Social Crisis and Temporalities in Thinking: A Comparative Study of Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard, 817–843

Tianpeng Zhang

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Sheffield
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Department of History

March, 2024

ABSTRACT

This thesis follows the path of *Begriffsgeschichte*, focusing on the contemporary representations of three concepts (*res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia*) in a specific period of the Carolingian regime (817–843 AD). It concentrates on three sources: Einhard's *Vita Karoli* (817x830), Nithard's *Historiae* (841–843) and Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* (843), which were written during the period when the Carolingian empire was moving from its heyday to crisis. The thesis shows that the Frankish lay nobles of the Carolingian period were accustomed to using concepts as tools and weapons for the expression of their ideas and in political struggles, through which the temporalities in their thinking were exposed. The concepts of *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* all play an important role in the *Vita Karoli*, the *Historiae* and the *Liber Manualis*. However, the concepts are more firmly bound up with spirituality and eternity in the *Vita Karoli*, whereas in the *Historiae* and the *Liber Manualis* they show a tendency to slip into secularity and provisionality, and sometimes the temporality within them also presents itself as interacting with the spatiality of reality. The thesis argues that these characteristics reflect the different moments of origin of the texts, specifically the *Vita Karoli* before the political crisis following the death of Louis the Pious but the *Historiae* and the *Liber Manualis* after it. From the way in which these three concepts were diachronically used by the Frankish lay nobles, and the subtle changes in the temporalities embedded in them, we gain a glimpse of the relevance of the contemporary political crisis to conceptions of temporality.

Declaration

I, the author, confirm that the Thesis is my own work. I am aware of the University's Guidance on the Use of Unfair Means (www.sheffield.ac.uk/ssid/unfair-means). This work has not been previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, university.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT **2**

LIST OF TABLES **8**

INTRODUCTION **9**

The purpose of this thesis 10

Defining the lay nobility 14

The choice of texts 21

The choice of concepts 30

CHAPTER 1: *BEGRIFFSGESCHICHTE* AS METHODOLOGY **36**

1.1 Introduction 36

1.1.1 Origin and development 36

1.1.2 Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe 39

1.2 Concept and historical time 42

1.2.1 What is the concept? 42

1.2.2 Historical time of concepts 47

1.2.3 Comparison with the *Annales* School 51

1.3 *Begriffsgeschichte* and the Middle Ages 54

1.3.1 Otto Brunner and *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* 54

1.3.2 Koselleck and the *Sattelzeit* 63

1.3.3 François Hartog and the *régimes d'historicité* 68

1.3.4 Reflection and revision of the presuppositions of *Begriffsgeschichte* 74

CHAPTER 2: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY SOURCES, THEIR

AUTHORS, AND THEIR CONTEXTS.....81

2.1 Historical background.....81

2.2 Einhard and the *Vita Karoli*.....88

2.2.1 Einhard and his life.....88

2.2.2 *The Vita Karoli*: date and purposes.....89

2.3 Dhuoda and the *Liber Manualis*.....94

2.3.1 Dhuoda and her life.....94

2.3.2 Bernard of Septimania and his family.....96

2.3.3 Historiographical Debates around Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*.....100

2.3.4 Three temporal layers in the *Liber Manualis*.....105

2.4 Nithard and the *Historiae*.....115

2.4.1 Nithard and his life.....115

2.4.2 Historiographical debates around Nithard's *Historiae*.....117

2.5 Summary of this chapter.....124

CHAPTER 3: *RES PUBLICA*.....128

3.1 Introduction.....128

3.2 Einhard.....131

3.2.1 The ox-cart of the Merovingian kings.....131

3.2.2 Mortal ruler and immortal rulership.....134

3.2.3 Conclusion.....142

3.3 Dhuoda.....143

3.3.1 The emotional tone of the *Liber Manualis*.....143

3.3.2 The cornerstone of fidelity.....147

3.3.3 The *Liber Manualis* and the *Admonitio Generalis*: a comparison.....153

3.3.4 Conclusion.....159

3.4 Nithard 160

3.4.1 *Publica utilitas* 160

3.4.2 *Sacramentum* and Kinship 165

3.4.3 Conclusion 178

CHAPTER 4: *FAMILIA* 180

4.1 Introduction 180

4.2 Einhard 194

4.2.1 Charlemagne's tears 194

4.2.2 Charlemagne's secular relatives as troublemakers 196

4.2.3 Spiritual kinship as a remedy for secular kinship 200

4.2.4 Charlemagne and his spiritual family 204

4.2.5 Conclusion 208

4.3 Dhuoda 209

4.3.1 Dhuoda and Augustine of Hippo 209

4.3.2 The problematic father-son relationship 215

4.3.3 The problematic husband-wife relationship 221

4.3.4 Maternal authority and advice 225

4.3.5 Conclusion 231

4.4 Nithard 232

4.4.1 Men: fathers and sons 234

4.4.2 Women: mother and sisters 237

4.4.3 Conclusion 242

CHAPTER 5: *ECCLESIA* 244

5.1 Introduction 244

5.2 Einhard 252

5.2.1 Imagery of Rome 252

5.2.2 Charlemagne as a writing novice 255

5.2.3 Exegesis and the divine ruler 262

5.2.4 Harbingers of discord 266

5.2.5 Conclusion 269

5.3 Dhuoda 270

5.3.1 Historiography on the 'New Israel' and the Franks 270

5.3.2 Dhuoda and her particular exegesis of Israel 274

5.3.3 Conclusion 280

5.4 Nithard 281

5.4.1 Koselleck and the historiography on medieval spatiality 281

5.4.2 Temporal Frankish identity and biblical discourse 286

5.4.3 The *unitas* of *ecclesia* 290

5.4.4 Spatiality and temporality: tension and interaction 293

5.4.5 Conclusion 297

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS 299

BIBLIOGRAPHY 309

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 '*rector*', '*defensor*' and '*adiutor*' in Einhard's *Vita Karoli* 155

Table 4.1 '*familia'* and '*domus'* in Einhard's *Vita Karoli* 187

Table 4.2 '*familia*' and '*domus*' in Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* 189

Table 4.3 '*familia'* and '*domus'* in Nithard's *Historiae* 191

Table 4.4 The beatitudes and their order in Matthew, Augustine and Dhuoda 211

INTRODUCTION

This thesis draws on the methodology of *Begriffsgeschichte* to examine three concepts in three texts from the first half of the ninth century, written by Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard. Its aim is to obtain a glimpse into the connections between the temporalities in people's thinking and the overall social context, and thereby to gain a further understanding of the Carolingian realm and the people who lived in it during this period.

The thesis is structured as follows. The origins and development of *Begriffsgeschichte*, and in particular the reflections and revisions necessary in order to make this approach suitable for early medieval studies, will be discussed in the first chapter. The lives of Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard, their works and the context of their writing are then presented in Chapter 2. Chapters 3 to 5 offer a sequential analysis of the concepts of *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* in the sources used in this thesis. Finally, this thesis will end with an overall conclusion to tie the argument together and consider its implications for research in this field.

Before launching into the main analysis of this thesis, however, it is necessary first to address some antecedent questions: (1) How was the theme of this thesis identified, and what is the significance of this work? (2) Why choose the writing of lay nobles as the key source? (3) More specifically, why select the texts of Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard as research lenses? And (4) Why pick *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* as target concepts?

The purpose of this thesis

From a historiographical perspective, this thesis argues that medievalists have traditionally not fully engaged with *Begriffsgeschichte* as a methodology. As we shall see, there have been many important studies focusing on concepts from the Carolingian period, of course, but they still tend to work within the framework of *Verfassungsgeschichte* (constitutional history) and hesitate to engage fully with the paradigm of *Begriffsgeschichte*. In other words, instead of the temporality with which *Begriffsgeschichte* is concerned, most historians have focused more on the internal structures of the various communities reflected by the concepts.[1] For example, in the famous debate between Johannes Fried and Hans-Werner Goetz, which will be discussed later, they both explored the concepts of *regnum*, *res publica* and *ecclesia*. Their understandings of the Carolingian regime pervade their arguments about these concepts. That is, they debated whether it was dominated by kings or nobles, or, in Gerd Althoff's words, whether the Carolingian royalty of the ninth century had a *Königsherrschaft ohne Staat* (kingship without a state).[2]

As the example of Fried and Goetz illustrates, the analysis of political terms within the framework of *Verfassungsgeschichte* seems especially popular in the German academic tradition. The German historians who adopt this approach try to overcome the projection of a modern understanding of the state into the past and instead describe the *Verfassung* (constitution) in terms of contemporary concepts. As Walter Pohl has suggested, this opens up a new path.[3] According to Goetz, the notion of 'the concept' is

[1] *Verfassungsgeschichte*, *Begriffsgeschichte* and the definition of temporality will be elaborated in Chapter 1, below.
[2] G. Althoff, *Die Ottonen: Königsherrschaft ohne Staat* (Stuttgart, 2005).
[3] W. Pohl, 'Staat und Herrschaft im Frühmittelalter: Überlegungen zum Forschungsstand', in S. Airlie, W. Pohl, and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), p. 11.

not a research goal in itself, but a way to reach it. The *Verfassungsgeschichte* attempts to bring out the important elements in the concepts of authors of a given period, by clarifying what they represented with the words they used. As Goetz explained, this particular approach first moved in this direction by studying Old High German vocabulary. [4] Certainly, the concept has also been used extensively beyond *Verfassungsgeschichte*: its role in medieval research was well summarised by František Graus in 1986.[5] Thus, in fact, research involving concepts is not a new phenomenon for medievalists and has already produced many valuable results in the fields of political and social history. To name but a few examples, Reinhard Schneider's work on how *caritas* and *fraternitas* expressed the relationship between the kings of the Carolingian subkingdoms,[6] Wolfgang Wehlen's work on how Nithard thought about the concept of *res publica*,[7] as well as the studies of Jochen Johrendt and Franz-Reiner Erkens on the meaning of *miles*[8] have indeed enriched the historiography of political and social history.

However, as I have already pointed out, the method of conceptual history adopted in these works is not quite the same thing as *Begriffsgeschichte*, which has the investigation of temporality as one of its basic purposes. Thus, although my thesis shares the same focus on concepts as these works, it leads to a different destination. A

[4] H. W. Goetz, 'Die Wahrnehmung von "Staat" und "Herrschaft" im frühen Mittelalter', in S. Airlie, W. Pohl, and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), p. 57.
[5] F. Graus, 'Verfassungsgeschichte des mittelalters', *Historische Zeitschrift* 243 (1986), pp. 529–90.
[6] R. Schneider, *Brüdergemeine und Schwurfreundschaft. Der Auflösungsprozeß des Karlingerreiches im Spiegel der caritas-Terminologie in den Verträgen der karlingischen Teilkönige des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1964).
[7] W. Wehlen, *Geschichtsschreibung und Staatsauffassung im Zeitalter Ludwigs des Frommen* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1970), pp. 57–105.
[8] J. Johrendt, '"Milites" und "Militia" im 11. Jahrhundert in Deutschland', in A. Borst (ed.), *Das Rittertum im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1976), pp. 419–36; F. R. Erkens, 'Militia und Ritterschaft. Reflexionen über den Ursprung des Rittertums', *Historische Zeitschrift* 258 (1994), pp. 623–59.

new methodology and a new vision can expand our knowledge of the ninth-century Franks.

On the other hand, in terms of methodology, the achievements based on *Begriffsgeschichte* are found first and foremost in the large series of German dictionaries consisting of long essays on political, social and philosophical subjects, of which the eight-volume *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (1972–1997) and the fifteen-volume *Handbuchpolitisch-sozialer Grundbegriffe in Frankreich 1680–1820* (1985–2000) are the best known.[9] However, these works concentrate on the examination of modern history and have found relatively little reception in medieval studies, especially in Anglophone work.

A recent exception is Matthew Gabriele's study, 'The Historian Hrabanus Maurus and the Prophet Haimo of Auxerre', in which a brief introduction to *Begriffsgeschichte* is placed at the beginning of the work, which hints at the path the article intends to follow.[10] However, while Gabriele does take the temporality in the thinking of two ninth-century monks as his research object, he does not seem to use concepts as the lens of his examination. In other words, in exploring the temporality of medieval thought, Gabriele follows the themes set by *Begriffsgeschichte*, but the fact that his exploration does not proceed through the study of concepts distances him from *Begriffsgeschichte*.

[9] The *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* will be introduced in more detail in Chapter 1.
[10] M. Gabriele, 'The Historian Hrabanus Maurus and the Prophet Haimo of Auxerre: Experiments, Exegesis, and Expectations Emerging from the Ninth Century', in M. B. Gillis (ed.), *Carolingian Experiments* (Turnhout, 2022), pp. 149–64.

By surveying the historiographical works of the eleventh to twelfth centuries, an earlier article by Hans-Werner Goetz also reached the same conclusion as historians working within the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm.[11] He argued that medieval historiography, while not lacking in the idea of chronology, had no 'historical time', but only chronological time. In particular, when looking at a series of illustrations produced between 1157–1185 and c. 1245–1250 for the Chronicle of Otto of Freising, Goetz notes that the three emperors Augustus, Charlemagne and Otto I were arranged in chronological order.[12] Yet they all wore the medieval symbols of power, and the Roman toga and the diadem were missing from Augustus. This anachronism was not caused by the producer's ignorance, but by his intention to establish a connection between the Holy Roman Empire and the ancient Roman Empire. He thus ignored the temporal difference between the three 'Roman Emperors', creating a past that never existed.[13] This finding by Goetz finds parallels with *Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen* ('contemporaneity of the noncontemporaneous'), the core idea of *Begriffsgeschichte*.[14] Like Gabriele, however, Goetz does not use concepts as mediators in this research. The fact that his article does not cite any works by representative scholars of *Begriffsgeschichte* illustrates this point. Thus, taking all of the above together, this thesis will also contribute to the field by extending the time periods to which *Begriffsgeschichte* has been systematically applied.

[11] The arguments of these historians, represented by Reinhart Koselleck, will be presented in Chapter 1.
[12] Ms. Bos. q. 6, 'Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena (Jena)', https://collections.thulb.uni-jena.de/rsc/viewer/HisBest_derivate_00013232/Otto_001r.tif [accessed 8 Sep 2023]. The images of Augustus, Charlemagne and Otto I are at 38v, 67v and 78v respectively.
[13] H. W. Goetz, 'The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', in G. Althoff, J. Fried, and P. J. Geary (eds), *Medieval Concepts of the Past* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 139–66.
[14] The main ideas of *Begriffsgeschichte* will also be introduced in Chapter 1.

Defining the lay nobility

The choice of lay nobles as the *ordo* to be studied in this thesis is based on two considerations. On one hand, most of the authors in the time period examined here were religious, either clergy or from monasteries, and only a few works by lay aristocrats have survived. Taking the works of the lay aristocracy as the texts under investigation therefore helps to deepen our understanding of the spiritual world of this relatively voiceless group. In addition, the lay aristocracy was once considered to be ideologically distinct from their religious contemporaries. Although this view has decreased in popularity, the investigations in this thesis contribute further evidence challenging the traditional interpretation. The analysis presented in the following chapters demonstrates that the view of time prevalent in religious institutions was not only shared by the lay aristocracy, on the basis of which the two formed an ideological community, but it can even be argued that the lay nobility also actively conceived temporalities of thought with different structural characteristics, in response to their own personal experiences and the social contexts in which they lived. As for choosing the nobility over the commoners, the reasoning here is much simpler: in terms of the laity, the surviving written record comes only from elite sources.

However, as this thesis intends to show the temporality of the thinking of lay nobles during the 840s, it is first necessary to define the terms ‘lay’ and ‘laity’ as well as ‘nobility’.

The first concept to be confronted is that of the ‘laity’. Here the matter is fairly clear. In general, in early medieval contexts, ‘lay’ (*laicus*) and ‘secular’ (*secularis*) were synonymous. For instance, in a text on clerical immunity, which was composed in the

fifth century by Bishop Leo of Bourges but accepted by the Carolingian Franks as the work of Pope Leo the Great (c.400–61), two pairs of opposing concepts are established: priestly (*sacerdotalis*)/secular (*saecularis*) and cleric (*clericus*)/layman (*laicus*). The two sets of opposing concepts were equivalent, so that 'lay' (*laicus*) was almost identical to 'secular' (*secularis*), as is confirmed by the expression in the text:

> If a cleric accuse a layman, let the cleric first demand to be heard by the bishop; then if he sees the layman is opposed to his demand, let him, with the permission of his bishop, contend in the judgement of the secular moderator.[15]

At a broader level, Lisa Bailey finds that the same idea is reflected in a large number of council texts from at least the fourth to the seventh centuries, which also see the categories of *laici* and *clerici* (or that of *saeculares* and *clerici*) as covering the whole Christian church.[16] However, the connection with 'secular' did not automatically give a stable connotation to 'lay', for the concept of 'secular' itself was used strategically by the authors of texts according to the rhetorical needs of a given situation.[17] It was marriage that ultimately came to distinguish 'lay' from 'cleric'.[18] For example, a fifth-century letter to Bishop Talasius of Angers states that it was better not to appoint married men as clerics, as they were more likely to have children during their term of office in violation of the canons.[19] The role of marriage in identifying lay people also

[15] 'Si clericus laicum pulset, prius audiri se ab episcopo poscat; tum si petitioni suae laicum viderit obviare, ex permisso episcopi sui in saeculi moderatoris disceptatione confligat'. Latin text based on Berlin, SB, Phillips 1741, fol. 34. Transcribed, edited and translated by Charles West, in C. West, 'Pope Leo of Bourges, Clerical Immunity and the Early Medieval Secular', *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 90–92.
[16] L. K. Bailey, *The Religious Worlds of the Laity in Late Antique Gaul* (London, 2016), pp. 24–26.
[17] West, 'Pope Leo of Bourges', pp. 86–108; R. Whelan, 'After Augustine, After Markus: The Problem of the Secular at the End of Antiquity', *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 12–35; R. Evans, 'A Secular Shift in Carolingian History Writing', *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 36–54.
[18] Cf. R. Stone, 'Spiritual Heirs and Families: Episcopal Relatives in Early Medieval Francia', in A. Höfert, M. Mesley, and S. Tolino (eds), *Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Eunuchs and Bishops in the Pre-Modern World* (London, 2018), pp. 129–48; R. Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 274–78; G. Vocino and C. West, 'On the Life and Continence of Judges: The Production and Transmission of Imperial Legislation in Late Ottonian Italy', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 131 (2019), pp. 87–117.
[19] *Epistola Sancti Lupi et Sancti Eufronii Episcoporum*, ed. C. Munier, *Concilia Galliae, a. 314 – a. 506* (Turnhout, 1963), p. 140. Cf. West, 'Pope Leo of Bourges', p. 95.

applied to women, as lay women were often associated with families and husbands in clerical discourse.[20] However, marriage did not make lay people morally inferior to the clergy, as Dhuoda clearly stated in her handbook to her son.

> The learned doctors of the church do not, indeed, deny its sacred rites to the marriage bed; they only busy themselves in rooting out lechery and illicit intercourse.[21]

Judged by marriage, Einhard and Dhuoda, whose legal spouses were Imma and Bernard, respectively, were clearly lay people. No reference has been found to Nithard being married,[22] but on the basis of another important characteristic of laymen, that of being engaged in warfare,[23] there should be no doubt about the lay status of Nithard, who served in the military for Charles the Bald.

The question of the nature of the *nobilis* ('nobility') in the Carolingian period is more complex. The origin of the medieval nobility and their privileges has been a central concern since the nineteenth century, when the German *Verfassungsgeschichte* tradition sprang into being.[24] To this day, historians are still divided on what 'nobility' meant in early medieval Europe: was it a closed group with a monopoly of power, or was it simply an expression of a free status?[25] The variety of genres and regional variability

[20] V. Garver, *Women and Aristocratic Culture in the Carolingian World* (Ithaca/London, 2011), p. 123.
[21] 'Non enim excludunt doctores nuptiarum sacris iungere thorum; sed concupiscentias stupras inlicitasque a nobis stirpare satagunt.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, ed. and trans. M. Thiébaux *Dhuoda, Handbook for Her Warrior Son: Liber Manualis* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 144–45.
[22] C. Treffort, 'Nithard, petit-fils de Charlemagne: note sur une biographie controversée', *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Picardie* 158 (1994), pp. 415–34.
[23] Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire*, pp. 69–115.
[24] There were two opposing views: one side argued that the noblemen had already existed at the beginning of the Middle Ages, while the other saw the aristocracy as a historical product of class differentiation from a community of equals during the medieval period, see H. Gollwitzer, 'Zum politischen Germanismus des 19. Jahrhunderts', in Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte (ed.), *Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel. Bd. 1* (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 282–356.
[25] T. Reuter, 'Introduction', in T. Reuter (ed.), *The Medieval Nobility: Studies on the Ruling Classes of France and Germany from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century* (Amsterdam/Oxford, 1979), pp. 1–16.

of the sources makes this issue even more complex, if not contradictory.[26] In order to clarify the trajectory of the various opinions surrounding the question of 'nobility', in the course of which the image of the Carolingian nobility gradually became clearer, I shall provide a brief overview of its historiographical development, concluding with the definition that will be used throughout the thesis. This review concentrates on the German perspective because German medievalists have been working in this field for a long time and have produced relatively rich and systematic expositions.[27]

In two articles dating back to the Second World War, Gerd Tellenbach suggested the existence of a *Reichsadel* (imperial nobility) in the Carolingian period and examined their transformation over the following centuries. He argued that the *Reichsadel* evolved into a *Reichsfürst* (imperial prince) in high medieval Germany in the context of the shifting *Verfassungsgeschichte*.[28] Tellenbach considered that 111 members from forty-two families or kinship groups (*Sippe*) made up the ruling *Reichsadel*, who often held prominent positions such as *missus*, *dux*, *princeps*, *marchio*, *comes*, and so on between the eighth and early tenth centuries. More than half of them came from Austrasia and were long associated with the Carolingian family by marriage. They supported the Carolingian kings in the expansion of the realm, leading armies and occupying estates in the newly conquered areas. On the issue of the link between the power structure of the centre with the regions and the forms of noble presence,

[26] Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire*, p. 22. In terms of the Bavarian charters, see C. I. Hammer, 'Land Sales in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Bavaria: Legal, Economic and Social Aspects', *Early Medieval Europe* 6 (1997), pp. 47–76. On the Salic or Ripuarian *leges*, see H. K. Schulze, 'Reichsaristokratie, Stammesadel und fränkische Freiheit: Neuere Forschungen zur frühmittelalterlichen Sozialgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift* 227 (1978), pp. 353–73. On the Carolingian capitularies: J. L. Nelson, 'Nobility in the Ninth Century', in A. Duggan (ed.), *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 43–51.

[27] For a recent English-language approach, see S. Airlie, 'The Aristocracy', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History (vol. II: c. 700– c. 900)* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 431–50.

[28] G. Tellenbach, *Königtum und Stamme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches* (Weimar, 1939); G. Tellenbach, 'Vom karolingischen Reichsadel zum deutschen Reichsfürstenstand', in T. Mayer (ed.), *Adel und Bauer im deutschen Staat des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1943), pp. 22–73.

Tellenbach proposed that the *Reichsadel* established bases throughout the realm by means of extensive kinship networks, which underpinned the political integration of the vast Frankish kingdoms.

The French historian Régine Le Jan makes this point even clearer. She argues that as Carolingian kingship developed, the nobles who travelled to various parts of the realm to take up official positions established local kinship networks and bases, either by integrating themselves with prominent local families with rich estates, or by establishing themselves as great landowners in the area. These families were further functionally united through the activities of a small number of senior family members who held positions in the royal court, forming the *cognatische Sippe* (cognatic kinship group). This open kinship was aligned to the power structure of the realm: through the *Reichsadel* who were in high politics, the Carolingian royalty exerted their influence on the members of the *Sippe* who were in various parts of the realm, thus constructing local governance structures.[29]

Building on Tellenbach's work, Karl Schmid, who was also a central figure in the Freiburg group focusing on the history on the nobility, argued that the list of personal names in sources such as *Libri memoriales* shows that, until the tenth century, noble individuals were in cognatic kinship groups that were variable and fluid, as each member could only be identified by their *Leitnamen* (unique personal names), which were passed down through both the paternal and maternal lines.[30] What gave such an

[29] R. Le Jan, 'Structures familiales et politiques au neuvième siècle: un groupe familial de l'aristocratie franque', *Revue historique* 265 (1981), pp. 289–333. For the same argument, which she sets out at greater length, see: R. Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc (VIIe – Xe siècle). Essai d'anthropologie sociale* (Paris, 1995).
[30] The ideas about *Leitnamen* later became an important basis for the paradigm known as prosopography. Cf. K. F. Werner, 'Important Noble Families in the Kingdom of Charlemagne', in T. Reuter (ed.), *The Medieval Nobility* (Victoria, 1978), pp. 137–202. Yet there has been growing doubt among historians as to the extent to which this

unstable group a collective sense of belonging and made them more aware of their relationship with their cohorts as compared to their ancestors? They were the mutual inheritance of properties and estates, the possession and succession of sacred and secular offices, and the intimate relationship with the kingship that guaranteed those above. The interests of the leading Frankish nobles were concentrated in the king's court; this was the source of their wealth and power. They were related to the royal family by marriage, and the king often entrusted important positions at court and at the local level to these noble relatives, whether they were from the paternal or maternal line, the elder or younger sons. In this sense, the nobility had not yet established a basis for existence independent of the royal power.[31]

However, while arguing that the nobility of the Carolingian period already had a certain collective sense of belonging, Schmid stressed that they should not be seen as having had a solidified identity. According to Heinrich Mitteis, there were two kinds of nobility, and their distinction was always in flux: the *Reichsadel* was transformed from the so-called *Stammesadel* (tribal nobility) by holding public office, while the *Reichsadel* who refused to serve the kings would revert to the *Stammesadel*.[32]

What, then, are the characteristics of the Carolingian aristocracy beyond the structural-functionalist perspective outlined above? Goetz examines the contemporaneous understanding of the Carolingian nobility in various ways and finds that they were seen

assumption of *Leitnamen* is valid. See C. B. Bouchard, *Those of My Blood: Creating Noble Families in Medieval Francia* (Philadelphia, 2001), pp. 7–10.

[31] K. Schmid and J. Wollasch, 'Societas et Fraternitas. Begründung eines kommentierten Quellenwerkes zur Erforschung der Personen und Personengruppen des Mittelalters', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 9 (1976), pp. 1–48; K. Schmid and J. Wollasch, *'Memoria'. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter* (München, 1984); K. Schmid and J. Wollasch, *Gedächtnis, das Gemeinschaft stiftet* (München, 1985).

[32] H. Mitteis, 'Formen der Adelsherrschaft im Mittelalter', in H. Mitteis and L. Petersen (eds), *Die Rechtsidee in der Geschichte. Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Vorträge* (Weimar, 1957), p. 649.

as a leading class with noble origins, wealth, certain qualities and virtues, and in this sense constituted a social identity, although internal hierarchical differences existed among them. However, the importance of holding official positions, the sense of open kinship and the fact that the leading nobles changed with the succession of kings, suggest that it was still not a closed legal identity.[33] Even Wilhelm Störmer, who argued that intermarriage within the same *ordo* became widespread during this period and that a fully-fledged aristocracy already existed, had to admit that the basis for the existence of the aristocracy and the representation of it by contemporaries was very different from that of the aristocracy from the eleventh century onwards. Prior to the tenth century, as the king's favour and service at court were important factors for the nobility in determining their own wealth, status and authority, the *Reichsadel*'s self-perception was centred not on their own households, but on the royal court.[34]

On the other hand, if the interlocal presence and mode of activity of the *Reichsadel* in the Carolingian period were inseparable from the political unity of the kingdoms, the division of the realm that began in the middle of the ninth century was inevitably accompanied by the fragmentation of large networks of noble kinship and the independence of the various local families. Tellenbach investigated the nature of the *Reichsadel* in order to show that the powerful nobles of the eighth to ninth centuries did not fit into the framework of the *Stamm* and were not the leaders of the political individuation of the various East Frankish *Stämme*. According to Le Jan, the *Reichsadel* maintained extensive kinship and political activity after the division of the empire but, after the end of the ninth century, tended towards disintegration and *Provinzialisierung*

[33] H. W. Goetz, '"Nobilis". Der Adel im Selbstverständnis der Karolingerzeit', *VSWG: Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 70 (1983), pp. 153–91.
[34] W. Störmer, *Früher Adel. Studien zur politischen Führungsschicht im fränkisch-deutschen Reich vom 8.–11. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 253–60.

(localisation). The decline in the leadership of the Carolingian kings and the patrimonialisation of official positions in certain regions resulted in the emergence of patrilineal, hereditary official positions.[35] Karl Bosl's opinion, however, is slightly different. He argued that the *Reichsadel* and the *Stammesadel* were fully integrated by the second half of the ninth century at the latest, forming a *neu Stammesadel* and showing a tendency towards localization. According to Bosl, they were both the cause and the result of the decline in imperial political unity.[36]

Chris Wickham's criteria for the basis of nobility provides a concise summary of the above historiographical developments. Wickham states that the core criteria for nobility are: 'distinction of ancestry; landed wealth; position in an official hierarchy; imperial or royal favour … recognition by other political leaders; and lifestyle'.[37] From this definition, Einhard, Nithard and Dhuoda evidently all belonged to the 'nobility', as can be seen in the subsequent descriptions of them in Chapter 2.

The choice of texts

In line with the research aims of this thesis, I will use three texts, Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* and Nithard's *Historiae*, as the main sources. This choice was made partly on account of the fact that they are all long texts and therefore provide a rich lexical context and conceptual-semantic field, both of which are indispensable for conducting *Begriffsgeschichte* research.[38] But more importantly, each of the three

[35] Le Jan, 'Structures familiales et politiques au neuvième siècle', pp. 332–33.
[36] K. Bosl, *Die Grundlagen der modernen Gesellschaft im Mittelalter. Eine deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1972), pp. 109–16, 122. Cf. F. Prinz, 'Bayerns Adel im Hochmittelalter', in F. Prinz, A. Haverkamp, and A. Heit (eds), *Mönchtum, Kultur und Gesellschaft: Beiträge zum Mittelalter* (München, 1989), pp. 17–82.
[37] C. Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800* (Oxford, 2005), p. 154.
[38] A detailed description of the methodology of the *Begriffsgeschichte* study will be presented in Chapter 1.

sources is doing something different: they each have a different strength, bring a different, but complementary, perspective that ultimately enables the thesis to build a richer, more comprehensive picture.[39]

On the level of authorship, Einhard, although not from a leading noble family, served for many years at the court of Charlemagne and continued to be closely associated with the court of Louis the Pious after Charlemagne's death. In contrast to Einhard, Dhuoda, whose husband was a powerful duke on the imperial frontier and was called to the court of Louis the Pious as chamberlain in 829, showed an inclination to defend her local dynasty. Her unique status as a female author also provides a valuable window into the Carolingian world from a gendered perspective that maintains a certain distance from male discourse. Nithard's background is even more unusual. He was a Carolingian in his own right, although he was born out of an illegal marriage of his mother, Berta, who was one of Charlemagne's daughters. And, unlike Dhuoda, who had been away from the political centre of the court since the beginning of the fratricidal strife and had only indirect access to the latest developments in the struggle, Nithard, as courtier to Charles the Bald, his emissary to Lothar for negotiations and general of his army, experienced the whole conflict personally and acquired a great deal of first-hand information. More importantly, because he felt that his services to Charles the Bald had not been duly rewarded, Nithard's emotional attitude changed dramatically between books one and four of the *Historiae*, which is starkly demonstrated between the lines and allows us to trace how this conflict influenced the way of thinking of a Carolingian lay elite. All of these give the *Historiae* a unique value that is different from the *Liber Manualis*.

[39] For an introduction to the three authors and their works, see Chapter 2.

On the other hand, in terms of the works themselves, the *Vita Karoli* was written sometime between 817 and 830, before Louis the Pious' three sons began the fratricidal war, while the *Liber Manualis* and the *Historiae* were completed in 843, i.e. three years after the death of Louis and the chaos of the Carolingian regime caused by royal sibling rivalry. These three texts can thus provide a good illustration of the differences in the thinking structures of the Carolingian lay elites before and after the crisis of the early 840s, and the relevance of their thinking structures to the changing political situation. As Georges Duby put it:[40]

> Ideologies are in fact coverings, systems of representation whose purpose is to reassure and justify people's behaviour... (The observation of ideologies) benefits from particularly favourable conditions in times of crisis, when movements in material and political structures eventually reverberates at the level of ideological systems and further intensifies the conflict between them. In the course of these crises, revolts, reform projects or the disturbances they provoke, underlying, often hidden structures are exposed to the light of day. The intensifying polemic leads to the expression of those who normally do not have either the means or the inclination to do so, while at the same time it triggers a burst of acceleration within the long-term trends that drive the evolution of the dominant ideology.

Nevertheless, in terms of the nature and genre of the material on which I have relied, the following points should be clarified. Given that the argument in this thesis is based primarily on written texts, the first question to consider is the social context in which the textual records emerged, and how they functioned. Michael Clanchy's *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307*, first published in 1979, is a landmark in historiography for its comprehensive discussion of the circumstances of the written

[40] 'Les idéologies sont en vérité des couvertures, des systèmes de représentation dont le but est de rassurer et de fournir une justification aux conduites des gens... (L'observation de l'idéologie) bénéficie de conditions particulièrement favorables dans les périodes critiques, où le mouvement des structures matérielles et politiques finit par se répercuter au plan des systèmes idéologiques et rend plus aigu le conflit qui les oppose. En s'intensifiant, la polémique conduit à s'exprimer ceux qui en temps normal ne se soucient pas de le faire ou n'en ont pas le moyen, tandis qu'elle déclenche une poussée d'accélération au sein des tendances de longue durée qui animent l'évolution de l'idéologie dominante.' In: G. Duby, 'Histoire sociale et idéologies des société', in J. Le Goff and P. Nora (eds), *Faire de l'histoire: Nouveaux problèmes* (Paris, 1974), p. 157.

record.[41] Drawing chiefly on English evidence, it notes that from the twelfth century onwards, the use of writing was proliferating as the kingdom's administrative practices developed. More importantly, Clanchy provides a serious examination of the specific functions of the resulting records and the preservation of them, as well as the development of literacy as a background and the changing attitudes and mindsets of people towards writing.

Clanchy's research has evoked a wide range of discussions about written records from different perspectives. The group led by Rosamond McKitterick, for example, focuses on early medieval Europe and seeks to situate the different levels of literacy and the symbolic and pragmatic functions of written records within the social and cultural contexts of their respective regions.[42] Furthermore, although the title of Clanchy's book gives the impression of a linear progression from oral memory to written record, Patrick J. Geary emphasises the complementary relationship between the two: memory was written down at a point in time, but it was read out in front of the audience and its future validity was assured by being remembered by the listener.[43] As our understanding of the (medieval) written record has thus deepened, the ways in which it has been treated as a historical source have become more diverse. Patrick Wormald, in his work on the strategic claims of local lords to territorial jurisdiction after the Norman Conquest, pointed out that, on the one hand, documents alleged to be forgeries may reflect the forger's view of the situation and, on the other hand, records assumed to be authentic

[41] M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307* (Cambridge, 1979). The book was published in its second and third editions in 1993 and 2012 respectively.
[42] R. McKitterick, *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe* (Cambridge, 1992); R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989).
[43] P. J. Geary, 'Land, Language and Memory in Europe 700–1100', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999), pp. 169–84.

may be based on manipulated testimony.[44] Thus it is now no longer taken for granted that documentary sources and the information they convey can be considered in terms of the sharp distinction between truth and falsehood, objectivity and subjectivity.

The same principle applies to the narrative sources, including the *Vita Karoli* and the *Historiae*. In other words, it is not advisable to take what they say as truth without discernment, since both texts come from individual authors who wrote with clear purposes and biases, whether political or moral, that the authors wished to convey to their readers. This cautious approach to sources does not, however, lead straight to a complete distrust of Einhard and Nithard's words. In fact, this view of scepticism is not falsifiable. In many cases, we do lack other material to verify every one of their accounts. Even so, there is no doubt that even if all of Einhard and Nithard's narratives were fictionalised for personal purposes, they would have had to write as it might have happened in reality, not to mention that in order for their audience to accept their opinions, they could not have created a parallel world in the texts completely divorced from the facts. This thesis will therefore approach narrative sources such as the *Vita Karoli* and the *Historiae* in such a way that, rather than examining the authenticity of the accounts given by Einhard and Nithard line by line, it will focus on what 'could' have happened at the time as reflected in the events they described. After all, the narratives of these authors must have been somehow compatible with their and, indeed, the wider Frankish aristocracy's worldview. This attitude, or presupposition, seems justifiable for a thesis intended to examine the way of thinking of Carolingian lay elites at a particular time.

[44] P. Wormald, 'Lordship and Justice in the Early English Kingdom: Oswaldslow Revisited', in W. Davies and P. Fouracre (eds), *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 114–36.

Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* is more complex. Dhuoda used different terms to define the genre of her text. The first is what the modern title given to the book suggests: it is a *liber manualis* (handbook) for Dhuoda's son to carry with him at all times to help in the salvation of his soul and body.[45] Then comes *sermo* (sermon), as Dhuoda wrote, 'this little book in the form of a handbook consists of a sermon from me, and their actualization in you.'[46] But being a *speculum* (mirror) was also an important role given by Dhuoda to her text: her son was admonished to hold it up for the delight of God, just as women used to raise mirrors to look at themselves in order to please their husbands.[47] It is also appropriate to classify the text as a letter on the basis of its formatting characteristics,[48] i.e. a *salutatio* (greeting formula) in which the names of the sender and addressee are mentioned,[49] followed by a *prooemium* (opening phrase), 'which should put the addressee in the mood for the matter dealt with in the actual communication',[50] and finally a closing formula with a *vale*.[51]

However, in view of its subject and purpose, it is best to categorise Dhuoda's work as a *speculum*, namely a mirror for princes, in the form of a letter. The genre 'mirrors for princes', initially known in modern historiography by its German name *Fürstenspiegel*, was first defined and systematically elaborated by German historians.[52] The most

[45] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 40–41.
[46] 'iste formatus libellus Manualis, hoc est sermo ex me, opus in te.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 42–43. The translation of *sermo* has been modified.
[47] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 48–49, 70–71.
[48] On epistolary literature in the Middle Ages, see J. T. Leclercq, 'Le genre épistolaire au Moyen Âge', *Revue du Moyen Âge latin* 2 (1946), pp. 63–70; G. Constable, *Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental: Letters and Letter-Collections. Fasc. 17* (Turnhout, 1976).
[49] Dhuoda used an acrostic poetry to illustrate that she was the sender and her son William was the recipient of the text: *Dhuoda dilecto filio Wilhelmo salutem*. See Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 42–47.
[50] 'die den Adressaten auf die in der eigentlichen Mitteilung behandelte Sache einstimmen sollte.' In: F.-J. Schmale, 'Brief, Briefliteratur, Briefsammlungen', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* (Munich/Zurich, 1983), p. 653.
[51] 'Vale et vige, nobilis puer, semper in Christo.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 236–37.
[52] A. Werminghoff, 'Die Fürstenspiegel der Karolingerzeit', *Historische Zeitschrift* 89 (1902), pp. 193–214; E. Booz, *Die Fürstenspiegel des Mittelalters bis zur Scholastik* (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1913); W. Berges, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1938); H. Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit* (Bonn, 1968). Some Anglophone scholars also contributed to the early stages of research on

distinctive feature of mirrors for princes as a type of text is its educational intent, which, in the context of medieval Europe, was based on the Christian imperative for princely behaviour,[53] as Roberto Lambertini defined it:[54]

> *Fürstenspiegel*...can be used in a rather loose sense, referring to a very wide range of sources, even narrative or iconographic ones, or parts thereof, carrying notions concerning rulership, or in a stricter sense, limited to independent works explicitly aiming at instructing kings and lesser rulers about the virtues they should cultivate, their lifestyle, their duties, the philosophical and theological meaning of their office.

It is noteworthy that, as Lambertini pointed out, the genre of mirrors for princes is in fact highly inclusive, with literary forms such as prose, poetry and letters all being included in its catalogue where appropriate. This feature also enable us to group Dhuoda's complex text under its directory. Admittedly, the inclusiveness of mirrors for princes has led some historians to increasingly question whether it can be called a genre at all.[55] Yet it is still agreed that 'mirrors for princes' can be regarded in a broad sense as a special genre if the two points are considered in the light of the fact that its audience was always 'princes', whether royal or not, and that its purpose was to admonish them to follow the example of the ideal princes of antiquity and the Scriptures.[56] Even from these two perspectives, Dhuoda's text conforms to the norms of mirrors for princes. It

---

mirrors for princes, eg. L. K. Born, 'The Specula Principis of the Carolingian Renaissance', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 12 (1933), pp. 583–612; A. Steiner, 'Guillaume Perrault and Vincent of Beauvais', *Speculum* 8 (1933), pp. 51–58.

[53] Certain types of texts from other parts of the world have also been considered by historians to fall under the category of mirrors for princes, the most studied of which are cases from Islamic cultural traditions. For a review, see L. Marlow, 'Surveying Recent Literature on the Arabic and Persian Mirrors for Princes Genre', *History Compass* 7 (2009), pp. 523–38. For the most recent studies, see D. Aigle, 'The Conception of Power in Islam: Persian Mirrors of Princes and Sunni Theories (11th–14th Centuries)', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden/Boston, 2023), pp. 136–59; L. Marlow, 'Royal Power and Its Regulations: Narratives of Hārūn Al–Rashīd in Three Mirrors for Princes', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 343–75; M. Abbès, 'The Arabic Mirrors for Princes as Witnesses to the Evolution of Political Thought', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden/Boston, 2023), pp. 314–42.

[54] R. Lambertini, 'Mirrors for Princes', in H. Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 2011), p. 1211.

[55] F. Lachaud and L. Scordia, 'Introduction', in F. Lachaud and L. Scordia (eds), *Le prince au miroir de la littérature politique de l'Antiquité aux Lumières* (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 2007), p. 13.

[56] E. M. Jónsson, 'La situation du Speculum Regale dans la littérature occidentale', *Études Germaniques* 42 (1987), p. 394.

is therefore necessary to provide an introduction to this literary genre before delving into Dhuoda's work.

The beginnings of the writing of mirrors for princes can be traced back to the pre-Medieval period, represented by *To Nicocles*, written by Isocrates (436–338 BC) to the prince of Salamis on Cyprus, *The Education of Cyrus* by Xenophon (c. 430–355 or 354 BC) to the great king of Persia, as well as *On Kingship* by Dio Chrysostomos (c. 40–c. 115), *On Duties* by Cicero (106–43) and *On Mercy* by Seneca the Younger (c. 4–65), etc.[57] However, it is generally accepted that the Christianised mirrors for princes are foreshadowed by Chapter 24 of *The City of God*, vol. 5 by Augustine of Hippo (354–430), entitled *The true happiness of the Christian emperors*.[58] In this chapter, Augustine elaborated on the ideal image of the *christianus imperator* (Christian emperor). He began with a strong admonition to princes not to mistake present happiness for the highest good. In other words, princes must not revel in the pleasures brought by rewards and consolations in this troubled life, but must perform their duties with a mind that sought true happiness beyond these. It is only after this basic premise has been confirmed that the content of the 'proper rule' of the princes can be determined, that is, not only to remain humble and equal to those who were pious before God, but also to make their power a *famula* (maid-servant) to be applied to extend the worship of God.[59] *Clementia* (clemency), *largitio* (generosity), *miseratio* (compassion), *lenitas* (lenience), *temperamentum* (moderation), *humilitas* (humility), *poenitentia* (penance), *oratio*

[57] Cf. T. Stevenson, 'Greek and Roman Writers on the Virtues of Good Rulers: Praise, Instruction, and Constraint', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 44–73.
[58] C. Bratu, 'Mirrors for Princes. Western', in A. Classen (ed.), *Handbook of Medieval Studies* (Berlin/New York, 2010), pp. 1928–29.. On Augustine's influence on mirrors for princes in the Carolingian period, cf. S. Moesch, *Augustine and the Art of Ruling in the Carolingian Imperial Period* (London, 2019).
[59] Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. and trans. W. C. Greene, *City of God, vol. VI* (New York, 1960), pp. 260–63.

(prayer). All of these were terms that would be repeated in mirrors for princes in the Carolingian period.[60]

Although many mirrors for princes have been produced since Augustine, historians do not seem to have published as many studies based on them for a long time, which is particularly noticeable when compared to the large number of sources that fall under the genre of mirrors for princes. One of the important reasons for this lies in a traditional view that, with the exception of a few unusual works, this genre of writing is generally trite and formulaic and has little to do with real political life.[61] The origin of this opinion can be traced back to *The Prince* by Machiavelli (1469–1527), which accuses the contents of mirrors for princes of being a patchwork of banal and tedious homilies, lacking any tension with political reality, but merely a list of heavily religious guidelines and moral precepts.[62] This view has long been popular since then. For example, in the Dictionary of the Middle Age. vol. 8, compiled in 1987, under the entry 'Mirror of Princes', Patricia J. Eberle writes that 'the medieval mirror takes monarchy as the given form of government and assumes that good government will follow from the rule of a morally good man.'[63] In other words, Eberle argues that works in this genre focus on advocating that the best princes were men of high character who could serve as the best moral role models for their subjects, and that only under such a prince was the best rule possible. A direct corollary to this understanding of mirrors for princes could be that their central concern was not so much the body politic or society as the morality of the

[60] Both Born and Berges provided lists of works they considered to be in the category of mirrors for princes in their pieces. See L. K. Born, 'The Perfect Prince: A Study in Thirteenth-and Fourteenth-Century Ideals', *Speculum* 3 (1928), pp. 470–504; Berges, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, pp. 289–356.
[61] Lambertini, 'Mirrors for Princes', p. 1211.
[62] F. Gilbert, 'The Humanist Concept of the Prince and the Prince of Machiavelli', *The Journal of Modern History* 11 (1939), pp. 449–483.
[63] P. J. Eberle, 'Mirror of Princes', in J. R. Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages. vol. 8* (New York, 1987), pp. 434–36.

individual prince presiding over it.[64] The long-standing prevalence of this view has largely prevented scholars from examining works in this genre in depth.

Now, however, we are encouraged to find that a new understanding of mirrors for princes is challenging traditional views. This is exemplified by Karl Ubl's recent study, which suggests that Carolingian mirrors for princes played an important role in the construction of a sophisticated theory of kingship and the creation of a particular Christian discourse of political power.[65] Mirrors for princes is not, therefore, a repetition of formulas out of time. On the contrary, it not only responded to the needs of contemporaneous politics, but was also closely linked to the ways of thinking of those who were involved in them. In this respect, Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*, chosen as one of the main sources for this thesis, does offer a different perspective on the perception of contemporaneous Carolingian lay elites than Nithard's *Historiae*, which was completed at the same time.

The choice of concepts

As I will detail in Section 1.2.1, in the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte*, the concept has a multi-layered semantic hierarchy and a multi-oriented structural nature, which makes it a different type of signifier than the word. It is therefore worth clarifying that in this research I am not studying the words as such, but the concepts themselves associated with these words. This is crucial because words like *familia* are not

[64] B. Guenée, *States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe*, trans. J. Vale (Oxford, 1985), p. 70.
[65] K. Ubl, 'Carolingian Mirrors for Princes: Texts, Contents, Impact', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 74–107.

necessarily used much in the sources I follow, although the concept of kinship is certainly important.

But why were *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* chosen as the conceptual fields to be studied in this thesis? To answer this question it is necessary to understand the requirements that *Begriffsgeschichte*, the methodology of this thesis, imposes on the study of *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (basic historical terms). This can be divided into two aspects. On the one hand, the selected concepts are expected to reveal various social structures and be relatable to major events.[66] On the other hand, they should be concepts that are essential to all rival classes and parties, that is, concepts that are indispensable to the expression of the respective experiences, interests or political claims of all sorts of people, and are thus commonly used in society. This requires the concepts to be polysemous, even ambiguous, and often controversial.[67] The next question is whether *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* can satisfy both of these requirements. As with the discussion of *nobilis* above, a brief review of the past scholarship that has investigated these concepts will demonstrate their appropriateness for the following study.

Historiographical discussion of the *res publica* of the Carolingian period has often been accompanied by the question of whether there was a political community that could be called a 'state'. Wehlen's answer to this was in the affirmative. By analysing the expression of *res publica* that appears in Nithard's *Historiae*, Wehlen supposed that there was an abstract idea of state embedded in it.[68] Fried, on the contrary, was sceptical. In his 1982 article, he argues that, like *regnum*, another concept that often appears in

[66] R. Koselleck, 'Einleitung', in O. Brunner, W. Conze, and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 1* (Stuttgart, 1979), p. XIV.
[67] Koselleck, 'Einleitung', p. VII.
[68] Wehlen, *Geschichtsschreibung und Staatsauffassung im Zeitalter Ludwigs des Frommen*, pp. 57–105.

narrative sources, *res publica* is 'pre-theoretical' and refers to the rule of kings in the customary, general sense. In other words, 'this "*res publica*" did not have any specific content and did not denote a unified association arching over the persons.'[69] Thus, whether or not the *res publica* refers to a political community, we can at least see from this opposing viewpoint that it has a certain ambiguity of meaning in the Carolingian sources and performed a certain structural function, be it practical or ideological.

The concept of *familia* played an equally important practical and ideological role in the Carolingian period. In the ninth century, Christian marriage, as promoted by the clergy, confirmed its priority over other forms of union of Frankish noble families, and the priority of legitimate children born in wedlock.[70] This ideology of marriage not only became an ethical and practical model of *familia*, with the couple at its core, but also, by extension and transfer, became the relationship outside the family and even in the exercise of power. For example, in a series of capitularies from 805 to 813, the peace plan is expressed through *familia*-related concepts such as *caritas* (love) and *concordia* (concord). They should not simply be seen as formulaic, but rather as a way of observing the blurring of boundaries between contemporaneous individual families and large political communities and their complementarity. Moreover, both within the royal family and in its dealings with the nobility, terms relating to marriage recurred as imagery of power relations that served as the basis for political action.[71] Thus, it was

[69] '…diese "res publica" fand keine spezifische inhaltliche Ausgestaltung und bezeichnete keinen sich über die Personen wölbenden, einheitlichen Verband mit seiner personenunabhängigen Ordnung'. In: J. Fried, 'Der karolingische Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh. zwischen "Kirche" und "Königshaus"', *Historische Zeitschrift* 235 (1982), p. 11.
[70] P. Toubert, 'La théorie du mariage chez les moralistes carolingiens', in *Il Matrimonio nella Societá altomedievale* (Spoleto, 1977), p. 51.
[71] P. Toubert, 'Conclusion', in R. Le Jan (ed.), *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne* (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 1998), pp. 519–26; P. Toubert, 'L'institution du mariage chrétien, de l'antiquité tardive à l'an mil', in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1998), p. 51.

with the help of the concept of *familia*, which is polysemic and bridges communities of various scales, that the Carolingian realm was able to maintain cohesion and unity.

As for the concept of *ecclesia*, here things are more complex. Fried argues that the effort to grasp the entire social order in abstraction was demonstrated in the ninth century with the Carolingians' use of the concept of *ecclesia*.[72] This is particularly evident in the reign of Louis the Pious, who developed the concept of *ecclesia* as the basis for the idea of imperial unity, as can be clearly seen in the *Ordinatio imperii* of 817.[73] For Fried, the concept of *ecclesia* has a special significance in the Carolingian period, mainly because the principle of unity it embodies was never a mere political manifesto nor an idealistic utopia. The political model built up with *ecclesia* was necessary to overcome the pre-theoretical *Gentilismus* (national/tribal consciousness) in an age when the idea of state was not developed. Thus, this model was not abandoned even if the efforts of the proponents of imperial unity ultimately failed. Fried, however, argued that *ecclesia* was not equivalent to the state because it could not correspond exactly to the reality of the ruling order. This sowed the seeds for the dissolution of the Carolingian empire.[74] Goetz, while disagreeing with Fried on whether the Carolingian regime can be considered a state, agrees that the concept of *ecclesia* lacks an association with nationhood, especially after the fragmentation of the Carolingian *regnum* into several *regna*, and that *ecclesia* was incapable of adapting to a new political framework.[75] As can be seen in Fried's and Goetz's discussions of *ecclesia*, although there are slight differences in

[72] Fried, 'Der karolingische Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh. zwischen "Kirche" und "Königshaus"', pp. 1–43.
[73] *Ordinatio imperii*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. I* (Hannover, 1883), pp. 270–75.
[74] For Fried's summary and restatement of his views, see J. Fried, *Die Formierung Europas 840–1046* (München, 1991), pp. 54, 159.
[75] H. W. Goetz, 'Regnum: Zum politischen Denken der Karolingerzeit', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung fur Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung* 104 (1987), pp. 110–89. For Fried's response to Goetz, see J. Fried, '"Gens" und "regnum". Wahrnehmungs- und Deutungskategorien politischen Wandels im frühen Mittelalter. Bemerkungen zur doppelten Theoriebindung des Historikers', in J. Miethke and K. Schreiner (eds), *Sozialer Wandel im Mittelalter. Wahrnehmungsformen, Erklärungsmuster, Regelungsmechanismen* (Sigmaringen, 1994), pp. 73–104.

its positioning in the political order, they both acknowledge that *ecclesia* played a role in the social structure and that it pointed to different referents in different contexts: the 'church' as an entity or the political community at the ideological level.

Thus, in terms of both their linkage to social structures and their own polysemy, *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* all fit the definition of the *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* and can therefore be investigated within the methodological framework of *Begriffsgeschichte*. Further, from the discussion of them by the historians mentioned above, they also play a fundamental role in the Carolingian realm from the micro to the macro level: they can be seen as the three pillars that together held up the Frankish society of the ninth century but ultimately failed to hold it together. Their historiographical examination is therefore of great importance in itself.

In conclusion, I have explained how the theme of this thesis was identified, why lay nobles was chosen, why texts by Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard were selected as research lenses and why *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* were picked as target conceptual areas. The answers to these antecedent questions also reveal the goal of this thesis: it will attempt to gain a deeper understanding of the Frankish lay nobles between 817 and 843, their conceptual world, and the relevance of contemporaneous social contexts to the temporalities in their thinking, on the basis of a relatively new approach to the study of the early Middle Ages.

As Jacques Le Goff pointed out, 'the historian, out of disdain for theory, is all too often the unconscious tool of implicit and simplistic theories.'[76] When we become too

[76] J. Le Goff, *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago/London, 1980), p. xiii.

accustomed to a certain perspective, we can instead be blinded by it. This is where an alternative theory is needed to open up new horizons for us. In the case of the subject under investigation in this thesis, it is often accepted as a given, especially by modern historians, that the view of time in the Carolingian period was defined by Christian knowledge and was therefore almost static. Yet this opinion may overlook the subtle variations in the temporality of people's thinking in response to changes in the external environment. The examination of this variation requires shifting perspectives, and this thesis does so by applying the lens of *Begriffsgeschichte*. It should be noted, however, that the context in which *Begriffsgeschichte* arose, as Chapter 1 will demonstrate, was the study of modern European history, particularly from 1750 to 1850. It is therefore necessary to make some adjustments to *Begriffsgeschichte* to the medieval context, a task which is undertaken in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 1: *BEGRIFFSGESCHICHTE* AS METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will thus begin with an overview of the origins, development and works of the paradigm of *Begriffsgeschichte* in the first section and clarify the principles and key terms of *Begriffsgeschichte* in the second. Finally it will review in the third section how *Begriffsgeschichte* was integrated with medieval studies at its inception, and reflect on and revise the theory of *Begriffsgeschichte* in order to adapt it to my research.

1.1.1 Origin and development

It is generally accepted that the term *Begriffsgeschichte* first appeared in *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* (*Lectures on the Philosophy of History*), a compilation of Hegel's (1770–1831) lectures, which makes it hard to establish whether *Begriffsgeschichte* was Hegel's own term or a label adopted by his students when editing the lectures. Indeed, Hegel's *Begriffsgeschichte* is far from its present-day counterpart, for it examined not individual concepts but large categories of art, jurisprudence, religion, and so on.[1] However, the later *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm fits into Hegel's vision in at least one respect, namely the interdisciplinary study of concepts.

[1] E. Müller and F. Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik. Ein kritisches Kompendium* (Frankfurt, 2016), pp. 4–45.

The basic meaning of what is known today as *Begriffsgeschichte* was first established by German philosophers. From the end of the nineteenth century, with the so-called linguistic turn, scholars noticed the complexity of the meanings of philosophical terms, and therefore called for compiling a dictionary to identify them. Their original intention was to standardise their definitions by sorting out the origin and the developmental history of the terms, since they believed that most ideological disputes arise from the unclear definition of concepts.[2] However, with the revival of historicism in the *Geisteswissenschaft* (sciences of mind), the non-historical position of this understanding has been widely questioned. Increasingly, scholars argue that, rather than saying that concepts have essential definitions which are beyond history, it is better to say that the essential feature of concepts is historicism.[3] They thus no longer pursue the essential contents of concepts, but concentrate on concepts' diachronic development, chronologically combing the changes in concepts' contents and the dynamic mechanism of their internal developments. When explaining the mechanism, most scholars are influenced by Hegel (1770–1831), regarding it as a logical impulse. In their opinion, concepts experience a continuous and logical movement, and *Begriffsgeschichte* is the description of this movement.[4] In brief, the widespread meaning of *Begriffsgeschichte* in the German philosophical world is the history of the semantic change of a concept in different times. In this framework, it is more like the history of terms or the history of questions.[5]

[2] S. Lorenz, 'André Lalande, Henri Bergson und die "Fixation du langage philosophique": Zur Vorgeschichte des "Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie"', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 38 (1995), pp. 223–35.
[3] O. Oexle, '"Begriffsgeschichte" — Eine noch nicht begriffene Geschichte', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 116 (2009), pp. 381–400.
[4] E. J. Palti, 'Reinhart Koselleck: His Concept of the Concept and neo-Kantianism', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), pp. 1–20.
[5] M. Richter, 'Begriffsgeschichte and the History of Ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987), pp. 247–63.

Unlike philosophers, German historians have paid more attention to the synchronicity of contents of concepts, which they believe reflects the structural relationship between the meanings of terms and the empirical world.[6] They criticise the philosophers for placing too much emphasis on logical or rational relationships in terms of conceptual contents, relationships which do not necessarily happen as such in the course of history. In other words, the factor that plays a decisive role in the changes of conceptual contents is not so much a rational or logical impulse as changes of the empirical world (economic, political, social structure, etc.).[7] For example, Richard Koebner (1885–1958), a pioneering historian working in the field of *Begriffsgeschichte*, argued for the examination of concepts in the context of concrete social settings and controversies, making the semantics clear through actual forms of discourse.[8] Historians therefore tend to argue that *Begriffsgeschichte* should focus on the tensions and interactions between conceptual implications and the overall social experience. This focus requires people to reflect upon the transition of the empirical world via distinguishing and comparing historical contexts of conceptual implications. Correspondingly, they attach importance to the study of social history, because it can provide us with empirical explanations of how conceptual meanings change.[9]

More importantly, within the historiographical framework of this period, *Begriffsgeschichte* began to set the temporalisation of concepts as one of its key research themes, thereby distinguishing it from other paradigms. Koebner argued that

[6] This tendency among German historians may derive from the ideas of Max Weber, whom some scholars regard as a precursor to *Begriffsgeschichte*. See Müller and Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik*, pp. 194–95.
[7] H. Jordheim, 'Does Conceptual History Really Need a Theory of Historical Times?', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), pp. 21–41.
[8] R. Koebner, 'Semantics and Historiography', *The Cambridge Journal* 7 (1953), pp. 131–44.
[9] Cf. K. S. Brorson, 'Histories of Concepts after the Linguistic Turn' (PhD thesis, University of St. Andrews, 2005), pp. 30–46.

modernity around 1750 underwent a *Zeitwende* (temporal turn), after which the semantics of political and historical concepts changed and renewed rapidly. His work was to draw on semantic analysis and investigations of the formation of political and historical terms and key works to better understand the new historical consciousness and its impact on public life.[10] It was in the academic tradition formed in this period that Reinhart Koselleck (1923–2006) established the classic *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm.

1.1.2 Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe

Today, *Begriffsgeschichte* is always associated with the great eight-volume dictionary *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* (1971–2007), edited by Koselleck. The *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* had nominally three editors: Otto Brunner (1898–1982), Werner Conze (1910–1986) and Koselleck. The three scholars were able to collaborate not only because of their teacher-student and collegial relationships, but also because they shared some ideas about *Begriffsgeschichte*. They agreed that social changes inevitably leave semantic imprints in the dominant concepts of politics and society, which absorb social, political, and empirical 'meanings' and constitute *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (basic historical concepts) as the object of study of *Begriffsgeschichte*.[11] The *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* is therefore considered to contain a wealth of 'political history' and 'social history', as well as a great deal of 'empirical history'. The aim of

[10] J. Arieli, 'Richard Koebner — Zeitwende und Geschichtsbewußtsein', in R. Koebner, H. D. Schmidt, and F. Stern (eds), *Geschichte, Geschichtsbewußtsein und Zeitenwende: Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Nachlaß* (Gerlingen, 1990), pp. 22–48; P. Tietze, '"Zeitwende": Richard Koebner und die Historische Semantik der Moderne Schwerpunkt: Der Erste Weltkrieg', *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 13 (2015), pp. 131–68.
[11] R. Koselleck, 'A Response to Comments on the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', in H. Lehmann and M. Richter (eds), *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte* (Washington, 1996), pp. 64–65.

Begriffsgeschichte is to reveal the underlying social experience and thereby become a 'social history of experience'. *Begriffsgeschichte* interprets the development of historical consciousness through the historical analysis of 'meaning'. It is only when the role played by basic historical terms in the historical context in which they are expressed is interpreted that they and their 'meaning' in that context can be fully described.[12] In this 'meaning', the temporal structure in people's thinking is particularly important. One of the main parameters of the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm, as Gabriel Motzkin comments, is the belief that historical discontinuities can be pinpointed by means of conceptual analysis.[13] Of Brunner, Conze and Koselleck, Brunner was the initiator, whose ideas and scholarly standing prepared the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, but his age and ill health made him less involved in the actual compilation of the dictionary;[14] Conze, although taking on the role of editor-in-chief at the start, died soon after. Thus, the compilation of the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* was, in fact, mostly done by Koselleck.[15]

The *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* was edited in accordance with three principles. First, *Begriffsgeschichte* must be used in conjunction with social history sources because of the dynamic process of interaction that is thought to exist between conceptual change and social transformation. Second, language is seen as both an indicator of and a factor in structural shifts. Relatedly, the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm must therefore use a set of methods derived from linguistics, historical semantics and structural linguistics in order to accommodate the intentions of *Begriffsgeschichte* itself. Finally, it is only

[12] H. E. Bödeker, 'Concept – Meaning – Discourse. Begriffsgeschichte Reconsidered', in I. Hampsher-Monk, K. Tilmans, and F. van Vree (eds), *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspectives* (Amsterdam, 1998), p. 63.
[13] G. Motzkin, 'On the Notion of Historical (Dis)Continuity: Reinhart Koselleck's Construction of the Sattelzeit', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 1 (2005), pp. 145–47. The meaning of 'concept' in the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte* will be described in detail in the next section.
[14] Brunner's academic influence will be discussed in more detail later
[15] N. Olsen, *History in the Plural: An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York, 2012), p. 192.

through the analysis of materials that are widely used, quite varied in their origins and claims, and covering features of social structures, that the usage and variations of the concept can be established.[16]

The objects of study in the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* are three types of political and social concepts. These are: a) long-used concepts, the meaning of which can still be reclaimed and understood by those who use them today, such as 'democracy', b) concepts such as 'civil society' and 'state', the earlier meanings of which have been erased from usage to the extent that their connotations in earlier texts can only be understood through a scholarly reconstitution, and c) new terms such as 'Caesarism', 'fascism', 'Marxism', and so on. These were constructed in the process of social transformation and, in turn, played a role in shaping the process of such transformations.[17]

As seen above, to grasp the research interest of the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* volumes, an understanding of some terms in the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte* is necessary, such as historical time, *Erfahrungsraum*, *Erwartungshorizont* and, most fundamentally, the idea of 'concept (*Begriff*)' itself. The following section offers a clarification of the basic terms in the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm.

[16] M. Richter, *The History of Political and Social Concepts: A Critical Introduction* (New York, 1995), p. 39.
[17] Richter, *History of Political and Social Concepts*, pp. 36–37.

