of the *Moissac Chronicle*. 
Following on from the rubric, the scribe returned to ground already covered, restarting the narrative from Adam onwards, only this time providing not Bede’s version but that of the *Chronicon universale*, i.e. including both the interpolations and the double datings.\(^{60}\) It is tempting to consider whether the scribe initially started copying from the wrong template — a regular copy of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* — before being made aware of his mistake and abandoning that text.\(^{61}\) Be that as it may, from this point onwards the text is basically that of the *Chronicon universale*, in the first age lacking two minor interpolations present in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts while at the same time significantly enlarging others and even adding entirely new ones.

Thus, at the start of Bede’s § 10, Adam’s son Seth is specified as ‘a quo filii dei’ (§ 10a), similarly, at the start of § 11, Seth’s son Enos is specified as ‘qui coepit inuocare nomen domini’ (§ 11a; despite Bede’s own text providing the same information in almost the same words a few lines later). Both interpolations have been taken from Isidore’s minor chronicle included in his *Etymologiae* (v.39.2), and have the appearance of glosses that were only later accidentally copied into the text proper of the chronicle. Within the first age, new interpolations ascribed to Isidore’s authority are located at the end of § 10 (on the murder of Cain; § 10b, fols 8r–9r) and § 16 (in praise of Jared’s son Enoch; § 16a, fol. 10r), while the old interpolation at the end of § 17 gets augmented by an elaborate computistic argument (on the respective ages of Methuselah, Lamech, and Noah; § 17a, fols 10v–11r), and the brief interpolation near the start of § 19 on Noah’s Ark is significantly expanded (§ 19a, fol. 11r–v).

The additional interpolations are mostly based on sources already used for the ‘first edition’ and include Jerome, Orosius, Isidore, the *Liber pontificalis*, and Fredegar. This observation gave rise to the hypothesis that both ‘editions’ of the text were compiled by the same person.\(^{62}\) However, Bruno Krusch has pointed out that the additional interpolations based on Fredegar in the Munich codex go back to a copy from the second manuscript class, while the ‘first edition’ in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts had used a copy closer to the third

\(^{60}\) This was overlooked by Von den Brincken, *Studien*, p. 114, who assumed both the section on fols 1r–2r and this section from fol. 8r onwards to provide the text of the *Chronicon universale*.

\(^{61}\) However, this confusion would presumably already have occurred in the exemplar used by the Munich scribe, which may then have confounded things even further by mixing up the quires on binding, which might explain why the series of three prefaces is not actually positioned at the start of the manuscript. All this is, however, highly speculative.

manuscript class. This would strongly argue against a single compiler having been responsible for both editions.

While the existing text of the *Chronicon universale* is thus considerably enlarged, its chronological scope is not, with the narrative still ending in 741. The manuscript continues with the remainder of *De temporum ratione* (chapters 67–71 on the end times, or seventh and eighth age), after which another scribe added Hrabanus Maurus’s *De praedestinatione* — again not without mishaps. Although much reduced in comparison to the other manuscripts, possibly by a mixture of accidents and incompetence, the version of the chronicle in the Munich codex retains at least part of its original context, i.e. Bede’s *De temporum ratione*. Clearly neither this extended version nor the original compilation of the *Chronicon universale* were ever intended as stand-alone historiographies.

(6) Brussels, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 17349–60

The history of this manuscript is rather complicated and in need of further research. A collection of various extracts of historical interest, it was compiled for Corneille-François de Nélis (later bishop of Antwerp) in 1783. The relevant part for the *Chronicon universale* is to be found on fols 13r–23v, in a section spanning fols 1r–23v either copied entirely or selectively from notes collected by Alexandre Wiltheim (d. 1684), a Jesuit cooperating with the Bollandists interested in the early history of Luxembourg. Wiltheim’s notes in turn were derived from several manuscripts from the abbeys of Stavelot, Echternach, and St Maximin in Trier.


64 Bischoff, *Schreibschulen*, i, 262: instead of the dedicatory letter, the scribe erroneously copied a ‘theologisches Stück’.

65 ‘The shelfmark — stated by Waitz in *Chronicon universale*, ed. by Waitz, p. 2, as ‘nr. 17351’ — can be confusing. In the catalogue, Van den Gheyen and Bacha, *Catalogue des manuscrits*, ix, 403–04, allocate the ‘numéro du présent catalogue’ of 6699 to the ‘cotes de l’inventaire’ 17349 to 17360 (or in short: ‘17349–60’). Thus, the shelfmark 17351 does not refer to a specific manuscript as much as to the third section within a manuscript containing the sections 17349 to 17360. Oddly enough, the catalogue then enumerates fourteen sections for the present manuscript, of which the part referenced by Waitz forms the third element of the first section (with the complete section going from fols 1r–23v). Cf. also Close, ‘Les Annales Maximiniani’, pp. 308–09, with n. 21.

Whether Wiltheim’s copy and the old manuscript from Trier — from the
time of Charlemagne, according to Wiltheim — still exist is unclear. According
to Waitz, who never saw the manuscript for himself, the Brussels manuscript
was consulted by Georg Pertz in 1825, though the description by Pertz him-
self implies that what he looked at was actually Wiltheim’s own copy. In
1844, Reiffenberg too indicated that de Nélis had copied from a manuscript
by Wiltheim that was still present in the Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, men-
tioning the shelfmark 2104. This is probably a slight misunderstanding on
Reiffenberg’s part, in that the manuscript described in the catalogue under the
shelfmark 2104–34 is only the first of several volumes containing material by
Wiltheim. But according to the catalogue, the fourth (and last) of these vol-
umes, no. 4495 with the shelfmark 6828–69, contains ‘Annales Trevirenses,
714–811’ on fols 82r–91r.

The relevance of the Brussels manuscript for the present study rests in its
set of annalistic notes for 710 to 811 on fols 13v–23r. Waitz only edited the
notes from 741 onwards as a direct continuation of the Chronicon universale
under the title Annales Maximi niani,72 as he had already included the earlier
notes (which repeat verbatim material otherwise only to be found in this form
and combination in the Chronicon universale) in his preceding edition of the

67 Waitz in Chronicon universale, ed. by Waitz, p. 2.
Wilthemii “Collectio rerum historicarum nondum editarum” in bibliotheca regia Bruxellensi
adservatis, seculi XVII exeuntis, Tomo quarto […] qui [the annals] inde ab a. 714 usque ad […]
anni 811 […] excurrunt’; the final sentence of the annals as quoted by Pertz is identical with the
final sentence of the Annales Maximi niani in Waitz’s edition. This was already noted by Kats
and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissia cense Maius’, i, 42.
71 Van den Gheyn, Catalogue des manuscrits, vi, 722. I am deeply grateful to my colleague
Bart van Hees, who has been instrumental in tracking down this notice as well as a potential
further copy in Den Haag. Since the time this article was originally composed, we have man-
aged to view the manuscript in Brussels and to ascertain that it is indeed a seventeenth-century
manuscript featuring the Annales Maximi niani on pp. 158–77, possibly a clear copy made for
Wiltheim and with several corrections and some additions in his own hand. If it is indeed a
copy then the original notes taken by Wiltheim himself are still missing. Bart van Hees and I are
preparing a separate study on the annals and their manuscripts. The manuscript of de Nélis lost
twelve words in the report for a. 807 due to an eye-skip and thus cannot have been the sole base
for Waitz’s edition.
72 Named after the monastery of St Maximin in Trier; not to be confused with the Annales
sancti Maximi niani Trevirensis, edited by Pertz in 1829 and again in 1841.
chronicle. Furthermore, there are also small remnants of chapters 66–67 of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* near the start and right at the end of the annals. Recently, Florence Close tried to argue that the annals, though based in part on the *Chronicon universale*, were never joined with a copy of the latter, but instead were compiled so as to add a narrative of the Carolingian dynasty’s history to a copy of Bede’s *Chronica maiora*.73

However, this would require an extremely unlikely scenario. Allegedly, the compiler wanted to add ‘la seule dynastie absente de la *Chronica maiora*’74 (i.e. the Carolingians) to Bede’s opus. He would then have started this task by extracting the relevant information from a manuscript that, though featuring the *Chronicon universale*, presumably declared itself to be a copy of Bede’s *De temporum ratione*, i.e. already contained the very material he wanted to add to the self-same text. Furthermore, despite his interest in the Carolingians, the compiler would have restricted himself, with few exceptions, to extract only material headed by an AD date75 while ignoring most of the *Chronicon universale*’s material on the Carolingian family culled from the *Liber historiarum Francorum* and hence lacking a separate AD date. On top of that the compiler chose to leave out two reports, for 712–13, but to include the last paragraph from Bede’s chapter 66 (§ 593) on the Lombard king Liutprand’s acquisition of the relics of St Augustine,76 though moving the section further down from its original place in the *Chronicon universale*, situating it as part of the report for 741 in between the death of Charles Martel and the plight of Pope Zachary.

Finally, Close entertains the possibility that the compiler of the annals, working in 811 or later, may have been identical with the compiler of the *Chronicon universale* himself.77 This is however rather unlikely. For one, the time elapsed between the original compilation (before 775, as the death of Emperor

---

75 In one case (a. 716) this included one of the extremely rare AD dates already provided by Bede himself, though, to make matters more complicated, not actually providing Bede’s report (on the Anglo-Saxon missionary Egbert) but extracting the date only, in order to clarify the *eo anno* with which the ensuing, otherwise undated report on Charles Martel starts.
76 A minor variant that could prove this story to have been lifted not from a Bede manuscript but from a copy of the *Chronicon universale* unfortunately may simply be due to a typo in Jones’s edition, cf. Bede, *De temporum ratione*, ed. by Jones, lxvi.593, p. 535, with ‘loca fedarent illa’, against Brussels, KBR, MS 17349–60, fol. 14v, as well as the Würzburg, Paris, Besançon, and Munich manuscripts (Leiden being illegible here due to damage) with ‘loca faedarent illa’. However, Bede, *Chronica maiora*, ed. by Mommsen, 593, p. 321, also has ‘loca fedarent illa’.
Constantine V in that year appears to have been unknown to the compiler) and the continuation (in 811 at the earliest) would require a rather long-lived author. For another, the original compiler had already done earlier precisely what Close claims was the aim of the composition of the annals: the addition of Frankish and Carolingian history to a copy of Bede’s *Chronica maiora*.

In general, Close’s hypothesis appears somewhat ill at ease with Ockham’s razor. Our sole evidence consists of an eighteenth-century copy of a set of late seventeenth-century extracts from an early medieval manuscript. The material taken from that manuscript is partly unique in this form (the annalistic reports from 741 onwards), and derives partly from several other sources (e.g. Bede, *Liber historiae Francorum*, *Annales Flaviniacenses*) — but is only encountered in a single source in this very combination and form, namely in the *Chronicon universale*. It is rather unusual to assume, based only on a change in sequence within a set of early modern extracts, that these extracts would not derive from the known source containing all of them but from an entirely hypothetical variant of that source which supposedly was produced by first taking most of those extracts from the known source, then adding a continuation for seventy years to the extracts, before finally re-inserting them back into an earlier version of the very same source they were extracted from previously.

Therefore, until stronger arguments can be brought forth, Close’s hypothesis has to be rejected. Instead, the alternative hypothesis she voiced herself (but discarded as less likely) should still be considered the most probable explanation: that Alexandre Wiltheim, collecting material on ‘d’histoire ancienne et luxembourgeoise de l’époque mérovingienne jusqu’au xviié siècle’ restricted himself to copying those passages that he assumed to form part of a Carolingian set of annals that had been inserted into a copy of Bede’s world chronicle. This explains why most of Bede’s original text was left out, as well as virtually all the material based on Fredegar or the *Liber historiae Francorum* that was not immediately preceded by an AD date. The omission of the reports for 712–13 might be due to their non-Frankish content, but could also have had different reasons. The inclusion of the (misplaced) last paragraph of Bede’s chapter 66

---

78 Every single extant manuscript of the *Chronicon universale* with a complete set of the annalistic reports at the heart of the *Annales Maximiniani*’s section for 710–41 also contains § 593 from chapter 66 of Bede’s *De temporum ratione*.


81 It is worth recalling the Paris codex, or rather its exemplar, in which the two reports missing in the Brussels codex are conversely the only two annalistic reports included.
(§ 593, on Liutprand), remains a mystery however, while the start of chapter 67 may have been copied to indicate the context in which Wiltheim encountered that set of annalistic notes, i.e. a manuscript with a text proclaiming to be a copy of Bede’s De temporum ratione.

A Text in Motion

Looking back on the six manuscripts, several points stand out:

All manuscripts from the ninth century, with the sole exception of the Munich codex, continue to embed the Chronicon universale within a complete copy of De temporum ratione, replacing, or more accurately: enhancing Bede’s Chronica maiora. Even the Munich codex, despite possible accidents on rebinding that may have caused loss of text, retains at least the preface of De temporum ratione and its final section (chapters 67–71, on the end times), following after the chronicle proper. This is a vital clue for the intentions and perceptions of contemporary compilers, editors, and readers of the text alike, and should caution against focusing too much on potential political interests of these groups.

This aspect ties in with the constant change in the size of the chronicle, which in most cases did not correspond to a change in its scope. The chronological range was only adapted twice (leaving aside the Moissac Chronicle): once to continue the narrative from Bede’s time to 741, and once in the Brussels manuscript, presumably, with the addition of annalistic reports up to 811. In contrast, in the Munich codex there is a massive amount of new material, roughly doubling the size of the chronicle, and yet its author did not care to add a single event from after 741. The compilers of the Würzburg and Paris manuscripts went even further when they extracted only sections from the Chronicon universale that fell within the original boundaries of Bede’s Chronica maiora, i.e. Creation to ad 725. Clearly, having a historical narrative that spanned as much of the past as possible had not been uppermost in the minds of these scribes or their audience.

In another remarkable feature, only two of the manuscripts (Besançon and Leiden) broadly share the same text. Every other manuscript creates a version of its own. Moreover, these versions cannot be pressed into a simple evolutionary

82 A similar caveat was already raised by Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensia’, i, 521, who questioned, with reference to the Moissac Chronicle, whether ‘die Herstellung einer historiographischen Synthese überhaupt beabsichtigt war’.

83 See e.g. Reimitz, History, Frankish Identity, pp. 345–51, with the hypothesis of the Chronicon universale having been compiled in order to legitimize Charlemagne’s conquest of the Lombard kingdom in 774.
model according to the amount of interpolations they contain. For though at first glance it may appear tempting to consider the Würzburg and Paris manuscripts to represent the first steps on the way from enhancing *De temporum ratione* to creating the *Chronicon universale*, another puzzling trait in several manuscripts suggests that the actual genesis of the extant ninth-century manuscripts was far more complicated.

Waitz had already noticed that within the *De temporum ratione* section of the Leiden manuscript, Bede’s test cases provided alongside his instructions in chapters 49, 52, 54, and 58 on how to calculate indictions, epacts, leap years, and the position in the lunar cycle had been changed from a base of 725 — the year in which Bede finished his work — to 800 and 801. From this Waitz had concluded that the *Chronicon universale* itself must have been compiled during those years.\(^8\) Mommsen had challenged Waitz, pointing to the Paris codex, in which this adaptation had been imperfectly executed, resulting in an unholy mess that occasionally takes, within the same calculation, some numbers from Bede’s original text and some from the updated version of the Leiden codex.\(^8\) This led Mommsen to argue that both Leiden and Paris are likely to have used a manuscript in which the changeover had not been present from the outset but had only been added retrospectively by a later corrector, with the copyist of the Paris codex misunderstanding or overlooking some of these corrections and hence copying the, still partly legible, original text by Bede instead.\(^8\)

A further comparison taking in the Würzburg and Besançon manuscripts has shown the latter to closely follow the text of Leiden, excepting some individual scribal mistakes in chapters 52 and 58. Würzburg, suffering from the loss of a quire in this section of *De temporum ratione*, has only retained chapter 49, in which the same change as in the Leiden codex can be observed.

\(^8\) Waitz in *Chronicon universale*, ed. by Waitz, p. 1; similarly Jaffé, ‘Über die Handschrift’, p. 680. In a previous article, Waitz had been more open to alternative explanations for this adaptation, cf. Waitz, ‘Zur Geschichtsschreibung’, p. 486.

\(^8\) For example, the resulting mathematics for epacts in chapter 52 on fol. 69\(^v\) run like this: divide 825 by 19 (Bede: 725 by 19; Leiden, UB, MS Scal. 28: 801 by 19; perhaps the scribe misread a correction of DCCXXV to DCCCI in which Roman numerals had been added and others expunged?). The division is split up in stages, assembling multiples of 19 first, before calculating the remainder: 19 \(\times\) 40 = 760 (same as in Leiden; Bede: 19 \(\times\) 30 = 570), 19 \(\times\) 8 = 152 (same as in Bede; Leiden: 19 \(\times\) 2 = 38); remainder 3 (same as in Bede and Leiden). However, 760 plus 152 makes 912, not 822 (as would have been required for a differential of 3 to the target year of 825). Scribal mistakes in the Besançon codex (a surplus I and a III misread as VI) compromise that manuscript’s calculation, too.

\(^8\) Mommsen, ‘Zur Weltchronik’. However, Mommsen did not consider the possibility of the scribe himself having already used two exemplars side by side, one Bede, one *Chronicon universale*.\(\)
The conclusions from this shed more light on the genesis of the extant *Chronicon universale* manuscripts and allow for some corrections of previous scholarly positions:

1. While the changes do indeed imply a terminus post quem of 801, the precise year of that change need not have been 801, and definitely was not 800. Obviously the scribe responsible for the changeover in chapters 49 and 54 to 800, and in chapters 52 and 58 to 801, could hardly have been copying the first and third of these chapters in a different year than the second and fourth. Moreover, neither Waitz nor Jaffé nor Mommsen had realized the mathematic motivation behind the change: the calculation in chapter 49 requires a division by 15, while those in chapters 52 and 58 require a division by 19.87 Changing Bede’s examples from 725 to 800 and 801 meant getting these three test cases closer to the time at which the copyist of the lost model used in the Leiden and Paris manuscripts was going about his business — in that Waitz has been correct — but crucially choosing these two years preserved the final result of each calculation, ensuring only some intermediate numbers had to be adjusted while Bede’s final concluding sentence could always be retained. For the differential to 800 amounts to 75, i.e. to a multiple of 15 and hence the remainder from the division by 15 (chapter 49) did not change, while the differential to 801, 76, as a multiple of 19 achieved the same for the two cases that required a division by 19 (chapters 52 and 58). Assuming the author of these changes to have chosen the most recent years from his immediate past, the timespan in which the calculations were adapted can now be narrowed down to between 801 and possibly 814, as 815 would already have been the next year with the same indication as 725 and 800.

2. The genesis of the Paris codex still requires further detailed study and a comparison of variants beyond the chronicle proper. Almost certainly,88 the original scribe had used two exemplars that both claimed to represent Bede’s *De temporum ratione*. One of these however did actually qualify as a *Chronicon universale* manuscript (similar to the Besançon and Leiden type) and

---

87 Chapter 54 is the odd one out, as it requires a division by four for the leap year, and another by seven for the solar epact. The ensuing calculation on the new base of AD 800 (Besançon and Leiden) or 825 (Paris; probably a scribal mistake, misreading a correction from DCCXXV to DCCC, or forgetting to erase a surplus C when trying to revert back from DCCC to Bede’s DCCXXV) barely manages to get it right in the case of the leap year, and flounders utterly when trying to divide by seven.

88 Unless the well-founded consensus on a pre-775 origin of the *Chronicon universale* is abandoned.
included the changeover in the model calculations. So far, the best explanation for the codicological record would appear to be the following scenario: the scribe started copying from an exemplar of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* that featured an interpolated version of chapter 66 (i.e. contained the *Chronicon universale*) until the end of the prologue of chapter 66.\(^89\) For unknown reasons, he changed his exemplar after § 8 at the latest. Perhaps he noticed that his two models offered entirely different texts for § 9, and therefore decided to switch his main exemplar, but to retain both versions of § 9. First, he copied Bede’s version of § 9, including a separate rubric for this section that erroneously declared it to be chapter 67 (‘LXVII De cursus aetatum earundem’).\(^90\) Then he added § 9a, again prefaced by a misleading chapter number (‘LXVIII’), though without a rubric. From then on, with § 10 and the start of the first age, he kept to Bede’s text (i.e. the *Chronica maiora*), eschewing the double datings so painstakingly calculated by the compiler of the *Chronicon universale*. Only near the end of the sixth age, from § 488 onwards, would he deign to include some of the compiler’s interpolations, though never with any of the additional Septuagint dates. Despite his general preference for Bede’s text the scribe did not revert back to Bede’s numbers for the test case calculations, even though he already executed several, partly still legible, expungements and corrections in those passages. It remained for a corrector to give up on the attempt to update the calculations to ninth-century examples and to return to Bede’s original text in full. In all, the Paris codex, while certainly offering a highly idiosyncratic text, does not quite ‘represen[t] a further and possibly independent extension of Bede’s chronicle text’\(^91\), but appears to represent a reduction of the *Chronicon universale*’s extensions to Bede. But it fits Mommsen’s dictum of a ‘Wechselbalg’ rather well, as a text that came into being through a series of changes (‘Wechsel’) of its models to copy from.

3. With the changeover in the model calculations established as having only been introduced to a lost copy of the *Chronicon universale* in or after 801,

\(^89\) Besides the changeover in the calculations this is made likely by the variant in § 5 discussed above. Further transcriptions of, at the very least, selected chapters of *De temporum ratione* in the other *Chronicon universale* manuscripts are needed to determine whether chapters 1–65 were exclusively copied from such an exemplar, or whether traces of the second exemplar with its regular version of Bede’s text can already be detected there.

\(^90\) Cf. BnF, MS NAL 1615, fol. 82r; about four letters (in regular ink) have been erased before the start of the rubric (in red ink) but this correction appears to be unrelated to the issue at hand. The misleading rubric is encountered in several manuscripts of *De temporum ratione*, as Jones notes (p. 464, apparatus for line 48).

the Würzburg manuscript cannot represent an early stage in the genesis of the *Chronicon universale* as it already contains that same change. Instead, here we have probably a case of contamination, with an attentive scribe approving both of the updated calculations and of § 9a as a more fitting conclusion to the chronicle’s prologue.

4. With the post-800 calculations not in conflict with the pre-775 dating of the initial compilation, the reception of the *Chronicon universale* most likely only took off after 800, as not a single manuscript retained calculations still using a date from the eighth century. Only the Munich codex may have been an exception, as it is missing two minor interpolations in the first age that are present in the Besançon and Leiden manuscripts and hence might have drawn on an earlier version. Finally, any compilation featuring the *Annales Maximiniiani* obviously has to post-date 811.

During that brief flurry of interest in the *Chronicon universale* however, the old compiler’s text was treated with a remarkable flexibility by almost every copyist. Far from indicating a lack of respect for his work, this may actually illustrate how widely shared his perception of the needs of his time were: namely that the Carolingian era required a constantly enhanced and updated version of Bede’s *De temporum ratione*.

**Conclusion**

A lot of work still remains to be done on the *Chronicon universale*. In this article, it was only possible to review the complicated manuscript transmission of the text. The flexibility of the *Chronicon universale*, indicative of its openness to constant revision and rewriting, stands out as a trait not usually associated with works of historiography. However, similarities in that respect can actually be found in several other historiographic texts from the eighth century as well, most famously in the complex web that is formed by the so called ‘minor annals’ and their bewildering multitude of stem texts, at least two of which were used for the *Chronicon universale*. All these texts pose a formidable chal-

---

92 On the problem of minor annals and stem texts cf. Davis, *Charlemagne’s Practice of Empire*, pp. 179–204; scaling back the possibly overestimated role of the *Royal Frankish Annals* in Davis’s model of the production of minor annals, the parallels to the pre-775 *Chronicon universale* appear even more distinct — as yet another stem text to which material could be added (as in the codices from Munich, for depth, and Brussels, for chronological breadth) or extracted from (as in the Paris and Würzburg manuscripts) to suit changing needs and priorities.
lenge to anybody inclined to look for Lachmannesque archetypes, or expecting a single authoritative and stable 'literary work'.

On the basis of the revised manuscript tradition, further research should now be possible, focusing on the text itself, the selection and treatment of its sources by the compiler, but also on the still unresolved issue of its time, place, and the intentions behind its genesis. Currently, mid-eighth-century Burgundy93 might be a hypothesis worth exploring, considering the recurring codicological links to Autun, Flavigny, St Seine, Fleury, and Auxerre, as well as the inclusion of a Burgundian origin myth, the possible contacts to the scribes working for Count Childebrand, most likely in Burgundy, on a substantial revision and continuation of the old Fredegar Chronicle,94 and its reception by the compiler of the Moissac Chronicle with his southern and Aquitanian slant.

The first Carolingian world chronicle? Historiography trying, and failing, in its attempt at a shotgun marriage of chronicles and annals? A barren collection of facts to pad out a handbook of computistics? An impressive multidisciplinary approach tackling time in all its dimensions? Textual fluidity indicating a regrettable lack of coherence, a laudable openness to future enhancement, or both? Definite answers to these questions may only be possible after further research into the text, including its earlier, as yet unedited parts. But in the end, the unique approach of the Chronicon universale may well turn out to be rather typical for pragmatic Carolingian appropriations, adaptations, and emulations of different genres.95

93 Thus already Kaiser, 'Chronicon universale', 440 ('possibly Flavigny').
94 On Childebrand, his family, and their possessions, cf. Kasten, ‘Erbrechtliche Verfügungen’, esp. pp. 300–04; Kasten, Königsöhne, pp. 104–05; see also Helmut Reimitz’s contribution in this volume. Unfortunately, Collins, Fredegar-Chroniken, p. 90, appears to be entirely unaware of Kasten’s findings.
95 On this general Carolingian tendency cf. McKitterick, ‘Legacy’.
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A Crowning Achievement:
Carolingian Imperial Identity
in the Chronicon Moissiacense

Rutger Kramer*

On the fourth of May 1678, the French civil servant Nicolas-Joseph Foucault wrote a letter to his colleague Étienne Baluze about a number of interesting manuscripts that he had found in the archives of the monastery of Moissac. The list featured many items, such as a seventeen-volume collection of works by Augustine, a copy of the *Lex Gothorum*, a *Sanctorale* that was later recognized as Lactantius’s lost *De mortibus persecutorum*, Smaragdus’s *Diadema monachorum*, and an ‘old pontifical’.\(^1\) It was enough to raise the interest of Baluze, who at the time served as the librarian of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, the notorious Minister of Finances under Louis XIV: the monastery received 1200 francs ‘to be used for ornamentations’, and the whole collection was sent to Paris.\(^2\) Also among these manuscripts was ‘une ancienne chronique d’Adam à Louis le Débonaire, avec quelques petits traités’.\(^3\) In the centuries that followed, this ‘ancient chronicle’, an eleventh-century manuscript that is currently in Paris,\(^4\)

\(^1\) The complete list may be found in a footnote in Foucault, *Mémoires*, pp. CXIX–CXX.

\(^2\) Foucault, *Mémoires*, p. 79: ‘Au mois de juillet 1681, j’ai envoyé à M. Colbert deux cents manuscrits de l’abbaye de Moissac; il a donné aux chanoines 1,200 applicables en des ornemens [sic].’
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On the fourth of May 1678, the French civil servant Nicolas-Joseph Foucault wrote a letter to his colleague Étienne Baluze about a number of interesting manuscripts that he had found in the archives of the monastery of Moissac. The list featured many items, such as a seventeen-volume collection of works by Augustine, a copy of the *Lex Gothorum*, a *Sanctorale* that was later recognized as Lactantius’s lost *De mortibus persecutorum*, Smaragdus’s *Diadema monachorum*, and an ‘old pontifical’. It was enough to raise the interest of Baluze, who at the time served as the librarian of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, the notorious Minister of Finances under Louis XIV: the monastery received 1200 francs ‘to be used for ornamentations’, and the whole collection was sent to Paris. Also among these manuscripts was ‘une ancienne chronique d’Adam à Louis le Débonaire, avec quelques petits traités’. In the centuries that followed, this ‘ancient chronicle’, an eleventh-century manuscript that is currently Paris,
BnF, MS lat. 4886, became known as the *Chronicon Moissiacense*, the *Chronicle of Moissac*.

The *Chronicon Moissiacense* is a highly interesting work of Carolingian historiography, which to this day continues to raise as many questions as it helps answer. Apart from the eleventh-century codex discovered by Foucault, it only exists in one other version, which was also part of Colbert’s library. This is a twelfth-century manuscript, currently Paris, BnF, MS lat. 5941. While both versions present themselves as copies of an adaptation of Bede’s computistical tract *De temporum ratione* (hereafter *DTR*) and imply Bede was the author of the narrative, the intention behind them or the codicological context within which they fit differs wildly between the two. The first one appears to be the more accurate copy of the two, starting with the prologue to the *DTR* and inserting a paragraph from Isidore’s *Etymologies* (the entry on ‘Chronicle’) as well as a prologue specifying both Bede, the purported author, and his sources. BnF, MS lat. 5941, on the other hand, has been heavily interpolated, and was later incorporated into a fourteenth-century manuscript with texts pertaining to the history of Barcelona, in the process turning it into a different work. This is indicated both by the title given in this manuscript, the ‘Genealogia ortus vel actus sive vita Karoli gloriosi atque piissimi imperatoris’, and by the fact that this version only starts around 680, with a defeat of the Austrasian Pippin of Herstal and Martin of Laon at the hands of Ebroin. This defeat set in motion the events that led to the decisive Austrasian victory over their Neustrian adversaries at Tertry, seven years later.

---

4 Apart from the edition by Kats and Claszen, ‘*Chronicon Moissiacense Maius*’, this text has been partially edited and commented on by Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensiæ’, as well as by Pertz, MGH Scriptores 1, pp. 280–313 (with additional improvements in MGH Scriptores 2, pp. 257–59). Buc, ‘Ritual and Interpretation’, also includes an edition of BnF, MS lat. 4886, albeit for the years 813–18 only. The dating is based on a list of popes on fol. 67v of BnF, MS lat. 4886, which ends in the tenth year of the pontificate of Alexander II, providing a *terminus ante quem* of 1071: Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensiæ’, p. 503. This list is written in a different hand from the preceding texts, however, and appears to have been written over an erased fragment entitled ‘Nomina apostolorum quis fuerit in Romam’; the first line ‘Petrus apostolus anni xxv et mensibus ii dies iii’ has remained intact, the remainder of the list of popes is written in a noticeably different hand (which may have been responsible for some marginal glosses as well).

5 BnF, MS lat. 5941 has been digitized; BnF, MS lat. 4886 is also online, see the entries in the bibliography. More research is needed to assess the composition of these manuscripts, especially BnF, MS lat. 4886. Many thanks to Anna Dorofeeva and Bernhard Zeller for helping me to make sense of some of its idiosyncrasies (and deciding it would be worth a separate research project to reach a fuller understanding of this manuscript).

6 *CM*, a. 680, p. 105. On this event, see Fouracre, ‘*Francia*’, pp. 390–92. It is unclear if this
While the two extant manuscripts thus highlight different qualities of the ‘Urtext’, it has been generally accepted that the version known as the *Chronicon Moissiacense* (*CM*) received its current form sometime in the early 820s. This form was the final link in what Ian Wood and Helmut Reimitz have called a ‘chain of chronicles’, a compilation of many older texts. The observation that it contains many otherwise unknown historiographical details with a definite southern slant has caused the *Chronicon Moissiacense* to be regarded as an ‘Aquitanian counterpart’ to the *corpus* of Carolingian historiography that owed its perceived credibility to its connection with the court. This has been enhanced by the edition in the first volume of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, which added the two extant versions together into a single reconstructed text that, until well into the twentieth century, was thought to represent this ‘southern’ version of Frankish history.

In 1978, Patrick Geary already argued that a southern origin for the *CM* was highly probable, although it will remain unclear where exactly this particular version of history first saw the light of day as there are several likely candidates among the monasteries in the region. Geary also signalled the need for a reappraisal of the *CM*’s manuscript transmission. His admonition was repeated version lost the beginning at some point during its transmission, or if it was a conscious choice by the compiler to start in the 680s. Given the pro-Carolingian slant of this late medieval Catalan version, it may not be a coincidence that it starts around the same time as the famously pro-Carolingian *Annales Mettenses Prioires*, for instance, which takes the Battle of Tertry (687) as its starting point: ed. by Von Simson, p. 1; trans. by Fouracre and Gerberding, p. 350. See also Hen, ‘The Annals of Metz’.

---

9 For example Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 11, 266. McKitterick, ‘Constructing the Past’. One could also consider the *Annales Mettenses Prioires* as such a family-friendly source, written as it was at the monastery of Chelles under the influence of Charlemagne’s sister Gisela, Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 11, 260–64; Hen, ‘Canvassing for Charles’.

10 See above, notes 4 and 5.
11 Geary, ‘Un fragment”; Kettemann, ‘Subsidia Anianensis’, p. 504. Geary postulated that the manuscript may have come from Narbonne, and Walter Kettemann, who favoured the region around the monasteries of Psalmodi, Gellone, or Sauves, it seems safe to assume that it has roots somewhere in the Languedoc-Roussillon region. See also Buc, ‘Ritual and Interpretation’, pp. 202–04, and Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, 1, 19–20, for alternative interpretations about the origins of the chronicle, which, most notably, centre on the monasteries of Ripoll and Rabastens, and which are based on connections to the manuscripts of the *CM* rather than the text per se.
by Philippe Buc twenty-two years later. Since then a lot more work has been done to deepen our understanding of the CM’s relation to its cultural and political context. Also in 2000, Walter Kettermann made a major step forward in his dissertation on the textual output of the monastery of Aniane, near present-day Montpellier, founded by Benedict, one of the most prominent players at court during the early years of Louis the Pious, and one of the architects of the emperor’s attempts to continue his father’s programme of correctio for the Frankish ecclesia. According to Kettermann, the CM should be placed among these texts. Although it is impossible to say anything with certainty, a strong case has been made by Kettermann for a composition somewhere in Septimania, based on what Fichtenau has called yearly Korrespondenzberichte that emanated from the court circle. It thus stands as evidence of enduring contacts between the court and the southern reaches of the empire: contacts which were maintained by Benedict of Aniane especially.

Over a decade later, Hans Kats, as part of his PhD thesis at Leiden University, set out to make a full critical edition of the text. His work was completed posthumously by David Claszen in early 2013. Their edition and commentary remain the most comprehensive version of the text currently available, and their work on the stemma and the codicological context around the CM proves a valuable starting point for further research. Between them, Kettermann and Kats/Claszen have recovered many pieces of the puzzle. The main goal of this contribution will therefore be to raise points for further development rather than to close the book on the Chronicon Moissiacense. It will do so by focusing on the narrative in its early ninth-century context, rather than on the question of its origins or the current state of our knowledge of the manuscript context.

If we accept that the CM in its early ninth-century version most probably sprang from the south, it offers a historical narrative that at times presents an alternative, localized version of events while still remaining anchored to the wider political realities at the time. Regardless of whether or not the text

---

12 Buc, ‘Ritual and Interpretation’.
13 Kettermann, ‘Subsidia Anianensis’, p. 37; the full work was made accessible to the public only in 2008, and is available online. On Benedict of Aniane and his influence, see Kramer, Rethinking Authority, pp. 169–214.
15 Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i–ii. In what follows, I shall refer to the commentary in vol. I by adding the names of the co-authors, and to the edition in vol. II simply by referring to the title they have given the work.
16 Similar to the Chronicon by Ado of Vienne, as studied in this volume by Sukanya
may be linked to the influence of the powerful courtier Benedict of Aniane, it offered a vision of the Carolingian rise to power that suited an audience of southern elites, a version which allowed the south to retain a sense of its own identity without denying the importance of the Carolingians for the development of the region.\footnote{Whether or not the sources from southern Gaul allow us to speak of a distinct ‘identity’ for the region remains an open question. One of the first modern historians to attempt a comprehensive history of the region, Auzias, \textit{L’Aquitaine carolingienne}, posited on p. 70 that ‘Aquitaine was no different from other regions within the empire’, but Wolff, \textit{‘L’Aquitaine’}, pp. 66–67 affirms that this appears only to be true from a political and administrative point of view. Focusing on the pre-Carolingian period, Rouche, \textit{L’Aquitaine} does work from the assumption that the history of southern Gaul gave the region a distinct flavour, whereas works such as Remensnyder, \textit{Remembering Kings Past} remind us that the challenge of pinning down Aquitaine consists in part in analysing the way medieval authors dealt with their own past(s). See also Bellarbre, \textit{‘Aquitania, Wasconia, Hispania’}, and Bellarbre, \textit{‘La “nation” aquitaine’}.
}

Studying the way in which the scribes responsible for composing and/or compiling the \textit{CM}, who probably stemmed from the elite monastic milieu of Septimania or Aquitaine presented their version will help us better understand the way they saw themselves as a function of the empire that had sprung up around them.\footnote{Cf. Reimitz, \textit{‘The Art of Truth’}, pp. 102–03. Although the \textit{CM} in its current form is the product of several generations of composition, compilation, and authorship, I will henceforth refer to its producer(s) as ‘the compiler’ whenever necessary.} The value of the \textit{CM} thus goes beyond the regional details it provides. For all intents and purposes, it still is a universal history, a narrative of God’s design for humanity, presenting the story of the rise of an empire as the culmination of a divine plan.\footnote{Werner, \textit{‘Gott, Herrscher und Historiograph’}} It provides a fresh perspective on the ways in which the Carolingian ‘success story’ could be written by contemporary observers who were part of the empire without being part of its inner circle, and who shaped their history according to the expectations of their audience as well as their own political preconceptions.\footnote{See for a later example Airlie, \textit{‘Sad Stories’}.} This becomes especially clear if we look at the final part of the \textit{CM}, which details the re-establishment of the empire in the West as a crowning achievement of Frankish history. Looking at this final part of the compilation not only offers us an opportunity to see how the recent and distant pasts would on occasion collide
in the early ninth century. It also helps to highlight the chimeric nature of the text itself.

**Contexts**

Understanding the manuscript context of the *CM* is a challenge in itself, and although it falls beyond the scope of this contribution to fully delve into the intricacies of the compilation history, some brief observations are needed to get a firmer grasp of the narrative strategies used as the story neared its final entries.

While it is unclear whether or not it concerns an addition made by the eleventh-century copyist, the earlier manuscript, BnF, MS lat. 4886, provides a hint as to the intent behind the compilation: it attributes the text to Bede, who, according to the preface added by the compiler, used a veritable who’s who of late antique historiography for his sources. In fact, the *CM* in this manuscript is bookended by Bede: the prologue to his *Chronica maior*, chapter 66 of *DTR*, is at the start, and it is followed by chapters 67 and 68 of that same work. The addition of these two chapters provided a short preview of the end of times to finish the historical narrative provided by the *CM*.

This provides a clear indication as to the intentions behind the compilation. One of the goals of Bede’s *Chronica maior* was to show how the computation of Easter Cycles, as explained in the *DTR* as a whole, and the reckoning of time in general related to the passage of human history, including its inevitable

---

21 For this distinction, see for example the cases presented by Sot, ‘Autorité’. On the importance of looking at the end of a chronicle to situate it in its most immediate context, see for instance MacLean, ‘Insinuation’, esp. pp. 24–25; and in the present volume, Ward, ‘The Sense of an Ending’.

22 The as-yet unpublished PhD thesis by Bellarbre, *Composer avec le passé*, offers the most comprehensive overview of the manuscript matrix, context, and transmission of historiographical works in Aquitaine in the high Middle Ages.

23 *CM*, p. 5: ‘In Christi nomine incipit LIBER CRONICORUM BEDANE PRESBYTERI FAMULI CHRISTI, collectum breviter ab auctoribus ceterisque storiografis, Iheronimo, Augustino, Ambrosio, Ysidoro, Orosio nec non Iosepho, qui multa de temporum seriem scripsit Rufino vel Marcellino comite, de totis summam incipiens ab Adam numerum annorum et aetates temporum secundum Hebreos vel secundum LXX interpretes, iuculente [*sic*; probably luculente] scripsit. Addens ad hoc [*sic*] annos ab incarnatione domini’.


end. That time was on the mind of the composer or compiler as well becomes clear in the prologue at the beginning of the narrative, in which Bede’s six ages are expanded upon. They are described as a series of sunrises and sunsets, with each age beginning positive and ending on a darker note. Thus, the CM signalled its audience that the story described would continue after the narrative was done: ‘It is uncertain when the evening will fall over the [sixth] age’, the author wrote, but evening will fall, ‘and at the end, the whole machinery of the world will be consumed by fire during the judgement of the heavenly majesty’. Afterwards, the seventh age would start with the liberation of the souls of the righteous, and those who would have been washed of all sins may take their place among the martyrs in heaven. That last time, the sun would not set.

To Bede’s chronicle, in itself a continuation of the Chronicon by Eusebius-Jerome, were added fragments from works by other authors, most notably Antiquities of the Jews and The Jewish War by Flavius Josephus, as well as Orosius’s History against the Pagans and the Latin translation of Eusebius’s Historia ecclesiastica by Rufinus for the parts dealing with early history, and the Liber historiae Francorum and Fredegar’s Chronicle from the moment the Franks make their appearance. Attached to this eighth-century composition is a continuation that, until the year 803, is based on the Annales Laureshamenses, a short chronicle from the Rhineland that was initially compiled in 785 at the abbey of Lorsch. This text comprises a more or less cohesive narrative for the first sixty-five years until 767, and was afterwards updated on a year-by-year basis. One version, similar, but not identical, to the one in Sankt Paul im Lavanttal MS 8/1, continued until 803 and served as the basis for the CM. While the


27 CM, De sex huius seculi etatibus, pp. 1–4.


29 CM, De sex huius seculi etatibus, p. 4.


readings integrated into the CM differ from those offered in this manuscript at several (minor) points, a cautious conclusion seems to be that the compilation of the CM must have been made after 803 as well. The choice of the *Annales Laureshamenses*, which may simply have been a matter of availability, gives the CM a rather idiosyncratic perspective on the Carolingian Empire, different from more ‘official’ narratives such as the *Annales regni Francorunm* and its later reworkings.\(^{33}\) This point of view is continued in the last fifteen years of the CM, which consist of material that has not been accounted for elsewhere, and which has been considered to be a continuation of the *Annales Laureshamenses*. This assumption is primarily based on the spurious idea that the compiler of the CM would not have been able to compose any ‘original’ content.\(^{34}\) It is, however, equally likely that the compiler of the extant version did add these entries without recourse to a previous source, adapting them to the style of the last source text used.

The ending in 818, the fact that the CM may be the culmination of a late eighth- and early ninth-century cluster of historiographical narratives, and the fact that the layout of the marginal glosses in BnF, MS lat. 4886 indicates that some of them may have been copied from an earlier version, all support the hypothesis that this is a relatively intact copy of a supposedly ninth-century predecessor.\(^{35}\) This is in spite of the fact that one quire or several pages appear to be missing between fols 45\(^{r}\) and 46\(^{v}\), leading to a gap for the years 716–72. Subsequent editors have filled this gap by incorporating the narrative in BnF, MS lat. 5941 wholesale, but given the wholly different historiographical strategies employed in that compilation, this solution raises as many problems as it solves: according to one reading by the influential Catalan historian Ramón d’Abadal, this manuscript even was based on ‘an independent work, written […] by a monk of Aniane in the mid-ninth century on the basis of the *Royal Frankish Annals*, another [southern] annals, now lost, and loose notes’, only tangentially linked to its counterpart BnF, MS lat. 4886, and more overtly concerned with establishing the history and identity of the rulers of

\(^{33}\) Collins, ‘Charlemagne’s Imperial Coronation’; Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity*, pp. 359–69. Íhegan also seems to have used the *Annales regni Francorum* exclusively, for example: Tremp, *Studien*, pp. 23–26.

\(^{34}\) Most notably, by Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, ii, 265–66: ‘Der Verfasser war so unselbständig und schrieb so gewissenhaft seine Vorlagen wörtlich ab, daß ihm auch der wertvolle letzte Teil der Chronik von 803–18 nicht zuzutrauen ist’; Rossignol, ‘The Entry of the Early Slavs’ follows this interpretation, albeit with some caveats. However, see Fichtenau, *Karl der Grosse*, pp. 303–05.

\(^{35}\) Kats and Claszen, ‘Chronicon Moissiacense Maius’, i, 30.
Barcelona. On the other hand, even if their precise relation cannot be gauged through the tangled skein that is Carolingian historiography in the early ninth century, the two texts appear to be connected by a shared pool of narratives, and it is the incidental details added in BnF, MS lat. 5941 that would situate the CM in south-western Gaul and possibly even the circle around Benedict of Aniane. It has a marginal note describing the foundation of the monastery of Aniane by ‘the abbot Benedict who was called Witiza (witiche)’ in 782, for example, as well as a gloss referring to the ‘flowering’ of the magister Ardo, the author of the *Vita Benedicti Anianensis*, in 793.

Both manuscripts thus show how the CM is situated in a ‘convergence’ of several versions of history in the late eighth and early ninth centuries, and how this played out over a longer period of time. To this is added the observation that the narrative is also attached to a ‘historiographical family’ around the nucleus of an earlier compilation known as the *Chronicon universale* or *Chronicle of 741*. This world chronicle, which tells the history of the world from Creation until the early 740s, also uses Bede’s *Chronica maiora* as its point of departure, and has a manuscript tradition and transmission that raises similar questions about the nature of that particular text and the intentions behind its compilation. It appears to be a historiographical text, but its dependence on Bede and its occurrence in such computistical manuscripts as Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Scaliger 28 makes it part of a tradition of *Zeitbücher* (‘time archives’). This also speaks volumes about the inten-


40 See Corradini, ‘Das Zeitbuch des Walafrid Strabo’.
tions behind the *CM*. While being a narration of Frankish history, the *CM* is presented as a description of the passage of (Christian) time itself: a practical application of Bede’s theories, a narration of history that is pastoral, political, and eschatological all at the same time.

Nevertheless, the *CM* remains a product of its own time, composed against a background of Carolingian rule. It was a period that saw the re-emergence of the empire in the West, as exemplified most by the coronation of Charlemagne in 800 which has, in various forms, been presented as the culmination of Carolingian ambition and an acknowledgement of their position in the European political scene. Even so, the importance of comparing the narratives of that event rather than reconstructing what may have happened has been demonstrated by Janet Nelson: each of the stories shows the different perspectives and attitudes brought to the political scene by the individual narrators, after all.  

Seen in the context of the long history presented in the *CM*, the portrayals of the various Carolingian imperial coronations that took place between 800 and 818 provide a fruitful testing ground to gauge the compiler’s ideas about the Frankish Empire he lived in, and the Church that was supposed to guide it. When Bede in his *Chronica maiora* wrote that ‘Aetius, the great salvation of the *res publica* […] was killed by Valentinian; with him fell the Western Realm, and to this day it has not had the strength to be revived’, this was a solemn moment that effectively exposed Bede’s disillusionment with Roman political ideology, and the beginning of the end.  

The composer of the *CM*, on the other hand, retains this passage but immediately follows it with the story, culled from the *Chronicle* of Fredegar, of how Avitus was proclaimed ‘Augustus’ by his armies in Toulouse and Arles in the year 455. This is followed by the establishment of the Merovingian dynasty under Clovis, who shortly afterwards is established as a Christian king, accepted by and acceptable to Romans and Franks alike. To the composer of the *CM*, the political structure of the Roman Empire with its headquarters on the Italian Peninsula may have fallen with the death of Aetius, but it clearly was not the end of the ‘empire’ as an ideal, which had been estab-

41 Nelson, ‘Why’.  
43 *CM*, p. 87. On the various representations of Avitus, see Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity*, pp. 70–73; Gillett, *Envoys*, pp. 87–89.  
44 *CM*, p. 90; more generally on Clovis and the role of the Merovingians in the continuation of the idea of a Roman Empire in the early Middle Ages, see Fanning, ‘*Clovis Augustus*’. 
lished under Julius Caesar and his adoptive son Octavian, and which would be definitively (?) revived with the inauguration of Charlemagne in 800.  

The place of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation as the culmination of a long narrative arc will be a first case to study the place of empire, dynasty, and authority in the *CM*. This event has been retold in two other near-contemporary sources, so comparing the version in the *CM* to those other perspectives will help us gauge the vision of empire held by the compiler. After that, the discussion will move on to two more coronations occurring in the final part of the text. Both concern elevations to co-emperorship: Louis the Pious was crowned first in 813, and four years later Louis crowned his son Lothar in a remarkably similar way. Comparing and contrasting these scenes, which together form the ending of one of the main stories of the *CM*, not only allows us a closer look at the writing goals of the many people who had a stake in the completion of the text, but also shows how they saw themselves as a function of the empire within which they operated.

**Caesar’s Heir: The Creation of a Frankish Empire**

The accounts of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation on Christmas Day in 800 in the *Annales Laureshamenses*, and *mutatis mutandis* in the *CM*, differed notably from the narratives presented in the *Annales regni Francorum* (especially the Revised version), or Einhard’s *Vita Karoli*. Both were composed later than the *Annales Laureshamenses*, but not necessarily later than the first draft of the *CM*.  

Einhard, writing for the court of Louis the Pious, famously treated the imperial coronation as a surprise for Charlemagne. He wove together Charlemagne’s *humilitas* and the political developments following his coronation, thereby expressing ‘Frankish attempts to shift the blame for Charles’s “usurpation” onto Leo III in order to appease the Byzantine emperors who were affronted by the appearance of a newly named emperor on their doorstep’.  

In the *Annales regni Francorum* (ARF) on the other hand, a primary concern was to show how the Carolingian dynasty had come to represent the Frankish people, and how Charlemagne had been recognized as the rightful leader of the *ecclesia*, symbolized by the fact that he had been handed the keys to the Holy Sepulchre in the weeks leading up to his coronation. As argued by Helmut

46 See, for example, Nelson, ‘Why’; Collins, ‘Charlemagne’s Imperial Coronation’.
Reimitz, the *ARF* were part of a concerted effort to synthesize ‘Frankish identity and western ethnicity’. This has been a favoured strategy for generations: whereas the earliest redactions of the *ARF* still opted for a rhetoric of Frankish inclusiveness, the Revision made in the early ninth century attempted to play down the Frankish aspects of Carolingian identity even further, in order to emphasize the essential unity of all the subjects of the Carolingian ecclesia.

The *Annales Laureshamenses (AL)* offered yet another perspective. Here, it was emphasized first that Byzantium was ruled by a woman, meaning it did not have someone worthy of the *nomen imperatoris*. Meanwhile, Charlemagne had conquered most of Europe, and had also become protector of Rome, first by defeating the Lombards, and later also by intervening on Pope Leo III’s behalf after the pontiff had been chased out of Rome by his political enemies.

Rather than focusing on the personal or Frankish implications of the coronation, the author of the *AL* had a keen eye for international politics as well. All three readings come together in the *CM*, which coupled this event with the long universal history preceding it. As presented here, the elevation of Charlemagne was the logical conclusion to a development that had been set in motion long before.

Expanding upon the *AL*, the *CM* continues by stating that the coronation meant that Charlemagne now controlled ‘Rome, the mother of the Empire, where Caesars and emperors had always used to have their seat’. It is an interesting phrase: the compiler did borrow it from the *AL*, but added the qualifiers *matrem imperii* and *et imperatores*. This characterization of Rome has many implications, chief among which may be the observation that the empire and

---


51 *CM*, a. 801, p. 139: ‘Anno DCCCI, cum apud Roma [sic; only BnF, MS lat. 4886] moraretur rex Karolus, nuncii delati sunt ad eum, dicentes quod apud Grecos nomen imperatoris cessasset et faemineum imperium apud se habebant, tunc visum est ipso apostolico Leoni et universis sanctis patribus, qui in ipso consilio aderant, seu relico [sic] christiano populo, ut ipsum Karolum regem Francorum, imperatorem [sic; only in MS 4886] nominare debuissent’. This reading is from MS 4886 exclusively. Whereas BnF, MS lat. 5941 is more grammatically correct, it also features a lengthy digression describing Charlemagne’s coronation and acclamation before the *nuncii* even arrive; this digression, which contains echoes of the coronation of Louis (see below) was most probably added later. MS 5941 also compares the Empress Irene to Queen Athaliah from *II Kings* 11.1–20.


A CROWNING ACHIEVEMENT

the Eternal City are inextricably tied up: by positing the Eternal City as the ‘mother of the empire’, the author of the CM implied that Rome was the cradle of the empire.\(^{54}\) However, as we shall see, it is perhaps even more significant that the phrase *et imperatores* was added.\(^{55}\)

The narrative proceeds. Charlemagne’s subjects, aristocrats and *sacerdotes* alike, gave the king the ‘name of emperor’:

> And it therefore seemed right that this very man, with the help of God and at the request of the entire Christian people, would have that very *nomen* [of emperor]. King Charles himself was unwilling to deny their request: rather, with all humility, subjecting [himself] to God and to the request of the bishops and of all the Christian people, that same Day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, he received the *nomen ymperatoris* [sic], with the blessing of the lord Pope Leo. And from then on he was called emperor and Augustus. And first of all, after he had become emperor, he strove to recall the Roman church herself away from that discord that the Romans had with the apostolic lord Leo, back to peace and concord.\(^{56}\)

To the author(s) of this passage, Charlemagne had become more than a king. He now was emperor of the Christians, and thus in a position to ensure that peace would reign even in the tumultuous city of Rome. In the *CM*, a sentence is added here to make clear what was meant. ‘The year passed without a campaign’, he wrote, copying from the *AL*.\(^{57}\) However, as justice and peace followed in the wake of Charlemagne’s return to his capital, a remark is added to the *CM*, stating that ‘the emperor (*imperator*) Charles should be praised above all kings

\(^{54}\) On *mater imperii* in late antique context, see Sinapi, ‘Les séductions’. For a similar use of the idea in the later Middle Ages, see Bailey, ‘Petrarch’, p. 324.

\(^{55}\) Compare *Annales Laureshamenses*, ed. by Katz, a. 801, p. 44: ‘imperatorem nominare debuissent, qui ipsum Romam tenebat, ubi semper Cesaras [sic] sedere soliti erant’. It may also be noteworthy that, whereas BnF, MS lat. 5941 follows the formulation from the *AL* more closely, BnF, MS lat. 4886 elaborates: ‘quia ipsam romam matrem imperii tenebat’.


\(^{57}\) This would not have implied that the government was idle in those years, however: Davis, *Charlemagne’s Practice of Empire*, pp. 350–64.
(reges) of the Franks who came before him with regard to riches, glory, honor, and reputation. He is the first of Frankish descent (genere) to be called Caesar.\textsuperscript{58}

In addition to the emphasis on the nomen of the emperor visible throughout the narrative recorded in the CM, this final passage juxtaposes caesar, rex, and imperator, which appears to hearken back to the description of the events leading up to the creation of the first Roman emperor, Octavianus/Augustus, and his adoptive father Julius Caesar. This part of the text is based almost completely on the earlier Chronicon universale (CU) and while it is important to spend some time on the choices made for the composition of that particular text, it is equally important to keep in mind that, at the moment of inscription of the CM, the choice of this particular text mattered. This retelling of the creation of the Roman Empire best suited the needs of the intended audience; the narrative was framed in such a way as to connect the account of the AL to the story the compiler presently wanted to tell.

Upon Julius Caesar’s assumption of imperial authority, the CM, channeling the CU’s reworking of Bede (quoting, in turn, from Jerome’s Chronicle), comments that ‘the rulers (principes) of the Romans are called Caesars’ after Julius, ‘the first of the Romans who obtained the sole imperium.’\textsuperscript{59} It reads as an almost offhand remark, hidden in a larger narrative of Caesar’s conquests, compiled predominantly from fragments of Bede’s Chronica maiora and Orosius’s Historia adversus paganos, as well as the Chronicle of Eusebius-Jerome. The CU and by extension the CM wanted to demonstrate how Caesar’s conquests (including his conquest of Cleopatra) paved the way for the creation of the imperium and the institutions that were to reign over it. The story continues with the briefest of accounts of Caesar’s victories against Scipio and the sons of Pompeius, describes a number of dire portents prefiguring the death of Julius Caesar, and then narrates his murder.\textsuperscript{60} Interestingly, Bede’s quip that this happened ‘because of [Caesar’s] arrogance’ is left out, while Orosius’s assessment

\textsuperscript{58} CM, a. 801, p. 140, ed. by Kettemann, App. 2, p. 100: ‘Et eo anno demoravit piissimus Caesar Karolus apud Aquis palatium quietus cum Francis, sine hoste [this sentence is absent in BnF, MS lat. 5941]. Magnificatus est autem imperator Karolus super omnes reges Francorum, qui ante eum fuerunt diviciis, gloria, honore et nomine. Item primo ex genere Francorum Caesar est appellatus [MS 5941 reads ‘Iste primus ex genere franchorum imperator extitit’].

\textsuperscript{59} CM, p. 43: ‘Anno tercio Cleopatre, ipse [= Julius Caesar] primus Romanorum singulare obtinuit imperium, a quo Caesares Romanorum principes appellati’.

\textsuperscript{60} CM, p. 44: ‘Caesar quattuor triumphus Romanus ingressus, recuperate rei publice statum, contra exempla majorum clementer instaurat. Auctoribus Bruto et Cassio, coniurantibus in curn LX vel amplius senatoribus acquitisbusque Romanis, in curia XXIII vulneribus confossus interiit, post annos III et menses VI quam regnare caeparet’.
that he was ‘more merciful than his predecessors’ while he was restoring the res publica is included.⁶¹

Although the passage is never quoted directly, the compiler of the CM seemed to agree with Orosius when the latter wrote that Julius Caesar ‘distinguished himself rather as the architect of the empire than as an emperor’.⁶² That honour fell to his nephew, ‘Octavianus Caesar Augustus’, who became the ‘second [ruler] of the Romans’, and after whom ‘the kings (reges) of the Romans are called Augusti’.⁶³ The narrative continues with the way Octavian had attained his position: ‘710 years after the foundation of the City, Octavian, who, according to the testament of Julius Caesar, had taken up his uncle’s estate (hereditatem) and nomen, that is, “Caesar”, and who was later called Augustus, came to Rome while still a youth, and rocked it by a civil war’.⁶⁴ It was through this civil war, and the subsequent wars he waged, that the entire empire would attain some peace and quiet at long last, which Octavian sought to ‘nurture […] among all the gentes’, for instance by promulgating laws.⁶⁵ And after ‘Caesar had established a true peace through God’s decree’, Christ was born. ‘In that time no man would dare to call himself dominus, because the true Lord is born among mankind’.⁶⁶

It is interesting to note that, while an explicit connection between the reign of Octavian and the birth of Christ is drawn, the CM largely eschews Orosius’s

---


⁶³ CM, p. 44: ‘Octavianus Caesar Augustus Romanorum secundus regnavit annis LVI et mensibus VI, a quo Augustis appellati reges Romanorum, quorum XV vivente Cleopatra, XLI postea vivit’. The fact that the text continues to call the Roman rulers ‘kings’ here could imply that to the author, imperium should have Christian connotations as well, or that they think that the institution of the ‘empire’ might be run by ‘kings’ all the same, or was larger than the individual regna that together made up the empire. Either way, it is significant that they are called Augustus here, not emperor.

⁶⁴ CM, p. 44: ‘Anno ab urbae condita DCCX, Octavianus, qui testamento Iulii Caesaris avunculi et hereditatem et nomen adsumpserat, id est Caesar, qui postea Augustus est appellatus simul ut Romam adulescens venit, bellis civi[li]bus movit’. The translation given here is based on Fear’s translation of Orosius.

⁶⁵ CM, p. 47: ‘Anno ab urbae condita DCCLII, [Caesar] Augustus ab orientem in occidentem, ad septemtrionaem in meridae hac per totum occiani circulum rem publicam quam bello quesierat, pacem cum cunctis gentibus nutrire studens, leges plurimas statuit. Domini appellacione declinabit’.

⁶⁶ CM, p. 47: ‘Igitur anno, quo verissimama pacem ordinatione Dei Caesar conspississet natus est Christus […]. Eo tempore dominum se homo appellari non ausus est, quos verum dominus inter homines natus est’.
apologetic digressions explaining how ‘Caesar’s rule had been ordained [...] entirely to prepare for the future coming of Christ’, possibly because his understanding of history and the place of the empire was shaped under entirely different circumstances. Instead, the text, basing itself mostly on Eusebius and Flavius Josephus as channelled through Bede’s *Chronicle*, fleshes out the state of the world at the time of Christ’s birth: it presents additional information about the political situation in Jerusalem, gives further examples of Roman exploits throughout Europe, and briefly explains that the death of Anthony and Cleopatra is reckoned ‘by some to be the first year of the *monarche* [sic] of Augustus’, with the later addition ‘that is, in the sixteenth year of Augustus’. If nothing else, this could be an indication that the *CU*, and by extension the *AL* and the *CM*, distinguished between ruling, and ruling alone unchallenged.

The development of the *imperium* is thus retold in terms that were not focused on dynastic policy or with a view towards consolidating the contemporary political situation. What was important instead were the auspicious circumstances that led to the sole rule of someone who happened to be called Caesar through his family connections, and Augustus through his conquest of and rule over various *gentes*, one of which was the Romans themselves—note, for instance, that the text highlights that the ‘kings’ of Rome are called ‘Augusti’. That this was needed so that the right circumstances for the birth of Christ (and by extension, Christendom) would be created is implied rather than explicated. Conversely, even if the ‘fall’ of the Western Empire in the late fifth century is connected to the ‘fraudulent’ death of Actius, the fall of the city of Rome is itself hardly dwelt on: apart from a brief statement that ‘Odoacer king of the Goths gained control of Rome’, one would hardly have thought anything had gone awry. It seems more significant indeed that the narrative presented here follows the ‘fall of Rome’ immediately with the rise and conquests of Clovis, ‘who became the first Christian king out of the kings of the Franks’, in a phrase taken from *Liber historiae Francorum*. There was light on the horizon: Clovis, too, ‘was called consul, or Augustus’, and crowned with

67 Orosius, *Historia*, trans. by Fear, v.1.20.4, p. 309. On the Carolingian uses of Orosius, see the articles by McKitterick and Evans and by Corradini in this volume.

68 *CM*, pp. 45–46. An interesting addition, given the *CM*’s southern origins, is the insertion of the information, from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, that ‘Monacius Placius’ (actually Lucius Munatius Plancus) allegedly founded the city of Lyon.

69 Other, similar instances of the use of *monarchia* may be seen in the *Annales Mettenses Priores*, ed. by Von Simson, a. 771, p. 58; or Regino, *Chronicon*, ed. by Kurze, a. 838, p. 74.

70 *CM*, p. 90: ‘Hic Clodoveus primus rex fuit christianus ex regibus Francorum’.
a ‘golden crown’.\(^{71}\) Significantly, this ends a period in the West where many candidates are being given that title in quick succession, and indeed between Clovis’s and Charlemagne’s coronation the CM presents *Augusti* in the Eastern Roman Empire exclusively: after Theodosius, Valentinian III (r. 423–55) is the last ruler in the West to be accorded the titles of both Caesar and Augustus.\(^{72}\) Chronologically and geographically closer to Clovis, Maiorianus (r. 457–61) and Libius Severus (r. 461–65) are both mentioned on one page in the edition, signalling a certain awareness of imperial instability — even if, significantly, the *de facto* ruler Ricimer (r. 461–72) is not mentioned at all.\(^{73}\)

If the coronation of Charlemagne in 800 as included in the CM marked the end of a longer narrative, the issue at hand seems not to have been the restoration of the Roman Empire *per se*. Instead, the acquisition of the *nomina* needed to wield imperial power separate from its ‘Romanness’, as a precondition for the upkeep of an empire may have been the ultimate aim of the narrative. By presenting the story of how Caesar had become the *nomen imperatoris* in a literal sense, the CM played with the particular concern for titles and terminology introduced into Carolingian discourse as a result of their knowledge of the *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, while also toying with the parallels between Julius Caesar’s name, Octavian’s title, and the words used to denote imperial power.\(^{74}\) Caesar had been ‘the first among the Romans to obtain the *imperium*, and the *imperator et Augustus* Charlemagne was ‘the first of Frankish descent to be called Caesar’. The Franks had taken over both the power (Augustus) and authority (Caesar) of the Romans, but had done so almost imperceptibly. By

---

\(^{71}\) CM, p. 91: ‘Et preconsulatu tunica platead indutus, in aecclesiae beati Martyni et coronam auream. Ab ea die tamquam consul aut Augustus est appellatus’.

\(^{72}\) Theodosius: CM, p. 75; Valentinian: CM, p. 82.

\(^{73}\) CM, p. 88 On the role of Libius Severus and Majorian in the context of the ‘reign’ of Ricimer, see MacGeorge, *Late Roman Warlords*, pp. 165–261; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 13–19. Of the emperors in the East, the inclusion of the Empress Consort Sophia *augusta* (r. 574–78) is worth mentioning, especially in the context of the AL’s remarks about Irene for the year 800.

\(^{74}\) Borst, ‘Kaisertum und Namentheorie’, p. 37. On the reception of Isidore in the Carolingian world, see the studies by Markauskas, ‘Rylands MS Latin 12’, and, in the same volume, Carlson, ‘Adoption, Adaptation, and Authority’. On p. 24 of the ‘Introduction’, pp. 11–30, the editors note that this remains ‘a massive topic in need of further study’. An ongoing NWO VENI project by Evina Steínová, entitled ‘Innovating Knowledge: Isidore’s *Etymologiae* in the Carolingian Period’, will address some of the lingering issues concerning the reception of Isidore in the early medieval West. For more information on this project see <https://www.huygens.knaw.nl/projecten/innovating-knowledge/> [accessed 28 October 2020], as well as Steínová, ‘Innovating knowledge’. 
combining the version of Bede’s *Chronica maiora* as presented by the *CU* with the specifically imperial narrative of the *AL*, the compiler of the *CM* wanted to de-emphasize the connection between Roman traditions and the newly re-established Christian *imperium* to an even greater extent than was the case in the *ARF*. In the additions made to the *AL*, in which *caesar*, *Augustus*, and *imperator* were put next to one another, the *CM* demonstrated how Charlemagne’s status as emperor was not Roman *per se*. He was a spiritual successor to the Roman Caesar, but also a Christian emperor, a combination which in the end trumped any other aristocratic, Frankish, or specifically Roman identity. With his assumption of the *nomen imperatoris* he had taken over an institution that was created by the Romans, with the city of Rome acting as the ‘mother’ of the empire, but which had universal applications all the same.

Charlemagne and his entourage wasted no time acting on their new responsibilities: the narrative of the *AL* ends with a description of measures taken in the following years. Missi were sent out to right any wrongs found in the empire; new impetus was given to the moral reform of the ecclesiastical hierarchy; and the laws were reassessed and improved.75 That ‘an elephant arrived in Francia that year’, as a gift from Harun al-Rashid, signified that Charlemagne’s new *nomen* had been accepted by his peers.76 The *AL* thus finish on a rather optimistic note, with a peaceful year during which Charlemagne consolidated his empire.

One of the writing goals of the *ARF* was to show how the Carolingians had integrated themselves into the erstwhile Roman Empire, and how their Frankishness had developed from one among many politicized ethnic identities into the one identity to rule them all. The combination of the *CU* and the *AL*, however, was less concerned with showing the providential history of the Franks than with showing how the pieces move into place to provide the best possible outcome for the inhabitants of a Christian empire in the world.77 The *CM* repeats the Trojan origin myth of the Franks, for instance, but did so not to portray the Franks as supplanting the Romans, but rather to show them as equals, brothers who had taken a different route westwards after the destruction of Troy.78 Obviously, the outcome given was the best possible result, but it

78 Cf. for a similar strategy employed in another historiographical narrative, Dörler, ‘The *Liber historiae Francorum*’; Yavuz, ‘From Caesar to Charlemagne’.
was not due to any misplaced sense of Frankish supremacy. It was a subtle difference with alternative versions of the Carolingian success story, but a difference nonetheless. The *Franci* play a pivotal role in the story of the *CM*, but their role took a back seat to the development of the *ecclesia* and the *imperium*, and lacks the politicized nature of, for example, the *Chronicle of Fredegar* and its continuator, or the *Liber historiae Francorum*. Even though both of these texts have been used in the *CM*, their narratives had been stripped of any Neustrian or Burgundian favouritism. After all, there was no need for that anymore once Charlemagne had assumed the name of emperor.

The choice to include the optimistic narrative of the *AL* in the *CM* may have been a matter of availability for the compiler. For instance, if the *AL* were indeed first composed in the circle around archbishop Richbod of Trier, as suggested by Heinrich Fichtenau and later, albeit more cautiously, by Rosamond McKitterick, Benedict of Aniane may have heard of the initiative as they were both working against Adoptionism, or even through Alcuin, who had been a teacher to Richbod and a friend to Benedict. This may explain why the Lorsch version of Frankish history made its way south. However, going by the ties between the court and Aniane at the time, and the network around Aniane, the monasteries in the area must also have had access to different visions of the Frankish past. There were many options available, and the possibilities to engage in a dialogue with authorities past and present, ‘to create new *Spielräume* for the compatibility of identities, laws and histories’ were still as great as ever. The compiler must have found something in the *AL* that they felt completed the narrative started by Bede and the *CU*, and which accorded with the overarching narrative created by the passage of time itself. Assuming he had access to a ‘completed’ version of the *AL*, the choice seems to have been deliberate. The message the compiler of the *CM* wanted to convey was that the *imperium* that happened to be held by the Carolingian dynasty was subservient to the observation that this was an unavoidable conclusion of God’s plan as it unfolded with the passage of time.

---


83 See also Van Espelo, ‘A Testimony of Carolingian Rule?’. 
The Lessons of the Fathers: New Models for Old Testament Kings

After the compilation leading up to Charlemagne’s imperial rule had finished, the CM continues for another fifteen years of ‘original’ input. This is marked by a rather jarring break between the old and the new generations. Instead of finishing, as the AL had done, with the statement that Charlemagne ‘let the year 803 pass without a campaign’, the CM immediately continues with a description of the conquest of Barcelona by Louis the Pious. It was business as usual once again; the narrative of this final part shifts towards the southern part of the empire to a greater extent than was the case in the preceding compilation, but this does not mean it became a local chronicle. Attention continues to be given to all frontiers, with the Franci’s decisions about the future of the empire forming the ties that bind it together. The CM was thus part of an ongoing conversation about the past between the court and the various places where histories were written. Gathering and ordering information was not the prerogative of a single central court; narratives were composed everywhere, in a way that made sense to an audience that may have been in the periphery, but that was by no means marginal. Even in Septimania, there were monks invested in the fate of the empire.

This becomes clearest if we briefly look at the two imperial inaugurations in this final part of the CM. The first one occurs in the entry for the year 813, in the palace of Aachen. It starts when Charlemagne convened his entourage in Aachen to discuss ‘matters of necessity to God’s church and the Christian people’. Immediately afterwards, a council was held during which Louis is confirmed in his new position as the heir apparent. It is a passage that deserves to be quoted in full:

---


85 *CM* a. 803, at p. 142. The switch occurs on fol. 51’ of BnF, MS lat. 4886, but (perhaps owing to the fact that this copy was made much later) there is no indication that a ‘new’ section begins apart from the same rubrication used throughout the text. On the siege and conquest of Barcelona and its significance, see Bachrach, ‘Military Organization’, pp. 24–26; Salrach i Marés, *El Procés*, 1, 9–26 and 32–39; Collins, *Caliphs and Kings*, pp. 224–33; generally, see Smith, ‘Fines imperii’, pp. 188–89 and Chandler, ‘Carolingian Catalonia’, as well as Chandler’s monograph, *Carolingian Catalonia*, pp. 60–110.


87 *CM* a. 813, p. 145: ‘Et convenerunt ad eum episcopi, abbates, comites et senatus Francorum ad imperatorem in Aquis. Et ibidem constituerunt capita numero XLVII, de causis, quae in necessariae ecclesiae Dei et christiano populo’.
After that council, the bishops, abbots, counts, and magnates of the Franks gathered to make his son, king Louis, emperor. Everyone agreed in equal measure, saying that this was fitting, and it pleased the entirety of the *populus*. And with the consent and acclamation of all the peoples he appointed his son Louis emperor with him, and conferred the imperial authority (*imperium*) upon him by means of a golden crown, with the people shouting their acclamation: ‘Long live emperor Louis!’ And there was much rejoicing among the people that day. The emperor Charles also blessed the Lord, saying: ‘Blessed are You, o Lord God, Who has given a heir to sit on my throne this day, my eyes even seeing it’ [*1 Chronicles 29.10* and *1 Kings 1.48*]. He instructed his son, that he ought to keep the precepts of the Lord in all things. He conferred the right of rulership (*ius regni*) upon him, and commended his sons, Drogo [of Metz], Theoderic, and Hugo. And when all had been concluded he gave everyone leave to depart, each back to his place, but himself remained in the palace of Aachen.88

Compared to the account of Charlemagne’s coronation in 800, there are many meaningful differences. The most striking of these is that Charlemagne had not actually been crowned, according to the *CM*. Instead, he had assumed the *nomen imperatoris* and was ‘consecrated’ as such by Pope Leo III, in effect taking on a new function and a new set of responsibilities.89 In a similar way, Louis had been ‘anointed’ king of Aquitaine by Pope Hadrian I in 781, for instance.90

---

88 *CM* a. 813, p. 146: ‘Post haec consilium cum prefatis episcopis et abbatibus et comitibus et maiores natu Francorum, ut constitueret filium suum, Lodovicum regem, ymperatorem. Qui omnes pariter consenserunt, dicentes hoc dignum esse, omnique populo placuit. Et cum consensu et aclamatione omnium popolorum, Lodovicum, filium suum, constituit imperatorem secum ac per coronam auream tradidit illi imperium, populis aclamantibus et dicentibus: “vivat imperator Lodovicus”. Et facta est lacticia magna in populo in illa die. Nam et ipse imperator Karolus benedixit dominum dicens: “Benedictus es domine Deus [*1 Chronicles 29.10*], qui dedisti hodie sedentem in solio meo, videntibus occasus meis” [*1 Kings 1.48*]. Docuit autem eum pater, ut in omnibus preceptum domini custodiret. Tradiditque ei ius regni commendavitque ei filios suos Drocone, Theuderico et Hugone. Et cum omnia perfectisset, dimisit unum[quem]que, ut haberet in locum suum. Ipsa autem resedit in Aquis palatium’. Interestingly, in BnF, MS Lat 4886, this occasion is marked by a comment in the margin that was probably added later (by the same scribe who composed the papal list at the end), reading ‘karolus magnus constituit filium suum Lodovicum imperatorem’, whereas on the same page a gloss appears marking the death of Charlemagne (‘karolus imperator obiit anno regni sui xlvii’), which, owing to the frame drawn around it, appears planned and added by the main scribe. This might indicate a later interest in highlighting dynastic continuity rather than the ‘end of an era’.