1.2 Concept and historical time

1.2.1 What is the concept?

The research objects of *Begriffsgeschichte* are concepts. Historians engaged in the study of *Begriffsgeschichte* believe that every society, the field where people conduct their social actions or practices, is formed by concepts that are variously understood by different social groups.[18] In this sense, it can be said that society is not only composed of substantive contents such as economics and politics, but also of a series of concepts, on which social activities rely.

What then are these concepts? In *Begriffsgeschichte*, concepts are based on words, but are not the words themselves. The essential attributes of concepts are that they are contested, contextual, political and temporal in nature.[19] Koselleck pointed out that 'concepts' and 'words' represent different 'sign types': 'the meaning of words can be defined more exactly, concepts can only be interpreted'; in other words, concepts maintain multiple meanings, and therefore have stronger 'semantic carrying capacity' brought by their 'ambiguity'.[20] The research of *Begriffsgeschichte* on concepts is carried out in both diachronic and synchronic dimensions. That is to say, it not only examines the semantic fields of important concepts in a specific period, pointing out the competing meanings within a given concept, but also describes and analyses the changes in the connotations of the concepts from the perspective of historical

[18] R. Koselleck, 'Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), p. 8.
[19] R. Koselleck, 'Begriffsgeschichtliche Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung', in H. Quaritsch (ed.), *Gegenstand und Begriffe der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung* (Berlin, 1983), pp. 7–21; D. Busse, *Historische semanik. Analyse eines Programms* (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 50–52, 80–82.
[20] R. Koselleck, 'Richtlinien für das Lexikon politisch-sozialer Begriffe der Neuzeit', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 11 (1967), p. 86.

development.[21] Take 'body' as an example. It can be either a 'word' or a 'concept', and its nature depends on the context. When we refer to the 'body' in a concrete sense in a modern hospital, it is a 'word' because it can be precisely defined as 'the whole physical structure of a human', and there is no sense of time in it. But if we locate the semantic field in Carolingian Francia of the ninth century, then the *corpus* (body) is likely to be symbolised and become a 'concept'. Influenced by Augustine's opinion, many people at the time believed that because the body was degenerate and mortal, it needed to be governed by the spirit. The noblewoman Dhuoda, however, expressed an opposite view in the *Liber Manualis* she composed for her son William, and a focus of the following chapters. Her discussion of the body offers a useful example to illustrate this point. She argued that the root of adultery lay in spiritual evil. In her opinion, the body was not only far from being the cause of degeneration, but rather it formed the foundation of people's pursuit of perfection and God, because people needed their bodies as the media to perceive and imitate the correct way of doing thing.[22] Correspondingly, the body also rose from a secular time of mortality to a divine beginning of eternity. Consequently, 'body' became a concept: not only was its symbolic meaning ambiguous and contested, but it was also arranged in different places in the temporal structure of different minds. Behind this concept, there might, perhaps, be a tension between monastic beliefs and lay ones.[23]

The remarkable medievalist Susan Reynolds also investigated the polysemy that makes concepts different from words. In exploring whether concepts such as nation and state in the modern sense can be used to describe the kingdoms of the medieval Latin West,

[21] Koselleck, 'A Response to Comments on the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', pp. 59–70.
[22] M. Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters: Right Order and Lay Masculinity According to Dhuoda and Nithard', *Comitatus* 39 (2008), pp. 24–29.
[23] Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters', p. 29. Note 113.

she noted that 'the everyday use of words and their meanings cannot be controlled.' 'It may help to start our attempt at analysis and mutual comprehension if we distinguish the word which any of us uses in our own language from the notion or concept that one has in one's mind when one uses it, which may well be different from what one's hearer or reader understands by it.'[24]

However, while concepts are different from words in their nature, they remain inseparable from one another. On one hand, those 'words' that are commonly recognised and have no controversial meanings, such as the purely technical and professional words, e.g., Kant's 'thing in itself', are destined to be excluded from research objects of *Begriffsgeschichte*. This is because they maintain a high degree of stability and have no 'history' at all. And since they are immune to socio-political contents, they cannot become 'indicators' of social processes, nor can they become 'factors'.[25] But on the other hand, this does not mean that the study of concepts can be conducted without involving words. As Koselleck argued, while concepts form the core of a discourse made up of words, words and discourse in turn provide the linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts in which concepts can express themselves. That is, the participation of concepts makes discourse politically combative, whilst the validity of concepts becomes possible only if the discourse gives context, through which 'the analyst [can] determine what are a concept's multiple meanings, its content, importance, and the extent to which it is contested.'[26]

[24] S. Reynolds, 'Nations, Tribes, Peoples, and States', *Medieval Worlds: Comparative & Interdisciplinary Studies* 2 (2015), pp. 79–80.
[25] R. Koselleck, 'Begriffsgeschichte and Social History', *Economy and Society* 11 (1982), pp. 409–27.
[26] Koselleck, 'A Response to Comments on the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', p. 65.

In addition to the need to draw on the contexts woven by words and discourse, the polysemous nature of concepts compels historians, in their pursuit of *Begriffsgeschichte*, to focus on the 'semantic field' composed of multiple groups of concepts, that is, to interpret a concept by examining its typical set of synonymous, antonymous and correlative concepts. As Koselleck points out, a concept is always located within a network of concepts, and it is impossible fully to analyse and understand a single concept without looking at its oppositional, superordinate, inferior, parallel, concomitant and auxiliary counterparts. In general, concepts cannot be isolated, but exist within a conceptual system, with many concepts being contextualised and interpreted by each other.[27] For example, if the core concept of *Herrschaft* (lordship) were under study, it would be necessary to start with terms such as *Macht* (power), *Gewalt* (force, violence), *Autorität* (authority), and *Staat* (country or state).[28] In this sense, *Begriffsgeschichte* focuses on the meaning-making of concepts in historical contexts, exploring why particular concepts were established, what imaginaries they sustain, what they exclude, obscure or reveal, who incorporates them into political discourse with what intentions, how they came to be popular in the public sphere, how they became political and social terms, and what kinds of future visions they contain. In other words, *Begriffsgeschichte*, which is concerned with pragmatics and context, asks by whom, when, where, why, for whom and how a concept is to be understood.[29]

In general, therefore, through concepts, *Begriffsgeschichte* explores the history of the generation of meaning via language, rather than the history of concepts themselves. It

[27] Koselleck, 'Begriffsgeschichtliche Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung', pp. 7–21.
[28] Cf. O. Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft. Grundfragen einer territorialen Verfassungsgeschichte Österreichs im Mittelalter* (Brünn/München/Wien, 1943). The third edition of the book, which was revised and supplemented in 1943, is used here. A fourth edition was published after the war in 1959 with major revisions, but it is difficult to understand the author's inextricable relationship with his works and the times using this edition.
[29] Müller and Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik*, p. 33.

aims to explore why people 'compete' or 'argue' about the 'meanings' of the concepts: why do they use this meaning instead of that when referring to a specific concept, and how have the temporal features attached to the concepts changed?[30] To answer these questions, a semantic analysis of the words themselves does not help. The socio-political practice associated with 'semantic struggles' is the key because 'semantic struggles' are often 'political struggle'. [31] *Begriffsgeschichte* investigates the relationship between 'words' and 'things'. It analyses concepts through their socio-political functions, not the linguistic ones. The socio-political character of a 'concept' emerges from its ambiguity. It is precisely because of the ambiguity and competitiveness of conceptual meanings, because of the multiple social and historical contexts contained in them, and because of people's conflicting experiences and expectations, that concepts are able to attract and mobilise the political and social groups who pursue different values or even stand in complete opposition, enabling them to use 'concepts' as weapons to persuade, negotiate, fight and struggle.[32]

It may be helpful to look at *Begriffsgeschichte* from a contrasting perspective, that is, in relation to the ideas of Michel Foucault (1926–84). A central notion in Foucault's theory is *épistémè*, the idea that each period has a set of basic categories that govern various discourses and knowledge: the norms of knowledge production. All knowledge activity is governed by a specific *épistémè*, which is the mechanism of power. An enquiry into the relationship between words and things is the key to the archaeology of knowledge.[33] As noted above, *Begriffsgeschichte* agrees that concepts are constructed

[30] H. E. Bödeker, 'Ausprägungen der historischen Semantik in den historischen Kulturwissenschaften', in H. E. Bödeker (ed.), *Begriffsgeschichte, Diskursgeschichte, Metapherngeschichte* (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 8–27.
[31] R. Koselleck, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, trans. K. Tribe (New York, 2004), p. 80.
[32] Cf. Bödeker, 'Concept – Meaning – Discourse', p. 56.
[33] Cf. M. Foucault, *Les Mots et les Choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris, 1966), pp. 32–59.

in the contexts created by discourse and knowledge. It is this affinity of *Begriffsgeschichte* with Foucault's theory that has led many historians to refer to their studies of concepts as *Begriffsgeschichte*, despite the fact that they are following the Foucauldian path.[34] However, Koselleck's *Begriffsgeschichte* is still at a considerable distance from Foucault's theory. This is reflected first of all in the fact that *Begriffsgeschichte* does not accept Foucault's transformation of the whole study into a discourse study, on the grounds that the agency of the person who is using concepts is crucial in order to understand speech acts. For a true understanding of the text, it is important to ignore neither agency nor intentionality. More significantly, Foucault was not concerned with the historical time produced by concepts in connecting social structures, while this is precisely one of the focuses of *Begriffsgeschichte*'s investigation.

1.2.2 Historical time of concepts

How, exactly, is historical understanding possible? In the tradition of *Begriffsgeschichte* discussed above, the answer is that historical understanding is only possible through *geschichtliche Zeit* (historical time). This *geschichtliche Zeit* refers to the human experience of time, which is concerned with the positioning of human beings in the course of history and is therefore different from natural time. From a physical point of view, only the present 'exists', whereas the past has 'ceased to exist' and the future 'does not yet exist'. In *geschichtliche Zeit*, however, the past, as something experienced, and the future, as something anticipated, affect every present.[35]

[34] D. Busse, 'Begriffsgeschichte oder Diskursgeschichte?', in C. Dutt (ed.), *Herausforderungen der Begriffsgeschichte* (Heidelberg, 2003), pp. 17–49.
[35] Cf. D. Carr, *Experience and History: Phenomenological Perspectives on the Historical World* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 8–30.

According to Koselleck, people's perceptions of history depend to a large extent on their view of the past, present and future and the relationship between them. Accordingly, the study of people's experiences and representations of the past, present and future is an important starting point for understanding historical experiences.[36] Koselleck presupposed the temporality and historicity of human existence and considered the possibility of historical understanding in the context of the changing interrelationship between past, present and future.[37] This means that he believed that human self-planning in time is not only about self-understanding and self-interpretation, but ultimately also about self-construction. It also means that human experience of time constitutes the real content of history and that the dimension of the future is of significant importance: 'there is no history which could be constituted independently of the past experiences and expectations of active human agents.'[38]

Koselleck understood historical time as metahistory, and the theory of historical time is the essence of his theory of historical knowledge.[39] *Erfahrungsraum* (the space of experience) and *Erwartungshorizont* (the horizon of anticipation) are two key categories in Koselleck's theory of historical time, which are used to describe changes in the structure of time.[40] According to Koselleck, our experience in general is a *vergegenwärtigte Vergangenheit* (presentised past) which is created by collecting memories of our own lives and knowledge about the lives of others. Memory and

[36] R. Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" — zwei historische Kategorien', in R. Koselleck (ed.), *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main, 1975), pp. 354–56.
[37] This reflects the importance of Heidegger's inspiration for Koselleck, see J. Hellerma, 'Koselleck on Modernity, Historik, and Layers of Time', *History and Theory* 59 (2020), pp. 188–209.
[38] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, p. 256.
[39] Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" — zwei historische Kategorien', pp. 354, 374.
[40] The term has conventionally been translated as 'horizon of expectation', but as Koselleck mentions not only 'hope' and 'desire' but also 'fear' and 'concern' as inclusions of the word *Erwartung*, it seems more appropriate to translate it as 'horizon of anticipation'. See Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" — zwei historische Kategorien', p. 355.

knowledge are not organised chronologically but are stored together as material that is reorganised each time they are invoked. In this sense, experience should be represented through the metaphor of space. On the other hand, our anticipation is *vergegenwärtigte Zukunft* (presentised future), which is the concrete form of hope, fear, expectation, will and concern. Basically, anticipation and experience are considered to be closely linked while being full of tension. The experience gained is repeatedly applied to understand individual events and is confirmed by successful application.[41]

In other words, although the space of experience is filled with given content, it is illuminated with new light each time it is looked back upon from the horizon of anticipation. The horizon of anticipation, although largely based on past experience, is a leap and a break from the past. 'It is the tension between experience and expectation which, in ever-changing patterns, brings about new resolutions and through this generates historical time.'[42] For Koselleck, the task of the historian is therefore to investigate how the past, present and future are related in the cognition of the subject of study, that is, how the space of experience impacts on the horizon of anticipation. This can be achieved through the study of particular concepts.

As concepts within the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte* are seen as containing space of experience and horizon of anticipation, they are considered to present the feature of *Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen* (contemporaneity of the noncontemporaneous).[43] Koselleck visualizes this feature as a concept's *Zeitschichten* (layers of time), in order

[41] Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" zwei historische Kategorien', pp. 349–75; A. Schinkel, 'Imagination as a Category of History: An Essay Concerning Koselleck's Concepts of Erfahrungsraum and Erwartungshorizont', *History and Theory* 44 (2005), pp. 42–54.
[42] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 255–76.
[43] R. Koselleck, 'Geschichte, Historie', in O. Brunner, W. Conze, and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 2* (Stuttgart, 1975), p. 691.

to denote the multiple temporal levels in the concept, each with different durations and various origins, but existing and functioning simultaneously.[44] Helge Jordheim, explaining what Koselleck calls the *Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen*, suggests that its connotations can be grasped better in terms of spatiality. Through the idea of *Gleichzeitigkeit* (contemporaneity), geographical or other forms of space are also spoken of where reality does not appear sequentially but coexists simultaneously. The whole world became such a space in the mid-eighteenth century, after the arrival in and exploitation of the New World of America by European settlers and traders. The global expansion of capitalism and imperialism strengthened the experience of *Gleichzeitigkeit*. Many seemingly discrete and disconnected things were happening all around the globe, yet they were, in fact, interrelated: they happened at the same time and thus had simultaneity.[45] Conversely, as Europeans integrated the unfamiliar cultures found in America, India or China into their world picture, they interpreted them as having a historical order, that is, a developmental hierarchy of cultural progress. This order or hierarchy is a kind of *Ungleichzeitigkeit* (noncontemporaneity). By existing together in an increasingly integrated world, these civilisations of varying degrees of development collectively shape the so-called *Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen*. In Koselleck's words,

> A constant impulse leading to progressive comparison was drawn from the fact that individual peoples or states, parts of the earth, sciences, *Stände*, or classes were found to be in advance of the others. From the eighteenth century on, therefore, it was possible to formulate the postulate of acceleration; or conversely from the point of view of those left behind, the postulate of drawing level or overtaking. This fundamental experience of progress, embodied in a singular concept around 1800, is rooted in the knowledge of noncontemporaneities which exist at a chronologically uniform time.[46]

[44] R. Koselleck, *Zeitschichten. Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt, 2000), p. 9.
[45] H. Jordheim, '"Unzählbar viele Zeiten": Die Sattelzeit im Spiegel der Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen', in H. Joas and P. Vogt (eds), *Begriffene Geschichte. Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Frankfurt, 2010), p. 463.
[46] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, p. 238.

1.2.3 Comparison with the *Annales* School

The focus on the historical time brings to mind the famous *Annales* school, especially the duration theory of Fernand Braudel (1902–85). In his *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Époque de Philippe II*, first published in 1949, Braudel also pointed out a certain *Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen*. Like Koselleck, Braudel begins with the relationship between spatiality and temporality, explicating a pluralistic sense of time. Specifically, he constructed his Mediterranean narrative with three temporal units, which correspond to different spatial domains. Long duration (*longue durée*) is used to describe the history of people and their environment, involving a slowly changing and recurring geography, climate, transport, etc. It outlines the deep structure of Mediterranean history, and its spatial scope is one of the largest and most expansive. In the medium duration, the 'social time' (*temps social)*, with its cycles of decades, Braudel dealt with the historical situation of the economy, the state, society, civilisation, etc. This gentle rhythm of time constitutes the *conjoncture* (conjuncture) in the Mediterranean. The short term corresponds to the *histoire traditionnelle* (traditional history), describing the history of a person or event. Braudel referred to the short term as the 'surface disturbances', which are 'the most exciting of all, the richest in human interest, and also the most dangerous.'[47] They are measured in months and days, even hours, and their spatial extent is the narrowest of the three.

These three durations are not in opposition to each other; together they form Braudel's account of the *histoire totale* (total history) of the Mediterranean. Structures and

[47] F. Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II*, trans. S. Reynolds (London, 1972), p. 21.

conjunctures are not only the basis of history, but also its obstacles, which set the movable space and the insurmountable boundaries of human beings and their own experience. Historical time thus takes on a spatial character. Individuals in the short term have to make their choices within the 'prison' of fate that is constituted by the temporal structures and conjunctures, and it is only in the context of long duration that the meaning of the event-history can really emerge. In Braudel's account of temporality, we can see that he follows the same structuralist path as Koselleck, although he was not as significantly influenced by phenomenology as Koselleck and does not look directly at the structure of time through the lens of concepts.

Admittedly, the *Annales* school is also concerned with concepts. In his article 'Les mots et les choses en histoire économique', published in the journal *Annales* in 1930, Lucien Febvre (1878–1956) advocated the study of the history of meaning of historical, economic and social keywords, stressing the collaboration between historiography and linguistics. Meanwhile, he emphasised the study of the isomorphism of the word with the thing it designates, which requires an understanding of the formation and development of words in the course of civilisation and an extension of the horizon to social issues. Thus, Febvre asked, is it not useful to identify the exact time of birth of the concepts of *prolétaire*, *capitaliste*, and *ingénieur*? Is it not important to explore and outline meticulously the development of the meanings of these words? Is this not part of true social history?[48]

However, in addition to the fact that the Annales school, as already noted above, does not investigate temporal structures through concepts, the ambiguity and polysemy of

[48] L. Febvre, 'Les mots et les choses en histoire économique', *Annales* 2 (1930), pp. 231–34.

the concepts themselves is not emphasised in the Annales framework. In a later article, Febvre noted that the primary requirement for an examination of concepts is to return to the particular field and context in which they were generated, in order to avoid understanding historical phenomena by their modern meanings. He emphasised that the study of concepts was not to elucidate what people had thought in the past, but to explore what they could think, that is, the mindset shared by a society or collective.[49] This is the *histoire des mentalité* that the *Annales* school has made the object of its study: the idea that every age has its linguistic, emotional and conceptual underpinnings that define the forms of thought and feeling, the categories of mystery, possibility, impossibility, and so on. Under the paradigm of *histoire des mentalité*, concepts are often implicitly presupposed to have a single stable connotation over a period of time, so that their ambiguity and polysemy are more or less ignored, in this way diverging from *Begriffsgeschichte*.

In summary, the above two sections present the general principles of *Begriffsgeschichte* and the connotations of its core terms, and show how *Begriffsgeschichte* can be distinguished from other paradigms from a historical and comparative perspective. But the key to making a theory a living one lies in its ability to be applied to research practice. The final section of this chapter is thus an introduction and reflection on how *Begriffsgeschichte* has been put to work in medieval studies.

[49] L. Febvre, 'Parole, matière première de l'histoire', *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* 4 (1943), pp. 89–91.

1.3 *Begriffsgeschichte* and the Middle Ages

In a thesis on medieval history, it is also necessary to describe how the *Begriffschichte* movement has viewed the Middle Ages. Overall, *Begriffschichte*, as paradigmatically completed by Koselleck, takes the Middle Ages as a context through which it is concerned with the structural break in temporality that manifests itself in Europe's transition to modernity. Since Koselleck's understanding of the characteristics of thinking in the medieval period was strongly influenced by Otto Brunner, it is necessary here to provide a brief historiographical overview to his work.

1.3.1 Otto Brunner and *neue Verfassungsgeschichte*

As mentioned earlier, the Austrian historian Brunner was the pioneer of *Begriffsgeschichte* and the oldest of the three men who compiled the *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*. Although he was not much involved in the actual work and wrote only a short essay, '*Feudalismus*', the foundations of *Begriffsgeschichte*'s understanding of the Middle Ages were largely laid by Brunner because he was a medievalist whereas the other two editors, Conze and Koselleck, both concentrated on modern European history. This makes it necessary to begin with a review of Brunner's views, focusing on the characteristics that he argued distinguished the Middle Ages from modernity. His perspective was grounded in the research paradigm he advocated, known as *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* (new constitutional history).

The central scholarly interest of this paradigm of the so-called *Verfassungsgeschichte* lies in the historical dimension of the relationship between people and state, and of the generation and development of rights and duties. In other words, all aspects of the forms

of domination (*Herrschaft*) are its object of study.[50] Its inception can be traced to the reinterpretation of the works of Tacitus (c.56–c.120) in the nineteenth century in a German Romantic context,[51] but its establishment as a path of study in a narrow sense is linked to Georg Waitz (1813–1886).[52] The starting point for Waitz's statement is the presupposition that the German *Verfassung* had maintained continuity from the time of Tacitus until his own day. This continuity was reflected in a perceived similarity of the primitive Germanic community to the polity in which he, Waitz, lived. They both allowed and even demanded a kingship derived from the *Volk* rather than from the nobility; there was no *ursprünglich* (primordial) aristocratic class in the Germanic community, and the Germanic *principes* to which Tacitus referred were more akin to the German bureaucrats of the nineteenth century.[53]

Brunner was deeply dissatisfied with Waitz's parallel between Germanic community and its modern constitutional counterpart.[54] In his view, this parallel was an anachronism, brought about by the presupposition that people in the Middle Ages shared the same mindset as modern people. In this presupposition, Waitz's *Verfassungsgeschichte* equated elements considered institutional in modern times with their counterparts in medieval (and indeed ancient) contexts, despite a different perception of medieval institutions. In other words, Brunner argued that elements that

[50] Graus, 'Verfassungsgeschichte des mittelalters', pp. 543–45.
[51] M. Imort, '"Forestopia": The Use of the Forest Landscape in Naturalizing National Socialist Ideologies of Volk, Race, and Lebensraum, 1918–1945' (PhD thesis, Queen's University Canada, 2000), pp. 58–63.
[52] On Waitz, see E. Böckenförde, *Die deutsche verfassungsgeschichtliche Forschung im 19. Jahrhundert: zeitgebundene Fragestellungen und Leitbilder* (Berlin, 1961), pp. 99–134.
[53] G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* (Kiel, 1844–1878).
[54] It must be noted that Brunner's historiographical claims were inextricably linked to his enthusiastic support for the Nazis. However, in the interests of space and subject matter, this thesis will not explore this point. For Brunner's involvement with the Nazis and its influence on his historiographical thought, see H. H. Kortüm and D. Geyer, '"I Got Through Those Times Well": Otto Brunner and National Socialism', *German Yearbook of Contemporary History* 5 (2021), pp. 74–114.

were non-institutional to the modern mind but played an institutional role in the Middle Ages were ignored by Waitz.[55]

Brunner pointed out that it was precisely the nineteenth century that witnessed the cognitive rupture between the modern and the medieval, what he called *Trennungsdenken*. By *Trennungsdenken*, Brunner meant that the social facts of the Middle Ages and the way they were perceived by the people of the time had a totalising character, whereas from the nineteenth century onwards there was a tendency for people's thinking to diverge into categories.[56]

This *Trennungsdenken* was also reflected in the practice of historiography. Specialised histories such as legal, economic and social history grew up as part of law, economics and sociology, which were themselves separate fields of study. The popularity of these specialised histories, which Brunner did not see as the result of internal differentiation within historiography, had in his view a negative impact on historiography, making it increasingly partial and fragmented.[57] Brunner argued that this historiography, based on modern disciplinary differentiation, could not be applied to a past with a completely different mindset.[58]

Out of dissatisfaction with Waitz's limitation of the *Verfassungsgeschichte* to the institutions he identified and the internal divisions of contemporaneous historiography, Brunner established his *neue Verfassungsgeschichte*. He absorbed Carl Schmitt's

[55] Koselleck, 'Begriffsgeschichtliche Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung', p. 13.
[56] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, pp. 127–28.
[57] O. Brunner, 'Moderner Verfassungsbegriff und mittelalterliche Verfassungsgeschichte', in H. Kämpf (ed.), *Herrschaft und Staat im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 1–19.
[58] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, p. 187.

definition of *Verfassung* in the sense of concrete and collective conditions as his first step. In this framework, *Verfassung* means first and foremost the *Gesamtzustand* (overall condition) of political unity and social order in a particular country. As Schmitt wrote, 'political unity and social order is part of every state. It is, in other words, some principle of unity and order, some decision-making authority that is definitive in critical cases of conflicts of interest and power.'[59] Without them, it would not be called a state at all; the overall condition of these things is *Verfassung*.[60]

In 1959, Brunner further explained his *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* in his rectorial lecture at the University of Hamburg.[61] He stated that historiography should make the people, as the bearers of culture, its object of study. The 'people' here include both the individuals who are always present in social interactions and, moreover, the various communities. Thus, only individuals and communities, including families, villages, cities, hierarchies, classes, nations, peoples, tribes and so on, have a history. Individuals and communities compete for their survival and assert their claims, and in this sense their actions are political. Within these communities there are the *Sozialgebilde* (social structures) that dominate relations, as well as the *Machtverhältnisse* (power relations) in the legal order. Politics has therefore been of central importance throughout history, and among the various communities, those with the capacity to act politically have become particularly important: politics cannot be understood without an understanding

[59] C. Schmitt, *Constitutional Theory*, trans. J. Seitzer (Durham/London, 2008), pp. 59–60.
[60] For a more extensive description of Schmitt's influence on Koselleck, see R. Koselleck and C. Dipper, 'Begriffsgeschichte, Sozialgeschichte, begriffene Geschichte. Reinhart Koselleck im Gespräch mit Christof Dipper', *Neue Politische Literatur* 43 (1998), p. 187; R. Mehring, 'Begriffsgeschichte mit Carl Schmitt', in H. Joas and P. Vogt (eds), *Begriffene Geschichte: Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 138–68.
[61] On Brunner's appointment by the University of Hamburg, see T. Etzemüller, *Sozialgeschichte als politische Geschichte: Werner Conze und die Neuorientierung der westdeutschen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945* (Munich, 2001), pp. 243–44.

of their internal organisation, social structure and mental state.[62] In other words, the task of the historian under the *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* paradigm is to give a holistic account of the history of individuals and communities that are essentially political beings from the perspective that the fundamental attribute of the human being is political. In this particular sense, political history is not the history of military, diplomatic or power struggles, but the history of *Gemeinwesen* (commonwealth) itself as seen from a political perspective.[63]

Brunner warned, however, that when working within the *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* paradigm, it is important to avoid the 'modern conceptual apparatus', because of the aforementioned cognitive break that occurred in the nineteenth century. This disjuncture not only made specialised history but also the use of 'modern' concepts to describe and analyse the past very misleading practices.[64] In the case of *Staat* (state), for example, Brunner regarded the concept as a product of the early modern political world. Its construction is inextricably linked to the concept of 'sovereignty', so that the particular organisational form of the 'sovereign state' forms the content of this concept. In the nineteenth century, this concept of the state was elevated by Europeans to a general concept of the form of political organisation of all times and peoples. It was also in the nineteenth century that the concept of *Gesellschaft* (society) was coined, which can essentially be understood as the private economic sphere as opposed to the public state. The combined form of the concepts 'state and society' has since become a recurring fixture, alluding to the inclusion of everything. In pre-modern Europe,

[62] O. Brunner, 'Das Fach "Geschichte" und die historischen Wissenschaften', in O. Brunner (ed.), *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1968), p. 19.
[63] O. Brunner, 'Der Historiker und die Geschichte von Verfassung und Recht', *Historische Zeitschrift* 209 (1969), pp. 1–16.
[64] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, p. 129.

however, the political community or, *res publica*, was the same thing as *societas civilis* (civil society), and they were both subsumed under the category of *Politik*. Distinguished from them was the *oikos* (home), which was covered under the category of *Ökonomik* (economics).[65] Thus, unlike in modern terminology, the 'civic' was in opposition not to the 'political' but to the 'natural'. Likewise, the 'civil society' was in opposition not to the 'state', but to the 'state of nature' (*bellum omnium contra omnes*). In the process of separating state and society that began in the second half of the eighteenth century, the holistic discipline of political science, which had originally studied civil society, was divided for the first time into the study of the state on the one hand and the study of the society on the other, alongside economics, which also shifted from the study of the home to that of the market in the space of the state. It was through this process that the state became the coercive apparatus or legal form and normative order that dominates power in opposition to society, which is the bearer of spiritual and material values.[66]

Brunner argued that after the cognitive rupture of the nineteenth century, a misunderstanding of the state as an essence-based concept had led historians to use it unreflectively in their description and analysis of medieval historical reality.[67] In some cases, they argued for the existence of the state as a historical entity in the long political reality of the Middle Ages, even though it sometimes seemed to lapse into 'feudal

[65] Brunner, 'Das "ganze Haus" und die alteuropäische "Ökonomik"', p. 104.
[66] O. Brunner, 'Zum Begriff des Bürgertums', *Vorträge und Forschungen* 11 (1966), pp. 13–23.
[67] Dietrich Schäfer (1845–1929), for example, saw the establishment and development of the state as the fundamental task of historiography. See D. Schäfer, *Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte* (Jena, 1891), p. 5.

anarchy'.[68] Others, in contrast, tried to portray its non-state nature.[69] Ultimately, however, these works revealed only whether, to what extent, and in what form the medieval political community was or was not a state in the modern sense, which, in any case, could not provide a concrete description of the medieval political structure itself.[70] In other words, medievalists who have misapplied modern conceptual apparatus seem to have failed to ask the real questions.

How, then, should a more effective study of the Middle Ages be initiated? It was in answering this question that Brunner took the first step in turning from *Verfassungsgeschichte* to *Begriffsgeschichte*. He suggested that the key was to grasp the non-essential nature of conceptual connotations, the fractured changes of which occurred particularly in the nineteenth century.[71] Brunner further illustrated this point with the example of *Fehde*.[72] *Fehde* could be understood as 'feud' in English. In the eyes of modern people, feuds between feudal lords were anarchic behaviours, and they were prominent symbols of the collapse of the political and legal order.[73] However, Brunner argued that although feuds might have resulted in violence, an understanding of *Recht* (law or justice) under lordship was implicit in it. He explained that lordship

[68] The description of the 'feudal state' has been an important issue in the *Verfassungsgeschichte* since Paul Roth (1820–1892), cf. P. Roth, *Geschichte des Benefizialwesens von den ältesten Zeiten bis ins Zehnte Jahrhundert. Neudruck der Ausgabe Erlangen 1850* (Aalen, 1967). On Roth, see Böckenförde, *Die deutsche verfassungsgeschichtliche Forschung im 19*, p. 180.
[69] With the collapse of the *Deutsches Kaiserreich* in 1918, the research interests of German historians shifted increasingly from the abstract state to the concrete people. But the focus on the interpersonal *germanischen Treue* (Germanic fidelity) can be traced back to Karl Friedrich Eichhorn (1781–1854), see T. Mayer, 'Die Königsfreien und der Staat des frühen Mittelalters', in *Das Problem der Freiheit in der deutschen und schweizerischen Geschichte* (Sigmaringen, 1955), p. 8.
[70] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, p. 503.
[71] Koselleck, 'Begriffsgeschichtliche Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung', pp. 7–21.
[72] For an exposition of Brunner's understanding of Fehde, see H. H. Kortüm, *Kriege und Krieger 500–1500* (Stuttgart, 2010), pp. 70–74.
[73] Patrick Geary argues that the equation of feud with anarchic chaos is born out of the modern Western political idea that the judicial function is the key to effective governance and that without public justice there can be no state and no order. See P. J. Geary, 'Vivre en conflit dans une France sans état: typologie des mécanismes de règlement des conflits (1050–1200)', *Annales* 41 (1986), pp. 1107–33.Also cf. D. Reither, *Rechtsgeschichte und Rechtsgeschichten: Die Forschung über Fehde, autonome Gewalt und Krieg in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Marburg, 2009).

was supposed to guarantee both the right of the lord to fight and the protection of his vassals and his own interests. When court justice did not work or did not exist at all, the feud became a legal form of trial by battle, and the final victory showed divine justice. Still, fighting in feuds was bound by regulations.[74] In this case, Brunner's main intention was to dismantle the conceptual system created by this mode of disjunctive thinking. In the late Middle Ages, nobles, church groups, cities, and other institutions who enjoyed lordship exercised jurisdiction: all had the right to exercise defensive functions, collect taxes, and manage affiliated peasants. For Brunner, the core of understanding the Middle Ages is no longer the 'state' as previously studied, but 'lordship'. Therefore, this mode of disjunctive thinking, in which public opposed private, could not comprehend the institutional structure of the Middle Ages.[75]

Brunner's ideas laid down at least three theoretical presuppositions that contributed to the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm developed by Koselleck. Firstly, to use concepts as a tool for investigating *Strukturgeschichte* (structural history),[76] it is necessary to consider them as historical and non-essential in nature with connotations that change over time and across the structures of communities. It is only in the changing connotations of concepts that we can glimpse the shifting structures in the communities.

Secondly, as discussed above, in comparing the character of medieval thought with that of the nineteenth century, Brunner found significant differences between the two in their

[74] Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, pp. 1–123.
[75] Later Anglophone scholars' understanding of feud largely coincides with Brunner's, although they approach it from the perspective of legal anthropology. See S. D. White, *Feuding and Peace—Making in Eleventh-Century France* (Aldershot, 2005); S. D. White, '"Pactum... Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium"—The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France', *The American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978), pp. 281–308; S. D. White, 'Feuding and Peace—Making in the Touraine Around the Year 1100', *Traditio* 42 (1986), pp. 195–263.
[76] *Strukturgeschichte*, a term originally proposed by Werner Conze, was adopted by Brunner and Koselleck to express the purpose of their studies. See W. Conze, *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters als Aufgabe für Forschung und Unterricht* (Köln, 1957).

delineation of conceptual categories. Here Brunner understood medieval minds as a whole that remained stable for centuries until the modern condition created the quality of *Trennungsdenken*.

Thirdly, the great cognitive change occurred at the point where the social structure fractured, which in Brunner's view was the nineteenth century, in the wake of the French Revolution of 1789. In his opinion, the opposite of the bourgeois-liberal social order established in the nineteenth century was the grouped, hierarchical one that had prevailed during the Middle Ages.[77] The nation-state, whose formation laid the foundation for the birth of the new order, was understood as a modern fact and an independent system of bureaucracy. Its corresponding field was society, which appeared as the field of action in pursuit of self-interests and personal desires. The function of the modern state was to protect the social order and personal life and property, thus monopolising public powers such as legislation, war, justice, taxation, and enjoying hegemony in the public domain.[78] It is against this backdrop of a rupture in the social structure that Brunner understood the transition from the Middle Ages to modernity, with respect to the character of people's thinking, was also completed. In this perspective, they were not necessarily causally linked, but they were certainly simultaneous.

[77] Opposition to bourgeois liberalism pervaded widely among right-wing conservative intellectuals who had been strongly influenced by Nazism since the mid-1920s. For a broad background, see H. Dreier, *Die deutsche Staatsrechtslehre in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. 1. Bericht von Prof. Dr. Horst Dreier, Würzburg* (Berlin, 2001), pp. 10–72.

[78] Brunner's understanding of the modern state was heavily influenced by his teacher at the University of Vienna, Othmar Spann (1878–1950). For Brunner's encounter with Spann at the University of Vienna, see A. Wandruszka, 'Otto Brunner — Forscher und Lehrer', *Annali dell'Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico in Trento* 13 (1987), pp. 11–18. For Spann's understanding of the state, see T. Ehs, 'Gesellschaftswissenschaft. 2. Othmar Spann', in T. Olechowski, T. Ehs, and K. Staudigl-Ciechowicz (eds), *Die Wiener Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät 1918–1938* (Göttingen, 2014), pp. 581–90.

Brunner's *neue Verfassungsgeschichte* laid an important foundation for the establishment of *Begriffsgeschichte*, and he himself had already taken the first steps towards *Begriffsgeschichte*. Yet it is undeniable that the three theoretical presuppositions Brunner laid down for *Begriffsgeschichte* also quietly created a bottleneck for the wider applicability of *Begriffsgeschichte* as a historical methodology. Before analysing this, however, it is necessary to look at how Koselleck and more recently François Hartog developed *Begriffsgeschichte* into a paradigm, because in doing so we can see more clearly the long-term implications of Brunner's intellectual legacy.

1.3.2 Koselleck and the *Sattelzeit*

Koselleck was committed to exploring the disintegration of the old world and the rise of the new one in a conceptual-historical framework. He mainly focused on German-speaking areas, but all of Europe was taken as the background. The research objects included the concepts that had changed and the ones that were newly coined.[79] His construction of *Begriffsgeschichte* is directly dependent on Brunner's understanding of the significance of the nineteenth-century transformation of thinking, although he adapted it to the time period 1750–1850 and named it the *Sattelzeit* (saddle period), applying a topographical metaphor, i.e., the saddle-shaped transition zone that connects two peaks, to the temporal dimension.[80] Koselleck argued that the concepts of this period had Janus' two faces, one facing the past and the other facing the future. For

[79] Like Brunner's redefinition of *Verfassung*, Koselleck's interest in concepts was similarly influenced by Carl Schmitt, who had asked Koselleck to cross-reference dictionaries to find out where a certain term appeared, what it meant and who the audience was. See Mehring, 'Begriffsgeschichte mit Carl Schmitt', pp. 138–68.
[80] Helge Jordheim argues that the English translation of Koselleck's 'Theorie der historischen Zeiten' as 'theory of periodizations' reflects a misunderstood reception of Koselleck's view of history in Anglo-American scholarship. See H. Jordheim, 'Against Periodization: Koselleck's Theory of Multiple Temporalities', *History and Theory* 51 (2012), pp. 151–71.

people today, the side facing the past was difficult to understand without critical thinking, but the side facing the future could be more readily understood.[81] He concluded that concepts of the *Sattelzeit* had four main characteristics: democratisation, ideologisation, politicalisation, and temporalisation. Firstly, democratisation is the idea that concepts transcend the narrow group of elites and are widely accepted and used by the lower classes. Then comes 'ideologisation', which means that the level of abstraction of concepts increases to the point where they are condensed into formally highly simple yet functionally aggregated signifiers that can be used in polemics to label a wide range of political claims in order to serve the interests of different groups and social movements. The next characteristic is politicisation, in which the concept is integrated into scenes of conflict, such as revolution and war, and acts as a tool for political mobilisation.[82] Finally, there is temporalisation. The temporalisation of a concept is perhaps Koselleck's most innovative development that builds on *Verfassungsgeschichte*, and takes some inspiration from Karl Löwith.[83] This final characteristic marks a true transition from *Verfassungsgeschichte* to *Begriffsgeschichte*. Thus, Gabriel Motzkin notes that,

> The philosophy of time has taken on a special importance in the twentieth century, and the linkage between that philosophy and its historical context has not yet been adequately characterized by historians. Koselleck's contribution has been that he has taken this sense of the questionability of temporal structures into an investigation of the language of the past. This project appears to be an analysis of concepts, but it is ultimately a synthetic one, since it seeks to bring the sense of time back into the sense of history through the medium of the analysis of language.[84]

---

[81] Koselleck, 'Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', pp. 9–10.
[82] Koselleck, 'Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe', pp. 10–15.
[83] Cf. K. Löwith, *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago, 2011). For a discussion of the influence of Löwith on Koselleck, see N. Olsen, 'Reinhart Koselleck, Karl Löwith und der Geschichtsbegriff', in C. Dutt and R. Laube (eds), *Zwischen Sprache und Geschichte: Zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Göttingen, 2013), pp. 236–55.
[84] G. Motzkin, 'On Koselleck's Intuition of Time in History', in H. Lehmann and M. Richter (eds), *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 45.

Presumably under Brunner's influence, Koselleck also saw people throughout the medieval period in Europe as sharing homogeneous traits of thought, particularly with regard to their perception of historical time. For Koselleck, images produced in the Middle Ages provided excellent visual evidence of this. In a painting by Albrecht Altdorfer in 1529 depicting the battle between Alexander and the Persians in 333 BC, the Persians looked like the Turks who besieged Vienna in 1529, while their opponents were like the mercenaries of the Holy Rome Empire led by Emperor Maximilian I. A cross appeared in the picture, although there had been no Christianity in 333 BC.[85] The event depicted throughout the painting thus appeared to occur in the era of its creation. Koselleck concluded that historical time was frozen and static in this painting. Although the battle of Issus represented the past, it was integrated with the present and the future and therefore appeared timeless.[86]

Why did this happen? Koselleck explained that until the eighteenth century, people still believed that the nature of humankind was consistent. Accordingly, human history could be cited repeatedly to prove various moral, theological, and political doctrines. Koselleck suggested that the prerequisites for this understanding changed so slowly, or even had no change at all, such that people could not perceive a clear disconnect between their own experience and their predecessors. In this view, the social and psychological conditions that ensured the continuity of experience-space always existed, and, as a result, people's expectations for the future would not differ from the past.[87] True, people enveloped in the Christian worldview had the idea of the apocalypse, but

[85] A. Altdorfer, 'Historienzyklus: Alexanderschlacht (Schlacht bei Issus)', (1529), https://www.sammlung.pinakothek.de/en/artwork/9pL3Qyz4eb [accessed 8 Sep 2023].
[86] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 9–10.
[87] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 26–28.

the apocalypse meant the end of secular time, before which point the future was not fundamentally different from the present and the past in the earthly world.[88] In other words, medieval people had chronological time, but no 'historical time'. A phrase adapted from the Book of Ecclesiastes summarises this ideology: 'The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun'. [Ecclesiastes 1:9]

However, for Koselleck the situation changed during the *Sattelzeit*, a period in which there was a revolutionary transformation in the way people thought, or a rupture between the space of experience and the horizon of anticipation. People began to look forward to a future different from the past. This new cognition of time was evident in the connotative transformation of concepts. Like Brunner, Koselleck also selected *res publica* for examination. He noted that *res publica* had been originally a general term that could encompass various forms of government. In the Age of Enlightenment, however, it was believed that there was only one kind of Republic that was worth being pursued, while the rest were simply different types of despotism. Koselleck proposed that this compulsory choice was also a manifestation of the temporalisation: the trajectory of history is to move out of the autocracy of the past and into the republic of the future. The concept of 'republic' emerged from the experience of the past and appeared on the horizon of anticipation.[89] According to François Hartog, whose work is addressed in the following section, it was not the past but the future that began to inspire and illuminate the present life.[90]

[88] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 140–41.
[89] R. Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, trans. T. S. Presner (Stanford, 2002), p. 128.
[90] F. Hartog, *Régime d'historicité. Présentisme et expériences du temps* (Paris, 2012), p. 146.

According to Koselleck, the new horizon of anticipation and the historical philosophy of progressivism brought a vision of classless society into historical reality and replaced the doomsday expectation of the past. In this way, history had new goals and ends, such as democracy, socialism, communism, and so on. These new goals served as a reference to explain the past. In the present life, people, based on their positions on these goals, distinguished between social and political concepts that had a motional meaning, such as progress and conservativeness, development and backwardness, and slavery and liberation. Koselleck considered this conceptual separation as a major feature of the *Neuzeit*, that is, the 'new age' or modernity. The present and the future should transcend the past; this was one of the fundamental characteristics of the modern historical time.[91]

To conclude, as Ernst Breisach notes, people live in three dimensions of time: the past, the present, and the future, or, to be more precise, the expected future.[92] With Koselleck's two core ideas, 'space of experience' and 'horizon of anticipation', the former comes from the past and the latter faces the future.[93] The relationship between the two underwent a significant change in the eighteenth century and nineteenth century. Prior to this change, there had been no difference between them, and people could naturally transition from one to the other. However, after the saddle period, while the future became unpredictable, and the distance between space of experience and horizon of anticipation widened, differences between the past and the future grew. The evolution of concepts is an excellent perspective from which to observe this change.

[91] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 222–54.
[92] E. Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, Modern* (Chicago, 2007), p. 2.
[93] Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 255–75.

1.3.3 François Hartog and the *régimes d'historicité*

The idea of historical time implicit in the concept, and its relevance to social and personal conditions, was among Koselleck's most important findings. Building on this work, François Hartog, once Koselleck's assistant and a French historian still active in the *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm, further refined the ideas put forward by Koselleck.[94]

Régime d'historicité is the core term that builds up Hartog's theoretical system, a term he describes as having been inspired by the anthropologist Marshall Sahlins.[95] To understand the term, it is necessary to clarify what *historicité* is. Both the French *historicité* and the English 'historicity' seem to be neologisms formed in the second half of the nineteenth century on the basis of the German *Geschichtlichkeit.* That term appears frequently in philosophical texts, and its usual meaning is defined by Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) as referring to 'the dynamic basic structure that makes history'.[96] To comprehend this meaning fully, it is important to understand the two roles that the German ending *-keit* plays here. On the one hand, it functions as forming an abstract noun, while on the other hand, it refers to a concrete thing or matter; consider, for example, *Einsamkeit* (lonely place) or *Schwierigkeit* (difficult point).[97] However, Hartog intentionally distances himself from Heidegger, perhaps in relation to his own lineage of scholarship.

Hartog cites the works of the phenomenologist Claude Lefort and the structuralist Claude Lévi-Strauss as the source of his own terminology, which shows Hartog's

[94] On the differences between Koselleck and Hartog, see G. Lenclud, 'Traversées dans le temps', *Annales* 61 (2006), pp. 1053–84.
[95] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[96] L. von Renthe-Fink, 'Geschichtlichkeit', in J. Ritter, K. Gründer, and G. Gabriel (eds), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie Bd.3* (Basel, 1974), pp. 405–07.
[97] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 20.

affinity with Brunner; his *Verfassungsgeschichte* is also inextricably linked to phenomenology and structuralism. In 'Sociétés sans histoire et historicité', a critical exposition of Hegel's philosophy of history, Lefort defined *historicité* as 'the way in which people relate to the collective past and future'.[98] Hartog, while arguing that it fails to consider the present explicitly, agrees that the definition is still valid today.[99] Lévi-Strauss offered a similar view. In his article 'Histoire et ethnographie', he suggested that societies could be distinguished and analysed according to their relation to the past.[100] Hartog goes further in this argument by stating that 'the modes of historicity, that is, the ways of living and thinking about this historicity, of using it, the ways of articulating past, present and future, differ from one to another: these are their regimes of historicity.'[101] In other words, Hartog's *historicité* refers to individuals' and groups' positioning of themselves in historical time.

Hartog divides time into the past, the present and the future, and in doing so establishes a basic framework for the experience of time. *Régimes* is used in the plural because it has multiple forms and is articulated in different ways in the three dimensions of time. In different societies, sometimes the past dominates (i.e., the old regime of historicity) and sometimes considerations of the future prevail (i.e., the modern regime of historicity, or futurism), while in Europe today, there is a preoccupation with the present and therefore a prevalence of presentism in the mind.[102]

[98] 'La manière dont les hommes se rattachent solidairement au passé et à l'avenir collectifs.' In: C. Lefort, 'Société "sans histoire" et historicité', in C. Lefort (ed.), *Les Formes de l'histoire. Essais d'anthropologie politique* (Paris, 1978), p. 65.
[99] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 37.
[100] C. Lévi–Strauss, 'Histoire et ethnologie', *Annales* 38 (1983), pp. 1217–31.
[101] 'diffèrent des unes aux autres les modes d'historicité, c'est-à-dire les manières de vivre et de penser cette historicité, d'en user aussi, les façons d'articuler passé, présent et futur: leurs régimes d'historicité.' In: Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 34.
[102] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 47.

Hartog draws on Koselleck's view of people's perception of historical time in the medieval period, although he places a greater emphasis on the significance of the future apocalypse.[103] He argues that in primitive societies, the passage of time was barely perceptible and there was no sense of distance between the present and the past. The past was used as a template for action in the present and the future, acquiring its meaning in cross-reference to events emerging in the present.[104] Judeo-Christian revelation, however, radically transformed the way in which time was experienced. The Old Testament gave rise to strong Jewish expectations of the future, as in the promise of Yahweh to Abraham: 'Go forth out of thy country…and come into the land which I shall shew thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and magnify thy name, and thou shalt be blessed.' [Genesis 12: 1–2]. Christianity incorporates the Jewish view of history while simultaneously making a unique contribution to the Western sense of time: it split time in two with the decisive event of the incarnation. Henceforth, a new kind of time emerged, which ends when the second coming of Christ and the last judgment come. As a result, the transitional period between the incarnation and the last judgement is a time of expectation, where every moment of the present holds the hope of the end of time.[105] As is written in Matthew 24, 'This generation shall not pass, till all these things be done…But of that day and hour no one knoweth, not the angels of heaven, but the Father alone' [Matthew 24: 34, 36]. The eschatological present is where the New Testament brings a new sense of time. It also establishes a tension between the present and the future because Christ will come again after the incarnation: everything is not finished, but will be finished at any moment. It is from this tension that history as salvation history develops.

[103] F. Hartog, 'L'apocalypse, une philosophie de l'histoire?', *Esprit* 6 (2014), pp. 22–32.
[104] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, pp. 69–73.
[105] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.

The Christian temporal order itself had a great power of temporality in that it saw history as a single-time journey with a final end.[106] In modern times, however, as the vision of progress gradually overwhelmed the expectation of salvation, a process of dialectical transformation from one order to another took place, as the concern for the past and the eschatological zeal shifted to the future. Hartog's formulation of this shift is from the *ancien régime d'historicité* to the *régime moderne d'historicité*.[107] In this system, according to the order of historical 'progress' as a collective singular, signs of the future are read out of the past and the present is guided by the future.[108]

However, in the face of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the disappearance of a glorious vision of a future society and the rise of various fundamentalisms, Hartog suggests a *régime* called 'presentism' has been established. In this new temporal order, not only is the abandonment of the past as a guide to the present in the *régime moderne d'historicité* inherited, but even the tension between the future and the present that has existed since the *régime chrétien d'historicité* is removed. For Hartog, the various fundamentalisms prevalent in contemporary society do not imply a return from a future-dominated modernity (*futurisme*) to a past-dominated pre-modernity (*passéisme*) since most of the traditions they talk about were made up in modernity.[109] Koselleck once envisaged the end of modernity as a state in which the richness of experience would be restored and expectations would become cautious and open,[110] but things have not turned out that way. In fact, Hartog suggests a quote by the poet Paul Valéry from 1935 might describe

[106] B. Guenée, 'Temps de l'histoire et temps de la mémoire au Moyen Age', *Annuaire Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire de France* 97 (1976–1977), pp. 25–35.
[107] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[108] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[109] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[110] Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" zwei historische Kategorien', p. 374.

the temporality in people's thinking nowadays more accurately: 'there is, on the one side, a past that has not been abolished or forgotten, but from which we can derive little or nothing to orient us in the present and to imagine the future. On the other, a future without the faintest outline.'[111] Presentism is established where the space of experience and the horizon of anticipation disappear, in which the present dominates and drives people towards one new present after another.

Two theoretical innovations are particularly noteworthy in Hartog's account. On the one hand, we can argue that Hartog's *régimes d'historicité* is based on the assumption that a society or a period, despite its internal fluctuations, has a dominant temporal structure. He admits that the regimes of historicity do not exist in their pure state, which means that the boundaries of each regime of historicity are in fact porous and blurred, even interpenetrating, and that the temporality in the thinking of individuals living under a given regime may fluctuate. In this sense, Hartog's *régimes d'historicité* is quite similar to Max Weber's ideal type.[112] Hartog's idea actually challenges the view, held since Brunner, that the whole of the Middle Ages shared a single temporal structure, though he does not explore this theoretical possibility fully and get rid of Brunner's presuppositions altogether.

On the other hand, Hartog suggests that when the *régime d'historicité* is switched, a characteristic called *brèche du temps* (gap in time) is present in people's minds. The term *brèche* is borrowed from Hannah Arendt. It refers to an 'odd in-between period which sometimes inserts itself into historical time when not only the later historians but

[111] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[112] S. Brown, 'Presentism: Stopgap or New State?', in F. Hartog, *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*, trans. S. Brown (New York, 2015), p. xvi.

the actors and witnesses, the living themselves, become aware of an interval in time which is altogether determined by things that are no longer and by things that are not yet.'[113] In other words, Hartog uses the *brèche du temps* to describe a sense of the old normative relations of past, present and future going out of order, brought about by the sudden shift between two *régimes d'historicité.*[114] Using the thought process of François-René de Chateaubriand (1768–1848) as an example, he points to the disorder in the sense of temporality that the transition between two regimes of historicity brought to those living in between: there was a sense that the past could not be restored and the future was unattainable.[115] Hartog's argument suggests that we should pay particular attention to the moment when the switch between two *régimes d'historicité* takes place, at which point the characteristics of both *régimes* can be more clearly observed in the chaos. In answering the question of what triggers this switch, however, Hartog adheres to the structuralist framework set by Brunner, as he argues that every shakeup of the old regime of historicity was accompanied by changes in the social structures: from the third-century crisis of the Roman Empire and the spread of Christianity, through the French Revolution of 1789, to the collapse of the communist camp in 1989 and the end of the Cold War.[116]

[113] H. Arendt, *Between Past and Future* (New York, 1961), p. 9.
[114] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[115] Hartog, *Régime d'historicité*, p. 28.
[116] On the influence of Koselleck's structuralism on Hartog, cf. M. Raymond-Dufour, 'Les trajectoires dans le temps: réflexion sur le concept de 'régime d'historicité', *Conserveries mémorielles. Revue transdisciplinaire* 15 (2014), https://journals.openedition.org/cm/1835#quotation [accessed 2 June 2023]

1.3.4 Reflection and revision of the presuppositions of *Begriffsgeschichte*

The *Begriffsgeschichte* paradigm, constructed by Brunner, Koselleck and Hartog, still has strong explanatory power today, especially because of its insightful concern with the relationship between past, present and future. From the perspective of *Begriffsgeschichte*, the language of the historian can be divided into *Quellensprache* (source language), which explores what has been textualised in the light of historical sources, and *historische Kategorien* (historical categories), which reconstructs what has not been textualised by means of hypotheses. The investigations of historical time or *régime d'historicité* fall into this category.[117] This could be because, unlike philosophers, who focus on time itself, Koselleck and Hartog concentrate first on the temporal order established by concrete events. The perception of the temporal order is not exclusively a reflection of objective time but is the result of the interaction between the subject of knowledge and objective time. A distinction therefore needs to be made between the two kinds of time when discussing temporality.

On the one hand, there is 'time in record', that is, ontological time or the natural presentation in human consciousness of the time that exists objectively in the physical world. Objective time itself is the foundational existential condition for events to be organised into sequences,[118] or an *a priori* prerequisite for the unfolding of human understanding.[119] When a multitude of concrete events enters consciousness, it necessarily arranges them into a sequence, which then forms a perception of the temporal order separate from objective time. In this sense, time in the record should be

[117] Koselleck, '"Erfahrungsraum" und "Erwartungshorizont" zwei historische Kategorien', p. 350.
[118] J. E. Boodin, *A Realistic Universe: An Introduction to Metaphysics* (Charleston, 2013), pp. 264–72.
[119] M. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. J. Stambaugh (New York, 1996), p. 384.

the original physical time, which reveals ontological time without conscious reflection, and thus tends to be the natural appearance of objective time in human consciousness, as opposed to time in the narrative, which has been given meaning. It must be acknowledged, however, that this objectivity is only relative, for as a human practical activity, subjective consciousness, and therefore meaning, cannot be completely excluded from the recording process.

On the other hand, there is 'time in narrative', which is time that has been rendered meaningful in the epistemological sense. It begins with a focus on the order of events and is a time of strong subjectivity. The events in the narrative are not simply a reflection of an objective sequence of events. As Benedetto Croce pointed out, historical events derive their meaning from the present.[120] Historical time is, in fact, a continuum of past and present time formed through human perception, which connects even to the future, thereby making it impossible to maintain objective time in its original form. Therefore, whether studying the *lieux de mémoire* (sites of remembrance) of people in the past,[121] or their representations of the future, historians are examining their perceptions of the present because when they visualise the future, they are actually speaking to the feelings and experiences of the present. Conversely, when they recall the past, they are trying to justify some thoughts or actions in the present.

It is clear, then, that *Begriffsgeschichte* still has a good deal to offer the historian. Yet, historians of the early Middle Ages seem somewhat indifferent to the perspective of *Begriffsgeschichte*. As stated in the Introduction, very few works on the Carolingian

[120] B. Croce, *History: Its Theory and Practice*, trans. D. Ainslie (New York, 1921), pp. 11–26.
[121] For an explanation of the *lieux de mémoire*, see P. Nora, 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations* 26 (1989), pp. 7–24.

period have engaged with the paradigm of *Begriffsgeschichte*. The reason for this may be related to the theoretical limitations imposed by some presuppositions that were planted at the very beginning of the construction of *Begriffsgeschichte*. Three of these presuppositions have already been pointed out in the introduction to Brunner's contributions above. Significantly, they have not been seriously reflected upon by either Koselleck or Hartog. Therefore, to adapt *Begriffsgeschichte* to early medieval studies, a series of revisions to these presuppositions are necessary.

Firstly, within the traditional *Begriffsgeschichte* framework, historians have looked for transformations in social structures almost exclusively in changes in conceptual connotations. However, such preconceptions inevitably limit the horizon to identifying the meaning of the concept, leaving out more possibilities, one of which is the changing positioning of the concept within the structure of thought. In this regard, some of Louis Althusser's thoughts on concepts may be instructive. Althusser generally shared *Begriffsgeschichte*'s views on the historical and non-essential nature of concepts, although as a structuralist he placed more emphasis on the need for concepts to be based on social structures, ignoring ideas such as the hermeneutic *Vorsicht* (fore-sight), because, as he wrote, 'the meaning... of a particular ideology (in this case an individual's thought), depends not on its relation to a truth other than itself but on its relation to the existing ideological field and on the social problems and social structure which sustain the ideology and are reflected in it.' [122] Yet in comparison to *Begriffsgeschichte*, Althusser attached more importance to the synchrony of the concept, which 'represents the organizational structure of the concepts in the thought-totality or system'. [123] In other words, in his view, not only is the implication of a concept

[122] L. Althusser, *For Marx*, trans. B. Brewster (London/New York, 2005), p. 62.
[123] L. Althusser, *Reading Capital*, trans. B. Brewster (London/New York, 1997), p. 65.

meaningful, but the way in which it is structured is an easily overlooked signifier. Althusser's argument reminds us to pay attention not only to changes in the connotation of concepts, but also to the relationship between changes in their position in the structure of thought and fluctuations in the social structure.

Secondly, since Brunner, the perception of time has often been seen as stable and unchanging throughout the medieval period, yet this view ignores the fact that the periodisation of over a thousand years as a historical phase is essentially a narrative, thereby inevitably missing the heterogeneity within it. The concept of 'Middle Ages' emerged at the beginning of the seventeenth century and became popular during the Enlightenment,[124] when a group of thinkers, in their vision of the future development of society, periodised history in terms of progressivism, dividing the evolution of human society into different stages. The aim of this historical periodisation is to establish temporal continuity between the past, the present and the future, and thus to find a firmer basis for the future. These thinkers did not study history as an end in itself but rather as a means by which to demonstrate the course of human progress. This idea of progressivism as the driving force behind the periodisation of history was exemplified in the French Revolution when the revolutionaries proclaimed themselves a new generation and referred to the institutions they sought to overthrow as the 'old regime'. Of this group of 'new men', Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) said,

> In 1789 the French tried harder than any other people has ever done to sever their past from their future, as it were, and hollow out an abyss between what they had been and what they wished to become. To that end, they took any number of precautions to ensure that they would carry over nothing from the past into their new condition. They imposed all sorts of constraints on themselves so that, in

[124] A. C. Murray, 'Should the Middle Ages Be Abolished?', *Essays in Medieval Studies* 21 (2004), p. 4.For the history of the term 'medieval', see W. A. Green, 'Periodization in European and World History', *Journal of World History* 3 (1992), pp. 13–53.

> fashioning the people they were to be in the future, they would not resemble their fathers. They spared no effort to make themselves unrecognizable.[125]

However, while Koselleck and Hartog have a deep understanding of progressivism in modernity, they have not been able to avoid this 'legacy' that it has left behind. Brunner himself, though a Romantic,[126] accepted the historical periodisation espoused by the Humanists and the Enlightenment, and saw the Middle Ages as a largely homogeneous composite. Later Koselleck and Hartog, restricted by their own professional backgrounds, also overlooked the need to revise this preconception laid down by Brunner. The neglect of temporal heterogeneity within the so-called 'Middle Ages', which lasted over a thousand years, may therefore be one of the reasons why historians have made few attempts to apply it to the investigation of early medieval history.

Thirdly, practitioners of *Begriffsgeschichte* usually observe the transition between *régimes d'historicité* at the fracture of the social structure: it is in this place that Hartog searches for the *brèche*, or the crisis of the temporal order. However, Hartog also admits that what he calls a *régime d'historicité* is only an ideal type, which, in reality, is necessarily filled with various elements of heterogeneity. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether there are also *brèches* within a *régime d'historicité*, accompanied by political crises that are perhaps not sufficient to constitute structural ruptures. It is better to think of time as indexical rather than as an indicator of social structure. According to Jonathan Turner, 'when an expression is said to be indexical, it means that the meaning of the expression is associated with a particular context.'[127] The indexicality of time

[125] A. de Tocqueville, *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution*, trans. A. Goldhammer and J. Elster (Cambridge, 2011), p. 1.
[126] D. M. Nicholas, 'New Paths of Social History and Old Paths of Historical Romanticism an Essay Review on the Work and Thought of Otto Brunner', *Journal of Social History* 3 (1969), p. 284.
[127] J. Turner, *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (New York, 2002), p. 586.

emphasises, on the one hand, the relationship between its meaning and the specific context in which it is produced: the meaning is not entirely in the expression itself, but also comes from the giving of the specific context. On the other hand, since it is an indexical expression, it means that the expression itself is concise, generalised, or partial rather than complete; that it has hidden or unexplained components; and that the index must cover more than what is actually said. In this sense, the indexical expression itself has a mediating meaning, in that it mediates the meaning, context, and search for the complete expression or the hidden component. Thus, according to the indexicality of time, it becomes possible to study Carolingian Francia, with a particular focus on the years 817–843, which is the focus of this thesis.

To avoid the obscuring of its internal heterogeneity that the term *régime d'historicité* entails, this thesis will use Heidegger's 'temporality' as an alternative to it. While this has, in fact, already been used several times, it is now necessary to explain what is meant by 'temporality' in the phenomenological sense of Heidegger.[128] The 'temporality' that is the object of investigation in this thesis is the equivalent of Heidegger's *Zeitlichkeit*. He defined *Zeitlichkeit* as essentially different from physical time, which flows backwards and forwards objectively, and instead as the basic structure of *Dasein* (there being). The *Dasein* rediscovers itself in the world, that is, in the *Sorge* (care), so that the essential prescriptive of *Dasein* is the *Sorge*, which is always born out of the past and points to the future. The *Sorge*'s three approaches are (1) *Schon-sein-in-der-Welt*: past; (2) *Sein-bei* (*dem momentan zu Besorgendem*): present; (3) *Sich-vorweg-sein* (*im Entwurf*): future. This *Ekstasen* (ecstasy) of the past, present and future turns into the original temporalisation. The past, the present and the

[128] For the following explanation, see M. Heidegger, *Die Grundprobleme der Phanomenologie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991).

future are not sequential, but are three aspects of one *Einheit* (unity), the three dimensions in which a *Dasein* carries out its *Sorge*, that is, the way in which a *Dasein* exists. *Zeitlichkeit* is what the *Sorge* is all about. In this sense, *Zeitlichkeit*, or temporality, is able to scale the object of study to each *Dasein* while fitting the underlying logic of *Begriffsgeschichte*, and thus avoiding, to a certain extent, the neglect of micro-differences under a macro-temporal narrative.

To conclude, the reflection and revision of the above three presuppositions of *Begriffsgeschichte* pave the way for the theoretical and methodological feasibility of this thesis. Before moving on to the textual analysis, however, it is necessary to introduce the period in which the sources I am focusing on were produced and how the sources have been studied by modern historians, the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PRIMARY SOURCES, THEIR AUTHORS, AND THEIR CONTEXTS

As stated earlier, the aim of this thesis is to investigate the temporalities in lay nobles' thinking during the Carolingian period. Whether or not there was a structural break in this period is debatable,[1] but it is certain that there were several political crises. The years 817 to 843, which are the focus of this thesis, fall within one of the crises, and this timeframe is determined by the date at which the sources on which this thesis is based were produced, namely Einhard's *Vita Karoli* (817x830), Nithard's *Historiae* (841–843) and Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* (843). It is therefore necessary to set out in this chapter the life of each author, their works and the contexts in which they wrote, before going into more detail.

2.1 Historical background

In 814, Louis the Pious (778–840) succeeded Charlemagne (740–814) as ruler of the Carolingian Empire and took control of the royal power of appointment and removal. In the first three years of his reign, Louis implemented a series of measures, including expelling his sisters and half-brothers from the court and sending them to monasteries; replacing many of the courtiers serving in Charlemagne's court with his own loyalists; and establishing the *Regula Benedicti* as the standard principle of organising monasteries within the empire. He also met with the Pope, who had come north to

[1] For a general introduction to the debate, see: R. Abels, 'The Historiography of a Construct: "Feudalism" and the Medieval Historian', *History Compass* 7 (2009), pp. 1008–31; S. MacLean, 'Apocalypse and Revolution: Europe around the Year 1000', *Early Medieval Europe* 15 (2007), pp. 86–106.

Reims, promising continued Frankish protection of the Holy See and of Rome.[2] All this shows that Louis the Pious was anxious to consolidate his power and to use Christianity to preserve the unity of the empire.

On Maundy Thursday 817, Louis the Pious was knocked to the ground by a collapsed wooden arcade as he was leaving the church. According to the court annalist, 'Through the diligence of the physicians who took care of him he evidently made a rapid recovery, since twenty days after it happened he went hunting at Nijmegen', a sign that his masculinity was not compromised, and that the realm had not fallen into disorder.[3] In a letter to Louis the Pious written in 830, Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon, retrospectively recounted that it was this accident that made the emperor feel that life was fragile and death certain, and led him decide to clarify the succession arrangements as soon as possible.[4] However, some modern historians argue that Louis arranged the succession at the age of thirty-nine, either because of pressure from his adult sons and their

[2] For the general process by which Louis consolidated his imperial power in Aachen, see M. de Jong, *The Penitential State* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 19–25. More specifically, on Louis' dealings with his sisters see J. L. Nelson, *The Frankish World, 750–900* (London, 1996), pp. 223–42. On his other relatives: B. Kasten, *Adalhard von Corbie. Die Biographie eines karolingischen Politikers und Klostervorstehers* (Düsseldorf, 1986), pp. 102–05; L. Weinrich, *Wala, Graf, Mönch, Rebell. Die Biographie eines Karolingers* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1963), pp. 28–33. On the replacement of old courtiers by new ones: J. L. Nelson, 'Carolingian Royal Funerals', in F. Theuws and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 149–50; R. McKitterick, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 158; J. L. Nelson, 'Bad Kingship in the Earlier Middle Ages', in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. VIII: 1–26; M. Gravel, *Distances, rencontres, communications: realiser l'empire sous Charlemagne et Louis le Pieux* (Turnhout, 2012), pp. 60–61; P. Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)* (Sigmaringen, 1997), pp. 390–91. On the *Regula Benedicti*, S. Keefe, *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire* (Notre Dame, 2002); M. de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', in J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 125–29; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 306–15. On meeting the Pope: E. Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme* (Darmstadt, 1996), p. 137; T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), pp. 302–08.

[3] 'Sed instantia medicorum, qui ei curam adhibebant, summa celeritate convaluit. Nam vicesima, postquam id acciderat, die Noviomagum profectus venatu sese exercebat.' In: *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH SRG* 6 (Hannover, 1895), p. 146; English trans. B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970), p. 102. With hunting, Louis tried to prove that his masculinity was not compromised: see E. J. Goldberg, 'Louis the Pious and the Hunt', *Speculum* 88 (2013), pp. 613–43. On hunting as a sign of a well-ordered realm, see Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 45, n. 44; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, p. 214.

[4] Agobard of Lyons, *Agobardi Lugdunensis Archiepiscopi Epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. 5* (Berlin, 1899), pp. 223–26.

followers to gain more power, or because of the desire to please God out of the virtue of royal vigilance.[5]

Whatever the case, a few months later he called a general assembly at Aachen, where he crowned Lothar (795–855) as co-emperor, and issued a document about his succession.[6] This provided that upon his death, Lothar would succeed him as emperor and rule over the centre of the Frankish kingdom; his second son, Pippin (797–838), would receive Aquitaine; and his third son, Louis (806–76), was given Bavaria. Pippin and Louis were required to submit to the rule of Lothar, and to present themselves before Lothar every year, in order to keep the peace between the brothers.[7] This succession arrangement, which established the predominance of the eldest son, is not necessarily a reflection of Louis the Pious' determination to change tradition with his emerging notion of imperial unity in mind. Such an understanding could be more the product of a mixture of the mental projections of historians concerned with national unity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the mistranslation of *unitas imperii*, meaning the 'unanimity of imperial rule', as the 'unity of empire'.[8] Instead, the spirit of this document, which has been given the modern title *Ordinatio Imperii*, is now considered to be more of a continuation of Charlemagne's practice of giving the eldest

[5] F. R. Erkens, '"Divisio legitima" und "unitas imperii". Teilungspraxis und Einheitsstreben bei der Thronfolge im Frankenreich', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 52 (1996), pp. 423–85; S. Patzold, 'Eine "loyale Palastrebellion" der "Reichseinheitspartei"?: Zur "Divisio imperii" von 817 und zu den Ursachen des Aufstands gegen Ludwig den Frommen im Jahre 830', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2006), pp. 43–78; S. Kaschke, *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen bis 831* (Hamburg, 2006), pp. 325–27.

[6] The new palace built by Charlemagne in Aachen in the 790s is sometimes considered to have become the real capital after Louis the Pious succeeded to the imperial throne in 814. See J. L. Nelson, 'Aachen as a Place of Power', in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. XIV: 217–41. However, McKitterick doubts this: see McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 157–71.

[7] For the full text of *Ordinatio imperii*, see: Boretius, *MGH Capit. 1*, pp. 270–75.

[8] Patzold, 'Eine "loyale Palastrebellion" der "Reichseinheitspartei"?'; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 25–27.

son the Frankish heartland and the other sons areas more recently incorporated into the *regnum*.[9]

However, the death of the Empress Ermengard in 818, followed by the marriage of Louis to Judith (797–843) the next year,[10] brought uncertainty to the empire.[11] This uncertainty became a reality in 823 with the birth of Judith's son, Charles (823–77), later known as Charles the Bald. But what was really causing tension between the older sons and their father, apart from their fear that the younger Charles would in future take the land that should have been theirs, was their resentment of Louis' paternal autocracy.[12] In an effort to defuse the conflict, especially with Lothar, Louis recalled him to Aachen in the summer of 823 to govern the empire jointly and made him the godfather of Charles the Bald. While the degree to which these measures were effective over the following years remains unclear, it has not been possible to pinpoint the family's tensions as the root cause of the first father-son conflict that began in 830. Instead, at this point, both the elder sons and their followers still appear to have been in awe of the authority of Louis the Pious, as father and earthly supreme ruler.

---

[9] J. L. Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London, 1992), p. 73. Some historians, however, argue that Louis the Pious changed the rules of succession to some extent, particularly given his overemphasis on the dominance of older brothers over younger ones, which led to tensions between brothers. See S. Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians* (London/New York, 2020), pp. 130–33.

[10] For Judith's life, see E. Ward, 'The Career of the Empress Judith, 819–43' (PhD thesis, King's College London, 2003); E. Ward, 'Caesar's Wife. The career of the empress Judith', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds), *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 205–77; E. Ward, 'Agobard of Lyons and Paschasius Radbertus as Critics of the Empress Judith', *Studies in Church History* 27 (1990), pp. 15–25; M. de Jong, 'Bride Shows Revisited: Praise, Slander and Exegesis in the Reign of the Empress Judith', in L. Brubaker and J. M. H. Smith (eds), *Gender in the Early Medieval World. East and West, 300–900* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 255–77. For the family of Welf from which Judith came, see B. Schneidmüller, *Die Welfen: Herrschaft und Erinnerung (819–1252)* (Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln, 2000), pp. 58–72.

[11] For an analysis of Louis' motivation to remarry, see de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 31–32; M. Costambeys, M. Innes, and S. Maclean, *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 205–06.

[12] On the older sons' concerns about young Charles, see Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 73; H. J. Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600–1000* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 157–65; E. J. Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire* (Ithaca, 2006), p. 60. on Louis the Pious' autocracy, see R. Collins, 'Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds), *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 378–79; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 32–33; Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)*, pp. 309–10, 346.

It was in 829 that things really began to take a turn for the worse. After experiencing military defeats at the hands of pagans on the frontier, seeing signs in the skies, and seeing epidemics of livestock diseases and widespread famine, among other *clades* (disasters), rumours that the *scandalum* (scandal) resulting from the emperor's sins had offended God and led to divine punishment soon spread from the court in Aachen across the empire.[13] In this atmosphere of unease, the Counts Matfrid and Hugh, scapegoated in 827 for losing the battle against the Muslims on the Spanish March, activated their vast network of patronage, choosing Pippin I of Aquitaine (797–838) as leader (and later Lothar), to start a rebellion against Louis the Pious.[14] However, Louis the Pious was able to take advantage of the tensions between his elder sons and succeeded in gaining the support of Pippin and Louis the German, eventually thwarting and capturing Lothar.[15] Thereafter the situation began to contradict the arrangement of 817, which was now clearly considered null and void. Pippin and Louis the German were rewarded for supporting their father with an expansion of their domains, Charles the Bald became a new player, while Lothar only received Italy.[16] In this new division of the empire, a principle was established that the father had the right to decide whether to make changes to the territory his son would inherit, depending on the latter's performance.[17]

---

[13] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 38–40, 148–57; D. Ganz, 'Einhardus Peccator', in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (New York, 2007), p. 43; C. M. Booker, *Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009), pp. 232–33.

[14] On Counts Matfrid and Hugh mobilising their clients after being punished as scapegoats, see Costambeys, Innes, and Maclean, *The Carolingian World*, pp. 213–14; Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*, pp. 140–41. For Matfrid and Hugh's interactions with Pippin of Aquitaine and Lothar, see Booker, *Past Convictions*, pp. 26–29; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 85–87, 152–53; Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*, p. 145.

[15] For details of the rebellion and its quelling, see Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 192–210; Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 59–77.

[16] For the full text of *Regni Divisio* of 831, see: *Regni Divisio*, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause, *MGH Cap. 2* (Hannover, 1897), pp. 20–24.

[17] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, p. 45. Airlie argues that this principle had already been implicit in *Ordinatio Imperii* of 817: see Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*, p. 131.

The first confrontation seemed to have subsided, but the new plan for the division of territory caused a new round of family tensions. A second father-son conflict soon broke out when Louis the Pious intended the *regnum* to be divided and inherited between Lothar and young Charles.[18] In April 832, Louis the German, backed by the Bavarian nobles, attempted to occupy Alemannia but was suppressed by Louis the Pious,[19] who then took Pippin into corrective custody in Trier (although Pippin soon escaped from this custody).[20] Under these circumstances, Lothar, Pippin I of Aquitaine and Louis the German put aside their old enmity and formed an alliance, rebelling in 833, and this time with the support of Pope Gregory IV.[21] After being betrayed and defeated and even abdicating and publicly repenting, the tables turned and Louis the Pious finally suppressed Lothar with the help of Louis the German, who had changed his mind. At this point, Lothar was expelled to Italy and ordered not to return to Francia without permission,[22] although Louis the Pious later changed his mind once again, drastically reducing the *regna* of Louis the German and reconciling with Lothar.[23]

Louis the Pious died on 20 June 840 on an island in the Rhine, two years after Pippin I of Aquitaine, who had died at the end of 838. Civil strife, however, continued, if with a slight reshuffle of participants: Charles the Bald and Pippin II of Aquitaine (823–864) entered the scene more fully and engaged in the struggle for power and land. The several divisions of the empire made it necessary for the nobility to break their previous vows

[18] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 46, 214.
[19] Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 64–67.
[20] Cf. J. L. Nelson, 'Kingship and Empire', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 188–89; P. Depreux, 'Das Königtum Bernhards von Italien und sein Verhältnis zum Kaisertum', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 72 (1992), pp. 1–25.
[21] On the impact and confusion caused by the unexpected advent of the Pope, see de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 38–40, 217–24; Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, pp. 308–22.
[22] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 46–51.
[23] For this division arrangement, proclaimed at the end of May 839 at the assembly in Worms, see J. L. Nelson The Annals of St-Bertin (Manchester, 1991), pp. 45–46.

repeatedly, causing confusion. Lothar attempted to place the empire under his own rule in accordance with the *Ordinatio Imperii* of 817. Louis the German and Charles the Bald, meanwhile, united in their respective interests and sought to seize a portion of the territory. [24] Successive conflicts and confrontations between the three brothers eventually led to the third civil war, which culminated in the Battle of Fontenoy in 841. At this battle, Louis the German and Charles the Bald defeated the allied forces of Lothar and Pippin II of Aquitaine. The horrific internecine warfare at Fontenoy so damaged the Frankish nobility that it was seen by contemporaries as the reason for the Franks' inability to defend themselves against the Viking raids.[25] For the time being, however, this battle led to the beginning of a turnaround in the series of civil wars, with Lothar now not strong enough to overcome his brothers, though Louis the German and Charles the Bald also suffered heavy losses. Neither side was able to fight again. The prolonged confrontations and struggles also increased the discontent of the nobles, who did not want the civil war to drag on. Under pressure, the three brothers negotiated and signed the Treaty of Verdun in August 843, which partitioned the empire into three independent kingdoms.[26]

The three authors of the sources analysed in this thesis, Einhard, Nithard, and Dhuoda, lived in these turbulent times. The remained of this chapter provides a description of these authors and their works.

[24] E. Screen, 'The Importance of the Emperor: Lothar I and the Frankish Civil War, 840–843', *Early Medieval Europe* 12 (2003), pp. 25–51.
[25] Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 117–21; Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 102–03.
[26] J. L. Nelson, 'Le partage de Verdun', in M. Gaillard et al. (eds), *De la mer du Nord à la Méditerranée. Francia Media. Une région au couer de l'Europe (c.840–c.1050)* (Luxembourg, 2011), pp. 241–54; Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 113–16.

2.2 Einhard and the *Vita Karoli*

2.2.1 Einhard and his life

Einhard was born around the year 770 in the Rhineland, where the Rhine and Main rivers meet. His family owned land in the Mulenheim area. In 779, when Einhard was a child, his parents sent him to the monastery of Fulda to be educated, although he never took the profession of monkhood. In the 790s, Einhard's outstanding learning and intellect led the Abbot of Fulda, Baugulf (?–815), to recommend him to Charlemagne's court, where he stayed until Charlemagne's death in January 814.

Prior to Einhard's arrival at the court of Charlemagne, it had already become a centre of scholarly activity thanks to the efforts of Alcuin (c.735–804), Paulinus of Aquileia (c.726–802/4), Paul the Deacon (c.720–c.799) and Peter of Pisa (744–799), among others. Although all these scholars had left the court by the time Einhard arrived, he was still given the opportunity to read in a strong academic atmosphere and to meet the great names, including the new circle of scholars around Charlemagne, such as Angilbert (c.760–814), Theodulf of Orleans (750–821), Fridugisus (c.790–834) and Modoin (c.770–840/3), and he himself soon became a rising star within what some modern historians have called the Carolingian Renaissance.[27] Einhard was at Charlemagne's side and in charge of the secretaries and involved in confidential matters; he also made several missions abroad on Charlemagne's orders. In 806, for example,

[27] For a general overview of the Carolingian Renaissance, see G. Brown, 'Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–51; P. Depreux, 'Ambitions et limites des réformes culturelles à l'époque carolingienne', *Revue historique* 623 (2002), pp. 721–53. It is worth noting that the appropriateness of the concept of the Carolingian Renaissance is still controversial among historians, see G. W. Trompf, 'The Concept of the Carolingian Renaissance', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34 (1973), pp. 3–26; J. L. Nelson, 'On the Limits of the Carolingian Renaissance', *Studies in church history* 14 (1977), pp. 51–69. Some historians prefer to replace it with the term 'Carolingian Renovation'. See M. Sot, '"Renovatio", renaissance et réforme à l'époque carolingienne: Recherche sur les mots', in M. Balard and M. Sot (eds), *Au Moyen Âge, entre tradition antique et innovation* (Grénoble, 2009), pp. 117–40.

Einhard met with Pope Leo III as Charlemagne's personal representative to discuss the succession to the throne, while, in 813, he addressed the assembly in Aachen as a spokesman for the magnates. After his accession, Louis the Pious gave Einhard a large part of Michelstadt and Mulenheim, probably in return for Einhard's support of him as sole heir to Charlemagne, and made Einhard the royal tutor of Lothar. It was probably around 829–30 that Einhard left the court and retired to a monastery in Seligenstadt. Einhard, however, remained in contact with the court by letter and courier. He died in March 840. The best known of Einhard's works is the *Vita Karoli* (*The Life of Charlemagne*), though he is also the author of *Translatio et miracula sanctorum Marcellini et Petri* (*The Translation and Miracles of the Blessed Martyrs Marcellinus and Peter*) and *Libellus de adoranda cruce* (*On the Adoration of the Holy Cross*), writing the latter in 836 in response to an enquiry from Lupus of Ferrières.[28]

2.2.2 *The Vita Karoli*: date and purposes

Einhard was already in Seligenstadt when he wrote the *Vita Karoli*, but the exact date of writing is still a matter of debate. In a letter sent by Lupus of Ferrières to Einhard and dated to 829–30, Lupus explicitly mentions that he had read the *Vita Karoli*.[29] In addition, Einhard wrote in the preface: 'Thus [I present] to you this book containing an account of the most splendid and greatest of all men.'[30] The word '*tibi* (to you)' in this phrase was long overlooked by scholars until David Ganz pointed out that the 'you' here together with the 'you' and 'G.' in the title ('*Einhardus G Suo Salutem*') of a

[28] For Einhard's life, Cf T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer* (University Park, 2009), pp. 7–18; P. E. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, 1998), pp. xi–xli.
[29] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistulae*, ed. and trans. G. W. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières*, (The Hague, 1966), pp. 1–3.
[30] 'En tibi librum praeclarissimi et maximi viri memoriam continentem.' In: Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, ed. and trans. M. Sot and C. Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard: Vie de Charlemagne* (Paris, 2019), p. 92. Translation from Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 16. The same below.

London manuscript of the *Vita Karoli* refer to the librarian at the court of Louis the Pious, Gerward, who left the court and his post in 829 or 830.[31] The text must therefore have been written before 829–30. Regarding the *terminus post quem*, the *Vita Karoli* must have been written after 817, for Einhard recorded the rebellion of Abodrites and the collapse of an arcade between the chapel and the palace, which took place in that year.[32] The date of the *Vita Karoli* thus falls between 817 and 830, a period on the eve of the succession conflict.

An understanding of the purpose of Einhard's writing is hampered by the difficulty of concluding whether he was writing before or after the sharp turn in imperial politics in 829. According to Einhard's own account in the *Vita Karoli*, his purpose in writing was, in part, to document the era of Charlemagne's reign, which he had personally experienced, so that it would not be obliterated, but also to repay the favour of Charlemagne, who had been his *dominus et nutrior* (lord and foster father):

> I did not see why I should refuse to take up a composition of this sort, since I was aware that no one could write about these things more truthfully than me, since I myself was present and personally witnessed them, as they say, with my own eyes. I was, moreover, not sure that these things would be recorded by anyone else...
>
> There is still another reason, an understandable one, I believe, which even by itself might explain why I felt compelled to write this account; namely, the foster care [Charlemagne] bestowed on me and the constant friendship [I had] with him and his children after I began living at his court.[33]

[31] D. Ganz, 'The Preface to Einhard's Vita Karoli', in H. Schefers (ed.), *Einhard: Studien zu Leben und Werk* (Darmstadt, 1997), p. 309.
[32] Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, pp. 23–25.
[33] 'Ab huiuscemodi scriptione non existimavi temperandum, quando mihi conscius eram nullum ea veracius quam me scribere posse, quibus ipse interfui, quaeque praesens oculata, ut dicunt, fide cognovi et, utrum ab alio scriberentur necne, liquido scire non potui… Suberat et alia non inrationabilis, ut opinor, causa, quae vel sola sufficere posset, ut me ad haec scribenda conpelleret, nutrimentum videlicet in me inpensum et perpetua, postquam in aula eius conversari coepi, cum ipso ac liberis eius amicitia.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 90; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 15.

Modern historians, however, generally agree that Einhard had a deeper motive for writing. One view sees widespread social criticism of Charlemagne's personal life and foreign policy. For example, on his deathbed, Wetti, a monk at Reichenau, had a vision of Charlemagne in purgatory being gnawed by wild animals on his genitals, and, not coincidentally, a vision of Charlemagne being tortured posthumously was shown to a 'poor woman' in Laon.[34] In this context, Einhard's *Vita Karoli* was a response and rebuttal to these criticisms. Paul Barnwell, on the other hand, argues that Einhard composed the *Vita Karoli* in the face of the risk of papal interference in the disputes between Louis the Pious and his sons. Its purpose was to oppose papal interference in Frankish kingship by emphasising that it was the fact that the Carolingians had already assumed substantial power in the late Merovingian period, rather than papal favour, that justified the family's acquisition of the throne.[35] Interestingly, there is also an opposite set of views. Matthew Innes and Rosamond McKitterick consider Einhard as a writer of political polemics in defence of Louis the Pious, suggesting that the crucial evidence for this interpretation of the *Vita Karoli* lies in its last sentence: 'after examining this same charter his son Louis, who succeeded by divine right, saw to it that [this division of properties] was fulfilled as quickly and faithfully as possible after his [father's] death.'[36] In other words, what Einhard sought to prove was that Louis the Pious fully and legally inherited Charlemagne's power and faithfully continued his father's internal and external policies, and that disloyalty to Louis the Pious was a breach of the oath that had been taken to Charlemagne.[37] Matthias Tischler, in contrast, argues that, by

[34] P. E. Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln/London, 1994), pp. 61–75; T. F. X. Noble, 'Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the Charlemagne Legend', in M. Gabriele and J. Stickey (eds), *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages* (New York, 2008), pp. 3–21.
[35] P. S. Barnwell, 'Einhard, Louis the Pious and Childeric III', *Historical Research* 78 (2005), pp. 129–39.
[36] 'Haec omnia filius eius Hludowicus, qui ei divina iussione successit, inspecto eodem breviario, quam celerrime poterat post obitum eius summa devotione adimplere curavit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 86; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 39.
[37] M. Innes and R. McKitterick, 'The Writing of History', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 202–05.

reading between the lines, Einhard's intimacy with Charlemagne and his description of Charlemagne's greatness was in fact self-empowering and critical of Louis the Pious' rule.[38] Mayke de Jong, however, gives a relatively neutral explanation, seeing Einhard as merely fulfilling his role as a senior courtier who had lived through the reign of Charlemagne by writing a biography of the great emperor for the then new-born Charles the Bald, in place of Louis the Pious, who had previously been absent from the Aachen palace for many years.[39]

Whatever Einhard's intentions in writing, his perception of temporality certainly permeates and pervades the text of the *Vita Karoli*. Einhard's great debt to Suetonius and his *De Vita Caesarum* (*The Life of the Caesars*) in writing the *Vita Karoli* was discovered by the French scholar Isaac Casaubon as early as 1595. For a long time afterwards, Einhard was disparaged as 'a slavish imitator' and his *Vita Karoli* was called 'the thirteenth Life of the Caesars'.[40] From this viewpoint, it could be dangerous to examine the perception of temporality by Einhard and his contemporaries through the *Vita Karoli*, since we cannot tell whether the temporality surfacing in the text belongs to the first half of the ninth century or to the second half of the first century, the time in which Suetonius was writing. Fortunately, however, numerous studies have rendered the above argument less convincing. Increasingly, historians see Einhard as making an attempt to combine classical tropes with Christian motifs. On one hand, Einhard has been shown to have merely borrowed the framework of Suetonius's writing, rather than being a stilted imitator of *De Vita Caesarum*.[41] The same is true of Einhard's attitude

[38] M. Tischler, *Einharts 'Vita Karoli'. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption* (Hanover, 2001), pp. 158, 161.
[39] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 68–69.
[40] L. Halphen, *Vie de Charlemagne / Éginhard* (Paris, 1923), p. XI.
[41] J. Meyers, 'Éginhard et Suétone: A propos des chapitres 18 à 27 de la Vita Karoli', in M. Goullet and M. Parisse (eds), *Les historiens et le latin médiéval* (Paris, 2001), pp. 129–50; M. Innes, 'The Classical Tradition in the

when it comes to other classical writers and works such as Cicero, Tacitus and *Historia Augusta*, which are considered as being equally influential for Einhard.[42] These distinctions between Charlemagne and the Roman emperors, as Jason Glenn has pointed out, stand for a kind of attempt 'to make sense of what it meant to become imperial — and how those attempts were shaped by the ways members of the Frankish elite understood the Roman world — essentially led to an empire that no longer resembled its model. In other words, the efforts among the Frankish elite to create an imperial identity modeled on Rome were perhaps the final nail in the coffin of the western Roman Empire itself'.[43]

On the other hand, one of the main factors contributing to the difference in ideology between Einhard and the classical writers on whom he drew was the different circumstances in which they lived. Einhard lived in a world where Christianity ruled, and the centrality of Christianity is reflected in the *Vita Karoli*. As David Ganz has examined in detail, Einhard not only drew on classical works, but also made extensive use of terminology from the biblical and patristic traditions. Ganz argues that Einhard insisted that what he wrote was a *vita* rather than a *gesta* lies in the fact that it is both a biography of an emperor from the classical tradition *and* simultaneously a hagiography in a Christian context.[44] The *Vita Karoli'*s flexible borrowing from classical works combined with its adoption of Christian tradition reflects the mindset of Einhard, who

Carolingian Renaissance: Ninth-Century Encounters with Suetonius', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3 (1997), pp. 264–82.

[42] M. S. Kempshall, 'Some Ciceronian Models for Einhard' s Life of Charlemagne', *Viator* 26 (1995), pp. 11–38; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 17–20; D. Ganz, 'Einhardus Peccator', p. 48; M. Thomson, 'The Original Title of the Historia Augusta', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 56 (2007), p. 122. However, Justin Stover and George Woudhuysen have recently argued that the argument that the *Vita Karoli* was influenced by the *Historia Augusta* is not well founded. See: J. Stover, and G. Woudhuysen, 'Einhard and the Historia Augusta', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 33 (2023), pp. 1–16.

[43] J. Glenn, 'Between Two Empires Einhard and His Charles the Great', in J. K. Glenn (ed.), *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture* (Toronto, 2011), p. 116.

[44] Ganz, 'The Preface to Einhard's Vita Karoli', pp. 299–310.

lived before the crisis of the 830s. It thus provides a glimpse into how a Frankish lay elite such as Einhard might have perceived temporality prior to the first father-son conflict of 830–1.

2.3 Dhuoda and the *Liber Manualis*

2.3.1 Dhuoda and her life

It is not clear when Dhuoda was born, but if she was between 15 and 20 years old when she married Bernard of Septimania, she would probably have been born between 806 and 811. If so, she would have been between 30 and 35 years old when she began writing in 841. The exact year of her death is also not known, but she wrote that she was in poor health, like 'a frail vessel' (*situla fragilis*), and that her health declined as a result of her continuing illness, so that she thought it was uncertain whether she would live to see William establish his own household.[45] The average life expectancy of women in the Carolingian period has been estimated at around thirty-six years, mostly due to difficult births, lack of care for the body and inadequate diet.[46] Based on these factors and that no later records of Dhuoda have survived, historians often date her death to 843, the year she completed her *Liber Manualis*.[47]

The Germanic character of the name 'Dhuoda' and her use of verses with Germanic rhythms in her *Liber Manualis* have led her to be identified by some historians as coming from the northern part of the Frankish realm.[48] On the basis of this opinion, Guarnarius and Rothlindis, who came from the Alemannic region and are listed in the

[45] M. Thiébaux, *Dhuoda*, pp. 67, 225.
[46] S. F. Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500 to 900* (Philadelphia, 1985), p. 101.
[47] K. Cherewatuk, 'Speculum Matris: Duoda's Manual', *Florilegium* 10 (1991), p. 49.
[48] P. Dronke, *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1984), p. 43; Thiébaux, *Dhuoda*, p. 8.

Liber Manualis as the close relatives for whom William should pray, are even sometimes considered to be Dhuoda's parents.[49] However, in a period when bilingualism and even multilingualism were common among the greater nobility, linguistic evidence does not seem to be decisive in identifying place of origin, let alone the fact that Guarnarius and Rothlindis were more likely to be the great-grandparents of Dhuoda's husband Bernard.[50] Dhuoda's ancestry could also be in the south, perhaps even the Visigothic nobility in Septimania.[51] Perhaps the reason why Dhuoda was trusted by her husband Bernard to look after the family interests in the remote region of Uzès was that she was born in the south and was familiar with the area.[52]

Dhuoda explicitly mentions in the *Liber Manualis* that her household members included her husband and two sons. While she was writing in the city of Uzès in the Rhone Valley, her eldest son, William, was sent by her husband to the court of Charles the Bald,[53] and her younger son, whose name she did not yet know, was taken by her husband to

[49] J. Wollasch, 'Eine adlige Familie des frühen Mittelalters', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 39 (1957), pp. 184–85; Thiébaux, *Dhuoda*, p. 8.
[50] On the bilingualism and multilingualism of the greater nobility in the Frankish period, see McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 21–22; P. J. Geary, *Language and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Waltham, 2013), pp. 65–68. For the identification of Guarnarius and Rothlindis, see C. B. Bouchard, 'Family Structure and Family Consciousness among the Aristocracy in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries', *Francia* 14 (1986), p. 656; R. Le Jan, 'Texte et intertextualité: le Manuel de Dhuoda', in S. Sato (ed.), *Herméneutique du texte d'histoire. Orientation, interprétation et questions nouvelles* (Nagoya, 2010), p. 107; C. Lauranson-Rosaz, 'Ermengarde, Ava, Ingelberge et les autres... "femmes" de Guilhelmides entre Austrasie et Aquitaine, entres Auvergne et Cluny, du Ville au Xe siècle', in J. P. Renard, D. Riche, and J. Teyssot (eds), *La place et le rôle des femmes dans l'histoire de Cluny* (Saint-Just-près-Brioude, 2013), pp. 38–39.
[51] C. Neel, *Handbook for William* (Washington DC, 1999), p. 8.
[52] Dronke, *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages*, p. 37. For the strategic position of Uzès, see R. Kaiser, *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht. Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfranzösischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1981), p. 313; M. Mayeski, *Dhuoda. Ninth Century Mother and Theologian* (Scranton, 1995), pp. 14–17.
[53] 'Audiui enim quod genitor tuus Bernardus in manus domni te commendauit Karoli regis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 50–51. There is a debate as to whether William was sent to Charles' court as a hostage or as a pledge of his father's goodwill. See B. Janssens, 'L'étude de la langue et les citations bibliques dans le Liber Manualis de Dhuoda: un sondage', in M. von Uytfanghe and R. Demeulenaere (eds), *Aevum inter utrumque. Mélanges offerts à Gabriel Sanders, professeur émérite à l'Université de Gand* (Steenbrugge, 1991), p. 259; Bouchard, 'Family Structure and Family Consciousness among the Aristocracy in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries', p. 639; J. Bessmertny, 'Le monde vu par une femme noble au IXe siècle. La perception du monde dans l'aristocratie carolingienne', *Le Moyen Âge* 93 (1987), p. 162; F. Sedlmeier, *Die laienparänetischen Schriften der Karolingerzeit: Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Texten des Paulinus von Aquileia, Alkuins, Jonas' von Orleans, Dhuodas und Hinkmars von Reims* (Neuried, 2000), p. 383.

Aquitaine.[54] Some historians suggest that Dhuoda later had a third child, a daughter, born probably in 844 or 845, countering the standard assumption that Dhuoda died in c. 843. They reason that an eleventh-century chronicler, Ademar of Chabanne (988/989–1034), recorded that William of Toulouse's sister married Vulgrimnus (866–886), count of Poitiers and Angoulême.[55] However, Ademar was writing much later and cannot always be relied on in matters of detail, so more evidence would be needed to support this argument.[56]

2.3.2 Bernard of Septimania and his family

Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* is inextricably linked to her husband Bernard, so a brief introduction to Bernard and his family is also necessary.[57] In contrast to the paucity of information on Dhuoda herself, the annals, chronicles, *vitae* and other sources of the ninth-century Carolingian empire are rich in references to Bernard and his family. Documentary evidence for Bernard's family, one of the few non-royal families of the time for which there are detailed historical records, dates from the eighth century and was related in some way to the Carolingians.[58] According to the *Annales regni Francorum*, Bernard's grandfather, Count Theodoric, was from Ripuaria on the west

[54] 'Etenim paruulum illum, antequam baptismatis accepisset gratiam, dominus et genitor Bernardus utrique uestrum, una cum Elefanto, praedictae ciuitatis episcopo, et cum ceteris fidelibus suis, in Aquitaniae partibus ad suam fecit adduci praesentiam.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 50–51.
[55] Thiébaux, *Dhuoda*, p. 7; L. Levillain, 'Les Nibelungen historiques et leurs alliances de familles', *Annales du Midi* 50 (1938), pp. 7–11.
[56] On Ademar of Chabanne and his chronicler, see R. Landes, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034* (London, 1995). On Vulgrimnus I of Angoulême, see A. Debord, *La société laïque dans les pays de Charente, Xe–XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1984).
[57] There seems to be a lack of monographic studies of Bernard's life, but the following works are worth referring to: Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)*, pp. 137–39; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 102–04, 111, 120–21, 139–41; Bouchard, *Those of My Blood*, pp. 181–91; A. Krah, *Die Entstehung der 'potestas regia' im Westfrankenreich während der ersten Regierungsjahre Kaiser Karls II. (840–877)* (Berlin, 2000); C. Lauranson-Rosaz, 'Les Guillelmides: une famille de l'aristocratie d'empire carolingienne dans le Midi de la Gaule (VIIIe–Xe siècles)', in L. Macé (ed.), *Les Guillaume d'Orange, entre histoire et épopée (IXe–XIIIe siècles)* (Toulouse, 2006), pp. 45–81.
[58] Bouchard, 'Family Structure and Family Consciousness among the Aristocracy in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries', p. 639; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 70.

bank of the Rhine and was ordered by Charlemagne to suppress a Saxon rebellion in 782.[59] When the Franks launched their expedition against the Avars in 791, one contingent was led by Charlemagne himself and the other by Theodoric.[60] This shows that the family was already very prominent by the late eighth century.

Theodoric's son William of Gellone was Duke of Toulouse from 790 to 811, and Aquitaine, where Toulouse is located, was an important region in the Carolingian period, once occupied by the Visigoths and therefore also known as Gothia. Geographically, the region was also on the frontier of the Muslim world. In order to subjugate the Goths, Basques and other communities in this region to Frankish rule, and to provide an effective defence against the Muslims, Charlemagne created the kingdom of Aquitaine in 781, making his three-year-old son Louis the Pious the king and assigning a group of *fidelis* to assist the young king.[61] William of Gellone achieved great military glory fighting against Muslim and local communities in this part of the Frankish southern frontier and became a central figure among Louis the Pious' faithful men. In his twilight years, however, the great warrior laid down his sword and retired to a monastery he founded in the village of Gellone. By virtue of his outstanding achievements, his devotion and his perfect moral character, William became a model of perfect nobility for his time.[62]

[59] B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970), p. 60.
[60] Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 69.
[61] Regarding the Spanish march and the kingdom of Aquitaine in the period of interest of this thesis, see C. J. Chandler, *Carolingian Catalonia: Politics, Culture, and Identity in an Imperial Province, 778–987* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 60–150.
[62] On William of Gellone, see M. Aurell, *Les noces du comte. Mariage et pouvoir en Catalogne (785–1213)* (Paris, 1995), pp. 35–36; A. Dubreucq, 'Guillaume de Toulouse et la politique carolingienne en Aquitaine, d'après les sources narratives', in L. Macé (ed.), *Entre histoire et épopée: les Guillaume d'Orange (IXe – XIIIe siècles)* (Toulouse, 2006), pp. 184–89.

The exploits of Bernard's grandfather and father thus include the conquest of the Saxons, the Avars and Aquitaine as well as the fight against the Muslims: in terms of spatial distribution, they present a spread from east to west and from north to south throughout the Carolingian Empire. William of Gellone's estates and public offices were inherited by his sons. Bernard was Count of Barcelona and Duke of Septimania, Gozhelm was Marquis of Gothia and Count of Roussillon and Gerona, and Theuderic was Count of Autun. William also had two daughters, Gerberga, a nun and possibly even the abbess of Ste.-Croix of Poitiers, and Rothild, who was the wife of Wala, the Count of Saxony and later Abbot of Corbie.[63]

During the chaotic period of the first half of the ninth century, Bernard was the most thoroughly documented of his siblings and one of the most notorious of his contemporaries.[64] In 824, he married Dhuoda at the palace in Aachen, and in 827, when their son William was one year old, the emperor Louis the Pious, who was also his godfather, commanded Bernard to suppress a rebellion in the area around the Spanish march and ordered Pippin I of Aquitaine to send a contingent to intercept the advancing army from Córdoba in order to assist Bernard. According to the *Royal Frankish Annals*, however, reinforcements from Aquitaine were led by Hugh of Tours, Lothar's father-in-law, and Matfrid of Orleans, whose delay allowed the Emir's army to ravage the area around Barcelona and Gerona and to withdraw unharmed. The military defeat against the Muslims on the imperial frontier caused the Franks deep anxiety and fear, believing that this was a punishment from an angry God for their sins. Hugh and Matfrid were

[63] On William's two daughters, see Bouchard, *Those of My Blood*, p. 186; Collins, 'Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine', p. 375; Weinrich, *Wala*, p. 18.
[64] In the works of contemporaries such as Paschasius Radbertus, Nithard, the Astronomer, and Prudentius of Troyes, Bernard is portrayed in a negative light, as seen in the following, respectively M. de Jong, *Epitaph for an Era: Politics and Rhetoric in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 151–58; Nithard, *Historiae*, ed. and trans. P. Lauer and S. Glansdorff, *Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris, 2012), pp. 10–1, 14–5, 58–61, 94–5; Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious*, pp. 274–6, 279, 283; Nelson, *Annals of St-Bertin*, pp. 45–46.

then scapegoated by Louis the Pious, who deprived them of their *honores*; Matfrid's public office and estate in Orléans, for example, were transferred to Odo, Bernard's cousin.[65]

In August 829, Bernard was promoted to mentor of the six-year-old Charles the Bald, and was also appointed chamberlain (*camerarius*), a promotion that made Dhuoda's husband second in power only to the emperor himself. At this point, Bernard, son of a saint, godson of the emperor, local leader, chamberlain in the court and mentor to the emperor's son, reached the pinnacle of his career.[66]

Soon after reaching these heights, however, he was allegedly embroiled in a scandalous affair with Empress Judith, and the fact that Bernard was Louis' godson made the accusation a more serious form of incest than adultery.[67] As chamberlain, Bernard was responsible for organising the daily life of the court and was in charge of the royal treasury, which held a large number of coins, precious materials for minting, books, tapestries and valuable gifts from foreign ambassadors. In outlining the functions of this office, drawing on a text probably originally written in the reign of Louis the Pious, Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims (806–882) placed particular emphasis on the fact that it had to be joined by the Empress in order to exercise its authority.[68] This daily contact between Bernard and Judith may have provided the ground for rumours. The underlying reason, however, was that Judith and Bernard were believed to have blocked others'

[65] Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, pp. 121–22.. For a specific analysis of this event, see de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 148–52.
[66] On Bernard's career at the court of Louis the Pious, see Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)*, p. 137.
[67] On this scandal, see G. Bührer-Thierry, 'La reine adultère', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 35 (1992), pp. 299–312; Ward, 'Caesar's Wife', pp. 205–27.
[68] Hincmar of Rheims, *De Ordine Palatii*, ed. and trans. T. Gross and R. Schieffer, *MGH Fontes 3* (Hanover, 1980), pp. 72–74.

access to Louis the Pious, disrupting patronage channels, and the deposition of the magnates Matfrid and Hugh in particular made those under their patronage deeply disturbed, all of which created a breeding ground for discord.[69] After the outbreak of war between Louis the Pious and his sons in 830, Bernard fled from court to his fortress in Barcelona and wavered on which side to support in the civil wars that followed. By the time Dhuoda was writing her *Liber Manualis*, he was hesitantly sliding from the side of Pippin II of Aquitaine to that of Charles the Bald.

2.3.3 Historiographical Debates around Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*

Three manuscripts of the *Liber Manualis* have been found to have survived, now in Paris (P),[70] Nîmes (N)[71] and Barcelona (B).[72] P was copied in the seventeenth century at the abbey of St.-Germain-des-Prés and was brought to light by Jean Mabillon (1632–1707) in 1677, making it the earliest of the three manuscripts to become widely known.[73] The date of the exemplar of P is not yet known. However, before it was acquired by Pierre de Marca (1594–1662), Archbishop of Toulouse and later of Paris, it was kept in the archives of the Cathedral of Uzès or in a library in Barcelona, the very places where Dhuoda wrote it and where his son William died, respectively.[74] In 1885, Eugène Germer-Durand (1812–1880) discovered N, copied in Carolingian minuscule

[69] de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 198–99; Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)*, pp. 284–86.
[70] 'Ms. lat. 12293, Bibliotheque nationale de France (Paris)', https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc736087 [accessed 8 Sep 2023].
[71] 'Ms 393, Bibliotheque Municipale de Nîmes (Nîmes) ', https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc104971r/cN121192 [accessed 8 Sep 2023].
[72] 'Ms 569, Biblioteca Nacional de Catalunya (Barcelona) ', https://manipulus.ucm.es/handle/20.500.12238/95 [accessed 8 Sep 2023].. For a commentary and description of this manuscript, see C. J. Chandler, 'Barcelona BC 569 and a Carolingian Programme on the Virtues', *Early Medieval Europe* 18 (2010), pp. 272–91.
[73] The title of this article is *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti IV. I*. It was later reprinted in Migne, see J. Mabillon, *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti IV. I*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina 106* (Paris, 1851), pp. 109–18.
[74] P. Riché, *Dhuoda. Manuel pour mon fils* (Paris, 1975), pp. 45–47; M. Tischler, 'From Disorder to Order: The Scientific Challenges of Early Medieval Catalonia for Twenty-First-Century Medieval Studies', in M. Breitenstein and J. Sonntag (eds), *Disorder. Expressions of an Amorphous Phenomenon in Human History* (Münster, 2020), p. 120.

in the ninth or tenth century. This is the oldest known codex of the *Liber Manualis*, although unfortunately it consists of only nine fragments of the text.[75] Despite the availability of manuscripts P and N, the study of the *Liber Manualis* did not seem to attract sufficient attention until a new manuscript from Barcelona came to the attention of historians in the 1950s.[76] B is the most complete of the three manuscripts. Its appearance before scholars can be traced back as far as an article by Alfred Cordoliani (1919–2018) in 1950, although it really became widely known until André Vernet's (1940–2022) article in 1956.[77] The readings in B suggest that its exemplar originated in Catalonia, and the fact that William died in Barcelona may imply that the original exemplar from which B was ultimately derived was William's own book.[78]

The edited translations into modern languages of the *Liber Manualis* are based on the three manuscripts above.[79] A large number of thematic studies accompanied the appearance of these translations.[80] They began with literary and theological perspectives until the feminine identity in the *Liber Manualis* became a new theme after the late 1970s, when the study of women's history emerged.[81]

---

[75] Riché, *Dhuoda*, pp. 47–48.
[76] Early studies of the *Liber Manualis* include P. A. Becker, 'Duodas Handbuch', *Zeitschrift fur Romanische Philologie* 21 (1897), pp. 73–101; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, vol. 1: Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts* (München, 1911), pp. 443–44. For a history of the reception of the *Liber Manualis* from its rediscovery in the seventeenth century to the present day, see J. F. Ruys, 'Mater Litterata: Considerations of Maternity and Latinity in the Post-Medieval Reception of Dhuoda's Liber manualis', *New Medieval Literatures* 10 (2008), pp. 200–20.
[77] A. Cordoliani, 'Los manuscritos de cómputo eclesiástico en las Bibliotecas de Barcelona', *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 23 (1950), pp. 122–23; A. Vernet, 'Un nouveau manuscrit du "Manuel" de Dhuoda (Barcelone, Biblioteca central, 569)', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 114 (1956), pp. 18–44.
[78] Riché, *Dhuoda*, pp. 49–50.
[79] On the various editions and translations, see Sedlmeier, *Die laienparänetischen Schriften der Karolingerzeit*, pp. 374, 546–7.
[80] Steven Stofferahn has reviewed the study of Dhuoda and her work at some length, see S. Stofferahn, 'The Many Faces in Dhuoda's Mirror: the Liber manualis and a Century of Scholarship', *Magistra* 4 (1998), pp. 89–134. But due to the proliferation of studies involving the *Liber Manualis*, this bibliography now seems to be in need of updating.
[81] From a literary perspective: B. Löfstedt, 'Zu Dhuodas Liber manualis', *Arctos. Acta Philologica Fennica* 15 (1981), pp. 67–83; Janssens, 'L'étude de la langue et les citations bibliques dans le Liber Manualis de Dhuoda', pp. 259–75; F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, Bd I* (Munich, 1975), p. 407; Dronke, *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages*, pp. 36–45. From a theological perspective: M. Mayeski, 'The Beatitudes and the Moral Life of the Christian: Practical Theology and Biblical Exegesis in Dhuoda of Septimania', *Mystics*

Dhuoda's self-identity first received attention in this gendered perspective. Generally speaking, historians believe that Dhuoda always identified herself in relationship to others, especially her family members. Peter Dronke suggested that Dhuoda identified herself first and foremost as William's mother. He noticed that Dhuoda was full of self-deprecation in her lines, yet this is not a 'topos of affected modesty'; rather, she was expressing a serious conviction that she had to write regardless of her intellectual and personal flaws, for her relationship with William was unique (*tamen genitrix tua, fili Wilhelme*), and she, accordingly, was able to convey something unique and appropriate to William that no other authority could replace, no matter how learned they were. Dhuoda saw herself as playing an important role in setting William's goals in life. She thought that William would do what was best, not because he listened to the preaching of the clergy, 'but for me' (*ob memoriam mei*).[82]

If Dronke's opinion is largely literary, speculating on Dhuoda's ideas through her diction, Rachel Stone then places the ideological source of Dhuoda's desire to assume pastoral responsibility as a mother in the context of Carolingian moral reform,[83] which is supported by Janet Nelson's research on Dhuoda's narrative on dreams.[84] Nelson also agrees that Dhuoda is putting herself first as a mother. But unlike Dronke, Nelson sees Dhuoda as using her motherhood to engage in public discourse; Dhuoda considered

Quarterly 18 (1992), pp. 6–15; G. W. Olsen, 'One Heart and One Soul (Acts 4.32 and 34) in Dhuoda's "Manual"', *Church History* 61 (1992), pp. 23–33; R. Martín and V. Eugenia, 'Los salmos bíblicos como enseñanza en el Manual de Dhuoda', in M. P. Gonzalez (ed.), *Actas del III Congreso Hispánico de Latín Medieval* (Léon, 2002), pp. 447–56. For an overview of the rise of women's history, see H. W. Goetz, *Frauen im frühen Mittelalter. Frauenbild und Frauenleben im Frankenreich* (Köln, 1995), pp. 31–68.

[82] Dronke, *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages*, p. 41.

[83] R. Stone, 'Masculinity without Conflict: Noblemen in Eighth and Ninth Century Francia', in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. 76–93.

[84] J. L. Nelson, 'Dhuoda on Dreams', in C. Leyser and L. Smith (eds), *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400–1400: Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser* (New York, 2011), pp. 41–54.

herself not only as a mother in the biological sense but also as a mother in the spiritual sense of her son's *comilitones* (fellow-warriors).[85] Dhuoda, therefore, is a mother, but also an 'organic intellectual'.[86]

In addition to motherhood, Dhuoda identified herself in her conjugal relationship with Bernard. Most historians agree that, in Dhuoda's consciousness, the father reigned supreme within the family, and paternal authority should be dominant.[87] In contrast to this standard interpretation, it must be noted that several historians, such as Martin Claussen and John Contreni, have claimed that Dhuoda was a denier of traditional patriarchal ideas.[88] Regardless, a crucial question is: how does Dhuoda position herself in the family? Régine Le Jan argues that although Dhuoda was a devout woman, she did not see her marriage as based on the Christian principle of mutual love and fidelity. Instead, she regarded it as an exchange of obligations out of 'necessity', i.e., Bernard protected her and she served Bernard.[89] Nelson largely agrees with Le Jan, but adds that the mutual support of Dhuoda and Bernard should be understood in the context of local dynasties against central authority.[90]

A second focus of research has been Dhuoda's motivation for writing. The early view, as suggested by Martin Claussen, was that Dhuoda was writing a book for her son

[85] J. L. Nelson, 'Dhuoda', in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 106–20.
[86] J. L. Nelson, 'Organic Intellectuals in the Dark Ages?', *History Workshop Journal* 66 (2008), pp. 1–17.
[87] Nelson, 'Dhuoda', p. 109. Also Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters', p. 32.
[88] M. A. Claussen, 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority: Dhuoda and the Liber manualis', *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996), pp. 785–809; John J. Contreni [review], 'Marie A. Mayeski, *Dhuoda: Ninth Century Mother and Theologian* (Scranton, 1995)', *Speculum* 72 (1997), pp. 1197–98
[89] R. Le Jan, 'The Multiple Identities of Dhuoda', in R. Corradini et al. (eds), *Ego Trouble: Authors and Their Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2010), p. 216.
[90] J. L. Nelson, 'Dhuoda's Context', in L. Jégou et al. (eds), *Faire lien. Aristocratie, réseaux et échanges compétitifs: Mélanges en l'honneur de Régine Le Jan* (Paris, 2015), pp. 456–58.

William that was designed to guide him to a godly life on earth.[91] More recently, however, historians have considered the possibility that Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* had other audiences. Nelson, for example, argues that Dhuoda subtly used her gender and life experiences in the Aachen court to preach to her son as well as to her son's *comilitones*, educating them on how to serve the *res publica*.[92] Le Jan includes Charles the Bald in Dhuoda's target audience. She argues that Dhuoda purposefully mentioned that William's loyalty to his father should come before his loyalty to the king because she wanted to admonish Charles: under a just king, nobles did not need to worry about a conflict between these two kinds of loyalties, whereas a tyrant who violated God's created order and divided the father from the son was not worthy of allegiance.[93] Based on Martin Gravel's research that reveals how Carolingian harmony relied heavily on the emperor's communication with the local elites,[94] Jean Meyers proposes that 'by writing the Manual, the princess tries to enter into dialogue with the authorities and seeks to ensure the future of her family threatened by the turmoil of the fratricidal war of the sons of Louis the Pious.'[95]

Thirdly, historians have discussed the differences between Dhuoda's ideas and those of the Church and of lay men. Compared to the first two themes, it can be observed that this issue still seems to be under-explored. In 1984, Dronke noted 'how unusual many of Dhuoda's expressions of Christian emotion are', and suggested that this 'may be why her work did not become widely adopted and diffused in learned circles.'[96] Yet, while

[91] M. A. Claussen, 'God and Man in Dhuoda's Liber manualis', in W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds), *Studies in Church History* (Oxford, 1990), p. 44.
[92] Nelson, 'Dhuoda', pp. 109–20. Also Nelson, 'Dhuoda's Context', p. 455.
[93] Le Jan, 'The Multiple Identities of Dhuoda', pp. 218–19.
[94] Cf. Gravel, *Distances, rencontres, communications*.
[95] 'En écrivant le Manuel, la princesse tente d'entrer en dialogue avec le pouvoir et cherche à assurer l'avenir de sa famille menacée par les remous de la guerre fratricide des fils de Louis le Pieux.' In: J. Meyers, 'Dhuoda et la justice d'après son Liber Manualis (IXe siècle)', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* 25 (2013), p. 461.
[96] Dronke, *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages*, pp. 38–39.

highlighting the existence of unusual features in Dhuoda's writing, Dronke did not explain in detail what is special about her thought. More recently, Claussen has crafted a detailed argument on why Dhuoda did not see lay as inferior in spirituality to religious and how her view of power differed from lay males.[97] Along Claussen's lines, but selecting two more specific comparative samples (Dhuoda and Nithard), Meg Leja suggests that there may have been a competition between monastic beliefs and those of lay people at the time, while at the same time lay men and women may have differed on issues such as notions of the body, perceptions of the sexes, and views on knighthood.[98]

In addition, historians have found that Dhuoda often distorted or even falsified the original context or wording when quoting classical Latin verses, the Scriptural texts or even ancient grammar books to illustrate or argue her points. However, Rosamond McKitterick argues that Dhuoda's extensive reading is at least a hint that we may well be underestimating the sophistication of Carolingian culture.[99]

2.3.4 Three temporal layers in the *Liber Manualis*

The *Liber Manualis* itself is a temporally rich text. Through the lens provided by Koselleck and Braudel, we find that there are three durations in Dhuoda's text, each with its own space of experience and horizon of anticipation, and that each is expressed in the form of a spatialised metaphor.

[97] Claussen, 'God and Man in Dhuoda's Liber manualis', pp. 44–49.
[98] Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters', pp. 24–29.
[99] McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 223–25.

Firstly, there is the long duration, which spans earth and heaven and represents the sacred time of stillness. God, as Lord of heaven and creator of earthly things, necessarily exists in still time:

> Dwelling in the past, now in the present and in the future, he is always here and everywhere. Existence in him contains the possibility of all good things. Existence is his forever, for in his words: 'I am Alpha and Omega' and 'I am who am.' And again, Scripture says. 'He who is has sent me to you', and so on.[100]

Dhuoda begins here by metaphorically representing time as a line, at one point of which is the present and either side is the past and the future, respectively. God, as an eternal being, is everywhere on this line. Borrowing from scriptural language, she then metaphorically transformed time into an alphabet in which God is also present in every letter of the alphabet. Through God's sacred time, Dhuoda realises the empowerment of her own work. And in explaining the meaning of *manualis* (handbook) to her son, she split it into the words: *manus* (hand) and *alis* (wings). Between them,

> Now the 'Hand' [in 'Handbook'] can be understood in many senses: sometimes it signifies God's power; sometimes the Son's power, and sometimes it means the Son himself…All these and similar passages can be understood as divine activity and power. For 'Hand' signifies the work completed, as Scripture says: 'And the Lord's hand was laid upon me', that is to say, the redemption which has led believers to perfection.[101]

Dhuoda metaphorically conceived of her handbook as a hand that occupies part of the space of the body. She saw the hand as representing a work that has already been done and will not be altered again, and the task of the handbook is to lead the believer towards

[100] 'Ipse in praeteritis tunc, ipse in praesentibus nunc, ipse in posteris manens, semper hic et ubique est, et esse apud se omnia utilia possibiliter habet. Apud illum semper esse abetur, dicente illo: Ego sum alfa et omega. Et Ego sum qui sum. Et iterum dicit Scriptura: Qui est misit me ad uos, et cetera.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 60–61.
[101] 'Manus' enim multis intelligitur modis: aliquando Dei potestas, aliquando Filii, aliquando etiam ipse intelligitur Filius… Haec omnia vel his similia operatio et potestas intelligitur sancta, nam manus opus significat perfectum, Scriptura dicente: Et facta est super me manus Domini, hoc est redemptio, quod credentes ad perfectum usque perduxit.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 40–41.

the eternal world after salvation. Thus, through the metaphor of spatialisation, we see a timeless state manifested in Dhuoda's text over the long duration that straddles earth and heaven.

The second temporal layer is one of medium duration; it exists on earth and is expressed as a time loop between the ancient and the modern. To reinforce the message and strength of her work, Dhuoda compared herself to the Apostle Paul, the *Liber Manualis* to Apollos the Evangelist, and her son William to the Corinthians:

> For let it be said that this little book in the form of a handbook consists of words from me, and their actualization in you. As a certain one has said: 'I have planted the seed, Apollo has watered it, and God has made it grow.'[102]

In the process of writing her book, earthly time was physically experienced and, as a result, time was metaphorically transformed into a circle. In addition, Dhuoda specifically reminded William not to confuse the long duration of stillness with other durations:

> In the struggle to claim the world, we say, and people say, 'This is mine, and all this is mine.' They speak the truth, since it's theirs, but then it isn't theirs. They have it and they don't have it. They have it for a little while, but not forever. It's theirs for a time, but not for all time.[103]

When one forgets that the long duration of eternity belongs to God, it leads to a cycle of tragic history in the medium duration:

---

[102] 'Dicatur enim iste formatus libellus Manualis, hoc est sermo ex me, opus in te, et ut ait quidam: Ego plantaui, Apollo rigauit, Deus autem incrementum dedit.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 42–43.
[103] 'Ista contendentes in saeculo dicimus et dicunt: 'Meum est, et cuncta'. Verum dicunt quia est et non est, abent et non abent, est ad modicum sed non semper, abent ad tempus sed non omne tempus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 66–67.

> Nebuchadnezzar, for example, faithless and most iniquitous man, lay defeated and spent. Once he had rallied, he said, 'It is the Lord who orders and commands and who has the power to raise up. Those who walk in pride he can cast down. He possesses the kingdom and will bestow it on whom he wishes…' I think now of those whose stories I have heard and read, and I have seen members of my family, and yours, my son, whom I've known. Once they cut a powerful figure in the world, and then they were no more. They are perhaps with God because of their noble merits, but they are not physically present on earth.[104]

Thus, in Dhuoda's view, the cyclic nature of the medium duration can be either good or bad, depending on whether the actor keeps in mind the correct nature of the long duration when acting. The short term as a space in which action unfolds is thus brought out.

The short term is as earthbound as the medium duration, but what distinguishes it most from the latter is that it refers only to the immediate future and past, and thus the space of experience is separated from the horizon of anticipation, or the past from the future, and thus is characterised by a linear progression. The short term appears in Dhuoda's arrangement of William's daily life, beginning with a reading of her handbook:

> The little book before you branches out in three directions. Read it through and, by the end, you will understand what I mean. I want the three guidelines to be marked with equal emphasis in the very useful sequence of my teachings: The Rule, the Form, and the Handbook.[105]

William is then taught to pray during his daily routine:

[104] 'Nam et Nabugodonosor incredulus pessimusque, uictus et prostratus et quasi recuperatus, ita afatus est dicens: Ipse est Rex imperans et regens, habens potestatem exaltandi, et eos qui in superbia gradiuntur potest humiliare, habensque regnum et cui uoluerit dabit illud. Considero quos audiui legere, etiam et uidi aliquos ex parentibus meis tuisque, fili, qui fuerunt in saeculo quasi potentes, et non sunt; sunt fortasse apud Deum, pro meritis dignis, sed non sunt corporaliter conuersantes in mundo.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 67.
[105] 'Praesens iste libellus in tribus uirgulis constat esse erectus: lege cuncta et in fine plenius nosse ualebis. Volo enim ut simili modo in tribus lineis secundum auctoritatis seriem utilissimum habeat nomen: id est Norma, Forma et Manualis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 40–41.

> As you repose in your bed, say three times: 'God, come to my support. Lord, hasten to help me.' When you arise in the morning, with God's help, or at whatever hour the loving Lord permits you to do so, say three times, 'God ...' as indicated earlier.[106]

It can be seen that Dhuoda followed the conventional rhetoric, often metaphorically referring to the short term as the number three. Where the number is not explicitly mentioned, she also tended to imply the number three by superimposing synonymous verbs three times, as when Dhuoda asked William not only to study the handbook thoroughly, but also to take good care of his younger brother after his baptism:

> These words that I address to you, read them, understand them, and put them to practice. And when your little brother, whose name I do not even know as yet, has received the grace of baptism in Christ, do not be slow to teach, encourage and love him, to rouse him to go from good to better.[107]

In admonishing William to believe in the Trinity, Dhuoda said:

> It would take too long to describe to you their attributes individually, but, however that may be, I counsel you to believe, love and cherish them.[108]

This metaphor of time as a number is also a strategy for spatialising time. Henri Bergson pointed out that 'Common sense is very much inclined to build up number with indivisibles.' When we count, a picture emerges in the mind of a number made up of indivisible units, such as the number one, placed side by side. This means that there is a pre-experiential thinking in the mind that places numbers in space. As Bergson

---

[106] 'Cum quieueris in lecto, dic ter: 'Deus in adiutorium meum intende. Domine, ad adiuuandum me festina'… Cum, auxiliante Deo, surrexeris mane, hora tibi permiserit Pius, dic iterum tertio: « Deus », ut supra.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 78–81.

[107] 'Haec uerba a me tibi directa lege, intellige et opere comple, fratremque tuum paruulum, cuius modo inscia sum nominis, cum baptimatis in Christo acceperit gratiam, insinuare, nutrire, amare, ac de bono in melius prouocare ne pigeas.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 70–71.

[108] 'Et licet longum sit illorum proprietates tibi conscribere per singula, hoc te admoneo ut ita credas, ames et diligas.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 74–75.

explains, 'from the beginning, therefore, we must have thought of number as of a juxtaposition in space.'[109] As to why the number three was chosen, Dhuoda hinted at the theological aspect of the reason:

> The number 3 contains perfect trinity in itself. In the highest sense, this is God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.[110]

In addition to incorporating Christian numerical symbolism in her writing, Dhuoda's handbook provided an elaborate arrangement of William's actions, thereby disciplining him more effectively and, in the words of Michel Foucault, 'administering time and making it useful, by segmentation, seriation, synthesis and totalisation'.[111]

It is also worth noting that the long, medium and short durations reflect a relationship of sequential empowerment rather than separation from one another. For example, Dhuoda required that in the short term, William 'must entreat in silence that he (God) may grant, bestow and lavish his bounty', because in the medium duration 'so did the holy Fathers in ancient times pour forth their prayers at length'. If William obeyed Dhuoda's instructions, he would benefit in the long duration, 'remaining constant in the Lord'.[112] Yet, since each duration has its own space of experience and horizon of anticipation, the transformation between durations often leads to changes in both, a development which is reflected in the metaphorical inversion. Returning to Dhuoda's explanation of '*Manualis'*, she said:

---

[109] H. Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*, trans. F. L. Pogson (New York, 2001), pp. 84–85.
[110] 'Ternarius quoque perfectum trinum continet numerum, quod intelligitur ad summum Deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 64–65.
[111] M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. A. Sheridan (New York, 1979), p. 160.
[112] 'silentio quaerendum est ut sua det, tribuat, largiatur…Nam Patres sancti, antiquis temporibus, longuas protrahebant orationes…Quia pro meritis digna cum Domino semper erant assidui.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 78–79.

> ‘The ‘-alis’ part of *Manualis* has many meanings... indeed, ‘bird’ signifies the herald and messenger of dawn, bringing the end of night and singing the light of the morning hours.’[113]

Evidently, within the frame of long duration here, Dhuoda metaphorically referred to earthly historical time as night and sacred time as day, and her handbook is the very bird that leads William from night to day. But in another place, Dhuoda interpreted earthly history by exegesis, noting in the frame of medium duration:

> ‘He himself watches our actions from dawn to evening’, that is, ‘from sunrise to sunset’, or, indeed, from our issuing forth from the womb to the moment of our death. ‘From dawn to evening’ also signifies from Adam, the first creature formed, to the last human to be born and die at the end of the world.[114]

In contrast to before, the daylight hours from sunrise to sunset are metaphorically the history of the earthly world, while the night after sunset instead becomes the eternal sacred time. The reason for this inversion is that as the text switches from long to medium duration, the space of experience and the horizon of anticipation change accordingly. In long duration, people in earthly time are in the darkness of night because of their sins, and once saved they ascend to the light of day of heavenly time; whereas in medium duration, as people have their activities under the sun, the earthly time in which life is lived is metaphorically referred to as day, and when life ends and they face the Last Judgement, they pass from day to night.