89 Cf. also the remarks on Louis’s designation as heir to the *imperium* by Beumann, ‘Nomen imperatoris’, pp. 647–48 (although it should be noted that he bases his conclusions on the description provided by Thegan).

To the author of the *CM*, these were liminal rituals that were not only supposed to have changed the identity of the person undergoing them, but which changed the office they held as well. They were reflective of the order governing Carolingian courtly life.91 When Charlemagne set a crown on the head of his son in 813, he transferred his *imperium* by means of the imposition of *regalia* symbolizing the transfer of authority within the same family, and he did so publicly.92 Similarly, when Louis was ‘blessed’ by Pope Stephen IV, who visited the Frankish court shortly after his own consecration in 816, the *CM* tells us that the pontiff had also brought a ‘golden crown’ with him: a public affirmation that Louis held the *ecclesia* in addition to the *imperium*?93 Was this a symbol that Louis had been crowned not only by his *pater*, but by a representative of the *mater imperii* as well? Was it an echo of Clovis’s elevation to the status of *Augustus*, which was confirmed with the imposition of the only other *corona aurea* in the preceding text — and which might thus emphasize a link with the Roman Empire to those who picked up on the reference?94 Whatever the case, any remaining doubts as to Louis’s legitimacy would now have been quelled. Whereas he had been made co-emperor by his father, the intervention of the pope, two years after Charlemagne’s death in 814, made him an emperor in his own right. This added emphasis may be more than just narrative consistency for the composer of the *CM*: the many different coronations and unctions, as well as the many different perspectives from which these rituals have been described, show that the establishment of imperial legitimacy was still in full development at the time.95

While the coronation as such is an interesting tool for publicly conferring legitimacy onto Louis, it is equally noteworthy that the narrative emphasizes

---

91 Althoff, ‘Rituale’; but see Buc, ‘Ritual and Interpretation’, pp. 199–201.
93 *CM*, a. 816, p. 148: ‘Sucessitque illi in sacerdocium dominus Stephanus et in ipso anno, ipse apostolicus Stephanus venit ad domnum imperatorem Ludovicum in Francia. Invenitque eum apud Remis civitatem et adtulit illi coronam auream. Susceptique eum imperator cum magnó honore benedixitque ipsum imperatorem et imposuit illi coronam auream, quam adulerat in capite’; more generally, see Garipzanov, *Symbolic Language*, pp. 46–53. Ermoldus Nigellus, *Carmen*, ed. by Faral, lib. 2, ll. 1076–77, pp. 84–85, claims that this crown had originally belonged to Constantine, but this is not taken over by the composers of the *CM*. See also Becher, ‘*Corona*’.
94 See above. The *CM*, p. 91, copied a fragment from the *Liber historiae Francorum*, which itself was a summary of the account of Gregory of Tours, who called this *corona a diadema* instead. The story of Clovis’s ‘coronation’ left traces throughout Frankish historiography, which still need to be resolved: see Mathisen, ‘Clovis’, pp. 101–12.
95 Buc, ‘Political Ritual’.
the paternal authority with which this happens. This was an obvious choice: after all, it was the first imperial succession in the West in nearly four centuries, and it had already been established within the CM that this depended on dynastic legitimacy as much as on acceptance by the populace. However, instead of using the Roman model yet again, the compiler this time has recourse to an even more venerable source: the Book of Kings. Specifically, he used a quotation that was taken from David's proclamation of Solomon as his heir.

This is not surprising. When it came to the development of Carolingian models for proper kingship, the Old Testament was limitless resource, whether it concerned Charlemagne's identification with king Josiah in his Admonitio generalis, or his nickname at court, David. The choice for this passage even was prefigured in the prologue to the CM, which comes after Bede's calculation of the six ages of the world, and presents a moral explanation of what each of the ages actually means — up to and including the seventh and the eighth ages, after the resurrection.

The third and fourth ages are defined by the Old Testament kings: the evening of the third age is described by the author:

Evening fell over this age, when the populus of Israel, neglecting the command (imperio) of God, desired a human king (rex) to be placed above them. And the first they elected was Saul, who apostatised from God, and whom the Philistines together with a large part of that same populus (= Israel) killed.

This is then followed immediately by

The morning of the fourth age came victoriously and [saw] an illustrious kingdom (regnum) due to the triumphs of King David; and also the glorious and peaceful empire (ymperium) of his son Salomon as well as the miraculous and mystical construction of the Temple.

---

96 Generally, see Pohl, 'Creating Cultural Resources'.
97 Admonitio generalis, ed. by Mordek, Zechiel-Eckes, and Glatthaar; De Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', pp. 114–16; Garrison, 'The Social World of Alcuin'.
98 CM, p. 3: 'Cuius vespera fuit, cum populus Israhel, Dei imperio negleto [sic], regem sibi hominem superesse maluissent. Primumque elegerunt apostatam a Deo Saulem, quem Philistei cum magna ipsius populi partem [sic] per[merunt]. Quartae aetatis mane fuit victorialae et triumphis clarum David regnum gloriosumque et pacificum filii eius Salomonis ymperium temploque mirabilis, ad mistica constructio'. On this and other passages, see in more detail Kramer, 'The Bede Goes On' (including an improved transcription and translation of the entire introduction to the CM on pp. 707-711). This introduction is referred to as § 9a by Sören Kaschke in his contribution to this volume.
It is, in other words, the age in which the *populus* elected to put a man between them and the Lord, adding a layer of authority to the covenant which had until then been between God and his chosen people directly.\(^99\) In many ways, this is the *fons et origo* of all ideas about royal responsibilities that permeated Carolingian political discourse, and David and Solomon, for all their faults, stood out as shining examples of how to be as good a ruler as the human condition would allow.\(^100\) Conversely, when the fourth age ends, this is because ‘that same *populus* committed sins with the king they had at the time’, leading to the Babylonian captivity: a stern reminder that good kings build temples and keep their people in line, but bad kings lead to sinfulness and cause their people to suffer.\(^101\)

Solomon is given pride of place at the end of the prologue, when he is cited as the source for an otherwise unattributed quote that is very loosely based on Proverbs 31. 21: ‘And so, Solomon said: “All those who wear two layers of clothing will rejoice endlessly and happily together with their king, whom they have at the time in this world served loyally”’.\(^102\) Whereas the Proverb upon which it is based uses these two layers of clothing as a sign of a well-run household, the lines that follow explain them in eschatological and even apocalyptic terms, as indications that these people would be clothed in white in Heaven as on Earth. Equally significant, however, is the interdependence between the worldly rulers, who provide the clothes, and the faithful, whose salvation would be dependent on their loyalty to him. Only when both did what was expected of them would they be able to rejoice together (*congaudere*) in Heaven. Wrapped in this eschatological narrative was thus an appeal to the loyalty of the readers to their rightful ruler, who would be revealed at the end of the work.\(^103\)

All this leads up to the reign of Solomon himself, which, according to the narrative in the actual *CM*, prefigured the ‘perfection’ of the ‘Church of Christ in this world’. This in turn prefigured the coronation of Louis by Charlemagne.


\(^100\) See Nelson, ‘Bad Kingship’.

\(^101\) See the reflections by Flail, ‘Is Loyalty a Favor?’, as well as the historicizing approaches by Depreux, ‘Les Carolingiens’, and Esders, ‘Treueidleistung’.

\(^102\) \[CM, p. 3: ‘Q(uonia)m idem populus peccatis agentibus cum rege, quem tunc habuerunt, in Babiloniam captivitatem ductus est eorumque metropolis Iherusalem, cum templo et omnibus privatis publicis aedificis, spoliata est igneque consumpta. Meens, ‘Politics’.\]

\(^103\) CM, p. 4: ‘Sicque et Salomon ait: “Omnes vestiti duplicibus cum suo rege, cui simul in hoc seculo fidelitero serviebant sine fine feliciter congaudebant”. De quo eorum duplici gaudio etiam in apocalipsis legitur’. In the book of Proverbs, this saying is attributed to the mother of the unknown King Lemuel.
in 813. The culmination of the scene occurs when Charlemagne takes on the role of king David, expressing his happiness at being able to see his heir come to the throne. Using this quotation actually gives the scene an ominous subtext, as the words in the Book of Kings are spoken by King David as he is ‘advanced in years’, and the court is rife with speculation about his successor. They are reported to Adonijah, Solomon’s rival, by his friend Jonathan, and the message about Solomon’s anointment ends up ‘spreading terror’ among Adonijah’s household. His dissatisfaction with this decision even ends up in a rebellion and Adonijah’s execution. Set up this way, the presentation in the CM could even be seen to foreshadow Bernard of Italy’s revolt and subsequent demise five years later, which could be a clue as to the date of redaction of this final part of the chronicle. However, the wording of this passage and the way God himself is addressed also invokes the same scene as described in 1 Chronicles 29.10, in which David is in fact depicted as giving a speech ‘before all the people’. The combination of these two biblical interpretations of the same event, which appears to be a deliberate choice by the compiler, thus states in unequivocal terms that Louis is the true and legitimate heir to the Frankish Empire, supported by tradition and biblical examples, as well as by the aristocracy and his father’s blessing. He was supposed to protect his family, but also obey his father’s wishes and heed his lessons. The narrative of the CM thus established an empire and a dynasty, giving them legitimate power as well as hard-earned authority.

Four years later, in 817, Louis would crown his eldest son Lothar in strikingly similar terms, something which is even emphasized when the text states that Louis sought permission from the people to have one of his sons rule (imperare) alongside him, ‘just as Charles, his father, had done to himself’.

---

104 CM, p. 21: ‘quo in hoc seculo Christi hedificatur ecclesia, quae in futuro perficitur, VIIannis perfecit et septimo octavi anni mense dedicavit’.
105 1 Kings 1.
107 1 Chronicles 29.10: ‘et benedixit Domino coram universa multitudine et ait benedictus es Domine Deus Israhel patris nostri ab aeterno in aeternum’.
108 On this method of picking, choosing, and recombining biblical verses to make a point, see, for example, Heil, ‘Labourers’; Kramer, ‘Justified and Ancient’.
109 The passages are extremely close: CM a. 817, p. 149: ‘Tunc omni populo placuit, ut ipso se viventem constitueret unum ex filiis suis imperare, sicut Karolus, pater eius, fecerat ipsum. Tunc tribus diebus ieiunatum est ab omni populo. [H]ac laetaniae factae post haec iam dictus imperator, Clotarium, qui erat maior natum, ymperatorem elegit. [H]ac per coranam auream
They acquiesce, and Louis elects Lothar, his eldest son, marking him out as the heir apparent by, once again, a golden crown and his father’s variation on David’s blessing to Solomon. Most noticeably, this ceremony lacked both papal involvement and the instruction of the newly crowned co-emperor by his father, but it stresses a familial connection by adding that Lothar, Louis’s heir, came from the seed of his father.\textsuperscript{110} Other than that, the transfer of the \textit{imperium} by means of a crown, the \textit{acclamation}, and the blessing of the Lord by the reigning emperor in terms echoing the coronation of Solomon by David in the Book of Kings are all there. Perhaps the person responsible for this passage thought that Lothar would still have many years left to learn the tricks of the trade. Perhaps this was an acknowledgment that, within the narrative, the \textit{imperium Christianum} had become an institutional reality, and the father-son dynamic was only vital insofar as it concerned the first new emperor in the West and his immediate heir. Within the narrative of the \textit{CM}, the continuation of the empire would be guaranteed by divine approval, as implied by the biblical examples provided.\textsuperscript{111}

If, in the context of the optimistic view of imperial authority presented in the \textit{AL} and the \textit{CM}, rex seems to be a rather neutral term, denoting people in a position of authority, the elevation from a \textit{regnum} to an \textit{imperium} entailed a lot of added responsibilities. Throughout the \textit{CM}, especially in the parts dealing with Roman and Frankish history, God-fearing people made good rulers, and good rulers took the responsibility given to them seriously, echoing the pattern in the Chronicles and the Books of Kings of the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{112} In that context, both \textit{regnum} and \textit{imperium} are rather neutral terms, and merely denote the power individuals wielded over their subjects. It is an observation that is made visible in the Prologue of the \textit{CM} already. There, the evening of the fifth

\textit{tradidit illi imperium, populis acclamantibus et dicentibus: “vivat imperator Clotarius”. Facta est autem leticia magna in populo in die illo, et ipse imperator benedixit Deum dicens: “Benedictus es domine Deus meus, qui dedisti hodie \textit{ex semine meo} consedentem in solio meo, videntibus occulis meis [1 Kings 1.48]”.

\textsuperscript{110} Curiously, this addition of \textit{ex semine meo} only occurs in BnF, MS lat. 4886. In BnF, MS lat. 5941, it has been added to Charlemagne’s speech instead. On the (lack of a) papal connection, see Mierau, \textit{Kaiser und Papst}, pp. 48–49; Lothar would be confirmed by Pope Paschal I in 823. Generally, see Kasten, \textit{Konigssohne}, pp. 162–70.

\textsuperscript{111} Werner, ‘Hludovicus Augustus’, pp. 28–29. See also Wendling, ‘Die Erhebung’, and also Schramm, ‘Die Anerkennung Karls des Großen’, pp. 510–11, who has an altogether more pessimistic view of the reign of Louis the Pious (although he does grant that the court’s outlook around 814 must have been optimistic as well).

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. Carr and Conway, \textit{An Introduction to the Bible}, pp. 131–36.
age is marked by the fact that, ‘while there was no legitimate ruler (princeps), Herod, from another people (gens), received the authority (imperium), and polluted it with many injustices and bloody deeds’: the point was not to employ neatly defined political vocabularies, but to denote the connection between the exercise of power and the fulfilment of the prophecies that heralded the arrival of Christ and the beginning of the sixth age. Near the end of the CM, for the year 803, the CM similarly describes the leader of the Saracens in Barcelona as a rex who became a subject of the imperator Charlemagne.

Conclusion

In the CM, controlling a ‘territorial’ empire was not a precondition to hold imperium. At its core, it was a form of power over a multitude of people, but this was the type of power that came with an ever greater responsibility. Or, just as Isidore in his Etymologies defined a king only as someone who rules rightly, holding an imperium did not make one automatically worthy of the nomen imperatoris. It required constant piety to live up to that name, foreshadowed by David and Solomon, created by the Romans, and ultimately blessed by the birth of Christ and the beginning of the sixth age. For the composer of the CM, the establishment of the Carolingian Empire was not a consequence of the rise of the dynasty. In this version, the regnum Francorum had already passed to them a generation earlier, through a series of fortuitous circumstances, and at the time of writing, this needed no further vindication. The Carolingians had adapted to the circumstances, and acquired all the right prerequisites to seize their imperium. Indeed, Louis’s reign would be challenged within only three years, by the rebellion of Bernard of Italy in 817–18. Like Octavian and Solomon before him, the challenge put before him would be to hold onto it,

113 CM, p. 3: ‘Quintae actatis [...] vespera fuit, cum secundum propheciam patriarchae, legitimo principe deficiente, Herodes aliena eiusdem gentis susciperet imperium, multisque illud injustis et sanguinaris operibus maculasset’.


116 Nelson, ‘Charlemagne and Empire’.

117 At least, not in the Chronicon Moissiacense Maius — the Carolingian family did go to lengths to legitimize their usurpation by means of other texts. See for example Strothmann, ‘Das Königstum Pippins’.
or, in narrative terms: he would immediately prove his worth and legitimacy by rising to the occasion and subduing any threat to his reign. The Carolingians thus perfectly fit the model of rulership that was described in the *CM*. They did not commission it, and neither was the *CM*’s narrative tailor-made to suit their dynastic needs. Rather, it was intended to be compatible with the model of rulership represented by the Carolingian court. The Carolingians were, in short, idealized because they happened to be in power; in the narrative, they did not attain power because they were ideal rulers, but because the composer had to deal with a given reality, and adjust their idealizations accordingly.118

The ‘ancient chronicle’ discovered by Nicolas-Joseph Foucault is a historical-compositional account about the place of the Carolingian Empire within the history of the world. The narrative of Charlemagne’s adoption of the *nomen imperatoris*, or of the way he conferred this title to his son, were as much concerned with the small world of the Carolingian court, as with the large world that had been built up around them. In order to present an image of that world, the *CM* contains a great number of choices made by everybody involved in its composition, leading to an idiosyncratic text that, more than anything, represented both the multiplicity of ideas at the disposal of any early medieval historiographer, and the way they converged in the Carolingian era. Instead of creating a narrative of authority that explicitly dealt with the Franks as the heirs of the Trojans or as a ‘New Israel’, or with the establishment of the Carolingian dynasty as the rulers of this people, the composer/compiler of the *CM* put *ecclesia* and *imperium* first, as recurring characters in a history that aspired to be truly universal. The fact that things were going so well at the time when the composer of the *CM* was making his yearly entries to the work was only partially due to the competence of the Franks and their Carolingian rulers. They ended up at the right place in the right time to renew the empire, but they should not forget that this was all part of God’s plan.

This narrative fits with the context of the late eleventh century, when BnF, MS lat. 4886 was copied, as much as with the early ninth century, when it was first compiled. At the time of our earliest manuscript witness, computus and the passage of time was still as relevant as ever, and the imperial stability created by the Carolingians might even have been looked at with some nostalgia.119 Around the start of the reign of Louis the Pious, a rhetorical strategy that favoured empire and *ecclesia* over specific ethnic or elite identifications would

118 See the opening remarks by Pössel ‘The Consolation of Community’, pp. 1–5.
have been entirely appropriate too, given that the compilation was developed in a peripheral context in (formerly Visigothic) Septimania. The *Chronicon Moissiacense* was about integration, about showing that, among the many choices available, there remained a correct way of doing things. Local details, such as the additional perspectives on the Aquitanian campaign waged by the Carolingians in the 760s, or the information provided about Saracen incursions into the region, point towards the origin of the narrative in its current form, but should in no way be taken to mean that this was intended to be a chronicle with a strictly local outlook. In the end, it is the broad scope of the text, rather than the incidental details, which gave it its unique flavour and which shows the terms in which the CM wanted to conceptualize the empire as it took shape around him. His narrative would show how Roman traditions and Christian ideals were among the most important signs that time was progressing in the way it should, guided by God, towards that inevitable end.

If the narrative of the CM sought to come to terms with the Carolingian success story, the vision of history contained in its pages likewise was the result of choices made by the author concerning the past he wanted to present. Local traditions and imperial preferences vied for attention; various streams of information that came together in various *scriptoria* had to be harmonized; and various sources, each with their own goals and agendas, had to be taken into account. The end result was a text as turbulent as history itself, with rulers continuously making sure that their realms were secure and at peace. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that the final entry in the CM, detailing three campaigns Louis is coordinating simultaneously, ends with what almost seems like a sigh of relief that at the end of the day, *terra quievit*.\(^{120}\)

\(^{120}\) See the final full entry in the *CM*, a. 818, p. 150.
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Much Ado about Vienne?

A Localizing Universal Chronicon

Sukanya Raisharma

Perhaps the oldest forms of historiography are world chronicles and universal histories. Some scholars attribute the earliest exemplars of this tradition to the Greek writer Ephorus (d. 330 BCE), and thereafter the historian and bishop Eusebius of Caesarea (260–339 CE), as well as his emulators in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. 1 The *Chronicon* of Ado is one such world chronicle written in the city of Vienne from Creation (until c. 866/69).2 Despite burgeoning interest in history-writing, this chronicle has been rather neglected in modern historiography. Indeed, nineteenth-century scholar, Georg Pertz, omitted everything that Ado had excerpted from older sources in his version of world history, publishing only the prologue in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica series, as well as those parts of the text that Pertz felt had the stamp of Ado's individuality. Consequently, he excised nearly two-thirds of...


2 Ado, *Chronicon*, ed. by Migne, cols 23–138. The Patrologia Latina edition is reprinted from the early modern edition prepared by Bigne (1618), pp. 258–96, which was a reprint of Bigne (1589), cols 1009–1116. For the end-date of the chronicle, see Von den Brincken, *Studien*, pp. 127–28; Also see McKitterick, *Perceptions*, pp. 2–4, 92.
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the original chronicle,3 whose only full-length study was executed by Wilhelm Kremers for his doctorate at the University of Göttingen, published in 1911.4

In terms of contemporary historiography, Nathanaël Nimmegeers’s recent monograph on the episcopacy of Vienne uses Ado’s Chronicon to reconstruct the history of the church of Vienne from Late Antiquity to the central Middle Ages.5 Richard Burgess and Michael Kulikowski have speculated that Ado’s text is based on an ‘unknown chronicle source from Vienne’.6 Steffen Patzold has moreover argued that Ado’s Chronicon resembles the ‘gesta episcoporum’ of Le Mans, Auxerre, and Verdun, and that episcopal lists are tied to historical epochs.7 Finally, in the work of Hans-Werner Goetz, Ado’s treatment of time is foregrounded and explored.8 Many aspects of Ado’s text are outstanding insofar as they have accorded little scholarship to date, owing to which there are ample opportunities for further exploratory work. However, given this paper’s circumscribed aims, I here propose two useful ways for studying the text. The aim of this paper is to break new ground against this existing scholarly backdrop, in particular across two dimensions. The first aim seeks to describe the structure of the chronicle, while the second asks how Ado’s text characterizes Vienne’s ancient local history within the broader genre of universal history. Consequently, the first section examines the constitutive elements of the chronicle, in particular by identifying those sources to which Ado took recourse in its composition. Such an enterprise moreover reveals Ado to be a figure worthy of historical attention in his own right. As such, we have occasion here to construct a cursory biographical account. The second section thereafter analyses the internal structure of the chronicle. In so doing, this paper seeks to understand the inspiration behind Ado’s creation. I propose that Ado sought to record the Roman and early Christian history of Vienne, in particular through its juxtaposition with the histories of other Gallic cities.

3 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Pertz, pp. 315–23. The oldest printed edition was done by the Parisian publisher Jodocus Badius Ascensius, who printed Ado’s Chronicon along with the Historiae of Gregory of Tours in 1512. For the chequered history of editorial decisions of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, see Knowles, ‘The Monumenta Germaniae Historica’, and also Pohl, ‘History in Fragments’.
4 Kremers, Ado von Vienne. Also see Krüger, Universalchroniken, pp. 31, 37–42; McKitterick, Perceptions, p. 29.
5 Nimmegeers, Évêques.
6 Burgess and Kulikowski, Mosaics of Time, 1, 254.
7 Patzold, Episcopus, pp. 430–34.
Ado’s Chronicon is a monumental piece of history-writing. Indeed, the majority of its medieval manuscripts present the work precisely as Ado intended. Thus, in the absence of a reliable, critical edition of the text, if we want to view the entire chronicle as a composite, then we must consult its numerous manuscripts, which are dispersed across various European libraries. Here, I provide a provisional list of manuscripts containing Ado’s Chronicon:

1. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 48 (xi c.). A short extract from the Chronicon on fol. 192v;
2. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 120 (xi c.). A composite manuscript which contains, along with Ado’s Chronicon (fols 2r–58v), Aurelius Victor’s De caesariibus, brief entries of Roman emperors, and Abbo of Fleury’s Excerptum des gestis Romanorum;
3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 290 (xi c.–xii c.). Produced at the Benedictine abbey of St Albans, Hertfordshire, the Chronicon (fols 1r–221r) is followed by genealogies of Frankish kings and the dukes of Normandy;
4. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. Lat. f. 39 (xi c.) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5920 (xi c.). The original composite manuscript is split between the Leiden manuscript and the Paris manuscript. In the Leiden manuscript, the codex begins with Gregory of Tours’s Decem libri historiarum, and is followed by the Chronicon (fols 81r–135v). Its provenance is likely to be Mont-Saint-Michel Abbey, France;
5. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Voss. Lat. f. 96 (xi c.). Composite manuscript; provenance of the second part of the manuscript is the monastery of Fleury, France. Text of Chronicon (fols 25r–68v) followed by the genealogy of Frankish kings;
6. London, British Library, MS Royal 13 A XXIII (xi c.). Produced at the Benedictine abbey of Mont St Michel, north-west France, the chronicle (fols 1r–94v) is followed by chronology of Roman emperors, the dukes of Normandy, and, finally, genealogies of Frankish kings;
7. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C XI (xv c.);
8. Montpellier, Bibliothèque Universitaire, MS Section de Méd. 31 (xiii c.). Origin is likely to be the abbey of Clairvaux, France. The chronicle (fols 165r–198v) was copied after Gregory of Tours’s Decem libri historiarum;
9. Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 2013 (xii c.). Historical miscellany of Saint-Denis compiled from various sources;

10. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 4888 (xi c.–xii c.). Contains Ado’s *Chronicon* (fols 1r–109v), followed by a version of the Latin translation of the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*;

11. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 5512 (xii c.). The manuscript belonged to Pierre Pithou (d. 1596). It contains Baldric of Dol’s *Historiae Hierosolymitanae*, a version of *Gesta regnum Francorum*, one side of a folio of *Lex salica*, the *Chronicon* of Ado (fols 60r–108v), and, finally, a few folios containing the names and dates of popes from Peter to Pascal II;

12. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 8948 (xii c.). Ado’s *Chronicon* (fols 152r–220v) copied after the chronicles of Eusebius-Jerome and chapter 66 of Bede’s *De sex huius saeculi aetatibus*;


14. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 17546 (xii c.). The first part contains sections of Ado’s *Chronicon* with later continuations (fols 1r–19v), as well as the earliest copy of Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis’s *Vita Ludovici Grossi*. Parts of the manuscript that were used by Pierre Pithou in the seventeenth century are now lost;

15. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Nouvelles acquisitions latine 2442 (ix c.–xiii c.). Fragments of the *Chronicon* of Ado. This also contains parts of Donatus’s *Vita Terentii*, Terence’s *Andria*, and Gregory of Tours’s *Vitae patrum*;

16. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. Lat. 556 (ix c.–x c.). Ado’s *Chronicon* is to be found in the first part of the manuscript (fols 1r–41v). The second part contains Gregory of Tours’s *Decem libri historiarum*.

In each of these manuscripts, the *Chronicon* begins with a reworked Frankish version of the prologue of Isidore of Seville’s *Chronica maiora*. Ado, following Isidore, mentions by name his history-writing predecessors (including Julius Africanus, Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome, and Victor of Tunnunna), while substituting the names of Visigothic kings with those of Frankish rulers. Ado wrote that he chose to end the chronicle with the rule of the emperor Lothar, his

---

9 Isidore, *Chronica maiora*, ed. by Martín.
brother Louis, and Kings Louis and Charles.\textsuperscript{10} If we correlate the end of the text and the prologue, then it seems that emperor Lothar refers to Lothar II (king of Lotharingia 855–69), and Louis refers to Louis II (emperor of Italy 855–75), while the two kings seem to be Louis the German (king of Eastern Franks 843–76) and Charles of Provence (king of Provence 855–63). It is unclear why Ado denominates Lothar the German as an emperor. What this ambiguous genealogy may suggest is that there was a lack of unanimity, and perhaps even some slippage, in narratives employing the titles ‘emperor’ and ‘king’.\textsuperscript{11}

Following the prologue, we are able to deduce the framework according to which Ado understands historical time. To this end, he implements the ‘six ages of the world’ model, which was one of the many systems for organizing time during this period.\textsuperscript{12} Such a schematic division highlights the cyclical and religious nature of experiencing and marking time by those living in the medieval period. It moreover reveals how intellectuals like Ado understood man’s place in the cosmic order, not least the place of the city of which he was bishop, viz. Vienne.\textsuperscript{13} In Ado’s \textit{Chronicon}, the first age spans from Adam to Noah, the second from Noah to Abraham, the third from Abraham to David, the fourth from David to the Babylonian exile, the fifth incorporates the exile to the reign of Augustus, and the sixth from the reign of Augustus to the present (and, implicitly, till the end of time). For Ado, the present was \textit{c. 866/69}.\textsuperscript{14} Ado further divides the first four ages in two. In the first section, Ado outlines the most salient historical events and episodes. To this end, he takes recourse to chapter 66 of Bede’s \textit{De temporum ratione} as a guiding framework, albeit augmented with additions from Isidore’s \textit{Chronica maiora}, Orosius’s \textit{Historiae}, Jerome’s \textit{Liber hebraicarum quaestionum in Genesim}, Augustine’s \textit{De civitate Dei}, as well as the Bible.\textsuperscript{15} In the second section, he provides spiritual interpretations of

\textsuperscript{10} Ado, \textit{Chronicon}, ed. by Migne, col. 23A: ‘Horum nos temporum summam, ab exordio mundi usque ad imperatoris Lotharii ac Ludovici fratris ejus, ac Ludovici et Caroli regum principatum, quanta potuimus brevitate notavimus’ (We have recorded with as much brevity as we were able a summary of those times from the beginning of the world up to the rule of Lothar and his brother Louis, and of the kings Louis and Charles).

\textsuperscript{11} For mistakes in chronology in the tenth century, see MacLean, ‘Carolingian Past’.

\textsuperscript{12} Dunphy, ‘Six Ages of the World’.


\textsuperscript{14} See footnote 2 above.

the historical episodes from the Old Testament. To this end, Ado largely borrowed from exegetical sources. Unlike its historical sources, the *Chronicon*’s exegetical sources have hitherto gone undisclosed by scholars. In addition to Augustine’s *De civitate Dei*, Ado loosely adapts excerpts from Quodvultdeus’s *Liber promissionum* and Isidore’s *Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum seu quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*. From the fifth age, we witness an increasing focus on empires and kingdoms. For the fifth age, Ado relied heavily on Orosius’s *Historiae*. Although Orosius’s work was originally composed as a riposte to pagan critics in the early fifth century, it was mostly used as a reference for world histories in the medieval West. Indeed, Ado reshapes the seven, dense books of Orosius in order to fit the *Chronicon*, in particular by invoking Bede’s chronological framework. And so, in the *Chronicon*, Ado restricts his scope from diverse empires, electing to focus instead on the history of the Roman Empire.

The sixth age — the longest of all — ushers in the birth of Christ and leads to the year 866/69. For this age, in addition to drawing on Orosius, Isidore, and Bede, Ado also takes recourse to Cassiodorus-EPiphanius’s *Historia tripartita*, the Roman *Liber pontificalis*, and Jerome-Gennadius’s *De viris illustribus*. As his grand historical narrative moved chronologically from the Roman Empire to the Frankish kingdoms, and ultimately to the Carolingian Empire, Ado began using Frankish sources, such as the *Liber historiae Francorum* and the *Annales regni Francorum*. Smaller additions were also made using the minor Frankish

---

17 Quodvultdeus of Carthage, *Liber promissionum*, ed. by Braun; Isidore, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, ed. by Migne. Also, Isidore, *Expositio in Vetus Testamentum Genesis*, ed. by Gorman and Dulac. Ado’s name can also be added to the list of writers such as Wigbod, Alcuin, Claudius of Turin, Angelomus of Luxeuil, and Harbanus Maurus, who used Isidore’s text for their own works on Genesis. Gorman and Dulac, *Expositio in Vetus Testamentum Genesis*, pp. xix–xxiv (cited under Primary Sources).
18 In general, see Van Nuffelen, *Orosius*. Ado, *Chronicon*, ed. by Migne, col. 49B.
20 Darby, ‘Bede’s History of the Future’.
21 Ado, *Chronicon*, ed. by Migne, col. 75B.
23 *Liber historiae Francorum*, ed. by Krusch; English trans. by Bachrach; *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. by Pertz and Kurze.
annals as well as Einhard’s *Vita Karoli Magni*. By the end of the chronicle, the focus narrows from a history of the world to one of the Franks, with special emphasis on the city of Vienne. Regarding the local history of Vienne, we do not know whence Ado derived his claims. Indeed, there is a paucity of written evidence from this region in the second half of the ninth century. Still, it is not unlikely that Ado may have relied upon oral sources, or documents from archives and libraries, from which there are no extant records.

In addition, Ado’s world chronicle seems to have been popular in the medieval world. Indeed, it was copied verbatim after Ado, although anonymous chroniclers added brief continuations to Ado’s original compilation, while Richard of Cluny (1140–70), Hugh of Flavigny (c. 1065–d. after 1111), and Hugh of Fleury (d. after 1118) copied large swathes of Ado’s work into their own compilations.

Ado’s sheer breadth of sources likely resulted from his upbringing and education. Born during the first half of the ninth century, he became a monk at an early age at Ferrières, where he studied under the monastery’s celebrated abbot Lupus. From a letter of Lupus dated to 859/60, we know that Ado moved to the monastery at Prüm (probably around 840–41), where he likely remained for around ten years. Thereafter, he travelled either to Italy or to Grenoble in Gaul. In the same letter, Lupus informed the *dux*, Gerard of Vienne, that he had recommended Ado to the bishop of Grenoble, Hebbo, and to the archbishop of Lyon, Remigius, for election to the bishopric of Vienne. In fact, it seems that Ado had moved to Lyon by the time that Lupus had written the

30 Levillain, ‘Girart’.
letter.\textsuperscript{31} Although Ado did not assist in the Council of Sisteron of September 859,\textsuperscript{32} he subscribed as an ‘episcopus’ in the acts of the Synod of Tusey on 22 October 860.\textsuperscript{33} In all likelihood, this means that Ado was ordained as archbishop of Vienne sometime after September 859, but before October 860.

Ado’s literary output actually exceeds the \textit{Chronicon}. He also wrote a passion of St Desiderius of Vienne, which he apparently sent to the abbey of St Gallen along with some relics of the saint in 870.\textsuperscript{34} Ado’s \textit{Vita Theudarii} was addressed to the monks of the monastery of Saint-Chef (which is roughly fifty-five kilometres from Vienne).\textsuperscript{35} According to Ado, this monastery was the one that Theudarius (a pupil of Caesarius of Arles) had established in his family estate around three hundred years earlier.\textsuperscript{36} Ado may also have written another text about the miracles of St Bernard of Vienne (810–40).\textsuperscript{37} Most importantly, however, the other major work by Ado was his martyrology.\textsuperscript{38} Maya Maskarinec has recently argued that Ado’s martyrology — written sometime between 855 and 860 — was critical in promoting a ‘comprehensive vision of a universalizing Christian Rome, an idea of Rome that far surpassed the city itself’\textsuperscript{39} In

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Lupus of Ferrières, \textit{Epistolae}, ed. by Levillain, 110, II, 152–53; trans. by Regenos, p. 128.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} \textit{Council of Sisteron}, ed. by Hartmann.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} \textit{Council of Tusey}, ed. by Hartmann, p. 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Ado of Vienne, \textit{Vita Theudarii abbatis}, ed. by Migne, cols 443–50; ed. by Krusch, pp. 525–30.
  \item \textsuperscript{37} \textit{Translatio seu elevatio S. Bernardi}, ed. by Migne, cols 451–52.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} According to Dom Quentin, there are two recensions of the martyrology written by Ado; the first recension has three different versions. See Dubois and Renaud, \textit{Le martyrologe d’Adon}, pp. xx–xxvii (cited here under Primary Sources). His martyrology was popular in the Frankish realm, and was also used for the later martyrologies of Notker, Usuard, Hermann of Reichenau, and Wolfdard, the monk of Herrieden. Quentin, \textit{Les martyrologes historiques}, p. 683; Notker Balbulus, \textit{Martyrologium}, ed. by Migne; Dubois, \textit{Le martyrologe d’Usuard}, esp. pp. 39–46; Dümmler, ‘Das Martyrologium Notkers’, esp. p. 208 onwards; \textit{De martyrologio Wolfhardi Haserensis}, ed. by De Smedt and others, pp. 5–23. Only extant manuscript is Munich, BSB, MS clm 18100 from the eleventh century. See Dubois, \textit{Les martyrologes}, pp. 57–58.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Maskarinec, \textit{City of Saints}, p. 166.
\end{itemize}
the martyrology, Ado also gave a comprehensive list of the bishops of Vienne.\(^{40}\) Since this text was written before the *Chronicon*, one could say that Ado was already — apart from his education in classical and Christian literature — collating information on the lives of Frankish saints and Roman martyrs, as well as linking places such as St Gallen and Vienne through the relics of martyrs. It seems, then, that Ado sought to universalize the city of Vienne, thereby localizing universal history, and monumentalizing the places of Francia (at least those locales to which he was connected), an undertaking that had been long in the making. However, the ways in which Ado documented Vienne’s past, a city of which he was archbishop, in particular its framing within the Roman and early Christian past, is itself deserving of close attention. It is to the peculiarities of this documentation that we now turn.