---

[113] ‘“Alis” quanquam multas habet significationes…certe « ales » preco et lucis intelligitur nuncius: finem noctis deducens, lucem precinit horarum.’ In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 40–41.
[114] ‘Et ipse actus nostros conspicit a luce prima in uesperum, hoc est ab ortu solis usque ad occasum, uel certe ab utero egressionis nostrae usque ad extremum obitus nostri; siue etiam a luce prima in uesperum, uidelicet a primo Adam formato usque ultimum nasciturum moriturumque mundi in finem.’ In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 60–63.

To conclude, in Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*, there is a threefold temporality that encompasses different spaces of experience and horizons of expectation, revealing itself through metaphor and eventually coming together to form the temporal and narrative character of the text as a whole. This also reflects what Koselleck termed the contemporaneity of the noncontemporaneous. Within this threefold temporal framework, Dhuoda effectively strengthened her text and admonished William.

However, it is also important to note that the reason for such clarity in the temporal hierarchy in the *Liber Manualis* lies in large part in its genre, the mirror of princes. As expounded in the introductory section of this thesis, mirrors for princes were principally conceived for pedagogical aims, notably directed at instructing princely figures in accordance with Christian precepts. Hence, it is unsurprising that the Scriptures serve as the most frequently invoked font of wisdom in such literary compositions, including the *Liber Manualis*. The scriptural corpus assumes a pivotal role in delineating both the long and medium durations within Dhuoda's textual tapestry.

It might be argued that genre and the sources it brings to bear are more important than other factors, such as the identity of the author, in making the temporal hierarchy clear in the texts. A pertinent illustration arises from the work of Hrabanus Maurus (780/83?–856), abbot of Fulda (817) and archbishop of Mainz (847), who was active at about the same time as Dhuoda, and who drew heavily upon Scripture as the primary source for his compositions. Hrabanus, like Dhuoda, essentially accepts Augustine's understanding of past events,[115] i.e., sacred history concluded with the advent of Jesus and would recommence with the unleashing of the devil, as prophesied in the Book of

[115] For Augustine's influence on Dhuoda, see section 4.3.1 of this thesis.

Revelation. Consequently, secular history, despite alterations in specific details, is by its very nature homogeneous and atemporal.[116] This perception of homogeneity and timelessness over long duration manifests as the circularity of history in medium duration. In the context of ninth-century Franks, they perceived themselves as retracing the footsteps of ancient Israelites.[117]

Thus, Hrabanus undertook extensive biblical exegesis post-820s to clarify to the kings their position within this homogeneous and timeless historical framework, as well as potential future trajectories.[118] However, the proposition that secular history is cyclical does not inherently denote an implicit acknowledgment of the insignificance of actors' subjectivity. On the contrary, akin to Dhuoda, Hrabanus made explicit in his works the significance of short-term occurrences and the ensuing actions. He notably stressed the kings' role in the *correctio*. In his view, rather than a circular argument, the kings' utilisation of the sacred past to inform their conduct and the aptness of their actions in steering kingdoms along virtuous paths of the sacred past are mutually reinforcing facets. Illustratively, in approximately 834, Hrabanus corresponded with Louis the German, asserting,

> It used to be the custom that a most Christian king, much occupied with divine precepts, was offered the history of the kings of Judah, that is, of the confessors, with some explanation of its spiritual meaning. Because your noble prudence

[116] For a discussion of Augustine's view of history, see Markus, R. A., *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine* (Cambridge, 1970), pp.17-23.
[117] On the Frankish vision of themselves as the New Israel, see 5.3.1 of this thesis.
[118] An introduction to Hrabanus Maurus and his works can be found at M. de Jong, 'The Empire as Ecclesia: Hrabanus Maurus and Biblical Historia for Rulers', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 191–226. For a recent translation of one of Hrabanus' works see: 'Hraban Maur, On honouring parents. 834', trans. R. Gilbert, A. Traves, C. West and T. Zhang, with an introduction by Mayke de Jong, in: *Mittelalter. Interdisziplinäre Forschung und Rezeptionsgeschichte* 5 (2022), pp. 1–33.

> rules over a Christian people redeemed by the precious blood of God's son and most accustomed to profess God's name, it suits a pious prince, that is to say, the *rector* of the members of the true king Christ, God's only son, to have and practise the right form of government which is in accordance with Scripture…[119]

As can be seen, the reliance on Scriptures underscores Hrabanus' presentation of a distinctly clear temporal hierarchy, akin to Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*.

Conversely, Einhard and Nithard, operating within the domain of historiography, drew from a divergent wellspring of sources in comparison to Dhuoda. Einhard, who was writing history in the guise of a biography, predominantly gleaned insights from Suetonius's *De vita Caesarum*, while Nithard, held in the crucible of military exigencies, encountered limitations in his access to external repositories of knowledge, likely necessitating a discerning curation of events predicated upon his own vantage point and objectives. Consequently, the temporal hierarchy in the *Vita Karoli* and the *Historiae* is not as overtly delineated as it is in the *Liber Manualis*. It is important to underscore, however, that the lack of immediate clarity regarding the temporal hierarchy does not negate its existence. Rather, temporalities within the *Vita Karoli* and the *Historiae* are intricately woven and necessitate nuanced exploration, aided by the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte*. This is what this thesis will follow up on.

[119] 'Quid est quod rex Assuerus dedit Esther reginae domum Aman adversarii Judaeorum, nisi quod rex verus et Dominus noster omnem dignitatem et omnem honorem quem prior populus ex scientia legis et prophetarum atque cultu piae religionis habuit…?' In: Hrabanus, *Epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. V* (Berlin, 1899), p. 423. The translation is from M. de Jong, 'The Empire as Ecclesia', pp. 204–05.

2.4 Nithard and the *Historiae*

2.4.1 Nithard and his life

The Frankish lay noble Nithard wrote his *Historiae* over several years, perhaps from 841 to 843. Courtney M. Booker recently provides us with detailed information about the creation of each of these four books, and I am quoting directly the table he makes:[120]

Books 1 / 2

• details events from 814 to June 840 / June 840 to June 841

• composed between May and October 841

• 2777 words / 3845 words

Book 3

• details events from June 841 to mid-March 842

• composed between October 841 and likely before August 843,

finished certainly after mid-March 842

• 3002 words

Book 4

• details events from late-March 842 to March 843

• composed between late-March 842 and likely before August 843,

finished certainly after March 843

• 2720 words

[120] C. M. Booker, 'The Two Sorrows of Nithard', in C. M. Booker and A. A. Latowsky (eds), *In This Modern Age: Medieval Studies in Honor of Paul Edward Dutton* (Budapest, 2023), p. 112.

As a participant in the third civil war of the Carolingian Empire between 840 and 843 and a faithful follower of Charles the Bald, he negotiated with Lothar's envoys on behalf of his lord on several occasions.[121] On June 25, 841, he was present on the battlefield of Fontenoy, where the fraternal civil war reached its climax. It was in about May 841 that he was commissioned by Charles the Bald to begin recording his experiences at court and in the war. As a *miles* and also one of the few historians of lay identity in the early Middle Ages, Nithard followed Louis the Pious and then Charles the Bald, regarding them as God-appointed monarchs.[122] His mother was Bertha (c.779–c.823), the second daughter born to Charlemagne and Hildegard, and his father was Charlemagne's counsellor and friend, Angilbert (c.750–814), who, because of his expertise in poetry, was nicknamed 'Homer' at the court, and the abbot of Saint-Riquier.[123] He also had a brother named Hartnid in the household, but we know little about him.[124] Since Charlemagne forbade his daughter to marry, the marriage of Nithard's parents was not officially admitted at that time, which was used by Louis the Pious as a pretext for sending Bertha to a monastery on his accession to the throne. Nithard does not mention any of these events in his book.

No definitive historical record of Nithard's death has yet been found. François Ganshof suggested that Nithard was killed in battle at Ponthieu on 15 May 845 while resisting an invasion by the Northmen of Saint-Riquier, the abbey of which his father and he

[121] Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 48–9, 128–9.
[122] For Nithard's life, cf. Treffort, 'Nithard, petit-fils de Charlemagne', pp. 415–34; J. L. Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp. 251–93; C. Villa, 'Nithard dalla storia alla leggenda famigliare', in F. Lo Monaco and C. Villa (eds), *I giuramenti di Strasburgo: testi e tradizione* (Firenze, 2009), pp. 93–110; D. M. Polanichka and A. Cilley, 'The Very Personal History of Nithard: Family and Honour in the Carolingian World', *Early Medieval Europe* 22 (2014), pp. 171–200.
[123] On Nithard's father Angilbert, see S. A. Rabe, *Faith, Art, and Politics at Saint–Riquier: The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert* (Philadelphia, 1995). On Nithard's mother Bertha, see Treffort, 'Nithard, petit-fils de Charlemagne', pp. 419–23.
[124] Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 150–51. No other source other than Nithard himself has so far been found to mention his brother Hartnid. Also see B. Cerquiglini, *L'invention de Nithard* (Paris, 2018), pp. 117–19.

were successively lay abbots.[125] But Nelson's conclusion is even bleaker, as she argues that Nithard was killed in action while fighting for Charles the Bald against Pippin II of Aquitaine at the battle of Angoulême in Aquitaine on 14 June 844, another round of conflict among the Carolingians.[126]

2.4.2 Historiographical debates around Nithard's *Historiae*

The original manuscript of Nithard's *Historiae* has been lost,[127] and the best-preserved version is a Latin copy from the late tenth century. This was produced in a scriptorium which probably either belonged to the abbey of Saint-Riquier, or to the abbey of Saint-Médard, where it was stored in the eleventh century at the latest.[128] This manuscript circulated among collectors after the Huguenots destroyed Saint-Médard in the sixteenth century, until Queen Christina of Sweden (1626–1689) presented it to the Pope. In 1797, it was returned to France as a 'national monument' after Napoleon's occupation of Rome, and has remained in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (MS. Lat. 9768) ever since.[129] A fragmentary copy of the text, which dates back to the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, was also deposited in this library (MS. Lat. 14663).[130] There may have been a third manuscript in the sixteenth century, which was in the collection of Pierre Pithou (1539–1596), although it has not survived. However, both Pithou's manuscript and the fragmentary manuscript now numbered MS. Lat.

[125] F. L. Ganshof, 'Note critique sur la biographie de Nithard', in *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (Bruges, 1930), pp. 335–44.
[126] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 291–93. Also, Treffort, 'Nithard, petit-fils de Charlemagne', pp. 427–34.
[127] Paschasius Radbertus, who made a stay at Saint-Riquier in the 850s, may have read Nithard's *Historiae*, see D. Ganz, 'The Epitaphium Arsenii and Opposition to Louis the Pious', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds), *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 547–48.
[128] B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979), p. 199. For a digitised version of this manuscript see: 'Latin 9768, Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris) ', https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc572968 [accessed 8 Sep 2023].
[129] J. W. Thompson and B. J. Holm, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York, 1942), pp. 171–72.
[130] Lauer, P., 'Introduction', in P. Lauer (ed.), *Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris, 1926), pp. xxii, n. 63.

14663 appear to be incomplete copies of the surviving complete manuscript, MS. Lat. 9768.[131] The scarcity of surviving copies of Nithard's work stands in stark contrast to Einhard's extent corpus. This difference must be considered from the perspective of reception history.

Nithard's work was not entirely unknown after his death. The *Historiae* was probably in the library of Charles the Bald.[132] Both the monk Mico of Saint-Riquier, who wrote the epitaph for Nithard, and Hucbald of Saint Amand (c.840–930), who wrote the *Vita Lebuini*, seem to have drawn their information from Nithard.[133] Hariulf (c.1060–1143), a monk of Saint-Riquier who lived in the central Middle Ages and was later abbot of Oudenburg, learned from the *Historiae* about the occurrence of the earthquake, the origin of Nithard, and the translation of Angilbert, Nithard's father.[134] The last appearance of the *Historiae* in medieval sources occurs in the thirteenth century, when the author of the *Historia regum Francorum* recorded that he quoted 'even from the book of Nithard, who writes about the discord of the sons of Louis the Pious'.[135] All of the above suggests that Nithard's work was all but shelved for the rest of the Middle Ages, and the paucity of references to it implies that not many seem to have read the *Historiae* until modern antiquarians and historians, though the lay author himself wrote with the assumption that his books would have been widely circulated.[136]

[131] C. M. Booker, 'An Early Humanist Edition of Nithard's De dissensionibus filiorum Ludovici Pii', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 5 (2010), pp. 231–58.
[132] R. McKitterick, 'Charles the Bald (823–877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning', *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), p. 32.
[133] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', p. 282.
[134] Hariulf, *Chronicon Centulense*, ed. and trans. F. Lot (Paris, 1894), pp. 101–02.
[135] 'a libro etiam Nithardi, qui de discordia filiorum Ludovici Pii agit.' In: E. Müller, *Nithard vier Bücher Geschichten* (Leipzig, 1911), p. x.
[136] Nithard made it clear in the prologue to his third book that his purpose, or at least the purpose of writing this book, was to provide accurate facts about recent events as an insider, so that contemporaries and even future generations would not be misled. See Booker, 'The Two Sorrows of Nithard', pp. 106–10.

In contrast to the *Historiae*, 123 surviving manuscripts have preserved Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, testifying to its widespread diffusion.[137] These manuscripts can be classified into three 'families', depending on the minor differences in content. They may not, however, be related in such a way that one is a copy of the other, nor are the differences in their contents necessarily the result of an oversight on the part of scribes. It is likely that Einhard presented several versions to both the court scholars and the royal librarian Gerward for first reading, and that this first group of readers and editors adapted the content to the needs of the moment, making minor changes and presenting the final version to the emperor Louis the Pious.[138] As a work that circulated widely, was revised at court and eventually housed in the royal library, the collective creation and high political status of the *Vita Karoli* meant that it was copied in far greater numbers than Nithard's *Historiae*. The greater number of copies of the *Vita Karoli* explains why it was cited far more often than the *Historiae* throughout the rest of the Middle Ages.[139]

Nevertheless, modern historians have long recognised the historical value of Nithard's *Historiae* and have relied heavily on it when investigating the events of the middle of the ninth century.[140] Likewise, they have long been aware of its biases: since Nithard wrote at the behest of Charles the Bald, it was inevitable that he would favour Charles in the text and discredit his rivals. However, it might be argued that to see a serious historical critique of the text of the *Historiae*, one had to wait until Janet L. Nelson published a ground-breaking article in 1985.[141] Since then, historians have developed new debates around the text of the *Historiae*, concentrating on the following issues.

[137] Tischler, *Einharts 'Vita Karoli*', pp. 22–24.
[138] Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. xc–xciii.
[139] For citations of the *Vita Karoli* in the Middle Ages see Tischler, *Einharts 'Vita Karoli*', pp. 1659–734.
[140] L. Halphen, *Charlemagne et l'empire carolingien* (Paris, 1947), p. 277.
[141] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 251–93.

The first area of debate concerns Nithard's motivation for writing. For a long time, historians focused only on the impact of Nithard's political positions on his work.[142] While a few noted the gloom of in Book IV, they either ignored its causes[143] or interpreted it as a result of the worsening political situation during 842–3.[144] Through thoughtful analysis, however, Nelson argued that this brooding mood must be considered in the context of Nithard's own position as an author, which, in fact, involves a shift in his motivation for writing and intended audience. Nelson suggests that the first two books of the *Historiae* were intended to be a defence of the justness of Charles the Bald's cause as well as an accommodation in the face of conflicting values. As Nithard began to write, Charles and Lothar were moving toward military conflict with seeming inevitability. If Charles won, then he would have defeated his brother and godfather, and thus violated the Christian doctrine and the Frankish norm of brotherly harmony. If he lost, then he would have to justify his past deeds all the more urgently. Therefore, Nithard, who was commissioned to defend his patron, was actually making a case for himself and his fellow supporters of Charles. The goal of Nithard's third book, which was composed just after the battle of Fontenoy in 841, changes somewhat, shifting from a defence to an effort to consolidate the united front with Louis the German, and its audience accordingly broadened to encompass Louis's men. In Nithard's view, after the military victory was taken, Charles and Louis needed to show a solid alliance politically in order to force Lothar to agree to peace talks.

[142] For example, G. M. von Knonau, *Über Nithards vier Bücher Geschichten: Der Bruderkrieg der Söhne Ludwigs des Frommen und sein Geschichtschreiber* (Leipzig, 1866), pp. 81–82; Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, pp. 658–59; J. Calmette, *L'effondrement d'un empire et la naissance d'une Europe: IX. – X. siècles* (Paris, 1941), p. 264. All discussed in Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', p. 252.
[143] Lauer, 'Introduction', p. xi.
[144] Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 30.

The last book, however, marks a radical shift in purpose and audience, as Nithard found that the outcome of the negotiation of peace did not make his fidelity pay off. As a counterpoint, Nithard's fourth book no longer serves the interests of Charles the Bald, but is instead a veiled indictment of the king, at which point Nithard was pouring out grievances to his own close circle of friends, or even just lamenting into the air.[145] However, Nelson also reminds us that while the intention for Nithard's writing changed, and his work was no longer 'public', this does not mean that the nature of the work also underwent a shift from objective narrative to subjective perspective. In fact, the first three books are as subjective as the last one: 'neither is fiction yet both blend fact with interpretation'.[146] Dana M. Polanichka and Alex Cilley add more arguments to Nelson's interpretation and reveal one of Nithard's hidden motives in his text: he intended to restore the honour of his parents, whose relationship had been considered scandalous at the time. They suggest that the reason Nithard did so was out of a desire to preserve his own honour and parent-child relationship, support his quest for material rewards, and fulfil the duty of commemoration tied to an inheritance relationship.[147]

A second of debate concerns the Carolingian world reflected by the *Historiae*. Nelson argues that the text demonstrates how the two systems of Frankish kinship and lordship acted on aristocrats such as Nithard. Modifying Régine Le Jan's model,[148] Nelson proposes a Frankish aristocratic hierarchy of 'king-magnates-clients', in which a 'client'

[145] Nelson later modifies her view that Charles the Bald was still set up by Nithard as the target reader for the fourth book of the *Historiae*, with the aim of trying to influence the current decisions of this king. See J. L. Nelson, 'History-Writing at the Courts of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald', in A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (eds), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 1994), p. 440. Stuart Airlie and Mayke de Jong agree with this view and have refined it. See S. Airlie, 'The World, the Text and the Carolingian: Royal, Aristocratic and Masculine Identities in Nithard's Histories', in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (New York, 2007), pp. 75–76; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, p. 102. However, Courtney M. Booker suggests that Nelson's initial point fits the context better. See Booker, 'The Two Sorrows of Nithard', pp. 114–32.
[146] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 255–82.
[147] Polanichka and Cilley, 'The Very Personal History of Nithard', pp. 191–200.
[148] Le Jan, 'Structures familiales et politiques au neuvième siècle', pp. 289–333.

such as Nithard might expect favours from the king through the 'magnate', who was both his patron and his kin. This patronage relationship, based on kinship, while supporting the interests of the 'clients', was also undermined by the weakness of family ties.[149] In her assessment of interpersonal connections, Meg Leja discusses how Nithard viewed relationships between men within the kingdom as well as relationships between the sexes.[150] Owen M. Phelan, on the other hand, starts with Nithard's analytical tool, the basic Christian catechetical ideas, noting that, in Nithard's worldview, sacramental logic was the fundamental principle by which everything worked. This combination of sacramental logic and religious concepts was one of the most distinctive features of ninth-century elite discourse.[151]

A third area of debate in recent scholarship concerns the Strasbourg Oaths.[152] The Strasbourg Oaths were expressed in two languages: Louis the German was speaking *lingua Romana* when he swore to Charles the Bald's men; Charles the Bald, on the other hand, used *lingua teudisca* when swearing to Louis the German's men. Why did these two lords swear to each other's men using different languages? And why was Nithard so concerned with this detail? The traditional view, which was influenced by nineteenth-century nationalist ideologies, suggests that this marks the formation of a cultural divide between the two *regna*, which can be seen as the origin of the two peoples of modern France and Germany.[153]

---

[149] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 285–89.
[150] Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters', pp. 1–41.
[151] O. M. Phelan, 'The Scope of Fidelity in Nithard's Ninth Century', *Viator — Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 48 (2017), pp. 21–47.
[152] There is a wealth of research on the Strasbourg Oaths. See, in particular, F. Lo Monaco and C. Villa, *I Giuramenti di Strasburgo: testi e tradizione* (Firenze, 2009)., and its bibliography. Most of them, however, do not include Nithard, who recorded the text, in their focus of examination, and will therefore not be considered here.
[153] For example, this opinion was held by Wilhelm von Giesebrecht, a nineteenth-Century representative of the Ranke school. See W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit. Bd. 1, Gründung des Kaiserthums (Chinese version)*, trans. R. Qiu (Changchun, 2019), pp. 119–20. This view is so influential that it is still accepted by some historians. For instance, see J. M. Bennett and C. W. Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A short history* (New York, 2011), p. 104.

However, historians today are increasingly inclined to read specific cases such as the Strasbourg Oaths back into their textual and contemporary contexts. In doing so, they are trying to avoid the teleology that can result from a preoccupation with the origins of the 'nation' state, or whatever else is seen as contributing to the formation of 'modernity'.[154] Thus, Nelson argues that the linguistic strategy of the two lords was to demonstrate the full solidarity of the two sides against Lothar while ensuring that every noble in the other camp understood it.[155] Focusing on the author's intent, Polanichka proposes that Nithard was showing the preciousness of *fraternitas*, or brotherhood, through the Strasbourg Oaths.[156] Unlike Nelson and Polanichka's positive view of the Strasbourg Oaths, Leja argues that Nithard was actually critical of Charles the Bald, Louis the German, and the ruling model of the time. She suggests that in Nithard's depiction, the two lords were not able to control their subordinates as Charlemagne was; rather, they were controlled by their subordinates. In Nithard's view, this substitution of horizontal bonds between subordinates for the vertical domination of lords over their subordinates was the root cause of social turbulence at the time.[157] If both Nelson and Leja assume the truth of Nithard's account, and Polanichka was noncommittal about it, McKitterick has questioned whether the oaths described by Nithard took place as he recorded them. She argues that, given that the *Historiae* was supposed to be read aloud, Nithard, by giving the specific texts of the Strasbourg Oaths, may have been aiming to emphasise the solidity and importance of the alliance in an aurally palpable way.[158]

[154] C. Wickham, *Medieval Europe* (New Haven, 2016), p. 1. For more on the critique of the teleological observation of the Middle Ages that results from taking a nationalist and modernity perspective, see P. J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2002), pp. 1–40; I. Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2013).
[155] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 265–66.
[156] Polanichka and Cilley, 'The Very Personal History of Nithard', pp. 184–85.
[157] Leja, 'The Making of Men, Not Masters', pp. 8–9.
[158] R. McKitterick, 'Latin and Romance: A Historian's Perspective', in R. Wright (ed.), *Latin and the Romance*

Patrick Geary also points out that, while it is true that many of the contemporary sources reported that the Carolingians accomplished their political practices by using different languages, the actual implementation of this should not be assumed in every instance.[159]

In conclusion, Nithard's close lineage to the Carolingian royalty gives him the potential to offer us a different perspective from that provided by Einhard as courtier and Dhuoda from the local dynasty. This gives his *Historiae* a unique value. The above debates among historians around Nithard's text remind us that the last book of *Historiae* may have had some kind of gap, both emotional and intellectual, with the first three. This rupture was caused by Nithard's own experience, which in turn epitomised the turbulence of Carolingian polity in the first half of the ninth century. Therefore, when reading the *Historiae*, it is necessary and useful to put the various details of the text back into the context of the time period.

2.5 Summary of this chapter

The above introduction to the lives of Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard; their works; and the Carolingian world in which they lived lays out the background necessary background to this thesis. Simultaneously, it reminds us of two points that should be borne in mind over the following analysis.

On the one hand, it should not be presupposed that there is an intrinsic unity of nature in a text. It is true that an author's ideas and work can be considered to some extent as

Languages in the Early Middle Ages (London, 1991), pp. 130–45. also R. McKitterick, 'Introduction: Sources and Interpretation', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History (vol. II: c. 700– c. 900)* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 11–12.

[159] Geary, *Language and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 56–74.

an integrated whole or a complete system, but this does not mean that there is no internal tension in the text. In Nithard's *Historiae*, for example, the influence of a changing social context can be seen in associated shifts in his writing. This tension and contradiction within the text provides a window into the author's mindset before and after key developments, which, in the context of this thesis, is characterised by two temporalities. Yet, even if the author's surroundings remained largely static during the writing process, whether in harmony or in chaos, this does not mean that the text lacks tensions. Turning to Einhard, it can be seen that the *Vita Karoli* had to be modified according to the political situation at the time of its completion, either to disguise certain people and events, or to highlight others. Dhuoda, for her part, had to take into account the fact that her son, the first reader of her handbook, was in the court of Charles the Bald, while her husband was wavering in his political stance. These authors, therefore, were not only influenced by the circumstances in which they found themselves, but also affected by their relatives and intended readers: all of these factors played important roles in defining the content of their texts. The tensions in these writings, however, are not a hindrance to the following discussion; rather, they are an invaluable resource for digging deeper into each author's thinking, providing an opportunity to observe the temporalities in their thinking and that of their contemporaries.

On the other hand, the ideas that these authors set out in their works were not only principles that guided political action but were part of political life, even political action itself. Their texts are both a description of their perceived society and an engagement with *Realpolitik* debates. That is why it is essential to discuss their texts with their contexts. After all, they were not only intellectuals of the Carolingian period, but also

actors involved in real political practice. As Geoffrey Koziol recently noted on the basis of Nelson's argument,

> These Carolingian political communities were also textual communities, in that their members used a common fund of texts to discuss current issues of politics and political ethics... the sense of belonging to such shared communities was not completely shattered by the successive crises of Louis the Pious's reign and the outbreak of 'the war of the brothers' in 840. On the contrary, the sense among contemporaries that these crises were enveloping a Christian empire and endangering its providential, historic mission produced a surge of writing that shows just how engaged Carolingian elites were in the issues and problems the crises laid bare.[160]

From the perspective of *Begriffsgeschichte*, an important task of these Carolingian authors was to legitimise questionable political actions, and this required the power of language and rhetoric. They employed rhetoric to redefine concepts and rearrange words to lend legitimacy to certain political practices. We are thereby invited to make connections between mindset, political action and rhetoric in the discussion of their texts. In other words, we should pay attention not only to the vocabulary in the text, but also to the rhetorical strategies used by the authors, focusing on how and with what purpose they spoke or acted. From this perspective, we should combine rhetoric, perception, and political action to examine what role the former plays in the changes of the latter two. For example, in expressing their ideas and indirectly expounding their claims, Einhard transposed the descriptions of Roman emperors from classical writings to Charlemagne, Dhuoda used a number of metaphors with a temporal overtone, and Nithard arranged several contrasts, either explicit or implicit, in his lines. It may even be argued, therefore, that the meanings contained in concepts are always related to certain linguistic acts and that their expression is driven to a large extent by the power

[160] G. Koziol, 'Authority and Christology in Dhuoda's Manual', in C. M. Booker and A. A. Latowsky (eds), *In This Modern Age: Medieval Studies in Honor of Paul Edward Dutton* (Budapest, 2023), pp. 51–52; Nelson, 'Dhuoda', p. 108.

of rhetoric. Therefore, to understand a concept, it is necessary not only to grasp the meaning of the words used to express the concept, but also the scope of what can be done with the concept. There is no general history of concepts, but only a history of their use in debate, and it is in this process that the temporalities implicit in concepts unfold.

With these points in mind, we can now turn to studying how the three concepts outlined earlier were expressed in the work of our three lay authors

CHAPTER 3: *RES PUBLICA*

3.1 Introduction

Before investigating how *res publica* was perceived in the early Middle Ages, it is essential to consider Augustine of Hippo's (354–430) views on this topic, given his influence on medieval political thought.

Augustine's exposition of the concept of *res publica* follows directly from the ancient Roman author Cicero (106 BC–43 BC). Between 54 and 51 BC, Cicero wrote *De re publica*, in which he proposed the following definition of *res publica*:

> The *res publica* is the same thing as *res populi*. A people, however, is not every assemblage of human beings herded together in whatever way, but an assemblage of a multitude united in agreement about *ius* and in the sharing of *utilitas*. The first cause of this assembling, however, is not so much weakness as a certain natural herding together, so to speak, of human beings.[1]

As can be seen, Cicero's definition of *res publica* is framed by several important concepts. First, he linked *res publica* with the people (*populus*), suggesting that the public thing is the people's thing (*Est res publica res populi*). What, then, constitutes 'the people'? Cicero suggested that the people are a commonwealth gathered together on the basis of 'agreement about *ius*' and 'sharing of *utilitas*', where *ius* contains the

[1] 'Est...res publica res populi, populus autem non omnis hominum coetus quoquo modo congregatus, sed coetus multitudinis iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatus. Eius autem prima causa coeundi est non tam inbecillitas quam naturalis quaedam hominum quasi congregatio.' In: Cicero, *De re publica, De legibus*, ed. and trans. D. Fott, *On the Republic and on the Laws* (New York, 2014), p. 47. The translation has been slightly modified.

meaning of law, justice, right, duty, etc., and *utilitas* refers to a variety of interests, including material wealth, security, freedom, power, honour, happiness, and so on.[2]

Augustine inherited Cicero's idea of the nature of *res publica* and likewise regarded it as equivalent to *res populi*.[3] Augustine, however, was consistent with Cicero only in form; in substance, he changed the actual meaning of *res publica* by redefining the people as 'an assemblage of a reasonable multitude united in agreement as to the objects of their love',[4] that is, a rational community united on the basis of the shared love. In his definition of *res publica*, Augustine simply displaced the content of the consensus of the people in Cicero's definition, without questioning the principle that the people are united in a partnership based on some kind of consensus; the content of this consensus is replaced by love. What, then, is the object of the people's love? To this question, Augustine gave a clear and certain answer: God. As he famously asserted, 'the two cities then were created by two kinds of love: the earthly city by a love of self - carried even to the point of contempt for God, the heavenly city by a love of God carried even to the point of contempt for self'.[5] Thus, for Augustine, it is love of God that constitutes the core of the *res publica*, while *ius* and *utilitas*, which play a central role in Cicero's definition, exist only as superstructures in that *res publica* which is established and ruled by love of God.

[2] E. Asmis, 'The State as a Partnership: Cicero's Definition of res publica in his work On the State', *History of Political Thought* 25 (2004), p. 578.
[3] R. W. Maass, 'Political Society and Cicero's Ideal State', *Historical Methods* 45 (2012), p. 80.
[4] '[Populus est] coetus multitudinis rationalis rerum quas diligit concordi communione sociatus.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *City of God, vol. VI*, p. 232. The translation is my own.
[5] 'Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. and trans. G. E. McCracken, *City of God, vol. I* (New York, 1957), pp. 404–05.

Augustine's idea of *res publica* had a wide and profound impact on the Carolingian world. The modern historiography of the early Middle Ages traditionally followed the tendency of secularising the state, unconsciously assigning secularity to the *res publica*,[6] or relegating political commentary with religious overtones to the idealised rhetoric of the clergy, which consequently had no bearing on *Realpolitik*.[7] This understanding has now been challenged, however. Mayke de Jong, for example, points out that the *res publica* of the early Middle Ages was closely linked to the worship of God and constituted, to some extent, a means of achieving it.[8] De Jong's view is close to Augustine's idea of *res publica* and is therefore very convincing. Yet, while she gives a qualitative framework, the ripples of thought that fluctuate subtly within the changing contexts of the period in question may be overlooked. While the Carolingian elites generally agreed conceptually that *res publica* was bound up with the worship of God, when it came to action, did they take other factors into account in the conduct of their political practice? And how did the temporality in their thinking change when they made such considerations? The following section will examine these questions, taking as its thread the semantic clusters of various concepts that are linked to *res publica* in the texts.

[6] H. W. Goetz, 'Erwartungen an den "Staat": die Perspektive der Historiographie in spätkarolingischer Zeit', in W. Pohl and V. Wieser (eds), *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat* (Wien, 2009), pp. 471–86.
[7] Fried, 'Der karolingische Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh. zwischen "Kirche" und "Königshaus"', pp. 1–44.
[8] M. de Jong, 'The Two Republics', in R. Balzaretti, J. Barrow, and P. Skinner (eds), *Italy and Early Medieval Europe: Papers for Chris Wickham* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 487–501.

3.2 Einhard

3.2.1 The ox-cart of the Merovingian kings

The opening chapter of the *Vita Karoli* is famous for its vivid portrayal of the last kings of Merovingian dynasty, with a particularly memorable image of the king on the ox-cart:

> He [Childeric III] traveled about on a cart that was pulled by yoked oxen and led, as happens in the countryside, by a herdsman to wherever he needed to go. In this way he used to go to the palace and so also to the public assembly of his people, which was held annually for the interests of the realm, and in this manner he also returned home.[9]

There are two traditional views on the purpose of Einhard's portrayal of this image. One view was born on the soil of *Germanistik* and can be traced back to Jacob Grimm, who wrote his work in 1828. This Germanist tradition links the ox-cart to the vehicle used by the deity Nerthus on her annual tour of the earth, as in the Germanic mythology recorded by Tacitus (c.56-c.120). The ox-cart thus became a ritual prop (*Kultwagen*) and riding in it became a ritual for the king to demonstrate his sanctity.[10] The other view is based on the opposite scholarly tradition, which emphasises the inheritance and continuation of *Romanitas*, Roman-ness, in the Middle Ages. Historians who hold this view believe that this ox-cart descends from the vehicles used in the late Roman postal system, the *angaria*; in this interpretation, Einhard intended nothing more than to describe the objective facts here.[11] Both views, however, discuss the episode in

[9] 'Quocumque eundum erat, carpento ibat, quod bubus iunctis et bubulco rustico more agente trahebatur. Sic ad palatium, sic ad publicum populi sui conventum, qui annuatim ob regni utilitatem celebrabatur, ire, sic domum redire solebat.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 4. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 17. The translation has been slightly adjusted.
[10] J. Grimm, *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* (London, 2018), pp. 262–64.
[11] John M. Wallace-Hadrill [review], 'Arnold H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964)', *The English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 785–90. More recently work, see A. C. Murray, 'Post vocantur Merohingii:

isolation without understanding it in the context as a whole. It would be better to see the late Merovingian kings as being intentionally placed by the author in contrast to the Carolingians such as Charles Martel, Pippin the Short and Charlemagne.

First of all, it is worth noting that in this description Einhard recorded that the late Merovingian kings went in an ox-cart to the *publicus conventus* (public assembly) held for the *regni utilitas* (the interests of the realm). In other words, these kings could only travel in ox-carts to maintain the *res publica*. Considering that the ninth century already saw the emergence of a concept of knighthood, with its imagery of fighting on horseback,[12] it seems that Einhard surely intended to convey that the feeble kings of the late Merovingian dynasty, who could not ride horses and had to travel by ox-cart, were no longer capable of fulfilling their role as kings and unable to defend the kingdom. Immediately following the allusion to the military weakness of the Merovingians, Einhard emphasises the bravery of Charles Martel from the Carolingian family, providing a stark contrast:

> This Charles [Martel] overthrew those oppressors who claimed personal control over all of Francia and he so completely defeated the Saracens, who were attempting to occupy Gaul, in two great battles — the first in Aquitaine near the city of Poitiers and the second near Narbonne on the River Berre — that he forced them to fall back into Spain.[13]

Another noteworthy point here is that Einhard made it clear that it was the Saracens whom Charles Martel defeated, thus defending Christendom. This can be related to

Fredegar, Merovech, and "Sacral Kingship"', in A. C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall. Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History* (Toronto, 1998), pp. 129–32.

[12] Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 75–87.

[13] 'Qui tyrannos per totam Franciam dominatum sibi vindicantes oppressit et Sarracenos Galliam occupare temptantes duobus magnis proeliis, uno in Aquitania apud Pictavium civitatem, altero iuxta Narbonam apud Birram fluvium, ita devicit, ut in Hispaniam eos redire conpelleret.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 17. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 17.

another implied meaning of the ox-cart in which the last Merovingian kings rode. According to Paul Barnwell, the imagery of the ox-cart is almost certainly associated with the pagan deity, whether she is Cybele, Nerthus or Berecynthia.[14] These pagan deities are widely described in Tacitus' *Germania*, St Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* and hagiographies, all of which were familiar to Einhard's court coterie.[15] Thus, by portraying the Merovingian kings in their ox-carts, Einhard implied that they were not only incapable of defending the Christian kingdom, but were betraying the divine duty of worshipping Christian God.[16] Since they were unable to promote the worship of God and truly uphold the interests of the realm, holding merely *inutilis regis nomen* (the empty name of 'king'), it was only natural that the Carolingians should take their place in the real kingship. Then Einhard wrote that Charles Martel's son Pippin, 'who had been mayor of the palace, was established as king by the decision of the Roman pope.'[17] The dignity of 'king' was transferred from those who were incapable of exercising it, via the Pope as the earthly spokesman of God, to those who actually possessed it.

The ability to promote the worship of God and maintain the *res publica*, that is, to fulfil the king's *ministerium* (divinely granted responsibility), reached an unprecedented peak with Charlemagne. Einhard devoted more than a third of the book to Charlemagne's foreign military activities, with particular emphasis on Charlemagne's wars against the pagans (including the Saxons, Slavs, Huns, Avars, and Northmen) and the victorious wars against the Lombards at the request of the Pope. Even when developing friendly

[14] Barnwell, 'Einhard, Louis the Pious and Childeric III', pp. 137–38.
[15] For the familiarity of Charlemagne's courtiers with Tacitus' *Germania*, see M. Innes, 'Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past', in Hen and Innes, *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 237–38.
[16] Cf. Y. Hen, 'The Uses of the Bible and the Perception of Kingship in Merovingian Gaul', *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998), pp. 282–89; J. L. Nelson, 'Inauguration Rituals', in P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (eds), *Early Medieval Kingship* (Leeds, 1977), pp. 53–4, 56–60.
[17] 'Per auctoritatem Romani pontificis ex praefecto palatii rex constitutus.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 6; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 18.

relations with the king of the Persians (i.e., the Abbasid Caliph, Harun al-Rashid), expanding the Christian faith remained Charlemagne's main aim: he gained control of Jerusalem, *sacrum illum et salutare locum* (the sacred and salvific place), from the former. In his account of Charlemagne's promotion of the worship of God, Einhard was similarly unsparing, describing the erection of church buildings, the regulation of religious rites, the relief of Christians within the realm as well as abroad, and the promotion of the church in Rome.

3.2.2 Mortal ruler and immortal rulership

Charlemagne's *magnitudo* (greatness) is the most important characteristic that Einhard wanted to highlight,[18] and this is reflected in the ability of Charlemagne as king to maximise the effectiveness of the kingship and to fulfil the king's *ministerium* to the fullest extent. Yet, did this characteristic of Charlemagne continue throughout his life? It may be surprising to find that, according to Einhard, the answer is no: by the end of the *Vita Karoli*, the figure of Charlemagne in his later years overlaps, to some extent, with that of the kings of the late Merovingian dynasty.

Firstly, Charlemagne's physical functions were deteriorating: 'his health was good until four years before he died, when he suffered from constant fevers. Toward the very end [of his life] he also became lame in one foot.'[19] Einhard's account of Charlemagne's fall is even more shocking:

[18] D. Ganz, 'Einhard's Charlemagne: The Characterisation of Greatness', in J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 38–51.
[19] 'Valitudine prospera, praeter quod, antequam decederet, per quatuor annos crebro febribus corripiebatur, ad extremum etiam uno pede claudicaret.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 52; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 30.

> He [Charlemagne] himself, when he was waging his last campaign in Saxony against Godefrid, the king of the Danes... the horse on which [Charlemagne] was sitting suddenly fell down headfirst and threw him to the ground with such a bang that the clasp holding his cloak snapped and his sword belt was ripped off. The attendants who were present rushed to his side and lifted him up without his weapons or mantle. Even the javelin that he had been grasping tightly in his hand had fallen and now lay twenty feet or more distant from him.[20]

What appears to be shown here is a manifestation of Charlemagne's loss of military ability. Not only did he fall from his horse, the symbol of knighthood, but he was also unable to continue mastering the weaponry that was the hallmark of a warrior: the clasp holding his cloak in place broke, his sword belt was ripped off, and the javelin in his hand was thrown far away. Interestingly, Einhard made a point of noting that Charlemagne's attendants did not pick up his weapons and cloak together when they ran to help him up. It seems that Einhard was implying here that even Charlemagne's entourage knew that he was no longer able to lead the war against the pagans (in this case the Danes) aimed at maintaining *res publica*.

In addition to the loss of military capacity, there are a number of other signs that Charlemagne could no longer exercise his kingship powerfully enough to fulfil his role as divinely appointed king. The wooden bridge that crossed the Rhine near Mainz built for the public utility (Einhard uses the expression *regni commoditas*) of the kingdom was accidentally destroyed by fire, and the palace, which was the centre of the realm, was often shaken.[21] Charlemagne, who still tried to invigorate himself, 'either rejected

[20] 'Cum ultimam in Saxoniam expeditionem contra Godofridum regem Danorum ageret..., subito equus, quem sedebat, capite deorsum merso decidit eumque tam graviter ad terram elisit, ut, fibula sagi rupta balteoque gladii dissipato, a festinantibus qui aderant ministris exarmatus et sine amiculo levaretur. Iaculum etiam, quod tunc forte manu tenebat, ita elapsum est, ut viginti vel eo amplius pedum spatio longe iaceret.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 74; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 36.

[21] For the palace as the centre of the realm and a symbol of royal power in Charlemagne's time, see Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*, pp. 53–91.

all these things or acted as if none of them had anything to do with him'.[22] He attempted to prove himself capable of leading the war by hunting (something akin to military activity) 'when he was already weighed down by poor health and old age',[23] but ended up being attacked by fever and then died.[24]

Charlemagne's attempts to prove himself ended in vain, the root cause of which, in Einhard's view, was that he was no longer able to undertake the duties of a king, including the promotion of God's worship, due to the time limitations on all earthly endeavour, and thus lost the favour of God. As the direct consequence, Charlemagne's rulership faltered. To this, Einhard gave an indication:

> In that same church an inscription written in red letters that ran between the upper and lower arches along the inside of the building [the inner octagon] gave the name of the builder of the church. In the last line of that inscription [the words] Karolvs Princeps were to be read. But it was observed by some people that in the very year he died, a few months before his death, the letters that formed Princeps became so faint that they were almost invisible.[25]

This is a strange description. Why is it the word *princeps* that disappears rather than the name of the monarch who was approaching the end of his life? And why was Charlemagne's dignity here *princeps* (prince or ruler) rather than *rex* (king)? Indeed, Einhard's careful wording implicitly conveys the point he was seeking to make. On the one hand, the disappearance not of 'Karolvs' but rather of *princeps* implies that the

[22] 'Superiora omnia sic aut dissimulavit aut sprevit, acsi nihil horum ad res suas quolibet modo pertineret.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 76; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 37.
[23] 'Cum iam et morbo et senectute premeretur.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 68; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.
[24] On the hunting as an important demonstration of the capacity of Frankish kingship, see E. J. Goldberg, *In the Manner of the Franks: Hunting, Kingship, and Masculinity in Early Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2020).
[25] 'Erat in eadem basilica in margine coronae, quae inter superiores et inferiores arcus interiorem aedis partem ambiebat, epigramma sinopide scriptum, continens, quis auctor esset eiusdem templi, cuius in extremo versu legebatur: KAROLUS PRINCEPS. Notatum est a quibusdam eodem, quo decessit, anno paucis ante mortem mensibus eas, quae PRINCEPS exprimebant, litteras ita esse deletas, ut penitus non apparerent.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 76; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 37.

point here is not that Charlemagne would die, but that he would no longer be able to assume the responsibilities of the leader of the realm. On the other hand, the term *princeps* has a strong classical tradition, and its first explicit articulation is also found in Cicero's *De re publica*, where it is considered a title that can only be enjoyed by citizens of incomparable prestige who are able to uphold the *res publica*. Cicero's idea then found historical fulfilment in the political regime established by Augustus around the principate. Since then, the Roman emperors who succeeded Augustus were called and self-referred to as *princeps*, with their principate polity seen as serving the *res publica*.[26] This perception of *princeps* continued into the early Middle Ages, at which time *principes* were considered as inferior to kings in terms of dignity and able to exercise sovereign power over their territory, while their attributes still lay in serving the public interest in order to gain the support of the people.[27] In contrast, *rex* was perceived in the Carolingian world as being more strongly associated with Scripture.[28] Thus, while the nature of *princeps* cannot be considered secular (after all, the title implies a responsibility to uphold Christian *res publica*), Einhard's textual strategy of using *Karolvs Princeps* rather than *Karolvs Rex* seems to be an attempt to avoid a concept with stronger Christian connotations. A glance back at Einhard's description of

[26] J. P. Martin, 'Res publica, libertas et principat', in G. Constable and M. Rouche (eds), *Auctoritas: Mélanges offerts à Olivier Guillot* (Paris, 2006), pp. 35–36; J. Béranger, 'L'expression du pouvoir suprême chez Tacite', in C. Nicollet (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l'Antiquité: Mots et réalités* (Paris, 1990), p. 108.
[27] H. Oudart, 'La fidélité au prince au temps de Louis le Pieux', in J. Quaghebeur, H. Oudart, and J. M. Picard (eds), *Le Prince, son peuple et le bien commun* (Rennes, 2013), pp. 319–48. Based on the assumption that the Germanic institution of the *Heerkönige* was radically broken off from Roman institutions, some historians once considered that the use of the term *princeps* in the early Middle Ages only preserved the Roman tradition in form, while its connotation of public interest was completely forgotten: see K. Schmid, 'Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht, Haus und Dynastie beim mittelalterlichen Adel. Vorfragen zum Thema "Adel und Herrschaft im Mittelalter"', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 105 (1957), pp. 1–62; R. Le Jan, *Histoire de la France. Origines et premier essor* (Paris, 1996), p. 38. This view of the complete lack of continuity between early medieval institutions and Roman institutions has been challenged, see I. Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (London, 1993), pp. 7–45; K. F. Werner, 'La "conquête franque" de la Gaule: itinéraires historiographiques d'une erreur', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 154 (1996), pp. 7–45.
[28] Cf. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, 'The Via Regia of the Carolingian Age', in B. Smalley (ed.), *Trends in Medieval Political Thought* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 22–41; W. Ullmann, 'The Bible and Principles of Government in the Middle Ages', in *La bibbia nell'alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1963), pp. 181–277.

the Merovingians when they were replaced by the Carolingians may make the matter clearer. He wrote that:

> [The Merovingian family had] demonstrated that there was nothing of any worth in it except the empty name of 'king'.[29]

In contrast to *Princeps* Charles, who was only succeeded in leadership by his son, the Merovingian *rex* was replaced by another family and dynasty in the God-given divine position. Thus, Einhard's use of *princeps* rather than *rex* in describing the vision that took place concerning Charlemagne may be suggesting that there could be a change in leadership of the *res publica*, but that the Carolingians' possession of the divine kingship would not be interrupted. Einhard was very wary of the possible misunderstanding that could confuse Charlemagne with the late Merovingian kings.

The *res publica* was calling for a ruler energetic and powerful enough to replace Charlemagne in order to defend the public interest of the realm, which was to promote the worship of God. Then,

> at the very end of his life, when he was already weighed down by poor health and old age, [Charles] summoned his son Louis [the Pious], the king of Aquitaine and the only one of Hildegard's sons still alive, to come to him. When all the leading Franks from the entire kingdom had solemnly assembled and had given their opinion, he established Louis as the co-ruler of the entire kingdom and the heir to the imperial title. Then he placed a crown upon his [son's] head and ordered that he should [henceforth] be addressed as emperor and augustus. This decision of his was widely approved by all who were present, for it seemed to have been divinely inspired in him for the good of the kingdom.[30]

---

[29] 'Nec quicquam in se clarum praeter inane regis vocabulum praeferebat.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 2; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 16.

[30] 'Extremo vitae tempore, cum iam et morbo et senectute premeretur, evocatum ad se Hludowicum filium, Aquitaniae regem, qui solus filiorum Hildigardae supererat, congregatis sollemniter de toto regno Francorum primoribus, cunctorum consilio consortem sibi totius regni et imperialis nominis heredem constituit, inpositoque capiti eius diademate imperatorem et augustum iussit appellari. Susceptum est hoc eius consilium ab omnibus qui aderant magno cum favore; nam divinitus ei propter regni utilitatem videbatur inspiratum.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 68, 70; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.

Charlemagne's elevation of his son Louis the Pious to co-emperor for the *regni utilitas* (good of the kingdom) was embraced by the secular and ecclesiastical magnates of the Frankish realm. In their view, Charlemagne judiciously matched the rulership to its nature and thus 'enhanced his powerful reputation'; the revitalised rulership was again able to maintain the *res publica* and thus 'filled foreign peoples with great fear'.[31]

Einhard's deliberate record of the collapse of the arcade in April 817, 'the arcade that he [Charlemagne] had erected with great effort between the church and palace fell to the ground in unexpected ruin on the day of the Ascension of our Lord'[32], further demonstrates his defence of the idea that rulership of the *res publica* had been transmitted to Louis the Pious. However, because of the uncertainty surrounding when Einhard wrote the *Vita Karoli* and, relatedly, of the context that entails, it is necessary consider the different moments in time in which he may have produced his work.

In one scenario, Einhard may have been writing between April 817 and July of the same year.[33] In this window of time, a particularly notable event was the collapse of the arcade, an incident which injured Louis the Pious and killed several of his attendants. The collapse of this structure, as a link between the palace, a symbol of secular power, and the church, a symbol of divine authority, could have easily been associated in the minds of contemporary people with a sign of faltering kingship, which communicated and unified *regnum* and *ecclesia*. It is probably for this reason that Louis the Pious

[31] 'Auxitque maiestatem eius hoc factum et exteris nationibus non minimum terroris incussit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 70; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.
[32] 'Porticus, quam inter basilicam et regiam operosa mole construxerat, die ascensionis Domini subita ruina usque ad fundamenta conlapsa.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 74; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 36.
[33] For a discussion of Einhard's writing time, see Section 2.2.2 of this thesis.

hastily decided on the arrangements for the succession that would follow his death. Einhard, however, subtly links the collapse of the arcade, originally associated with Louis the Pious, to Charlemagne, and the shaky throne is thus transferred from that of Louis the Pious to that of Charlemagne. His clever substitution of the subject seems intended to uphold the rulership of Louis the Pious.

A second possibility is that Einhard was writing between July 817 and 829. One of the most serious events that took place during this period was a rebellion staged by Bernard, nephew of Louis the Pious, after learning that the *Ordinatio Imperii* had deprived him of the Italian throne. After quelling the rebellion, Louis the Pious punished Bernard by blinding him, which eventually led to his unexpected death. The fate of Bernard of Italy gave rise to widespread criticism of Louis the Pious at the time since Bernard was not only the son of an anointed king, i.e., a Carolingian, but also a king himself.[34] Once the tragedy of Bernard is placed alongside the collapse of the arcade, we can likewise discover Einhard's possible deeper intention: it was the fall of the arcade that prompted Louis the Pious to draw up the *Ordinatio Imperii*, which in turn gave rise to Bernard's rebellion and his eventual tragic and unexpected death. Thus, as above, by linking the downfall of the arcade to Charlemagne rather than to Louis the Pious, Einhard subtly diverted attention and defended the rulership of Louis the Pious.

A third option is that Einhard wrote between 829 and 830, during which time Louis the Pious changed the original succession arrangement. In 817, Louis the Pious established the *Ordinatio Imperii* as the will of God, not only by holding a three-day fast before the

[34] For example, a text known as *The Vision of the Poor Woman of Laon*. See: H. Houben, 'Visio cuiusdam pauperculae mulieris. Überlieferung und Herkunft eines frühmittelalterlichen Visionstextes', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 124 (1976), pp. 41–42. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, pp.179–80. Also see: Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire*, pp. 67–80.

assembly, but also by asking his sons and magnates at the meeting to take a vow of observance, which could almost be seen as his announcement that this decision would not be changed in the future. In 823, however, his second wife Judith gave birth to a son, Charles the Bald, and, at the great assembly of Worms in 829, he decided to grant the territories of Alemannia and Burgundy to the six-year-old Charles the Bald.[35] This has traditionally been seen as a crucial factor that led to turmoil after 830. Recently, however, historians have pointed out that this conclusion is based on retrospective, partisan sources from the 840s,[36] and that it may not have been such a serious matter in the eyes of the contemporary people. One source tells us that Charles the Bald was made a duke (*dux*) by Louis the Pious, possibly announcing to his other sons and magnates the fact that Charles was in a subordinate position.[37] With this in mind, if Einhard was writing between 829 and 830, his motivation may not have stemmed from the reassignment of the *regnum* in 829. This does not, however, change the basic judgement that his writing strategy was in the service of Louis the Pious.

In sum, regardless of when Einhard wrote the *Vita Karoli* or what his specific motives were, it appears that he intended to associate the arcade with its builder, rather than with its victim, in order to divert attention and vindicate the success of Louis the Pious in taking over the dominion transferred from Charlemagne.

---

[35] Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious*, p. 208.
[36] Ward, 'Caesar's Wife', pp. 205–77; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 87–88; Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe*, pp. 160–63; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, p. 41; Costambeys, Innes, and Maclean, *The Carolingian World*, pp. 217–19. Contrast Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 178–80; T. Zotz, 'Ludwig der Fromme, Alemannien und die Genese eines neuen Regnum', in G. Köbler and H. Nehlsen (eds), *Wirkungen europäischer Rechtskultur. Festschrift für Karl Kroeschell zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1997), p. 1490; B. Kasten, *Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zur Teilhabe am Reich in der Merowinger- und Karolingerzei* (Hannover, 1997), p. 187.
[37] A. Hofmeister, 'Weißenburger Aufzeichnungen vom Ende des 8. und Anfang des 9. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 73 (1919), p. 419; Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe*, pp. 162–63. Compare with Zotz, 'Ludwig der Fromme', p. 1491. MacLean reminds us that the same thing happened between Louis the German and Charles the Fat, when the latter was made the *rector* of Alemannia. See S. Maclean, *Kingship and Politics in the Late Ninth Century: Charles the Fat and the End of the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 84–85.

3.2.3 Conclusion

Section 3.2 has taken a range of imagery surrounding the concept of *res publica* in the *Vita Karoli*, such as the ox-cart, the military equipment and architecture of Charlemagne and the 'writing on the wall' at Aachen, as an entry point to explore the temporality that permeates these semantic clusters. The evidence is, admittedly, not straightforward and requires us to draw reasonable inferences from it. Collectively, however, the multiple lines of evidence reinforce each other, thereby providing a solid foundation for exploring *res publica*.

From Einhard's narrative, we can see that, in his perception, the rulers belonging to the secular world took their turn, while the rulership as a sacred arena remained timelessly eternal. The rulership did not disappear, but was only transferred: when the Merovingians were unable to defend the *res publica*, it transferred from them to the Carolingians; when Charlemagne lost his ability to fulfil the *ministerium* of a ruler, his rulership transferred to Louis the Pious. What the *Vita Karoli* reflects may be a facet of how lay elites, represented by Einhard, felt about the temporality in the first half of the ninth century before the outbreak of civil strife: Frankish rulership existed eternally in timelessness, and the laymen's recognition of its embodiment in a particular ruler depended on his ability to uphold the *res publica* and to serve the public interest, that is, to promote the worship of God.

However, did this perception of temporality, as represented by Einhard, change as the Carolingian political situation took a sharp turn for the worse and descended into chaos? Was the change, if any there were, caused by a variation in the contemporaneous

understanding of the *res publica*, or was it the result of something else more subtle and unnoticeable? This is the question that will be addressed in the next section through an examination of Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*.

3.3 Dhuoda

Dhuoda wrote later than Einhard, at a time when the Carolingian polity was already in turmoil caused by the struggle between the sons (and a grandson) of Louis the Pious. How did Dhuoda perceive *res publica* in the midst of this disorder? In her *Liber Manualis*, Dhuoda devoted a short section entitled *Post uerba praescripta, de re publica* ('Additions to the preceding, on public affairs') to the discussion of *res publica*. In contrast to Einhard, the content of this section has little to do with the rulership that is supposed to be responsible for upholding the *res publica* of the Frankish realm. Instead, it expresses Dhuoda's expectation that her son William would be able to fulfil the obligations of public life. Indeed, her only reference to *res publica* in the body of the text reads, 'you must faithfully and methodically carry out all the obligations in the *res publica*'.[38] This fact seems to imply that Dhuoda's perception of *res publica* would have been different from Einhard's, which we can only approach through more circumstantial evidence, since she so rarely spoke directly of *res publica*.

3.3.1 The emotional tone of the *Liber Manualis*

Before focusing on Dhuoda's perception of the *res publica*, it is necessary to consider the emotional tone of the *Liber Manualis*, which will influence our understanding of the way she conceptualised it. As already described in Section 2.3, historians agree that

[38] 'in re publica cuncta ordinabili cursu fidenter perage.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 224–25.

Dhuoda infused her work with an abundance of maternal love, but this observation seems to be limited to viewing the *Liber Manualis* as a private text, leaving open the question of its emotional tone when considered in terms of the political or public attributes of the text.[39] Dhuoda's implicit and subtle presentation seems to have prevented historians from providing more answers to this question.

It is worth noting, however, that the way Dhuoda recorded the start and end dates for her handbook possibly reveals some information. When dating the beginning of her writing (the year of 841), Dhuoda implied a certain negativity towards Lothar by juxtaposing Louis the Pious with the sacred festivals, those associated with the commemoration of Andrew the Apostle (c.5–60/70) and the Second Coming of Christ, as temporal coordinates, instead of connecting Lothar, who was then the sitting emperor, with the sacred time behind the Christian festivals:

> This little book was begun in the second year after the death of the late emperor Louis, on November 30 on the mass day of St. Andrew at the beginning of the Lord's holy Advent.[40]

As for dating the time when she ended her writing, Dhuoda adopted only the sacred time of a Christian festival. Once again, she disregarded the emperor of the time, Lothar, yet also made no mention of Charles the Bald, to whom her son William owed allegiance, expressing instead the desire for a new and legitimate divinely appointed king:

---

[39] Historians, however, mostly agree that Dhuoda expressed a tone of warning and even criticism in her text, although they are divided as to the object to which this sentiment was directed. Cf. Le Jan, 'The Multiple Identities of Dhuoda', pp. 211–20; Claussen, 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority'; Polanichka and Cilley, 'The Very Personal History of Nithard'.

[40] 'Incoatio huius libelli II° anno obitus Ludouici condam imperatori, II° kalendas decembri, sancti Andreae missa, incoante sanctum Domini Aduentum.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 238–39.

> It was finished with God's help on February 2, the Feast of the Purification of the sainted, glorious, and perpetually virgin Mary, in the reign of the beneficent Christ, and in hope of whatever king God may send.[41]

There is an argument that Dhuoda was writing to warn Charles the Bald that the nobility would not be loyal to a tyrant who forced his sons to oppose their father.[42] From this perspective, the reason Dhuoda did not refer to Charles the Bald when dating her book would lie in her desire to admonish him that he was not yet a king, and that to be one he would have to behave righteously in order to gain the support of the nobility. This opinion needs to be reconsidered, however, as it seems to presuppose that Charles the Bald is one of Dhuoda's target audiences,[43] and that Dhuoda would expect Charles the Bald to listen to a woman who could not even stop her husband from taking their second child away from her.[44]

The fact that Dhuoda neither dated her work with the reign of Lothar nor with that of Charles the Bald may have resulted from her uncertainty about the prospective control of the throne and the anxiety it engendered. In the chaotic political situation of that time, Dhuoda did not know who the king and even emperor would be. If Charles the Bald, her son's current lord, became an emperor in the future (an outcome which would ultimately happen in 875), dating the year by Charles' enemy would cause political trouble. But she could not date the year in Charles' name either, not only because he was not yet a king but also because she did not know whether he would succeed in

---

[41] 'Finitus est autem, auxiliante Deo, IIII° nonas februarii, Purificationis sanctae et gloriosae semperque uirginis Mariae, Christo propitio regnante, et regem quem Deus dederit sperantem.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 238–39.
[42] Le Jan, 'The Multiple Identities of Dhuoda', pp. 218–19.
[43] The conjecture that Charles the Bald was one of Dhuoda's audience was put forward by Janet Nelson, but Le Jan, the main proponent of the idea mentioned here, does not cite Nelson, nor does she give her own proof of Charles the Bald as an audience for the *Liber Manualis*. Cf. Nelson, 'Dhuoda', pp. 106–20.
[44] For an assessment of the position of women in the Carolingian household, see R. Stone, 'Carolingian Domesticities', in J. M. Bennett and R. M. Karras (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 230–46.

claiming the crown. Moreover, Pippin II, who was allied with Lothar, was more favourably disposed towards Bernard. They had become close as early as 831, driven by shared interests.[45] Bernard's family, therefore, still had the chance to survive or even be prominent under Lothar's reign though there was a feud between them. If Dhuoda enunciated support for Charles by dating the year in his name, this possibility would be greatly reduced. It was therefore best for Dhuoda to date her handbook without mentioning either Lothar or Charles the Bald in order to avoid recognising either of them as having rightful rulership. In fact, Lothar is quite absent from the entire *Liber Manualis*. In this way, Dhuoda consistently demonstrated her attitude and standpoint, whether directly or indirectly.

Another indication of Dhuoda's prudence is that her far greater emphasis on spiritual rather than biological fraternity seems to be an attempt to make a grander narrative dissipate the political sensitivities that came fratricide within the royal family. Throughout the text of the *Liber Manualis*, Dhuoda used *frater* (brother) or *fraternitas* (brotherhood) six times to describe the relationship between the two sons she bore, while she applied the same words at least twenty times to refer to the spiritual relationship between the Christian Franks in general.[46] Through this textual strategy, Dhuoda avoids the association of Lothar's brutal struggle with his brother Charles the Bald that too many references to William's responsibility and affection for his little brother would have provoked. Simultaneously, the emphasis on spiritual fraternity

[45] The Astronomer mentioned that Bernard and Pippin II had conspired against Louis the Pious when their political positions were shaky: see Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious*, pp. 278–79.
[46] Regarding William and his brother, examples are 'natiuitas fratris tui XI Kalendas aprilis', 'fratremque tuum paruulum, cuius modo inscia sum nominis, cum baptimatis in Christo acceperit gratiam', 'aegritudo angustiarum corpus undique conterit Istum tibi et fratri ut prosit'. Regarding the Christian Franks in general, examples are 'compassionem erga proximos habueris fraternam', 'lege Mosaicae admonitionis Israeli filios ad compassionem satiari fraternam', 'ne obliuis caris compassionem minoris fraternitate'. In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 7, 70, 218, 236, 250, 254.

allowed Dhuoda to pursue a broader aim, namely, to persuade the several parties then engaged in civil war to reach reconciliation and peace on a shared moral principle.

3.3.2 The cornerstone of fidelity

During this period of uncertainty regarding the rulership of the Frankish realm, which belongs to the earthly dimension of time, what would Dhuoda have seen as the cornerstone of her son's allegiance? In other words, would Dhuoda, like Einhard, have taken the perspective of sacred time, regarding the ability to uphold the cult-related *res publica* and to serve the common interest as a criterion for recognising a particular ruler's right to rule? Dhuoda answered this question in one sentence:

> Hold fast still to Charles, whom you have as your lord, since God, as I believe, and your father Bernard chose for you at the beginning of your youth a flourishing strength for serving him — for he comes of a high and noble lineage on both sides of his family.[47]

It is evident that Dhuoda basically stayed in earthly time and made blood ties the cornerstone of fidelity. Dhuoda based fidelity on two kinds of worldly blood relations. One is the *fideles*' own family, where Bernard, the father, chose for William, the son, the lord to whom he should be faithful. The second was the royal line, that is, because Charles 'came of a high and noble lineage on both sides of his family', he was a worthy object of allegiance.[48] Yet, it is noteworthy that in another place, when trying to justify her argument, she invoked the biblical past, writing:

---

[47] 'Seniorem quem habes Karolum, quando Deus, ut credo, et genitor tuus Bernardus, in tuae incoationis iuuentute florigeram uigorem tibi ad seruiendum elegit, adhuc tene quod est generis ex magno utrumque nobilitatis orto progenie.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 92–93.

[48] 'credo, et genitor tuus Bernardus, in tuae incoationis iuuentute florigeram uigorem tibi ad seruiendum elegit, adhuc tene quod est generis ex magno utrumque nobilitatis orto progenie'. In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 93–94.