II

According to Ado, the first written record of Vienne was preserved in the annals of the Roman historian Livy, who wrote that the city of Vienne was founded by an exile named Venerius of Africa. Ado further adds that the city was first called ‘Bienne’ since it was built in two years. Some time hence, the ‘B’ was substituted for a ‘V’, and thereafter the city was known as ‘Vienne’.\(^{41}\) No extant text actually proves that Livy had discussed Vienne’s etymology. Nevertheless, this philological enquiry — whether fabricated or real — reveals the extreme care that Ado took in charting the ancient origins of the city. Indeed, his reporting that the city was built in only two years may seem like a relative triviality but it in fact serves to set the stage for the foundational story of Vienne for the rest of the text’s ‘fourth age’.

Further nuances in Vienne’s nomenclature is catalogued in the *Chronicon*. There, Ado claims that, owing to the position of the senate of Gaul in Vienne, the city was called *Vienna Senatoria*. There were also five legions and five camps situated in and around Vienne, the latter of which took their names from the five tribunes of the emperor Julius Caesar: Crappus; Eumedius; Sospolus; Quiriacus; and Pompeitiacus. Furthermore, the Roman state’s storehouse and granary were constructed in Vienne. What strikes the reader from Ado’s rather exaggerated characterization of the city — enumerating aspects of its construction, the presence of the senate, Roman defences, and military silo — is its

\(^{40}\) McKitterick, ‘The Scripts of the Bobbio Missal’, pp. 43–44.

\(^{41}\) Ado, *Chronicon*, ed. by Migne, col. 44C–D.
portrayal as a well-defended centre, one that would have been indispensable to the economic and political life of Gaul.  

42 Ado refers to how the famous Roman consul, Sempronius, constructed a bridge over the Rhône, as well as military fortifications on both sides of its banks.  

43 We then find an anecdote about Marius, the fourth consul of the province of Vienne, who fought against the tribes of the Teutons, the Cimbri, and the Tigurini when they had resolved to attack Italy.  

44 Ado further documents how, in east Vienne, there was a temple of Mars and Victory built by the Senones of Gaul and Vienne.  

The foregoing descriptions should not be construed as sheer artistic licence on Ado’s part. They are instead resourceful depictions of Roman ruins, which Ado would have encountered in Vienne’s vicinity. There is, in fact, archaeological backing to Ado’s portrayal. For, in 2017, French archaeologists unearthed a Roman neighbourhood of nearly 75,000 square feet — preserving the remains of grand houses and public buildings — in the area of Sainte-Colombe surrounding Vienne. The site’s leading archaeologist, Benjamin Clement, entitled his discovery ‘la petite Pompeii’ owing to the rich mosaics and intact monuments discovered in the area.  

Although the Pompeii-like splendour of Vienne may not have continued throughout the early medieval period, some of its Roman-era architecture may well have stood during Ado’s time.

Vienne’s somewhat fortified history aside, the Chronicon also links Vienne to the high politics of the Roman Empire and the story of the Bible. For example, almost all historical sources affirm that Marcus Piavvonius Victorinus, praetorian prefect under Postumus (the military commander who later established himself as Roman emperor in Gaul, Britain, and Spain), was killed in Cologne in 271.  

47 Ado had, however, changed the city of his death to Vienne.  

48 In a similar vein, Ado also wrote that, following Magnus Maximus’s (r. 383–88) usurpation of Gaul, Valentinian II first chose to hide in Vienne.

42 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, cols 44D–45A.  
43 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 62A.  
44 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 66 D. Also see Nimmegeers, Évêques, pp. 159–60.  
45 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 52C.  
46 Clement, field reports: ‘Exploration d’un quartier antique de Vienne’ and ‘Les fouilles du Bourg’. For more reports on this ongoing investigation, see <www.archeodunum.ch> [accessed 1 May 2020]. Also see Pelletier, Vienne antique; Gauthier and Picard, eds, Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule, III.  
47 See ‘M. Piavvonius Victorinus 12’, in Jones, Martindale, and Morris, Prosopography, 1, 965.  
48 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 88B.
much ado about vienne? a localizing universal chronicon

but finally paid with his life thanks to his links to the Arian heresy through his mother Justina. Magnus Maximus's connection to Vienne is only found in this chronicle.

Ado's methodology for carving out a space for Vienne in the biblical narrative is similar to the one described above. The links Ado drew between Vienne and these biblical figures have been studied by Nathanaël Nimmegeers — indeed, much of what follows draws upon his work. For example, the Chronicon furthermore highlights connections between Vienne and various figures from the Old Testament. Ado had copied Bede's story of the Jewish priest Mattathias (from 11 Maccabees), typically regarded as deuterocanonical throughout the patristic and early medieval period. However, Ado soon deviated from Bede's narrative, expanding upon this episode by adding that it was under the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, that the seven Maccabean brothers were martyred, and that it was in their honour that the church of Vienne was founded. While Hrabanus Maurus (780–856) wrote a commentary on 11 Maccabees 7 as political support for King Louis the German, Ado instead used the basic plotline for imagining the history of Vienne outside of the recorded biblical narrative. Ado again drew on Bede in his reconstruction of Herod the Tetrarch who, at the instigation of Herodias, had come to Rome seeking friendship with Agrippa. While Bede's version of this episode simply states that Herod and Herodias fled to Hispania and died there in grief, Ado's text adds another stop on their journey to Hispania, namely Vienne, which he called 'the city of the Gauls'. Ado is the only writer from the ancient and medieval world to claim (as far as I am aware) that Pontius Pilate had lived in perpetual exile in Vienne before committing suicide. According to this chronicle, Vienne is a city where Roman officials and biblical figures — both holy and unholy — intersect as they move across the Mediterranean. Thus, Vienne was not only an urban hub

49 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 96B–C.
51 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 64D: 'Verum Mathathias sacerdos leges patrias vindicat, adversus Antiochi duces arma corripiens; unde ortum martyrium sanctorum Machabaeorum septem fratrum nimis venerabile, in quorum honore Vienensis Ecclesia fundata est'. Although Ado's words are the only testimony we have to this story, there is enough evidence that the legend of the Maccabean martyrs was widespread in Gaul. Nimmegeers, Évêques, pp. 263–65.
52 Joslyn-Siematkoski, Christian Memories, pp. 29–86.
53 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 75B–C and 77C; Bede, De sex huius saeculi aetatibus, ed. by Jones, p. 496, ll. 1023–26.
54 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 77C.
but a city whose origins and growth are linked with both Roman history and biblical narrative.

The Chronicon, furthermore, is the first surviving text to systematically trace the origins of the church of Vienne.⁵⁵ Ado enumerates forty-seven bishops of Vienne, perhaps again with some creative licence, to create an official episcopal list for the city.⁵⁶ According to the Chronicon, the first bishop of Vienne was Crescens, a disciple of Paul, whom the latter had left behind in Vienne on his way to Spain, along with T rophimus of Arles.⁵⁷ As early as the fifth century, the bishops of Arles in a letter to Pope Leo had claimed apostolic origins for their church by explaining that T rophimus was the first bishop of their city, whom Peter himself had commissioned.⁵⁸ Ado was the first writer to have identified T rophimus as the one mentioned in Acts 20.4, 21.29, and II Timothy 4.20, and Crescens as the one of II Timothy 4.10. Although Louis Duchesne observed that the link Ado had forged between the preaching of Crescens in Vienne and T rophimus in Arles was a product of ancient rivalry between Arles and Vienne, it seems that Ado was actually tracing the history of Vienne in the early Christian centuries, in particular by associating the city with the other, relatively well-documented city of Arles.⁵⁹ Furthermore, although this ancient conflict between the two cities had certainly cooled by the ninth century, the established apostolic tradition of Arles could not have been ignored by Ado at the time he was reconstructing the apostolic origins of Vienne. Amongst all of the Romano-Provençal cities, Arles, and to a certain extent Lyon, had thrived following the third century, enjoying substantial expansion after the Christianization of the empire.⁶⁰ To conclude, T rophimus of Arles, who is usually called a disciple of Peter, is recorded as a disciple of Paul along with Crescens in the Chronicon.⁶¹ So, by making both T rophimus and Crescens co-disciples of Paul, Ado accorded Arles and Vienne equal apostolic pedigree.⁶² Thus, it seems that among Ado’s agendas was setting the record straight about the regional history of Vienne, especially in relation to other Provençal

⁵⁵ Nimmegeers, Évêques, pp. 81–84.
⁵⁷ Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 79A.
⁵⁸ Leo I, Epistulae, ed. by Migne, 65, cols 879–83.
⁵⁹ Duchesne, Fastes, 1, 154–55.
⁶¹ Duchesne, Fastes, 1, 154–55.
⁶² Duchesne, Fastes, 1, 246–47.
cities. Indeed, in reconstructing Vienne’s early history, Ado unequivocally looked to the history of Lyon. For example, in the Chronicon, Dionysius, bishop of Vienne, is touted as a contemporary of the famous martyr Irenaeus of Lyon (d. c. 202). We also find Ado making more overt connections between Vienne and Lyon: Justus, bishop of Lyon in the fifth century, apparently grew up under Paschasius, bishop of Vienne (c. 420), while Claudian was first a deacon of Vienne before being transferred to the city of Lyon as bishop. Given Ado’s own connections with Lyon, it is likely that he was well positioned to combine the oral histories of both Vienne and Lyon in his chronicle, thereby presenting to his readers information unavailable from any other extant source.

Among the stories of local legends in the Chronicon is that of the priest Severus. Reportedly Indian by birth, Severus had come to Vienne during the time of the bishop Isicius (fl. 480), whose legacy consisted in destroying the city’s pagan temples while beginning to construct a church dedicated to the protomartyr Stephen in front of the city gates, while at the same time anticipating the return of Bishop Germanus of Auxerre (c. 378–c. 448). Germanus had promised that he would attend the dedication of the church of St Stephen, and, true to his word (although he would not return alive), the body of Germanus was borne through Vienne on the day of the dedication of the church and carried inside where it rested. Germanus was a popular figure in Carolingian hagiographical literature and is especially renowned for his journeys and meetings with other saints. In the fifth-century hagiography Vita sancti Germani by Constantius of Lyon, Germanus is reported to have travelled to Arles and Lyon, although not Vienne. Owing to this, we may speculate that the connection of Germanus with Severus and the church of St Stephen in Vienne could have been taken by Ado from local traditions. Vita sancti Germani furthermore

---

63 There was a debate between the provincial boundaries of Vienne and Lyon about a century before Ado wrote the chronicle. See McKitterick, Charlemagne, pp. 302–03.
64 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 84B.
66 There is a longer version of St Severus of ‘India’ in a ninth-century manuscript, St Gallen, Stibi, MS Cod. Sang. 566, the anonymous ‘Vita sancti severi presbyteri’ (BHL 7692). This manuscript also contains two other works by Ado: The Life of Desiderius and that of Theudarius. Nathanaël Nimmegeers is of the opinion that the text found in this manuscript was written by Ado. Nimmegeers, Évêques, p. 162.
67 Ado, Chronicon, ed. by Migne, col. 123 A–C.
clearly states that Germanus’s body was brought back to rest in his own see at Auxerre rather than Vienne. Since Constantius’s text had been widely circulated by the ninth century, the prominence given to Vienne in the *Chronicon* in relation to Germanus points to two things. First, Ado may have taken it upon himself to document the oral legend circulating in Vienne about Germanus. Second, Ado bothered to record such legends in order to give Vienne pride of place among the other cities that Germanus had visited in his lifetime.69

In conclusion, it seems that — especially when we take into account the internal structure of the chronicle — one of its aims was to compile a historiography documenting the fame of Vienne under the ‘six ages of the world’ rubric. It is plausible that Ado inserts several oral legends to augment his account of the classical and Christian origins of the city. While there is no external evidence to suggest so, the chronicle may well have been intended for local aristocratic houses, especially given the extent to which the *Chronicon* records the heritage of the city. Aristocratic elites in Provence, especially in the area surrounding Vienne, were enormously influential on local politics, so it is likely that they were amongst the chronicle’s intended audience.70 One such aristocrat was *dux* Gerard of Vienne, to whom Lupus composed a letter of recommendation regarding Ado’s election to the see of Vienne.71 Until the death of King Charles of Provence I in 863, Gerard was also the kingdom’s regent and the brother of Lothar I’s wife, Ermengarde, making him the uncle of the young king.72 Could the *Chronicon* have been a memento of local pride and the cultural inheritance of Vienne, intended to be read by men like Gerard? Were the oral legends and stories preserved by Ado meant to be read by aristocratic families in Provence? Unfortunately, these are questions that cannot be answered. Nevertheless, we can say with certainty that, in writing the history of the world, Ado capitalized upon his classical and Christian education in judiciously curating an array of salient sources. To this end, Ado took great pains in tracing the city’s connection to the early Christian world, as well as its inception at the beginning of the Roman Empire.

71 See n. 28 above.
72 Levillain, ‘Girart’.
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THE SENSE OF AN ENDING IN THE HISTORIES OF FRECHULF OF LISIEUX

Graeme Ward

Introduction

We often look to the ends of stories and narratives in order to help make sense of them. Amongst the surviving corpus of historical writing from the Carolingian period, it is therefore not surprising to find that the work which possesses one of the least conventional endings has long been considered challenging to understand. Around 830, Frechulf, bishop of Lisieux, completed the second of his two volumes of Histories (labelled here part II) and dedicated it to the Empress Judith, wife of the reigning Carolingian emperor Louis the Pious (814–40), for the instruction of her young son Charles (king of the West Franks, 840–77). Frechulf’s first volume (labelled here part I) covered human history between the world’s creation and Christ’s incarnation, and was contained within seven books. Addressing Judith, Frechulf explained that subsequently:

I set about writing a second volume, beginning with Octavian Augustus and the birth of our Lord and Saviour, and carrying it down to the kingdoms of the Franks and the Lombards, when the emperors and governors of the Romans disappeared

I am grateful to Rutger Kramer, Rosamond McKitterick, and Giorgia Vocino for their help in preparing this contribution. All mistakes are my own.

1 Cf. Kermode, The Sense of an Ending; for a Carolingian example, Airlie, “Sad Stories”.
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from Italy and Gaul, and the kings of the Goths, who had succeeded them, were likewise driven out by these peoples. I have divided this work into five books.\(^2\)

In the work’s epilogue, Frechulf stated the end point of his Histories with a little more detail:

On account of the love for my domina, Judith Augusta, I have undertaken a second volume, which I have carried through from the birth of the Lord Jesus Christ to the death of the extraordinary doctor, Gregory [the Great]. Next, I selected certain of the deeds of Pope Boniface. I decided to set the end of my books here, when the Franks and the Lombards took charge of the kingdoms of Gaul and Italy, after the governors of the Romans and the Goths had been driven out.\(^3\)

Frechulf’s decision to draw his narrative to a close ‘so abruptly with the establishment of the Frankish and Lombard kingdoms’ and ‘not continue to [his] own time’ has often been seen as one of the defining features of his text, as well as one of the central interpretative obstacles to overcome.\(^4\) What can be taken away from a Carolingian history in which the narrative extends no further than the seventh century?

For some, the answer to this question was: not much.\(^5\) For others, the absence of any sort of original continuation forced them to look elsewhere when seeking to identify features that make the Histories appear distinct, individual, and therefore historiographically significant. To this end, a clear thread in previous (and predominantly German-language) research centred on Frechulf’s Zeitbewußtsein, that is, his sense of history and perception of his own world’s place within the grand sweep of time.\(^6\) Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, for example, in her survey of medieval Latin world chronicles, stressed that for all Frechulf’s lack of originality, his work displayed ‘ein neu-artiges Geschichtsbewußtsein’ (an unprecedented historical consciousness).\(^7\)

---

\(^2\) Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii. Prol, p. 436; trans. adapted from Lake, p. 113. Unless otherwise stated, translations are my own. For a fuller study of Frechulf, see my forthcoming monograph, History, Scripture and Authority.

\(^3\) Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.27, pp. 723–24: ‘Igitur a natiuitate Domini Iesu Christi ob amorem dominae meae Augustae Iudith secundum scribendo adgressus sum opus, quod usque ad Gregorii eximii doctoris obitum perduxi. De gestis etiam Bonefacii papaec quaedam deinceps praelibando perstrinxi. Romanorum iudicibus et Gothis ab Italia et Galliis depulsis, his Francis et Langobardis succedentibus in regnis, hic terminum censui meorum inponere librorum’.

\(^4\) Natunewicz, ‘Freculphus’, p. 123.


\(^6\) On this research topic, see for example Goetz, ‘Historiographisches Zeitbewußtsein’.

\(^7\) Von den Brincken, Studien, p. 126.
He dislocated Frankish history from the Roman world and in his conclusion stressed that the establishment of Frankish and Lombard rulership, together with the pontificate of Gregory the Great, represented a major turning point: the beginning of ‘a new epoch in world history’, no less. ‘Clearly’, she stated, Frechulf ‘saw the break which today we label the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages’, something, she added, was ‘unique for that time’.\footnote{8}

Nikolaus Staubach offered a critical modification to this reading, arguing that the changes in rulership which Frechulf highlighted were themselves less important than the age of Gregory and especially the ‘deeds of Boniface’ (conflating those of Boniface III and IV) noted in the epilogue.\footnote{9} These deeds comprised the recognition of papal primacy over the universal church and the conversion of the Pantheon to the Church of St Mary and all the Martyrs;\footnote{10} they marked the culmination of an Augustinian-inflected narrative structured around the theme of the two cities. Augustinian \textit{Geschichtstheologie}, Staubach argued, supplied the hermeneutic key with which the whole text’s idiosyncrasies, not least its ending, were unlocked and ‘the controversial question concerning [Frechulf’s] appreciation of epochs and his historical perspective’ was answered. The turn of the seventh century marked ‘the most important caesura in world history’, ‘an epochal turning point that brought the results of the Incarnation to fuller historical fruition’ and signified the emergence of \textit{Christiana tempora}, ‘Christian times’.\footnote{11} More recently still, Hans Hubert Anton has pushed things back in the other direction, drawing attention to Frechulf’s ‘secular’ rather than his ‘theological’ concerns. Nevertheless, Anton reached a somewhat similar conclusion: the changes in secular and ecclesiastical leadership signalled the beginning of a new stage in Christian history, what he called simply ‘the West’. Anton again underscored Frechulf’s ‘exceptional ability to recognize historical periods and breaks’.\footnote{12}

All these readings evaluate Frechulf above all as a historian who set out to write a text that made a profoundly novel political or theological point, despite the fact that he based his work primarily upon the words of others. To some extent this assumes that the \textit{Histories} were written as a coherent essay or book, to be read and studied by Carolingian students and scholars in a way

resembling how modern academics approach literary texts. It also assumes that ninth-century writers and readers asked similar questions to those we pose today. Textual criticism and analysis were important skills for intellectual elites, but it is important to remember education and learning were placed almost always in the service of God. Although the political implications of historiography often are given pride of place in modern scholarship, the religious and devotional facets of both the writing and the reading of history ought also to be considered since these account for the contexts in which historiography was composed and consumed. In the ninth century, Frechulf’s Histories were, at the very least, held and presumably consulted and studied in monastic libraries and cathedral schools. In this chapter, I wish to explore this context, not only so as to offer a new interpretation of Frechulf’s ending, but also in order to sketch — albeit briefly — some of the wider social horizons within which the work as a whole can be situated. To begin, however, I wish to discuss the compilatory nature of the Histories.

-libri [...] a Frechulfō Lixoviensis ecclesiae ex diversis historiografforūm libris deflorati-

How helpful or meaningful is it to consider Frechulf specifically as a historian? Frechulf conceived of his own work as a ‘compendium’, a summary or abridgment of much older historical texts: he referred to it as an ‘opus conpendiosum’ (sic) that comprised material ‘plucked from the diverse books of historiographers’. Throughout parts I and II of the Histories, Frechulf worked with an impressive range of sources, but significantly those used most frequently

13 Contreni, ‘Learning for God’.
15 Evans, ‘Carolingian History Writing’.
16 See Allen, Prolegomena, pp. 58*–78* (St Gallen), 79*–82* (Reichenau), and 147*–48* (Lorsch). On the St Gallen Frechulf (Stibi, MS Cod. Sang. 622), see also Allen, ‘Bede and Frechulf’.
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and extensively amount to the fundamental works of Christian history that, as the surviving manuscripts and library catalogues reveal, were ubiquitous in Carolingian centres of learning. These sources included: Jerome’s Latin translation of Eusebius’s *Chronicle*; the Latin translations of the *Jewish Wars* and *Jewish Antiquities* of Josephus; Orosius’s *Historiae adversus paganos*; Augustine’s *City of God*; Rufinus’s translation and continuation of Eusebius’s *Historia ecclesiastica*; Cassiodorus-Epiphanius’s *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, a translation and edition of Eusebius’s three Greek fifth-century continuators, Sozomen, Socrates, and Theodoret; and Jerome’s *De viris illustribus*.19 When Frechulf came to compile his Histories, the scriptorium at Lisieux was clearly well stocked with books.20

A snapshot of how Frechulf situated himself in relation to his sources comes during the middle of the fourth book of part ii, which dealt with the persecution against Catholics launched by the Arian emperor Valens in the 370s. This theme had occupied much space in Frechulf’s sources, especially Rufinus’s continuation of the *Historia ecclesiastica* and the *Historia tripartita*. Frechulf, however, distanced himself from them. Firstly, he excerpted Orosius’s concise account of the persecution, noting that he did not need to go into greater detail because ‘enough is revealed within the ecclesiastical histories’.21 He then explained that:

Due to the many exiles, suffocations and innumerable torments which were devised in the Roman world under this impious prince to extirpate the vines of Christ, the historiographers (*historiographi*), whose purpose was to extend to future posterity written accounts of these events, struggled to provide clear coverage because of the great multitude of differing deaths. We have taken care to insert one example from many in this compendious little work.22

---


19 See further Allen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 200*–19*.

20 Cf. Frechulf, *Epistola*, ed. by Allen, p. 6, where Frechulf complained to Hrabanus Maurus that he found no books at Lisieux when he first arrived there. On Frechulf’s relationship with Hrabanus, see Allen, *Prolegomena*, p. XXX.


In contrasting his own work with that of the historiographers which he read and utilized, Frechulf distinguished his task from theirs. His ‘compendious little work’ was not a comprehensive narratio rei gestae, but an attempt to emphasize what was — in his eyes — particularly important to know. Utilitas, ‘usefulness’, was the name of the game: when summarizing the first volume of his Histories, the bishop of Lisieux wrote that he had ‘taken care to excerpt everything which seemed [to him] useful and beneficial to readers’.\(^{23}\)

Compilation rendered a vast amount of received knowledge manageable; it conveyed the central message of these historiographi with clarity and concision. The core of this message was encapsulated in the sixth century by Cassiodorus, when, in his Institutiones, he recommended historical study as part of the syllabus for his monks at Vivarium. Christian historians, he explained, ‘go through changing events and the transformation of kingdoms’ and ‘insist that nothing happens by chance or because of the weak powers of the gods as the pagan historians did; instead they truly strive to attach all events to the providential guidance of the Creator’. Moreover, ‘Since they tell the history of the Church and describe changes happening through different periods, they inevitably instruct the minds of the readers in heavenly matters’.\(^{24}\)

\[\textit{God, History, and the Ecclesia}\]

Instructing the minds of his readers in heavenly matters was one of Frechulf’s key aims. His central message, likewise, was that since the world’s beginning, God ‘did not rest from the management of his creations’; and that ‘he steered the course of all things at all times, in the sky, on earth and throughout every age’.\(^{25}\) God controlled all history, and all earthly events corresponded to his plan.\(^{26}\) This is illustrated structurally by the fact that in Frechulf’s hands, history was divided into two parts: before Christ and after, the ages of the Old and New


\(^{24}\) Cassiodorus, Institutiones, ed. by Mynors, i.17.1, p. 55; trans. by Halporn, p. 149.

\(^{25}\) Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, i.1.1, p. 29: ‘Post cuius namque conditionem Deum cessasse a nova operatione, non a gubernatione creaturarum, haud dubium est’; Histories, ed. by Allen, i.Prol. (versus), p. 21: ‘Nec sibi, sed Domino tribuat quae gesta videntur | Qui dedit ingenium stolido, qui cuncta gubernat | In caelis, terries, perque omnia saecula semper’.

Testaments, two periods separated by darkness and light. The Histories’ two-part division can be seen in relation to the biblical narrative as it was described by Jean Leclercq in his classic study of medieval Benedictine monastic culture:

the Old and New Testaments are considered in the Middle Ages not as two collections of ‘books’, but as two periods, two ‘times’ which echo each other. The time of law (tempus legis) and the time of grace (tempus gratiae) are different stages of one and the same salvation, each of them includes, over and above the scriptural texts, the sum of the realities told us in these texts.

The basic structure of the Histories itself echoed the bipartite relationship of Christian scripture. In part i, all history worked towards the birth of Christ and beginnings of the Church, when the New Testament fulfilled the Old. The books and chapters of part ii showed in turn how the ecclesia grew and the Gospel was spread throughout the world; it is this narrative that concerns me here.

From the birth of Christ in the reign of Augustus, the first Roman emperor, the story of the Church unfolds in relation to the Roman Empire. The shape and narrative rhythm of Frechulf’s Histories owed much to the sources he employed, which on the whole were written by Christian Romans in the Christian Empire of the fourth and especially fifth centuries. The Latin translation of Eusebius of Caesarea’s Historia ecclesiastica, Cassiodorus-Epiphanius’s Historia ecclesiastica tripartita (a Latin translation and abridgement of three of Eusebius’s fifth-century Greek continuators), and Orosius’s Historiae adversus paganos (written c. 417) were particularly important and supplied complementary perspectives on ecclesia and empire. For Eusebius and his continuators, the focus was primarily on episcopal succession within the major apostolic sees, saints and martyrs, persecutions, and the struggles — physical and doctrinal — of Christian churchmen against heresy. Orosius, in his seventh and final book adversus paganos, focused more narrowly on imperial affairs, but from a fiercely apologetic perspective. He dealt explicitly with ‘the time when the Christian faith germinated, the times when it grew all the more amid the hands of those who would have stopped it.’

---

27 For the contrast between lightness and darkness, see Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, i.1.9, i.7.19, and ii.1.1, pp. 36, 432, and 440.
30 Van Nuffelen, Orosius. See further the contribution by Evans and McKitterick in this volume.
31 Orosius, Historiae, ed. by Arnaud-Lindet, vi.22.10, ii, 237; trans. by Fear, p. 316.
Frechulf, as compiler, placed himself between these two traditions, embodying and reifying their respective emphases. His own focus was ‘both the deeds of emperors and the acts of ecclesiastics’; addressing Judith in the prologue to part II he expressed his hopes that her young son Charles would ‘be enlightened by the deeds of the emperors, the triumphs of the saints, and the instruction of eminent teachers’. But underpinning this was the wider story of ecclesiastical growth. This growth — although divinely ordained — was depicted as a difficult and painful process, met with frequent resistance from imperial persecution and doctrinal heresy, both of which were spurred on by the Devil. Although running throughout part II, this was made particularly clear at the beginning of book III, at a moment which marks a turning point of sorts between the most recent imperial persecution of Christianity (by Severus and his son Antonius) and the religion’s subsequent acceptance and promotion by Constantine:

And so I have taken care to note down how many and what kind of doctors of the Church and robust defenders of our faith existed at this time of persecution, so that, discerning the wonderful dispensation of God, his omnipotence, and his clemency towards mankind, we may busy ourselves to praise and to thank [him] more willingly just as he himself granted, since he miraculously deigned to extend the ecclesia that his blood had redeemed, even while the whole world stood up against it. Grieving over human salvation, the arrogant Ancient Enemy did not cease to inflict upon us diverse schismatic doctrines, while also he determined to inflict terrors and murders on the Church from outside [i.e. through imperial persecution]. But even though the Church of Christ was pressed hard from all sides more greatly than before by perfidious and schismatic men deceived by diabolic trickery, majestically it was so much the more greatly enlarged and took courage by growing in many places.


33 E.g. Frechulf, *Histories*, ed. by Allen, ii.1.20, p. 475, ed. by Allen, ii.2.11, p. 517.

34 Frechulf, *Histories*, ed. by Allen, ii.3.1, p. 558: ‘Igitur hac tempestate persecutionum quanti qualesue ecclesiarium extiterint doctores ac robusti pro fide nostra propugnatores ex parte adnotare curaui, ut miram Dei dispensationem cernentes, illius omnipotentiam et circa genus humanum eiusdem elementiam propensius laudare ac gratias agere prout ipse donauerit satagamus, quoniam mirabiliter ecclesiam suo redemptam sanguine dilatate dignatus est, dum totus aduersus eam adsurgeret mundus. Ab externis terrores et mortes, a nostris diuersa scisma tum dogmata superbus hostis antiquus non cessabat inferre, dolens humanam salutem seque expoliari dum cerneret. Sed ut magis undique premebatur a perfidis et ab scismaticis uiris diabolic a fraude deceptis, eo amplius nobiliter propagabatur et crescendo confortabatur in pluri mis Christi ecclesia.’
In this passage Frechulf presents a sort of synthesis of Eusebian and Orosian approaches to history: Orosius’s understanding of ‘Christian times’ merges with Eusebius’s greater focus on the ‘doctors of the churches’ and the pernicious influence of the Ancient Enemy. The result, for want of a better term, can simply be called ‘Christian history’. History here represents not just the story told through the amalgamation of texts, but a shared identity and ‘an inherited community [...] rooted in the Bible’ and in the writings of the church fathers.35 A sense of this identity can be gleaned through Frechulf’s use of the first-person plural. Frechulf envisaged that ‘we’ (in the present) pray and thank God while reading about what the Devil inflicted upon ‘us’ (in the past). These pronouns are vague and general, but they offer at least the barest of glimpses of the very real connections felt between Carolingian Christians and their church, its history, and its historians.

The narrative Frechulf told, therefore, was not novel, but foundational: new peoples accepted Christianity while the worship of the old gods lost traction. Important moments occurred during Constantine’s reign: the Gospel ‘illuminated India’, a land ‘so far removed that the plough of apostolic preaching had made no furrow there’.36 The Georgians and Armenians likewise accepted the ‘Christiani dogmatis rudimenta’ (basics of Christian teaching) and the conversion of the latter’s king brought further evangelization, for after which ‘the Christian religion crossed other borders, and the multitude (of believers) was enlarged’.37 Frechulf chose to end book iii with Constantine’s edict (as reported by Orosius) that pagan temples be closed without bloodshed, an act which demanded — Frechulf thought — that his readers ‘praise and marvel at Christ’s omnipotence’.38 In book iv, the teachings of the desert fathers in Egypt during Valens’s persecution ‘fulfilled the Apostle [Paul’s] words that “where sin abounded, grace did more abound” (Romans 5.20)’, which in the Histories was further emphasized. ‘For Egypt’, Frechulf added, ‘more so than all other nations once served with deeply misplaced devotion the various monsters of

35 Allen, ‘Universal History’, p. 17; see also McKitterick, History and Memory, p. 221.

36 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.3.18, p. 603: ‘exteriorem Indian lustrando [...] quam velut longe remotam nullus apostolicae praedictionis vomer inpresserat’; trans. adapted from The Church History, trans. by Amidon, pp. 18–19.

37 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.3.19, p. 605: ‘apud ceteros confines Christianum dogma transiuit, et multitutine dilatum est’.

idolatry’. Yet even in Alexandria, ‘where pagan superstition had become especially ingrown’, the shrines to the old gods, most notably the Serapeum, were soon destroyed following an imperial decree, this time of Theodosius I. The result was that after ‘renouncing their former errors’, many pagans ‘delivered themselves to the true religion of the Christians’. This narrative is worth sketching in order to highlight that the vast majority of part II followed the course set by Christian historians in the fourth and fifth centuries. Frechulf’s narrative has been seen from the perspective of ‘cultic history’, a history in which pagan worship declined as Christianity rose; yet it also needs to be stressed that the Histories followed and indeed responded to the broad trajectory outlined by Orosius and by Eusebius and his continuators. The story, simply put, underscored divine providence in history and highlighted that despite the best efforts of the Ancient Enemy in the form of heretical doctrines and persecuting emperors, the ecclesia grew within and beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire, triumphing over its opponents.

Book V and the Transformation of the West ( partes Hesperiarum)

In the fifth and final book of part II, the coverage provided by Frechulf’s core texts came to an end. Orosius’s Historiae, used throughout both parts I and II, supplied Frechulf with material as far as the seventh chapter of book V. The Historia ecclesiastica tripartita, although a product of the sixth century, went no further in its narrative than the reign of Theodosius II (408–50), and even then only until c. 439 (its ending was dated to the seventeenth consulate of Theodosius II). This took Frechulf up to the eleventh chapter of book V, over a third of the way through. On the whole, therefore, part II dealt with the first five centuries of

39 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.4.18, p. 647: ‘Aegyptus enim prae omnibus nationibus superstitionis superstitiosissime diversis idolorum monstris quondam servierat’.
40 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.4.30, p. 668.
41 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.4.29, p. 669: ‘alii quidem ex paganis errors pristinos abdicantes ad veram Christianorum religionem se contulerunt’.
43 On this narrative, see for example Brown, Authority and the Sacred, pp. 3–26; Brown, The Rise of Western Christendom, pp. 72–92; Markus, ‘Tempora Christiana Revisited’.
Christian history. For the final twenty-six chapters, Frechulf still had authoritative sources to guide him, namely: the Getica and Romana by Jordanes (composed in the sixth century), the Chronicle of Fredegar (composed in the seventh century), and the world chronicle that comprised chapter 66 of Bede’s De temporum ratione (written c. 725). Armed with these texts, Frechulf was able to take the core story of ecclesiastical growth forward into the post-imperial West.

In several chapters drawn from Orosius, for example, Frechulf had first looked at the barbarian incursions into the Western Empire after 407, which he summarized as ‘the scourges of wretchedness which, driven by sin, at that time came to pass in the west, in the regions of Gaul and Spain and also in Africa.’

Later chapters, excerpted from both Bede and Jordanes, advanced this story further. The Vandals, who had first settled in Spain, set sail for North Africa, and joined by Alans and Goths they ‘defiled everything with fire, sword, rapine, together with the Arian impiety.’ Later under Gaiseric they plundered Rome.

During the reign of Majorian (457–61), military action was planned against the Vandals. In the same chapter, Frechulf then looked at the fate of the Western Empire between Majorian and the last Western emperor, Romulus Augustulus (475–76). This period was one of internal political instability, which was shown to be the ultimate cause of the Western Empire’s demise. Jordanes’ Getica supplied most of the details, but Frechulf provided his own stresses. Following the death of Romulus Augustulus in 476, he wrote, much more explicitly than Jordanes had, that ‘henceforth the res publica of the Romans in the West, which hitherto had ruled over the gentes, now with a groan yielded to their kings.’


46 Interestingly Frechulf changed Orosius’s present-tense statement about the Vandals in Spain: ‘usque ad nunc [...] consistunt’ to the perfect ‘residerunt’.


48 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.15, pp. 700–01. See also ii.5.17, pp. 704 and 705.

49 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.17, pp. 703–07; see also the chapter title at p. 671, which offers a neat summation of its contents: ‘De crebris mutationibus principum, et sic periderunt Occidentis imperium Romani’.

50 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.17, p. 707: ‘Hinc iam res publica Romanorum partibus Hesperiarum quae actenus gentibus imperaverat, regibus gentium gemens subcubuit’. See further Lošek, ‘Non ignota canens?’.
Frechulf did not stop there, but included further changes that took place in Italy: the Ostrogoths ruled until Justinian’s reconquest, which itself was ultimately undone by the Lombard invasion. Gaul likewise experienced significant changes as a result of the ‘many gentes who flooded’ into the region during the reign of Honorius, a story which Frechulf found in Orosius. The Gothic kingdom, for example, came to an end following the defeat of Alaric II’s army by Clovis’s Franks at Vouillé (‘in campania Voglauense’) in 507. Frechulf wrote:

It was determined by the wonderful dispensation of God that Alaric I — whom the Goths made king when military service was taken away from them as a result of the greed of the Roman consuls, and who plotted to take up arms against the Romans as a result of hunger and need, ravaging Illyricum, invading Italy and plundering Rome, the mistress of the gentes — rejoiced in his various prosperous successes, raised up his people and his kingdom; and so it also was that, in Alaric II’s reign, the people and kingdom of the Goths ultimately came to an end. This was just like how, in the West under Octavian Augustus, the Roman Empire became mistress of other nations, and then in the end, perishing under Augustulus, the Empire became subjected to the rule of those other nations.

Jordanes had already drawn comparisons between the fates of the Western Empire and the Gothic kingdom, but Frechulf not only amplified these realms’ interconnected histories but also stressed that their parallel courses demonstrated divine providence in action.

God’s hand guided the rise and fall of the kingdoms of the gentes but also it was through his ‘wonderful dispensation’ that after the Nativity the boundaries of the ecclesia extended far and wide. In effect book v extended the core Eusebius-Rufinus/Cassiodorus-Epiphanius narrative, but primarily in a way

---

51 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.21, 23, and 25, pp. 713–17 and 722.
52 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.6, cap., p. 670: ‘De diversis gentibus quae se infuderunt per Gallias’.
53 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, ii.5.22, pp. 717–18: ‘Mira Dei dispensatione actum est: ut Alaricus — quem Gothi regem creauert quando avaritia consulum Romanorum stipendiae sunt subtractae ab eis, qui fame et penuria coacti consipruerunt contra Romanos in arma, Illyricum depopulantes, Italiam inaudentes, Romam gentium dominam depraeandantes — Alaricus ouans diversis successibus prosperitatum sublimauit gentem suam et regnum, demum in Alarico gens et regnum Gothorum defecit, sicuti et Romanorum in Hesperia sub Octoviano Augusto aliarum gentium domina, et nouissime in Augustulo deficiens, ut supra retulimus, gentibus est aliis subiecta’. See also Staubach, ‘Christiana tempora’, pp. 188–89. This is considerably more elaborate than Jordanes, Getica, ed. by Mommsen, 245, p. 121: ‘Nam pari tenore ut de Augustis superius diximus, et in Alaricis evenisse cognoscitur: et in eis saeppe regna deficiunt, a quorum nominibus incohaurunt’.
that concerned the West, the *partes Hesperiarum*: this affirms the argument of Anton, but alters its emphasis. At the beginning of book v, the acts of holy man Maruthas ensured that ‘apud Persas Christianitas est dilatata’ (Christianity spread amongst the Persians). In subsequent chapters, Christianity also first reached Britain, and near the end of the *Histories*, Gregory the Great dispatched Augustine of Canterbury across the Channel in order to ‘ad Christum Anglos convertit’ (convert the Angles to Christ). What was perceived as the correct form of Western Christianity, moreover, scored further points. The history of heresy was enshrined in the church’s collective memory from its early days: the struggles between orthodoxy and heterodoxy, which began in the reign of Constantine, were a particularly prominent topic for the ecclesiastical historians. Frechulf was able to present further resolutions to these conflicts. In book iv, the deeds and writings of Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan were said to have freed Gaul and then Italy ‘a peste Arriana’ (from the Arian plague). In book v, Frechulf introduced a further battlefield of Arian-Catholic hostility which fell outside the scope of the tradition of ecclesiastical histories, but which in Frechulf’s *Histories* appears in direct continuation of them. Under the Vandal king Hilderic (r. c. 523–30), the anti-Catholic actions of his predecessors were reversed and ‘hereticas submovit profanationes’ (he expelled the heretical profanations) from North Africa. The final act in this long-running drama occurred in Visigothic Spain, where King Reccared (586–601), at Bishop Leander of Seville’s insistence, ‘converted to the catholic faith the whole Gothic people over whom he ruled’.

Frechulf’s final chapters, brief as they may be, resound in triumph. The penultimate chapter ‘on the deeds of Pope Boniface’ notes that the Eastern emperor Phocas recognized that the ‘Roman see and apostolic church was the head of all churches’ and also that at this time the Pantheon was converted from

54 See above, n. 12.
56 Frechulf, *Histories*, ed. by Allen, ii.5.13, pp. 696–97; ii.5.16, p. 703; ii.5.24, p. 721.
a pagan shrine to a Christian church, 'so that where once the worship, not of all the gods but rather of all the demons had taken place, there should thenceforth be a memorial to all the saints'.

With paganism vanquished and Rome's primacy asserted, Frechulf concluded by couching his Western focus within a veneer of universality. His final chapter signified the victory of Christianity and the establishment of orthodoxy by listing in order the six universal synods which were received in the east amongst those who 'soundly uphold the catholic faith'.

By providing a short overview of the recognized and accepted definitions of orthodoxy, Frechulf ended on a clear high note. Readers were given a condensed, reframed digest of authoritative Christian historiography with an ending that, from a ninth-century perspective, brought the story contained within the core Christian histories to a more fitting conclusion. As Michael Allen expressed it, 'Frechulf thus sealed his story of religious transformation and affirmed Carolingian readers by halting his Histories when the spatial foundations of their world were laid'.

Frechulf's ending nevertheless needs also to be read within the context of his compilatory project as a whole. It was shaped by the intertwined concerns of education and authority, at the nexus of which stood a central element in Carolingian intellectual culture: the written word.

Texts, Authority, and Knowledge

Frechulf's Histories evoke a world of books. Written texts are enshrined within its pages via the process of compilation itself, but also as a result of a key characteristic of some of the sources with which he worked. Christianity is a scriptural religion. It is a religion of the Book, but also of books: written texts were understood to be a fundamental part of the story of ecclesiastical growth, going back at least as far as Eusebius, who in the prologue to the Ecclesiastical History wrote that a particular focus of his work would be the 'extraordinary men [...] who famously reinforced the word of God either through writing and or teaching'.

Many early medieval readers certainly would have known their

---


61 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, II.5.27, p. 723: 'quae sunt universales sex sinodi quas totus Oriens recipit et concelebrat, qui catholicam fidem sana mente retinent, ostendamus'.


63 Eusebius-Rufinus, Historia ecclesiastica, ed. by Schwartz, Mommsen, and Winkelmann, I.1.1, p. 7: 'qui etiam insignes viri in locis maxime celeberrimis ecclesiis praefuerunt vel qui singulis quibusque temporibus seu scribendo seu docendo verbum dei nobiliter adstruxere'.

Eusebius, but many of *Ecclesiastical History*’s assembled authors would also have been known through another important and influential source: Jerome’s *De viris illustribus*. Completed in c. 392/93, Jerome’s *On Illustrious Men* presented a series of concise bio-bibliographies running from Peter the Apostle down to Jerome himself, each of which provide a brief description of an individual’s life and known works. Jerome’s apologetic aim was to challenge the status of classical, secular authors by surveying in chronological order those whose lives and writings ‘founded, built up and adorned’ the *ecclesia* (‘quant et quales viri eam fundaverint, struxerint, adornaerint’).

Jerome’s text was immensely popular in the eighth and ninth centuries, yet Frechulf’s conspicuous use of the *De viris illustribus* still manages to stand out. He incorporated the vast majority of it into part II of his *Histories*, omitting only fifteen of its 135 chapters (and only eight of those fifteen individuals were not included via other sources). This process involved Frechulf breaking up the *De viris*, restructuring and recontextualizing its entries according to his own designs. Jerome’s authors were placed within a much more fleshed out, chapter-driven narrative, and they were frequently grouped together into coherent, self-contained sections. These sections were then inserted throughout the text, keyed to the reigns of the emperors under which famous individuals flourished or in which they passed away. Frechulf, for example, devoted chapters to those men ‘who under [Constantine] left behind in writing monuments for posterity’, or the ‘divine men who distinguished themselves through their writings’ during the reign of Theodosius I, and the *virii illustres* ‘who shone brightly in the churches like twinkling stars during the reigns of Arcadius and his brother Honorius’.

---

64 Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, ed. by Richardson; trans. by Halton.
65 Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, ed. by Richardson, prologus, p. 2; trans. by Halton, pref.7, p. 2. For Jerome in context, see Vessey, ‘Forging Orthodoxy’ and ‘Augustine’.
67 Frechulf, for example, omitted Jerome’s chapter on John, a priest of Antioch (c. 129): when the *De viris* was written, much of John’s career (i.e. as John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople) still lay ahead; a fuller biography was found in the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartite*, written well after John’s death. See Frechulf, *Histories*, ed. by Allen, II.5.1, pp. 672–74.
Frechulf also made significant alterations and additions. Jerome’s personal pronouns were restyled in the third person, and authors who were still alive when Jerome composed his text (himself included) were rendered deceased through the perfect tense. Working from the vantage point of the ninth century, moreover, Frechulf was able to revise existing entries as well as make his own Jeromanesque contributions. Jerome’s somewhat ambiguous entry on Ambrose (‘Ambrose, bishop of Milan, continues writing down to the present day. Concerning him I postpone judgment in that he is still alive lest I get blamed for flattery, on the one hand, or, on the other, for telling the truth’) was recast in a considerably more positive light: ‘Ambrose, bishop of the church of Milan [...] died at this time. Marvellously he published many little works: I believe it is unnecessary to summarize them, since they are known through constant reading’.

Assumed familiarity, however, did not stop Frechulf from copying verbatim all that Jerome had written about himself. One of the striking features of Jerome’s De viris illustribus was that he included himself amongst the great ecclesiastical writers; in his work’s final chapter, he ‘raised his own monument long before he was ready to be inhumed’. His own bibliography was completed in 392/93, but was presented as a work in progress: ‘many other [commentaries] on the work of the Prophets which I have on hand, and are not yet finished’. Frechulf, writing well over four hundred years later, supplied a more rounded entry by including the names of some of the works completed in the three decades between De viris illustribus and its author’s death: ‘usefully [Jerome] published an explanation of Isaiah in [several] large volumes, and he also explained [the book of] Jeremiah as well as Daniel. Furthermore, he produced a commentary on Matthew along with many more little works’.

69 Allen, Prolegomena, p. 212.
70 Vessey, ‘Jerome and the Jeromanesque’.
72 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, 11.5.3, p. 678: ‘Ambrosius Mediolanensis ecclesiae episcopus, de quo supra mentionem fecimus, qui multa nobiliter edidit opuscula quae quidem proper notitiam assidue legentium reor non esse recapitulare necessarium, eo tempore defunctus est’.
73 Vessey, ‘Reinventing History’, p. 279.
74 Jerome, De viris illustribus, ed. by Richardson, 135, p. 56; trans. by Halton, p. 168.
75 Frechulf, Histories, ed. by Allen, 11.5.4, pp. 679–80: ‘Esaiam utiliter explanando gran-
Immediately following this updated entry on Jerome, Frechulf included amongst the *inlustres viri* a prominent Frankish holy man, Martin of Tours. Frechulf was able to make Martin one of those ecclesiastical stars who twinkled while Theodosius I’s sons ruled:

In these days the most blessed of the confessors, Martin, bishop of Tours, having accomplished many renowned and splendid deeds and having freed himself from the bonds of the flesh, journeyed to the Lord. Martin, born to a noble family, was considered important under Constantius and fought in the army under Julian, before finally abandoning his soldier’s belt at the Gallic city of Worms and brought himself to the most devoted servitude to Christ. Sulpicius Severus made famous Martin’s life and miracles through his words. Frechulf had no obvious model to follow in this example, and indeed turned to Sulpicius Severus’s *vita* itself to draw out pertinent information. Something similar can also be seen in the short biography he composed for Boethius:

Boethius the patrician, who wondrously published in Latin two books about arithmetic and very elegantly wrote other little works, in the end was condemned to exile and killed in Milan, after (completing) the books *On the Consolation of Philosophy*, which he composed most skilfully in metre and prose.

---

70 Vessey, ‘Jerome and the Jeromanesque’.
A final author for whom Frechulf again had no available model was Gregory the Great, whose bio-bibliography concluded the third-last chapter of the *Histories* as a whole. For the biographical data, Frechulf relied on the material contained within chapter 66 of Bede’s *De temporum ratione* but then he added in a summary of Gregory’s literary legacy, something which Bede had not done:

Guided by divine inspiration, [Gregory] wrote his *Moralia in Job*, and set out most clearly his *Pastoral Rule*; moreover he transmitted to future readers his *Dialogues*, which were addressed to the venerable men of his own time for them to imitate. He created the very splendid work on Ezekiel, and his *Homilies* offer up for [our] enjoyment the healthiest spiritual food. His many extant letters are useful to readers, on account of the tasks for which they were written.\(^{80}\)

Frechulf’s descriptive language suggests direct knowledge of the Gregorian sources, something which, considering Gregory’s patristic status, may come as no great surprise.\(^{81}\) The fact that he included them is nevertheless significant, not only because it was in the Carolingian period that Gregory’s status was firmly established but also because it takes us back to the ending: the ‘obitus Gregorii eximii doctoris’, along with the deeds of the Boniface and the ascendency of the Franks and Lombards, was one of the stated moments that marked the *Histories*’ terminus.

Frechulf’s engagement with Jerome’s *De viris illustribus* was undoubtedly an important part of his project, though thus far it has escaped any detailed comment and the implications of the text’s reception have not been considered. Von den Brincken, for example, noted merely that ‘the development of Christian literature greatly occupied Frechulf’.\(^{82}\) More ought to be said. Through Frechulf’s preoccupation with Christian literature we perhaps can catch a glimpse, unexpected yet illustrative, of the largely unarticulated purposes and audiences that the *Histories* sought to satisfy. It can, moreover, help us to make sense of Frechulf’s ending. By adopting, adapting, and adding to the entries of Jerome, Frechulf studded the second volume of his *Histories* with short notes detailing

\(^{80}\) Frechulf, *Histories*, ed. by Allen, ii.5.24, p. 721: ‘Qui Moralia in Job gratia diuina inspirante conscrisit, librum etiam Pastoralem luculentissime edidit, Dialogorum uero ad imitandos uenerabiles uiros qui per haec tempora claruerunt libros dictans ad nostram porrexit legendos posteritatem. In Ezechiel opus praeclarum condidit, Omeliarum eius liber saluberrimas et spiritales gustantibus ministrat dapes, epistolae uero exstant eius plures pro negotiis quibus sunt compositae legentibus utiles.’

\(^{81}\) On Gregory’s medieval influence, see Mews and Renkin, ‘The Legacy of Gregory the Great’ and Leyser, ‘The Memory of Gregory the Great’.

the formation of a canon, biblical and patristic, stretching from the writers of
the Gospels through to Gregory the Great. This literary aspect was itself inte-
grated within a narrative that for the most part traced the intertwined threads
of imperial and ecclesiastical history until the fifth and final book, during the
course of which the threads began to unravel as new political and spiritual con-
stellations emerged.

Conclusion

Frechulf’s ending may represent what Matthew Innes has called the ‘shift from a
sub-Roman to a post-Roman mentality’, in which Frankish ‘intellectuals began
to sense a more radical discontinuity between their world and that of Rome’
and thus ‘began to write of barbarian invasions shaping their world, telescop-
ing what were actually longer and more complex processes of acculturation’.83
Yet we should be wary of amplifying the ‘political’ background noise so much
that the religious, educative experience of reading a work like the Histories is
drowned out. Frechulf’s ending reflects a work that was as much post-patristic
as it was post-Roman (insofar as the two can be separated). The prime focus
was the story of the Western Church as contained within the writings of its
authoritative historians: its struggle against a diabolic adversary, its growth
throughout the world, and the famous authors, whose writings shaped its iden-
tity. This identity was first forged in Late Antiquity but was then received and
consolidated throughout the early Middle Ages, and Frechulf’s Histories offer
a detailed snap-shot of one stage within this process. His adaptation of the
Christian literary canon, as contained within Jerome’s De viris illustribus, is
especially revealing: it parallels the general thrust of book v, in which the core
texts of Christian history were updated, modified, and augmented in line with
the geographical and also textual parameters of Carolingian Christianity. The
‘patristic period’ was extended from the age of Augustine to include that of
Gregory the Great, and encompassed the events and authors which ninth-cen-
tury intellectuals frequently turned to when seeking to understand the mean-
ing of scripture and Christian worship. Likewise, it was the forms of orthodox
Christianity espoused by the church fathers that Carolingian reformers peren-
nially advocated as a means to improve their own society.

The Histories’ conclusion was thus not abrupt, as was once thought. Frechulf’s Zeitbewußtsein, furthermore, was not remarkable for its sense of dis-
continuity with the Roman world or distinctive due to its sensitive and sophis-

83 Innes, ‘Teutons or Trojans’, p. 235.
ticated reception of Augustinian Geschichtstheologie; rather, it was profoundly Carolingian on account of its intimate connections and conscious adherence, both pronounced and practised, to the authoritative writings of the Christian past. There is a real danger in overinterpreting the ending because it can take us too far from the Histories’ most probable social function: a reference book to be consulted in ecclesiastical centres of learning, which embodied some of the core concerns of Carolingian education.84 Both at the stages of composition and consumption, Frechulf’s work ‘implies a library’.85

Frechulf, in short, aimed not at advanced theological meditation but basic instruction and guidance concerning the overall order and texture of Christian history. From a twenty-first-century viewpoint, this leaves Frechulf looking less extraordinary and exceptional than some modern commentators have argued. It was, however, the success with which he managed to digest a sizeable corpus of authoritative historiography into a single, straightforward narrative that gets us closer to appreciating why his Histories were copied and read in the ninth century and beyond.86

---

85 Williams, Monk and the Book, p. 134, who used this phrase in reference to Jerome.
86 On the manuscript transmission of the Histories, see Allen, Prolegomena, pp. 55–192.
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Uses of Carolingian History
Uses of Carolingian History
In the introduction to his late ninth-century history of the southern Italian Lombards, Erchempert draws a close connection between the writing of history and the affirmation of identity: 'It is the habit of a master of historiography (ystoriographi doctoris), especially when he is dealing with his own kin (stirps), to relate only what pertains to the peak of praise'. Remarkably, the objects of praise are neither the political unit nor its leader/s, but the gens Langobardorum, a point reinforced by the notion of kindred in the word stirps.

This is how Erchempert explains that his model, the History of the Lombards by Paul the Deacon, stopped well before the fall of the Lombard kingdom in 774: 'not in vain did he exclude the time when he spoke, because at that point the Kingdom of the Lombards was gone'.1 As we shall see, Erchempert regarded the Lombards of his own time as even more lamentable; he could relate 'not their rule but their undoing, not happiness but misery, not triumph but ruin'.2 Unlike Paul, though, he did tell their story throughout much of his lifetime.

---

1 'Non frustra exclusit aetas loquendi, quoniam in eis Langobardorum desiit regnum. Mos etenim ystoriographi doctoris est, maxime de sua stirpe disputantis, ea tantummodo retexere quae ad laudis cumulum pertinere noscuntur.' Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and W aitz, 1, p. 234. For Erchempert, see below.

2 ‘Non regimen eorum sed excidium, non felictatem sed miseriam, non triumphum sed per­niciem’, Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and W aitz, 1, p. 235.

W alter Pohl is Professor for Medieval History at the Department of History at the University of Vienna and Director of the Institute for Medieval Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences.
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In some ways, the development of historiography in ninth-century Italy ran parallel to that of the Carolingian realms north of the Alps. The time of Charlemagne was in fact one of the few periods in which medieval historiography reached a ‘peak of praise’ for king, kingdom, and people, extolling the deeds of the Franks and of their rulers. The continuations of Fredegar, the Frankish Annals, and the Annals of Metz, Einhard’s Vita Karoli, and other works are affirmative histories of the regime. It is remarkable how historiographic moods changed in the course of the century, as can be gleaned from the present volume. Already in 843, Nithard’s History strikes a note similar to Erchempert’s: Charlemagne, ‘deservedly called a great emperor by all peoples’, ‘left the whole of Europe filled with all goodness’. And he sums up towards the end of his history: ‘Then, there was abundance and joy everywhere, now everywhere misery and sadness. The elements themselves were then favourable to everything, now they are contrary to all and everywhere’. And he rounds off his devastating diagnosis with a quote from the Book of Wisdom, with a clear eschatological note: ‘And the universe will fight against the unreasonable’.

The most ambitious synthesis of Carolingian history, Regino’s early tenth-century Chronicle, presents a dire panorama of the more recent past. Frankish expansion and the reform efforts encouraged by the Carolingian regime had generated high expectations. Inner conflicts, military setbacks, and the failure of the moral mission to solicit God’s unfailing protection by building a Christian society sparked off a historiography of disillusion. Historians became increasingly critical of the rulers, but also of the sins and shortcomings of the people, and especially of the clerics. They had squandered divine favour. A sense of exposure to the folly of their contemporaries prevails in these histories. Such voices of distance from, dissent with, and critique of one’s political, ethnic, or religious peers presents a challenge for a study of textual constructions of identity. Positive affirmation is not the only form of identification. Ferocious critique of kings and regents is possible and common, but this is not in fact the norm. Further recent work has explored some of the intricacies of group identification in the negative mode, with the exception of the short History of Disillusion

3 McKitterick, History and Memory; McKitterick, ‘Political Ideology’; Reimitz, History, pp. 293–444.
4 See the introductory chapter by Helmut Reimitz, in this volume.
5 ‘Karolus bone memoriae et merito magnus imperator ab universis nationibus vocatus […] decedens omnem Europem omni bonitate repletam reliquit’. Nithard, Histoire, ed. and trans. by Lauer and Glansdorff, i.1, p. 4.
6 Nithard, Histoire, ed. and trans. by Lauer and Glansdorff, iv.7, p. 156.
7 Liber Sapientiae 5.20 (5.21 in the Vetus Latina): ‘Acuet autem duram iram in lanceam | Et pugnabit cum illo orbis terrarum contra insensatos’ (I have underlined what Nithard quoted). This is God punishing the unjust at the Last Judgement; the chapter culminates in verse 23: ‘Et ad eremum perducet omnem terram iniquitas | et malignitas evertet sedes potentium’.
8 McLean, History and Politics.
religious peers presents a challenge for a study of textual constructions of identity. One could argue that Frankish or Lombard identities did not matter for writers such as Nithard or Erchempert. But in fact, things are not so simple. Positive affirmation is not the only form of identification. Ferocious critique of or desperation about the actions of other representatives of one’s group may be a strong statement of identity: because one’s affiliation mattered, and there was no escaping it. Gildas’s sixth-century *De excidio Britonum* is a particularly forceful example, comparing the fate of the Britons with that of the Jews:

> For (I say to myself) when they strayed from the right track the Lord did not spare a people that was particularly his own among the nations, a royal stock, a holy race [...] What then will he do with this great black blot on our generation? 

Gildas uses the biblical language of the chosen people in reverse, to show how deep a gens could fall from God’s grace because of its sins. This chapter will explore some of the intricacies of group identification in the negative mode, looking at the example of Erchempert’s *History* of ninth-century southern Italy.

**Historiography in Italy after Paul the Deacon**

In Italy the rhythms of historiographic delusion were somehow different from the Carolingian core areas. They had not started with similarly great expectations, with the exception of the short *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani*, written in c. 810, which gives Lombard history including the Frankish takeover a providential meaning. The Lombards, it maintains, were descended from snakes, ‘a bloody and rough offspring, and without law’. They were providentially led to Italy, land of milk and honey, where they received baptism; ‘First they were ravenous wolves, then lambs grazing in the flock of the Lord’. Then, the text

---


10 The quote (‘peculiari ex omnibus nationibus populo’) is from 1 Peter 2.9; see Pohl and Heydemann, ‘The Rhetoric of Election’.

11 *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani*, ed. by Waitz, pp. 7–11. The two latest bits of information are about a war against the Beowinidi, the Bohemian Slavs, in 805, and the libera-

12 *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani*, ed. by Waitz, 1, p. 7.
follows the *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, covering most of Lombard history with a simple king list.\(^{13}\) It ends with a chapter extolling Charlemagne and his son Pippin, king of Italy: ‘Presently, through his help Italy shone, as it did in the most ancient days.’\(^{14}\) It may not be a coincidence that the text is only preserved in one manuscript written in Mainz in the late tenth or eleventh century and now in Gotha, a version of Eberhard of Friuli’s lawbook (while the Italian version now in Modena contains the *Origo gentis Langobardorum*).\(^ {15}\) This ninth chapter of the *Historia* is the only emphatically Carolingian piece of Italian historiography.

The relatively sparse historiographic production in ninth-century Italy unfolded under the long shadow of Paul the Deacon.\(^ {16}\) After a modest career at the ducal courts of Friuli and Benevento and at the royal court of Pavia, Paul wrote his *History of the Lombards* in the 780s or early 790s when he was a monk at Montecassino. He had tempered his initial opposition to the Frankish takeover of the Lombard kingdom during his stay in Francia, where he had become a distinguished member of the circle of reformers around the court of Charlemagne. His *History* covers the period from the mythical name-giving of the Lombards by Wodan to the death of King Liutprand in 744. As I have argued, Paul’s history offers a rather balanced account that acknowledges both the Lombards’ moments of glory and their shortcomings, and sets their history firmly in a world of other peoples and powers, each of whom had better or worse rulers in turn.\(^ {17}\) Erchempert noted that it leaves out Lombard history in most of his lifetime. Surely Paul could have reported first-hand information about the dramatic years that he had passed in Pavia and Benevento, but he remained silent. Modern scholars have mostly thought that death had taken the pen out of his hand, but Erchempert may be right that Paul simply preferred to remain silent. Yet contrary to Erchempert’s statement, Paul had not only heaped praise on the Lombards. The troubled process in which Paul came to terms with Lombard defeat can only be guessed at through a few hints in let-

---

\(^{13}\) *Origo gentis Langobardorum*, ed. by Waitz, pp. 1–6.

\(^{14}\) *Historia Langobardorum Codicis Gothani*, ed. by Waitz, 9, p. 11.


\(^{16}\) For Paul, see my chapter in volume 2 of this series: ‘Historical Writing in the Lombard Kingdom’.


ters and poems, and through a prophecy ascribed to a seventh-century hermit that the Lombard kingdom would last until unworthy clerics squandered the protection by St John the Baptist. 18

Paul's open-ended history and its wide horizon made it eminently usable for a number of different purposes. The work was a great success and still exists in well over a hundred medieval manuscripts. It soon became popular north of the Alps, where it provided essential information about the post-Roman history of an Italy now considered part of the Carolingian world. 19 In southern Italy, on the other hand, Paul was soon remembered as a Lombard patriot who had maintained his opposition to Frankish rule at Charlemagne's court, and was even involved in plots against Charles. 20 The tension between Paul's work, the way that he was perceived by later historians, and the historiographic strategies that these authors employed themselves raises an issue which can only partly be explored here: the problem of the relationship between earlier and later historical works. The impact of earlier histories on later ones is usually treated under two aspects: their use as sources, and their (formal, stylistic, or conceptual) influence. The term 'influence' is a bit vague for what is at stake here. How did the presence of earlier and later works of historiography shape the perceptions of the past, and the strategies of its appropriation, at any given moment? This problem can be studied well in the continuing influence of Paul's Lombard History in southern Italy, an issue that also goes beyond the time frame addressed here.

Paradoxically, not a single manuscript of the Historia Langobardorum has survived in southern Italy, where it was written. 21 The library of Montecassino contains what is regarded as the best text of Gregory of Tours's Histories, but it lacks Paul's. On the other hand, there are so many references to Paul and his history in later texts that the reason for the loss of the Historia Langobardorum can hardly be a lack of interest: rather, his work was so popular that it was used too much. Theft or uncontrolled borrowing of manuscripts from monastic libraries is a recurrent issue in later southern Italian texts, for instance, in the Cassinese chronicle by Leo Marsicanus, written around 1100. 22 In fact, the historiography of the Lombard south is altogether badly transmitted. Most of it has only survived in a single manuscript, the Vatican codex Vat. Lat. 5001 writ-

18 Paul the Deacon, Historia Langobardorum, ed. by Bethmann and Waitz, v.6, p. 147.
19 About the Frankish background and reception of the Historia Langobardorum, see McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks'.
20 Taviani-Carozzi, ‘Le souvenir et la légende’.
21 Chiesa, ‘Caratteristiche’; McKitterick, ‘Paul the Deacon and the Franks’.
22 Chronica monasterii Casinensis, ed. by Hoffmann; Pohl, Werkstätte, p. 169.
ten in c. 1300. It contains Erchempert’s Historiola written in c. 890, which will be discussed here, and a smaller ninth-century work, the so-called Continuatio Casinensis of Paul’s history. The most extensive text in this historiographic compendium is the Chronicon Salernitanum, finished in 974 and probably written by Radoald, the abbot of the monastery of St Benedict at Salerno. The manuscript also contains a great number of brief, in part historiographical texts from the ninth century: a list of kings and of Beneventan princes; poems and epitaphs; the treaty of separation of the principates of Benevento and Salerno in 849; the so-called ‘Frankish Table of Nations’; and a brief chronicle covering the years 891–97, which continued Erchempert’s text with a focus on a series of dramatic coups in Benevento. Most of these texts clearly come from a compilation produced at Montecassino in the years after 899; this collection was then used by the Chronicle of Salerno, and copied along with it.23

This Lombard history book does not contain Paul’s history, but reflects it in many ways. He is repeatedly mentioned, and clearly served as a stylistic model. We often find verbatim quotes in these histories that use his phrases to describe different events — the Chronicle of Salerno even recounts Paul’s death in his own words, which he had used for the death of King Liutprand.24 Paul’s poetry (and the way in which he inserted poems into his histories) was also a source of inspiration. But none of the southern Lombard histories followed his general pattern. Most ninth- and tenth-century works of historiography are much shorter and often not very structured; ‘scriptiuncula’, as Leo Marsicanus, author of the first systematic history of Montecassino in c. 1100, called them. I have described this phenomenon as ‘history in fragments’.25 Editions, especially the MGH Scriptores rerum Langobardiarum, tend to obscure the rather haphazard composition of the manuscript. Erchempert’s Historiola is more extensive, and the Chronicon Salernitanum is rather long. Unlike Paul, these two works seem to have been finished almost simultaneously with the events described in their last chapters. They are much more overtly critical of many of the historical actors they describe than Paul was. Whereas Paul had included substantial information about Byzantium and the Frankish kingdoms, and occasionally featured Visigoths, Avars, and Slavs, their perspective is almost exclusively regional.26 Paul served as a model in many ways, but not in the outline of his

---

23 Pohl, Werkstätte, pp. 67–76.
25 Pohl, ‘History in Fragments’.
26 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 11 and 19, pp. 239 and 241, supplies some brief information about the problems of Carolingian succession.
history. Erchempert and the *Chronicon Salernitanum* are, not least, histories of the immediate past, with all the partisanship, urgency, and vacillation that their agenda implied.

Remarkably, the histories of the Lombard south did not start with Lombard origins, nor with the conquest of Italy in 568, or with Italy before the conquest. Paul had placed Lombard history in Italy in the double matrix of his ‘Roman history’ written a quarter of a century before, and of Lombard origins and migration from Scandinavia. His *Lombard History* would have provided the material to equip the principate of Benevento with a streamlined narrative from the first duke Zotto to the princes of the ninth century, but no one used this potential. There is one partial exception, the so-called *Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis*, a dossier of historical excerpts mixed with reports of events of the 840s to the 860s preserved in a manuscript of the Rule of St Benedict including Hildemar of Corbie’s commentary. The dossier of the ‘Chronica S. Benedicti’ was probably compiled while Emperor Louis II stayed in southern Italy in 867–71. It contains several summaries or extended quotes from Paul, one about the Lombard invasion of 568, but mainly about St Benedict and the foundation of the monastery. Paul is only mentioned once as the author of a poem in honour of Benedict; repeatedly the reader is directed ‘elsewhere, at its place’ for a full text, ‘hec alibi requirantur suo in loco’. At the time, Paul’s history was clearly accessible at Montecassino. Most other histories did not bother to repeat what it said.

For the period before the mid-eighth century, one simply relied on Paul, and all later histories set in where Paul left off. We have no evidence whether any of these histories were ever actually placed in manuscripts after Paul’s text. The text that Waitz edited as ‘Continuatio Casinensis’ is in fact a Lombard king list supplemented by excerpts from the *Liber pontificalis* (to which the reader who wants to know more is explicitly referred: ‘legat episcopale Romanum’). The focus of these brief excerpts is on the two kings who were sent into monastic exile in Montecassino, Pippin III’s brother Carloman and the Lombard king

---

27 This manuscript of the rule from the 920s, still at Montecassino (Archivio dell’Abbazia, MS cod. 175), also contains Paul’s epitaph written by his pupil Hilderic. See Pohl, *Werkstätte*, pp. 77–107.


29 *Continuatio Casinensis*, ed. by Bethmann and Waitz, pp. 198–200. The text is transmitted separately in two compilations originally from Montecassino: the already mentioned Lombard History book in the BAV, MS Vat. lat. 5001, and in a manuscript of Lombard law preserved at the abbey of Cava (Bibl. della Badia, MS 4).
Montecassino cherished the memory of its royals in monastic confinement, and in the course of transmission even transformed Carloman into Carolomagnus, claiming that Charlemagne himself had ended his life as a monk in Montecassino. The only additions to the text of the *Liber pontificalis* are two passages repeatedly copied into important manuscripts at Montecassino: the foundation of a nunnery by Ratchis and his wife Tasia; and the claim that Carloman’s body had been sent from Gaul to Montecassino in a golden reliquary after his death.

All histories that covered the events between Liutprand’s death and the fall of the Lombard kingdom had to rely on the *Liber pontificalis*, which projected a highly negative image of the last Lombards rulers. There does not seem to have been an alternative narrative available. Even Andreas of Bergamo, a ninth-century northern Italian historian who is very sympathetic to the Lombard cause, had no other choice. The papal perspective therefore shaped all further views of the last thirty years of the Lombard kingdom, even up to present scholarship. But that would hardly have been Paul’s point of view. Where his narrative broke off, it was continued from an oblique angle, although the openness of his text made that feasible.

**Erchempert and his History**

Erchempert’s *Historiola* is the only relatively contemporary and comprehensive overview of the ninth-century history of southern Italy that we have. It ends with the armistice concluded after the Battle of Brescia between Berengar and Guy of Spoleto in 888, and with a promise to insert the events after the termination of the armistice in January 889 — ‘whether the two of them would join each other in a treaty or in war’. The author did not, and therefore his work must have been finished in late 888. The *Historiola* is only transmitted in one manuscript, the Vaticanus 5001, four hundred years after it was written. However, there are


32 *Continuatio Casinensis*, ed. by Bethmann and Waitz, 3–4, pp. 198–99.

33 Andreas of Bergamo, *Historia*, ed. by Waitz.

34 Pohl, ‘Das Papsttum’.

35 Chiesa, ‘Erchempertus Casinensis’.


37 BAV, MS Vat. lat. 5001, fols 106r–131r.
no signs that anybody had tampered with it. I have argued that we can recon-
struct at least three steps in which this compilation took shape. As stated on the
first folio, the Vatican manuscript was copied in c. 1300 from a ‘Liber quarun-
dam hystoriarum’ written in Lombard script (the Beneventana). Apart from
two additions in the last quires of the manuscript, all other texts contained in
the manuscript were at least three hundred years old when it was copied, so the
Lombard Liber historiarum had been preserved seemingly unchanged at Salerno
for three centuries. The latest text in this Liber historiarum was the initial list of
rulers of Italy from the first Lombard king Alboin to Emperor Otto III. It is
followed by the Chronicon Salernitanum, which was finished about twenty years
earlier, in 974, most likely, by Abbot Radoald of the monastery of St Benedict of
Salerno. The rest of the Liber hystoriarum contained a yet older compilation,
in which none of the many mostly short texts seems to have been written after
c. 900. Most of them were composed towards the end of the ninth century, and
have a clear Montecassino background. They must have been copied together
with or slightly after Erchempert’s work, which one of them briefly continues.
This Montecassino compilation seems to have been used by the author of the
Chronicon. Remarkably, two thirds of the Salerno Chronicle also deal with the
ninth century and suggest a Montecassino/Benevento perspective, so Radoald
must have had further sources at his disposal which he used, and which were
then not preserved in the manuscript. His narrative for the first half of the tenth
century is much patchier, and focuses on Salerno.

‘Ego Erchempert’ — the author names himself at the beginning of his nar-
native, and he is the only one to do so among the several historiographic texts
and fragments contained in the Salerno compilation. He does not explicitly

38 BAV, MS Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 1r: ‘In nomine domini et salvatoris [nostri Jesu Christi in]
cipit [li]ber quarundam ystoriarum dominorum et diversarum guerrarum regni ytalie prout
inventum fuit in quodam antiquo libro scripto litterarum longobardarum. Cuius libri principi-

39 BAV, MS Vat. Lat. 5001, fols 1r–2r. It ends with Otto III’s twelfth year (as the number for
Otto II demonstrates, the compiler of the list did not distinguish between regnal and imperial
years), which was in 995/96.