> Remember how David conducted himself with respect to Jonathan, the son of King Saul, and not only toward the father and son but also their offspring, both during their lifetime and after their deaths. As long as he lived he showed himself honest and faithful, their constant champion…Therefore again, you, son William, submit to the regular yoke of service, and be faithful to Charles your lord, whatever his status may be, and to his noble kin of both sexes and to all those descended of royal race.[49]

It can be seen from this quotation that the things of sacred time were for Dhuoda more to provide support for the importance of their counterparts in worldly time than to affect the earthly world directly. Interestingly Dhuoda demanded fidelity from William not only to Charles the Bald, but also 'to his noble kin of both sexes and to all those descended of royal race'. Were those who were in the fratricidal war with Charles the Bald included? Dhuoda was vague when reflecting on whether those people had legal royal power:

> God, as we believe, chose and predestined them *in regno*, granting them preeminence that tends to resemble in its greatness the preeminence he promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, their noble offspring and all their seed.[50]

The understanding of '*in regno*' in this passage, and in particular of '*regnum*' therein, determines how the implications of Dhuoda's words should be interpreted. In the Carolingian period, *regnum* was usually an expression associated with the rule of the king. In Louis the Pious' *Ordinatio imperii*, *regnum* is almost synonymous with royal *ministerium* (office). Formulations such as 'King X's *regnum*' and 'his *regnum*', which are remarkably common in other sources, also reflect the close association of *regnum*

[49] 'Meminere Dauid erga Ionathan, filium regis Saul, qui ad patrem et filium, nec non et illorum posteros propinquitati, non solum in uita, sed etiam post eorum obitum, tempore dum uixit, purus atque fidelis illis in omnibus uerus adstitit certator…eiusdem. Tu ergo, fili Wilhelme, obtempera iugum famulantis normam, sisque fidelis seniori tuo Karolo, quisquis ille est, et suis dignis utrorumque sexuum parentibus atque regalium generis ortos'. In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 104–07.

[50] 'Deus enim eos, ut credimus, elegit et praelegit in regno, dans illis gloriam ad illam tendentem, conformem similitudinis magnae, quam pollicitus est Abraam, Ysach et Iacob, prolisque dignis et semini eorum.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 106–07.

with the king. However, the term *regnum* could also be a signifier for the state and could have the characteristics of a territory. Although expressions such as *regnum Italiae* (Kingdom of Italy), *regnum Aquitaniae* (Kingdom of Aquitaine) or *regnum Baioariae* (Kingdom of Bavaria) rarely occur in the sources, in this sense, a *regnum* did have borders (*termini*, *fines regni*). More importantly, while *regnum* was closely associated with the individual king, it was moreover a concept that went beyond the pure sense of the king's rule, as Goetz has emphasised; rather, it represented the entire political order, a transpersonal conception of the state.[51] From this perspective, '*in regno*' in Dhuoda's text could either mean 'to sovereignty', which was an acknowledgement that they had legal royal power and were therefore the object of William's fidelity, or it could mean 'in the kingdom', which would simply state that they were magnates living in the *regnum Francorum*, leaving open the question of whether they had legal royal power. In this way, of the two lineages of *fideles*' own family and the royal line, both of which existed in earthly time, it was actually the former that finally established Charles as the object of allegiance.

Dhuoda's instructions to her son and his fellows not to be unfaithful to their lord offers another piece of evidence:

> Never once let yourself fall into the folly, the outrageous affront of breaking faith. Never let such an idea of disloyalty against your lord arise or grow in your heart… But I do not think that will be the case with you or your companions-in-arms. Such behavior never appeared or existed among your ancestors, they say: it does not exist at present, and never will in the future. Now you, my son William, are

[51] Goetz, 'Regnum', pp. 110–89; A. Grunin, 'Imaginer l'empire. Étude d'un concept étatique carolingien et evolution du vocabulaire politique dans le royaume et l'empire franc entre 768–840, et dans la Francia occidentalis entre 840–877' (PhD thesis, Université d'Avignon, 2010). In contrast, see Fried, 'Der karolingische Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh. zwischen "Kirche" und "Königshaus"', pp. 1–44. (As briefly described in 'the purpose of this thesis' in the 'Introduction' to this thesis.).

> descended from their stock. Conduct yourself toward your overlord as I have instructed you…[52]

Evidently, the basis for Dhuoda's belief that William and his fellows would not be unfaithful to their lord lay in earthly time: their ancestors in the bloodline, and certainly William's father Bernard, had never behaved in this way. Conversely, if Bernard had chosen to change sides, the bond of William's allegiance to Charles the Bald would have been broken. To whom, then, could William be faithful but to Charles the Bald as well as to his ally Louis the German? Dhuoda would not have wanted that person to be Lothar, since he had killed Bernard's brother Gozhelm; drowned the nun Gerberga, Bernard's sister, in the Saône as a witch; and blinded another brother, Herbert.[53] By naming Gozhelm and Gerberga as people for whom William should pray,[54] Dhuoda recognised them as kin and felt a connection with them. This recognition and closeness to their relatives may well have brought distress to Dhuoda by the fact that they had been killed through violent attacks.[55]

However, Dhuoda did not reveal any anger towards Lothar in her text (in fact, as noted earlier, she did not even mention him). The reason for her silence may lie in the subtle relationship between her husband Bernard and Pippin II of Aquitaine, who was Lothar's nephew and ally, and this delicate connection also appears to have been intentionally evaded in the *Liber Manualis*. According to Nithard, Bernard on the one hand 'did not

---

[52] 'Nunquam aliquando ex infidelitatis uesania improperium ex te exeat malum; non sit ortus nec in corde tuo unquam ascendens ut infidelis tuo seniori existas in ullo… Quod in te tuisque militantibus futurum esse non credo; ars enim haec, ut aiunt, nequaquam in tuis progenitoribus non apparuit unquam, nec fuit, est, nec erit nec ultra. Tu ergo, fili Wilhelme, ex illorum progenie ortus, seniori ut praedixi tuo sis uerax'. In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 94–95.

[53] These cases were extensively documented by contemporaries, such as Nithard, the Astronomer, Thegan, and the Annals of St-Bertin. See: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 12; Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious*, pp. 215–16, 276, 286; Nelson *The Annals of St-Bertin*, pp. 28–31.

[54] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 226.

[55] For research on these names, cf. Lauranson-Rosaz, 'Les Guillelmides', pp. 45–81; Dubreucq, 'Guillaume de Toulouse et la politique carolingienne en Aquitaine, d'après les sources narratives', pp. 184–89.

agree to commend himself to that man [Charles the Bald]'.[56] But on the other hand, he did not swear allegiance to Pippin II either, as he declared that he had sworn to Pippin not to enter into any agreement with anyone else without mutual consent.[57] This binding agreement does not look like a commendation. The fact that Bernard did not commend himself to any of the competing Carolingian royals explains why Bernard remained neutral in the battle of Fontenoy of 841, offering no military support to either side.[58] However, we can still see that, rather than Charles the Bald, Bernard was much closer to Pippin II.

As with Lothar, Pippin II is absent from Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*. This was presumably because the handbook was to be sent to William, who was at the court of Charles the Bald, and therefore the contents of the book might be read or heard by Charles, who was Pippin's enemy. However, in contrast to Bernard, William was explicitly expected to be favoured by Charles: his father sent him to Charles the Bald, and '(ordered) him to commend himself to Charles if the latter were willing to give him the *honores* which William held in Burgundy.'[59] This two-sided betting arrangement, whereby father and son were on two rival camps, was designed to ensure that their family survived, and even profited from, the political crisis. More importantly, this strategy of loyalty is a stark reflection of their view of the earthly projection of divine rulership of the realm: while the rulership remained uncertain and temporarily absent, local dynasties could try to keep a horse in each race.

[56] 'ut illi se commendaret, minime acquievit'. In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 94–95.
[57] 'cum Pippino suisque sacramento firmasse, ut neuter absque alterius consensu cum quolibet quodcumque pactum inire deberet.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 58–59.
[58] Cf. Koziol, 'Authority and Christology in Dhuoda's Manual', p. 56.
[59] 'filium suum Willelmum ad illum direxit, et, si honores quos idem in Burgundia habuit eidem donare vellet, ut se illi commendaret praecepit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 94–95.

Moreover, we can see that what really maintained William's fidelity to Charles the Bald, apart from Bernard's orders as father, was also Charles' recognition of William's *honores* in Burgundy. Dhuoda, however, made no mention of the role *honores* played in her son's loyalty to Charles the Bald, and instead she hinted at her suspicion and distrust of the *honores* that were in the midst of earthly time:

> A person in the world will lay a claim, saying 'This is my *regnum'*… Another man who is embroiled here too may say, 'this *terra* is mine'… They speak the truth, since it's theirs, but then it isn't theirs. They have it and they don't have it. They have it for a little while, but not forever. It's theirs for a time, but not for all time.[60]

Dhuoda's lack of confidence in holding *honores* was caused by the difference in the object of allegiance between Bernard and William, father and son. It was also due to this difference that Dhuoda was unable to establish royal lineage as the ultimate criterion for William to determine his own allegiance. Faced with the paradox of admonishing William to value his blood ties with his father, while accepting that William and his father each owed loyalty to rival brothers of another family, Dhuoda had to make Bernard's demand the final say in matters of fidelity. For William, this meant that loyalty to his father should come before loyalty to his lord:

> It is true that in men's eyes, the outward appearance and power of kings prevail in this world, and men's custom is above all to venerate the actions and titles of kings — as though royal and imperial power resided in the loftiness of their office…Yet, my son, this is my wish: that, obeying my humble counsels and obeying God, you do not neglect as long as you live to render primarily a specific, devoted, and resolute allegiance to your father…Therefore I admonish you again, most beloved son William, that first you love God as you have seen it written earlier here, and then love, fear, and cherish your father.[61]

[60] 'Contendit quis in saeculo et dicit: "Meum est regnum"… Contendit alius et dicit: "Mea est terra"… Verum dicunt quia est et non est, abent et non abent, est ad modicum sed non semper, abent ad tempus sed non omne tempus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 64–67.

[61] 'Quanquam in specie humanitatis forma uel potential regalis atque imperialis praecellat in saeculo, ut secundum morem hominum illorum prior ueneretur action et nomina quasi causa uenerationis et potestas fulta culmine honoris…; mea tamen, fili, talis est uoluntas, ut secundum admonitionem paruitatis meae intelligentiam, secundum

3.3.3 The *Liber Manualis* and the *Admonitio Generalis*: a comparison

If, as argued above, Dhuoda did not regard the ability to maintain the *res publica* associated with sacred time as the cornerstone of the lay nobility's allegiance to a particular king, how did Dhuoda position or perceive this concept?

Returning to the stylistic features of the *Liber Manualis*, it can be noted that Dhuoda made extensive use of an important form of political language, the admonition. As a kind of political discourse, the admonition came from the *Regula Benedicti*, a rule written by Benedict of Nursia (c. 480–550) at the beginning of the sixth century to establish spiritual principles and rules of organisation for his monastic community at Monte Cassino. Although it is no longer considered a fixed standard to which Carolingian monasteries uniformly adhered, many sources bear witness to its strong influence in the early Middle Ages.[62] Thereafter, as the *Regula Pastoralis*, written by Gregory the Great (590–604), borrowed this set of discourses to instruct priests on the different ways in which to admonish Christians of different temperaments and in different situations, 'admonition' began to be widely applied outside monastic communities as a set of political discourses designed to guide the proper conduct of the God-worshipping community.[63] Thus, under the influence of the *Regula Benedicti* and

Deum, in primis illi qui te prolem habuit, proprium, fidelem et certum dum uiuis non negligas reddi obsequium…Ego autem admoneo te, desideratissime fili Wilhelme, ut in primis diligas Deum sicut supra habes conscriptum; deinde ama, time, et dilige patrem tuum; scitoque, ex illo tuus in saeculo processit status.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 88–89.

[62] Cf. A. Diem, 'The Carolingians and the Regula Benedicti', in R. Meens (ed.), *Religious Franks* (Manchester, 2016), pp. 243–61; M. Czock, 'Monks Pray, Priests Teach, Canons Sing and the Laity Listens: The Regula Benedicti and Conceptual Diversity of Sacred Space in Carolingian Discourse', in D. R. Kramer, É. Kurdziel, and G. Ward (eds), *Monastic Communities and Canonical Clergy in the Carolingian World (780–840): Categorizing the Church* (Turnhout, 2022), pp. 355–80.

[63] Cf. C. Schütz, 'Einleitung', in M. Puzicha (ed.), *Kommentar zur Benediktusregel* (München, 2015), pp. 13–46.

the *Regula Pastoralis*,[64] an admonition became, in the Carolingian period, a warning of a moral, political, and religious nature that was used to remind laymen and priests alike to fulfil their ministry in the earthly order of Christendom.[65] The use of various genres containing admonitions, including capitularies, acta of synods, letters, and mirrors for princes, by figures of different identities to express political views is a meaningful development.

Admonitions were widely applied in the Carolingian world to urge laymen and priests to act correctly in the Christian community and to promote the effective worship of God, that is, to uphold the *res publica*. Since Dhuoda made extensive use of admonition in her *Liber Manualis*, a comparison of her handbook with the *Admonitio Generalis*, a text promulgated by Charlemagne in 789 as the programme of the 'Carolingian Reform',[66] offers an opportunity to see the particular features of Dhuoda's understanding of the *res publica*.

In the first place, Dhuoda and the *Admonitio Generalis* disagree on who the *rector* (ruler*)*, *defensor* (defender) and *adiutor* (supporter) were within the lay nobility. The *Admonitio Generalis* opens with the following lines:

> I, Charles, by the grace and mercy of God, king and head of the Kingdom of the Franks, devoted defender and humble supporter of the Holy Church, offer to all members of ecclesiastical order and to all dignities of secular power in Christ, the Lord and eternal God, the greeting of everlasting peace and happiness.[67]

[64] For the influence of the *Regula Benedicti* and the *Regula Pastoralis* on the Carolingian political ideas, see T. F. X. Noble, 'The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious', *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), pp. 235–50.
[65] An examination of the application of admonition in the time of Louis the Pious, Cf. de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 112–42.
[66] For more on the *Admonitio Generalis*, see R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), pp. 1–18.
[67] 'Ego Carolus, gratia dei eiusque misericordia donante rex et rector regni Francorum et devotus sanctae ecclesiae

In the opening section of this preface, Charlemagne clearly saw himself as being in a special relationship with both church and state. Specifically, he was not only the *rex* (king) of the Franks, but also their *rector*, a term used by the aforementioned Gregory in the *Regula Pastoralis* to describe the priests and bishops who had pastoral duties. Charlemagne was also the *defensor* and *adiutor* of the Holy Church. These titles conveyed the political message that Charlemagne had a religious pastoral responsibility for secular politics and political guardianship of the Church. The *Admonitio Generalis* suggests a picture involving, at one end, a Christian people to be led; at the other, a ruler, who is a combination of secular leader and spiritual preceptor; and, in the middle, a church elite and a lay nobility, who together promote the worship of God and uphold the *res publica* under the rulership of the ruler. This political-religious vision portrayed by the *Admonitio Generalis* is very similar to the ideological imagery presented by Einhard in his *Vita Karoli* discussed in Section 3.2, and thus represents the collective aspirations of the elite during Charlemagne's reign.

Likewise, in the *Liber Manualis*, Dhuoda made several references to the *rector*, *defensor* and *adiutor* of her son, a lay nobleman. The specific contexts are as follows:

Table 3.1 'rector', 'defensor' and 'adiutor' in Einhard's *Vita Karoli*

rector	May God and your Lord...be your guardian, your kindly ruler (*rector*), your protector![68]

defensor humilisque adiutor, omnibus ecclesiasticae pietatis ordinibus seu saecularis potentiae dignitatibus in Christo domino deo aeterno perpetuae pacis et beatitudinis salutem.' In: 'Admonitio Generalis', in *Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Großen* ed. and trans. H. Mordek, K. Zechiel-Eckes, and M. Glatthaar (Wiesbaden, 2013), p. 180.

[68] 'Sitque Deus et senior tuus...tutor, rector almificus atque protector.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 94–95.

	There is indeed only one Creator, framer, ruler (*rector*) and helmsman.[69]
defensor / adiutor	May God and your Lord...deign throughout all your actions to be your supporter (*adiutor*) and constant defender (*defensor*)![70]
	May He be your supporter (*adiutor*) and your strongest defender (*defensor*) against all your enemies.[71]

It is evident that Dhuoda did not adopt the positioning of the king's *ministerium* as articulated in the *Admonitio Generalis*, but instead assigned the role of *rector*, *defensor* and *adiutor* of the lay nobility directly to God rather than to the king, thus suspending the earthly presence of the ruler who was supposed to straddle the sacred and the secular; in other words, the succession of rulership in earthly time was put on hold.

On the other hand, since Dhuoda and the *Admonitio Generalis* disagree on the question of whether a rightful ruler was existing in the earthly time in their respective periods, it is conceivable that they would also differ in their view of the nature of the king's orders. In the preface to the *Admonitio Generalis*, Charlemagne asked all priests and lay nobles to preach (*praedicere*) the *Admonitio Generalis* to the 'people of God' with devout zeal.[72] As for the sources of its contents, the first fifty-nine capitula of the *Admonitio Generalis* are usually thought to be derived from the *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* given to Charlemagne by Pope Hadrian I in 774, which was a revised and supplemented edition of the sixth-century *Collectiones canonum Dionysianae* translated and compiled by the Syrian monk Dionysius Exiguus under the auspices of the Roman Curia of the

[69] 'Unus est enim Creator, Formator, Rectorque et Gubernator.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 122–23.
[70] 'Sitque Deus et senior tuus...in cunctis actibus tuis adiutor atque defensor assiduus dignetur adesse.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 94–95.
[71] 'Sit tibi adiutor et contra omnes inimicos tuos fortissimus defensor.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 214–15.
[72] '...ut et ista et illa aequali intentione praedicetis. Nee aliquid, quod vestrae sanctitati populo dei utile videatur, amittite, ut pio studio non ammoneatis, quatenus ut et vestra sollertia et subiectorum oboedientia aeterna felicitate ab omnipotente deo remuneretur.' In: 'Admonitio Generalis', p. 184.

time.[73] The remaining twenty-one capitula are mostly adapted from the Scriptures, including the Two Great Commandments of the New Testament, the Ten Commandments of the Jewish Law, the Pentateuch, and so on. The *Admonitio Generalis* can thus be seen in itself as a sermon by Charlemagne in the form of an admonition. The final section of the whole piece is a spiritual exhortation commonly used in sermons, and the concluding sentence is also quite similar in style to the sermon: 'Peace to those who preach, grace to those who obey, glory to our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.'[74] These features suggest that Charlemagne, or Alcuin, the probable chief author of the *Admonitio Generalis*,[75] saw the ruler's order as a sermon with divine connotations.[76]

Dhuoda, by contrast, did not seem to regard the orders of Charles the Bald as having a divinely sermonic aspect. Rather, she regarded the orders of both of her son's lords, his father and his seigneur, as secular. For example, she wrote,

> [I]n the name of the sovereign God, go and accomplish the temporal service that awaits you, or what your lord and father Bernard has ordered, or what seigneur Charles has directed to be done, as God permits.[77]

In another place, Dhuoda made a direct point that benefits *in saeculo* came from obeying the lords' orders:

---

[73] On the Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana, see L. Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400–1140): A bibliographical guide to the manuscripts and literature* (Washington DC, 1999), pp. 13–20. On Dionysius Exiguus and his work, see D. Heith-Stade, 'Dionysius Exiguus', in P. L. Reynolds (ed.), *Great Christian Jurists and Legal Collections in the First Millennium* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 315–33.
[74] 'Pax praedicantibus, gratia oboedientibus, gloria domino nostro Iesu Christo. Amen.' In: 'Admonitio Generalis', p. 238.
[75] Mordek, Zechiel-Eckes, and Glatthaar, *Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Großen*, pp. 47–63.
[76] For a discussion of the sermonic attribute of the *Admonitio Generalis*, see T. M. Buck, *Admonitio und Praedicatio. Zur religiös-pastoralen Dimension von Kapitularien und kapitulariennahen Texten (507–814)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997).
[77] 'in nomine Dei summi egredere in seruitio tibi adcrescente temporali, uel quod domnus et genitor tuus Bernardus iusserit, aut senior Karolus praeceperit faciendum, ita tamen si Deus permiserit.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 80–81.

> And Holy Scriptures are filled with so many others who faithfully submitted to their lords' orders. Because of their vigilance and effort, they deserved to thrive in the world.[78]

The question here is to what does '*in saeculo*' refer? Throughout the *Liber Manualis*, *saeculum* evidently distinguishes itself from the sacred, but also from the profane. For example, when she paralleled *saeculum* with God and wrote that 'the virtuous men of the past have proved pleasing to God and the *saeculum* because of their faith and perseverance', or 'the good men are found worthy to receive fitting reward both from God and *saeculum*',[79] Dhuoda regarded *saeculum* as something closely related to good qualities, but slightly differentiated from the religiosity represented by God. It is reasonable to infer on this basis that *saeculum* essentially refers to a state that is neither religious nor anti-religious.[80] In terms of the perspective taken in this thesis, one of its aspects can be thought of simply as earthly time. In this way, it can be argued that, in Dhuoda's view, Charles the Bald's commands had only secular attributes; conversely, the authority to issue divine commands belonged exclusively to God. The basis of Dhuoda's perception may still be that she did not consider Charles to be a ruler like Charlemagne or Louis the Pious, whose vocation was to uphold the *res publica*. In other words, the ruler was temporarily absent in the present, earthly world. It was in this

[78] 'et multi alii in Scripturis continentes sacris, seniorum iussa fideliter obtemperantes? Vigii uigore florere meruerunt in saeculo.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 94–95.
[79] '(dignitates)...qui Deo et saeculo per fidem placuere atque perseuerasse probantur...'; '(boni)...dignum a Deo et saeculo praemium accipere meruerunt magnum...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 104, 130. Further examples appear throughout the text, including on pp.140, 168, 178.
[80] Robert Markus proposed that this mindset for *saeculum* as morally neutral had a place in the period between Augustine and Gregory the Great, but thereafter, with the gradual Christianisation of the Roman world, *saeculum* was 'drained out' along with religious pluralism and traditional civic culture. See: R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990). Peter Brown generally agrees with Markus, although he postpones the 'end of ancient Christianity' to the mid-eighth century. See: P. Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000* (Chichester, 2013). It seems to me, however, that given the fact that people have been reading the writings of the Fathers, including those written before the imperial polity was Christianised, the concept of *saeculum* may not have been completely off the stage in the Middle Ages, even if the interpretation of its connotations may have changed.

understanding that Dhuoda felt she was living in a world of chaos, where the struggle for power all seemed to end up as an empty dream.[81]

3.3.4 Conclusion

The first point made in Section 3.3 concerned the temporality in Dhuoda's thinking as reflected through the concept of *res publica* and the semantic clusters surrounding it. Whether it is the tone of anxiety that Dhuoda planted in her *Liber Manualis*, her replacement of the ability to maintain *res publica* with family ties as the cornerstone for determining her son's allegiance, or the perception of God's direct rule over the lay aristocracy without a secular ruler as revealed in the contrast between the *Liber Manualis* and the *Admonitio Generalis*, all of these reflect Dhuoda's temporality. Although she believed in the existence of a rulership in eternal time, empowered by God, unfortunately the ruler who is the bearer of this rulership was temporarily absent in the earthly world. That is, although rulership as a sacred arena was timelessly eternal, for the time being, there was no longer a ruler in secular time who could uphold the *res publica*.

Secondly, Section 3.3 also shows that the temporality implied by the text is not necessarily discernible from a superficial assessment of its style. Historians have long asserted that the *Vita Karoli* is more secular because of its apparent imitation of the *De vita Caesarum* and that the *Liber Manualis* has numerous biblical references and is therefore more theological.[82] However, the discussion of these two texts, with the

[81] 'Verum dicunt quia est et non est, abent et non abent, est ad modicum sed non semper, abent ad tempus sed non omne tempus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 66. Also cf. Nelson, 'Dhuoda on Dreams', pp. 41–54.
[82] Evans, 'A Secular Shift in Carolingian History Writing', pp. 36–54; Mayeski, *Dhuoda*.

concept of *res publica* at the centre, reveals that the conclusion is not so straightforward. In fact, it is Einhard who explicitly linked sacred time to its earthly counterpart by pointing out that rulership always had a ruler in the secular world as its embodied projection, whereas Dhuoda focused on earthly time through the suspension of the question of whether the contemporaneous kings had a rightful rulership designed to preserve the *res publica*. This is certainly not to say that the *Vita Karoli* is concerned only with sacred time and Dhuoda with earthly time, but that *Begriffsgeschichte* offers a lens that can help to reveal other aspects of the text.

In the discussion of this section, it becomes clearer that the temporality in Dhuoda's thinking was triggered in large part by the political crisis of the time. Could this have been a uniquely personal experience for Dhuoda? To answer this question, the writings of Nithard, who wrote at around the same time as Dhuoda but with different personal experiences, will be explored in the next section.

3.4 Nithard

3.4.1 *Publica utilitas*

The *publica utilitas* or *communis utilitas* ('public interest' or 'commonwealth') is a concept closely linked to *res publica*, around which Nithard developed an extensive argument in his *Historiae*. An examination of the *publica utilitas* is thus helpful in understanding the role of the *res publica* in constructing the idea of fidelity among the lay aristocracy.

First of all, Nithard clearly considered Charles the Bald's interest as the *publica utilitas*. This was displayed by his portrayal of Charles the Bald's political rivals, such as Duke Bernard of Septimania, Dhuoda's husband, and Seneschal Adalhard, as the destroyers of the *publica utilitas*. In the *Historiae*, Bernard appears as a figure introduced into the court by Louis the Pious to counterbalance Lothar, yet he, 'recklessly abusing his power in the *res publica*, turned upside down what should have been consolidated',[83] which eventually led to Louis' first downfall. After the restoration of Louis with the help of the monk Guntbald, as well as Pippin I of Aquitaine and Louis the German, Bernard returned from exile and struggled for power with Guntbald, which contributed to the second downfall of Louis the Pious. During these two periods of Louis the Pious' loss of power, '*res publica* was worsening by the day, as everyone, driven by greed, sought their own advantage.'[84] After the death of Louis the Pious, Nithard saw Charles the Bald, who was in conflict with Lothar, as the defender of the *publica utilitas*: this youngest legitimate son of Louis the Pious declared that 'he wanted in everything to conform to the *publica utilitas* and that for this he was even prepared to face death immediately, if necessary.'[85] Yet Bernard did not keep his word. In the beginning, he remained outside the battles awaiting their results and looking on from a distance. He then pretended to serve Charles the Bald, but, as noted in the previous section, his strategy was actually to bet on both sides. But Charles the Bald and his men, who were deceived by Bernard, thought that the troubles everywhere had disappeared, and therefore separated from Louis the German and his men. 'Thus forgetting the *res*

[83] 'Qui dum inconsulte re publica abuteretur, quam solidare debuit, penitus evertit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 10–11.
[84] 'Res autem publica, quoniam quisque cupiditate illectus sua quaerebat, cotidie deterius ibat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 12–13.
[85] 'seque in omnibus publicae utilitati et parere velle, insuper etiam, si oporteret, pro ea mortem subire, minime differre fatetur.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 62–63.

publica with more imprudence than was necessary, each one withdrew carelessly to where his will carried him.'[86]

Nithard's criticism of Adalhard is also justified on the ground that the seneschal compromised the interests of Charles the Bald, and therefore of the *utilitas publica*, although the real reason appears to have had more to do with the personal interests of the author himself. In the first three books, Adalhard appears as a faithful warrior and envoy of Charles the Bald. He was sent by his lord to negotiate with the hostile Lothar and the Frankish nobles in the valley of the Wadz who were suspicious of Charles, and played an important part in the victory at the Battle of Fontenoy.[87] However, this author's description of Adalhard's activities changes subtly with the loss of Nithard's claimed land. He argued that during the second peace negotiations with Lothar, Adalhard had not only made overly generous offers at the outset, but had also been 'deceived (*decipere*)' into increasing Lothar's share beyond the stipulated portion.[88] After this, Nithard's opinion of the magnate, whom he had once regarded more favourably, took a sharp turn for the worse, centred on his assessment of Charles the Bald's marriage to Ermentrude (Hirmentrude), Adalhard's niece: while Charles the Bald assented to the marriage 'because he thought he could attract most of the people to himself by doing so.'[89] Nithard did not agree with him and thought that everything

[86] 'Res autem publica inconsultius quam oporteret omissa, quo quemque voluntas rapuit, perfacile omissus abscessit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 12–13.
[87] Adalhard's first negotiations with Lothar: 'Insuper ad Lodharium Hugonem, Adelhardum, Gerhardum et Hegilonem direxit.' Adalhard's negotiations with the Frankish nobles in the valley of the Wadz: 'Interea Adhelardus ceterique quos Karolus ad Francos direxerat, scire cupiens si ad illum reverti vellent, Carisiacum venientes, quo illi, ut missos dirigeret, mandaverant, perpaucos obviam habuerunt; qui hoc dicebant, si idem Karolus ad praesens esset, ad illum venire minime differrent; aliter autem nescire aiebant, utrum viveret an non.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 50, 52, 96.
[88] 'Quod quidem, quamquam ultra quod iustum ac congruum, ut quibusdam videbatur, inventum fuerit, per Conradum, Cobbonem, Adhelhardum et ceteros mandatum est;... Quamobrem ignoro, qua fraude decepti, hi qui missi fuerant, augent illi supra definitam partem usque in Carbonarias.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 138, 140.
[89] 'quia cum eo maximam partem plebis sibi vindicare posse putavit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 154–55.

Adalhard had done was for his own benefit instead of a real desire to help his lord. The author explained:

> Adalhard, with little regard for the *utilitas publica*, had set out to please everyone; he had advised distributing liberties here and public revenues there for the use of private individuals, and thus, by having everyone do what they wanted, he had completely ruined the *res publica*.[90]

At the end of the book, Nithard once again condemned people, such as Bernard and Adalhard, whose activities were detrimental to the interests of Charles the Bald, pointing out that their pursuit of private interest, in concert with their reckless disregard of public interests, would be punished by God:

> Let everyone learn here that he who commits the folly of neglecting the *utilitas publica* and gives himself up like a fool to his personal and selfish desires, thereby offends the Creator to such an extent that he makes all the elements themselves contrary to his extravagance.[91]

Along with the interests of Charles the Bald, Nithard equated the interests of the entire Carolingian polity with the *publica utilitas*. This was displayed on his portrayal of Charles the Bald and Lothar. As recorded in Section V of Book II, by the time Louis the Pious died, the parties of Charles the Bald and Lothar had already been embittered toward each other like fire and water, so there was no doubt about the imminence of war. As one of the members of Charles the Bald's faithful supporters, Nithard showed his party's stance:

---

[90] 'qui utilitati publicae minus prospiciens, placere cuique intendit. Hinc libertates, hinc publica in propriis usibus distribuere suasit, ac dum quod quique petebat, ut fieret, effecit, rem publicam penitus annullavit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 154–55.

[91] 'Hic quique colligat, qua dementia utilitatem publicam neglegat, privatis ac propriis voluntatibus insaniat, dum ex utrisque Creatorem adeo offendat, ut etiam omnia elementa eius vesaniae contraria reddat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 156–57.

> If his brother [Lothar], as he had promised, wished to seek and consolidate the *communis utilitas*, this would please everyone and it would be reasonable to welcome him with gratitude; but that, if it were otherwise, strengthened by his right and, consequently, by the help of God and his faithful, he should use all his energy to secure that part of the Empire which his father had given him with the consent of the faithful men of both kings.[92]

Evidently, Nithard here not only suggested that it was just for Charles the Bald to take any part of the realm granted to him by his father, but also made it clear that the condition that triggered Charles to force such a move was that Lothar was more concerned with his own interests than with the *publica utilitas*. Here, Nithard actually pitted the emperor Lothar's own interests against the public good, which was both a questioning of whether Lothar cared to preserve *res publica* and therefore deserved to have the rulership, and an argument that in Nithard's view, if the peace of the Frankish realm could be maintained, that is, if Lothar could peacefully give Charles the part that belonged to him, then the *publica utilitas* was well attended to. Furthermore, as noted in Section VIII of Volume II, in May of 841, Charles the Bald was to negotiate a peace talk with Lothar in Attigny. When explaining the reason why Charles the Bald gave up war and sought peace, Nithard wrote that:

> However, he informed him that, in spite of everything, he still agreed to come to the meeting they had arranged by mutual agreement. There, if Lothar wished to seek and strengthen the *communis utilitas*, according to his promise, he would rejoice; if not, he would let him know that, conforming in all things to the divine will, he would follow the advice of his followers with regard to the kingdom that God and his father had given him with their consent.[93]

---

[92] 'quod si frater suus, uti promiserat, communem utilitatem quaerere ac statuere vellet, hoc omnibus notis placere, et ut gratanter reciperetur congruum esse; sin aliter, fretus iustitia ac per hoc auxilio divino suorumque fidelium, et quicquid regni pater suus amborumque fidelium consensu illi dederat, obtinere omni virtute non neglegat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 62–65.

[93] 'Verumtamen, quamquam se haec ita haberent, in conventum quod communi consensu statuerant, venire se velle mandavit; ubi si communem utilitatem, uti promiserat, quaerere ac statuere vellet, sibi placere; sin aliter, de regno quod Deus paterque suus suorum consensu illi dederat, consiliis suorum fidelium in omnibus secundum Dei voluntatem parere se innotuit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 74–75.

The method of securing the *publica utilitas* mentioned in this passage likewise refers to the compromise negotiated between Lothar and Charles, whereby a portion of the realm was peacefully granted to the latter. Once again, therefore, keeping the peace throughout the Frankish realm was considered an important aspect of preserving the *publica utilitas*.

In summary, Nithard's view of *publica utilitas* is demonstrated in his description of a series of events. On the one hand, Nithard equated Charles's interests with the *publica utilitas* and saw anything that prevented Charles from acquiring his kingdom as undermining the *publica utilitas*. On the other hand, the *publica utilitas* is not the same as Charles's personal interest, for in Nithard's view the interest of the whole Frankish realm was the *publica utilitas*. These two views are not opposed but compatible in this warrior writer. Here, he was not claiming the entire Frankish *regnum* for Charles the Bald, but meant to emphasise that his lord was a true ruler, dedicated to the service of the *res publica*. It was therefore in the interest of the whole empire which God had entrusted to the Franks in trust that Charles the Bald should receive the *regna* to which he was rightfully entitled. In other words, insofar as Charles made it his ministry to preserve the *res publica*, his interest was equated with the *utilitas publica* but distinguished from his private interest.

3.4.2 *Sacramentum* and Kinship

However, as Nelson points out, Nithard left plenty of contradictory views and perceptions in his text as a result of his personal experiences.[94] As previously mentioned,

[94] See Section 2.2.2 of this thesis.

Nithard saw Charles the Bald as the ruler in the earthly world, but then, surprisingly, ended his work with a sentiment that seemed to negate Charles' rulership:

> For in the time of Charlemagne, of happy memory, who died nearly thirty years ago, as the people walked in the same straight path, which is for this reason the public path of the Lord, peace and harmony reigned everywhere; but now, on the contrary, as each one follows the path that pleases him, dissensions and quarrels appear on all sides.[95]

These contradictory expressions foreshadow the fact that Nithard was neither as confident as Einhard that there was always a ruler in the earthly world who was committed to preserving the *res publica*, nor as certain as Dhuoda that the ruler was already absent from the realm. His perception was an ambivalence that combined the two, and this ambivalence can be understood more readily in Nithard's answer to the question of what was the cornerstone of fidelity.

Owen M. Phelan has noted that Nithard's *Historiae* revolves around the establishment and destruction of *sacramentum*. While his translation of *sacramentum* as 'solemn oath' gives us an idea of its basic meaning, the sacredness and sense of time implied by the concept may be overlooked in the language shift.[96]

In the context of the early Middle Ages, *sacramentum* was a verbal assurance of divine or superhuman power, a ritual of a magical or religious nature.[97] In terms of the role it

---

[95] 'Nam temporibus bonae recordationis magni Karoli, qui evoluto iam pene anno XXX. decessit, quoniam hic populus unam eamdemque rectam ac per hoc viam Domini publicam incedebat, pax illis atque concordia ubique erat: at nunc e contra, quoniam quique semitam quam cupit incedit, ubique dissensiones et rixae sunt manifestae.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 156–57.

[96] Phelan, 'The Scope of Fidelity in Nithard's Ninth Century', p. 24.

[97] The oaths of the Carolingian period have received more attention from a variety of perspectives. Ganshof, for example, focused his examination on the political role played by the oath in the state system before and after Charlemagne's establishment of the empire. See F. L. Ganshof, 'Charlemagne's Use of the Oath', in F. L. Ganshof (ed.), *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy: Studies in Carolingian History* (London, 1971), pp. 111–24. Matthias Becher argues that the oath of fidelity was instrumental in the administration of the frontiers in the

played, a distinction can be made between the assertory oath, which has evidentiary effect at trial, and the promissory oath, which regulates the subsequent behaviour of the contractors.[98] But whether the *sacramentum* took place in a court or in a church, the place where it was held became the site of God's intervention.[99] The person in question, who drew on God as his witness and aid in the struggle, made it clear that if he swore falsely, he would suffer the vengeance of the Lord. It was a common belief among those involved in *sacramentum* that swearing an oath for one's fraudulent behaviour in the presence of God would be punished by natural forces such as lightning strikes or by weapons imbued with supernatural powers.[100]

By its very nature, *sacramentum* is a method of self-attestation. It was based on language and certain physical gestures. The affiant swore on his honour, his right, and above all, the favour of God, to guarantee the truthfulness of his words and the seriousness of his intentions. He then uttered the wording required by the *sacramentum* in a loud voice so that all present could hear it clearly. He also used gestures, such as stretching his hands and fingers upwards, as well as body languages, such as touching his hair, beard, or chest, and placing his hands on the altar, holy relics, or the Bible, so

Frankish kingdoms after Charlemagne. See M. Becher, *Eid und Herrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen* (Sigmaringen, 1993). Ian Spencer Ward observes the changing nature of the oath in the context of the reorganisation of the political structure of Western Europe in the tenth century. See I. S. Ward, 'The Oath of Loyalty and the Post-Carolingian Transformation, c.830–1000' (PhD Thesis, Princeton University, 2018). André Holenstein, on the other hand, takes a longer view, arguing that after the emergence of the group oath as a mandatory statement under Charlemagne, the widespread and sustained use of public oath-taking ceremonies within the German state had a profound social and legal impact, see: A. Holenstein, *Die Huldigung der Untertanen. Rechtskultur und Herrschaftsordnung (800–1800)* (Stuttgart, 1991), pp. 507–11. However, as far as I can see, there is a lack of studies that think about oaths or *sacramentum* in the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte*.

[98] Becher, *Eid und Herrschaft*, pp. 11–10.

[99] The Carolingian monarchs seem to have tried to limit the place where the sacramentum was held to the church. See R. Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Stammesrecht und Volkssprache in karolingischer Zeit', in R. Schmidt-Wiegand, D. Hüpper, and C. Schott (eds), *Stammesrecht und Volkssprache. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zu den Leges barbarorum* (Weinheim, 1991), p. 190.

[100] R. Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Eid und Gelöbnis, Formel und Formular im mittelalterlichen Recht', in P. Classen (ed.), *Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1977), p. 56.

that all the witnesses could see them clearly.[101] The whole process was enveloped in a sense of the sacred and a feeling of timelessness that comes with that sacredness.

The *sacramentum* highlighted by Nithard was part of the broader discourse of the Carolingian elite. Phelan argues that Nithard's voice, aims, and audience varied as he wrote each book over time and as his own circumstances changed, yet the *sacramentum* was always an important thread in his writing.[102] In the first and second books, Nithard portrayed the origins of the Carolingian civil war as Lothar's breach of the oaths taken by his father, Louis the Pious, and his younger brother and godson, Charles the Bald, thereby justifying Charles the Bald's confrontation with his eldest brother and godfather, Lothar. The third book was devoted to preserving the unity of the alliance between Charles the Bald and Louis the German, which had just been established by oath. The voice of the fourth and final book becomes sombre and resentful as Charles the Bald ceded the area containing Nithard's *honor* to Lothar in order to reach a compromise with him, an act seen by Nithard as a breach of the lord's oath to his loyal vassal. Such an argument as Phelan makes is persuasive, but as I have already suggested, we would gain a rather different perspective if the sacredness and temporality of *sacramentum* were taken into account.

By my count, *sacramentum* and its various declined forms are mentioned a total of thirty-two times in Nithard's *Histories*. Its first occurrence was as a strategic tool used by Louis the Pious to manage his allegiances with and among his sons. In 817, Louis the Pious called a general assembly at Aachen, crowned Lothar as co-emperor, and decreed the *Ordinatio Imperii*, which provided that upon his death, Lothar would

[101] Schmidt-Wiegand, 'Eid und Gelöbnis, Formel und Formular im mittelalterlichen Recht', p. 55.
[102] Phelan, 'The Scope of Fidelity in Nithard's Ninth Century'.

succeed him as emperor and rule over the centre of the Frankish kingdom; the second son, Pippin, would receive Aquitaine; and the third son, Louis, was given Bavaria. Pippin and Louis were required to submit to the rule of Lothar, and to present themselves before Lothar every year, in order to keep the peace between the brothers. The death of the Empress Ermengarde in 818 and Louis' marriage to Judith the following year, however, brought uncertainty to the empire, which became a reality in 823 with the birth of Judith's son, Charles, later to be known as Charles the Bald. According to Nithard:

> Once Charles was born, Louis, who had divided his Empire between his other sons, did not know what to do for this one. Tormented by this, he implored his sons for this child; finally, Lothar consented and accepted on *sacramentum* that his father would give Charles whatever portion of the Empire (*regnum*) he wished, swearing an oath to be his future protector and defender against all his enemies.[103]

Evidently, Louis the Pious intended to use the *sacramentum* to deal with allegiances among the royal family. Yet Nithard tells us that this attempt failed, and Lothar was soon incited by some magnates to rebel in violation of the *sacramentum*. Noticing the situation, Louis the Pious had to find another way to counterbalance Lothar, and summoned Duke Bernard of Septimania, to court. Bernard's actions, however, provoked even greater discontent and the rebellion eventually broke out.[104]

Although Louis the Pious drove Lothar back to Italy through hard-fought warfare, he did not appear to have learned his lesson and still looked to the *sacramentum* to create an allegiance between himself, as father and king, and his hopefully faithful son: he

[103] 'Karolo quidem nato, quoniam omne imperium inter reliquos filios pater diviserat, quid huic faceret ignorabat. Cumque anxius pater pro filio filios rogaret, tandem Lodharius consensit ac sacramento testatus est, ut portionem regni quam vellet, eidem pater daret.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 8–9.
[104] For the historical background, see Section 2.1 of this thesis.

compelled Lothar to declare by a *sacramentum* that he would not enter the territory of the Franks without the consent of his father.[105] Once again, however, this strategy proved unreliable, and as soon as Lothar heard of his father's new plan for the distribution of territory, he immediately ignored the *sacramentum* by which he had sworn and set about starting a new rebellion, which, however, was ultimately aborted. By 839, Louis the Pious had finally decided that Lothar would carry out his will concerning Charles the Bald and had Charles the Bald and Lothar swear by the *sacramenta* to each other as a guarantee. However, as on two previous occasions, the *sacramentum* still failed to demonstrate any value in dealing with allegiances, only this time it was the higher-ranking party that violated the *sacramentum*. After the death of Louis the Pious in 840:

> He [Charles the Bald]… chose Nithard and Adalger as his messengers and sent them as quickly as he could to Lothaire, begging him to remember the *sacramenta* they had exchanged...[106]

But Lothar, apparently as usual, did not intend to keep the *sacramentum* he had sworn. He 'pretended to receive them [Charles' messengers] kindly',[107] but in fact was only secretly building up his strength to destroy Charles the Bald at a stroke. So, 'the *sacramenta* that he [Lothar] had failed came into [everyone's] mind.'[108]

Nithard's account above can certainly be seen as his condemnation of Lothar for reneging, thus justifying the confrontation of Charles the Bald against Lothar. But this

[105] 'Quamobrem cum nec fugae nec praelii locum videret, ea pactione novissime praelium diremit, ut infra dies statutos Alpibus excederet, ac deinceps sine patris iussione fines Franciae ingredi non praesumeret, et extra patris voluntatem in eius imperio deinceps nihil moliri temptaret. Quod et ita se et suos servaturos, tam is quam et sui sacramento firmaverunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 26.
[106] 'Missos, videlicet Nithardum et Adelgarium, delegit, et uti ocius valuit, ad Lodharium direxit, mandans ac deprecans, ut memor sit sacramentorum quae inter se iuraverant...' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 48–49.
[107] 'Quae quidem Lodharius simulans se benigne suscipere...' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 48.
[108] 'Occurrebant insuper sacramenta quae tunc nuper fefellerat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 62.

is not the whole story, for some other evidence suggests that Nithard was at the same time defining the nature of the *sacramentum*, including its temporality. Nithard deliberately contrasted the circumstances in which the magnates swore a *sacramentum* to Lothar and Charles the Bald, respectively. He wrote,

> On hearing of his father's death, Lothar… also ordered that those whose fidelity was in doubt should be proven by the *sacramentum* of faith; in addition he commanded them to come to meet him as quickly as possible, threatening those who refused to do so with capital punishment.[109]

In contrast to Lothar's threatening tactics, magnates came to Charles the Bald voluntarily and swore by the *sacramenta* to him. It is particularly noteworthy that Nithard recorded some of their names, as they are among the relatively few named characters in his *Histories*:

> Hilduin, abbot of the church of St.-Denis, and Gerard, count of the city of Paris, and all others living within this territory came together and declared faith to Charles by a *sacramentum*.[110]

There was also Bernard, who looked as if he might be about to withdraw the *sacramentum* with Pippin II of Aquitaine in order to join Charles the Bald:

> But Bernard, as was his wont, refrained from going to him, saying that he was engaged with Pippin and his people by a *sacramentum*, having sworn mutually not to make any pact with anyone without the consent of the other; so he declared that he wanted to go and find them, and that, if there was a way, he would return with them; if not, he promised to release himself from his oath, to return within a fortnight and to submit.[111]

---

[109] 'Audiens Lodharius patrem suum obisse…dubios quoque fide sacramento firmari praecepit; insuper autem iussit, ut, quantocius possent, obviam illi procederent; nolentibus vero capitale supplicium ut praediceretur, indixit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 44.
[110] 'Hilduinus autem abbas ecclesiae sancti Dyonisii, et Gerardus comes Parisius civitatis, ceterique omnes praedictos fines inhabitantes, convenerunt fidemque sacramento Karolo firmaverunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 30.
[111] 'Sed Bernardus more solito ad illum venire distulit, dicens se cum Pippino suisque sacramento firmasse, ut neuter absque alterius consensu cum quolibet quodcumque pactum inire deberet; quamobrem testatus est, ad illos

Of the four, it is unclear whether there is a kinship between Gerard and the Carolingians, but Hilduin and Bernard are indeed Carolingians in the broad sense: Hilduin was the nephew of Hildegard, Charlemagne's second wife and the mother of Louis the Pious, while Thegan considered that Bernard belonged to the 'royal family' (*stirps regalis)*.[112]

Thus, at first glance, the reader would be led to believe that Lothar's side would surely be divided and his camp threatened with disintegration, while Charles the Bald's side would be united by the combined effects of kinship and *sacramentum*. Yet Nithard revealed, seemingly carelessly, the surprising answer later on: it was precisely Charles the Bald's side that suffered betrayal. Hilduin and Gerard 'abandoned Charles and failed in their faith',[113] while Bernard, on the other hand, appeared indecisive and delayed in keeping his promise, causing great resentment from Charles the Bald. To explain this contrasting effect presented by Nithard, it is essential to explore how Nithard perceived the *sacramentum* and the temporality implicit in it.

As noted earlier, the nature of the *sacramentum* was usually considered divine, a notion that was also prevalent at least as late as the middle of the ninth century, when Nithard was writing: a Lotharingian council held in 855 claimed, 'in the *sacramenta* of the Church, there is nothing broken, nothing playful, but rather total truth, conjoined by its

se ire velle; et si efficere posset, ut una secum sui devenirent, bene; sin aliter, soluto iuramento infra dies quindecim ad illum reversurum, suaeque ditioni se commissurum esse, promisit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 58–59.

[112] For Hilduin, see M. Lapidge, *Hilduin of Saint-Denis: The Passio S. Dionysii in Prose and Verse* (Leiden, 2017), pp. 3–63. For Bernard, Thegan said, 'Dixerunt Iudith reginam violatam esse a quodam duce Bernhardo, qui erat de stirpe regali, et domni imperatoris ex sacro fonte baptismatis filius...' In:Thegan, *Gesta Hludovici Imperatoris*, ed. E. Tremp, *MGH SS rer. Germ., 64* (Hannover, 1995), p. 222.

[113] 'Hilduinus abbas sancti Dyonisii, et Gerardus comes Parisii civitatis, a Karolo deficientes, fide frustrata ad illum venerunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 52–53.

own verity and sincerity'.[114] In other words, the *sacramentum* was still believed here to bear the connotation of eternity. Yet Nithard presented the opposite view. The originally sacred *sacramentum* was now so easily and frequently violated, not only by Lothar's side but also by Charles's, as it was used as a tactic of fratricidal rivalry, that it fell into temporary in the temporality. For example, when Charles the Bald suffered the aforementioned betrayal, Lothar judged that there would be more defections from Charles as time went on. It would have been wise, therefore, for Lothar to have made a temporary truce with Charles in order to coax more magnates to his side during the period of truce, further weakening Charles' power. On the other side, Charles's men, fearing that they would be outnumbered if Lothar attacked at this time, decided that the best strategy for the moment was to agree to peace talks as a delaying tactic, and to take the time to retreat and regain their strength. Thereupon Charles's *fideles*, in anticipation of Lothar's breaking the treaty, agreed with Lothar by *sacramentum* that until the next meeting Lothar should be as loyal to Charles as a brother, allow him to take possession of the lands he had been given, and refrain from hostile acts against Louis the German. Otherwise, their oath of truce to Lothar would be automatically nullified. 'In this way, they were able to shield their king from danger and soon free themselves from their *sacramentum*',[115] for Lothar, as expected, soon stirred up trouble again.

As for Lothar's use of *sacramentum* as a temporary strategy without taking its sanctity seriously, examples abound in the *Historiae*. One of such cases is when prior to the battle of Fontenoy, Lothar falsely agreed to make peace with Charles the Bald and Louis

[114] 'Cum in ecclesiae sacramentis nihil sit cassum, nihil ludificatorium, sed prorsus totum verum et ipsa sui veritate ac sinceritate subnixum.' In: *Valence*, ed. W. Hartmann, *MGH Conc. III* (Hannover, 1984), p. 355. The translation is from C. West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation between Marne and Moselle, c.800–c.1100* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 102.
[115] 'Qua quidem arte et regem suum a periculis subtrahunt, et se mox a sacramento absolvunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 58–59.

the German in order to stall for time while he waited for reinforcements from Pippin II of Aquitaine. 'Nevertheless, he made Ricuin, Hirmenald and Frederic swear by *sacramentum* that in asking for this respite, his only desire was to seek their common good, for themselves and all the people, as justice demands between brothers and among Christian people.'[116] From the above two cases we can see that in spite of the fact that Lothar was always depicted as the one responsible for the violations of *sacramentum* in the narratives, it can still be observed that the sense of sanctity and eternity that the *sacramentum* was supposed to have was trampled upon wantonly in Nithard's writing, and that it itself was reduced to a temporal instrument of the worldly struggle.

In contrast to the occasional temporariness of the *sacramentum*, the supposedly mundane and temporary ties of blood are revealed to be immortal in the *Historiae*, at least those between royals. For example, when describing the death of Louis the Pious, Nithard wrote,

> Meanwhile, with Lothar still in Italy, Louis [the German] beyond the Rhine and Charles [the Bald] in Aquitaine, the emperor Louis, their father, died on an island near Mainz on the twelfth of the calends of July, and his brother, Drogo, bishop and archchapelain, in the company of the bishops, abbots and counts, had him buried with the honours due to him in his city of Metz, at Saint-Arnulf.[117]

Stuart Airlie comments brilliantly on this episode, writing:

[116] 'Verumtamen Ricuinum, Hirmenaldum et Fredericum sacramento firmare praecepit, quod pro nulla re alia has indutias peteret, praeter quod commune profectum tam illorum quam et universae plebis, sicut iustitiam inter fratres et populum Christi oportebat, quaerere volebat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 84–85.
[117] 'Cumque se haec ita haberent, Lodharius in Italia, Lodhuwicus trans Renum, et Karolus in Aquitania essent, Lodhuwicus imperator paterque illorum in insula quadam iuxta Magonciatum XII. Kal. Iulii obiit; quem Drogo, frater et episcopus atque archicapellanus eius, Mettis civitate sua apud Sanctum Arnulfum una cum episcopis, abbatibus comitibusque congruo honore sepulturae tradidit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 42–43.

> All the far-flung parts of the empire were in the hands of legitimate successors, explicitly labelled as sons of Louis, while Louis himself was buried by his brother in the shrine of his sacred ancestor, St Arnulf. An aura of glorious Carolingian continuity from the holy ancestor in the past to the new rulers of the future, with their royal names unique to the Carolingian family, surrounds death, which threatens dissolution, but which is here masterfully orchestrated into a hymn to Carolingian splendour by Drogo, brother of Louis.[118]

The different temporalities implied in *sacramentum* and kinship sometimes led to contradictions faced by those who were in both bonds. On the one hand, as vassals who received *honores* and swore the *sacramentum*, men such as Hilduin and Bernard were supposed to be loyal to their lords. But on the other hand, in the midst of a civil war, Hilduin and Bernard were facing enemies whose leaders were also their own kinsmen. Not only should they owe them allegiance, but the necessity of such allegiance should even take precedence over the obligation based on the *sacramentum*, considering the respective temporalities of *sacramentum* and blood relationship presented in the *Historiae*. In this way, the coexistence of *sacramentum* and kinship in one person, instead of strengthening the principle of allegiance, could be in conflict. The underlying cause of this conflict was the shaking of the sanctity and eternity of the *sacramentum* as the Frankish nobility became confused as to whether a ruler now existed to uphold the *res publica*. This confusion about the existence of a legitimate ruler and the tension between the *sacramentum* and blood ties that prevailed within the Carolingian Empire in the mid-ninth century not only brought widespread anxiety, but also allowed some local dynasties to justify their disloyalty: just as Dhuoda taught her son to put his *fides* to his father above that to his lord, which was the conclusion of the previous section.[119]

[118] Airlie, 'The World, the Text and the Carolingian', pp. 63–64.
[119] See Chapter 3, especially Section 3.3.2.

The subtle changes in the author's terminology in the Fourth Book of the *Historiae* corroborate the above argument. Firstly, Nithard did not mention in the first three books the establishment of a *sacramentum* between Charles the Bald and Louis the German. The groups to whom they swore by *sacramenta* at Strasbourg in 842 were their faithful men.[120] But between them there was nothing but pure brotherhood. This is represented through the intimacy that Charles and Louis shared in their daily lives: they ate together, slept together, played together, exchanged gifts, and 'dealt with public and private matters with the same accord.'[121] Nithard's carefully choreographed scenes appear designed to present a stable alliance based solely on kinship. In contrast, the relationship between Louis the Pious and Lothar, and between Lothar and Charles the Bald, was structured on both *sacramentum* and kinship, and thus exhibited instability. An example of this is when he proposed peace talks to Lothar in 840, Charles the Bald reminded him first of the *sacramentum* they swore to each other and then of their brotherhood.[122] The result, however, was predictable: while Lothar pretended to accept, in secret he was actively preparing for war.

Yet by the fourth book, when Charles the Bald ceded the region containing Nithard's *honores* to Lothar in order to reach a compromise with him, Nithard no longer emphasised this distinction, but simply stated that the three brothers tried to establish a *sacramentum* between themselves.[123] Does this nuance suggest that Nithard considered

[120] On the oath revealing the object to which Charles and Louis swore, see this sentence: 'si autem, quod absit, sacramentum, quod fratri meo iuravero, violare praesumpsero, a subditione mea, necnon et a iuramento quod mihi iurastis, unumquemque vestrum absolvo.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 114.
[121] 'Nam convivia erant illis pene assidua, et quodcumque pretium habebant, hoc alter alteri perhumane dabat. Una domus erat illis convivii, et una somni; tractabant tam pari consensu communia quam et privata; non quicquam aliud quilibet horum ab altero petebat, nisi quod utile ac congruum illi esse censebat. Ludos etiam hoc ordine saepe causa exercitii frequentabant.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 120.
[122] 'Qui quidem ex omnibus nuntio recepto, missos, videlicet Nithardum et Adelgarium, delegit, et uti ocius valuit, ad Lodharium direxit, mandans ac deprecans, ut memor sit sacramentorum quae inter se iuraverant, et servet quae inter illos pater statuerat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 48.
[123] 'Hinc omnes in eadem domo convenerunt, a parte Lodharii dicentes, quod parati ad sacramentum et ad

this *sacramentum* that the three brothers were about to swear to be only a temporary tactic like so many *sacramenta* before it?[124] Further, in choosing whether to use *sacramentum* or kinship to describe a relationship, was the author also revealing his expectations and attitudes towards it?

Secondly, as already noted, Nithard was the illegitimate son of Angilbert, the lay abbot of St. Riquier, and Bertha, a daughter of Charlemagne. At the time of writing the first book, Nithard had no intention of revealing his relationship with the royal family. When speaking of Charlemagne, Nithard referred to him as 'your' grandfather, not 'our' grandfather.[125] This use of the term seems to indicate that Nithard anchored his *fides* to Charles the Bald exclusively to the *sacramentum*-based relationship of a *fidelis* to his lord.[126] However, Nithard revealed himself explicitly in Book IV, writing, 'from this great king's daughter, called Bertha, he [Angilbert] begat Hartnid, my brother, and me, Nithard.'[127] What this great turn in attitude shows may be Nithard's changing mindset. The *sacramentum* was broken (or at least severely weakened, since it is not known whether Nithard had any *honores* elsewhere) after Charles had surrendered his *honores*.[128] Thus, Nithard needed to find a new reason to continue to serve Charles, even if that reason somehow went against his previous attitude and principle, and this

divisionem, uti iuratum fuerat, essent; at contra a parte Lodhuwici et Karoli, similiter se velle, si possent, aiebant.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 148.

[124] Modern historians now agree that it is hindsight to see the Treaty of Verdun as the permanent division of the Carolingian Empire and the birth of France and Germany. Their studies show that the agreement of 843 was widely regarded as provisional at the time. Cf. Costambeys, Innes, and Maclean, *The Carolingian World*, pp. 205–06.

[125] 'Avi quoque insuper vestri venerandam memoriam per omnia obmittere ratum minime videtur.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 2.

[126] The idea that a specific relationship called 'vassalage' or 'feudalism' arose during the Carolingian period has been seriously challenged. See S. Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford, 1996).

[127] 'Qui ex eiusdem magni regis filia nomine Berehta, Hartnidum, fratrem meum, et me Nithardum genuit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 150–51.

[128] The acquisition of property is the basis on which *fides* can be established, both for *sacramentum* and kinship. For Dhuoda's case, see Section 4.3.2 of this thesis. For more explanation of Nithard's case, see Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard'.

breach may partly explain the sombre tone of Book IV. In any case, it is known that Nithard eventually persuaded himself: he was killed either in the battle against the invasion of the Northmen in 845, or in the battle against Pippin II of Aquitaine in 844. But either way he was still under Charles the Bald's command at the time.[129]

3.4.3 Conclusion

Section 3.4, at the level of both 'public *Histories*' and 'private history' (to borrow Nelson's terminology), analyses the way in which the *publica utilitas* and *sacramentum*, which closely relate to the concept of *res publica*, are characterised in the *Historiae*. Here I will summarise the temporality that characterises Nithard's thinking.

On the one hand, like Einhard, in the 'public *Histories*' Nithard basically agreed that the divinely-given rulership in eternal time was still assumed by an earthly ruler (Charles the Bald), who was maintaining the *res publica*. This is shown by his equating the interests of the *res publica*, or rather the *publica utilitas*, with those of his lord, and by describing Charles the Bald's acquisition of the Frankish *regna* as being in accordance with the interests of the Frankish *regnum*, or rather the Carolingian empire.

But on the other hand, in the 'private history', Nithard was increasingly hesitant about Charles the Bald's ability to uphold the *res publica* and assume the rulership. Like Dhuoda, the warrior writer gradually regarded kinship as the cornerstone of fidelity to his lord, for he found that the *sacramentum* was being used more and more as a tool of temporary tactics, which seriously undermined the sanctity and timelessness that the

[129] For a short biography of Nithard, see Section 2.4.1 of this thesis.

rite had originally possessed. The degradation of *sacramentum* in temporality has rendered it less and less useful for anchoring the *fides*.

Nithard was more of an ambivalent figure than Einhard and Dhuoda. We can perhaps explain this tension in his text on the basis of his particular experience, as he grew disenchanted with the structures of legitimate authority to which he had, at the outset, enthusiastically subscribed.

CHAPTER 4: *FAMILIA*

4.1 Introduction

The word 'family' has been in the Romance languages since at least the twelfth century, was used in English in the fifteenth century, and was introduced into German in the sixteenth century.[1] Its etymology is the Latin word *familia*, whose resemblance to what is understood today as family is purely formal, as there are fundamental differences in terms of their connotations. In other words, there would be a high risk of falling into anachronism if *familia* were to be equated with 'family' and used as a conceptual tool without a diachronic examination.

The basic meaning of *familia* in Roman society consisted of both interpersonal relations and property. This was explicitly noted in Justinian's *Digest*, which was compiled in the sixth century but here quoting a passage originally written by Ulpian (? – 228) in the early third century, which stated that 'the designation of *familia*... is accepted in various ways: for it points to things and persons'.[2] Its broad connotation is equivalent to family or clan when *familia* refers to interpersonal relationships, as in the *Digest*, '[the term] *familia* is applied to several persons, who are descended by blood from the same last father (*genitor*)'.[3] And when *familia* refers to property, it may be derived from

[1] D. Herlihy, 'Family', *The American Historical Review* 96 (1991), p. 2.
[2] 50, 16, 195.1: '"Familiae" appellatio...qualiter accipiatur, videamus, et quidem varie accepta est: nam et in res et in personas deducitur.' In: Ulpian, *Digesta*, ed. T. Mommsen, *Corpus Juris Civilis. vol. I, Institutiones* (Berlin, 1888), p. 864. The *Digesta* is, as its name suggests, a blend of much earlier sources. The Franks tended to use another, smaller and earlier compilation of imperial law, the *Theodosian Code*. For an introduction to the more widely used law books of the Carolingian period, see R. McKitterick, 'Some Carolingian Law-Books and Their Function', in B. Tierney and P. Linehan (eds), *Authority and Power. Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann on His Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 13–27.
[3] 50, 16, 195.4: 'Appellatur familia plurium personarum, quae ab eiusdem ultimi genitoris sanguine proficiscuntur.' In: Ulpian, *Digesta*, p. 865.

the original meaning of 'slave' to other possessions of the slave owner. Both ancient and medieval grammarians believed that the word *familia* was borrowed by the Romans from their neighbouring tribe, the Oscans, for whom the root word *famel* meant slave. *Famel* also provides a common noun for the Latin word for slave: *famulus*.[4] Thereafter, the meaning of *familia* was gradually extended from slaves as property to all inheritable possessions. Articles 4–5 of the fifth table of the archaic *Twelve Tables* (formally promulgated in 449 BC) detail the circumstances in which an heir may inherit a *familia*, which in this case clearly has the meaning of property. For example, it writes, 'if a person dies intestate, and has no self-successor, the nearest agnate male kinsman shall have possession of the deceased's household (*familia*).' [5] The *Codex Justinianus,* compiled along with the *Digest* in the early sixth century, is more explicit in stating that 'the word *familia* ought to be understood as property (*substantia*) because both slaves and other property are considered to be in each person's estate.'[6] It should be noted, however, that when *familia* is used in relation to property, it seems to be primarily a legal term and is not often used in non-legal contexts.[7]

Yet whether in the sense of kinship or property, what the concept of *familia* in Roman society reflected was, above all, a relationship of possession and domination. The Latin word *pater* in a sense focuses on the holder of authority rather than the biological father, who is more often referred to by *genitor*. 'Father's power (*patria potestas*)' was at the core of the Roman *familia*; the fact that the *pater familias* dominated wives and children

[4] Herlihy, 'Family', p. 2.
[5] 'Si intestato moritur, cui suus heres nec escit, adgnatus proximus familiam habeto.' In: *Lex duodecim tabularum*, ed. and trans. E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin, vol. III* (New York, 1938), pp. 448–49.
[6] 'Nomen familiae pro substantia oportet intellegi, quia et servi et aliae res in patrimonio uniuscuiusque esse putantur.' In: *Codex Justinianus*, ed. and trans. F. H. Blume, B. W. Frier, S. Connolly, S. Corcoran, M. H. Crawford, J. N. Dillon, D. P. Kehoe, *et al. The Codex of Justinian: A New Annotated Translation, with Parallel Latin and Greek Text Based on a Translation by Justice Fred H. Blume* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 1624–25.
[7] R. P. Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 75.

and a certain number of slaves made the Roman *familia* a unit of power under patriarchy rather than a natural family based on marriage and blood ties as it is today. *The Digest* comments on this: 'we define the *familia* "under Roman law" (*iure proprio*) as a plurality of persons who are subjected, either by nature or by law, to the power of a single person.'[8] In this respect, although there is a tendency to analogise the father and his power under Roman patriarchy to that of the king/emperor and his power,[9] historically, the opposite was the case: the ruler more often achieved the consolidation of his authority by exploiting paternal power, which was much older. Augustus, for example, subtly exploited the idea of the Roman *familia* by combining the roles of *pater familias* and *Pater Patriae*, making Roman society one big *familia* of which Augustus himself was the *pater*. This established his supreme authority while also making his heir the successor not only to his personal property, but also to the public role he had assumed.[10] Meanwhile, we can also see from Augustus' strategy for the use of *familia* that *familia* did not have to be confined to an individual household, but could be extended to a huge scale along the grain of power.