40 Pohl, Werkstätte, p. 57; Taviani-Carozzi, La principauté Lombarde, t, 81–91.


42 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 1, p. 234.
profess any ethnic affiliation, but it occasionally emerges from the text. In chapter 6, Grimoald III of Benevento withstands Frankish attacks, ‘God fighting it out for us, under whose rule we were fostered until then’. Erchempert also talks about ‘gens nostra’ when in the course of the civil war between Radelchis and Siconulf ‘across the sea captives of our people of various sex and age were confined’. When the Neapolitans in 885 besieged Capua in vain, only ‘de nostris unus’ was killed, and ‘ut fertur, a suis’, by his own people. After a victory against the Neapolitans, ‘us’ and ‘them’ is neatly juxtaposed. Apart from these Lombard identifications, Erchempert makes it clear that he belongs to Montecassino, ‘nostrum coenobium’; the deacon Dauferius is twice called ‘(diaconus) noster’.

There is no rubric or title in the manuscript, but Erchempert states the intention of his own work, to ‘compose a little history of the Lombards who live at Benevento more or less from the beginning’, ‘quasi ab ortum [...] ystoriolam condere Langobardorum Beneventum degentium’. This phrase strangely blurs the more than two hundred years that had passed between the actual beginning of the Beneventan Lombards and 774 when the narrative sets in. Neither did Erchempert continue Paul directly, but he solidly remained focused on the south, starting with dux Arichis II, who ruled in Benevento during the fall of the Lombard kingdom. However, Erchempert very explicitly links his history to Paul’s, and begins his prologue by praising him, a very skilled man, ‘vir valde peritus’. He describes the subject of Paul’s history as ‘the sequence of the Lombards, the emergence and place of the kingdom, that is, their origin’.

43 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 6, p. 236: ‘Deo decertante pro nobis, sub cuius regimine adhuc fovebamur’.
44 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 17, p. 241: ‘ultramarina loca captivis nostris gentis diversi sexus et actatis fulciebantur’.
45 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 57, p. 258.
46 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 74, p. 262.
47 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 69, p. 261.
48 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 71, p. 261; 80, p. 264.
49 ‘Praecipueque ab Adelgiso’: from chapter 20, the accession of Adelchis, the narrative becomes more detailed.

50 From this phrase, the MGH editors have derived their title, Historia Langobardorum Beneventanorum, straightening out the curiously indirect link in the text (‘Beneventum degentium’): Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, pp. 231–64.
51 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 1, p. 234: ‘Langobardorum seriem, egressum situmque regni, hoc est originem eorum’.
This is a slightly garbled definition with a focus on ethnic origins (still relevant for the Beneventans) and the political frame (which had passed). The set-up is clear: this was intended to be a Lombard history, while Beneventan identity remains vague: the phrasing for the ‘Lombards who live in Benevento’ is identical with that for the ‘Saraceni Benevento degentes’, the mercenaries hired by the prince during the civil war of the 840s.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 18, p. 241.}

The rest of the prologue offers a long and bitter series of juxtapositions between the glory days of the Lombard kingdom and what Erchempert could tell about the Lombards of his own time, already quoted at the beginning of this article: ‘Not their rule but their undoing’. ‘About them nothing dignified or laudable can be found these days that would be worth to be written down by a truthful pen’.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 1, p. 35: ‘de quibus quia his diebus nil dignum ac laudabile repperitur quod veraci valeat stilo exarari’.} Paul would not have regarded his subtly balanced narrative as a story of triumphs and happiness, but from the perspective of a monk living in the deeply divided Lombard south at the end of the ninth century it might seem that way.

Erchempert repeatedly recounts his own misadventures. In August 881, he was captured by a troop of Neapolitans supported by Pandenulf of Capua, and stripped of all his belongings ‘acquired since childhood’, and of his horse, and had to continue to Capua on foot.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 44, p. 254.} In 884, together with other monks obviously transporting waggons of food and precious objects from Montecassino to Capua which was safer from Saracen raids, they were robbed by Greeks, and he was once again left without his horse.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 61, p. 259.} A few years later, Count Atenulf of Capua confiscated the possessions of the monastery in Capua to give them to his exiled brothers. Erchempert was sent by his abbot to Pope Stephen V and returned with a privilege confirming the monastery’s possessions and with a letter admonishing Atenulf. Indeed, the count returned the property of the monastery, but not Erchempert’s own, and even kept the cellula given to him by his abbot.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 69, p. 261.} The author’s most traumatic experience is hidden in one laconic sentence that recounts how the monasteries of Montecassino, San Vincenzo al Volturno, and many others were burnt down by Saracen raiders.\footnote{Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Wäitz, 44, p. 254: ‘a quibus [i.e. Saracenis] etiam sanctissimi Benedicti coenobia decentissima, toto orbe veneranda, et sancti Vincentii martiris...’}
Obviously, Erchempert was a prominent figure at Montecassino, entrusted with delicate political missions. This fits well with his identification with an ‘Erchempertus notarius’ who testifies to a donation to Montecassino at Benevento in 884. It also warrants his qualification as grammarian by Leo Marsicanus, although the manuscript of his *Chronica monasterii Casinensis* shows some insecurity about Erchempert’s status: he first defined him as ‘domnus Erchempertus quidam grammaticus’, then replaced ‘quidam’ with ‘monachus et’, and then blotted out both terms. Peter the Deacon’s information that Erchempert had entered the monastery as a child oblate from a noble family is obscured by chronological problems; but the repeated reference to his property in the *Historiola* indicates an aristocratic background. It has also raised some doubts about whether he was actually a monk.

Unlike Paul, Erchempert wrote down the dreary history of his day in a depressing succession of conflicts, raids, and political turmoil. That he wrote the later sections close to the events is demonstrated by some radical changes in his political outlook. Atenulf, who had confiscated his property, comes to embody the hope of more peaceful times at the end of the *Historiola*. It is obvious how much Erchempert, to write his history, had to depart from Paul’s principle put forward in the prologue: only write in praise of your own people. What starts out as a history of the Lombards soon turns into a history of fragmentation, in which identities disintegrate and become ambivalent.

**Lombards and Others**

Erchempert sets out with an unmistakably ethnic identification of the subject of his *Historiola*, and aligns it with the ethnic focus in Paul’s history. He makes no effort to differentiate between the Lombards in the north who had become Frankish subjects more than 120 years ago, and the independent Lombards monasterium igne exusta sunt’. The destructions at San Vincenzo are well attested by the major excavations conducted there in the 1990s and 2000s: Hodges, *Light in the Dark Ages*; Marazzi, *San Vincenzo al Volturno*.

---

59 *Chronicon monasterii Casinensis*, ed. by Hoffmann, 1.9, p. 37. See also Meyvaert, ‘Erchempert’.
60 Petrus Diaconus, *De viris illustribus Casinensis*, ed. by Sperduti, p. 75.
62 See also Gruber, ‘The Construction of Allegiance’.
in the southern principates. Had he really begun his history ‘ab ortum’, from the beginning of the Beneventan Lombards, he could have used the political identity of the duchy and later principate of Benevento, which had more or less maintained its independence for more than three hundred years, to frame his history. Yet the principate crumbles in the course of his narrative, and dissolves into Benevento, Salerno, and Capua, each of which are haunted by frequent internal strife. Thus, the Lombards have become incapable of joint action. In early medieval historiography, ethnonyms are a narrative device for representing collective agency; in Erchempert’s history, they can hardly play that role after the initial section.63

The Lombards occur as historical subjects or actors five times in the first four chapters: they are identified as subjects both of Paul’s and of Erchempert’s histories, suffer the end of their kingdom, and daily oppress the Neapolitans. In chapter 4, Charlemagne releases his hostage Grimoald (III) after his father’s death under the condition that he should make his Lombards shave off their beards.64 The long beards of the Lombards are a symbolic marker of their identity, highlighted in the origin legend in the Origo gentis Langobardorum and in Paul’s History. It is no coincidence that their name recedes into the background from then on. The name occurs twice in the context of the fatal civil war between Radelchis and Siconulf in the 840s, which led to the division of the principate between Benevento and Salerno: there was never, Erchempert claims when the struggle begins, such dissent in Benevento since the Lombards had entered the city.65 This is another symbolic caesura. And ultimately, in one of the few passages of the Historiola in which Erchempert accentuates the rare establishment of peace and consensus with a more high-blown rhetoric, Emperor Louis II comes to Benevento, has the Saracen mercenaries killed, and ‘in the presence of all Lombards’ equally divides the province between the two contenders, taking solemn oaths from both parties.66 An emperor of the Romans (of Frankish origin, which Erchempert does not highlight) orchestrates a last manifestation of Lombard consensus, in which the division of the

63 See Pohl, ‘Historiography and Identity’.
64 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 4, p. 236: ‘ut Langobardorum mentum tonderi faceret’.
65 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 14, p. 240.
66 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 19, p. 242: ‘celeriter veniens, universos prophanae gentis hostes ab urbe vi distrahi ac framea necari fecit; et praesentibus omnibus Langobardis, inter duos praedictos viros totam provinciam Beneventanam acquiratis discrimine sub iureiurando dispertivit’. Martin, ‘Divisio principatus Beneventani’.
principate is sealed.\textsuperscript{67} Then, both concord and the name disappears from the narrative for a long time.

There are two more occurrences of the ethnonym ‘Lombards’ in the text, both in ambiguous context. The first is in a bitter conflict between the sons and grandsons of Lando I of Capua over the succession to the episcopal see of Capua in 879/80, in which Abbot Bertarius had travelled to Rome to implore the pope not to choose Landenulf, Count Pandenulf’s brother, warning him that he would ‘light such a fire’ that it would reach the pope himself.\textsuperscript{68} Indeed, Pope John VIII came to Capua to settle the issue, but his decision in favour of Landenulf indeed made things worse. The agitated factions were variously supported by Neapolitans, Saracens, and Greeks, while the princes of Salerno and Benevento both contested the pope’s choice. When the pope came again, both parties pressurized him, and ‘all Lombards approached him in a hostile manner’.\textsuperscript{69} ‘The abbot’s position was indeed supported by both principates at this point, and Erchempert clearly wants to stress this broad backing for Bertarius: yet these ‘Lombards’ were on the losing side. When Louis II had sanctioned the division of Benevento, at least there had been unity in disunity. Now, another supreme authority from abroad did not even succeed in establishing a compromise, and was the target of attacks from ‘all Lombards’ united in one of the factions in the strife.

The last time the ‘Lombards’ feature explicitly in the Historiola is in a similarly controversial situation, and again the notorious disunity of the numerous offspring of Lando of Capua provides the context. Athanasius II, bishop of Naples, sought to exploit the strife to get Capua under his control, and tried to persuade Atenulf to capture all his rivals with Neapolitan support, and become sole ruler of the city. ‘Among all the Lombard people, I chose Capua as most fitting for me […], and from Capua, your kin (\textit{gens}), and among all your brothers I preferred only you,’ he flatters him.\textsuperscript{70} Even more clearly than in the previous passage, ‘omnis gens Langobardorum’, as fatally divided as the \textit{gens} of Lando’s offspring, here becomes an emblem of discord and trickery, and an object of foreign intervention.

\textsuperscript{67} Gantner, ‘Between a Rock and a Hard Place?’.
\textsuperscript{68} Cilento, ‘La cronaca della dinastia capuana’.
\textsuperscript{69} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 47, p. 25. For the context, see Pohl, \textit{Werkstätte}, p. 158; Cilento, ‘La cronaca della dinastia capuana’.
There is, however, an almost providential passage towards the end of the *Historiola* in which the Lombards reappear as *cohors Bardica*. Atenulf, supported by the prince of Benevento, Aio, defeats a strong army of Greeks, Neapolitans, and ‘Ismaelites’, and ‘from that day, Atenulf began to be powerful, and Athanasius impotent’.

The following chapter culminates in an apotheosis. It starts with a quote from the Gospel of Matthew, ‘Who has ears, let them hear’. It continues with Core, Dathan, and Abiram, rebels against Moses who were annihilated. It describes the fall of Guaiferius, ‘praefectus harenarum’, who had his refuge in the amphitheatre of ancient Capua, and ‘who committed almost all the bad deeds that were done in his days’.

When that was done, all those who had once been arrogantly exiled from their homes returned obediently. Great joy, peace, and security were effected; those who used to be on the bottom began to be on top; and those who had governed lawfully for 300 years and more began to dominate those who had been victorious with the help of the Saracens for some years. Now the Bardic cohort (*cohors Bardica*) began to reign triumphantly over those whom they had always subdued with their arms.

Finally, the Lombards had regained their agency — against external enemies, not in internal strife.

_Bardi or gens Bardorum_ is a poetic term that Paul could find in late antique grammars which he edited, where the Celtic bards were ethnicized, and which he used for the Lombards in his poetry. In ninth-century Benevento, it became an emblem of noble birth, for instance in some of the poems preserved in the Vatican codex lat. 5001. In Erchempert’s passage, this poetic

---

72 Matthew 13.43, here rendered as: ‘Qui habet aures audiendi, audiat’.
74 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 74, p. 262: ‘Hoc facto, universi qui a propria sede olim fuerant superbe exulati, ad sua obedienter reversi sunt, factumque gaudium magnum, pax et securitas; coeperuntque praesesse qui subesse soliti erant, et qui per trecentos et eo amplius annos imperaverant legibus, praesesse coeperunt his qui cum Saracenis vicerant per aliquod soles. Tunc coepit cohors Bardica triumphans regnare super eos, quos semper arnis subegerant’.
76 E.g. Rofrit’s epitaph, BAV, MS Vat. lat. 5001, fol. 104*: ‘Bardorum fulsit magno de germine Rofrit’; and fol. 147*, a poem for Landulf: ‘Ortus fuit ex Bardorum stemate claris[si]ma’. 
sublimation blends with an image of military unity and discipline, and with a sense of confidence in divine retribution, which is based on biblical precedent. This is reinforced in the next chapter, which relates how the ‘Ismaelite’ allies of Naples turned against the Neapolitans, and accentuates the significance of this event by a further array of biblical quotes. Erchempert explicitly quotes the Apocalypse of John about Babylon: ‘Give back to her as she has given; pay her back double for what she has done. Pour her a double portion from her own cup.’

He adds quotes from the Psalms and from Isaiah. ‘How the Neapolitans are devastated, who always devastated, so now maybe we will devour, who have always been devoured’. Happy are those, Erchempert adds, who live far from the turmoil of the saeculum, protected by God, and will be recompensed in the eternal life: ‘Amen’. This could have been the end of the Historiola, on a positive note after so many unsettling events. It would also fit with what probably is its dedicatory poem, which is, however, preserved separately in the codex. Yet history continued, and so did the historian. He pursued his history until 888, and ended it announcing a further addition.

The Lombards, therefore, provide only a loose frame for Erchempert’s Historiola. Compared with 217 occurrences of the ethnonym in Paul the Deacon’s history, Lombard agency is very limited in Erchempert’s text. Of course, Lombard political unity was lost in chapter 14 of 82, and never regained. He clearly did not attempt to replace it by any consistent notion of shared identity of the divided polities, apart from the lofty vision of the Bardi in chapters 74 and 75. Few of the other collective actors in his Historiola, though, reach more narrative coherence. Most ethnonyms are used inconsist-

---

77 Revelations 18.6; Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 75, p. 262: ‘prout Iohannes dicit in Apocalipsis, immo et Dominus per Iohannem, de Babilone: Quantumcumque ministravit vobis, ministrate illi; in poculo quo miscuit, miscite illi duplum’.

78 Psalms 49.15–21; Isaiah 33.1; Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 75, p. 263: ‘Hae autem audientes, nolite cor apponere, quod Deus hoc meritis alicuius praedati fecerit, set sua misericordia et miseriis hominum egerit nactus, ut ipse per psalmistam dicit: Invoca me in die tribulationis tuae, eripiam te et magnificabis me. Nam peccatorii dicit: Quare tu enarras iustitias meas etc. quousque ait: Haece fecisti et tacui, existimasti iniquitatem; in quo ergo ero tibi similis? In una tamen re moveor, quod cum dicat apostolus: Nonne qui praedat et ipse praedavertit?’


80 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 82, p. 264: ‘Cum autem uterque se iunxerit ad pactum vel ad bellandum [that is, Berengar and Guido of Spoleto], quod deinceps egerint, presenti opusculo inseram’.
ently. That may be due to a rhetorical principle of variation, but reinforces the general picture of shifting and precarious identities. Franks feature repeatedly in the narrative as *Franci*, but they are first introduced as Gauls: Charlemagne arrives with ‘Gallico exercitu’,81 Grimoald IV concludes peace ‘cum Gallis’,82 and Louis the Pious ‘in Gallia augustali preratur imperio’.83 Later the ‘regnum Gallicum’ is divided:84 after the death of Lothar, the five units are specified as Baioaria, Aquitania (instead of Eastern and Western Francia), Italia, Aquis, and Provincia.85 Southern Italians perceived the part that was to be Lotharingia as a city-based territory, like Naples or Benevento. Obviously, Gaul is not clearly circumscribed in the *Historiola*; here, even Italy is part of the ‘regnum Gallicum’, the *Galli* can be the Franks in Italy; but travelling into Gaul may actually mean leaving Italy, for instance, when Guido (III) of Spoleto went to Langres in 888 to be crowned king of the Western Franks after the death of Charles III.86

The Greeks also enter the narrative in a classical guise. The Byzantine emperor is presented as ‘augustus Achivorum’,87 and they speak the ‘lingua Pelasgica’.88 Occasionally they are also called Grai.89 They are never regarded as Romans or Hellenes; the majority of references are to ‘Greci’.90 Byzantine officials can be *imperialis* or *augustalis*,91 Constantinople is the *regia urbs*, the royal
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81 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 2, p. 235; see also 29; p. 245.
83 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 11, p. 239.
87 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 5, p. 236. See also 81, p. 264.
90 Berto, ‘The Image of the Byzantines’. For the eighth- and ninth-century Greeks in Italy in
91 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249 (‘baiolus imperialis
92 Berto, ‘The Image of the Byzantines’. For the eighth- and ninth-century Greeks in Italy in
93 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249 (‘baiolus imperialis
94 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249 (‘baiolus imperialis
95 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249 (‘baiolus imperialis
96 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249 (‘baiolus imperialis

city, which corresponded to contemporary usage in Greek (*basileousa polis*) and Latin.92 Erchempert clearly despised the Greeks: ‘The Achivi, although they have similar habits, are equal to animals in spirit, Christians by name, but in their customs more deplorable than the Agareni’.93

The most complicated foes are the ‘Saracens’.94 The variety of names for them is, on the one hand, due to their diverse origin: they came from North Africa, Sicily, or Spain, could be Arabs, Berbers, or Spanish Muslims. Erchempert (as other south Italian authors) rarely defines them by their religion or even mentions it, although what most of them had in common probably was their Islamic religion. He calls them pagans once and ‘prophana gens’ at another point.95 Neither does he ever call them Arabs. As other Christian authors, he mostly uses biblical names for them: *Saraceni, Agareni, Ismaeliti*. Often, no clear distinction emerges between them, although sometimes he differentiates. Sicily is conquered by the ‘gens Agarenorum a Babilonia et Africa’.96 This name may remind readers of the biblical Babylon, but it probably refers to al-Fustat, in modern Cairo, previously called Babylon by the Byzantines.97 When in the civil war Radelchis puts his Agareni (who seem to have been based in Bari) into the field, Siconulf mobilizes ‘Libicos Hismaelites Hispanos’.98 Athanasius of Naples attacks Capua with an army of Greeks from Matera, Egyptians, and Neapolitans.99 Repeatedly, the generic terms are defined by the respective place of settlement in Italy: ‘Saraceni Benevento degentes’ (who have their own king,
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96 Erchempert, *Historiola*, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 11, p. 239.

97 I owe this observation to Clemens Gantner.


Massari), ‘Agareni Barim incolentes’,100 ‘Saraceni tam de Gariliano quam de Agropoli’, or similar.101 This often sounds strikingly precise.

By the time when the Historiola was written, they had become a familiar part of the landscape, and all south Italian powers employed them as mercenaries or allies. Although some of their leaders acquired considerable power (for instance, ‘rex’/Emir Sawdan of Bari), they operated separately and rarely coalesced, thus reflecting the divided political landscape of southern Italy. This lack of unity among the southern Italian Muslim mercenaries resembles that of the contemporary units of Turkish mercenaries, ghilmān, in the crumbling Abbasid Caliphate, who exploited a shifting balance of power but did not impose their own rule.102 Erchempert certainly deplored Saracen presence in the country, and was traumatized by their sack of Montecassino. He criticized Louis II for having spared Sawdan and other Saracen leaders after having captured Bari, and likens this act to King Saul’s not killing all the Amalekites, which the prophet Samuel had severely condemned.103 It is a rare Christian reference to the recurrent Old Testament demand that defeated enemies of Israel should all be killed. Yet, Erchempert seemed to loathe Neapolitans and Greeks who employed Saracens as much as the Saracens themselves.

**Did Ethnicity Matter in Erchempert’s Southern Italy?**

On the basis of the evidence presented here, one could argue that ethnicity was an important form of social distinction in ninth-century southern Italy.104 Erchempert’s text is full of ethnonyms. The composition of raiding armies is often described in ethnic terms: these soldiers were distinguishable, and it made sense to distinguish them along ethnic lines. The text can be surprisingly precise, sometimes even about numbers. It rarely recurs to generic terms such as barbari, pagani, or milites. The ethnic definition also embedded the narrative in stereotypes, and delineated expected behaviour. Only Saracens would
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101 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 51, p. 256.


103 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 37, pp. 248–49 (‘non iuxta voluntatem Domini eum protinus, ut dignum erat, crudeliter interfici’); 1 Samuel 15 (the transmitted text has ‘quidam propheta Samaria’).

104 For a balanced argument, Granier, ‘Local or Regional Identity’. See also Palmieri, ‘Le componenti etniche’.
sometimes resort to burning down churches and monasteries, Neapolitans and Greeks could be sly and treacherous, and the *Francorum gens* was particularly greedy for money.\(^{105}\) The urban culture of southern Italy was pervaded by different *gentes*, and that was one element of its instability.

On the other hand, it would also be possible to maintain that in fact ethnicity did not matter much in Erchempert’s world. The ethnic terminology that he uses is full of outside designations (Greeks, Saracens), biblical (Agareni, Ismaelites) and classical (Galli, Achivi) labels, names based on territories (Aegypti, Hispani), or names of Roman provinces (Tusci, Marsi). Ethnic groups rarely act as such, they are usually led by one of the contenders for power within or outside the Lombard area. Politically, regional players mattered much more, almost invariably defined by cities: Benevento and Salerno, Spoleto and Rome, Amalfi and Gaeta. For the shifting alliances in this deeply divided political landscape, ethnic affiliations hardly mattered.

There are points that could be raised against both of these arguments. Political unity and agency of the Lombards had been lost half a century before Erchempert wrote, but as chapters 74 and 75 demonstrate, he wished that it could be re-established; indeed, that seemed his only hope at that point, when even the distant emperor could not intervene anymore, and his throne was increasingly contested (as Erchempert’s last chapter about the bloody conflict between Guido of Spoleto and Berengar underlines).\(^{106}\) When the *Historiola* was written, political fragmentation between Benevento, Salerno, Capua, Naples, and further power centres, between Greeks, Saracens, Franks, and Lombards was at its peak. However bad some of these Lombard leaders might be, to Erchempert, Saracens, Greeks, or Neapolitans were even worse. Lombard unity was the only possible remedy, and if that had been attained in the past, it might also be possible in the future — Aio and Atenulf raised some such expectations. As often, ethnic affiliations were clear enough — the Capuans were Lombards and the Neapolitans were not — and did not have to be mentioned.

Furthermore, names that do not correspond to a group’s self-designation or are taken from an ancient stock of names may still function very well as ethnonyms. The Hellenes (or, for a time, *Rhomaioi*) have been called Greeks in the West for more than two thousand years, but that had little impact on their identification as a people. In the cognitive system of distinctions between peoples

---


that I would call ‘ethnicity’, territorial, political, or other groups could be accommodated. It was an essential tool for orientation and for the reduction of complexity, and was used as such in many early medieval histories. Ethnonyms could either denote the politically independent agency of large and dominant named groupings — for instance, the Lombards in Paul the Deacon’s History. Or they made it possible to distinguish recognizable minorities within hybrid political or military units, as the many Saracen groups in Erchempert’s Historiola. They could also circumscribe larger units which were incapable of joint action, but inspired some sense of commonality. This is the case of the Lombards in Erchempert, whom he projects as a notional unit, and criticizes for their lack of unity.

From my point of view, debating whether ethnicity mattered or not in ninth-century Italy is rather unproductive. The evidence that we have (in Erchempert, for instance) can be used for much more differentiated questions. What exactly were the social and cognitive uses of ethnicity and ethnic identities? How did they blend with religious, territorial, or military forms of identification? To what extent did they legitimize political power, and motivate political action? Erchempert is a good example to study such questions.

As already remarked, the main political actors in southern Italy were city states: Benevento, Salerno, Naples, Capua, Amalfi, Gaeta, and at times also Bari and Taranto. Regardless of their — rather different — territorial extension, they were the key bases of power. This urban political structure was, on the one hand, based on the ancient cityscape of the region, which had a venerable tradition going back to the Greek colonies founded more than 1500 years before. In a sense, it continued the ancient system of the civitas, a city in firm control of its rural district: the terra Beneventana, Beneventana provicia, or Beneventi tellus, as Erchempert often calls it. In the sixth century, the Lombards had inserted themselves into this civic topography, and had installed powerful dukes in many of the ancient cities that they had conquered; Spoleto and Benevento were the most autonomous among them. In the mid-eighth century, the Lombard king Ratchis forbade his subjects to send messengers to any foreign powers without the king’s approval. The text of the law mentions ‘Roma, Ravenna, Spoleti, Benevento, Francia, Baioaria, Alamannia, Ritias aut in Avaria.’ Remarkably, all foreign powers in Italy were defined as cities, even the exarchate; and all others as ethno-territorial units, with the exception of Raetia which was in the middle, and was known by its ancient provincial name.
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108 Ratchis, ed. by Azzara and Gasparri, 9, p. 240; Pohl, ‘Frontiers in Lombard Italy.’
In ninth-century Europe, the southern Italian system of city-based political agency and legitimacy was quite an anomaly. Similar urban powers existed in the northern Adriatic region — Cividale/Friuli, Venice, Comacchio, Ravenna, and some Dalmatian towns. Of course, Rome had preserved its urban self-governance, overlaid by the wide-ranging authority of its bishop. The northern Italian communes only reasserted themselves as major political players in the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{109} Barcelona gradually emerged as a proud and precarious regional power on the frontier between the Frankish realm and al-Andalus. Otherwise, the regional powers that originated from the gradual dissolution of the Carolingian Empire were territorial units, mostly duchies, that could be defined by ethno-\-noms (Bavaria, Saxony, Burgundy), ancient provincial names (Aquitaine, Tuscia, Raetia) or ad-hoc designations (emerging Lotharingia, the \textit{regnum Lotharii} — which Erchempert quite characteristically styled as a city state, Aachen).\textsuperscript{110}

In most cases, Erchempert expresses collective political agency of the urban powers by a collective name derived from the city: Beneventani, Spoletini or Spoletenses, Neapolites, Capuani, Teanenses, Amalfitani (or Malfitani). \textit{Urbs} and \textit{populus} still represent notions of classical civic identity.\textsuperscript{111} To an extent, such group names could be ethnicized as \textit{gens Beneventanorum}, or more loosely designated as a multitude of Beneventan \textit{populi}.\textsuperscript{112} Only these peoples could act in the collective, the cities/principates could not; the closest we get to any form of Beneventan agency is Landulf of Capua’s warning to his sons never to allow Benevento to be at peace with Salerno.\textsuperscript{113} In this form, the political and urban identities of the political actors could be blended with an ethnic system of denominations, and these groups could be treated as basically analogous on the political scene: Neapolitans could be juxtaposed to Lombards\textsuperscript{114} and Beneventans;\textsuperscript{115} they could unite with the count of Capua, Gaetans, and

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. Wickham, \textit{Sleepwalking into a New World}.
\textsuperscript{110} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 19, p. 241.
\textsuperscript{111} See, for instance, Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 54, p. 257: ‘(Greci) custodirent urbem et populum eius (i.e. of Prince Guaimarius)’.
\textsuperscript{112} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 12, p. 238; 27, p. 244: ‘a Beneventanorum populis Neapolites fortiter caesos legimus’.
\textsuperscript{113} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 22, p. 243: ‘Horum denique genitor cum iam diei ultimae appropinquaret, ut a referentibus audivi, vocatis liberis suis, hoc in edictum illis tradidit, ne umquam, quantum ad se pertineret, sinerent Beneventum cum Salerno pacisci’.
\textsuperscript{114} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 2, p. 235.
\textsuperscript{115} Erchempert, \textit{Historiola}, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 27, p. 244.
Saracens;\textsuperscript{116} Guaiferius (the lord of the amphitheatre of Capua) could collect Greeks from Matera, Neapolitans, and Egyptians to attack Capua;\textsuperscript{117} and later, a mixed army of Greeks, Neapolitans, and Ismaelites could march on Capua again.\textsuperscript{118} Especially in the later parts of the Historiola, with the gradual political ascent of Byzantium, the combination of Greeks and Neapolitans in hostile armies is a recurrent theme, although the Neapolitans are never subsumed under the Byzantine ‘Greeks’.\textsuperscript{119}

As the examples show, identifications of urban and ethnic groups most frequently occur in military contexts. This may seem surprising in a history written from a monastic background, but it does reflect the focus of Erchempert’s narrative. Montecassino and its extensive landed property, later called the terra Sancti Benedicti, were directly concerned by the constant shifts in the volatile political scene and by the mostly military character of political conflict.\textsuperscript{120} These multi-ethnic armies fed directly on the land and its remaining riches, and Montecassino was in no position to organize its own military defence. It was crucial to keep precise records about past and current actors in the continuous power struggles that regularly involved plundering the rich, but already depleted resources of the country. Particularly delicate from the point of view of Montecassino was what happened to Liguria (Terra di Lavoro), the fertile region around Capua, constantly contested between Naples, Capua, Saracens, and even the factions in the family of the counts of Capua. This is what Erchempert’s history reflects.\textsuperscript{121}

Apart from the monastic context which is surprisingly restrained in the Historiola, ecclesiastic affairs receive little attention.\textsuperscript{122} Even the bishops of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 44, p. 254: ‘Pandonulfus […] cum Neapolitibus, Caietanis ac Saracenis unitus’.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 57, p. 258: ‘collectis Graccis Materensibus, Aegipciis et Neapolitibus’.
\item \textsuperscript{118} Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 73, p. 262: ‘Collecto Athanasius multitudine exercitu mixto Graecorum, Neapolitensium et Hismaelitarum, equitantium et pedestrium, misitque illos adversus Capuam pugnaturas’.
\item \textsuperscript{119} Granier, ‘Napolitains et Lombards’.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Fabiani, La terra di S. Benedetto, I, II, and III; Bloch, Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages, I, II, and III.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Cf. Cilento, ‘Capua e Montecassino’.
\item \textsuperscript{122} There are ten occurrences of monasterium, eight of coenobium, and six of monachus in the text, more than half of them in the context of attacks or repressive measures against Montecassino.
\end{itemize}
Capua and the pope are mainly presented as secular lords. Bishop Landulf of Capua is portrayed as a ruthless and boundlessly ambitious power broker and a persecutor of monks. Reputedly, he had said that whenever he saw a monk he knew that he was going to have a bad day. Erchempert thus paid little attention to religious legitimation of power or to religious identities. At most, he complained that the Christian population, the christicoli or christicolum genus, had suffered from armed conflict again. There is, however, a strong notion that much contemporary politics clashed with divine law and justice, and a succinct hope for divine retribution already in this world. Sometimes, he notes with some satisfaction that God had punished another evil lord. Otherwise, Erchempert the man of God only makes brief but intense appearances in chapters 34 and 74–75, in his biblical sublimation of rays of hope in a dreary political landscape.

As many historical accounts of the period, Erchempert strongly personalized political action. The main actors were city-based warlords and office-holders who mostly came from powerful families, although their dynastic background or social status is rarely specified. Seldom is joint action by the political elite mentioned, for instance, after the death of Arichis II, when the ‘Beneventan magnates’ sent an embassy to Charlemagne to ask for the return of the prince’s son. Otherwise, high-status groups, for instance, the ‘Beneventanae gentis proceres’ or the ‘primores’, are mostly mentioned as suffering from political persecution. Dynastic succession did matter; in the bloody struggles for power in Capua, only the descendants of Landulf could hope for the comital office. Erchempert takes that for granted without accounting for it. When

123 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 31, p. 246: ‘Landolfus, ut pollicitus inseram, ex natura prudens, set ex consuetudine callidus, lubricus nimium et petulans, ambitio -

124 Nobiles: Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 13, pp. 239 and 45, p. 254 (as opposed to mediocres and vulgus). The noble descent of the political actors is never highlighted (unlike in the poems contained in BAV, MS Var. lat. 5001); there is no generic mention of potentes as a group.

125 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 4, p. 236: ‘consilio habito Beneventanorum magnates legatos ad Karum destinarunt’.


127 The only mention of a man ‘regia de stirpe generi sui procreatum’ is an Agarenus from Africa, probably an Aghlabid prince: Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 51, p. 256.
Prince Sicard of Benevento died, and his treasurer Radelchis was elevated contrary to the principle of dynastic succession, Erchempert underlines that he was elected consensually by the whole province of Benevento.¹²⁸ This was the beginning of the devastating civil war; Erchempert clearly sides with Radelchis against Sicard’s son, Siconulf, although he does not deny that Radelchis was the usurper, and even acknowledges that he was the first to call in Saracen mercenaries, who swiftly captured Bari.¹²⁹

The political actors are often mentioned with their office or rank. There are over forty mentions of princeps and principatus; only rarely are they related to the respective city, which means that the author assumes that his readers knew who had been princes of Benevento or of Salerno.¹³⁰ Lower ranks, such as comes or gastaldus, are more frequently attributed to a town or region.¹³¹ As in the Frankish realms, comitatus could also be applied to the region of office.¹³² In southern Italy, the title king, rex, is only used for the leaders of the Saracens: Calfon/Khafūn and Saugdan/Sawdan of Bari, Massar of the ‘Saraceni in Benevento degentes’, Utmagnus/Uthman who came from Africa and became king by capturing Taranto.¹³³ In one case, the text stresses that a prince ‘from a royal family’ in Africa arrived in Italy and rallied the Saracens of Garigliano and Agropoli to attack the Greeks in Calabria.¹³⁴ The end of the regnum

About Aghlabid influence in southern Italy, see Di Branco and Wolf, eds, ‘Guerra santa e conquiste islamiche. About the limited significance of royal/princely genealogies and dynasties on the early medieval European continent, Pohl, ‘Genealogy’.

¹²⁸ Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 14, p. 240.
¹²⁹ Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 15, p. 240.
¹³⁰ There are four specifications of ‘princeps Beneventi’ or ‘Beneventanus’: Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 3, p. 236; 28 and 29, p. 245; 54, p. 257; and one of the ‘principatus Salernitanus’; 20, p. 242.
¹³² ‘In comitatu suo Capua’: Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 49, p. 255.
¹³³ Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 38, p. 249.
¹³⁴ Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 51, p. 256: ‘Tunc nutu Dei, a quo omne procedit bonum, quendam Agarenum ab Africa evocans, regia de stirpe generi sui procreatum, Agropolim, inde Garilianum, quo residebant agmina Hismaelitica, misit, arque omnium illo-rum mentem accendens, eius hortatus universi Saraceni tam de Gariliano quam de Agropoli comuniter collecti, Calabriam, qua residebat Graecorum exercitus super Saracenos in sancta Severina commorantes, properarunt.’
Langobardorum is recounted in the first chapter; a little later, the last Lombard king Desiderius is mentioned under the title rex Italiae. The Frankish/imperial titles are used with much variation. Regnum Francorum is used once, alongside regnum Gallicum; the empire can be described as ‘augustalis imperium in Gallia’, the emperor as caesar or augustus, and all Carolingian emperors as ‘cuncti Augusti Gallici.’

Ethnic titles rarely occur in the Historiola, at a time when they were quite current in Northern Europe. Two of the few direct ethnic attributes in a regnal title are biblical: ‘Iudayorum reges’ (in a passage about the partition of their kingdom), and ‘rex Amalechitorum’ in the passage from Samuel cited above. The scarce contemporary usage is unsurprising. In Italy, the Carolingians had initially preserved the title rex (gentis) Langobardorum, which Charlemagne had adopted in 774; but soon, rex Italiae must have seemed more appropriate, although rex Langobardorum continued to be used. The princes of Benevento, who were the only Lombard rulers since 774, did not express this claim in their title. That would have been unacceptable for the rex Francorum et Langobardorum Charlemagne; they had chosen the classical and absolute form princeps instead.

Concluding Observations

Erchempert’s Historiola was explicitly designed as a Lombard history; but Lombard identity mostly receded into the background in his narrative. This presents a challenge to our interpretation. The tension should not be explained away and resolved too easily in one or the other way. In Erchempert’s lifetime, joint Lombard agency was limited. Affiliation to the Lombards could hardly further social cohesion or political consensus. Erchempert was palpably critical of the many leaders in the divided principate who sought their own advantage rather than the common good, and of their endless internal strife. This did not only impede their capacity to protect their subjects from external enemies and
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135 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 1, pp. 234–35; 6, p. 237.
136 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 11, p. 239; 19, p. 241.
137 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 11, p. 239.
138 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 10, p. 239: ‘cesar Lodoguicos cognomento Almus, filius Karli superioris Augusti’.
139 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 78, p. 263.
140 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 55, p. 257; 38, p. 249.
141 Pohl, ‘Gens ipsa peribit’.
other threats, and endanger the monasteries and their possessions. The many sins of the powerful, bishops included, also squandered divine protection. Where many erred, the entire people had to suffer. Only sometimes, God punished evil leaders directly, and granted some relief to the victims of political turmoil.

Disillusion and desperation about the state of the community which Erchempert by implication calls his ‘stirps’ in the beginning pervades the text. Lombard identification was not an attractive option. One alternative was Emperor Louis II who repeatedly inspired hope to establish some unity and rally the Lombards against the Saracens and other enemies. This corresponds to a recurrent Montecassino attitude to seek imperial protection against the regional powers in its immediate surroundings. It is no coincidence that the text of the capitulary with which Louis II prepared his expedition against the Saracens in 866 is transmitted in the Montecassino codex of the Rule of St Benedict, as part of the so-called Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis. The following chapter of the Chronica reports the emperor’s visit to Montecassino in tones of self-indulgent admiration. The apex of these hopes in Louis came with his conquest of Bari in 871. Yet already the following chapter in Erchempert’s Historiola relates how the devil instigated new discord, upon which Prince Adelchis of Benevento took the emperor, ‘sanctissimum virum’, prisoner. This comes with another dose of references to the Old Testament: a quote from the prophecy of Zachariah (13.7), ‘smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered’. Louis as an emblem of pastoral power corresponded to Carolingian ideology, but this was an image rarely used in southern Italy. Revenge upon the Lombards arrives quickly with renewed Saracen attacks, which Erchempert parallels with the curse of Elisha against young lads who have mocked him, upon which two bears come out of the woods and devour forty-two of the boys (II Kings 24).

The hopes in Louis II thus fade out in the Historiola. How much Erchempert was still attached to a vision of Lombard community only emerges
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143 Montecassino, Archivio dell’Abbazia, MS cod. 175, fols 536–38; Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis, ed. by Waitz, 3, pp. 469–71, or as Constitutio de expeditione Beneventana, ed. by Boretius and Krause, no. 218, pp. 94–96. Pohl, Werkstätte, p. 88.

144 Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis, ed. by Waitz, 4, p. 471.

145 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 33, p. 247.


147 Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 34, p. 247.

148 The death of ‘divae memoriae Lodoguicus’ is related two chapters later: Erchempert, Historiola, ed. by Pertz and Waitz, 36, p. 248.
briefly from the optimistic vision of a restoration of the unity of the cоборs Bardica in chapters 74 and 75. Towards the end of the Historiola, Aio and Atenulf seem to warrant some hope to overcome the many scissions within the principate. Being Lombards still held the option of mobilizing support against non-Lombard enemies, not least, the Saracens.

The Lombards of the south in the later ninth century are, perhaps, a case of an ethnic identity that would not die.¹⁴⁹ That was not least due to the attractive model that Paul the Deacon had established. Paul and his Lombard history remained a basic point of reference for southern Italian historiography in the two centuries after his death. There were several reasons for this. The story that Paul told could be transformed into a distant vision of a glorious past when most of Italy had been ruled by Lombards. It served as a counterpoint to recent events mostly painted in dark colours. Cultural differences between ‘Lombards’ and ‘Romans’ had long faded away, but were maintained in ancient stereotypes of treacherous Greeks and Neapolitans, greedy Franks, and bloodthirsty Saracens. Lombard law also kept up a sense of difference, and in Montecassino a manuscript of the Leges was produced as late as c. 1000.¹⁵⁰

Paul and Erhempert were both monks at Montecassino, and so were the anonymous authors of the Chronica Sancti Benedicti Casinensis and of the Continuatio Casinensis. In the Lombard south, the historiography that has survived all comes from Benedictine monasteries, most of all, from Montecassino. I have tried to reconstruct the strategies and perspectives of this monastic ‘workshop of memory’ in my book Werkstätte der Erinnerung.¹⁵¹ On the one hand, the relations of one of the richest monasteries in Italy with the powers of the region were often strained: they were competitors for property, income, and influence. On the other hand, Montecassino owed most of its rights and properties to Lombard princes, and guarded their memory. In the late ninth and tenth centuries, when it seemed that warlords could grab what they wanted, it was especially vulnerable to a lack of central control and protection. Abbots and influential monks were closely linked to aristocratic factions and power brokers between Capua and Benevento, and their views of history were hardly very distinct from those of the world outside. History, it seems, did not only tell you who you were. It was also a medium of negotiation with the lay

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Haldon, The Empire that Would Not Die.

¹⁵⁰ Codex Cavensis (Cava, Biblioteca della Badia, MS 4); for its attribution to Montecassino, see Pohl, Werkstätte, pp. 108–21.

¹⁵¹ Pohl, Werkstätte.
elites around the monastery. From Erchempert’s *Historiola*, monks could learn to talk politics with their lay counterparts.

As I have argued, in the later ninth and the tenth centuries, the texts from Montecassino that have been preserved (not least, in the Vatican compilation) put surprisingly little weight on the sanctity and the spiritual achievements of the recent past, and rather cherish the exploits and donations of much earlier days. The death of Abbot Bertarius at the destruction of the monastery by the Saracens in 883 could have created the cult of a venerable martyr; but Erchempert does not even mention it. Erchempert does not create the impression that he was writing to convince a lay audience of the spiritual profit of being a ‘neighbour of St Benedict’.  

Historiography at Montecassino, then, was not simply dictated by the concerns of a monastic institution. It was mostly about understanding the intricacies of its political environment. The historians at Montecassino and at other Benedictine monasteries in southern Italy could build on the work of Paul the Deacon, who had masterfully told the story of a more distant past, and explained what it meant to be Lombards. They complemented the rest, without striving to place these histories in a broader spatial or chronological context. Unlike Paul’s work, these histories do not offer integrative visions of community; the distant past overshadows the present.

Unlike Paul, whose Lombard history is preserved in over a hundred manuscripts, almost the entire historiography of the Lombard south only survives in the Vatican codex. However, references to and borrowings from Erchempert’s work can be traced. In fact, none of the Italian histories from the ninth century seems to have reached a wider circulation. The *Historia* in the Codex Gothanus is only attested there. The *Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis* is transmitted in one fifteenth-century copy and one sixteenth-century fragment; of course, it may have been of little interest outside the see of Ravenna. Andreas of Bergamo’s *History* is preserved in one, almost contemporary, St Gall manuscript, in which the end is missing. Of course, Paul the Deacon’s *History*

---

152 Bertarius was only venerated as a saint in the early modern period: Avagliano, ‘Il culto di San Bertario’. See also Pohl, *Werkstätte*, p. 175.

153 Cf. Rosenwein, *To Be a Neighbor of St Peter*, for the more successful way in which Cluny catered to the needs of aristocrats in its region.

154 E.g. *Chronicon monasterii Casinensis*, ed. by Hoffmann, i.9, p. 37; Petrus Diaconus, *De viris illustribus Casinensibus*, ed. by Sperduti, p. 75.


has not survived in the south at all, and that was, as we have seen, hardly due
to a lack of interest. As the manuscript transmission shows, Paul’s work invited
different interpretations and identifications. Erchempert, on the other hand,
left little room for positive identification. Yet he took the Lombards and their
rule over large parts of southern Italy for granted, in spite of all his critique.
Hardly any of the chapters do not involve Lombards, apart from the two last
chapters relating a battle between Greeks and Saracens in the distant south,
and another one between two Frankish pretenders in the north.157 Unlike the
shorter and fragmentary historiographic texts from the period preserved in the
Vaticanus and in a few other manuscripts, Erchempert established a coherent
narrative in a confused environment.

Walter Pohl has not survived in the south at all, and that was, as we have seen, hardly due to a lack of interest. As the manuscript transmission shows, Paul’s work invited different interpretations and identifications. Erchempert, on the other hand, left little room for positive identification. Yet he took the Lombards and their rule over large parts of southern Italy for granted, in spite of all his critique. Hardly any of the chapters do not involve Lombards, apart from the two last chapters relating a battle between Greeks and Saracens in the distant south, and another one between two Frankish pretenders in the north. Unlike the shorter and fragmentary historiographic texts from the period preserved in the Vaticanus and in a few other manuscripts, Erchempert established a coherent narrative in a confused environment.
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In 864, tragedy struck the court of Charles the Bald. Hincmar of Reims reported that the king’s son and namesake Charles ‘the Young’ (also known as Charles ‘the Child’) went hunting one day with some companions in the Forest of Cuise. As the party of huntsmen was returning to the palace at nightfall, the king’s son suffered a terrible injury. Hincmar of Reims briefly recounted the shocking event in the so-called Annals of St-Bertin:

Charles the Young, whom his father recently had taken back from Aquitaine and brought with him to Compiègne, was returning at night from a hunt in the woods of Cuise. While only trying to play with the other young men his age, by the work of the Devil he was struck in the head with a sword by a young man named Albuin.

The cognomen ‘the Young’ is a translation of Hincmar’s reference to the prince as Karolus iuvenis in 864. Five years earlier Prudentius had referred to him as Karlus puer, which accounts for his alternative sobriquet: Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 859, p. 81; a. 864, p. 105. Charles the Young of Aquitaine should not be confused with Charlemagne’s son Charles ‘the Younger’, who died in 811.

Eric J. Goldberg is Associate Professor of History at M.I.T. I would like to thank Rutger Kramer, Simon MacLean, Helmut Reimitz, and Rachel Stone for helpful comments on early drafts of this article. The quotation in the title is an abbreviated version of Ado of Vienne’s description of Charles the Young, which I discuss below.
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The blow almost penetrated the brain, reaching from the left temple all the way to the cheek of the right jawbone.2

The grievous wounding of this Carolingian prince was a crisis for Charles the Bald, since it threw into question his plans for royal succession, and it cast into doubt whether he still enjoyed God’s favour. The injury left Charles the Bald’s son hideously scarred and physically impaired, and he never fully recovered. Charles the Young died two years later on 29 September 866, at the age of nineteen. He was buried in the church of St Sulpice in Bourges.

This article examines the surviving reports of Charles the Young’s forest misadventure in 864 and the divergent ways in which chroniclers remembered this dramatic event. Historians have largely accepted uncritically Hincmar’s account of Charles the Young’s injury. And, because they have privileged Hincmar’s narrative, scholars have used the alternative reports of the event by two other Carolinian chroniclers, Ado of Vienne and Regino of Prüm, merely to augment Hincmar’s account. Modern discussions of the wounding of Charles the Young therefore tend to take the form of a ‘super-narrative’ that synthesizes the individual narratives of these three different chroniclers.3 Because Hincmar depicted the injury as occurring within the context of a princely hunt, most scholars interpret this event as an intriguing example of a Carolingian ‘political ritual gone wrong’.4 The reason is that historians tend to view early medieval hunting through the lens of political ritual and interpret it as a Frankish aristocratic activity that fostered consensus-building and male-

---


bonding. Hincmar’s narrative therefore seems to describe a moment when the choreography of a Carolingian royal ritual spectacularly failed.

Such a harmonizing approach to the chroniclers is problematic, however. This is because Hincmar, Ado, and Regino offer significantly different accounts of what happened to Charles the Bald’s son. In other words, what we have here is not agreement among chroniclers about an important political event, but rather divergence and debate. Philippe Buc labels such conflicting accounts among chroniclers ‘contested narratives’. Buc cautions that early medieval chroniclers were not objective, unbiased reporters of political rituals like royal hunts. Instead, they were actively engaged partisans who sought to shape the memory of past events through carefully crafted narratives that bolstered their larger ideological inclinations and political loyalties. Buc’s insights about disagreement in early medieval chronicles are important, and they highlight the methodological pitfalls when historians attempt to harmonize fundamentally divergent accounts of a significant political event such as Charles the Young’s injury. Yet even if we concur Buc’s arguments about ‘contested narratives’, there is still hope to offer plausible reconstructions of early medieval politics. This article examining Charles the Young’s misadventure proposes a strategy to elucidate ‘what really happened’ from among divergent narrative accounts. This methodology combines close analysis of the chroniclers’ differing reports with other, often-neglected but readily available evidence. This evidence includes a consideration of the immediate political context as well as overlooked sources such as royal charters, letters, and, in this case, a later medieval chivalric epic. Through a methodology that combines textual analysis of the chronicles with an examination of political context and non-narrative evidence, we may gain new insights into both the literary representation and the historical reality of Charles the Young’s disastrous outing in the Forest of Cuise in 864.

Because historians have accepted Hincmar’s picture of a princely hunt gone awry, they generally present Charles the Young’s injury as a tragic misfortune

5 The *locus classicus* for this interpretation is Nelson, ‘Lord’s Anointed’, pp. 120–24. See now Goldberg, *In the Manner of the Franks*.

6 For a similar case of royal-ritual-gone-wrong, see MacLean, ‘Ritual, Misunderstanding’, pp. 97–119.

7 Buc, *Dangers of Ritual*.

8 Buc, *Dangers of Ritual*, pp. 1–12, expresses doubt about the ability of early medieval historians to go beyond narrative texts to uncover the details of political events. For scholars who push back against this view, see: Kozl, ‘Review Article’; Walsh, review of Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual*; MacLean, *Ritual, Misunderstanding*; Pössel, ‘The Magic of Early Medieval Ritual*.
— ‘ein sehr unvermuteter Unglückfall’, ‘un déplorable accident’ — of the late Carolingian dynasty. Some scholars have cited the misadventure of Charles the Young as embodying key characteristics of the masculine, aristocratic political culture of the Carolingian elite. In her important study of the reign of Charles the Bald, Janet Nelson invokes the event as an example of the unpredictable ‘ramshackle world’ in which Carolingian rulers struggled to maintain a rudimentary but effective state. Guy Halsall interprets Charles’s injury as an illustration of the danger of early medieval military training erupting into deadly violence, similar to brawls at modern football matches. In a similar vein, Matthew Innes uses the incident to illustrate the role of hunting, ‘playing with swords and horses’, and other macho ‘shenanigans’ in the gendered socialization of young nobles at court. In contrast, Martina Giese argues that the injury in fact was the result of an assassination attempt on the king’s son, thereby suggesting how royal hunts could serve as a venue for the playing out of pre-existing political conflicts. Misfortune, mayhem, military training, male-bonding, murder: we should keep these interpretations in mind as we turn to the evidence.

A significant oversight of historians when discussing Charles the Young’s injury is to ignore the political context. The young Charles’s career in many ways was typical of the generational struggles of Carolingian princes to lay claim to kingdoms and power in the face of overbearing fathers, rival Carolingians, and unpredictable aristocratic support. He was the second of the four sons of Charles the Bald and his first wife Ermentrude: Louis ‘the Stammerer’ (b. 846), Carloman (b. 849), and Lothar (b. 850).15 For the date of Charles the Young’s birth, see Martindale, ‘Charles the Bald’, pp. 115–38, esp. 126–29. On Carolingian father-son conflicts, see: Nelson, ‘A Tale of Two Princes’; Schieffer, ‘Väter und Söhne’; Kasten, Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft; Costambeys, Innes, and MacLean, Carolingian World, pp. 208–22.

10 Nelson, Charles the Bald, pp. 67–68.
11 Halsall, Warfare and Society, p. 118.
12 Innes, ‘A Place of Discipline’, p. 67; Costambeys, Innes, and MacLean, Carolingian World, pp. 296–97.
Charles the Young (b. 847/48), Carloman (b. 849), and Lothar (b. c. 850). In 855 Charles the Bald sought to secure his tenuous control of Aquitaine by making his young namesake king of the region while keeping royal power in his own hands. This did little to satisfy the restive Aquitanian nobles, however, and they continued to rebel against Charles the Bald in an effort to secure direct access to royal patronage.

Like many Carolingian princes, Charles the Young sought to assert independence from his father as he approached young manhood (iuventas), which in the Frankish world was reckoned to begin around fifteen. In 862 Charles entered a conspiracy with a group of Aquitanian magnates around Count Stephen of Nevers, an alliance that he solidified through an illicit marriage. Hincmar reported:

Charles the king of the Aquitanians, the son of King Charles, who had not yet finished his fifteenth year, at the urging of Stephen took to wife the widow of Count Humbert without the will or knowledge of his father.

Humbert seems to have been the former count of Bourges, and we hear that another Aquitanian magnate named Egfrid (presumably a kinsman of the former Count Egfrid of Toulouse) also participated in the conspiracy.

15 For the date of Charles the Young’s birth, see Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 862, p. 90 n. 2.

16 Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 855, pp. 70–71. Nelson, Charles the Bald, p. 174, suggests that Charles the Young’s guardians were bishops Rodulf of Bourges and Stodilo of Limoges and counts Hugh and Raymund.


20 Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 864, pp. 105, 114. Nelson, Charles the Bald, pp. 174, 201–02, suggests that Stephen and his father Hugh were counts of Nevers and that Hugh may have been one of Charles the Young’s guardians (with further discussion of Stephen’s eventful career on pp. 185, 192, 196–97). Concerning Count Egfrid of Toulouse, see: Nithard, Historiarum libri IIII, ed. by Müller, iv.4, p. 45; Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 864, p. 114; Nelson, Charles the Bald, pp. 126, 135, 173. For further discussion, see Annals of St-Bertin, trans. by Nelson, pp. 100 n. 12, 119 n. 26.
The rebellion around Charles the Young gained momentum: the following year (863) Stephen seized the county of Clermont and replaced the local bishop with his own supporter, and Hunfrid of Gothia drove out Stephen’s rival Raymund of Toulouse and took that county for himself. At an initial meeting with his father at Meung on the Loire river, Charles the Young was respectful but unbowed. Determined to bring the rebellion to heel, Charles the Bald marched into Aquitaine with a strong army in December 863. At Nevers he compelled Charles the Young and the Aquitanian magnates to submit and renew their oaths of fidelity, and he revoked from his namesake his royal title and power (‘regium nomen ac potestas’). In early 864 Charles the Bald returned north to Compiègne, bringing his rebel son with him. Rudolf Schieffer was surely correct when he described Charles the Young’s situation at his father’s court as a kind of imprisonment (Inhaftierung).

These events are significant because they provide the immediate political context for Charles’s injury in 864. Hincmar’s account in the Annals of St-Bertin cited above is the most contemporary report of the event. The Annals of St-Bertin were a continuation of the Royal Frankish Annals, and they provide the most important narrative of West Frankish politics between 830 and 882. Hincmar took over authorship in the early 860s, and he wrote for an audience that included Charles the Bald, his court, and the West Frankish nobles in general. During these years Hincmar was (with a few interruptions) a lead-

23 Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 862, p. 91. Pope Nicholas I tried to intervene on Charles the Young’s behalf: Nicolai I. papae epistolae de rebus Franciae, in Nicolai I. papae epistolae variae, ed. by Perels, nos 9 and 12, pp. 275, 278–79.
27 Schieffer, Die Karolinger, p. 158.
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The forest misadventure of Charles the Young of Aquitaine (864)

Figure 1. Napoleon hunting in the Forêt d’Compiègne by Carle Vernet (1811), Hermitage, St Petersburg.

As a royal forest, Cuise was strictly off-limits to anyone without the king’s explicit permission. In the *Capitulary of Quierzy* (877), Charles the Bald identified Cuise near Compiègne (‘Compendium cum Causia’) as one of the forests in which his son Louis the Stammerer was not allowed to hunt while he was away in Italy. Hincmar did not specify the date of the accident, although his ordering of events in the 864 entry suggests that it occurred around Easter on 2 April. Charles the Bald’s charters demonstrate that he was at Compiègne before Easter and at Saint-Denis in late April. Since hunting and eating meat were frowned upon during Lent, it is possible that Charles the Young’s injury occurred in April after Easter Sunday, when his father had departed for Saint-Denis and left his son behind at Compiègne.

As we have seen, Hincmar asserted that Charles the Young was accidentally injured by a young man named Albuin while horsing around with his companions as they returned from hunting. Yet we should be cautious about accepting Hincmar’s narrative at face value. As a chronicler Hincmar was often highly selective with the truth, and there are many examples where one can demonstrate that he was intentionally deceptive to paint a favourable picture of himself and Charles the Bald. For example, Hincmar does not mention in the annals that he himself had acted as a mediator during Charles the Young’s rebellion in an effort to secure Charles the Bald’s leniency toward his son.

---

31 For Carolingian legislation protecting royal *forestes*, see the following decrees in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, ed. by Boretius, i: *Capitulare de villis*, 11, 36, 46, pp. 84, 86, 87; *Capitulare missorum generale*, 39, p. 98; *Capitulare Aquisgranse*, 18, p. 172; *Capitula per se scribenda*, 7, p. 288; *Capitulare missorum*, 22, p. 291; *Responsa missis data*, 3, 6, p. 314. See further Lorenz, ‘Der Königsforst’, pp. 261–85. For Merovingian and Carolingian forest law, see Goldberg, *In the Manner of the Franks*, pp. 61–65, 73–82, 120–22.


33 *Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 864, p. 111, although Hincmar’s reference to Easter is in connection to the activities of Louis II of Italy. The first date Hincmar provides for Charles the Bald in 864 is his assembly at Pîtres on 1 June: *Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 864, p. 113.


37 One of Hincmar’s letters reports this: Hincmar, *Epistolae*, ed. by Perels, no. 169, p. 146.
The youthful prince’s subsequent loss of royal title, imprisonment, and maiming therefore was potentially embarrassing for the archbishop, since it pointed to the conclusion that he had failed in his diplomatic efforts. This in turn may explain why Hincmar passed over in silence his role in resolving Charles the Young’s rebellion. It is because of omissions like this that Janet Nelson describes Hincmar’s annals as ‘a tissue of selective truth and misrepresentation and wishful thinking, of much-wordiness and significant silences.’

At the same time, Charles the Young’s injury was a serious blow to Charles the Bald, whom Hincmar supported. Because the Franks sought to decode God’s plan from earthly events, any serious mishap involving a member of the royal family, such as a fall from a horse or an injury from a building collapse, could be seen as an ominous sign of the king’s approaching death or loss of divine favour. Moreover, the Frankish nobles considered significant bodily defects as potentially undermining a Carolingian prince’s claim to royal succession. Indeed, Charles the Bald already had several sons with physical handicaps: his eldest son Louis reportedly had a stutter (although his father still considered him throne-worthy), while his fourth son Lothar was lame and therefore had become a monk. Charles the Bald had also given over his third son Carloman to the monastic life, apparently because he believed he had the requisite ‘heir plus a spare’ in his eldest two sons. In this way Charles the Young’s ghastly disfigurement threw into question his father’s plans for royal succession. The wounding of the king’s son haunted Hincmar. In a coronation blessing he composed for Queen Ermentrude in 866, Hincmar lamented that God had allowed some of Ermentrude’s sons ‘to meet with great suffering, which his faithful men still lament.’ At that moment Charles the Young still lived on as an invalid, while the previous year Charles the Bald’s son Lothar had died and Ermentrude

---

39 Einhard, Vita Karoli, ed. by Holder-Egger, 32, p. 36 (fall from a horse); Annales regni Francorum, ed. by Kurze, a. 817, p. 146 (colonnade collapse); Annales Fuldenses, ed. by Pertz, a. 870, p. 71 (balcony collapse).
40 According to Einhard, Charlemagne’s first son Pippin was a hunchback, but Einhard may have invented this charge to justify his disinheritance by his father: Einhard, Vita Karoli, ed. by Holder-Egger, 20, p. 25.
42 Nelson, Charles the Bald, pp. 173–74 and n. 68.
43 Ordo of Ermentrude, ed. by Jackson, i, 80–86 at p. 83.
delivered twin boys who passed away soon after birth. Charles the Young’s injury therefore was part of a growing West Frankish succession crisis.

Upon closer examination, one detects Hincmar trying to smooth over as best he could the horrific reality of Charles the Young’s misadventure. Hincmar’s claim that Charles the Young ‘was only trying to play with some other young men his own age’ (‘iocari cum aliis iuvenibus et coevis suis putans’) is an awkward formulation that sounds defensive, and it raises suspicions that he was being economical with the truth. By claiming that the young Charles had been injured during a friendly hunt, Hincmar situated the event in the context of an activity that had become a distinctive emblem of the Carolingian monarchy. The Royal Frankish Annals (of which the Annals of St-Bertin were a continuation) reported the frequent royal hunts of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. In this way, Hincmar presented the young Charles as engaged in a time-honoured royal ritual of his dynasty. To downplay the extraordinary nature of Charles the Young’s injury, moreover, Hincmar took the remarkable step of reporting three additional hunting misadventures that same year: he narrated how Louis the German’s son Carloman (who like Charles the Young had recently rebelled against his father) escaped his father’s custody by pretending to go hunting, how Louis the German himself fell from a horse and injured his ribs while pursuing a deer in a game park, and how Emperor Louis II was gored by a stag while hunting in the mountains of Italy. This string of four hunting misadventures in a single year was unprecedented in Carolingian chronicles, and it foreshadowed the emergence of this ominous theme in later Carolingian historiography. By presenting Charles’s injury as part of a larger pattern of

---

44 Annales de Saint-Bertin, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 865, p. 84; Hyam, ‘Ermentrude and Richildis’, p. 159 n. 36; Annales of St-Bertin, trans. by Nelson, p. xiii (Genealogy III).
45 Goldberg, ‘Louis the Pious and the Hunt’; Goldberg, In the Manner of the Franks.
hunts gone awry, Hincmar argued that the event was not unique and therefore did not signal a loss of divine support for Charles the Bald. Here Hincmar echoed the official ‘spin’ of the tragedy at the West Frankish court. In a letter to Pope Nicholas, Charles the Bald lamented that his son had been incapacitated by an accident (‘casu [...] infirmatus’), but he emphasized that his predecessors had experienced similar hardships. Hincmar ultimately blamed the accident on the work of the Devil (‘operante diabolo’), thereby asserting that neither Charles the Young, nor Albuin, nor Charles the Bald had been to blame. To drive home this point, after 864 Hincmar began reporting Charles the Bald’s successful annual hunting trips, thereby reasserting the connection between the West Frankish king and the vigorous hunting of his ancestors.

In sum, there are good reasons to believe that Hincmar’s account of Charles the Young’s injury is not an objective report of ‘what actually happened’. Instead, it was a carefully crafted narrative, the objective of which was to shape the memory of this deeply troubling event for Charles the Bald’s court. We therefore need to compare Hincmar’s version with the two other independent narratives of the event. One comes from the pen of Archbishop Ado of Vienne, who made a brief reference to Charles the Young in his Chronicle on the Six Ages of the World. Ado was a Lotharingian ally of Charles the Bald’s, and he finished his Chronicle in c. 870, just after Charles secured his rule over western Lotharingia (including Vienne) in the Treaty of Meerssen. In the Chronicle Ado repeatedly praised Charles the Bald as gloriosus, inclytus, praeclarissimus, and pius, suggesting that he intended the work to be read by the West Frankish king. In the concluding encomium for Charles the Bald, Ado referred to Charles the Young in his survey of the king’s sons:

He begot four sons from Queen Ermentrude: Louis, Charles, Carloman, and Lothar. Of these he offered two to God in clerical clothing: Carloman and Lothar.

49 Caroli regis epistola, ed. by Mansi, no. 9, xv, p. 735.
52 Concerning Ado’s chronicle, see the essay by Raisharma in this volume.
53 Nelson, Charles the Bald, pp. 217, 223, 276. The latest datable event Ado mentions is the division of Lotharingia between Louis the German and Charles the Bald in 870: Ado of Vienne, Chronicle, ed. by Pertz, p. 323. Ado does not mention Charles’s second queen, Richildis, whom he married on 22 January 870.
But Lothar, a boy of good character, was taken by an early death. Also, Charles, a man of notable good looks, for a time was made king of the Aquitanians when he was a young man. But he was injured and disfigured by a cruel wound and afterward died.\textsuperscript{54}

Several things deserve comment about Ado’s brief statement. To begin, this summary of Charles the Bald’s sons are the final words of Ado’s chronicle, which underscores the importance of the passage for his overall message. Ado concluded on a note of concern about royal succession, since he highlighted that Charles the Bald now had only one son, Louis the Stammerer, who was eligible to inherit the West Frankish kingdom. It is also significant that Ado does not corroborate any details from Hincmar’s story about Charles the Young except for his debilitating wound: he does not mention a hunt, nor does he describe the injury as the result of an accident. Ado’s silence about how the young Charles received the wound suggests that it still was an uncomfortable topic in political circles six years after the event. Ado’s main emphasis was Charles the Young’s physical beauty, describing him as ‘vir satis honestae formae’ (a man of notable good looks) who had been ‘adversa […] dehonestatus iniuria’ (disfigured by a cruel wound). Several scholars have focused on Ado’s use of the word \textit{dehonestatus}, translating it as ‘dishonoured’ and thus seeming to corroborate Hincmar’s story about macho aristocratic horse-play gone awry.\textsuperscript{55} Undoubtedly some people saw Charles’s wound as dishonourable, since the Franks believed that physical beauty, fitness, and martial prowess were important qualities of a nobleman.\textsuperscript{56} But Ado’s primary message was that the young Charles had been handsome (\textit{honestus}) but disfigured (\textit{dehonestatus}) as a result of the injury. Ado’s remark forms a diptych with his preceding comment that Lothar had been a boy of good character but taken by an early death. In this way Ado praised Charles the Bald’s two deceased sons, one for his good character and the other for his good looks.

The third chronicler who narrated Charles the Young’s injury was Regino of Prüm. Regino was abbot of Prüm from 892 to 899 (he was driven out by

\textsuperscript{54} Ado of Vienne, \textit{Chronicon}, ed. by Pertz, p. 323: ‘Hic ex regina Ermentruide quatuor filios suscepit, Ludovicum, Carolum, Carlomannum et Lotharium. Ex his Deo in clericali habitu duos obtulit, Carlomannum et Lotharium; sed Lotharius, puer bonae indolis, immatura morte praeceptus est; Carolus quoque, vir satis honestae formae, juvenis rex Aquitanis iam constitutus, adversa primum molestatus et dehonestatus iniuria moriturus’.


Lotharingian rivals), and he later became abbot of St Martin’s in Trier where he finished his chronicle in 908. Regino wrote with the knowledge of the breakup of the Carolingian Empire in 888, and he therefore consciously narrated both the rise and decline of the Carolingian dynasty. Regino thus viewed Charles the Young’s injury as one of the mounting dynastic crises faced by the descendants of Louis the Pious. There is no indication that he knew the account in the *Annals of St-Bertin*, and his version of events differs from Hincmar’s in important ways. On the other hand, Regino may have known Ado’s *Chronicle*: he likewise situates his report within a survey of Charles the Bald’s sons with Ermentrude, and his opening sentence seems to echo Ado. But Regino’s account is far more extensive than Ado’s, indicating that he had other information available to him. He wrote:

> The abovementioned king begot three sons from Queen Ermentrude: Charles, Carloman, and Louis. But two of them met unhappy ends. For Charles, carried away by youthful rashness, wanted to test the daring and oft-praised courage of Albuin, the brother of Bivin and Betto. Pretending to be someone else, he made a solo attack on him one day when Albuin was returning at nightfall from a hunt, as if he intended violently to carry off the horse upon which he rode. Having no idea it was the king’s son, he drew his sword to defend himself, struck him in the head, and immediately threw him to the ground. He left him barely alive pierced with many wounds and carried off his weapons and horse. Thus crippled in body and deformed in the face, he survived only a little time longer. When Albuin realized it was the king’s son to whom he had done these things, he quickly took flight and escaped the death penalty.


59 Regino, *Chronicon*, ed. by Kurze, a. 870, p. 101: ‘Siquidem predictus rex ex Hirmintrude regina tres filios susceperat, Carolum scilicet, Carlomannum et Ludowicum; sed duo ex his infelicitatem perierunt. Nempe Carolus levitate iuvenili ductus, temptare volens Albuinum, fratris Bivini et Bettois, audatiam ac saepe laudatam constantiam, alium se esse simulans, cum ex venatione vespertinis horis idem Albuinus quadam die revertetur, super eum solus impetum fecit, veluti equum, in quo sedebat, violenter ablaturus. Ille nihil minus existimans quam filium regis, evagnatio gladio ex adverso eum in capite percussit modoque terrae prostravit, deinde multis vulneribus confossum semivivum reliquit, arma pariter et caballum secum auferens; debilitatus ergo membris ac vultu deformatus pauco tempore supervixit. Albuinus cognito, quod filius regis esset, in quem talia exercerat, celeriter aufugit mortisque periculum declinavit’. For alternate
Although scholars have tried to harmonize Regino’s account with that of Hincmar, they differ on several key points. According to Regino, Charles the Young and Albuin had not been hunting together, and there is no mention of youthful horsing around. Instead, Regino states that Albuin had been hunting and that the king’s son attacked him *violenter* in an effort to injure or kill him and make it look like the work of a horse thief. Moreover, Regino asserts that Albuin had no idea that it was the king’s son who was attacking him, since Charles disguised his identity (‘alium esse simulans’) and it was nightfall. In short, Regino presents the event, not as an accident during a friendly hunt, but rather a violent ambush perpetrated by the king’s son.

Regino also offers the important new information that Albuin was brother of Bivin and Betto. This comment enables us to place Albuin in one of the leading Lotharingian families that was closely allied with Charles the Bald. Bivin was count in the region of Metz, lay-abbot of Gorze from 856 to 863, and married to the sister of Lothar II’s queen Theutberga. 60 During the 860s, Charles the Bald was an ally and supporter of Theutberga and her influential relatives, the ‘Bosonids’. Bivin’s power in Lotharingia is highlighted by the fact that, when the recently widowed Charles the Bald annexed Lotharingia in 869, he chose none other than Bivin’s daughter Richildis as his new queen. 61 Albuin’s other brother Betto was a high-ranking layman at Charles the Bald’s court. A capitulary dated 856 names him as one of Charles the Bald’s *missi* to rebels in Aquitaine and Neustria. 62 In a charter dated that same year, Charles the Bald confirmed an exchange between Betto and the abbot of Saint-Denis, and in that document the king praised him as ‘vir illuster fidelis noster Betto’. 63

Following in Betto’s footsteps, Albuin seems to have been a layman rising in Charles the Bald’s service. A report of a dispute settlement at Charles the

translations of the passage, see: *Chronicle*, trans. by MacLean, p. 163; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 68, which harmonizes with Hincmar’s language.


63 *Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve*, ed. by Giry and others, t, no. 185, p. 489. This Betto may have had a son with the same name who entered the monastic life and became a West Frankish abbot by 864: *Epistolae ad diversum Lotharii II regis pertinentes*, in *Nicolai I. papae epistolae variae*, ed. by Perels, no. 9, p. 222.
Bald’s Verberie assembly in October 863 mentions an *Alboinus comes* among the attending West Frankish magnates. The long witness list records in rank order the names of five archbishops (Hincmar comes first), twenty bishops, six abbots, and eighteen counts — the seventeenth of whom is Albuin. Albuin’s relatively low rank among Charles the Bald’s counts may be due to the fact that he was, in Hincmar’s words, still a young man (*iuvenis*), suggesting that the king had only recently promoted him to the office. Notably, Charles the Bald held this assembly at Verberie on the eve of his departure for Aquitaine in late 863 to confront his namesake’s rebellion. It is therefore likely that many of the counts in the witness list, including Albuin himself, marched with Charles the Bald into Aquitaine and were present at Nevers in December when the king deposed his son and took him into custody. This in turn points to a motive why Charles the Young would have wanted to attack Albuin in early 864: not only to test Albuin’s ‘daring and oft-praised courage’, but also to carry out violent retribution against one of his father’s supporters who had contributed to his recent humiliation.