This Roman understanding of *familia*, which placed power, whether that of the father over the members of the household or that of the owner over his property, at its heart, was introduced into Christianity in late antiquity and carried over into the early medieval West in both its sacred and secular dimensions.[11] For example, Lactantius (c. 250 – c. 325) in his *De mortibus persecutorum*, completed in the early fourth century, accused the pagan emperor Galerius (305 – 311 as Augustus) of following the practice

[8] 50, 16, 195.2: 'Iure proprio familiam dicimus plures personas, quae sunt sub unius potestate aut natura aut iure subiectae.' In: Ulpian, *Digesta*, p. 864.
[9] For example, H. F. Jolowicz and B. Nicholas, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 113.
[10] B. Severy, *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire* (London, 2003).
[11] Cf. D. Herlihy, *Medieval Households* (London, 1985), pp. 1–78.

of the Persian emperors in incorporating Roman Christians into his *familia*, thereby brutally abusing them as slaves.[12] Augustine of Hippo's theory on marriage, although seen by one view as removing the individual from the power structure of *familia*,[13] actually re-imbeds the individual in a religious community, while detaching him from the secular community.[14] Augustine therefore called the entire Christian Church the 'familia Christi' or 'familia Dei' to express the supreme authority of God over all Christians.[15]

Moreover, the intellectual elites of the Church also maintained a considerable degree of classical understanding of *familia* in economic life. Pope Gregory I, who lived two centuries after Augustine in the second half of the sixth century, regarded the *coloni* who worked on his estates as members of his *familia*.[16] In his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, completed in 731, the Venerable Bede (c.673 – 735) wrote, 'Now at the east end of Kent there is Thanet, an isle of goodly size, that is to say, containing 600 *familiae* according to the custom of the estimation of the English.'[17] Bede was clearly using *familia* here as a unit of property.

[12] 'nam post deuictos Persas, quorum hic ritus, hie mos est, ut regibus suis in seruitium se addicant et reges populo suo tamquam familia utantur, hunc morem nefarius homo in Romanam terram uoluit inducere...' In: Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, ed. and trans. A. Städele, *Die Todesarten der Verfolger* (Turnhout, 2003), p. 146.
[13] S. McSheffrey, *Love and Marriage in Late Medieval London* (Detroit, 1995), pp. 78–79.
[14] C. E. Gunton, *The One, the Three and the Many* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 64–66. also P. L. Reynolds, *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments: The Sacramental Theology of Marriage from its Medieval Origins to the Council of Trent* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 101–19.
[15] 'Quid familia Christi respondere debent infidelibus...Habet itaque omnis familia summi et veri Dei...' In: Augustine of Hippo, *City of God, vol. I*, p. 122.
[16] 'si quis ex familia [colonis] culpam fecerit...' In: Gregory I, *Gregorii I Papae Registrum Epistolarum, Mense Maio I. 42*, ed. P. Ewald and L. M. Hartmann, *MGH Epp. I* (Berlin, 1891), p. 65.
[17] 'Est autem ad orientalem Cantiae plagam Tanatos insula non modica, id est, magnitudinis iuxta consuetudinem aestimationis Anglorum, familiarum sexcentarum.' In: Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. and trans. J. E. King, *Ecclesiastical History, vol. I* (New York, 1930), pp. 108–09. The unit of property in the early Middle Ages was more a matter of power relations than of geographical extent, a point illustrated from another perspective (the Carolingian fisc) by Charles West, see West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution*, pp. 62–64.

Yet human beings are, after all, emotional creatures, and the organisation of everyday life they have constructed cannot be held together exclusively by cold power.[18] Thus, while stressing the important role played by power, especially that of the father, in the construction of the *familia*, it is also necessary not to overlook the presence of love in the Roman *familia*, which is divided into *amor*, often directed towards physical love, *caritas* or *amicitia*, more oriented towards spiritual love, and *dilectio*, shared by the members of the *familia*. A monument from the imperial period, found in northern Italy, for example, contains an epitaph from a husband to his second wife, which states, 'O too beautiful and always modest with your husbands, you lay in two marriage beds, where two children were born of love (*amor*).'[19] A mid-third-century monument, on the other hand, records the reason why a husband wrote an epitaph for his wife, 'I added this so that those who read may understand how much we loved (*diligere*) one another.'[20]

Like power, the element of love in Roman *familia* was absorbed by the Church of the late antiquity and the *familia* of the early Middle Ages and tended to increase in weight over time, although the nuances of the love represented by the words *amor*, *caritas*, *amicitia* and *dilectio* faded. Augustine, the most systematic expositor of Christian spiritual *familia*, argued that each person is essentially an expatriate in a foreign land (*peregrina*) and that the secular *familia*, whether it is a household or a country, is only a temporary place for him or her, and that only where God is there is the true homeland. In order to return to God and realise one's true and complete self, one must see life as

[18] Achievements in this area have come in particular from the emotional history of the Middle Ages, cf. B. H. Rosenwein, *Love: A History in Five Fantasies* (Cambridge, 2021).
[19] 'O, formosa nimis semperque pudica maritis duobus recubuisti toris, ubi duos natos dedisti amoris.' In: *CIL V. 7453*, ed. J. Cholodniak, *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina* (Petropoli, 1857), p. 21.
[20] 'Haec ideo adieci, ut legentes intellegant, quantum nos dilexerimus.' (CIL VI 29580 = ILS 8450) In: T. Späth and B. Wagner-Hasel, *Frauenwelten in der Antike: Geschlechterordnung und weibliche Lebenspraxis* (Stuttgart/Weimar, 2016), p. 48.

a pilgrimage (*peregrinatio*) back to one's home. When the end is reached, that is, eternal life in God, the temporal things of earthly world can be left behind.[21] But to avoid loneliness during this long pilgrimage, one needs to be accompanied by a loving connection, to form a spiritual *familia*, whether it is a household or a Christendom. In Augustine's own words, 'love (*caritas*), which ties people together in the bonds of unity, makes souls overflow and as it were intermingle with each other';[22] 'through loving (*caritas*), many souls are made one soul and many hearts are made one heart'.[23] This kind of *familia*, with a bond of religious obligation and emotion based on a common quest for the love of Christ, reshapes the ethical order and provides a collective identity for the solitary individual.[24]

Beside theologians such as Augustine, lay people found love equally in the grand Christian *familia* in the broad sense and in the blood *familia* in the narrow sense. In terms of the three sources we examine here, Einhard mentioned in his *Vita Karoli* that Charlemagne loved his daughters deeply and cried bitterly over the death of Pope Hadrian 'as if he had lost a brother or a deeply loved son' (a point that may have special significance and will be discussed below), and loved foreigners the way Augustine had asked: 'he loved foreigners and took great trouble to welcome them [to his court]'.[25] In her *Liber Manualis*, Dhuoda expressed her deep maternal love for her son, calling him 'my most beloved son' and exhorting him to 'love everyone so that everyone will love

[21] Cf. P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A biography* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 2013), pp. 323–25.
[22] '...caritas, quae sibi homines inuicem nodo unitatis adstringit, ...haberet aditum refundendorum et quasi miscendorum sibimet animorum.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford, 1996), pp. 6–9.
[23] 'multae animae per charitatem una anima est et multa corda unum cor.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *In epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus decem*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina 35* (Paris, 1845), pp. 5, 39.
[24] Cf. D. Konstan, *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 157.
[25] 'Quae cum pulcherrimae essent et ab eo plurimum diligerentur...'; 'acsi fratrem aut carissimum filium amisisset'; 'amabat peregrinos et in eis suscipiendis magnam habebat curam'. In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.

you, cherish them so you will be cherished. If you love all, all will love you. If you love in the singular, they will love in the plural!'[26] Nithard, on the one hand, accused Lothar of disregarding brotherly love, which he saw as a major cause of fratricide, and on the other hand justified his own side's behaviour by showing their concern for Christian brotherhood, which was demonstrated by the fact that, even during the battle, they refrained from attacking Lothar's retreating men.[27] Thus, whether in a secular *familia* or a spiritual *familia*, no matter the size of the *familia*, love, either kindred or religious, is present in it, playing a constructive role; as Augustine famously remarks in his *De Civitate Dei*, 'the two cities then were created by two kinds of love'.[28]

It is worth noting, however, that in Latin the sense of family is expressed by the word *domus,* in addition to the word *familia*. The *Digest* thus juxtaposes the material *domus* with the blood *gens*, arguing that they can both be included under the category of *familia*:

> We designate the *familia* of all the agnates as under a shared rule: for even though the father (*pater*) of the *familia* is dead, and each member has a separate *familia*, still, all of them who were under the power of one single person will rightly be called as belonging to the same *familia*, as they have sprung from the same *domus* and *gens*.[29]

However, beyond the strict provisions of the law, the meaning of *domus* was in fact greatly extended in everyday life. In addition to the original meaning of the material

---

[26] 'amantissime fili'; 'ama omnes ut ameris ab omnibus, dilige ut diligaris. Si tu omnes, omnes te; si tu singulariter, illi pluraliter'. In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 64, 112–13.

[27]Nithard began his *Historiae* with the words, 'ut optime, mi Domine, nostis, iam poene annis duobus illatam a fratre vestro persecutionem vos vestrique haudquaquam meriti pateremini...' While recounting the aftermath of the Battle of Fontenoy, Nithard emphasised the benevolence of Charles the Baldand his men towards their Christian brothers: 'amicos et inimicos, fideles et infideles, pariter sepulturae tradebant; plaga correptos ac semivivos eodem modo pro viribus ex animo refovebant. Post hos qui fuga evaserant miserunt, offerentes, si reverti sana fide vellent, omnia delicta remitti. Post haec reges populique super fratre populoque christiano dolentes, percontari episcopos coeperunt, quid agere super hoc negotio deberent.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 2–3, 90–93.

[28] 'Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. and trans. P. Levine, *City of God, vol. IV* (New York, 1966), pp. 404–05.

[29] 50, 16, 195.2: 'communi iure familiam dicimus omnium adgnatorum: nam etsi patre familias mortuo singuli singulas familias habent, tamen omnes, qui sub unius potestate fuerunt, recte eiusdem familiae appellabuntur, qui ex eadem domo et gente proditi sunt.' In: Ulpian, *Digesta*, p. 864.

house, *domus* developed three other meanings. First, it meant the persons who live in the same house, equivalent to a household, which includes a wife, children and other members. In this aspect, the *domus* differs from the *familia* in that the *familia* emphasises pedigree, that is, whether the holder of the *familia* came from a noble lineage with a long history, whereas the *domus* focuses more on the existing wealth and social status of the holder. Secondly, *domus* can also refer to a wider range of kin groups than those living under the same roof. But unlike *familia*, which refers more formally to agnates, *domus* covers a broader range and can include a wider circle of kin linked by marriage. Thirdly, the continuation of the *domus* was considered to be dependent not only on the production of heirs, but also on an economic base to be maintained. From this point of view, the meaning of *domus* and heritable property comes very close.[30] But in general, the difference between *domus* and *familia* is that whereas *familia* tends to refer to a unit of power under patriarchal control, *domus* represents more of a social entity that organises daily life, although this lexical distinction was sometimes ambiguous in everyday use.

So what is the use of *familia* and *domus* by the three sources we are investigating? It may be useful to conduct a survey here of all three authors considered in this thesis:

Table 4.1 '*familia'* and '*domus'* in Einhard's *Vita Karoli*

[30] Saller, *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, pp. 80–95.

	familia	domus
1		For both the riches and power of the kingdom were in the possession of the prefects of the palace, who were called the mayors of the *domus*, and to them fell the highest command.[31]
2		On that estate, he [the Merovingian king] had a *domus* and *famuli* who ministered to his needs and obeyed him, but there were few of them.[32]
3		In this way he used to go to the palace and so also to the public assembly of his people, which was held annually for the good of the kingdom, and in this manner he also returned *domus*.[33]
4		But it was the prefect of the court who took care of everything, either at *domus* or outside that needed to be done and arranged for the administration of the kingdom.[34]
5		Nevertheless, so that I might not skip anything either necessary or worth knowing, I shall first describe his deeds at *domus* and outside, then his habits and interests, and finally his administration of the kingdom and his death.[35]
6		Some of the chief Franks, whom he [Pippin the Short] regularly consulted, were so opposed to his plan that they openly stated that they would abandon the king and return *domus*.[36]

[31] 'Nam et opes et potentia regni penes palatii praefectos, qui maiores domus dicebantur, et ad quos summa imperii pertinebat, tenebantur.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 16.
[32] 'in qua [villam] domum et ex qua famulos sibi necessaria ministrantes atque obsequium exhibentes paucae numerositatis habebat.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 17.
[33] 'Sic ad palatium, sic ad publicum populi sui conventum, qui annuatim ob regni utilitatem celebrabatur, ire, sic domum redire solebat.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 17.
[34] 'At regni administrationem et omnia quae vel domi vel foris agenda ac disponenda erant praefectus aulae procurabat.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 17.
[35] 'ita tamen, ut, primo res gestas et domi et foris, deinde mores et studia eius, tum de regni administratione et fine narrando, nihil de his quae cognitu vel digna vel necessaria sunt praetermittam.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 18.
[36] 'quibus consultare solebat, adeo voluntati eius renisi sunt, ut se regem deserturos domumque redituros libera voce proclamarent.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 19.

	familia	**domus**
7		She [Charlemagne's mother] died, not long after Hildegard's death, but [had lived long enough] to have seen three grandsons and the same number of granddaughters in her son's *domus*.[37]
8		when he [Charlemagne] was at *domus* he always ate his meals with them [his children][38]
9		he [Charlemagne] kept them [Charlemagne's daughters] close beside him at *domus* until his death[39]
10		[Charles] passed his whole life with the highest love and esteem of everyone, both at *domus* and outside[40]
11		the palace at Aachen frequently shook and the ceilings of the *domi* in which he lived constantly creaked.[41]
12		The church in which he was later entombed was hit by lightning and the golden apple that stood at the peak of the roof was struck by lightning and landed on top of the bishop's *domus* next door.[42]

Table 4.2 '*familia*' and '*domus*' in Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*

	Familia	**Domus**
1		But the other, proud [counselor] [Haman] lost everything, along with his *domus*[43]

[37] 'Decessit tandem post mortem Hildigardae, cum iam tres nepotes suos totidemque neptes in filii domo vidisset.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 28.
[38] 'numquam domi positus sine ipsis caenaret...' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29.
[39] 'omnes secum usque ad obitum suum in domo sua retinuit....' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29.
[40] 'per omne vitae suae tempus ita cum summo omnium amore atque favore et domi et foris conversatus est...' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 30.
[41] 'creber Aquensis palatii tremor et in domibus, ubi conversabatur, assiduus laquearium crepitus.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 36.
[42] 'Tacta etiam de caelo, in qua postea sepultus est, basilica, malumque aureum, quo tecti culmen erat ornatum, ictu fulminis dissipatum et supra domum pontificis, quae basilicae contigua erat, proiectum est.' In: Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 37.
[43] 'alter econtra superbus, cum omni domo sua inanis...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 102.

	Familia	Domus
2		In a *domus* as great as that [the king's], there have been, and will be many conversations to be held, if the good [Lord] commands.[44]
3		For in God's *domus* there are many mansions[45]
4		This multiform and writhing serpent of demons never rests, but undermines the *domi* and topples the temples of those attempting to stand firm in Christ's faith.[46]
5		It is written of him, 'He was magnanimous and loyal to all in his *domus*, and the gentlest man who ever lived on earth.'[47]
6		In fact, as he asserts, like the *domus* of Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Moses, Aaron, and Levi...[48]
7		Whoever deserves to be filled with this fear, 'his descendants will be powerful on the earth, for glory and riches shall dwell forever in his *domus*, and his justice shall beam forth forever and ever.'[49]
8		Walking or standing, you will be content, and happiness will be in your *domus*...[50]
9		For it is written, 'Share your bread with the hungry, welcome the poor and homeless into your *domus*.'[51]

[44] 'In domo etenim magna, ut est illa, fuitque, et erit, si iusserit Pius, collationes conferuntur multae.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 108.
[45] 'In domo etenim Dei mansiones multae...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 122.
[46] 'Ille etenim milleformis daemonum tortuosusque serpens, non quiescens perfodi domos et templa subuerti in fide solidantium adstare Christi...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 126.
[47] 'Nam de eo scriptum est: Erat magnus et fidelis in omni domo sua, atque mitissimus super omnes homines morantium in terra.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 146.
[48] 'Nam, sicut ille asserit, domus Abraam, Ysach, Israeli, Moysi, Aaron et Leui...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 152.
[49] 'Quisquis hoc timore repleri meruerit, erit semen eius potens in terra. Gloria namque et diuitiae in domo eius per cuncta manebit, et iustitia illius semper in saeculum saeculi fulgebit.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 156.
[50] 'Ambulans et stans, bene tibi erit, et felicitas in domo tua...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 156.
[51] 'Scriptum est enim: Frange esurienti panem tuum, et egenos uagosque induc in domum tuam.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 162.

	Familia	Domus
10		He blessed the *domus* of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses and Levi...[52]
11		The same number of days contained in these individual figures is the number of years needed to rebuild the *domus* of the Lord in Jerusalem... They [the Jews] said to Him, 'It has taken forty-six years to build this *domus*... '[53]
12		By the number 7, understand what I have spoken of earlier, or again the seven candelabra or the seven lamps lighting the Lord's *domus*.[54]
13		For I desire and urge that when you have reached adulthood, with God's help, you will dispose your own *domus*, taking the appropriate steps to regulate it well.[55]

Table 4.3 '*familia'* and '*domus'* in Nithard's *Historiae*

	Familia	domus
1	He [Nithard's father Angilbert] was a man from a well-known *familia* at the time, Madelgaud, Richard and he were from the same pedigree and they	For even before those men [the faithful of Charles the Bald], who had sworn, had left the *domus*, Lothar attempted to seduce several of them, and the next day he received some defectors.[57]

[52] 'Qui benedixit domum Abraham, Ysaach et Iacob, Moysen et Leui...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 208.
[53] 'Quantos dies esse particulationes continentur, tot annis restaurata est domus Domini in Ierusalem...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 210–11.
[54] 'In septenarium, ut supra, uel septem candelabra et septem lampadas domum inlustrantes Domini.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 212–13.
[55] 'Volo enim et ortor ut cum, auxiliante Deo, ad perfectum perueneris tempus, domum tuam per legitimos gradus utiliter disponas.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 222–25.
[57] 'Nam antequam idem qui haec iuraverant domo egrederentur, aliquos ex his qui aderant subducere ab illo temptavit, et in crastinum quosdam suorum recepit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 58.

	Familia	domus
	were rightly held in high regard by Charlemagne.[56]	
2	He [Angilbert] built an admirable masterpiece in honour of Almighty God and Saint Richard; he managed the *familia* that was entrusted to him admirably and ended his life in complete bliss, then rested in peace in Centule.[58]	They [Charles and Louis] ate and slept in the same *domus*; they dealt with public and private matters with the same consensus; neither demanded anything but what he thought would be useful and agreeable to the other.[59]
3		Hence all of them [the faithful of Charles, Louis and Lothar] met in the same *domus*[60]

Based on the three tables above, two main points can be drawn out. On the one hand, the word *familia* is not used much in any of the three sources. Einhard and Dhuoda did not use it, while Nithard used it once each in the sense of a patrilineal descent and a monastic community. It should be noted, however, that although Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard did not use *familia* in the classical sense of authority within the household, this does not mean that the concept of *familia* is not present in all three sources, as the concept, unlike the word, can be constructed by semantic clusters. We will see this point

[56] 'Fuit hic vir ortus eo in tempore haud ignotae familiae. Madhelgaudus autem, Richardus et hic una progenie fuere, et apud magnum Karolum merito magni habebantur.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 150.
[58] 'Centulo opus mirificum in honore omnipotentis Dei sanctique Richarii construxit; familiam sibi commissam mirifice rexit, hinc vitam cum omni felicitate defunctam, Centulo in pace quievit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 150.
[59] 'Una domus erat illis convivii, et una somni; tractabant tam pari consensu communia quam et privata; non quicquam aliud quilibet horum ab altero petebat, nisi quod utile ac congruum illi esse censebat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 120.
[60] 'Hinc omnes in eadem domo convenerunt... Illi autem dixerunt: Quadraginta et VI annis edificata est domus haec...' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 148.

in the analysis of the discourse associated with the concept in these texts in the pages that follow. On the other hand, both Einhard and Nithard use *domus* in the sense of a material house, while Dhuoda, in addition to this original use of the word, extends it to a family living in the same house, that is, a household, or even a larger consanguineous family. Thus it is clear from these two observations that the implications of both *familia* and *domus* in the ancient world were well understood among the Frankish lay elite of the first half of the ninth century.

Thus, in light of the meaning of *familia* and *domus* in the ancient world as well as in the early Middle Ages, the aim of this chapter can be identified as an examination of how, in the *Vita Karoli*, the *Liber Manualis* and the *Historiae*, notions of authority and love are elaborated and applied for specific purposes under the concept of family (*familia* and *domus*), and how the domestic and the external are linked and express the homogeneity between home and country.

It is worth noting that studies of early medieval *familia* have mostly focused on the aspect of power and property, especially on estates and the dependent population living on them.[61] The foundational work in this area was done by the German medievalist Ludolf Kuchenbuch, who in his book *Bäuerliche Gesellschaft und Klosterherrschaft im 9. Jahrhundert* pioneered the idea that in the ninth century, lordship used the terminology indicating common subordination in the framework of *familia* to override the difference in the legal status of peasants as free/unfree.[62] Kuchenbuch's view has been carried on and developed by subsequent historians. A more recent book, *Les*

[61] Stuart Airlie devoted himself to the study of the familial royalty of the Carolingians, but the Carolingian family evidently was special in nature. See Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*.
[62] L. Kuchenbuch, *Bäuerliche Gesellschaft und Klosterherrschaft im 9. Jht. Studien zur Sozialstruktur der Familia der Abtei Prüm* (Wiesbaden, 1978).

hommes et la terre de saint Remacle, by Nicolas Schroeder, for example, suggests that in the early Middle Ages *familia* was the framework for maintaining the peasants' dependence on their lords; however, the situation changed in the tenth century and by the 1200s *familia* ceased to exist as lordship was redefined and lords transformed their dominated space into territorial principalities.[63] However, both Kuchenbuch or Schroeder adopted a 'bottom-up' perspective, focusing on the interaction between seigneurs/landlords and peasants within the framework of *familia*, without seeming to pay particular attention to the role this framework played within the aristocratic laymen. But as the three tables above show, Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard all use the concept of family in their own texts and do not relate it to peasants and property. This chapter is therefore also, to some extent, a new perspective on the use of their concept of the family as a polemic tool for interaction between lay elites in different political contexts, and on the temporality of their thinking that is reflected in this.

4.2 Einhard

4.2.1 Charlemagne's tears

In the years between 796 and 811 Charlemagne is said to have shed tears several times, once for the death of Pope Hadrian I and the rest for his eldest daughter and two sons. It is Einhard who tells us this information when he related in his *Vita Karoli* that

> Despite the surpassing greatness [of his spirit], he was deeply disturbed by the deaths of his sons and daughter, and his affection [toward his children], which was just as strong [a part of his character], drove him to tears. When he was informed of the death of Hadrian, the Roman pontiff, he cried so much that it was as if he

[63] N. Schroeder, *Les hommes et la terre de saint Remacle: histoire sociale et économique de l'abbaye de Stavelot-Malmedy, VIIe–XIVe siècle* (Bruxelles, 2015).

> had lost a brother or a deeply loved son, for he had thought of him as a special friend.[64]

This is not the only time Charlemagne is reported to have shed tears in the Carolingian narrative sources of the ninth century. Another impressive shedding of tears occurs in Notker's *Gesta Karoli*, in which Charlemagne was coming to a city in Narbonnese Gaul when a band of Northman pirates arrived in ships out of nowhere. While his men had difficulty identifying the unexpected visitors, the very wise Charlemagne immediately decided that they were a dangerous group of enemies and ordered his men to strike quickly. As soon as the Northmen discovered the presence of the man they often called the 'Hammer', Charlemagne, they fled in haste. When his men returned to report, they only found that

> Charles, religious, just, and reverent, rose from the table and stood at the east-facing window. For a long time he shed countless tears, and no one dared to press him on the matter. Finally, he explained to his war-hardened nobles his behavior and weeping. 'Do you know', he said, 'my faithful followers, why I have been weeping so bitterly? It is not that', he said, 'I am afraid that these nobodies can harm me in any way. But I am very sad indeed that they have dared to attack this coast while I am alive, and I am torn up with particular grief because I foresee how much trouble they will cause for my successors and their subjects.'[65]

Robert Morrissey compares these two accounts of Charlemagne's shedding of tears, and argues that nothing could better portray the richness of the emperor's emotions than Einhard's depiction of his weeping grief on hearing the sad news of the death of his

---

[64] 'Mortes filiorum ac filiae pro magnanimitate, qua excellebat, minus patienter tulit, pietate videlicet, qua non minus insignis erat, conpulsus ad lacrimas. Nuntiato etiam sibi Hadriani Romani pontificis obitu, quem in amicis praecipuum habebat, sic flevit, acsi fratrem aut carissimum filium amisisset.' In Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 46; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29.

[65] Religiosus autem Karolus, iustus et timoratus, exurgens de mensa ad fenestram orientalem constitit; et inestimabilibus lacrimis diutissime perfusus, cum nullus eum compellare praesumeret, tandem aliquando ipse bellicosissimis proceribus suis de tali gestu et lacrimatione satisfaciens: 'Scitis', inquit 'o fideles mei, quid tantopere ploraverim? Non hoc' ait 'timeo, quod isti nugae et nihili mihi aliquid nocere praevaleant. Sed nimirum contristor, quod me vivente ausi sunt litus istud attingere, et maximo dolore torqueor, quia praevideo, quanta mala posteris meis et eorum sunt facturi subiectis'. In: Notker, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, ed. H. F. Haefele, *MGH SRG n.s. xn* (Berlin, 1959), pp. 77–78; English trans. T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious* (University Park, 2009), p. 108.

children or friend, for these expressions reflect the private feelings and personality of Charlemagne as a father or friend. In contrast, Notker extended Charlemagne's tears to the public domain.[66] Indeed, Morrissey's assessment of Notker is well-founded, for the purpose of Notker's very possibly fictitious account was euphemistically to advise Charles the Fat, then monarch of the Carolingian empire as well as Notker's intended audience, that, faced with the fact that his only illegitimate son was still young, Charles should let go of his misgivings about his nephew Arnulf, the illegitimate son of his brother Carloman. Only by working in solidarity with Arnulf, entrusting him with greater responsibilities and even considering him as a potential successor, could the Carolingian dynasty avoid the danger of extinction and fight back strongly against the Northmen's invasion.[67] The question, however, arises as to the other half of Morrissey's comment, that is, are the tears of Charlemagne in Einhard's writing really confined to the 'private' domain?

4.2.2 Charlemagne's secular relatives as troublemakers

Einhard's account of Charlemagne's tears appears in the second part of his *Vita Karoli*, in which Einhard said he would begin to tell of Charlemagne's *interior atque domestica vita*. This seems to suggest that what is written in this section, including Charlemagne's tears, is of a 'private' nature. As Nelson reminds us, however, Einhard here adapted his borrowing from Suetonius, who wrote in his *De vita Caesarum*, after describing Augustus' public behaviours, that his protagonist's *interior et familiaris vita* would be continued. For Suetonius, the account of Augustus' interior and domestic life is no

[66] R. Morrissey, *Charlemagne and France: A Thousand Years of Mythology*, trans. C. Tihanyi (Notre Dame, 2003), pp. 37–38.
[67] Maclean, *Kingship and Politics in the Late Ninth Century*, pp. 199–229.

different from depicting 'quibus moribus atque fortuna domi et inter suos egerit' (in what ways and with what fortune he behaved in his own household and amongst his own family), while Einhard, on the other hand, reformulated the same concept as 'animi dotes et summa...constantia' (his qualities of soul... his extraordinary steadiness), where *animi dotes* and *constantia* have strong moral connotations.[68] Yet, strangely enough, it is in the midst of such a morally loaded text that Einhard made the most pointed ethical accusation against whom he called 'the most excellent king, the greatest of all the men in his time', namely that Charlemagne seemed to have an abnormal relationship with his daughters:

> Although his daughters were extremely beautiful women and were deeply loved by him, it is strange to have to report that he never wanted to give any of them away in marriage to anyone, whether it be to a Frankish noble or to a foreigner. Instead he kept them close beside him at home until his death, saying that he could not stand to be parted from their company (*contubernium*). Although he was otherwise happy, this situation [that is, the affairs of his daughters] caused him no end of trouble. But he always acted as if there was no suspicion of any sexual scandal on their part or that any such rumor had already spread far and wide.[69]

Einhard did not seem to be helping Charlemagne clear up rumours here, nor did he appear to be praising Charlemagne for not caring about gossip. Meaningfully, Einhard picked *contubernium* to describe Charlemagne's relationship with his daughters, a word that originally meant 'companionship in a tent', which in this context could be understood either as 'companionship in the palace' or as 'companionship in the king's

[68] J. L. Nelson, 'Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?', in D. Bates, J. Crick, and S. Hamilton (eds), *Writing Medieval Biography, 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 18.
[69] 'Quae cum pulcherrimae essent et ab eo plurimum diligerentur, mirum dictu, quod nullam earum cuiquam aut suorum aut exterorum nuptum dare voluit, sed omnes secum usque ad obitum suum in domo sua retinuit, dicens se earum contubernio carere non posse. Ac propter hoc, licet alias felix, adversae fortunae malignitatem expertus est. Quod tamen ita dissimulavit, acsi de eis nulla umquam alicuius probri suspicio exorta vel fama dispersa fuisset.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 18; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29.

chamber'.[70] This purposely chosen double-entendre presumably represents Einhard's intentions in some way.[71]

In fact, it was not only with his daughters but with many, if not most, of his relatives that Charlemagne had problems in Einhard's writing. In other words, Einhard described him as being constantly troubled by problematic worldly kinship in secular time. During his co-rule of the realm with his brother Carloman, Charlemagne had to put up with the latter's constant provocations, so much so that 'it seemed remarkable to all that he could not be provoked to anger by him'.[72] His intimate relationship with his daughters was overshadowed by accusations of illicit incest.[73] His son, Pippin the Hunchback, conspired with some Frankish magnates to usurp his throne. In this and another earlier plot, many of the Frankish nobles involved were tortured or killed, widely believed to have been ordered by Charlemagne at the instigation of his supposedly brutal queen, Fastrada.[74] This again was a serious charge, for in the eyes of the Franks of the Carolingian period, being manipulated by a woman signified the loss of that king's masculinity and prudence as royal virtues.

[70] See Nelson, 'Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?', p. 21.
[71] Leaving aside the intentions of Einhard's account, Charlemagne may have kept his daughters from marrying for two reasons: firstly, to avoid the political troubles of marriages with the nobility, and secondly, he needed his daughters to take over the role of the absent queens at the court in the early ninth century. See McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 93.
[72] 'Omnibus mirum videretur, quod ne ad iracundiam quidem ab eo provocari potuisset.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 40, 42; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 28.
[73] Cf. Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 223–42; J. L. Nelson, 'La cour impériale de Charlemagne', in R. Le Jan (ed.), *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne* (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 1998), p. 191.
[74] 'Is...aegritudine simulata, cum quibusdam e primoribus Francorum...adversus patrem coniuravit.. Facta est et alia prius contra eum in Germania valida coniuratio... Harum tamen coniurationum Fastradae reginae crudelitas causa et origo extitisse creditur. Et idcirco in ambabus contra regem conspiratum est, quia uxoris crudelitati consentiens a suae naturae benignitate ac solita mansuetudine inmaniter exorbitasse videbatur.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 48, 50. For more research on Queen Fastrada, see M. Innes, 'Queenship in Dispute: Fastrada, History and Law', in E. M. Screen and C. West (eds), *Writing the Early Medieval West: Studies in Honour of Rosamond Mckitterick* (Cambridge, 2018), pp. 230–47; S. Coupland, 'A Coin of Queen Fastrada and Charlemagne', *Early Medieval Europe* 31 (2023), pp. 1–13.

Was Charlemagne always dragged down by his secular relatives, as Einhard claimed? The answer is clearly no. In fact, Einhard disguised the truth by claiming ignorance in two instances, both of which concerned Charlemagne's secular kin. In one case, after the death of his brother Carloman, the latter's wife fled to the Kingdom of the Lombards with their sons to escape persecution by Charlemagne. Einhard, however, asserted that, 'for no reason at all, she spurned her husband's brother and placed herself and her children under the protection of Desiderius, the king of the Lombards.'[75]

The other is likewise associated with the Kingdom of the Lombards. After the death of Pippin the Short and the equal division of the realm between Charlemagne and Carloman, Charlemagne, at the suggestion of his mother, married Desiderata, the daughter of the king of the Lombards, in order to gain a strategic advantage over Carloman, seeking to forge an alliance with the Lombards and to form a geographical siege of Carloman. Yet this marital alliance soon lost its value in the new situation where Carloman died shortly afterwards, his wife and sons fled to the Kingdom of the Lombards, and the Lombards turned hostile to the Franks. Charlemagne consequently abandoned Desiderata.[76] However, Charlemagne's immoral behaviour, in which political interests were taken into account at the expense of the sanctity of marriage, is silently passed over in Einhard's writing:

> Then [in 770], at the urging of his mother [Bertrada], he married a daughter of Desiderius, the king of the Lombards, but for some unknown reason he sent her away after a year and took Hildegard [758-783], a Swabian woman of distinct nobility.[77]

[75] 'Nullis existentibus causis, spreto mariti fratre, sub Desiderii regis Langobardorum patrocinium se cum liberis suis contulit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 8; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 8.
[76] J. L. Nelson, *King and Emperor: A New Life of Charlemagne* (London, 2019), pp. 101–07.
[77] 'Deinde cum matris hortatu filiam Desiderii regis Langobardorum duxisset uxorem, incertum qua de causa, post annum eam repudiavit et Hildigardam de gente Suaborum praecipuae nobilitatis feminam in matrimonium accepit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 42; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 28.

Why then did Einhard choose to expose some of Charlemagne's problems with his secular relatives while concealing some others? A closer look reveals that Einhard exposed cases in which the secular relatives were troublemakers that Charlemagne seemed to be a victim of, but left ambiguous the cases in which Charlemagne was the active troublemaker, all of which makes Charlemagne seem to have suffered in secular time from the hardships generated by secular kinship. This arrangement was probably not intended to highlight Charlemagne's *magnanimitas* and *pietas*, two important virtues of the Christian emperors in late antiquity;[78] after all, the charges of incest and lack of masculinity go too far for that purpose.

4.2.3 Spiritual kinship as a remedy for secular kinship

To understand Einhard's textual strategy, it is necessary to go to the time when he was writing, that is, to the beginning of Louis the Pious' reign, to find the answer. Admittedly, the fact that the exact date of Einhard's writing remains unclear and can only be dated between 817 and 830 certainly hampers our understanding of Einhard's precise intentions.[79] But even if we limit Einhard's writing to the earliest possible date of 817, we can still glean a great deal from what Louis the Pious did after Charlemagne's death in 814 and up to 817. It is worth noting, however, that 817 was a special year in which the serious event of the collapse of the arcade connecting the church to the palace occurred on 9 April, which Einhard mentions in his text, so he must have completed the *Vita Karoli* after this event. Spurred on by this near-fatal accident, Louis the Pious promulgated the *Ordinatio imperii* in July of the same year, clarifying his succession

[78] Ganshof, 'Einhard, Biographer of Charlemagne', pp. 7–8.
[79] For a discussion of Einhard's writing time, see Section 2.2.2 of this thesis.

arrangements after his death, which further exacerbated his relationship with some of his relatives[80] and may therefore have had an impact on Einhard's writing.[81] But even if the most conservative and therefore the safest approach is taken, limiting the completion of the *Vita Karoli* to some point after the spring and summer of 817, we know that Louis the Pious was already troubled by secular kinship problems at that time, for when he entered the palace at Aachen as early as 814, in order to consolidate his power, Louis the Pious expelled his (half-) sisters, his two cousins Wala and Adalhard, and some other relatives such as Gundrada from the palace to the monasteries.[82] And Einhard's narrative of how secular relatives brought danger to Charlemagne seems to justify what Louis the Pious did to his secular relatives who, after all, had caused trouble for Charlemagne during his reign and may therefore continue to cause problems for Louis the Pious now and in the future.

The dilemma remains, however, because treating family members well was an important principle in Carolingian ethics: Nithard recalled that a brother owed his sister *benignitas* (kindness) in his *Histories*,[83] and Dhuoda admonished her son to show *compassio* (fellow-feeling) towards his brother.[84] In contrast, Louis the Pious' persecutions of his sisters and, later, of his half-brothers, Bernard the nephew and his own oldest surviving son Pippin, on the pretext of moral turpitude and premeditated rebellion, undermined kinship and thus paradoxically violated the Carolingian code of morality.

---

[80] The half-brothers of Louis the Pious were sent to monasteries, and his nephew Bernard, King of Italy, rose up in fear. See Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians*, pp. 130–37.
[81] See Section 3.2.2 of this thesis.
[82] P. Riché, *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe* (Philadelphia, 1993), p. 146.
[83] 'Karolus... multisque verbis blande illam allocutus, omnem benignitatem, quam frater sorori debet, si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet, ei perhumane promisit, ac, quo voluit, illam abire concessit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 108.
[84] 'Nam in subportationem, uel uicissitudinis mutationem, dilectionem tam in maioribus quam in minoribus per compassionis fraternitatem omnimodis per cuncta in generi humano ostendit esse tenendam.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 112. And many places.

How could this paradox be avoided so that Louis the Pious could establish his authority on the moral high ground? Einhard chose to emphasise the sacred, supra-temporal kinship as an alternative to the secular, mortal one. The textual reflection of this shift is the juxtaposition of Charlemagne's tears for his sons and daughter, to whom he was physically related, and his tears for the Pope, to whom he was spiritually related, thus making the transition from secular to spiritual kinship. Although Einhard here said that the Pope was regarded by Charlemagne as *amicus praecipuus* (a special friend), in early medieval contexts, as Hans Hummer points out, there was no absolutely clear line of demarcation between close friendship and kinship: 'kinship expressed intimate friendship, and intimate friendship conveyed kinship'.[85]

It is in fact in Einhard's account that Charlemagne treated his earthly relatives in the same way and with the same attitude as he treated the Church as his spiritual kin. In other words, in Einhard's description, Charlemagne imposed authority and love equally on secular and spiritual families. Charlemagne restrained himself in the face of his brother, Carloman, in keeping with the principle of *patientia*; similarly, he was able to refrain from his own preferences and maintain the same *patientia* in order to comply with the popes' demand that he should dress in Roman style in Rome, even though he had 'rejected foreign clothes, however gorgeous they might be, and never agreed to be dressed in them' in his daily life.[86] He arranged for his children to study the subjects he thought were appropriate for them: '[Charles] believed that his children, both his daughters and his sons, should be educated, first in the liberal arts, which he himself

[85] H. J. Hummer, *Visions of Kinship in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 146–59.
[86] 'Peregrina vero indumenta, quamvis pulcherrima, respuebat nec umquam eis indui patiebatur.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 54; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 31.

had studied. Then, he saw to it that when the boys had reached the right age they were trained to ride in the Frankish fashion, to fight, and to hunt. But he ordered his daughters to learn how to work with wool, how to spin and weave it'.[87] For the Church, he was equally 'very carefully corrected the way in which the lessons were read and the psalms sung'.[88] Charlemagne placed great importance on the company and protection of his children, making it normalised to have them with him for meals and trips, and to have a guard to protect his daughters when they went out. He took the same practice with the Church, 'as long as his health allowed him to, [Charles] regularly went to church both morning and evening, and also to the night reading and to the morning Mass',[89] and sent troops to defend the fleeing pope on several occasions. At the end of the *Vita Karoli*, Einhard copied Charlemagne's long will, in which more than two-thirds of the property was distributed to the church as the spiritual heir, while the rest belonged to his children as secular heirs.[90]

While these actions of Einhard's Charlemagne can certainly be interpreted as expressions of piety, in the context created by the Carolingian reform, piety and kinship were in fact inseparable rather than distinct. In the case of inheritance, for example, its acquisition was conditional on the recipient fulfilling the moral obligation to pray for the soul of the grantor, as it was understood by contemporaries.[91] This high moralisation and religiosity of kinship is equally evidenced in Einhard's use of words. In describing

[87] 'Liberos suos ita censuit instituendos, ut tam filii quam filiae primo liberalibus studiis, quibus et ipse operam dabat, erudirentur. Tum filios, cum primum aetas patiebatur, more Francorum equitare, armis ac venatibus exerceri fecit, filias vero lanificio adsuescere coloque ac fuso.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 44; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 28.
[88] 'Legendi atque psallendi disciplinam diligentissime emendavit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 62; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 33.
[89] 'Ecclesiam et mane et vespere, item nocturnis horis et sacrificii tempore, quoad eum valitudo permiserat.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 60; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 33.
[90] Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 76–84; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, pp. 37–39.
[91] M. Innes, 'Practices of Property in the Carolingian Empire', in J. R. Davis and M. McCormick (eds), *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe* (Abingdon, 2008), pp. 267–86.

the way Charlemagne treated his grandchildren, Einhard commented: 'The king displayed a special token of affection (*pietas*) toward his [family]'.[92] At another place, when Charlemagne is about to be reported shedding tears over the death of his sons and daughter, Einhard again uses *pietas* to express Charlemagne's feelings towards his secular family members: 'his affection (*pietas*) [toward his children], which was just as strong [a part of his character], drove him to tears'.[93] And in depicting Charlemagne's affection for the Church, Einhard still uses the same word as in his previous description of secular affection, namely *pietas*: 'With great piety and affection (*pietas*) [Charles] followed the Christian religion, in which he had been reared from infancy'.[94] It is clear that in the *Vita Karoli*, kinship in the secular family is quite similar to that in the sacred family of the Church, and it was with this interchangeability of the same affection that Einhard achieved the shift between the two kinships. However, it is more important to note that in Einhard's view, although secular and spiritual kinship are closely linked, they can nevertheless be separated, as shown by the fact that in the *Vita Karoli* Charlemagne can choose to replace the temporal kinship between him and his secular relatives with the spiritual kinship between him and the Church. In other words, in this aspect of kinship, secular time, although linked to sacred time, can still be relatively separated from it by their attachment to different objects.

4.2.4 Charlemagne and his spiritual family

Einhard's writing of the interaction between the Church as spiritual kin and Charlemagne is in keeping with the Frankish perception of the nature of kinship in the

[92] 'In quibus rex pietatis suae praecipuum documentum ostendit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 46; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29. The translation is slightly adjusted.
[93] 'Pietate videlicet, qua non minus insignis erat, conpulsus ad lacrimas.' In: Ibid.
[94] 'Religionem Christianam, qua ab infantia fuerat inbutus, sanctissime et cum summa pietate coluit. Slightly changed.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 60; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 32.

Carolingian period. Dhuoda once used the analogy of a herd of harts crossing a river, explaining to her son that when the harts help each other, 'a fraternal creaturely kindness surges through all of them'.[95] Nithard also wrote that, '[Charles the Bald] spoke to her [his sister] with many gentle words, and very friendly promised her all the kindness a brother owes his sister, if she would be willing to kind to him henceforth.'[96] It is thus evident that, for the Franks of the time, one of the central aspects of kinship was reciprocity. But in the *Vita Karoli*, Charlemagne's devotion to his earthly relatives seems to be always one-sided, with the latter always bringing nothing but trouble. Instead, the Church, as a spiritual kin, developed a healthy reciprocity with Charlemagne, a relationship that culminated in 800 when the Pope crowned Charlemagne emperor of the Romans: whatever Charlemagne's true attitude for this coronation,[97] the Church did repay his favour in its own way, and thus formed a true kinship with the Carolingians.

It is noteworthy that the *Divus Augustus* from *De Vita Caesarum*, one of Einhard's main models, also refers to Augustus' two episodes of weeping, and again respectively for the sake of his children and his friends, but its plot is quite different from that in the *Vita Karoli*. With regard to children, Suetonius made it clear that Augustus 'bore the death of his kin with far more resignation than their misconduct'.[98] Augustus was reported to have exiled his daughter Julia and a granddaughter who was also named Julia because of their debauchery and depravity, and his stepson Agrippa because of his

[95] 'In illis transcurrit compassio dilectionis fraterna.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 112.
[96] 'Multisque verbis blande illam allocutus, omnem benignitatem, quam frater sorori debet, si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet, ei perhumane promisit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 108–09.
[97] Historians are divided around the question of Charlemagne's willingness or otherwise for this imperial coronation. See J. L. Nelson, 'Why Were There So Many Different Accounts of Charlemagne's Imperial Coronation', in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. XII:1–27.
[98] 'Aliquanto autem patientius mortem quam dedecora suorum tulit.' In: Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe, *Lives of the Caesars, vol. I*, (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 246–47.

low tastes and violent temper, and 'at every mention of him [Agrippa] and of the Julias he would sigh deeply and even cry out: "Would that I ne'er had wedded and would I had died without offspring"'.[99] From the very different attitudes of Charlemagne and Augustus towards their delinquent children, we can assume that Einhard is far from a slavish imitation of Suetonius, but indeed incorporates his own views and intentions into the text of the *Vita Karoli*.

More interesting, nevertheless, is the attitude of Augustus towards the death of his friends, as described by Suetonius. Unlike in the *Vita Karoli*, where it is the Church that forms spiritual kinship with Charlemagne, in the *Divus Augustus*, Augustus' friends are secular people. But what makes the two even more different is that, in contrast to the harmonious relationship between Charlemagne and the Church, Augustus's secular friends caused Augustus himself as much trouble as his blood relatives or Charlemagne's secular relatives. Salvidienus Rufus and Cornelius Gallus, for example, were both promoted from humble ranks by Augustus to high positions, but both later plotted rebellion. Maecenas was thoughtless in his actions, while a friend named Agrippa was jealous of Augustus giving favours to other friends. But even though Augustus was often troubled by the transgressions or even misdeeds of his friends, when he heard that the Senate had sentenced Salvidienus Rufus and Cornelius Gallus to death, Augustus 'yet shed tears and bewailed his lot, because he alone could not set what limits he chose to his anger with his friends'.[100] Thus, in the similarities (both Charlemagne and Augustus shed tears over the death of their friends) and the

[99] 'Atque ad omnem et eius et Iuliarum mentionem ingemiscens proclamare etiam solebat: Αἴθ' ὄφελον ἄγαμός τ' ἔμεναι ἄγονός τ' ἀπολέσθαι.' In: Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, pp. 246–47.
[100] 'ceterum et inlacrimavit et vicem suam conquestus est, quod sibi soli non liceret amicis, quatenus vellet, irasci.' In: Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, pp. 248–49. The examples above of friends causing troubles are also on the same pages.

differences (Charlemagne was able to impose his authority over the Church and yet show mutual respect and love to it, whereas Augustus lost control over his spiritual kin, so that the latter as much a problem for him as his blood relatives), we can find in Einhard's intention to break away from the trajectory of his model in order to commend the spiritual amity that developed between Charlemagne and the Church.

Einhard's implicit emphasis on Charlemagne's harmony with the Church was also consistent with the aim of further moralising the authority of the monarch in order to restructure the system of power, an aim that had been established in Charlemagne's time.[101] Einhard said Charlemagne wept over the death of the Pope 'acsi fratrem aut carissimum filium amisisset' (as if he had lost a brother or a deeply loved son). The *acsi* (as if) here is not creating a fictitious kinship between Charlemagne and the Pope. As Hummer points out, 'kinship could be carnal or natural (never biological), and it necessarily was either encompassed within, or in a dialectical relationship to, spiritual and mystical forms...What historians have too often set aside as fictions is what the natives would have perceived to be the point'.[102] In the context of the *Vita Karoli*, it is the relationship between the ruler of the realm and the Church that is truly kinship, a sacred bond that morally empowers both within it.

Returning to the opening question, we can now say that the tears of Charlemagne in the *Vita Karoli* do belong to the public domain, since Einhard moved smoothly through this narrative to his textual purpose, namely to have the kinship between the ruler of the realm and the Church override the kinship between him and his secular family members,

[101] See de Jong, *The Penitential State*; M. Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000).
[102] Hummer, *Visions of Kinship in Medieval Europe*, p. 327.

thus justifying the expulsion of his kindred by Louis the Pious as the *paterfamilias* in the secular family at the time of Einhard's writing, as well as endorsing the sanctity and morality of the Carolingian kingship as the *paterfamilias* in the spiritual family. The value of Charlemagne's tears lies in the construction of a collective memory in which the actions of his successor are therefore reconciled as something acceptable.

4.2.5 Conclusion

Section 4.2 points out that in Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, it is the love and authority of the *paterfamilias*, rather than blood, that forms the true basis of a good family. In this sense, Charlemagne's union with the church rather than his union with his children and brother constructs an ideal family. This is probably why Einhard did not use *familia* with its connotations of blood ties throughout his text, but instead consistently used the more status-emphasising *domus* to refer to the family.

More importantly, this section takes Charlemagne's two tears as its point of departure and argues that, probably to achieve his goal of relieving Louis the Pious of the moral crisis of secular kinship and reinforcing the sanctity of Carolingian kingship, Einhard, through the construction of the discourse in his text, portrayed Charlemagne as failing to balance authority and love in his treatment of his secular kin while achieving a state of reciprocal harmony with the Church as his spiritual kin. In shaping Charlemagne's relationship with his relatives, the difficulties caused by worldly kin do not affect the spiritual realm, while good spiritual kindred can compensate for troublesome earthly kinship. In other words, secular kinship is somehow separable from spiritual one: the former as an earthly thing differs in temporality from the latter in the minds of contemporaries.

Considering the nature of *Vita Karoli* as court propaganda,[103] Einhard's temporal understanding of secular and spiritual kinship should in some ways mirror ideas that were widespread in the Charlemagne period. Could the political upheavals of the mid-ninth century then have led the Frankish lay nobility to a different mindset? With this question in mind, we will turn our attention to Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*.

4.3 Dhuoda

4.3.1 Dhuoda and Augustine of Hippo

It is evident that Dhuoda, who wrote her *Liber Manualis* about ten to twenty years after Einhard, was influenced in some way by Augustine of Hippo, whose presence is visible in many parts of the *Liber Manualis*. For example, in an emphatic discussion of the relationship between *quasi* (as if) and *verum* (true) in the first chapter of Book V, Dhuoda stated, 'we say "as if" about something that is not true, and call a thing true when it is not "as if"'. She explained that those who turn away from the truth and indulge in illusion are like those who are struck by a dream, who think they are galloping, attending a feast, enjoying a meal, but wake up suddenly from their brief dream only to find that everything is vanity, with their hands empty, having wasted their time in a dream, and finally dying without gain. Dhuoda therefore admonished her son to be vigilant in distinguishing between the temporal 'quasi' and the eternal 'verum', avoiding the former and grasping the latter.[104] Dhuoda's exposition here seems to be

[103] See Section 2.4.2

[104] 'Quasi' dicimus quod non est uerum; uerum, quod non est 'quasi'. Dicit quidam captor sompnii: 'Quasi equitabam, quasi currebam; quasi epulans pocula, ni prius atque cibus, cuncta manibus tenebam; ferculis in pomis, sapor gusti quo triplectabant; huc illucque me uoluens, equestrium sessor aderam. Expergefactus a somno, nichil cernens ualui amplecti; inanis et fragilis, demensque et palpans, totus cum quasi remansi. O si fuisset uerum quod

based on the elaboration of a certain sermon on Psalm 75.[105] This sermon was certainly influenced by Augustine's work, if was not written by Augustine himself.[106] In fact, Augustine, in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, elaborated on the words of St. Paul in *II Corinthians 6: 10*, 'as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing', explaining that, 'our sadness has an "as if" prefixed to it, but there is no "as if" quality about our joy, because it springs from certain hope. Why is an "as if" attached to our sadness? Because it will fade away like a dream, and the righteous will have dominion in the morning.'[107] It is evident that Augustine equated the easily faded and void dream with 'as if', just as Dhuoda did. Following on from this, Augustine presented the same imagery as Dhuoda had seen in the dream: 'when someone relates a dream, he puts in the phrase, "as if"; 'it was as if I were sitting there; it was as if I were speaking, as if 1 were dining, as if I were on horseback, as if I was having an argument...All of it is described in terms of "as if", because when the dreamer wakes, he does not find things as they were in the dream.'[108] The presence of these same images in these two different texts clearly demonstrates Augustine's influence on Dhuoda, whether that influence was direct or indirect. It is therefore not surprising that Augustine ended his paragraph with the same conclusion as Dhuoda, namely, to recognise the nature of 'as if' and to pursue the truth. In his own words, a man 'was "as if" without any possessions, yet he truly possessed

annuens oculis, manu palpans, pedem terens!' 'O, dicit doctor, si talis uel quisquis futurus "quasi" cerneret uerum, lapsus per umbras, surgeret ad dapes. Transit moriens, et ecce "quasi" felicitas rerum temporalium, cum ab insipientibus et negligentibus relinquitur; nichil aliud per funebra carminum restat nisi "quasi"'. In Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 164–67.

[105] Riché, *Dhuoda*, pp. 262–3, n. 2.

[106] Cf. Becker, 'Duodas Handbuch', pp. 85–86; Nelson, 'Dhuoda on Dreams', pp. 45–47.

[107] 'Tristitia nostra habet quasi; gaudium nostrum non habet quasi, quia in spe certa est. Quare tristitia nostra quasi habet? Quia sicut somnus transiet, et dominabuntur recti mane.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos CI–CL*, ed. E. Dekkers and I. Fraipont, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 40* (Turnhout, 1956), p. 569. English trans. M. Boulding, *Expositions of the Psalms 33–50, vol. 2* (New York, 2000), pp. 372–73.

[108] 'qui somnium indicat, addit quasi. Quasi sedebam, quasi loquebar, quasi prandebam, quasi equitabam, quasi disputabam. Totum quasi; quia cum evigilaverit, non invenit quod videbat.' In: Dekkers and Fraipont, *Augustine*, p. 569; Boulding, *Expositions of the Psalms,* p. 373.

all things; no "as if" applied there. How did he truly possess all things? By clinging to the Creator of all things.'[109]

Another possible indication that Dhuoda was influenced by Augustine is Dhuoda's adaptation of the beatitudes in the Gospels. According to Matthew 5, the eight beatitudes belong to eight categories of people. But in order to make it serve his own idea that the eight beatitudes, which supposedly represent the highest standard of Christian morality, correspond to the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit (cf. Isaiah 11: 2-3),[110] Augustine, in commenting on this section, not only changed the order of the eight beatitudes, but also reduced them to seven. In this he followed the understanding of Fathers who preceded him and considered the original last one to be concerned with the secular and therefore irrelevant to the spiritual attributes here as a whole.[111] Dhuoda may have been influenced by Augustine's practice of adapting the eight beatitudes to his own understanding, and thus also gave a unique version of the section expounding the eight beatitudes according to her own needs:

Table 4.4 The beatitudes and their order in Matthew, Augustine and Dhuoda

[109] 'Quasi nihil habebat; non autem quasi, sed uere omnia possidebat. Vnde uere omnia possidebat? Quia omnium conditori adhaerebat.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, p. 570; Boulding, *Expositions of the Psalms*, p. 373.
[110] Cf. K. Naoki, 'Augustine's Scriptural Exegesis in De sermone Domini in monte and the Shaping of Christian Perfection', in G. Dunn and W. Mayer (eds), *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies Inspired by Pauline Allen* (Leiden/Boston, 2015), pp. 225–47.
[111] 'Haec octaua sententia, quae ad caput redit perfectumque hominem declarat, significatur fortasse et circumcisione octauo die in Veteri Testamento, et Domini resurrectione post sabbatum, qui est utique octauus idemque primus dies, et celebratione octauarum feriarum quas in regeneratione noui hominis celebramus et numero ipso Pentecostes.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De sermone Domini in monte libros duos*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 35* (Turnhout, 1967), p. 1062.

order	author		
	Matthew 5	**Augustine[112]**	**Dhuoda[113]**
1	Blessed are the poor in spirit	Blessed are the poor in spirit	Blessed are the peacemakers
2	Blessed are the meek	Blessed are the meek	Blessed are the meek
3	Blessed are they that mourn	Blessed are they that mourn	Blessed are the clean of heart
4	Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice	Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice	Blessed are the poor in spirit
5	Blessed are the merciful	Blessed are the merciful	Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice
6	Blessed are the clean of heart	Blessed are the clean of heart	Blessed are the merciful
7	Blessed are the peacemakers	Blessed are the peacemakers	Blessed are the meek
8	Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake		

Looking at the table above, it can be seen that, like Augustine, Dhuoda reduced the eight beatitudes to seven and re-ordered them due to her own reasons.[114] However,

[112] Cf. Augustine of Hippo, *De sermone domini in monte libros duos*, pp. 1229–308.
[113] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 149–61.
[114] Also cf. Mayeski, 'The Beatitudes and the Moral Life of the Christian', pp. 6–15; Mayeski, *Dhuoda*, pp. 93–116.

while Augustine did so on the basis of theological understanding, Dhuoda was motivated by secular concerns. As Jean Meyers insightfully points out,[115] Dhuoda was in a turbulent political situation and therefore expected the Frankish nobles, who were in the midst of a civil war, to make peace and be moderate, and not to grieve and suffer injustice and persecution. With this historical context in mind, it is understandable why Dhuoda placed 'blessed are the peacemakers' first, mentioned 'blessed are the meek' twice and omitted 'blessed are they that mourn' and 'blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice' sake'.

Since Dhuoda followed Augustine's example in her work, it is not surprising that her way of understanding history was also inspired by the latter, directly or indirectly. Augustine believed that human knowledge of history was limited by two factors. On the one hand, the human will, under the weight of evil, can never properly recount what has happened in the present, and therefore any historical narrative other than the Bible as a sacred text is unreliable. On the other hand, the essence of man's understanding of history lies in his recollection of similar events in the present; in other words, a person in the present can understand a historical narrative only after having had a similar experience, as Augustine wrote in his *De Trinitate*:

> For the only reason why I could understand what the narrator was saying, even though I then heard his words put together for the first time in a connected discourse, was because I remembered generically the individual things that he described. For example, he who describes to me a mountain that is stripped of its forest and clothed with olive trees is speaking to one who remembers the forms of the mountains, the forests, and the olive trees; had I forgotten them, I should not at all know what he was saying, and, therefore, I could not conceive that description. And so it comes about that everyone who conceives corporeal things, whether he himself forms an image of them or whether he hears or reads what someone relates

[115] Meyers, 'Dhuoda et la justice d'après son Liber Manualis (IXe siècle)', pp. 456–60.

> about the past or foretells about the future, returns to his memory and finds there the mode and the measure of all the forms that he beholds in his thoughts.[116]

Dhuoda's quotations are characteristically based on this historical epistemology, and in her Handbook she quoted extensively from Scripture, notably from the Psalms. Sometimes her quotations are inaccurate, as if she wrote them down in a rush from memory. Yet it is also true that Dhuoda was not concerned to ensure that the meaning of the original text was not distorted in her quotations, but rather that she deliberately adapted it to her own needs. Dhuoda, for example, admonished his son William to 'gird up your loins like a man' and 'turn toward that which is upright, be all glorious and clothe yourself in splendor' as written in the Book of Job,[117] in order to demonstrate nobility and manliness. In the original context, however, this is an expression of God's criticism and mockery of Job's complaint against God:

> And the Lord went on, and said to Job: Shall he that contendeth with God be so easily silenced? surely he that reproveth God, ought to answer him... Gird up thy loins like a man: I will ask thee, and do thou tell me... Clothe thyself with beauty, and set thyself up on high and be glorious, and put on goodly garments' (Job 40. 2, 7, 10).

Another method of adaption was to splice together unrelated biblical phrases in order to attach divine validity to Dhuoda's own admonition. So, when she sought to prove to William the authority of the priests, she combined the passage about the giving of the keys to the apostles (Matthew 18.18) with the condemnation of the bad priests (Hosea

---

[116] 'Neque enim uel intellegere possem narrantem si ea quae dicit et si contexta tunc primum audirem, non tamen generaliter singula meminissem. Qui enim mihi narrat uerbi gratia aliquem montem silua exutum et oleis indutum, ei narrat qui meminerim species et montium et siluarum et olearum. Quas si oblitus essem, quid diceret omnino nescirem et ideo narrationem illam cogitare non possem. Ita fit ut omnis qui corporalia cogitat, siue ipse aliquid confingat, siue audiat aut legat uel praeterita narrantem uel futura praenuntiantem, ad memoriam suam recurrat et ibi reperiat modum atque mensuram omnium formarum quas cogitans intuetur.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De trinitate libri quindecim (Libri I–XII)*, ed. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie, *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 50* (Turnhout, 1968), p. 351. Translation from *Augustine: On the Trinity. Books 8–15*, trans. G. B. Matthews and S. McKenna, (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 76–77.

[117] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 68–69.

4.8) by writing 'following the example of the holy apostles, they bind and loosen, "eating the sins of the people"'.[118] And once again, Dhuoda changed the context of the original text. The phrase 'eating the sins of the people' originally meant that the wicked priests deliberately led the people away from the true God, for if the sins of the people increased, the more people offered sacrifices for their sins, and the more sacrifices these priests could receive. But this verse in Dhuoda's writing becomes a praise for the sacrifices of the priests. In the view of modern historians, Dhuoda adapted the scriptures in order to make the only 'reliable' historical text fit her own experience and feelings. In Dhuoda's own eyes, however, the sacred texts necessarily predicted what she would experience, and all she did was to understand what she experienced from the very words of the sacred texts.

4.3.2 The problematic father-son relationship

Guided by the Augustinian view of history, Dhuoda selected the sacred figure of Joseph from the Book of Genesis as the medium through which to express what she perceived to be the reason for her family being in turmoil.

In describing Joseph, Dhuoda once again highlighted or minimised the various aspects of Joseph's character to suit her needs. For example, Joseph was originally known for his ability to interpret dreams, but since Dhuoda followed the Augustinian tradition of seeing dreams as falsely *quasi*, which was therefore in opposition to the real *verum*, she omitted several of Joseph's dream-interpretation stories and simply described him as an 'interpreter of messages in a dream'. But at the same time Dhuoda also stressed the

[118] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 120–21.

merits of Joseph in two ways. On the one hand, Dhuoda noted that 'he protected himself against the shamelessness of women.'[119] The reference here is to the account in Genesis 39 that Joseph, while working as the housekeeper of the military leader Potiphar, was tempted by the latter's wife, and after firmly refusing his hostess, Joseph was falsely accused of intent to rape by Potiphar's wife and consequently suffered imprisonment. On the other hand, Dhuoda stressed that 'he was made powerful and sublime in the great and lofty presence, where he shone in second place because of his worthy merits.'[120]

As can be seen, the two events of Joseph highlighted by Dhuoda bear a striking resemblance to the experience of her husband Bernard. Emperor Louis the Pious summoned Bernard to his court in the 820s and 'appointed Bernard his chamberlain, entrusted Charles to him, and made him the second man in the empire.'[121] But soon afterwards there were rumours of Bernard's affair with his lord's wife, Judith, for which he was attacked and lost all his power at court. Obviously, the experience of Joseph as given by Dhuoda is the opposite of Bernard's: the former suffered hardship after being sexually accused by his lord's wife, but eventually rose to a high position of authority within the kingdom, while the latter initially enjoyed the distinction of being second chair of the empire, but then fled the court in disarray because of the scandal with his lord's wife.

[119] 'ab stupris mulierum se cauens.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 90–91.
[120] 'ad coronam celsitudinis sublimis, potensque effectus est, et in aula regali dignis pro meritis secundus refulgens.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 90–91.
[121] 'Camerarium constituit, Karolumque eidem commendavit, ac secundum a se in imperio praefecit.' Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 48.

Yet what is Dhuoda's intention in bringing out this contrast? In fact, Dhuoda was not showing optimism that Bernard would rise again, as Joseph did, but was implicitly criticising Bernard for taking the exact opposite path of the holy man. Dhuoda repeatedly emphasised her and her family's status as exiles in the text: 'I am feeble, an exile, dragged to the very pit',[122] 'We are very insignificant exiles, so that we cannot be counted or ranked among the number of the great.'[123] At this point she was clearly talking about her and her family being forced to leave the court because of Bernard's misconduct, where they had married in 824.

In the midst of anxiety, Dhuoda attributed the turmoil that befell her family to the fact that Bernard compromised his kinship in the earthly world which subsequently undermined the sacredness inherent in the secular kinship, and in this case, her family lost the favour of God. Here, unlike in Einhard, secular and sacred time in the *Liber Manualis* are closely related and interlinked, not separable.

Dhuoda first presents the father-son relationship as an aspect of secular kinship. In her description of Joseph, Dhuoda proposed that the reason he was able to avoid misbehaviour and eventually win the *honores* lay in his obedience and respect for his father's authority, thus enjoyed the favour of God. She wrote:

> Going from virtue to virtue, he deserved, through his humility, chastity, and obedience, to be united with God, shining among the highest and reigning with the saints in glory. And all of this was for his father! And many others who have obeyed God and submitted faithfully to the commands of a father, have been acknowledged

[122] 'Limo reuoluta, trahens ad imma.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 44–45.
[123] 'Quamuis minimi et exules simus, et hoc magnatorum computari uel aequari numero.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 128–129.

> and honored in the world, and have by their efforts assuredly reached their loftiest aim without harm.[124]

Contrary to Joseph, Bernard in Dhuoda's writing reflects more neglect and spiritual rebellion against his father, Duke William of Toulouse, whose importance in Dhuoda's text does not seem to have been sufficiently appreciated by historians. Duke William was a first cousin of Charlemagne, one of the relatives for whom Dhuoda required her son to pray continually, and was known for his great military exploits for the first half of his life. But he then retired as a monk to his own monastery of Gellone, founded by himself in the early ninth century, which was deeply associated with the Carolingian monastic reform centred by Benedict's rule; meanwhile, Duke William also heavily funded the Abbey of Aniane, another centre of the monastic reform. In response, Duke William's biography was inserted into the biography of Benedict of Aniane, who presided over the monastic reform, and who directly controlled the Abbey of Gellone from 822 onwards.[125] This close connection between the family of Bernard and the Carolingian monastic reform led Dhuoda to attach particular importance to Benedict's rule, from which she did, in fact, quote much.[126] It is clear that Duke William's great contribution to the reform of the monastic system made Dhuoda hold him in high esteem, and she therefore hoped that her father-in-law's son, her husband, would take sacred duties equally seriously in order to maintain a good father-son relationship, so that the spirituality inherent in this earthly kinship could be preserved, and ultimately,

[124] 'Ambulans de uirtute in uirtutem, Deo, per humilitatem et castitatem atque obedientiam, iungi meruit, ad summum fulgensque et regnans cum sanctis in gloria; haec omnia pro patre. Et multi alii obedientes Deo patrique fideli obtemperantes iussa, digni et acceptabiles fuerunt in saeculo, ad summum certantes sine laesione peruenerunt securi.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 92–93.
[125] Claussen, 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority', p. 795.
[126] See Riché, *Dhuoda*, pp. 383–85. For clarification, Benedict of Nursia, founder of the Benedictine monastery at Monte Cassino, and Benedict of Aniane were different people, but the latter modelled himself on the former, hence his name change.

God should be pleased. The reality, however, was clearly the opposite of what Dhuoda had in mind, for she wrote to her son:

> If through the clemency of almighty God, your father (*genitor*) decides in advance that you shall receive a portion of these estates, pray then with all your strength for the increasing heavenly recompense to the souls of those who once owned all these. Circumstances now do not allow your father to do so, since he has many urgent duties. But you, insofar as you have the strength and the opportunity, pray for their souls.[127]

Dhuoda's reference to Bernard with *genitor*, which carries a biological connotation, rather than *pater*, which has an implication of power, seems to indicate her questioning of her husband's patriarchal authority. But more importantly, Dhuoda apparently did not believe that Bernard would fulfil the obligation he was obliged to undertake because of the property he had inherited from his relatives, to pray for the salvation of their souls, for she exhorted her son to perform this duty on his father's behalf.[128] In Dhuoda's view, Bernard's failure to uphold his earthly kinship, especially with his father who left him the most property, led him to compromise the spirituality inherent in his relationship with his secular kin, which resulted in his repeated frustrations in the earthly world. With this in mind, Dhuoda wholeheartedly hoped that her son would learn his father's lesson and also help Bernard regain God's favour. For this reason she had to ask her son to pray for his father and implore the clergy to pray for Bernard in

[127] 'Si, concedente prius clementia omnipotentis Dei, tuus genitor aliquid exinde tibi iusserit largiri, in quantum ualueris per amplius, ora ut illi merces adcrescat ex eorum animabus quorum cuncta fuerunt. Ex occupationibus enim multis illi non licet ad tempus. Tu uero, dum uales et licentiam habes, pro animabus eorum iugiter ora.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 204–05.
[128] On this obligation to pray, see Section 4.2.3 of this thesis.

order to repair the spiritual damage brought about by a lack of respect for worldly kinship and the earthly instability caused by the latter.:

> Concerning your father, I exhort you, I urge you to pray constantly for him, and diligently, and to beg all ranks of the clergy to plead on his behalf so that as long as he lives God may grant him peace and concord with other people — if this is possible![129]

Dhuoda claimed in the *Liber Manualis* to be William's mother (*genitrix*) physically and spiritually,[130] but never said that Bernard was William's father (*genitor*) in the spiritual sense. Instead she simply said to her son, 'recognize that your worldly position depends upon him [Bernard].'[131] Even more intriguing is the fact that, Dhuoda considered Theuderic, Bernard's brother and William's uncle and godfather, to be more like William's father in the sense of the 'second birth' because of his spiritual following in the footsteps of his father, Duke William. As a charter of 842 highlighted by Martin A. Claussen points out, Theuderic may have donated all his worldly possessions to the Church and the poor, which was evidently an act of respect for his father's authority (following the father's example) and the preservation of the spirituality inherent in earthly kinship.[132]

In Dhuoda's view, therefore, the root cause of Bernard's opposite path to Joseph and her family's miserable situation lies in Bernard's failure to uphold secular kinship, of which the father-son relationship was one aspect. In other words, in Dhuoda's

[129] 'Pro genitori tuo ortor et admoneo ut pro eo frequens et assidue orator sis, atque ceteros ecclesiasticorum gradus pro illo exorare facias, ut det illi Deus, tempore dum uiuit, pacem et concordiam, si fieri potest.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 198–99.
[130] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 190–93. Also see Nelson, 'Dhuoda', pp. 106–20.
[131] 'scitoque, ex illo tuus in saeculo processit status.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 88–89.
[132] Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 206–07. Also see Claussen, 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority', pp. 807–09.

understanding, secular kinship and spiritual kinship almost overlapped, since spirituality was embedded in secular kinship. Similarly, worldly time and sacred time were intertwined rather than separable. Transgressions in the earthly world could lead to falling out of favour with God in sacred time, and the loss of God's favour could in turn result in instability in the earthly world; sacred time could no longer be dealt with separately.

4.3.3 The problematic husband-wife relationship

In addition to the father-son relationship, Dhuoda also identified the conjugal relationship as an important aspect of secular kinship. Dhuoda's view of marriage may again have been influenced by Augustine, who saw it as having three benefits:

> This is threefold: fidelity, offspring, sacrament (*sacramentum*). Fidelity means that one refrains from sexual contact outside the marriage bond; Offspring, that [the child] is lovingly received, tenderly nurtured, religiously brought up; the Sacrament, that the marriage is not broken and the abandoned spouse marry another, not even for the sake of having children.[133]

For Augustine, procreation was a sacred duty and a 'necessity' for the ancestors of the Old Testament,[134] which is why polygamy was practised at that time: to demonstrate the 'naturalness of procreation' (*fecunditatis natura*).[135] In other words, it was to produce enough 'citizens' for the city of God (*civitas Dei*), and to enable Christ to become incarnate through procreation. But now that there were enough people to make

[133] 'Hoc autem tripartitum est: fides, proles, sacramentum. In fide attenditur ne praeter vinculum conjugale cum altera vel altero concumbatur; in prole, ut amanter suscipiater, benigne nutriatur, religiose educatur; in sacramento, ut conjugium non separetur et dismissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri conjungatur.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De Genesi ad litteram inperfectus liber*, ed J. Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28/1* (Vienna, 1894), p. 397. English trans. J. H. Taylor, *St. Augustine: The Literal Meaning of Genesis, vol. 2* (New York, 1982), p .78.
[134] Augustine of Hippo, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, ed. K. F. Vrba and J. Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 42* (Vienna, 1902), p. 397
[135] Augustine of Hippo, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, p. 419,

up the city of God, and since Christ had come, the 'necessity' of procreation no longer existed. So theoretically, there was no need for people to get married and have children. If this is the case, why did people get married? Augustine's explanation for this is that since people cannot abstain from carnal desire (*concupiscentia carnis*), which is brought about by the Original Sin, marriage is used to avoid the 'sinful desire' (*peccandi desideria*) of carnality.[136] Here, the same reason for marriage is given in Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis* that chastity does not necessarily mean celibacy, but rather that entering into and respecting a formal marriage is also a way of remaining chaste: 'the learned doctors of the church do not, indeed, deny its sacred rites to the marriage bed; they only busy themselves in rooting out lechery and illicit intercourse.'[137] It is true that the *De institutione laicali* (especially Book 2), written by Bishop Jonas of Orléans (c.760 – 843), a little earlier than Dhuoda, in the same genre of 'mirrors for princes', makes the same point and thus seems more likely to have influenced Dhuoda, but Jonas of Orléans himself adopted Augustine's view on the issue of marriage.[138] The influence of Augustine's view of marriage on Dhuoda may therefore have been either direct or indirect.

More importantly, however, is *sacramentum*. Augustine stated that although carnal desire was the reason why couples entered into marriage, it could not be a reason for them to dissolve it, for marriage had an intrinsic spirituality that must not be compromised. He wrote,

[136] Augustine of Hippo, *Contra iulianum opus imperfectum (libri I–III)*, ed. E. Kalinka and M. Zelzer, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 85/1* (Vienna, 1974)
[137] 'Non enim excludunt doctores nuptiarum sacris iungere thorum; sed concupiscentias stupras inlicitasque a nobis stirpare satagunt.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 144–45.
[138] Cf. O. M. Dubreucq, 'Le De Institutione Laicali de Jonas d'Orléans: édition, traduction, commentaire' (PhD thesis, Université de Paris, 2007).

> But once the lusting of the flesh comes over them and they marry, suppose they subsequently control that urge; since they have not the option of dissolving the marriage as they had the option of not marrying, they become what the status of marriage proclaims them to be.[139]

The 'status of marriage' (*forma nuptiarum*) is in fact what Augustine called the 'Sacrament of marriage' (*sacramentum connubii*, *sacramentum nuptiarum* or *sacramentum matrimonii*).[140] Although Augustine was not very explicit about what the meaning of *sacramentum* was,[141] he did refer to it as a *sacrum signum* that symbolised the union of Christ with the Church.[142] In this framework, marriage is understood as a relationship between the individual self and God. The Christian marriage of 'the two being one flesh'[143] is neither an absolute attachment of individuals to a secular family (the Roman view) nor a contract between two atomised individuals (the modern view), but a spiritual fellowship (*societas*) between two individuals in Christ. To create this Christian marriage, individuals must first commit themselves to Christ in order to create a marital fellowship between husband and wife. Augustine therefore said, 'let us cling to God in a holy fellowship.'[144]

However, the rumour that Bernard had undermined his marriage to Dhuoda once again compromised the spirituality inherent in the secular kinship. Although Dhuoda did not literally associate marriage with *sacramentum* in her *Liber Manualis*, she did allude to the sanctity of her marriage to Bernard. In the very opening paragraph of the Preface,

---

[139] 'Sed cum dominante concupiscentia fuerint copulati, si eam postea uicerint, quia non ita licet dissoluere coniugium sicut licebat non conligare, fiunt tales quales profitetur forma nuptiarum.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *De Bono Coniugali, De Sancta Virginitate*, trans. P. G. Walsh (Oxford, 2001), pp. 30–31.
[140] É. Schmitt, *Le mariage chrétien dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin: une théologie baptismale de la vie conjugale* (Paris, 1983), pp. 5–11.
[141] Charles Couturier argues that *sacramentum* has three basic meanings in Augustine's treatises: ritual, symbol and mystery. See C. Couturier, '"Sacramentum" et "mysterium" dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin', *Etudes Augustiniennes* 28 (1953), pp. 161–332.
[142] Augustine of Hippo, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, p. 443.
[143] As in Genesis 2:24 quoted by Dhuoda: 'Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they shall be two in one flesh.' Also see Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 114.
[144] '... sancta societate inhaereamus Deo...' In: Augustine of Hippo, *City of God, vol. I*, p. 272.

Dhuoda wrote, 'in the eleventh year of the reign of our departed lord Louis, who ruled in splendor by the will of Christ, I was given in lawful marriage on June 29, 824, in the palace of Aachen, to my lord Bernard, your father.'[145] In this statement, the court as the place where the marriage was held is the source of the secular legitimacy of Dhuoda's marriage, while the presence of the emperor as Christ's delegated authority attests to the intrinsic sanctity of the marriage.[146] In this way, Bernard's damage to his marriage was in turn an expression of his failure to commit himself to Christ, and this is why he was repeatedly frustrated in the secular world. It was probably with this understanding that Dhuoda wrote this exhortation to his son, admonishing him to keep the marriage relationship pure in order to achieve the secular and spiritual security symbolised by 'feast': 'you, my son, whether you keep your body in a virgin state, which is the most resplendent gift, or in the chaste bond of the marriage bed. You will be clean of the origin of this sin. Your soul will share in the eight beatitudes. You will remain "secure" and peaceful in all things, "as at a perpetual feast".'[147]

Once again, it can be observed that Dhuoda saw Bernard's undermining of the marital relationship as another aspect of secular kinship as damaging to spirituality and an indication of his failure to commit himself to God. In other words, the way Bernard treated his secular kin was a microcosm of how he approached God in the sacred family. Again, secular time was inseparable from sacred time.

[145] 'Anno feliciter, Christo propitio, XI, domno nostro Ludouico condam fulgente in imperio, concurrente V, III Kalendarum iulii diem, in Aquisgrani palatio, ad meum dominum tuumque genitorem Bernardum legalis in coniugio accessi uxor.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 48–49.
[146] On Dhuoda's recognition of Louis the Pious as a sacred ruler, see Section 3.3.1 of this thesis.
[147] 'Tu ergo, fili, si in uirginitate, quod est lucidissimum donum, uel etiam in thoro iugali consortii castitatem, corpus seruaueris tuum, mundus eris ab huius peccati originem, et in partes octium beatitudinis mens, ut iuge conuiuium, tua, per omnia secura quiescet.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 144–45.

4.3.4 Maternal authority and advice

What then should be done to end this crisis caused by the father's destruction of earthly kinship and the corresponding spirituality inherent in it? Dhuoda's solution started with worldly kinship and went straight to spirituality, that is, establishing maternal authority and using it as a basis for admonishing her son, and even her son's fellow nobles, to avoid Bernard's transgressions, to act properly and to maintain the spirituality inherent in earthly kinship.

First of all, Dhuoda sought in her text to establish her authority as a mother, which was the foundation of her right to admonish her son William and his fellow noblemen, who constituted the political body of actors in this troubled world. To this end, Dhuoda first suppressed William's nobility through biblical discourse. In exhorting William to pay attention to the teaching she gave him in the *Liber Manualis*, she wrote,

> I, Dhuoda, although of the frail sex and living unworthily among women who are worthy, am nonetheless your mother, my son William. It is to you that the words of my manual are now addressed. The game of tables, among other pleasurable pursuits, is agreed to be a most congenial and apt pastime for young people. And, some women will customarily peer at their own faces in the mirror so that they may cleanse away the spots of dirt and show themselves radiant and, in a worldly way, give pleasure to their husbands. In just such a way, I would like you, in spite of the pressures of your worldly occupations, to give your devoted attention — for my sake — to the reading of this little book which I have addressed to you. Give it that same degree of attention and zeal that others give to looking in the mirror or playing a board game.[148]

[148] 'Dhuoda quanquam in fragili sensu, inter dignas uiuens indigne, tamen genitrix tua, fili Wilhelme, ad te nunc meus sermo dirigitur manualis, ut, ueluti tabularum lusus maxime iuuenibus inter ceteras artium partes mundanas congruus et abtus constat ad tempus, uel certe inter aliquas ex parte in speculis mulierum demonstratio apparere soleat uultu, ut sordida extergant, exhibentesque nitida, suis in saeculo satagunt placere maritis, ita te obto ut, inter mundanas et saeculares actionum turmas oppressus, hunc libellum a me tibi directum frequenter legere, et, ob memoriam mei, uelut in speculis atque tabulis ioco, ita non negligas.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 46–49. For an explanation of this passage also see Claussen, 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority', p. 798.

It can be noted that Dhuoda here compared William as a noble warrior to the playful young man (*iuvenis*) and the wife (*mulier*) eager to please her husband, both of whom were in a dependent position and needed to be disciplined in the eyes of the Franks. The traditional view holds that people living in the Middle Ages did not perceive a clear line between *pubes* (adult) and *iuvenis* (young).[149] This view has been challenged, however. Many early medievalists have pointed out that in the Carolingian world, young people were seen as being in a period of potential transgression and transition to a stable state, and therefore in need of being disciplined by someone in authority.[150] Paschasius Radbertus (785 – 865), Abbot of Corbie, who lived at about the same time as Dhuoda, described Charlemagne's cousin, Count and later Abbot Wala, as having been deliberately placed under discipline in his youth:

> The emperor observed the power of his intellect, and although he was his cousin and the son of his uncle, at the prompting of someone or other he ordered him to be humbled and demoted down among the lowest group. This did not happen by accident, but through the just dispensation of God, so that his tender age, like gold, might be tested in the furnace of temptation. In this way he might learn while still young to face adversity with courage in the same measure as he met good fortune with equanimity. For it is written that temptation tests the just as the furnace does gold.[151]

[149] For example see P. Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood* (London, 1996).
[150] Cf. J. L. Nelson, 'Parents, Children, and the Church in the Earlier Middle Ages', *Studies in Church History* 31 (1994), pp. 81–114; R. Meens, 'Children and Confession in the Early Middle Ages', *Studies in Church History* 31 (1994), pp. 53–65; M. de Jong, 'Growing up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and His Oblates', *Journal of Medieval History* 9 (1983), pp. 99–128; M. Innes, '"A Place of Discipline": Carolingian Courts and Aristocratic Youth', in C. Cubitt (ed.), *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 59–76.
[151] 'Cuius augustus efficatiam auspicatus ingenii, licet consobrinus ipsius esset, patrui eius filius, decrevit humiliari cuiuslibet instinctu, et redigi inter infimos, non quidem fortuitu, sed divino dispensante judicio, ut tenera aetas fornace tentationis tanquam aurum probaretur, quatenus ediscceret adhuc juvenis, non minus adversa fortiter, quam et prospera aequanimiter tolerare. Scriptum quippe est, quod sicut fornax aurum, ita tentatio probat justos.' In: Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed E. Dümmler, *Abhandlungen der Preussische Akademie, phil.-hist. Klasse 2* (Berlin, 1900), pp. 28-29; English trans M. de Jong and J. Lake, *Confronting Crisis in the Carolingian Empire* (Manchester, 2020) pp. 76–77.

Like the restless young man, the wife was also in a position of dependence in terms of social identity. A sermon written around 802 establishes an exemplary hierarchical relationship within the family:

> Let wives be submissive to their husbands, in all goodness and modesty.... Let husbands love their wives and speak no dishonest words to them; let them rule their households with kindness... Let sons love their parents and honour them. Let them [sons] not disobey them [parents]...[152]

The context in which this sermon was written was the Carolingian project of moral reform that was initiated since Charlemagne.[153] One of many texts promoting reform, this sermon calls for wives to submit to the authority of their husbands, sons to submit to the authority of their parents, and husbands/fathers to govern their families with love, thus creating a harmonious order within the household. The hierarchy conveyed in this sermon must have been widely spread in Carolingian society from the royal assemblies and councils down through the diocesans and even parishes, and was thus well known to the lay people,[154] including Dhuoda's son William. Thus, as he is compared to the playful young man and the wife who looks in the mirror and waits to please her husband, and is urged to carefully read the *Liber Manualis* written to him, William is effectively subordinated into a dependent position by Dhuoda in a triple authoritative identity: preceptor, husband and parent.

But the question here is would not Dhuoda be concerned that her own wifely status would undermine her authority? It should be noted that Dhuoda in fact made it clear at

[152] 'Mulier sint subiecti viri sui in omni bonitate et pudicitia... Viri diligant uxorem suam, et inhonesta verba non dicat ei, guberne domus suas in bonitate ... Filii diligant parentes suos et honoret illos; non sint inobedientes.' In: 'Missi cuiusdam admonitio', in J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus vol. 97* (Paris, 1851), p. 242. A French translation see P. Viollet, *Oeuvres chrétiennes des familles royales de France* (Paris, 1870), pp. 26–33.
[153] Cf. Buck, *Admonitio und Praedicatio*, pp. 157–238.
[154] Cf. R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London, 1983), pp. 140–68.

the beginning of this passage in what capacity she was admonishing her son: a mother and a woman in her sex. Motherhood as a parent has been discussed above, and womanhood in sex likewise would not diminish Dhuoda's authority. Haimo of Auxerre (? - c.853), a Benedictine monk who lived around the same time as Dhuoda, wrote in one of his sermons commenting on Christ's feeding of the five thousand that,[155]

> Mystically, we are warned that if we should desire to taste how sweet the Lord is, let us be men, that is strong against the devil's temptations... Nor will a woman remain hungry from this refreshment of the Lord, if with feminine sex, she should manfully restrain the attempts of the devil: just as on the contrary, a man by sex is made feminine in mind, if he is found soft and dissolute in his labour against the attack of temptation.[156]

As noted earlier, Dhuoda's father-in-law, William of Gellone, played an important role in promoting the Benedictine Reform, We might even go so far as to presume that Dhuoda shared with the Benedictine monk Haimo of Auxerre the understanding that being a sexually fragile woman did not prevent her from being masculine in her thinking.[157] This is just as she demonstrated her full confidence in grasping correct Christian thought immediately after the passage: 'you will find in this book in succinct form all that you want to know.'[158] Thus, in Dhuoda's view, being a woman in sex did

[155] For information about Haymon d'Auxerre and his works, see D. Iogna-Prat, H. F. Jolowicz, and B. Nicholas, 'L'œuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre', in G. Lobrichon (ed.), *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre: de Murethach à Rémi, 830–908* (Paris, 1991), pp. 157–79.

[156] 'Non absque consideratione praetereundum est quod in hac refectione Domini nulla femina interfuisse memoratur, sed tantummodo viri. Vir quippe a viribus dicitur . . .Cum ergo in hoc convivio Domini tantummodo viri fuisse dicuntur, mystice monemur ut, si quam suavis sit Dominus gustare desideramus, viri simus, id est fortes contra diaboli tentationes... Nec ab hac refectione Dominica femina jejuna remanebit, si sexu femineo viriliter tentamenta diaboli compresserit: sicut e contra vir sexu femineae mentis efficitur, si contra impetum tentationis mollis et dissolutus in opere suo invenitur.' In: Haimo of Auxerre, *Homilia XLIX*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latin 118* (Paris, 1852), col. 291B. The translation is from R. Stone, '"In What Way Can Those Who Have Left the World be Distinguished?": Masculinity and the Difference between Carolingian Men', in C. Beattie and K. Fenton (eds), *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages* (London, 2010), p. 20.

[157] Nelson suggests that Dhuoda may even have read the works collected by her father-in-law in the monasteries built by the latter when she wrote, see Nelson, 'Dhuoda's Context', pp. 459–60.

[158] 'Inuenies in eo quidquid in breui cognoscere malis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 48–49.

not weaken her power of persuasion, and her masculine mind was sufficient to support her authority.

But more surprisingly, having brought her own son into dependence on her, Dhuoda further extended her authority to her son's fellow nobles to make the latter obey her admonitions: after all, it would only be possible to bring the Frankish realm, rather than just her own family, back into harmony if most of the major political elites acted on her advice. To achieve this, Dhuoda again drew on her motherhood, in which she clearly demonstrated both the secular and the sacred aspects of secular kinship.[159] She indicated that, 'two births can be recognized in a single human being, one of the flesh, the other of the spirit. But the spiritual birth is nobler than the fleshly.'[160] This is evidently again a product of thought influenced by Augustine, who wrote in his *Tractatus in Johannem*, 'there are two births... One is from earth, the other from heaven; one is from the flesh, the other from the Spirit; one is from mortality, the other from eternity; one is from male and female, the other from God and Church.'[161] It is in the aspect of spiritual motherhood that Dhuoda herself sought to extend her maternal authority to her son's fellow nobles. It should be noted that Dhuoda used military rhetoric in assigning herself spiritual motherhood. For example, she stated that,

> I have tried my best to serve as the woman who put you in line for helping you to regulate your entire temporal conduct so that you might go forth without reproach or disregard of dignity, as long as you are engaged in active military service.[162]

---

[159] For this point, see Nelson, 'Dhuoda', pp. 106–20.
[160] 'duo natiuitates in uno homine esse noscuntur, una carnalis, altera spiritualis, sed nobilior spiritualis quam carnalis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 190–91.
[161] '...sint duae nativitates... Una est de terra, alia de coelo; una est de carne, alia de Spiritu; una est de mortalitate, alia de aeternitate; una est de masculo et femina, alia de Deo et Ecclesia.' In: Augustine of Hippo, *In epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus decem*, p. 1478. Translation from *Tractates on the Gospel of John 11–27*, trans. J. W. Rettig (Washington DC, 2003), p. 16.
[162] 'Qualitas temporalium, ut, absque reprehensione, tempore dum uiuis in militia actuali, siue dignitatis contemplationum, secure et quiete ualeas incedere, prout ualui ordinatrix tibi astiti in cunctis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 190–91. With the translation being slightly changed.

And in referring to her son's noble fellows, she borrowed the appellation used by Saint Paul in Philemon 1.2,[163] calling them *comilitones*.[164] By this term, Dhuoda was referring both to the secular retinue of Charles the Bald in which her son was of lower rank and required to be ordered around, and to the army of God in which her son and his noble fellows blurred ranks and fought side by side. The *comilitones* thus appear as a double-entendre, by virtue of which Dhuoda discreetly passed on her authority as a spiritual mother to the other nobles, admonishing them in the capacity of *ordinatrix* on how to act correctly. Indeed, Dhuoda did believe that her handbook would be read by the other nobles in Charles the Bald's court, and therefore asked that her admonitions might be treated with tolerance.[165]

Having used her identity as a secular and spiritual kinswoman to establish her authority, Dhuoda's admonition to her son and his son's fellow nobles is straightforward. Since Bernard was used as an implicit counter-example, Dhuoda exhorted her audience, on the one hand, to clarify the relationship between father and son and to acknowledge their fathers' position of authority, both temporal and spiritual, which was expressed in action by following their fathers on earth and praying for them.[166] Dhuoda displayed a certain paradox here in that, on the one hand, she believed that Bernard's failure to fulfil his spiritual kinship obligations had led to his frustration in the earthly world, while on the other hand, also with the same concern for the proper fulfilment of kinship duties,

[163] *Philemon 1.2*: 'et Appiæ sorori carissimæ, et Archippo commilitoni nostro, et ecclesiæ, quæ in domo tua est.'
[164] 'Tu ergo, licet inter comilitones minimus esse uidearis in formam... Magnos ut sublimes, aequales ut altos, consimiles praepone, ut tibi una cum illis profectum dignitatis adquiri possis maiorum...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 110.
[165] 'Item. Rogo et humiliter suggero tuam iuuentutis nobilitatem, quasi praesens, necnon etiam et illos ad quos hunc libellum ad relegendum ostenderis, ne me dampnent uel reprehendant pro eo quod sim temera in tali subintrari agonizatrio acumine laboris, ut tibi aliquid de Deo dirigi audeam sermonem.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 58.
[166] For Dhuoda's request that sons followed their fathers, see Section 3.2.2 of this thesis.

Dhuoda asked her son to follow his father. This paradoxical nature stems from the gap between reality and the ideal.

In addition to the father-son relationship, Dhuoda also admonished his son and his son's fellow nobles to deal properly with the conjugal relationship, that is, to avoid inappropriate sexual relations outside of marriage and to learn to control lust: 'if at the instigation of the Devil, death's agent, fornication or some other goad to the flesh should tickle your heart, oppose it with chastity.'[167] It could be argued that, in the light of Bernard's lessons, the establishment of proper paternal and conjugal relationships for lay aristocrats to preserve the spirituality inherent in earthly kinship was Dhuoda's solution to bring stability to the turbulent families of the time, whether it was her own small family or an extended family made up of the Franks.

4.3.5 Conclusion

Comparing the *Vita Karoli* and the *Liber Manualis*, it can be seen that both texts confront the problem of the absence of the authority of the *paterfamilias* in the family, and the frustrations in the earthly world that this absence entailed. In the *Vita Karoli*, Charlemagne's lack of authority leads to his secular relatives constantly causing him problems. It should be noted, however, that these troubles were created by worldly relatives, but only at the earthly dimension, and did not have an impact in sacred time. And Charlemagne's remedy, according to Einhard, was to form a spiritual kinship with the Church in order to use it as a substitute for a secular one. But equally, spiritual

[167] 'Si, suadente Zabulo, mortis auctore, fornicatio aut aliquis stimulus carnis cor titillauerit tuum, adhibe in contra castitatem.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 142–43.

kinship did not interact with secular one. In other words, for Einhard, secular time and sacred time were essentially separate and parallel.

In *Liber Manualis*, the absence of *paterfamilias* authority and the problems it caused are equally present: Bernard's disobedience to his father's authority led to his frustration in the earthly world, and his transgressions as a husband resulted in his family being in turmoil when he was unable to exert his authority in his own household. More importantly, however, in Dhuoda's view, spirituality was inherent in earthly kinship and did not need to be established with other objects through other means. Conversely, Bernard's failed handling of secular kinship also affects its aspect as a spiritual kinship in sacred time, which in turn had an impact in secular affairs. In other words, in *Liber Manualis*, secular time and sacred time are intertwined and inseparable: they are two sides of the same coin.

The question here, therefore, is whether the difference in Dhuoda's opinions from Einhard's was due to her strong Augustinian influence, or to the genre of the 'mirrors for princes' of the *Liber Manualis*, or whether it was a result of the historical context in which she lived? In order to check this, it is necessary to further examine Nithard and his *Historiae*, which are different in intellectual sources and genre but situated in the same historical context as Dhuoda.

4.4 Nithard

> A fidelity... that appears in the filial relationship... explains why the tensions within the Carolingian family, the revolts of the sons against their father, particularly those

> of the sons of Louis the Pious, appeared as a scandal that undermined the very foundations of social relations.[168]

Le Jan rightly emphasises that the revolt of the Carolingian sons against their father in the first half of the ninth century can be understood as a double betrayal: both an undermining of the father's power and a challenge to the king's authority. It is a dual threat to the family and the political order. Immersed in this political culture of the homogeneity between household and country, it was common for contemporaries to try, either consciously or unconsciously, to clarify the link between family and power, and to explain political action in terms of the logic of the family. Perhaps we can borrow Lynn Hunt's definition of what she calls 'family romance' to point to the existence in the first half of the ninth century of a certain collective unconscious imagination of family order that constituted a contemporaneous political ideology.[169] In this sense, contemporaneous texts, which in many cases appear to deal with domestic themes or refer to domestic figures, refer far beyond the family to cover the entire political sphere. Nithard and his *Historiae* are no exception.

Like Dhuoda, Nithard saw the dysfunctional relationships between family members as the root cause of the political crisis through which he was living, but he expanded the scope to include the father-son, sibling and husband-wife pairs. However, Nithard's observation that the crisis in family relationships that occurred within the ruling dynasty led directly to a social crisis goes beyond Dhuoda's limitation of the crisis to a single family. Surely the creation of this causal relationship reflects Nithard's own efforts as a

[168] 'Une fidélité... apparaît dans la relation filiale... explique que les tensions au sein de la famille carolingienne, les révoltes des fils contre leur père, en particulier celles des fils de Louis le Pieux, soient apparues comme un scandale qui sapait les fondements mêmes des relations sociales.' In: Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc*, p. 77.
[169] L. Hunt, *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1992), p. xiii.

member of the Carolingian family himself to construct the legitimacy of the Carolingian family as a ruling family at an ideological level, even if the slide towards chaos had taken place under the leadership of the Carolingian dynasty.

4.4.1 Men: fathers and sons

Nithard began his *Historiae* by recounting the return of Louis the Pious to Aachen to seize the throne, thus bringing to life the old regime under Charlemagne, in which the father-emperor was the pinnacle of an entire social order bound together by the bond of obedience. Nithard wrote,

> As soon as he was certain of his father's death, he immediately travelled from Aquitaine to Aachen. There, he easily submitted to his power the people who came to him from all sides, reserving the right to examine the case of all those whose loyalty remained in doubt.[170]

Nithard explicitly noted here that some of the nobles did not approve of Louis the Pious at the time of his accession, but they did not openly and clearly express their opposition because 'they no longer dared to undertake anything openly in the Empire that was not in the *publica utilitas*.'[171] Charlemagne had done a good job of controlling the magnates during his lifetime, forcing them to serve the *publica utilitas*; in other words, he made them obey himself and continue to obey his son after his death. It is therefore clear that Nithard's Charlemagne handled the relationship between father and son well, as shown by the fact that as a father he tamed the magnates and thus paved the way for his son's future reign. However, Einhard's account is clearly different from Nithard's because, as

[170] 'Qui ut pro certo patrem obisse comperit, Aquis ab Aquitania protinus venit; quo undique ad se venientem populum absque quolibet impedimento suae ditioni addixit, de ceteris qui sibi creduli videbantur deliberans.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 4–7.
[171] 'Nihil in imperio moliri, praeter quod publicae utilitati congruebat, manifeste auderent.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 4–5.

mentioned, in the *Vita Karoli* Charlemagne's secular relatives often conspired with the Frankish nobility to obtain the *regna* in the Carolingian Empire.[172] For example, Pippin the Hunchback, 'when his father [Charlemagne] had taken up the war against the Huns and was wintering in Bavaria, pretended to be sick and entered into a conspiracy against his father with certain leading Franks who had enticed him with the false promise of a kingdom.'[173] According to Einhard, Charlemagne did not always suppress the Frankish nobles from putting into practice their plans for interfering with their lord's succession, and the Carolingian son was not afraid to rebel against his father for his own good. Nithard's silence on these events serves to highlight by contrast the idea he was trying to convey: that Louis the Pious's failure to establish a political world of patriarchal domination led to the current social disorder.

In Nithard's narrative, Louis the Pious fared poorly in the matter of subduing his sons and the Frankish nobles to his will of succession, in sharp contrast to his father. After discovering the ambitions of his legitimate eldest son, Lothar, he employed Bernard, Duke of Septimania, Dhuoda's husband, as a counterweight to Lothar. But it turned out that Louis the Pious failed to control Bernard, whose abuse of power led directly to the collapse of the father-son relationship between Louis the Pious and Lothar, which eventually triggered the beginning of the political turmoil of the ninth century.[174]

Worse still, when it came to securing his sons' support for himself, in contrast to Charlemagne, who 'showed himself to all the inhabitants of the globe to be at once

[172] See Section 4.2.2 of this thesis for details.
[173] 'Is, cum pater bello contra Hunos suscepto in Baioaria hiemaret, aegritudine simulata, cum quibusdam e primoribus Francorum, qui eum vana regni promissione inlexerant, adversus patrem coniuravit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 48. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 29.
[174] See Section 2.3.2 of this thesis.

terrible, amiable and admirable',[175] Louis the Pious was unable to use his paternal authority to force his sons to comply with his wishes, and instead had to make a pleading gesture, even in exchange for material benefits. When Judith gave birth, for example, the emperor had to 'implored his sons (*filios rogaret*)' in order to find a place in the empire for his newborn child.[176] After his first overthrow by Lothar, Louis the Pious, in order to seek the help of Pippin I of Aquitaine and Louis the German, 'promised to increase their kingdoms if they were willing to join forces with those who wished to restore him to power.'[177] As a result the two Carolingian sons 'accepted very easily and even eagerly', not out of their father's authority and their love for him, but out of their desire for the land.[178] However, this kind of obedience, based on the temptation of material gain, was doomed to be unreliable: 'Pippin and Louis, although their kingdoms had been enlarged in accordance with the promises they had made, both strove to be the first in the Empire after their father.'[179] So the two Carolingian sons join forces with Lothar to rebel against their father once again. The Frankish nobles also revolted from their feeble lord: in what came to be known as the Field of Lies, 'the sons put various pressures on the people to abandon their father.'[180] Even after his second restoration, Louis the Pious, who was confident that his authority had been consolidated throughout the *regnum*, assigned a part of the empire to Charles the Bald, 'all this was given by Louis to his son Charles by virtue of divine authority and his paternal authority',[181] but after his death the nobles in these territories again flocked to betray his youngest son in defiance of the succession arrangements of this father-

[175] 'omnibus orbem inhabitantibus terribilis, amabilis, pariterque et admirabilis videretur.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 4–5.
[176] Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 8.
[177] 'promittens, si in sua restitutione una cum his qui hoc cupiebant adesse voluissent, regnum utrisque se ampliare velle.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 14–15.
[178] 'Ac per hoc perfacile cupideque paruere.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 14–15.
[179] 'Pippinus quoque et Lodhuwicus, quamquam eis regna, sicut promissum fuerat, aucta fuissent, tamen in imperio ut post patrem primi essent, uterque laborabat.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 16–17.
[180] 'variis affectionibus populum, ut a patre deficeret, filii compellunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 18–19.
[181] 'una cum auctoritate divina atque paterna praefato filio suo Karolo dedit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 30–31.

emperor. This scenario was the opposite of the one in which Louis the Pious himself took the throne in Aachen, thanks to the residual power of his father.

In any case, Nithard's observation about Louis the Pious's failure to fulfil his fatherly role, and consequently his inability to defend the *res publica* even as emperor, reflects the fact that, in his mindset, the earthly time in which secular kinship was situated was closely linked to and inseparable from the eternal time represented by the *res publica*.[182]

4.4.2 Women: mother and sisters

In Nithard's narrative, the death of Louis the Pious as father led the Carolingian polity to what historians call the 'regime of confraternity'.[183] Under this regime, fratricidal conflict was an undeniable reality of the new era, despite the fact that the Frankish aristocracy, represented by Dhuoda and Nithard, were keen to imagine and advocate a world in which brothers could co-exist peacefully with one another. Thus in the great family of the Empire, the emperor-father retired, but the confraternity, which should have been the model and self-image of the new institution, was slow to be established. In this context, historians have generally focused most of their attention on the brothers in contention.[184] But the fact remains that women also play an important role in the *Historiae* and were given an emotional dimension by Nithard.

After the death of their emperor-father, the brothers were faced with two problems, one was their relationship with each other and the other was their relationship with the

[182] For the temporality of *res publica* in the *Historiae*, see Section 3.4.
[183] Toubert, 'La théorie du mariage chez les moralistes carolingiens', pp. 233–81; J. P. Devroey, *Puissants et misérables: système social et monde paysan dans l'Europe des Francs (VIe – IXe siècles)* (Bruxelles, 2006), p. 177.
[184] The same applies to Section 3.4 of this thesis.

women of the royal family. In general, Nithard had a negative view of women involved in political life. First and foremost is the empress as a mother. Speaking of Judith, Nithard wrote,

> But he [Louis the Pious] was approaching old age and decrepitude was threatening him as a result of the various sorrows he had suffered; the mother [Judith] and the great men who had worked for him, in accordance with the Emperor's wishes, fearing that if he died before everything was finished he would incur the mortal hatred of his brothers, thought it best that Louis should also secure the support of one of his other sons, so that if, after his death, the others did not wish to remain in agreement, at least two could agree to resist the envious party.[185]

In this part of Nithard's narrative, Louis the Pious, misled by the Frankish nobles under the 'mother (*mater*)' Judith, not only forgave Lothar, who had rebelled against his father, but also pinned his hopes on the eldest son's support of his youngest brother in the future to establish the regime of confraternity. There is no doubt that this was a disastrous decision in hindsight, as it gave power back to Lothar, who had already lost it in Francia, and Lothar broke the covenant immediately after Louis the Pious's death in an attempt to destroy Charles the Bald, thus starting the fratricidal war. It is worth pointing out that Scholz's English translation of the passage in a way hides Nithard's emphasis, since Nithard wrote 'mater', which Scholz silently expands as 'Queen Judith' (sic).[186] This may rather obscure the implications of the original text. As the archetypal woman active in public politics, the portrayal of the empress-mother is not only about her status, but also about attitudes towards women's political participation that blur

[185] 'Veruntamen ingruente senili aetate, et propter varias afflictiones poene decrepita imminente, mater ac primores populi qui in voluntate patris pro Karolo laboraverant, metuentes, si infectis rebus decederet, odia fratrum usque ad internitionem sibi insurgere, ratum duxerunt, ut quemlibet e filiis pater in supplementum sibi assumeret, et si post discessum eius ceteri concordes esse nollent, saltem hi duo unanimes effecti, valerent resistere invidorum factioni.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 34–35.

[186] Scholz's English translation is 'Louis was getting old and his mind was beginning to falter because of his many troubles. Queen Judith and those nobles who were working for Charles, as Louis wished them to, feared that the hatred of the brothers would pursue, them until death if the emperor died without settling his affairs. For this reason they thought it wise for Louis to secure the support of one of his sons and that at least this son and Charles could work together and resist the malcontents if the others were unwilling to preserve harmony after their father's death.' See Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 138.

gender boundaries. Behind this narrative seems to permeate Nithard's interpretation of Carolingian political disorder.[187] In another place when the narrative reaches the point where both Charles the Bald and Lothar were building up their strength for the final showdown, Nithard wrote:

> Some said that, since his mother was coming with the Aquitanians, he should go and meet her; but the majority advised him to go and meet Lothar or, in any case, to wait for him to come wherever he wished, for the main reason that, if he began to change direction, everyone would claim that he had fled, that Lothar and his followers would thus redouble their audacity and that those who until then had not joined any party, out of fear, would flock to him from all sides: which indeed happened. The first opinion prevailed, although not without difficulty.[188]

Here, Nithard again used 'mother (*mater*)' to refer to Judith and emphasised Charles' insistence on rejoining his mother despite the opposition of the majority (*quamquam difficile*). But just three lines later, Nithard bluntly pointed out the serious consequences for Charles of relying on, and even clinging to, his mother and involving her in political life:

> Lothar, for his part, was immediately informed of the situation, and announced to those around him that Charles had fled and that he wanted to pursue him as quickly as possible; with this news, he rekindled the zeal of his supporters, gave those who were hesitant the courage to run and strengthened them in his side.[189]

---

[187] For Nithard's negative view of Charles the Bald's influence by his mother, also see K. Leyser, 'Three Historians', in K. Leyser and T. Reuter (eds), *Communications and Power in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 22.

[188] 'Quidam autem aiebant, quoniam mater sua una cum Aquitaniis veniebat, obviam illi ire debere; sed maxima pars aut obviam Lodhario iter arripere suadebant, aut certe ubicumque vellet adventum illius praestolari debere dicebant; ob hoc quidem maxime, quoniam si quoquo modo aliorsum iter flectere coepisset, cuncti fugam illum inisse iactarent, et hinc Lodharium et suos audentiores fieri debere, atque hi qui adhuc causa timoris neutri se copulaverant, ad illum affluere undique sperabant; quod et evenit. Nam, quamquam difficile, praevaluit tamen sententia priorum.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 74–77.

[189] 'Lodharius quoque ut haec ita se habere deprehendit, circumfusae plebi, Karolum fugam iniisse persequique illum quantotius posset velle denuntiat; quo quidem nuntio fidos sibi alacriores reddidit, dubiis autem quibusque et affluendi audaciam iniecit, et firmiores suae parti reddidit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 76–77.

Nithard's description of Charles's rendezvous with his mother as having led many Frankish nobles to believe that Charles had fled seems to have been intended to express his view of what he believed to be the correct new regime. It was grounded in the brotherhood of men, and women should be excluded from politics. The new institution required masculinity, which called for the rejection of the feminisation of the public sphere. Involving mothers as women in political life would only cause the Carolingians to lose the *fides* of the Frankish nobles.

In addition to implicitly criticising the involvement in political life of Charles's mother, Nithard held the same negative attitude towards sisters who participated in the new regime. In Section 4 of Book III of the *Historiae*, Nithard abruptly inserted his anecdote about Charles the Bald's sister Hildegard. Nithard claimed that Hildegard had imprisoned one of Charles' men in Laon. On hearing of this Charles led his army to the rescue. Hildegard, knowing she was outmatched, agreed to surrender. However, 'in the meantime, the men-at-arms, finding it hard to bear the wait and, what's more, tired of the suffering they had endured all night before, began to attack the town from all sides.'[190] Out of 'compassion for the churches of God as well as for his sister and the Christian people', Charles firmly and decisively stopped his soldiers. Eventually, after Hildegard came under Charles's protection,

> Charles received his sister kindly and forgave her for all her misdeeds to this day; he promised her, with great kindness and many kind words, all the kindness that a brother owes to a sister, if she agreed to remain kind to him from now on, and he allowed her to go freely wherever she wished.[191]

[190] 'Dum haec agerentur, milites moram huius rei graviter ferentes, insuper laboris taedio praeteritae noctis quem passi fuerant permoti, in excidium urbis ruere undique coeperunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 108–09.
[191] 'Sororem suam siquidem Karolus benigne excepit, et omnia quae hactenus erga illum deliquerat, illi donavit; multisque verbis blande illam allocutus, omnem benignitatem, quam frater sorori debet, si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet, ei perhumane promisit, ac, quo voluit, illam abire concessit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 108–09.

Here again Scholz's English translation extends the original semantics and thus appears to be misleading, since he translates the condition of Charles' forgiveness of his sister 'si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet', which plays a key role in the passage, into 'if in the future she would be willing to side with him'.[192] In the semantics of this translation, Hildegard was still politically active, but had simply moved from Lothar's side to Charles'. In fact, however, immediately following this passage, Nithard wrote that 'he [Charles] imposed his rule on the city [Laon].'[193] This seems to indicate that Charles seized Hildegard's dominion over Laon. If this was the actual situation, then 'he allowed her to go freely wherever she wished' seems to imply that Charles forced his sister to withdraw from political life, rather than simply winning her allegiance.

Thus in *Historiae*, not only Charles's mother, who represented the culmination of women's intrusion into the public space, but also Charles's sisters, who played a role in the fratricidal rivalry, were disliked by Nithard, because in his view, politically active women were not only one of the factors that caused social unrest after the death of Louis the Pious, the emperor-father, but also a hindrance to the establishment of a new regime of confraternity. This political misogyny on Nithard's part may have been one of the major reasons that prevented him from self-identifying as belonging to the Carolingian family through his maternal line (he referred to Charlemagne as 'your [Charles the Bald's]' grandfather rather than 'our ' grandfather). It was only by the time he was writing his fourth book that Nithard, who had lost faith in *sacramentum*, had to return

[192] 'Sororem suam siquidem Karolus benigne excepit, et omnia quae hactenus erga illum deliquerat, illi donavit; multisque verbis blande illam allocutus, omnem benignitatem, quam frater sorori debet, si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet, ei perhumane promisit, ac, quo voluit, illam abire concessit.' In: Ibid. pp.160–161.
[193] 'Urbi sua iura statuit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 108.

to kinship for political bonds.[194] In any case, in this family-dependent political imaginary, secular kinship is once again closely linked and inseparable from the Carolingian polity with its sacred character.[195]

4.4.3 Conclusion

Section 4.4 argues that in thinking about Carolingian polity, it is important to emphasise political culture, as a kind of 'family romance' that provided contemporaries with a way of weaving together political experience or understanding the sphere of political power. It therefore explored how the roles of father, mother and sister in Nithard's mindset impacted on the Carolingian regime of the mid-ninth century by analysing the narratives of the family-dependent political imagination in the *Historiae*.

This section suggests that, in Nithard's view, Charlemagne succeeded in making his paternal authority loom over the empire under the old emperor-father regime, so that the Frankish nobility, despite their discontent, did not dare to violate his arrangements for succession. But in contrast, Louis the Pious failed to play the role of emperor-father properly, not only incapable of imposing his paternal authority on the nobles, but also weak to his sons, eventually resulting in a situation in which the sons led the nobles in a competitive rebellion against the emperor-father. The regime of the Emperor-Father faltered under the rule of Louis the Pious. In addition to the old emperor's own lack of fatherly authority, Empress Judith's involvement in politics as a mother was a major

[194] See Section 3.4 of this thesis.
[195] On the sanctity of the Carolingian polity, see Section 5.1 of this thesis.

factor in the collapse of the old system. Even in the new regime of confraternity, a sister who participated in public affairs continued to play a destabilising role in society. It can therefore be argued that in Nithard's thinking, the failed family relationships, which were reflected in the failure of their family members to take their places and do their duty, of the earthly and temporary rulers who were the bearers of the eternal rulership had a significant impact on the Carolingian polity, which was regarded as timeless in its temporality. This idea of secular and sacred time being intertwined and inseparable in the *Historiae* bears a strong resemblance to Dhuoda's *Liber Manualis*.

CHAPTER 5: *ECCLESIA*

5.1 Introduction

The nature of the Frankish polity has long been of concern to medievalists. As mentioned in the introduction to Section 4.4 of this thesis, the political culture of the Frankish kingdoms under the Carolingian dynasty can be understood as being dependent on the idea of the family. From an organisational standpoint, some historians have similarly argued that the Carolingian *regnum* was based on interpersonal bonds, as opposed to the so-called 'institutional territorial state' that followed.[1]

In this conceptual framework, *ecclesia* was understood by Johannes Fried to be the closest thing to a 'state', but it was destined not to be truly synonymous with a 'state' because it was conceptually too narrow in some aspects and too broad in others to correspond to the realities of the political order of the time.[2] As Mayke de Jong put it, in this reading 'either the *ecclesia* referred to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, a body of clerics with their own collective interests, or to a universal *ecclesia* that could at best be equated with *imperium*, not with *Staat*. As long as the undivided Carolingian empire existed, *ecclesia* might have been a useful way of conceptualizing the polity, but after 840 and the subsequent fragmentation of the *imperium*, 'the Church' became useless as a metaphor for political unity.'[3] Based on this consideration, Fried diagnosed the

[1] S. Patzold, 'Die Bischöfe im karolingischen Staat. Praktisches Wissen über die politische Ordnung im Frankenreich des 9. Jh.', in S. Airlie, W. Pohl, and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 133–38.
[2] G. Althoff, 'Die Bösen schrecken, die Guten belohnen. Bedingungen, Praxis und Legitimation mittelalterlicher Herrschaft', in G. Althoff, H. W. Goetz, and E. Schubert (eds), *Menschen im Schatten der Kathedrale. Neuigkeiten aus dem Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1998), pp. 1–99.
[3] M. de Jong, 'Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity', in W. Pohl, H. Reimitz, and S. Airlie (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 113–32.

ideological underdevelopment of the political order of the Frankish realm as a factor in its fragmentation and collapse.

However, this reading of *ecclesia* has now been challenged by a group of historians, including Mayke de Jong. She suggests that the *ecclesia* of the Carolingian period essentially refers to a community of Christians within the political frontier of the Frankish realm, not the church in the narrow or broad sense of Fried. According to de Jong, within the *ecclesia*, there existed several *ordines* (orders): monarchs, bishops and counts. Each of them was endowed by God with a *ministerium*. These *ministeria* did not have to be concepts understood only in terms of persons, but were attached to their respective *ordines* and therefore constituted institutions with a transpersonal connotation. In this new conceptual framework, the Carolingian regime should not be seen as consisting purely of an alliance between individuals.[4]

de Jong's view that a comprehension of the Frankish realm requires an understanding of the concept of *ecclesia* is now widely accepted. However, it might be further suggested that, unlike modern forms of state based on territorial spatiality, the Carolingian polity was largely grounded in political imaginaries of temporality. Limiting space and the subject matter of later attention, this introduction will focus here on the biblical elements utilised in the construction of the Carolingian polity.

In the case of the Carolingians, the use of biblical imagery to construct legitimacy can be traced back to Pippin the Short, the first king of the dynasty, although it is unclear

[4] de Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church', pp. 103–35; de Jong, 'Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity', pp. 113–26. For more information on the concept of *ministerium*, see: Patzold, 'Die Bischöfe im karolingischen Staat', pp. 133–62.

whether he was anointed on his accession to the throne in 751, and even in 753, when Pippin and his sons were indeed anointed, there is still a controversy over the nature of the oil of unction used in the process.[5] Yet despite these still-debatable details, what is certain is that, in order to combine this new ritual with the establishment of the orthodoxy of the new royal family, the ritual itself had to be orthodox. Arnold Angenendt argues that these elements, including the discovery of instances in the Old Testament where the kings of the Israelite were consecrated with anointing oil, the imitation of long-standing rituals of ceremony or baptism in Gaul, and the approval or involvement of the pope, were all crucial. Since then, despite occasional exceptions, the rite of anointing has featured prominently in the coronation of kings.[6]

Besides rituals, the Carolingians also used various titles associated with biblical discourse to establish their sanctity. Among the surviving sources, the expression '*rex gratia dei*' (king by/in God's grace) first found in a letter sent to Bishop Lull of Mainz around 765, and later, from Pippin's son onwards, the kings began to formulaically emphasise their status as rulers 'in the grace of God'.[7] In this regard, the German medievalist Achim Thomas Hack stresses the wording of the pope's letters to Pippin since Stephen II. He argues that the repeated references to kings being enthroned by divine promise, being blessed by God, and exercising their office 'by God's will', seem to indicate the role of the Pope in advancing the santification of Frankish kingship.[8]

[5] It is traditionally believed that Pippin was anointed by his bishops in 751. See for example M. Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges* (Paris, 1983), p. 69.. But Josef Semmler disputes this, arguing that Pippin was not anointed in 751, and that even in 754 the oil of unction he and his children applied was for baptism rather than coronation. See J. Semmler, *Der Dynastiewechsel von 751 und die fränkische Königssalbung* (Düsseldorf, 2003). Also J. Semmler, 'Zeitgeschichtsschreibung und Hofhistoriographie unter den frühen Karolingern', in J. Laudage (ed.), *Von Fakten und Fiktionen* (Köln, 2003), pp. 135–64.
[6] Angenendt, 'Das geistliche Bündnis der Päpste mit den Karolingern (754–796)', pp. 1–94.
[7] H. Fichtenau, 'Forschungen über Urkundenformeln', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 94 (1986), pp. 285–340.
[8] A. T. Hack, *Codex Carolinus. Päpstliche Epistolographie im 8. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2007), pp. 339–429.

The Carolingian kings were identified as *pastores* even earlier than they claimed to be rulers *gratia dei*. At the Concilium Germanicum of 742, Pippin's brother Carloman was present not so much as a king but as a saviour of Christians' souls, as he declared at the beginning of this council's act,

> In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, I, Carloman, duke and prince of the Franks, in the seven hundred and forty-second year of the Incarnation of Christ and the twenty-first day of April, with the advice of the servants of God and my chief men, have brought together out of fear of Christ the bishops of my realm with their priests into a council or synod... they might give me their advice how the law of God and the service of religion, fallen into decay under former princes, might be reestablished, and how the Christian people might attain salvation for their souls and not perish through the deceit of false priests.[9]

It was perhaps from this moment that the rulers of the Carolingian dynasty were increasingly likened to *pastores* and *lectores* who were responsible for instructing and guiding the faithful within the Frankish realm.[10] These *pastores* ruled over the people entrusted to them by God by way of admonition. In the Scriptures, God as *pastor* entrusts the 'flock' of people to the kings, who rule as *lectores*. King David, for example, took over the shepherding task in representation of Yahweh: '[All the tribes of Israel said to David:] The Lord has said to you, You shall be shepherd of my people Israel, and you shall be prince over Israel' (2 Sam 5:3).[11] Gregory the Great also refined the model of *pastor* and *lector* in the *Regula Pastoralis*, explaining the course of action of

[9] 'Ego Carlomannus dux et princeps Francorum anno ab incarnatione Christi septingentissimo XLII., XI. videlicet kal. maias, cum consilio servorum Dei et obtimatum meorum episcopos, qui in regno meo sunt, cum presbiteris ad concilium et synodum pro timore Christi congregavi... ut mihi consilium dedissent, quomodo lex Dei et aecclesiastica religio recuperetur, que in diebus preteritorum principum dissipata corruit, et qualiter populus Christianus ad salutem animae pervenire possit et per falsos sacerdotes deceptus non pereat.'. In: *Concilium in Austrasia Habitum Q. D. Germanicum*, ed. A. Werminghoff, *MGH Conc. II: 1* (Hannover, 1906), p. 2. English trans. A. C. Murray, *From Roman to Merovingian Gaul. A Reader* (North York, 2008), p. 649.

[10] Cf. M. Suchan, *Mahnen und Regieren. Die Metapher des Hirten im früheren Mittelalter* (Berlin/Boston, 2015), pp. 137–39.

[11] See also the designation of David by the prophet Nathan, which is described as a commission to take over the shepherd ministry (2 Sam 7:5–16; also 1 Chr 17:4–14). Cf. B. Hirt, 'Das Bild des Hirten im Alten und Neuen Testament', in M. Fischer and D. Rothaug (eds), *Das Motiv des Guten Hirten in Theologie, Literatur und Musik* (Tübingen, 2002), pp. 15–49.

pastoral ministers such as bishops in moral terms, but using the concept of *lector* without distinguishing between the sacred and the secular.[12] Through the influence of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries, Gregory's model of pastor and lector, with the *Regulae Pastoralis*, was also widely shared in the Frankish realm.[13] This is the background to Pippin's being called a *lector*: long before he claimed to be '*gratia dei*', Pippin, in his charter issued to the Abbey of Prüm in 762, had invoked the duties and obligations of ruling in accordance with God's will, and stated that it was the priestly king's ministry to discipline the people as entrusted by God.[14] However, although it was the king's duty to instruct the people, he was only one of his 'peers' who shared this responsibility; in addition to the powerful laymen, the king also worked with the higher *ordines* of the priesthood. This idea of the different *ordines* having their own roles prompted Louis the Pious to issue the *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines* in 825, which declared that 'all of you should be our helpers'.[15]

In addition, the biblical and late antique kings/emperors were also used by the Carolingian rulers to construct the nature of their own identity and the Christendom under their rule.[16] Pippin the Short established a parallel between himself and King Solomon.[17] The preface to the *Admonitio generalis*, promulgated by Pippin's son Charlemagne in 789, cites King Josiah as an example of reform in the kingdom:

---

[12] Suchan, *Mahnen und Regieren*, pp. 66–98.
[13] Cf. B. Yorke, 'The Reception of Christianity at the Anglo-Saxon Royal Courts', in R. Gameson (ed.), *St.Augustine and the Conversion of England* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 152–73; L. E. von Padberg, *Christianisierung im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2006), pp. 35–41; B. Yorke, 'Anglo-Saxon Gentes and Regna', in H.-W. Goetz, J. Jarnut, and W. Pohl (eds), *Regna and gentes. The relationship between late antique and early medieval peoples and kingdoms in the transformation of the Roman world* (Leiden/Boston, 2003), pp. 381–407.
[14] Cf. S. Airlie, *Power and Its Problems in Carolingian Europe* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 123–24.
[15] 'omnes vos nostriadiutores esse debetis'. In: *Admonitio ad Omnes Regni Ordines (825)*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. 1* (Hannover, 1883), p. 303. This title was added by the modern editor, see G. Olivier, 'Une "ordinatio" méconnue: le capitulaire de 823–825', in P. Godman and C. Roger (eds), *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious* (Oxford, 1990), p. 457.
[16] Cf. C. B. Bouchard, 'Images of the Merovingians and Carolingians', *History Compass* 4 (2006), pp. 293–307.
[17] H. Schade, 'Studien zu der Karolingischen Bilderbibel aus St. Paul vor den Mauern in Rom', *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch* (1960), pp. 15–19.

> In the Books of the Kingdoms we read how St Josiah sought to call the kingdom given to him by God back to the worship of the true God by travelling, correcting and teaching - not that I want to be like his holiness, but because we need to follow the example of the saints everywhere and all the time and it is necessary to rally whoever we can around us in zeal for a good life to the praise and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.[18]

Charlemagne himself was known at court by the nickname (King) David. As demonstrated by many mirrors of prince, this is not merely a nickname, but evokes a positive image of Christian kingship; when Pope Hadrian I referred to Charlemagne as 'the new Constantine', it recalls that Constantine not only formally recognised Christianity but also convened the First Council of Nicaea, an important step towards establishing the orthodox faith.[19] Another point is that after Pippin's accession to the throne, the comparison of the Franks to the chosen people, the people of Israel, appeared not only in the Frankish realm, but also in the Papacy.[20]

After the promulgation of the *Admonitio generalis* in 789, the above ideas were increasingly explicitly reflected in the governance of the Carolingian rulers. The view that Charlemagne shouldered the responsibility of the salvation of the community of *populus christianus* was particularly clear in Alcuin's letters of the late 790s. In 796 Alcuin wrote to Charlemagne referring to Carolingian territory inhabited by the *populus christianus* as *Christianitatis regnum*,[21] and then in 798 calling it *imperium*

[18] 'Nam legimus in regnorum libris, quomodo sanctus Iosias regnum sibi a deo datum circumeundo, corrigendo, ammonendo ad cultum veri dei studuit revocare, non ut me eius sanctitate aequiperabilem faciam, sed quod nobis sunt ubique sanctorum semper exempla sequenda, et quoscumque poterimus, ad studium bonae vitae in laudem et in gloriam domini nostri Iesu Christi congregare necesse est.' In: 'Admonitio Generalis', pp. 183–85.
[19] Cf. J. Emerick, 'Charlemagne: A New Constantine?', in M. S. Bjornlie (ed.), *The Life and Legacy of Constantine* (London, 2016), pp. 145–73.
[20] The Frankish self-identification with the Israelites will be discussed in Section 5.3.1 of this thesis.
[21] 'Gloria et laus deo Patri et domino nostro Iesu Christo, quia in gratia sancti Spiritus — per devotionem et ministerium sanctae fidei et bonae voluntatis vestrae — christianitatis regnum atque agnitionem veri Dei dilatavit, et plurimos longe lateque populos ab erroribus impietatis in viam veritatis deduxit. [...]. Tuam tamen, o veritatis et salutis multorum amator, optimam voluntatem maiore gloria et laude Christo remunerare placuit. Gentes

christianum.[22] And in the realm, Charlemagne and his court sought to correct various neglects. In the texts that historians have taken to calling *capitularia*, which contain numerous normative *capitula* (entries) such as directives and admonitions, the issues requiring *correctio* can be found enumerated one by one. The aim of the *correctio* was not to reform or introduce new thoughts, but to return Christians to their right kind, an idea that fits exactly with the aforementioned notion of the ruler as *pastor*.[23]

Having established its divine legitimacy through the use of biblical discourse, the kingship sought the *unitas* (unity) of the Carolingian polity as an ecclesia. The widespread use of writing played an important role in this process. Although many peoples speaking different languages coexisted within the vast Frankish realm, texts of all kinds, including laws, capitularies, letters, acts of synods, histories, theological writings, poems, epitaphs, and so on, were mainly written in Latin. Most of the writers were clergymen and monks, and the Charlemagne court also required them to learn 'proper' Latin in order to understand the doctrine correctly through 'infallible' texts. They compiled 'correct' manuscripts with orthodox knowledge and, where appropriate, combined multiple texts into codices for use throughout the realm.[24] Such a principle appears explicitly in, for example, Article 70 of the *Admonitio generalis* of 789:

> You should properly correct psalms, writings, chants, chronology, grammar in each monastery or bishop's house and in the Catholic books, because some, while they

---

populosque Hunorum, antiqua feritate et fortitudine formidabiles, tuis suo honori militantibus subdidit sceptris; praevenienteque gratia colla diu superbissima sacrae fidei iugo devinxit et caecis ab antiquo tempore mentibus lumen veritatis infudit.' In Alcuin of York, *Alcuini Epistolae*, no. 110, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. 4* (Berlin, 1895), p. 157.