Indeed, there may have been a direct connection between Albuin’s reputation for valour, hunting, and his family’s property. In the exchange between Betto and the abbot of Saint-Denis mentioned above, Betto received a large estate in the Ardennes called Sulis. It seems that Albuin’s family was a significant property holder in the Ardennes. Albuin’s deceased older brother Richard (d. 839) had been Louis the Pious’s doorkeeper who received from the emperor the manor of Villance, likewise in the Ardennes. For centuries, the Ardennes with its dense forests, varied landscape, and copious deer and boar had been a favourite hunting region of the Frankish kings, and in 877 Charles the Bald designated it as one of the royal *forestes* where his son Louis was not allowed to hunt while he was in Italy. Like their kings, the Frankish nobles were ardent huntsmen, and possession of estates in the Ardennes gave Albuin and his broth-
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64 *Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve*, ed. by Giry and others, 11, no. 258, pp. 81–86.
66 *Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve*, ed. by Giry and others, 1, no. 185, p. 490. The location of Sulis is unknown.
ers access to one of the most coveted hunting districts in the empire. This in turn suggests one of the avenues through which the young Albuin obtained his reputation for daring and courage: through expertise at hunting. In this context, it is significant that, according to Regino, Albuin was returning from the hunt when Charles the Young ambushed him. This was a symbol of Albuin’s high favour with Charles the Bald, since hunting in a royal forest without the king himself being present would have required his permission.

The possession of landed properties in the Ardennes also helps explain why Regino took such an interest in Albuin and his brothers. On his deathbed in 839, Richard had asked his brother Bivin to give the estate at Villance to the monastery of Prüm (also located in the Ardennes) for the salvation of his soul. This grant of Villance was so important to the monastery of Prüm that the monks asked Lothar I and Lothar II to confirm it with royal charters. The fact that Villance had passed from Albuin’s brothers to Prüm in turn clarifies why Regino knew detailed information about Albuin’s misadventures: his brothers had been important patrons of his monastery, a fact that was memorialized in two royal charters in Prüm’s archive. Albuin’s family apparently remained influential in the Ardennes region around Prüm while Regino was abbot, since the count of the nearby Eifelgau (where Prüm owned property) was also named Albuin. Thus, although Regino was writing in the early tenth century, there are reasons to believe he took an active interest in the history of Albuin’s family and thus had access to detailed information about the events of 864.

At this point one might simply conclude that Hincmar and Regino offer fundamentally different accounts of Charles the Young’s forest misadventure and that these ‘contested narratives’ cannot be reconciled. However, several pieces of neglected evidence shed additional light on the contradictions in the chronicles. To begin, Regino’s contention that Charles the Young’s ‘hunting accident’ actually was a failed ambush is to a certain extent indirectly corroborated by Hincmar himself. Hincmar notably admitted that someone had in fact plotted an unsuccessful nocturnal attack in a forest in 864, although he alleged that the perpetrator had been, not the king’s son, but rather Count Bernard of Autun, the son of Bernard of Septimania. According to Hincmar, Bernard planned to waylay and murder Charles the Bald (or some of his supporters) as vengeance for the execution of his father twenty years earlier. Bernard’s plot failed, however, and the king drove him into flight and confiscated his honours.

70 DD Zw 25, ed. by Schieffer, pp. 62–63.
Hincmar’s version of these events may be accurate, but it is possible that he told this story to draw attention away from the other failed nocturnal ambush that year, that of Charles the Young.

The second piece of evidence comes from the *Magdeburg Centuries*, a sixteenth-century ecclesiastical history by Protestant scholars around Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–75). The *Magdeburg Centuries* report that a now-lost ninth-century Fulda letter collection contained detailed information about the case of Albuin. The information about Albuin from these lost Fulda letters can be summarized as follows:

1. Albuin was a close relative (*nepos*) of Abbot Thioto of Fulda (856–69).
2. Abbot Thioto wrote a letter to Pope Nicholas I asking him to protect Albuin for having injured Charles the Young, since Albuin had not known who it was when he wounded the king’s son (‘qui inscius vulnus inflixerat Carolo’).
3. Thioto gave his letter to Abbot Eigil of Flavigny (who was the former abbot of Prüm) to deliver to Pope Nicholas.
4. The Fulda monks petitioned Louis the German to protect Albuin.

Taken together, these references to Albuin from the lost Fulda letter collection independently corroborate the essence of Regino’s account, which was that Albuin did not know who Charles the Young was when he wounded him. It is difficult to envision how this could have happened in the context of horseplay during a friendly hunt as Hincmar claimed, since under such circumstances Albuin presumably would have recognized his assailant. Moreover, the additional details that Thioto of Fulda was Albuin’s relative and that the Fulda monks asked Louis the German to protect him corroborate Regino’s statements that Albuin had powerful relatives and that his deed forced him to flee Charles the Bald’s kingdom. At the same time, the fact that Thioto gave his letter to Eigil, the former abbot of Prüm, gives additional reason to believe that Regino had access to detailed information about Charles the Young’s injury.

A final piece of evidence concerning the forest misadventure of Charles the Young comes from an unexpected source: a *chanson de geste* (‘song of heroic

---

73 Eigil had been abbot of Prüm 853–60 before Charles the Bald made him abbot of Flavigny in c. 861. In 865 he became archbishop of Sens and in 866 delivered a letter from Hincmar to Pope Nicholas: *Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. by Nelson, p. 133 and n. 16.
74 *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, ed. by Dümmler, nos 33 and 36, p. 532.
deeds’) known as *Huon of Bordeaux*. Written by an anonymous thirteenth-century French poet, *Huon of Bordeaux* tells the fantastical adventures of the knight Huon, the son of Duke Seguin of Bordeaux, during the reign of Charlemagne.\(^7^5\)

The young hero’s tale begins when he unwittingly slays Charlemagne’s wicked son Charlot, who has rebelled against his father. Charlemagne demands that Huon fulfil a seemingly impossible quest to obtain pardon for his crime: travel to the court of the emir of Babylon, decapitate the first man he meets in the emir’s banqueting hall, kiss the emir’s daughter three times, and bring back to France the emir’s beard and canine teeth. Huon is able to fulfil his mission with the help of a magical elf king named Auberon. After surviving many adventures with Auberon and marrying the emir’s daughter Esclarmonde, Huon regains Charlemagne’s favour and his patrimony in Bordeaux.

Although set during the reign of Charlemagne, the general scholarly consensus is that *Huon of Bordeaux* has no historical foundation.\(^7^6\) However, as Auguste Longnon noted in an 1879 article, the episode of Huon slaying Charlot in fact seems to be based on Albuin’s wounding of Charles the Young in 864.\(^7^7\)

The parallels between the two stories are striking, and Longnon’s case can be strengthened. Both stories hinge on the conflict between a Carolingian father and his rebellious son, both named Charles. (‘Charlot’ means ‘little Charles’ in medieval French, thus preserving the sense of *Karolus iuvenis*, Charles ‘the Young’.) The story of Charlot shares unmistakable details in common with Regino’s version of Charles the Young’s injury. The wicked Charlot ambushes Huon and his young brother Gerard in a forest as they travel to court, but Huon does not recognize the king’s son because he has donned a helmet and disguised his coat of arms. Although taken by surprise, Huon inflicts a fatal blow to Charlot’s head. The *Huon* poet painted a vivid scene of the ambush:

> Adont hurtait le boin chevalx de prix,
> La lance baisse, s’ait l’escut avant mis,
> Enver Huon en vint tous esramis;
> De tant vait mal au gentis filz Seguin


\(^7^6\) Lens, ‘Huon of Bordeaux’, p. 149.

Qu’il n’ot el dolz le blanc haubert vestis,
Et de tant bien qu’il ot le blanc forbis.
Or escoutez dou damoiselz qu’il fist:
Lou boin mantelz d’escarlette ait saisís,
Enter son bras l’anvolleppait et mist,
Pues trait l’espee don’t l’adoubait Seguin;
Le chevalx hurte des esperon d’or fin,
Contre Charlot en vint tout aaitis,
Et si ver lui, qui Dieu puist malleýr!
Or s’antreffierent li damoiselz de pris:
Charlot ferit Huelin au fier vis
Desor le bras ou le mantelz ot mis,
Qu’il li despiece la panne de l’ermin
Et enaprés le drap de Belvoisin;
Entre lez coustes et le blanc drap de lin
Li conduit drot son espiet poiteving —
Dieu le sauvait qu’a cheýr mal ne fist! —
Et cil paisse oultre sor le chevalx de pris.
En trepaissant le fiert si Huelin
Amont sor l’ialme ou l’escherboucle cist
Ne li vallut la monte d’un eslit;
La blanc coiffe qu’il ot dessus assis
Ne li haubert, qu fuit blans et trellis,
Nel porent oncque transfer ne garantir
Qu’il nel pourfande entresi jusqu’a pis;
Estourt son colz, del chevalz l’abaitit,
Jus a la terre est cheûs mort souvins.

(Then [Charlot] spurs his brave horse,
Lowers his lance, positions his shield before him,
And charges at Huon.
The noble son of Seguin is in a bad situation
Because he is not wearing his white hauberk.
But he can still fight and draws his shining blade.
Listen to what the young nobleman does:
He takes his scarlet cloak
And winds it round his arm.
He grips the sword with which Seguin knighted him,
Urges forward his horse with golden spurs,
And charges at Charlot
While the other man [God curse him!] comes toward him.
The young men crash together.
Charlot strikes Huon fiercely
On the arm protected by the mantle,
Slicing in half the scarlet cloak
Made of fabric from Beauvais.
Between his ribs and white linen shirt
He drives his spear,
But God averts the blow from his body.
Just as Charlot charges past,
Huon strikes him on his helm
Where a garnet is set:
The helmet does not give the least protection.
Neither the white hood he wears beneath
Nor the shining hauberk of linked mail
Gives him additional security:
He is hacked in twain down to the chest.
Completing the blow with a twist, he knocks Charlot from his horse
And throws him on the ground where he lays dead in a heap.)

For the 1898 French translation of *Huon of Bordeaux* by Gaston Paris, the popular art nouveau illustrator Manuel Orazi contributed twelve elegant pictures of Huon’s adventures, including one of Charlot’s ambush in the forest. Orazi skilfully captured the moment just before Charlot’s death: Huon, with sword raised and tunic wrapped around his shield arm, evades Charlot’s lance as he prepares to deliver the fatal blow.

There are other parallels strengthening the argument that the opening scenes of *Huon of Bordeaux* went back to the memory of Albuin’s injuring of Charles the Young. To begin, the name of the elf king Auberon, Huon’s companion in his adventures, seems to be a variant of Albuin, which in fact means ‘elf friend’ in Frankish. At the conclusion of the poem, Auberon makes Huon the heir to his kingdom, thereby drawing a close connection between the two figures. The poet described Huon as the son of Seguin of Bordeaux, who actually was

---

78 *Huon de Bordeaux*, ed. and trans. by Kibler and Suard, ll. 885–915 (pp. 50–53).
79 *Aventures merveilleuses de Huon de Bordeaux*, trans. by Paris, plate between pp. 24 and 25. In the foreground Orazi depicted a royal seal that he seems to have modelled on those of the Anglo-Norman kings of England.
a magnate early in the reign of Charles the Bald: Count Sigwin of Bordeaux (839–46), the *dux* of Gascony.80 Recalling Charles the Young’s rebellion in Aquitaine, Charlot and his wicked accomplice Amaury plot to seize the duchy of Bordeaux and its surrounding territory.81 It is also significant that, after Huon unwittingly slays Charlot, he is aided by his uncle, the abbot of Cluny, which recalls Abbot Thioto of Fulda’s efforts to intervene with Pope Nicholas on the behalf of his *nepos* Albuin. Indeed, in the *chanson de geste*, Huon visits Rome where the pope pardons his crime of killing the king’s son, which may be a faint echo of Pope Nicholas’s role in obtaining absolution for Albuin.


81 *Huon de Bordeaux*, ed. and trans. by Kibler and Suard, l. 266 (p. 16).
Another crucial parallel is the mendacious account that the rebel Amaury gives when he brings Charlot’s corpse to Charlemagne’s court. When the horrified king demands an explanation, Amaury falsely claims that the injury occurred during a hunt:

Sor cez brullet, que ciet desor Paris,
La en allemme jouer, et moy et li,
Et si getayme nous ostour el laris.
Ung en perdisme ersoir a l’avesprir;
Huy maitinet, quant il fuit esclersi,
Si encontrasme Gerard et Huelin;
Hue l’aisney avoit l’oisel saisi.
Charlot vous filz son oisel li requist
Et li traiitre moult bien li escondit;
Tant estriverent qu'i ferit Gerardin.
Quant le vit Hue, si trait le brant forby,
Sel pourfandit enfressi jusques pis,
Pues s’an tornait, fuyait de devant my,
Il et cez frere sor lez chevalx de pris;
Nel pos ataindre, s’an fus au cuer marris.

(In the small wood not far from Paris
[Charlot] and I went hunting
And set out into the heath.
We got lost around evening,
And in the morning at sunrise
We encountered Gerard and Huon.
Huon, the elder, had caught a bird.
And Charlot your son demanded it,
But the traitor flatly refused to hand it over.
The argument escalated so far that Charlot struck Gerard.
Seeing this, Huon drew his shining blade
And split Charlot down to the chest.
He then turned his reins before me and fled
On his mighty horse with his brother.
I am sorry to say that I could not catch them.)

Here we find that Amaury’s fabricated report of Charlot’s death echoes Hincmar’s narrative in the *Annals of St-Bertin*: an unexpected mishap during an otherwise friendly hunt in the forest. In this way, *Huon of Bordeaux* contains
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82 *Huon de Bordeaux*, ed. and trans. by Kibler and Suard, ll. 1404–18 (pp. 78–81).
vestiges of both Carolingian narratives of Charles the Young’s injury and suggests an explanation for their co-existence: the account by Regino (which is independently supported by the lost Fulda letters) seems to preserve a more accurate description of what actually happened (a failed ambush perpetrated by the king’s rebellious son), while Hincmar’s report reflects the attempt to cover-up a debacle that was politically embarrassing to the king. However, there is no evidence that the Huon poet actually knew the *Annals of St-Bertin* or Regino’s *Chronicle*. Instead, he apparently based the episode on oral stories that circulated in West Francia/France between the ninth and thirteenth centuries. It is significant that the *Huon* poet probably came from Picardy, which is precisely the region around Compiègne and Cuise. 83

In sum, one cannot harmonize the different accounts of the forest misadventure of Charles the Young without distorting these ‘contested narratives’. Hincmar of Reims, Ado of Vienne, and Regino of Prüm give fundamentally different explanations of what happened to Charles the Bald’s namesake that fateful evening in 864 in the Forest of Cuise. It does an injustice to these authors to try to synthesize their separate versions into a ‘super-narrative’ that in the end does not reflect what any one author actually wrote. On the other hand, by using a methodology that combines textual analysis of the chronicles with an examination of other evidence — charters, letters, poetry, as well as the political context — we can offer a plausible explanation of ‘what really happened’ and how the different narratives of the event came into being. The evidence we have examined supports the conclusion that Regino’s account is closer to the actual historical event, while Hincmar’s report reflects the archbishop of Reims’s attempt to whitewash as best he could an event that was deeply distressing to himself and Charles the Bald.

Once this is recognized, we can offer a new explanation of Charles the Young’s forest misadventure that places it firmly within the political context of his recent failed rebellion in Aquitaine. Deposed by his father and brought back in custody to Compiègne in early 864, Charles the Young lashed out violently against Albuin, a youthful count from a powerful family that supported Charles the Bald and who likely had participated in the king’s campaign against his son. Resentful of his recent humiliation, the young Charles sought to injure or kill Albuin as he returned one night from hunting in the Forest of Cuise — a privilege that itself indicates Albuin’s high favour with the king. The ambush backfired, however, and Albuin, who did not recognize his assailant, seriously wounded the king’s son. 84

83 Lens, ‘Huon of Bordeaux’, p. 149.
84 *This interpretation agrees with Martina Giese’s argument about hunts serving as a stage*
Hincmar then attempted to cover up this politically embarrassing episode in the Forest of Cuise by cloaking it in the guise of a traditional royal hunt. As we have seen, he even took the unusual step of reporting three other Carolingian hunting misadventures that same year, thereby making the case that such sylvan mishaps were not unique to the West Frankish dynasty. He also reported another failed nocturnal ambush that same year, that of Bernard of Autun, perhaps as a strategy to displace the memory of Charles the Young’s failed surprise attack. And, after 864, Hincmar revived the tradition of recording regular royal hunts in the *Annals of St-Bertin*, thus reaffirming Charles the Bald’s connection to the hunting traditions of his ancestors and asserting that the king still enjoyed God’s favour. Nevertheless, both versions of the story evidently circulated by word of mouth in the region around Compiègne, and several centuries later they provided the raw material for the *Huon* poet’s account of the slaying of Charlot.

The misadventure in the Forest of Cuise had a profound impact on the careers of the people involved. Charles the Young was left horribly disfigured and incapacitated by his head wound and other injuries. Hincmar noted that the king’s son subsequently suffered serious epileptic fits (‘cerebro commoto, diutius epilemtica passione vexatus’), which can be the result of a serious traumatic brain injury.85 In the months after the tragedy, the king issued charters requesting that his subjects pray not only for himself and Ermentrude, but, uncharacteristically, also ‘ad posteritatis nostre salutem’ (for the health of our offspring).86 Two charters reveal that Charles the Bald visited the Forest of Cuise in the autumn of 864: undoubtedly to hunt, but perhaps also to view the site of his son’s injury and assert that he did not fear the ‘work of the devil’.87 The following year Charles the Bald acquiesced to the requests of the Aquitanian

---

86 *Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve*, ed. by Giry and others, ii, nos 273–75, pp. 114, 117, 119. One recipient (no. 275, p. 119) was the Aquitanian archbishop Rodulf of Bourges, who seems to have been a former guardian of Charles the Young; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 174.
87 Hincmar does not record Charles’s autumn visit to Cuise, but it is demonstrated by two charters issued on 22 November 864: *Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve*, ed. by Giry and others, ii, nos 277–78, pp. 120–23. Charles made these grants at Ermentrude’s request, a detail that highlights the fact that queens often accompanied kings on their seasonal hunts: Goldberg, *In the Manner of the Franks*, pp. 95, 114–15, 125–26, 240.
magnates to reinstate Charles the Young as their king, even though he had not fully recovered.\textsuperscript{88} It may be that his once-handsome, now disfigured son was an embarrassment to the king, an unwelcome reminder of an ominous misfortune that Charles the Bald wanted removed from the eyes of the court. Shipped off to Aquitaine, Charles the Young lingered on for over a year as an incapacitated shadow king while his father managed the government of that region from afar.\textsuperscript{89} He died from complications from his injuries on 29 September 866 at an obscure manor near Buzançais, west of Bourges.\textsuperscript{90} Notably, Charles the Bald did not grant his namesake a royal burial at Saint-Denis, nor did he attend the funeral. Charles the Young was quietly laid to rest in the church of St Sulpice in Bourges by the archbishop and his brother Carloman. Charles the Young’s death left Louis the Stammerer as the last of Charles the Bald’s sons eligible to inherit the West Frankish throne.

This dramatic event shook Albuin’s career as well. As we have seen, his wounding of the king’s son forced him to flee West Francia to escape execution, and he apparently for a time sought refuge in the kingdom of Louis the German. Just a few months after Charles’s injury, Thioto of Fulda’s letter-carrier Eigil of Flavigny met with Charles the Bald at Reims, where they undoubtedly talked about the case of Albuin.\textsuperscript{91} In July 865, Pope Nicholas I’s envoy Arsenius of Orte also arrived at Charles the Bald’s court to discuss (among other things) the matter of Albuin.\textsuperscript{92} In the end, it seems that Charles the Bald could not permanently remain at odds with Albuin, since he needed an alliance with his powerful relatives. Indeed, immediately after Ermentrude died on 6 October 869, Charles the Bald took as his wife Richildis, the daughter of Albuin’s brother Bivin, to secure political support in Lotharingia.\textsuperscript{93} Albuin’s family remained powerful after Charles the Bald’s death, and in 879 Richildis’s

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Annales de Saint-Bertin}, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 865, pp. 117–18.


\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Annales de Saint-Bertin}, ed. by Grat, Vielliard, and Clémencet, a. 866, p. 130. A later source claims he was poisoned, but there is no contemporary evidence to substantiate this: Longnon, ‘L’élément historique’, p. 9 n. 3.

\textsuperscript{91} The king was favourably disposed toward Eigil during this meeting, and at his request he issued a charter for Prüm and soon thereafter appointed Eigil archbishop of Sens: \textit{Receuil des actes Charles II le Chauve}, ed. by Giry and others, ii, nos 271–72, 295, pp. 109–12, 151.


brother became the first non-Carolingian king in over a century, Boso of Provence (879–87).  

As for Albuin himself, he seems eventually to have recovered his position in the West Frankish kingdom. Hincmar mentions an Albuinus comes in the service of Louis the Stammerer, and this may be the same man who had injured Louis’s brother. If this identification is correct, then Albuin enjoyed high favour with Charles the Bald’s heir, since Louis the Stammerer entrusted him with the important responsibility of delivering his crown, sword, and other regalia to his son Louis III (879–82) as he lay on his deathbed at Compiègne in 879. Albuin disappears from the historical record at this point. But, as we have seen, this Carolingian nobleman with the curious name meaning ‘elf friend’ attained a strange immortality by living on in European literature in the guise of the elf king Auberon in Huon of Bordeaux. Shakespeare knew this chanson de geste through an early English translation, and it was Auberon who served as the model for his fairy king Oberon in A Midsummer Night’s Dream. In turn, Auberon/Oberon apparently was one of the inspirations for J. R. R. Tolkien’s Elrond Half-elven, the lord of Rivendell, one of the last refuges of the Eldar (elves) in Middle Earth. And through this peculiar literary genealogy of Albuin-Auberon-Oberon-Elrond, the Frankish count who accidentally wounded Charles the Young in 864 found himself sailing on the last ship from Middle Earth at the close of the Third Age: 

In the twilight of autumn it sailed out of Mithlond, until the seas of the Bent World fell away beneath it, and the winds of the round sky troubled it no more, and borne upon the high airs above the mists of the world it passed into the Ancient West, and an end was come for the Eldar of story and of song.

---

97 Lens, ‘Huon of Bordeaux’, pp. 151–52; Rose, Spirits, Fairies, p. 244.
98 Tolkien, The Hobbit, p. 60, first introduced Elrond as an ‘elf-friend’. For the name of Elrond and names meaning ‘elf friend’ (Elwin, Elfwine, Alboin, Elendil), see The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien, ed. by Carpenter, pp. 346–47. In Out of the Silent Planet, C. S. Lewis loosely modelled his protagonist, the philologist Dr Elwin Ransom, on Tolkien. Concerning Elrond, see Foster, Complete Guide to Middle Earth, pp. 144–45.
chanson de geste through an early English translation, and it was Auberon who the guise of the elf king Auberon in 'friend' attained a strange immortality by living on in European literature in we have seen, this Carolingian nobleman with the curious name meaning 'elf Clémencet, a. 869, p. 156.
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Hugo, abbot of Saint-Quentin and son of Hugh of Fleury: 277
Humbert, former count of Bourges: 359
Hugo, abbot of Saint-Quentin and son of Hugh of Fleury: 277
Huon of Bordeaux: 372, 373–75, 376
Huon of Bordeaux, chanson de geste: 372–75, 376–77, 378, 380
Illyricum: 77 n. 45, 302
Irenaeus, bishop of Lyon: 283
Isaiah, biblical prophet: 306, 334
Isicius, bishop of Vienne: 283
Isidore, bishop of Sevilla: 2, 276
Chronica Maiora: 21, 130, 160, 202, 208, 213, 274, 275
Chronica Minora: 214
De natura rerum: 133
Etymologiae: 171, 214, 247, 257
Historia Gothorum, Vandalorum et Suevorum: 74
Ismaelites/Ismaeliti: 333, 336, 338, 341
Israel: 253, 337
Italy: 10, 23, 40, 45, 46, 48, 50, 66, 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77 n. 45, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 88, 100, 131, 133, 134, 155, 277, 280, 292, 302, 303, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325, 327, 335, 336, 339, 343, 344, 346, 362, 364, 369
Northern: 75, 126, 180
Jeremiah, biblical prophet: 52, 55, 92, 306
Jerome: 67, 137, 163, 171, 176, 204, 275
Chronicon: 20, 55, 161 n. 19, 166, 202, 204, 213, 214, 237, 244, 274, 295
De viris illustribus: 276, 295, 305–07, 308, 309
Jerusalem: 131, 179, 246
heavenly: 40, 47
John I, pope: 68 n. 10, 74 n. 31, 74 n. 32, 75, 76, 82
John Chrysostom: 170, 305 n. 67
John VIII, pope: 332
John the Baptist, saint: 45, 54, 332
Jordanes: 2, 161 n. 19
Getica: 72–73, 81 n. 67, 82, 83–84, 88, 89, 301, 302
Historia Romana: 72–74, 82, 301
Joseph, biblical person: 51
Joshua, biblical person: 44; see also Wala
Josiah, biblical king: 253
Judith, biblical book of: 55
Julian, Roman emperor: 143–44, 179, 307
Julius Africanus: 274
Justina, wife of Valentinian I: 53, 54, 55, 281
Justinian I, Eastern Roman emperor: 53, 54, 124, 302
Justinian II, Eastern Roman emperor: 162
Justus, bishop of Lyon: 283
Lactantius: 231
Lamech, biblical patriarch: 214
Landenulf I, count of Capua: 332
Lando I, count of Capua: 332
Landulf I, count of Capua: 334 n. 76, 340, 342
Landulf II, bishop and count of Capua: 342
Langres: 335
Laon: 127, 174
Laurentius, pope: 81
Lausanne: 83
Leander, bishop of Seville: 303
Le Mans: 272
Leo I, pope: 282
Leo III, pope: 45, 74 n. 31, 241, 242, 243, 251
Leo Marsicanus, Chronica monasterii Casinensis: 323, 324, 330
Liber historiae Francorum: 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 202–03, 217, 218, 219, 237, 246, 249, 276
Libius Severus, Western Roman emperor: 247
Nithard: 320, 321
Noah, biblical patriarch: 213, 214, 275
Noirmoutier, island: 40, 51

Octavius Augustus, Roman emperor: 132, 133, 134, 142, 241, 244, 245, 246, 257, 275, 291, 302
Odoacer, king of Italy: 68 n. 10, 71 n. 18, 73, 75, 77 n. 45, 81, 246
Orosius: 124, 166

Ostrogoths: 66–67, 69, 70, 71–72, 73, 80, 81, 82, 84, 88, 89, 100, 302
Ovid, Roman poet: 55, 90

Palermo: 72 n. 26, 83
Palladius, Opus agriculturae: 159, 167, 172
Pandulf, count of Capua: 329, 332
Pantheon: 293, 303–04
Paschasius, bishop of Vienne: 283
Paschasius Radbertus, abbot of Corbie: 21, 44, 51, 56, 57, 92, 137
Vita Adalhardi: 39–40, 43–48, 50, 57, 90–91
Paul the Deacon: 325, 330, 333

Historia Romana: 82
Paul, apostle: 282, 299
Paula, patroness of Jerome: 55
Pavia: 68 n. 10, 80, 81, 322
Pelagians, Christian group: 156
Persia: 133, 134, 143
Persians: 131, 134, 162, 303
Pertz, Georg Heinrich: 8–10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 216, 271
Peter, apostle: 274, 282, 305
Peter the Deacon: 330
Phassur, biblical person: 55

Peutinger, Konrad, German humanist: 79
Philip II, king of Macedon: 131, 133, 134
Philistines, biblical people: 253
Phocas, Eastern Roman emperor: 303
Picus, mythological Roman king: 164
Pippin II, Carolingian mayor of the palace: 162, 232
Pippin III, Carolingian king: 12, 14–15, 25, 44, 326
Pippin I, Carolingian king of Aquitaine: 55
Pippin, Carolingian king of Italy: 45, 82, 321 n. 11, 322
Pompeius, tribune of Julius Caesar: 279
Pontius Pilate: 281
Procopius of Caesarea: 124
Provence: 284
Prüm, monastery of: 171, 277, 366, 370, 371, 379 n. 91
Quiriacus, tribune of Julius Caesar: 279
Quierzy, capitulary of: 362

Ratian: 75 n. 38, 339, 340
Radelchis I, Lombard prince of Benevento: 328, 331, 336, 343
Radoald, abbot of St Benedict at Salerno: 324, 327
Ratchis, Lombard king: 326, 339
Ravena: 66, 67–68, 71 n. 18, 71 n. 20, 72, 76, 77, 80 n. 60, 81, 82, 87 n. 101, 88, 93, 126, 339, 340, 347
Raymund, count of Toulouse: 359 n. 16, 360
Reccared I, Visigothic king: 303
Regensburg: 76 n. 38, 161 nn. 19–20, 176, 180, 212
Reginbert of Reichenau, librarian: 71 n. 18, 73 n. 26, 78, 79 n. 58, 173, 175, 180
Reichenau: 68, 71 n. 18, 76, 79 n. 56, 79 n. 58, 89, 96, 127, 155, 159 n. 14, 160 n. 18, 161 n. 19, 161 n. 20, 165, 168, 172–73, 175, 176–78, 180
Remigius, archbishop of Lyon: 277
Rhineland: 237
Rhône, river: 280
Richard of Cluny: 277
Richard, brother of Albin: 369, 370
Richbod, abbot of Lorsch and archbishop of Trier: 249
Richildis, wife of Charles the Bald: 365 n. 53, 368, 379
Ricimer, magister militum: 247
Robert II, king of France: 26, 27
Romans: 45, 81 n. 71, 145, 240, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 257, 291, 292, 297, 301, 302, 331, 335, 346
Romans, biblical book of: 299
Roman Empire: 11, 19, 20, 21, 40, 57, 123, 130, 132, 133, 143, 147, 162, 182, 240, 244, 245–47, 248, 252, 276, 280, 284, 297, 300
Western: 2, 5 n. 17, 7 n. 45, 73, 77 n. 45, 84, 246, 301, 302
Eastern: 84, 247, 277
sack of: 123, 130, 132, 133, 138, 145–46
Romulus Augustus, Western Roman emperor: 301, 302
Rufinus of Aquileia, Historia ecclesiastica: 125, 165, 167, 170, 172, 178, 179, 181, 237, 295, 302; see also Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica
St Amand: 22, 72 n. 25, 127, 206
St Chef: 278
Ste Colombe: 280
St Denis: 27 n. 100, 274, 362, 368, 369, 379
St Gallen: 96, 127, 133, 157, 159 n. 14, 165, 173, 175, 176, 177–78, 180, 278, 279, 394 n. 16, 347
St Martin, Trier: 367
St Maximin, Trier: 77 n. 47, 127, 215, 216
St Riquier: 82, 83, 89
St Seine: 211–12, 224
St Vaast: 85
Salerno: 324, 327, 331, 332, 338, 339, 340, 343
Salzburg: 128, 176, 206
Samuel, biblical prophet: 337, 344
San Vincenzo al Volturno: 329
Satyrus of Milan, saint, brother of Ambrose: 52
Saul, biblical king: 253, 337
Sawdan, emir of Bari: 337, 343
Saxons: 43, 49–50, 52, 57
Saxony: 44, 48, 49–50, 340
Sedulius Scottus, De Christianis Rectoribus: 137
Seguin, fictional duke of Bordeaux in Huon of Bordeaux: 372, 373–74, 375
Seligenstadt: 89, 95, 96, 98–99
Sempronius, Roman consul: 280
Senones: 280
Septimania: 212, 234, 235, 250, 258
Severus, priest in Vienne: 283
Shakespeare, William: 380
Sicily: 131, 132, 336
Sicard, prince of Benevento: 343
Siconulf, prince of Salerno: 328, 331, 336, 343
Sidonius Apollinaris, Gallo-Roman aristocrat: 85
Sigwin of Bordeaux, duke of Gascony: 375
Sisteron, council of: 278
Smaragdus, abbot of St-Mihiel: 231
Socrates, church historian: 56, 295
Solomon, biblical king: 253–55, 256, 257
Sospolus, tribune of Julius Caesar: 279
Sozomen, church historian: 56, 295
Slavs: 235 n. 16, 321 n. 11, 324
Spain: 128, 132, 133, 280, 282, 301, 336
Visigothic: 74, 124, 303
Spoletini, Spoletenses: 340
Spoletto: 338, 339
Stavelot, abbey of: 215
Stein, Heinrich Friedrich Karl von und zum: 8
Stephen, saint: 283
Stephen IV, pope: 252
Stephen V, pope: 329
Stephen, count of Nevers: 359–60
Sulis: 369
Sulpicius Severus: 307
Symmachus, pope: 81
Symmachus, Roman politician: 74 n. 32, 75, 76, 82
Taranto: 339, 343
Tasia, wife of King Ratchis: 326
Tassilo III, duke of Bavaria: 16
Teanenses: 340
Tertry, battle of: 232
Teutons: 280
Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris*: 18, 79, 172, 238 n. 33, 251 n. 89
Theoderic, son of Charlemagne: 251
Theoderic II, Visigothic king: 85
Theodoric, Ostrogothic king: 20, 65, 66, 67, 68–69, 70–82, 83, 84–85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 92, 99, 100
statue of: 67, 68, 76, 82, 84, 93
death of: 68 n. 10, 73, 74, 75, 76
Theodosius I, Roman emperor: 53, 54, 55, 132, 144, 145, 247, 300, 305
penance of: 54, 57
Theodosius II, Eastern Roman emperor: 300
Theodore, church historian: 56, 295
Theodrada, abbess of Notre Dame in Soissons: 44
Theodulf, bishop of Orléans: 67, 90
Thermopylae: 131, 138
Theudarius, pupil of Caesarius of Arles: 278, 283 n. 66
Theutberga, wife of Lothar II: 368
Thioto, abbot of Fulda: 371, 375, 379
Tigurini: 280
Titus, Roman emperor: 141
Tolkien, John Ronald Reuel, English writer and philologist: 380
Toulouse: 240
Tours: 88, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 136, 138, 139, 146
Trajan, Roman emperor: 132, 141
Trier: 77 n. 47, 127, 216, 367
Trophimus, first bishop of Arles: 282
Troy: 134, 248
Tuscia: 340
Tusey, synod of: 278

Valerian, Roman emperor: 141
Vandals: 124, 301
Venice: 128, 340
Verberic: 369
Verdun: 272
Verona: 81, 82 n. 76
Victor, bishop of Tunnuna: 274
Vienne: 23, 271, 272, 275, 277, 278, 279–84
Villance: 369, 370
Visigoths: 75, 274, 325
Vivarium: 77 n. 45, 296
Vouillé, battle of: 302

Waitz, Georg: 204, 215 n. 65, 216, 220, 221, 325
Wala, abbot of Corbie: 20, 39, 40, 44, 48, 49, 51–52, 53, 55, 57, 92; see also Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*
Walahfrid Strabo, monk: 3, 18–19, 98, 127
Libellus de exordiis et incrementis: 179
*Visio Wettini*: 155–57
Warin, abbot of Corvey: 49
Weltenburg, abbey of: 212
Wetti of Reichenau, monk: 155; see also Heito, *Visio Wettini*; Walafrid Strabo, *Visio Wettini*
William the Great, duke of Aquitaine: 26
Wilhelm, Alexandre, Jesuit priest and humanist: 215–16, 218–19
Wodan, Germanic god: 322
Wulfila, Gothic bishop and missionary: 67
Zachariah, biblical prophet: 345
Zeno, Eastern Roman emperor: 81
Zotto, Lombard duke of Benevento: 325
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Classical civilization (and hence contemporary Western culture) was constantly in contact with a variety of cultures and traditions: yet these influences were not fully acknowledged or understood in the past. This series of monographs and edited collections addresses exactly these issues, by focusing on the social, religious, and cultural interactions between East and West, North and South.

Historiography and Identity

The six-volume sub-series *Historiography and Identity* unites a wide variety of case studies from Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages, from the Latin West to the emerging polities in Northern and Eastern Europe, and also incorporates a Eurasian perspective which includes the Islamic World and China. The series aims to develop a critical methodology that harnesses the potential of identity studies to enhance our understanding of the construction and impact of historiography.

Carolingian Approaches

This volume explores the extent to which the reinstitution of the Empire in Western Europe brought about new ways of reconciling the multitude of post-Roman identities with the way the past was shaped in historiographical narratives. From universal histories to local chronicles, and from narratives that support Carolingian rule to histories with a more local focus, the centralization of power and authority in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries forced those who engaged with their own past and that of their community to acknowledge the new situation, and situate themselves in it. The contributions in this volume each depart from a single source, event, or community, and relate their findings to the broader issue of whether the rise of the multi-ethnic Carolingian court allowed for more inclusive narratives to be created, or if their self-proclaimed place at the centre of the Frankish world actually created a context in which local communities were given new tools to assert themselves.