[22] 'quatenus per vestram prosperitatem christianum tueatur imperium'. In: *Alcuini Epistolae*, no. 177, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. 4* (Berlin, 1895), p. 292.

[23] Cf. J. R. Davis, *Charlemagne's Practice of Empire* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 294–98, 312–13.

[24] J. Fleckenstein, *Die Bildungsreform Karls des Grossen als Verwirklichung der Norma Rectitudinis* (Bigge-Ruhr, 1953), pp. 7–23.

> want to pray well to God, often pray badly from books that have not been corrected. And do not allow your boys to spoil the books by reading them aloud or copying them. And when the task is to write a Gospel book, a Psalter and a missal, let men of full age write with all diligence.[25]

The ideas and intentions of Charlemagne's reform were carried out to some extent at the local level through the transmission of the various genres of texts mentioned above by all levels of the sacerdotal and the secular *ordines*.[26] This is largely confirmed by research on the inventory of parish priests' possessions and the production, circulation and use of codices of their books, sermon collections and other documents.[27]

In such a context, for the *populus christianus* living on the Frankish realm, the source from Rome was truly authoritative. Most bishops of the ninth century traced the history of their dioceses back to the Roman past and thus saw themselves as successors to the Roman apostles and the texts from the Holy See as credible.[28] But the practice of holding Rome as orthodox was not limited to texts. The sources emphasise the introduction of Roman ceremonies into the Frankish realm during the late eighth

[25] 'Psalmos, notas, cantus, compotum, grammaticam per singula monasteria vel episcopia et libros catholicos bene emendate, quia sepe dum bene aliqui deum rogare cupiunt, sed per inemendatos libros male rogant. Et pueros vestros non sinite eos vel legendo vel scribendo corrumpere. Et si opus est evangelium, psalterium et missale scribere, perfectae aetatis homines scribant cum omni diligentia'. In: 'Admonitio Generalis', pp. 224–45.
[26] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms*, pp. 206–09. J. L. Nelson had doubts as to whether these measures made a substantial difference to the Frankish realm. See Nelson, 'On the Limits of the Carolingian Renaissance', pp. 51–69. But she later seems to have revised her views. See J. L. Nelson, 'Revisiting the Carolingian Renaissance', in H. Reimitz and J. Kreiner (eds), *Motions of Late Antiquity: Essays on Religion, Politics, and Society in Honour of Peter Brown* (Turnhout, 2016), pp. 331–46.
[27] C. I. Hammer, 'Country Churches, Clerical Inventories and the Carolingian Renaissance in Bavaria', *Church History* 49 (1980), pp. 5–17; C. van Rhijn, 'Manuscripts for Local Priests and the Carolingian Reforms', in S. Patzold and C. v. Rhijn (eds), *Men in the Middle: Local Priests in Early Medieval Europe* (Berlin, 2016), pp. 177–98; Keefe, *Water and the Word*.
[28] T. Bauer, *Lotharingien als historischer Raum. Raumbildung und Raumbewußtsein im Mittelalter* (Köln, 1997), pp. 347–76.

century under the leadership of the king. The diocese of Metz, for example, modelled its liturgical organisation on that of Rome.[29]

In general, during the Carolingian period, the Frankish realm constructed itself as a polity that self-identified as an *ecclesia*. In this construct, Rome, the sanctification of its own kingship by the Carolingian royalty, and the practice of writing all played an important role. And it was also the way in which the Carolingian polity was shaped that made itself fundamentally more a regime framed by a political imaginary that relied on Christian ideas at its core. Yet is this form of polity, ideologically based in Heaven rather than on Earth, and largely temporal rather than spatial, really immune to shocks from earthly political disruptions and spatial changes? This chapter aims to explore this issue.

5.2 Einhard

5.2.1 Imagery of Rome

At the end of the chapter on *Augustus* in *The Twelve Caesars*, Suetonius recounts the will of Augustus, who left two-thirds of his property to the future emperor Tiberius, the remaining third to his own wife, and only bits and pieces to his hometown, his soldiers and every citizen of the city of Rome.[30] More than seven hundred years later, Einhard, an imitator of Suetonius' writing, also concluded his book with the will of the new Augustus, Charlemagne, who sent three quarters of all his property to the twenty-one

[29] Cf. M. A. Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004).
[30] 'Heredes instituit primos: Tiberium ex parte dimidia et sextante, Liviam ex parte tertia... Legavit populo R. quadringenties, tribubus tricies quinquies sestertium, praetorianis militibus singula milia nummorum, cohortibus urbanis quingenos, legionaris trecenos nummos'. In Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, p. 306.

metropolitan cities of the empire, including Rome, to be stored in the 'bank of heaven' of the Church, leaving the rest to his numerous children and court servants.[31] Matthew Innes proposes that Charlemagne's practice was a kind of gift exchange mediated by the Church: Charlemagne commissioned his heirs to give a portion of his vast inheritance to the Church for charity, in return for which the emperor's soul would enjoy well-being in eternity.[32] But perhaps we could go further and argue that the difference in the distribution of legacies between Charlemagne and Augustus implies some kind of shift in the ideological foundations of the empires they ruled, probably as a result of the temporalisation brought about by the Christianisation of the polity. The Frankish realm, as an ecclesiastical polity founded on the timelessness of Christian sanctity in the political imagination, was gradually built up through its links with Rome and the Papacy.[33] The *Vita Karoli* of Einhard provides side evidence in this regard: of the thirteen times it mentions *ecclesia* and its declensions, nine relate to the Roman Church. Einhard's hint, therefore, is that to explore the temporalisation of the Frankish realm through its construction as a grand *ecclesia*, it is first necessary to examine how Charlemagne continued his father's strategy of constructing the Carolingian polity as an *ecclesia* through resorting to Roman resources.

[31] '...omnem substantiam atque suppellectilem suam...primo quidem trina divisione partitus est. Deinde easdem partes subdividendo de duabus partibus XX et unam partem fecit, tertiam integram reservavit. Et duarum quidem partium in XX et unam partem facta divisio tali ratione consistit, ut, quia in regno illius metropolitanae civitates XX et una esse noscuntur...Unius autem partis, quam integram reservari voluit, talis est ratio...eadem pars quattuor subdivisionibus secaretur, et una quidem earum supradictis XX et unae partibus adderetur, altera a filiis ac filiabus suis filiisque ac filiabus filiorum suorum adsumpta iusta et rationabili inter eos partitione divideretur, tertia vero consueto Christianis more in usum pauperum fuisset erogata, quarta simili modo nomine eleimosinae in servorum et ancillarum usibus palatii famulantium sustentationem distributa veniret.' In Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 78, 80.
[32] M. Innes, 'Charlemagne's Will: Piety, Politics and the Imperial Succession', *The English Historical Review* 112 (1997), pp. 833–55.
[33] On the sanctification and authorisation of the Pope and the Papacy over themselves, cf. R. McKitterick, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy* (Cambridge, 2020).

One of the most visible symbolic signs of Charlemagne's active engagement with the Holy See after his accession was the use of the title *patricius Romanorum*. It was originally a title of honour in Roman imperial times and had been conferred on the Merovingian kings since at least the end of the sixth century, although it was first given to the Carolingians by the pope in the mid-eighth century. Pippin's sons and, it seems, Pippin himself were honoured with this title.[34] When he succeeded his father in 768, Charlemagne also did not immediately use the title until six years later when he conquered the Lombard kingdom, which was a threat to the papacy, calling himself *rex Langobardorum* (king of the Lombards) and attempting to further strengthen his ties with the Papacy for his own rule. The earliest documentary evidence known at present comes from a cartulary recording Charlemagne's grant of land to St-Denis in late 774 or early 775. By 776, Charlemagne was using this title fairly frequently until it was replaced by *Augustus* and *Imperator Romanum* in 800.[35]

Besides his symbolic declarations, Charlemagne was also active in the practice of the sacred politics constructed by the popes, the most direct manifestation of which was his two campaigns to rescue the pope from danger in Italy in 774 and 799, which led to his reaffirmation of the title of *patricius* and to the conferral of the titles of *Augustus* and

[34]On Pippin's sons: 'benedictus es, eximie fili...et tuos amantissimos natos meosque spiritales filios, domnum Carolum et Carolomannum, a Deo institutos reges Francorum et patritios Romanorum.' In: *Codex Carolinus*, No. 11, ed. W. Gundlach, *MGH Epp. 3* (Berlin, 1892), p. 505. On Pippin: 'temporibus felicissimi atque tranquillissimi et catholici Pippini regis Francorum et patricii Romanorum, fili beatae memoriae quondam Caroli principis.' In: *De unctione Pippini regis nota monachi sancti Dionysii*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS xv: 1* (Hannover, 1887), p. 1. The *De unctione Pippini regis* was produced by an anonymous author who claimed to have written it in 767. But the authenticity of this source has now been questioned by a number of historians. Cf. F. C. W. Goosmann, 'Memorable Crises: Carolingian Historiography and the Making of Pippin's Reign, 750–900' (PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2013), pp. 196–98; R. McKitterick, 'The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals', *The English Historical Review* 115 (2000), pp. 1–20; R. McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 137–42.

[35] F. L. Ganshof, 'Note sur les origines byzantines du titre "Patricius Romanorum"', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10 (1950), pp. 261–82. For the change in Charlemagne's titles, see McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, p. 116.

Imperator Romanum respectively.[36] In his *Vita Karoli*, Einhard also implied that Charlemagne launched his military campaign in the service of the Church, even though he had not been requested to do so by the pope. In his account of Charlemagne's war against the Beneventans in 787, for example, Einhard emphasised that it was via Rome that Charlemagne led his army into the city of Capua, where he demanded the Beneventans' surrender. At the end of the same war, Charlemagne 'returned to Rome and spent a few days visiting holy places before coming back to Gaul'.[37] Such references to Rome before and after the war are clearly purposeful, in order to suggest the close connection between this military activity and the Papacy, in that they both contributed to the construction of a 'Holy Roman Empire'. As Einhard wrote, when the duke of Benevento decided to submit to Charlemagne on the condition that he would not appear before the king in person, Charlemagne, with magnanimity, agreed because 'the king [was] more concerned with the souls (*animi*) of the Beneventan *gens* than with the stubbornness of the duke'.[38] Thus, Charlemagne in the *Vita Karoli* is portrayed as a Christian king fighting for the construction of Christendom.

5.2.2 Charlemagne as a writing novice[39]

In addition to borrowing Roman imagery, biblical elements were an important resource through which Einhard evoked the Frankish imagery of a divine ruler who ruled over a Christian community.

[36] For the reconfirmation of the title *patricius* by Stephen II, see 'Stephanus II', pp. 440–62. Leo III crowned Charlemagne as *Augustus* and *imperator Romanum*, see Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 497.
[37] 'Romam redit, consumptisque ibi in sanctorum veneratione locorum aliquot diebus in Galliam revertitur.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 24; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 22.
[38] 'Rex, utilitate gentis magis quam animi eius obstinatione considerata.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 60; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 32.
[39] I am grateful to Professor Li Longguo of Peking University in China for inspiring me in this section.

In the *Vita Karoli*, Einhard painted a vivid picture of Charlemagne's later years, and among the many episodes, Charlemagne's learning to write is particularly impressive. In Chapter 25, Einhard wrote,

> He [Charlemagne] also attempted to [learn how to] write and, for this reason, used to place wax-tablets and notebooks under the pillows on his bed, so that, if he had any free time, he might accustom his hand to forming letters. But his effort came too late in life and achieved little success.[40]

The rise of the New Cultural History has led historians to try to read more into this passage, among which Paul Dutton's views are representative.[41] He argues that, based on Einhard's account here, we can probably establish that Charlemagne did not have the ability to write, although he was fluent in speech and oral communication in Old German, Latin and even Greek.[42] However, Dutton goes on to point out that Charlemagne would not have needed to be able to write, since he had so many courtiers at his service. A vivid example of this is that when Charlemagne received a letter, if this letter-writer was a very close courtier of his, such as Alcuin or Leidrad, Bishop of Lyons, then these writers would suggest in the text with whom Charlemagne should read the letter (the one Alcuin trusted most was Einhard). Following this line of thought, Dutton comes to his conclusion that it was Charlemagne's pursuit of Christian ideals and the reforms he led that brought a group of *litterati* together in his court to serve him, which made it less urgent for Charlemagne to learn to write himself. Consequently, Charlemagne's attempts, which began in 800 and lasted fourteen years until his death, ended in failure. In other words, it is Charlemagne's failure that illustrates his greatness.

---

[40] 'Temptabat et scribere tabulasque et codicellos ad hoc in lecto sub cervicalibus circumferre solebat, ut, cum vacuum tempus esset, manum litteris effigiendis adsuesceret, sed parum successit labor praeposterus ac sero inchoatus.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 60.
[41] P. E. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Mustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York, 2004), pp. 69–92.
[42] 'Nec patrio tantum sermone contentus, etiam peregrinis linguis ediscendis operam impendit. In quibus Latinam ita didicit, ut aeque illa ac patria lingua orare sit solitus, Grecam vero melius intellegere quam pronuntiare poterat. In Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 58.

Interestingly, Dutton argues that in addition to the factor of lack of urgency, Charlemagne's greatness itself prevented him from successfully learning to write. As a great man, his pride forced him to shy away from learning in public and instead to ponder alone in his bedroom, which severely limited his time and efficiency in this endeavour.

Dutton's view puts Einhard's account into the context of the times and is therefore quite illuminating. Yet there is still one point worth making in the explanatory framework he constructs: and this is also the problem encountered when explaining Einhard's description of Charlemagne's secular relatives as trouble-makers in Section 4.2.2 of this study. The general tone of the *Vita Karoli* is admittedly a celebration of Charlemagne, so is it not paradoxically a disservice to Charlemagne's greatness that, according to Dutton, Einhard's Charlemagne was still unable to write after fourteen years of learning? Why then did Einhard even include this episode in his *Vita Karoli*? The paradox can only be more conspicuous considering that Einhard also emphasised Charlemagne's studiousness by stressing that he persisted in his learning even at his bedside.

Is there a possibility of another explanation? Einhard does not tell us when Charlemagne began to learn to write, nor does he specify what texts he used to practice writing. Fortunately, however, Thegan's *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, written in 836–7, gives us some hints. In Chapter 7, entitled *What the Emperor Charles Did in His last Days, and His Death and Burial*, he wrote,

> After they [Charlemagne and Louis] had taken their leave, the emperor did nothing but spend his time praying and giving alms and correcting books; the four Gospels of Christ, titled after the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, he corrected to

> the best of his ability with the help of Greeks and Syrians until the very end before his death.[43]

Janet Nelson considers this account of Thegan to be not necessarily true, but certainly consistent with the context. She finds that Hildebald, who administered the last rites to Charlemagne and was also his *familiarissimus* and arch-chaplain, knew the story of Bede the Venerable's deathbed translation of the Gospel of John, which may have been the prototype for Thegan's story about Charlemagne's reading of the Gospels.[44]

Nelson's argument is persuasive. To say that Thegan's account fits the context of the time means not only that it matches the point in time when Charlemagne was close to his deathbed, but also that it conforms to Charlemagne's personality. Many sources point to Charlemagne's preference for texts related to the Bible. A codex dating from around 780 was found in 1719 in St Maximin in Trier and contains Wigbod's commentary on the Octateuch. The scribe who produced this codex left his own dedication, which clearly states that it was made at the behest of Charlemagne and for the king's own use.[45] As well as for his own use, some of the codices produced at Charlemagne's behest were given by him to courtiers and bishops, who were required by Charlemagne to use them.[46] Einhard also says in his *Vita Karoli* that Charlemagne's favourites are Augustine's works, especially the *De Civitate Dei*.[47] Thus, if what Einhard and Thegan describe about Charlemagne's later years engaging in writing points to the same thing, then we might assume that Charlemagne, at least in the textual

[43] '[VII.] Postquam divisi fuerant, domnus imperator nihil aliud cepit agere nisi in orationibus et elemosinis vacare et libros corrigere; et quattuor evangelia Christi, que praetitulantur nomine Mathei, Marci, Luce et Iohannis, in ultimo ante obitus sui diem cum Grecis et Siris optime correxerat.' In: Thegan, *Gesta Hludovici Imperatoris*, pp. 184–87. The translation here is my own.
[44] Nelson, *King and Emperor*, pp. 481–82.
[45] 'Carolus rex Francorum et Longobardorum ac patricius Romanorum hunc codicem ad opus suum scribere iussit.' In *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Poetae 3* (Berlin, 1881), p. 95.
[46] S. Shimahara, 'Charlemagne, premier souverain chrétien commanditaire d'exégèse biblique?' in R. Grosse and M. Sot (eds), *Charlemagne: les temps, les espaces, les hommes* (Turnhout, 2018), pp. 101–07.
[47] 'Legebantur ei historiae et antiquorum res gestae.' In Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 56.

narrative, did not learn to write until his deathbed, and that the texts he wrote were biblically relevant.

Einhard's portrayal of Charlemagne's activities in his later years also suggests that Charlemagne may not have begun learning to write as early as Dutton estimates. According to Einhard, Charlemagne, after parting from Louis the Pious, hunted until November 813, when he returned to Aachen for the winter.[48] This was a total of just over three months before the 28th of January 814, the date of his death. It was therefore probably during these last three months of his life that Charlemagne really learned to write. Only then can we understand why Einhard said that Charlemagne started too late and always kept wax-tablets and notebooks under his pillow. It was to cherish time, as either Charlemagne felt that his life was ending or Einhard knew with hindsight that Charlemagne only had three months left.

The question that immediately follows is why Charlemagne, or at least the Charlemagne of Einhard, tried to write out biblically relevant texts on his deathbed. The answer may be closely related to Charlemagne's self-identification or the perception of his contemporaries as Charlemagne's identity. In many cases, historians are confused about a particular sentence because they have cut it out of the text and examined it in isolation, whereas once they return to the original context, it may become clear. With this in mind, it seems necessary to take a holistic view of Chapter 25 of the *Vita Karoli* and even its adjoining chapters. The full text of Chapter 25 and the beginning of Chapter 26 read as follows:

[48] 'Dimisso deinde in Aquitaniam filio, ipse more solito, quamvis senectute confectus, non longe a regia Aquensi venatum proficiscitur, exactoque in huiuscemodi negotio quod reliquum erat autumni, circa Kalendas Novembris Aquasgrani revertitur' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 70.

> [25] [Charles] was a gifted and ready speaker, able to express clearly whatever he wished to say. Not being content with knowing only his own native tongue [German], he also made an effort to learn foreign languages. Among those, he learned Latin so well, that he spoke it as well as he did his own native language, but he was able to understand Greek better than he could speak it. Indeed, he was such a fluent speaker, that [at times] he actually seemed verbose. He avidly pursued the liberal arts and greatly honored those teachers whom he deeply respected. To learn grammar, he followed [the teaching of] Peter of Pisa, an aged deacon. For the other disciplines, he took as his teacher Alcuin of Britain, also known as Albinus, who was a deacon as well, but from the Saxon people. He was the most learned man in the entire world. [Charles] invested a great deal of time and effort studying rhetoric, dialectic, and particularly astronomy with him. He learned the art of calculation [arithmetic] and with deep purpose and great curiosity investigated the movement of the stars. He also attempted to [learn how to] write and, for this reason, used to place wax-tablets and notebooks under the pillows on his bed, so that, if he had any free time, he might accustom his hand to forming letters. But his effort came too late in life and achieved little success.
>
> [26] With great piety and devotion [Charles] followed the Christian religion, in which he had been reared from infancy...[49]

It may be noted that in Chapter 25 Einhard first remarked on Charlemagne's fluency in languages, while writing is mentioned at the end, very far apart from each other. Why are these two, which seem to us to be closely linked, arranged by Einhard at each end? A closer look at Einhard's description of Charlemagne's subjects of study shows that there is a carefully orchestrated sequence here. Having said that Charlemagne was fluent in his native language (a version of Old German), Einhard then added two foreign languages, Latin and Greek, to the list of languages that Charlemagne's tongue and ears

[49] '[25] Erat eloquentia copiosus et exuberans poteratque quicquid vellet apertissime exprimere. Nec patrio tantum sermone contentus, etiam peregrinis linguis ediscendis operam impendit. In quibus Latinam ita didicit, ut aeque illa ac patria lingua orare sit solitus, Grecam vero melius intellegere quam pronuntiare poterat. Adeo quidem facundus erat, ut etiam dicaculus appareret. Artes liberales studiosissime coluit, earumque doctores plurimum veneratus magnis adficiebat honoribus. In discenda grammatica Petrum Pisanum diaconem senem audivit, in ceteris disciplinis Albinum cognomento Alcoinum, item diaconem, de Brittania Saxonici generis hominem, virum undecumque doctissimum, praeceptorem habuit, apud quem et rethoricae et dialecticae, praecipue tamen astronomiae ediscendae plurimum et temporis et laboris inpertivit. Discebat artem conputandi et intentione sagaci siderum cursum curiosissime rimabatur. Temptabat et scribere tabulasque et codicellos ad hoc in lecto sub cervicalibus circumferre solebat, ut, cum vacuum tempus esset, manum litteris effigiendis adsuesceret, sed parum successit labor praeposterus ac sero inchoatus. [26] Religionem Christianam, qua ab infantia fuerat inbutus, sanctissime et cum summa pietate coluit...' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, pp. 58–61; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 32.

could master. Once he described what Charlemagne could do with his senses, Einhard went on to talk about the liberal arts, which required the king to use his mind to learn. And Charlemagne's study of the liberal arts has a gradual progression in Einhard's writing, starting with grammar, rhetoric and logic on earth and then moving to the heavens, that is, astronomy and calculations about observing the movement of the stars. Only last of all was writing. In such a logical sequence, writing, especially the writing of biblically relevant texts, would be considered the most sublime as the final stage of Charlemagne's learning activity.

In Charlemagne's or Einhard's view, the learning of writing should be placed after the acquisition of the liberal arts, because writing was about the sacred knowledge of the Bible, and was therefore considered to be a subject closely related to the liberal arts and yet more exalted and sacred than them. In other words, the liberal arts were the basis for learning to write biblical knowledge, the necessary path between the mundane and the sacred. The religious sanctity of the writing is also revealed in Einhard's subsequent lines: the opening phrase of Chapter 26, which immediately follows the end of Chapter 25 on Charlemagne's writing, is 'Religionem Christianam (Christian religion)', and the whole of Chapter 26 is a portrayal of Charlemagne's devotion to the Christian faith.

Thus, as Rosamond McKitterick points out, in Charlemagne's period writing not only served an important political function as an instrument of royal administration and jurisdiction, but also, by virtue of its particular symbolic and historical power, became a necessary tool for the construction of a political ideology with a Christian dimension.[50] In the *Vita Karoli*, Charlemagne's learning of writing suggests that at the

[50] McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 319–20.

end of his life he maintained the quest for sanctity that was expected of him as the ruler of the *ecclesia*. Considering his exhortation to *sacerdotes* in the *Admonitio generalis*, mentioned in the Introduction to this Part, 'if the task is to write a Gospel book, a Psalter and a missal, let men of full age write with all diligence',[51] Charlemagne in the *Vita Karoli* evidently places himself in the *ordo* of *sacerdotes*, and therefore has sufficient sanctity and sublimity to engage in writing.

As for Charlemagne's final failure, if this is not historically true, it is most likely that Einhard is suggesting that since 813, when Louis the Pious was installed as co-emperor and the old emperor's own time was coming to an end, more and more obviously, Charlemagne was unable to uphold the *res publica* that aimed to promote the worship of God, or the Frankish *ecclesia* as a Christian community. The rulership shifted from Charlemagne to Louis the Pious.[52]

5.2.3 Exegesis and the divine ruler

Charlemagne's attempts to write biblically relevant texts on his deathbed imbued him with sacredness, and similarly, scriptural elements were used by Einhard to portray Charlemagne as the supra-temporally divinely inspired ruler of Christendom. The first approach is biblical exegesis. In the framework of early medieval exegesis, what was in the Bible was considered not only a precursor to what was to come, but also a determinant of what was to follow: the prior existence not only gave rise to the forms

[51] 'si opus est evangelium, psalterium et missale scribere, perfectae aetatis homines scribant cum omni diligentia'. In: 'Admonitio Generalis', p. 224.
[52] For a discussion of Einhard's demonstration of Charlemagne's increasing inability to defend the *res publica* in his later years, see Section 3.2.2 of the of this study.

that followed, but also determined how they should be interpreted.[53] Through such a prefigurative construction, the past, present and future, separated by time, are integrally absorbed into timelessness, thus constructing a Christian community of supra-temporality, with Charlemagne as its ruler.[54]

Specifically, Einhard can be seen to emulate the Scriptures in his writings. He, referring to the time of Charlemagne's death, wrote, 'he died in the seventy-second year of his life and in the forty-seventh year of his reign, at nine o'clock in the morning on 28 January'.[55] The expression for the time of the monarch's reign is absent from the *De vita Caesarum*. For instance, in the chapter on Augustus, which Einhard imitated the most, Suetonius, stating the time of Augustus' death, wrote, 'he died...in the consulship of two Sextuses, Pompeius and Appuleius, on the fourteenth day before the Kalends of September at the ninth hour, just thirty-five days before his seventy-sixth birthday'.[56] Einhard's formulation actually comes from the Bible, where when a king died, it was common to count the time of his reign to indicate a change of rulership. In *1 Kings*, for example, 'the days that Jeroboam reigned, were two and twenty years: and he slept with his fathers: and Nadab his son reigned in his stead'; and in *2 Samuel*, 'the number of the days that David abode, reigning in Hebron over the house of Juda, was seven years and six months'.

[53] For some practical examples of exegesis in the first half of the ninth century, see M. de Jong, 'Exegesis for an Empress', in E. Cohen and M. d. Jong (eds), *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 69–100; M. de Jong, 'The Empire as Ecclesia', pp. 191–226.
[54] On biblical exegesis and its development and evolution, see J. H. Hayes and C. R. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook* (Louisville/London, 2007). For a general discussion of the application of biblical knowledge in the early Middle Ages, see McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World*, pp. 218–64.
[55] 'Decessit, anno aetatis suae septuagesimo secundo et ex quo regnare coeperat quadragesimo septimo, V. Kalendas Februarii, hora diei tertia.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 29; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.
[56] 'Obiit...duobus Sextis, Pompeio et Appuleio, cons. XIIII. Kal. Septemb. hora diei nona, septuagesimo et sexto aetatis anno, diebus V et XXX minus.' In: Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, pp. 302–03.

Biblical numerology is also employed to sanctify Charlemagne, most notably through the use of the number seven. The number seven represents 'completion' in the Judeo-Christian religion, and its symbolism is heavily applied in the Bible.[57] The Gospel of John, for example, merely records seven miracles performed by Jesus and his seven conversations with people, without being written out in full.[58] The purpose of listing exactly seven of each of these miracles and dialogues is to convey the meaning of completion, for as far as the seven miracles are concerned, none of the other five is recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, except for the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand and the walking on water, the other five being added for the clear purpose of making up the number seven. Furthermore, Jesus used the seven 'I am' (*ego sum*) to declare his identity;[59] the book of *Revelation* is addressed to the seven churches of Asia, which are called 'seven lampstands' and their angels are called 'seven stars' (Revelation 1: 11; 20). All this emphasis on the number seven is intended to highlight the significance of 'completion' and 'perfection'. This sensitivity to the number seven was inherited by the Franks of the Carolingian world. Dhuoda, for example, devoted a separate section of her *Liber Manualis*, entitled 'How to compute with the number seven', to educating her son on how to derive other numbers with good connotations through various operations based on the number seven.[60]

[57] M. G. Easton, *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (New York, 2005), pp. 616–17.
[58] The seven miracles are: turning water into wine (2: 1–11); healing the son of the ruler at Capernaum (4: 46–54); healing the infirm man at the pool of Probatica (5: 2–18); feeding five thousand people (6: 1–15); walking on water (6: 16–21); healing the man born blind (9: 1–41); raising Lazarus (11: 1–46). The seven dialogues are about: Man needs to be reborn (3: 1–21); Jesus is the fountain of life (4: 4–42); Christ is the Son of God (5: 16–47); Jesus is the bread of life (6: 22–59); Believers will receive the life–giving Spirit (7: 25–44); Jesus is the light of the world (8: 12–30); Jesus is the Good Shepherd (10: 1–21).
[59] They are 'I am the bread of life' (Jphn 6: 35); 'I am the light of the world' (John 8: 12); 'I am the door' (John 10: 9); 'I am the good shepherd' (John 10: 11); 'I am the resurrection and the life' (John 11: 25–26); 'I am the way and the truth and the life' (John 14: 6); 'I am the vine' (John 15:5).
[60] 'De septem compoti partibus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 184–89.

In the *Vita Karoli*, Einhard likewise used the ‘‘biblical seven’’ to suggest Charlemagne’s sanctity and perfection in order to indirectly justify the Christendom he established in his interactions with the Roman Papacy. First of all Charlemagne had a perfect body: ‘it is known that his height was seven times the length of his own foot’.[61] Secondly, the possession of a perfect soul and a complete life was also manifested in the deathbed of this ruler: ‘on the seventh day after taking to his bed, he died after receiving Holy Communion.’[62] Most importantly, the reign of this Christian king, who devoted his life to establishing Christendom, was also perfect and complete. To convey this, Einhard placed the Christian calendar, which embodies sanctity, alongside the classical calendar, which enables the number seven to appear, and purposefully obscured Charlemagne’s age in order to make the number seven stand out, with the final line reading: ‘he died in his seventies, in the seventh indiction, on the twenty-eighth day of January, in the year of the Lord 814’.[63] Furthermore, Einhard depicted a vision that appeared in the sky just before Charlemagne’s death: ‘for three straight years near the end of his life there were frequent eclipses of the sun and moon and a dark mark was seen on [the face of] the sun for a space of seven days’.[64] This vision, which contains the number seven and appeared before his demise, also has a biblical parallel. In Revelation, the seven-year period between the time of Christ’s future appearance in the air and his Second Advent will be marked by the Great Tribulation. These unprecedented worldwide catastrophes will be unleashed by the Lamb unveiling the Seven Seals (Revelation 6: 9–17), the seven angels sounding the trumpet (Revelation 8: 2–13; 9: 1–21) and the angels pouring

[61] ‘Septem suorum pedum proceritatem eius constat habuisse mensuram.’ In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 50; Dutton, *Charlemagne’s Courtier*, p. 29.
[62] ‘Septimo, postquam decubuit, die, sacra communione percepta, decessit.’ In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 70; Dutton, *Charlemagne’s Courtier*, p. 35.
[63] ‘Decessit septuagenarius anno domini DCCCXIIII, indictione VII, V. Kal. Febr.’ In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 72; Dutton, *Charlemagne’s Courtier*, p. 36.
[64] ‘Per tres continuos vitaeque termino proximos annos et solis et lunae creberrima defectio et in sole macula quaedam atri coloris septem dierum spatio visa.’ In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 74; Dutton, *Charlemagne’s Courtier*, p. 36.

out the seven vials (Revelation 16: 1–21). Thus, Einhard's imitation of Scripture in his depiction of Charlemagne's death evidently imbues the king with a certain sanctity, thereby constructing the status of Charlemagne as head of the earthly Church and the Christian sanctity of the Carolingian regime as *ecclesia*, respectively.

5.2.4 Harbingers of discord

In his *Vita Karoli* Einhard endeavoured to paint a political picture of a divine ruler over a united and harmonious community of *ecclesia*. Yet the background and intent of this lay author's writing dictate that his lines reveal the reality of the situation in which he was writing: internal strife was already looming in the Carolingian realm under the rule of Louis the Pious. Einhard's emphasis on the divine rule of Charlemagne may have been intended to highlight the legitimacy of Louis the Pious by depicting the transfer of rulership from the old ruler to the new, while at the same time revealing how the realm, or the *ecclesia*, under the Charlemagne was able to maintain internal harmony, so as to admonish the Frankish nobility under Louis the Pious on how to behave correctly. Put another way, in Einhard's view, the Frankish *ecclesia* under Charlemagne must have kept spiritual harmony, which is evidenced by his narrative.

In his account of the war against the Lombards, Einhard drew an interesting contrast between Charlemagne and his father Pippin. He began by describing the internal disagreement among the Franks over the plight of Pippin, who had gone to defend the Papacy in response to Pope Stephen II's call and therefore with a spiritual purpose,[65]

[65] 'Rogatu et precibus Hadriani Romanae urbis episcopi exoratus bellum contra Langobardos suscepit. Quod prius quidem et a patre eius, Stephano papa supplicante, cum magna difficultate susceptum est; quia quidam e primoribus Francorum, cum quibus consultare solebat, adeo voluntati eius renisi sunt, ut se regem deserturos domumque redituros libera voce proclamarent.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 12; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 19.

> [Charles] took up war against the Lombards. Hadrian [I], the bishop of the city of Rome, [had] asked and appealed to him to do this. Indeed, his father had previously taken up this war at the request of Pope Stephen [II], [but] with great trouble, since some of the chief Franks, whom he regularly consulted, were so opposed to his plan that they openly stated that they would abandon the king and return home.

In contrast, when depicting Charlemagne's departure for Italy at the request of Pope Hadrian I, also with a spiritual purpose, Einhard, with a neat twist, wrote,

> But, although [Charles] and his father seem to have had a similar or, rather, identical reason for taking up this war, all agree that the effort expended [in them] and the conclusion [of the two conflicts] were different.[66]

Although Einhard did not directly state here the unity of the Franks in spiritual matters under Charlemagne, it is evident that he was making this point implicitly by contrasting it with the previous situation. The fact that the Franks did not retreat from the harsh geographical conditions they encountered in Italy and that they eventually completed their conquest of the Lombards, which he described immediately after, further underlines how much the Frankish community, united in their struggle for divine purposes, was able to achieve at that time.[67]

Another piece of evidence comes from Einhard's account of the sources of legitimacy at the time of the succession of the various Carolingian rulers. In describing Pippin, he mentioned only the source of sanctity,

---

[66] 'Sed licet sibi et patri belli suscipiendi similis ac potius eadem causa subesse videretur, haud simili tamen et labore certatum et fine constat esse conpletum.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 12; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 19. Translation slightly adjusted.
[67] Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, pp. 39–40.

> Pippin, who had been mayor of the palace, was established as king by the decision of the Roman pope.[68]

Yet by the time of Pippin's death and the succession of his sons Charles and Carloman, the full consent of the Franks was added,

> [Pippin] was survived by two sons, Charles and Carloman, and upon them, by divine will, fell the succession of the kingdom. Indeed, the Franks at a general assembly solemnly established both of them as their kings.[69]

Nevertheless, the Franks' agreement was on the condition that Charles and Carloman should share equally the territory of the realm, and the Franks themselves split into two factions and struggled against each other. The unity and harmony of the Franks as a whole under divine providence was forged during the reign of Charlemagne alone. In his later years, when Charlemagne crowned his son Louis the Pious, Einhard wrote,[70]

> At the very end of his life... [Charles] summoned his son Louis [the Pious]... to come to him. When all the leading Franks from the entire kingdom had solemnly assembled and had given their opinion, he established Louis as the co-ruler of the entire kingdom and the heir to the imperial title... This decision of his was widely approved by all who were present, for it seemed to have been divinely inspired in him for the general good of the kingdom.

---

[68] 'Pippinus autem per auctoritatem Romani pontificis ex praefecto palatii rex constitutus.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 6; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 18. In contrast to the *Vita Karoli*, the Continuations of the *Chronicle of Fredegar* and the *Clausula de unctione Pippini*, written in the early Carolingian dynasty, both mention the coronation of Pippin with the unanimous consent of the Franks. Rosamond McKitterick, however, argues that both sources have selected, manipulated and even falsified facts for their own purposes. See McKitterick, 'The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals'. Likewise, then, Einhard may have done so for different motives.

[69] 'Superstitibus liberis Karlo et Karlomanno, ad quos successio regni divino nutu pervenerat. Franci siquidem facto sollemniter generali conventu ambos sibi reges constituunt.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 8; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 18.

[70] 'Extremo vitae tempore... evocatum ad se Hludowicum filium... congregatis sollemniter de toto regno Francorum primoribus, cunctorum consilio consortem sibi totius regni et imperialis nominis heredem constituit.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 70; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 35.

Admittedly, some Franks under Charlemagne also attempted to rebel. But Einhard attributed this to the cruelty of the queen Fastrada, while Charlemagne 'passed his whole life with the highest love and esteem of everyone'.[71]

5.2.5 Conclusion

Section 5.2 suggests that the *Vita Karoli* is not so secular for its imitation of classical works, as used to be commonly believed, nor does it contrast so sharply with another work by the same author, the *Translatio et miracula ss. Marcellini et Petri*. Instead, it can be argued that Einhard planted many sacred elements in his texts as a way to serve the purpose for which he wrote.

Firstly, Einhard's subtle use of words in his narrative of Charlemagne's two rescues of the Pope from danger portrays the emperor as a Christian ruler fighting for the building of Christendom. Secondly, in his portrayal of Charlemagne as a learner of writing, Einhard made the emperor's devotion to the Christian faith impressive through sophisticated plotting. Finally, biblical exegesis and numerology are also used to construct Charlemagne's proximity to the divine. All three of these points serve to emphasise Charlemagne's position as leader of the Church on earth and of the Carolingian regime. But at the same time this reflects the fact that in Einhard's thinking the Carolingian polity was essentially equated with the *ecclesia*, and the nature of the *ecclesia* as a temporal institution was therefore shared by the Carolingian polity. In the

[71] 'Per omne vitae suae tempus ita cum summo omnium amore atque favore et domi.' In: Sot and Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard*, p. 50; Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, p. 30.

Vita Karoli, the Carolingian *regnum* emerges as a temporal empire internally harmonious and united under the effective leadership of Charlemagne.

However, Einhard's intention in writing was not simply to praise the splendour of Charlemagne's governance. Instead, he sought to promote the legitimacy of Louis the Pious's succession against the backdrop of the Carolingian Empire on the brink of civil strife, and to exhort the Frankish nobility to remain united under the new ruler. Yet the harbinger of discord eventually became a reality. How would the Frankish nobles perceive the *ecclesia* in the new historical context? This is what we will subsequently observe in Dhuoda and Nithard.

5.3 Dhuoda

5.3.1 Historiography on the 'New Israel' and the Franks

If the Franks living in the Carolingian realm saw their regime as somehow a temporal entity, then they necessarily needed an ideological glue to establish it in their perceptions. The 'New Israel' identity was a possible option, because through this concept the Franks would be able to link themselves to the biblical Israel in the eternal time exclusive to the saved, thus completing the construction of their own sense of community. However, whether the Frankish 'ideological, social and/or emotional factors' that constitute 'identification, belonging or integration', i.e., the 'visions of community',[72] were present in the 'New Israel' based identity is still a matter of debate today. The traditional view often tends to affirm this presence. In his study of the rites

[72] A. Gingrich and C. Lutter, 'Visions of Community: An Introduction', *History and Anthropology* 26 (2015), p. 2.

of *laudes regiae*, Ernst Kantorowicz claims that since Pippin the Short, the first king of the Carolingian regime, the Franks acquired 'the political as well as religious self-esteem and self-reliance', viewing themselves as 'the new people chosen by God' and seeing their history as 'the continuators of Israel's exploits'.[73] John Wallace-Hadrill suggests that the early Carolingian accounts of the exploits of Charles Martel, the founder of the dynasty, consciously portrayed the Franks as the new chosen people.[74] Janet Nelson similarly argues that Pippin's anointing ceremony in 751 revealed the identity of the Franks as the 'new Israel'.[75]

In recent decades, however, a different opinion has emerged, questioning the earlier view. Mary Garrison argues that the ideology of 'divine election' (the idea that God chose the Frankish people, entered into a 'covenant' with them, and granted them privileges and favours) did not exist in the second half of the eighth century.[76] Mayke de Jong tends to agree with Garrison, suggesting that the biblical scholars of the early ninth century regarded the regime in which they lived as less Israel than *ecclesia*, which triumphantly replaced Judaism as the old Truth and the old Law, and was thus a critical development of Israel.[77] Conor O'Brien's recent study advances the critique of the 'New Israel topos' tradition of early medieval studies by stressing that the Latin world after the Roman Empire used discourses related to the chosen people not to express, as scholars have traditionally believed, the possession of divine identity and charism by

[73] E. H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1946), p. 56.
[74] J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1971), p. 99.
[75] Nelson, *The Frankish World*, p. 409.
[76] M. Garrison, 'The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61.
[77] de Jong, 'Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity', pp. 119–21.

particular communities (Franks, Anglo-Saxons, Visigoths, etc.), but rather their participation in the universal Christian Church and its history.[78]

These revisionist historians challenge and critique the fixed thinking that the Franks saw their regime as New Israel and are significant in suggesting a more cautious approach to the New Israel topos as well as a rethinking of the sources involved. However, their arguments are likewise debatable. Garrison emphasises the strict distinction between the corpus of the Old Testament in early medieval sources and the genealogy of the idea of 'divine election' in modern politics. In contrast to the latter, which has its intellectual origins in the Calvinist 'Covenant Theology' of the Reformation and which has been repeatedly used in modern history for radical political mobilisation or national myth-making, the former lacks a systematic political theology and should be understood only as a series of context-specific cases of discourse. But as some reviewers have pointed out, Garrison's deconstruction of the proposition of the 'Franks as the New Israel' does not help to explain the persistent and intense presence of Israelite and Old Testament elements in Carolingian ideology, not to mention that Garrison's strict definition of the idea of 'divine election' even runs the risk of anachronism.[79] De Jong seems to encounter a similar problem, for while she makes a distinction between Israel and *ecclesia*, she does not systematically explain the intrinsic relationship between the two. This is particularly striking when considering that in her book, *The Penitential State*, she devotes an entire section to the intense presence of Israelite metaphors in various sources during the reign of Louis the Pious.[80] As for

[78] C. O'Brien, 'Chosen Peoples and New Israels in the Early Medieval West', *Speculum* 95 (2020), pp. 987–1009.
[79] Thomas F. X. Noble [review], 'Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (eds), *The Uses of the past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000)', *Speculum* 77 (2002), pp. 1307–09. Also Cf. T. F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2011), pp. 233–34.
[80] Cf. de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 114–18.

O'Brien, based on his reflections on the current wave of anti-globalisation and ethnic politics, he highlights the ecclesiological and inclusive nature of the early medieval discourse of the chosen people and denies its ethnicity and exclusivity. Yet the two sets of dichotomies he proposes may not be the best fit for the early medieval context. As Walter Pohl's and Patrick Geary's studies have shown, unlike modern views of ethnicity, ethnic identity in late antique and early medieval Europe was a mixture of history, lineage, faith, law and other elements that were highly malleable and fluid, and often dependent on the specific political context of the time, which means that, in certain contexts, religious identity may have formed the core of ethnic exclusivity.[81]

Consequently, although the traditional view of the Franks as holding a 'New Israel' self-identity in Carolingian times has been challenged, this does not mean that the concept of Israel is irrelevant to the visions of community constructed around *ecclesia* in this period. Rather, the research of revisionist historians has confirmed the important role that a range of discourses around Israel played in the construction of the Carolingian community, and especially in the way that particular scriptural texts associated with this concept were appropriated and interpreted in different contexts. Dhuoda, as a noblewoman who lived in the Carolingian realm during the mid-ninth century and was deeply involved in high political struggles, also participated in the construction of this discourse, but while maintaining commonalities with her predecessors, she left her own distinctive mark of her time.

[81] W. Pohl, 'Disputed Identifications: Jews and the Use of Biblical Models in the Barbarian Kingdoms', in Y. Hen and T. F. X. Noble (eds), *Barbarians and Jews: Jews and Judaism in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2018), pp. 11–28; P. J. Geary, 'Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages', in E. Peters (ed.), *Folk Life in the Middle Ages* (Richmond, 1991), pp. 1–17.

5.3.2 Dhuoda and her particular exegesis of Israel

The use of Israel as a conceptual tool to construct national identity was not new to Carolingian writers. For example, Theodulf of Orléans, a distinguished scholar at Charlemagne's court, refers to 'us' (i.e., the Carolingian Church) as 'spiritual Israel' in his book the *Libri Carolini*, written at Charlemagne's behest to refute the conclusions of the Byzantine Second Council of Nicaea (787).[82]

Similarly, in her *Handbook*, Dhuoda made several references to Israel and implied that the Carolingian Church was the descendant of Israel. Dhuoda claimed, for example, that, 'we believe that... not only the Gentile nations are to be saved but also the generations of Israel... Following the commands of the holy patriarchs to their offspring...'[83] Dhuoda might be echoing here the conversion and salvation of the Jews recorded in *Romans 11.25, 26* ('...blindness in part has happened in Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in. And so all Israel should be saved, as it is written: There shall come out of Sion, he that shall deliver, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.') Yet it may also be that Dhuoda was inspired by the story of the conversion of the Jews in *De fide catholica contra Iudaeos* by Isidore of Seville, which was very influential in the Carolingian world. In this book, Isidore wrote, 'Israel has experienced a hardening in part until the full number of the gentiles has come in.'[84] In any case, however, Dhuoda referred to the converted Israel as 'the holy patriarchs' and to the Carolingian Christians represented by her son as 'their offspring', thus creating a

[82] 'nos, qui spiritalis Israel sumus...' In: 'Opus Caroli regis contra synodum', in A. Freeman and P. Meyvaert (eds), *MGH Conc. 2, Suppl. 1* (Hannover, 1998), p. 183. Cf. C. O'Brien, 'Empire, Ethnic Election and Exegesis in the Opus Caroli (Libri Carolini)', *Studies in Church History* 54 (2018), p. 103.
[83] 'credimus... non solum nationes, sed etiam Israelitarum saluandae sunt generationes... Secundum ammonitionem sanctorum Patrum in prole'. In Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 214–15.
[84] 'Donec plenitudo gentium introeat, et sic omnis Israel salvus fiat.' In: Isidore of Seville, *De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento contra Iudaeos ad Florentinam sororem*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina 83* (Paris, 1862), p. 508. On the influence of *De fide catholica contra Iudaeos*, see M. Neuman, 'Carolingian Monastic Writers and the Ninth-Century Jewish Question', *The American Benedictine Review* 42 (1991), p. 260.

spiritual bond between the two that transcends space and is forged in the eternal time of salvation.

In addition to direct references to Israel, Dhuoda also reinforced the impression of her contemporary Franks as Israel's successors through indirect appropriation. In Book 4, she admonished, 'the precepts of the Old Testament teach us that we must bear the names of the twelve Patriarchs inscribed on our foreheads'.[85] These words are an adaptation of the Book of Deuteronomy, where Moses, as the leader of Israel, in his capacity as God's spokesman, gave an admonition to the Israelite people who were about to enter the Promised Land: 'Hear, O Israel... thou shalt bind them as a sign on thy hand, and they shall be and shall move between thy eyes' (Deuteronomy 6.4, 8); 'Lay up these my words in your hearts and minds, and hang them for a sign on your hands, and place them between your eyes' (Deuteronomy 11.18). Through this adaptation, replacing the subject of the admonition from the people of Israel with the contemporary Franks, Dhuoda subtly established a spiritual bond between the two.

Yet in addition to using Israel as a conceptual tool for constructing the Carolingian community, as her predecessors did, Dhuoda also incorporated the particularities of her time into the scenes and expressions in which she appropriated Israel, above all in her references to Israel that focus on her discourse on the treatments of fathers, lords and brothers.

The first is how to treat fathers. Dhuoda warned that how fathers were treated was the criterion for earthly blessings and ultimate salvation. It is only by loving and obeying

[85] 'scriptum est secundum admonitionem ueteris Testamenti, duodecim nomina patriarcharum ante frontem scripta portare deberi praecipitur.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 128–29, 214–15.

fathers that God 'will bless you with blessings', 'multiply your name like the stars in the sky, and you shall be blessed, and furthermore you shall bear the name of Israel'.[86] In other words, only those who were loved and obeyed their fathers were eligible to be included into the Carolingian *ecclesia* as successors to Israel. In addition to this direct reference to Israel, Dhuoda also reminded the *populus christianus*, who formed the Carolingian *ecclesia*, once again of the correct attitude to be taken towards their fathers by using the command of the Levites to Israel in Deuteronomy 27.16:[87]

> And what shall I say about the others? They run great risks. Let those who commit that evil act incur the consequences. This is not a malediction on my part but a warning from Scripture which contains a terrible threat mingled with a curse: 'Cursed is the one who does not honor his father'.

Beyond constructing the community of Carolingian *ecclesia* by appropriating the admonition to Israel, Dhuoda left her readers with a sense of her distinctive apprehension of her time and *ecclesia*. For example, also on the subject of the treatment of fathers, Dhuoda quoted God's warning to Israel through Moses:[88]

> And again, 'Whoever has cursed the father who has begotten him will die a pointless and wretched death'. And if this is to be the punishment for a heavy, hurtful word, what do you think will happen to those who inflict injury on their parents, striking at the hearts of their fathers? (*Leviticus 20.9*)

[86] 'Benedicens benedicam tibi, et uelut stellas coeli multiplicabo nomen tuum erisque benedictus et insuper Israel uocaberis.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 90–91.
[87] 'Et quid dicam de pluribus? Periculosum est ualde; illi sustineant qui hoc opus patrantur malum. Non me maledicente, sed Scriptura pollicente, qui terribiliter minans cum maledictione, dicens: Maledictus qui non honorificat patrem suum.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 84–85.
[88] 'Et iterum: Qui maledixerit patri generanti se, inuili et turpi moriatur morte. Et si de graui uel inutili sermone ita, quid putas illis eueniet qui iniuriam irrogant parentibus ut patrum suorum affligant animos?' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 84–85.

What, then, was the behaviour of 'inflict[ing] injury on their parents, striking at the hearts of their fathers'? Dhuoda explained in the following lines,[89]

> It is said that there are many in these times who are borne along in such a crime, people who do not consider the past and regard the present as unjust. On them, and on others who act as they do, fall envy, spite, destruction and misfortune, together with everything that inflames hatred against them.

Dhuoda's formulation here, in fact, adapted the portrayal in Genesis 37.8 of the internal contradictions and divisions of the patriarchs of the twelve tribes of Israel (i.e., the persecution of Joseph by his brothers), with the twelve tribes of Israel alluding to their successor, the Carolingian *ecclesia*, as implied in Dhuoda's repeated admonitions (e.g., 'we ought to bear the names of the twelve patriarchs in our hands and on our foreheads').[90] Thus, along the line of Dhuoda's view of Israel as the patriarch of Carolingian *ecclesia*, her allusion to the infighting of the twelve tribes of Israel may be expressing a concern that, in the fratricidal strife of the sons of Louis the Pious, the Carolingian *ecclesia* was heading towards dissolution, which would be a great dishonour to the late king.

The second is how to treat lords. Dhuoda believed that the core of proper service to lords was the ability to give correct advice to them, and that the proper service to lords would greatly contribute to the construction of the Carolingian *ecclesia*. To illustrate this point, she invoked the example of Exodus 32.14, where Moses gave correct advice to God which led to the survival of Israel, writing that, 'For his sake, the Lord refrained

[89] 'Multi sunt, ut dicunt, qui praesenti in saeculo tali uoluuntur scelere, non considerantes praeterita gesta, pro nefas tenentes praesentiam. Cadit super tales uel illos qui ita agunt similes zelus, liuor, clades et calamitas, necnon et fomitis inuidiae suae.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 84–87.
[90] 'nomina XII patriarcharum in manibus scripta tenere et in frontibus debere iubetur portari.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 130–31.

from inflicting harm on his people, as he had threatened'.[91] In another place, Dhuoda stated this principle of service to the lord directly,[92]

> Scripture says, 'Evil abounds and charity is grown cold among many.' In these turbulent times, a man doesn't know whom to choose as counselor, or someone he can trust above all. For many people the hope of finding help from any one remains dim. Read the *Synonyms*. But all the same, do not despair on that account, my son. There are still, among the descendants of our elders, several people who with God's help are good at and capable of giving advice, which I believe is useful, appreciated, and pertinent to them and their lords.

It is noteworthy that Dhuoda placed the exhortation here in a very distinctly bleak context. The exhortation begins with a quotation from Matthew 24.12, whose context is that the Israelite people were about to be divided and plunged into civil strife because of the disputes of faith: 'nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom', 'and then shall many be scandalized: and shall betray one another: and shall hate one another' (24.7, 10). Thus, once again, Dhuoda, in appropriating the history of Israel in order to articulate the principles of the construction of *ecclesia*, expressed her concern that the Carolingian community was heading towards division.

Finally, Dhuoda considered how to treat brothers. The brotherhood that Dhuoda addressed in her *Handbook* is primarily spiritual, not temporal, as she demonstrated by citing Ecclesiasticus 35.11 and Isaiah 58.7, 'the brotherly condition (*fraterna conditio*)' manifested itself in the form of the flesh, which, however, would eventually return to

[91] 'Placatus pro ipso est Dominus de malignitate quam dixit populo facere suo.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 146–47.
[92] 'Ait enim Scriptura: Abundat iniquitas et inter multos refrigescit karitas. In hac uolutione nescit homo quem eligat consiliatorem aut cui primum debeat credere, spemque utilitati in ullo comitti incertum manet a pluribus. Lege Sinonima. At tamen nec in hoc difidendum est, fili: sunt plures ex prioribus orti qui adhuc, auxiliante Deo, sibi et senioribus utile et acceptum congruumque possunt et ualent, ut credo, dare consilium.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 100–01.

dust, but only the spirit made it established.[93] Having defined the nature of brotherhood, Dhuoda again appropriated Moses' admonition to Israel in *Deuteronomy 10.19* to remind her readers how to complete the construction of the Carolingian *ecclesia*:[94]

> Read the law of Moses admonishing the sons of Israel to exercise brotherly compassion. He urged them strongly, saying, 'Remember that you too were strangers and pilgrims in the land of Egypt'.

In Dhuoda's view, empathy for spiritual brothers rested on the renunciation of the covetousness of possessions. Only by valuing the duties and responsibilities of being a brother in *ecclesia* over worldly possessions could the whole *ecclesia* remain harmonious and united. But if the case of being heartless, rich and wilfully ignorant brotherhood arose, what could be the cause of this? In her analysis of this issue, Dhuoda once again showed her concern about the division of the Carolingian *ecclesia*, for she claimed that some 'kings, princes, and to bishops and other prelates who lead a wicked dishonorable life' should be blamed for this, since they were not only unable to be just themselves, but they also failed to fulfil their ministry of correcting others.[95] It was in this double failure that they held divine offices but failed to conduct the divine cult, eventually wreaking havoc on the *ecclesia* by detaching themselves from it.

---

[93] 'Carnem hic fraternam conditionem designat, ex qua nos cum omnibus originem trahimus... Karo namque a cadendo nomen accepit, ea vero tenore rationis mensura, licet cadat, licet resurgat, tam pauper quam diues, omnes per finem, in puluerem reuertentur... Fraterna etenim compassione...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 162.
[94] 'Lege Mosaicae admonitionis Israeli filios ad compassionem satiari fraternam; ualde eos ortabatur, dicens: Mementote quoniam et uos ipsi aduenae et peregrini fuistis in terra Aegipti.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 150–51.
[95] 'Sic et in regibus et in ducibus, sic etiam et in episcopis atque in ceteris praelatis qui male et nequiter uiuentes, semetipsos, propter iniustitias suas, non solum nequiter perdunt, uerum etiam aliis consentientes in praecipiciis ruere faciunt.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 154.

5.3.3 Conclusion

Section 5.3 argues that Dhuoda also saw the Carolingian polity as *ecclesia* in the new historical context of the outbreak of the fratricide, but her perception of it changed subtly. This becomes even more evident when the *Liber Manualis* is examined with the methodology of *Begriffsgeschichte*.

Like many Carolingian writers, Dhuoda used Israel as a conceptual tool to express her views and participated in the construction of the Carolingian *ecclesia*. What makes her distinctive is that, because of the particular circumstances of her time, Dhuoda also implied her concern about the division and disharmony of the *ecclesia* in her adaptation of scripture, as in her discussions of the treatments of fathers, lords and brothers discussed above. It is worth noting, however, that Dhuoda also alluded to her concern when directly discussing *ecclesia* and the priests who played an important role in it. Dhuoda began by explaining to William that as God's chosen adjutors (*adiutores*) and votaries (*cultores*), priests were divinely endowed with peculiar graces: 'they are the peculiar heralds of God's word to us'[96] and 'peculiar to God'.[97] Dhuoda claimed that, 'with the help of priests and ministers of God's holy church',[98] William was able to join the army in the service of God, 'together with your comrades-in-arms in temporary service', forming a community, 'fighting together and not separately' for the eternal kingdom.[99] But it was in the midst of this high acknowledgement of the role played by priests in forging Christian community that Dhuoda shifted her ground, revealing a concern for division among the priests: 'if they vary in their manners, don't censure

[96] 'Ipsi sunt peculiares uerbum nobis adnuntiantes Dei.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 120–21. The translation has been slightly modified.
[97] 'Absculta eos quos Deo conspexeris peculiares.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, p. 122.
[98] 'cum sacerdotibus et ministros sanctae Dei Ecclesiae.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 124–25.
[99] 'inter comilitones temporaliter seruientium...non sequestrate sed pluraliter militando...' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 124–25. The translation has been slightly modified.

them'.[100] She explained with exegesis that John 14.2 mentioned that there were many mansions in the house of God, 'and so, even among priests there are comparable differences'.[101] Dhuoda's admonition here, especially her construction of the image of the many mansions in God's house, is reminiscent of the divisions that occurred in the various episcopal groups at the time over their support for the different Carolingians.

This section therefore argues that, in Dhuoda's view, the Carolingian *regnum* was on the verge of fragmentation, although she still saw it in general terms as a temporal empire. Paradoxically, however, a temporal rather than spatial body politic was by its very nature indivisible. In other words, the fratricidal disputes of the first half of the ninth century caused serious confusion in the minds of (at least some of) the Frankish lay aristocracy, represented by Dhuoda, which fundamentally undermined their belief that the Carolingian polity carried eternity in temporality.

5.4 Nithard

5.4.1 Koselleck and the historiography on medieval spatiality

Drawing on Nithard's *Historiae*, this section will discuss why, before and after the crisis following the death of Louis the Pious, people perceived the essentially temporal *ecclesia* differently, perceptions that were already revealed in the respective analyses of Einhard's and Dhuoda's texts in the previous two sections. In other words, this section will focus on what elements of reality were interacting with the perceived temporal entity within the conceptual framework of *ecclesia*.

[100] 'Quod si diuersi sunt in moribus.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 124–25.
[101] 'Sic etiam et in sacerdotibus talis dissimilis agitur ordo.' In: Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, pp. 122–23.

In fact, Koselleck has long offered insight on this subject. In explaining the so-called Saddle Period between 1750 and 1850, he suggested that this was the period when numerous concepts achieved their temporalisation, and that one of the factors that inspired this process was the change of spatiality in reality or in perception. Using the example of 'utopia', he pointed out that in the second half of the eighteenth century, when most of the major regions of the earth had been explored and a wave of secularisation had taken hold, 'if utopia was no longer to be discovered or established on our present-day earth nor in the divine world beyond, it had to be shifted into the future.'[102] Another example is the concept of 'revolution', where Koselleck argued that the successful 'rebellion' of the thirteen colonies in North America against their sovereign power led to a perceptual change in contemporaneous conceptions of geographical spatiality. This sense of change allowed the original legal connotation of the concept of 'rebellion' to be ideologised into a political one, with a temporalisation of the quest for a freer future being generated. The conceptual transformation of 'rebellion' triggered a chain of shifts in the sense of rights within the 'Atlantic space', which, when transmitted to France, pushed the concept of 'revolution' from referring to the recurring movement of celestial bodies in space or the natural cycles of various polities to an irreversible progress or change, planned and accelerated by people, that led to a better future than people had ever experienced before.[103]

[102] Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History*, p. 86.
[103] N. Bulst et al., 'Revolution, Rebellion, Aufruhr, Bürgerkrieg', in O. Brunner, W. Conze, and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 5* (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 653–788; Koselleck, *Futures Past*, pp. 43–57. For the response of Francophone historiography to the *Begriffsgeschichte* of German-speaking historians, see A. Rey, *Révolution. Histoire d'un mot* (Paris, 1989).

The linkage of spatial and temporal elements in certain concepts identified by Koselleck is very illuminating. However, given that the concepts he investigated all have a supposed tendency towards temporalisation, it is further worth asking whether concepts such as *ecclesia*, which were already highly temporalised, also linked up with spatial changes in reality or perception, and whether such a linkage manifested itself in the form of different perceptions of *ecclesia*?

On the other hand, medievalists began to approach the Middle Ages from a spatial perspective as early as the rise of the New History in the early twentieth century.[104] In the last thirty years of historiography, interest in medieval spatial issues has broadly focused on three areas.[105] First, the analysis of territory or territoriality in political or institutional history, aiming to examine the territorial pattern and spatial domination of certain authorities, such as kings, seigneurs and cities.[106] This is an area in which the territorialisation of power becomes an important issue. In Roman law, a territorial area was a defined space with definite boundaries, generally under the control of an authority. In the Middle Ages, there was a process of annihilation and rebirth in the representation of such territories, which is at the centre of the study of territorialisation.[107] Some scholars also emphasise the plurality of medieval territories and explore their evolution and interactions.[108] Second, the study of settlement patterns and land occupation. After

[104] K. Pomian, 'L'heure des "Annales": La Terre – les hommes – le monde', in P. Nora (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1997), pp. 903–52.
[105] J. P. Devroey and M. Lauwers, 'L'"espace" des historiens médiévistes: quelques remarques en guise de conclusion', in T. Lienhard (ed.), *Construction de l'espace au Moyen Âge: Pratiques et représentations* (Paris, 2007), pp. 439–42.
[106] For example: B. Guenée, 'Des limites féodales aux frontières politiques', in P. Nora (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1997), pp. 1103–21; M. Lauwers and L. Ripart, 'Représentation et gestion de l'espace dans l'Occident médiéval (Ve–XIIIe siècle)', in J. P. Genet (ed.), *Rome et l'état moderne européen* (Rome, 2007), pp. 97–114; G. Duby, 'La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise', in G. Duby (ed.), *Qu'est-ce que la société féodale?* (Paris, 2011), pp. 536–97.
[107] For example: J.-M. Poisson, 'De la villa au castrum: l'habitat rural dans la châtellenie dauphinoise d'Albon, de la fin de l'Antiquité au XIIe siècle', in L. Feller, P. Mane, and F. Piponnier (eds), *Le village médiéval et son environnement* (Paris, 1998), pp. 571–86; A. Taylor, *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124–1290* (Oxford, 2016).
[108] Cf. Wickham, *Medieval Europe*.

the 1980s, historians focused on the break in medieval settlement patterns: from dispersion to group living, from relative mobility to settlement. This discussion often revolves around the concept of *encellulement*, derived from the famous Italian *incastellamento*.[109] Third, the study of spatial imagination or representation, which has its direct roots in the French *histoire des mentalité*. Its central concern is how medieval people perceived or imagined space. In this regard, the concept of 'polarisation', introduced by Alain Guerreau in 1996, has become the core idea of many studies.[110] Guerreau and some other historians are also concerned with issues such as how space was expressed in the Middle Ages.[111]

In this context of the so-called 'spatial turn', the study of early medieval history has also come to use space as a lens. In the collective volume edited by Cécile Treffort entitled *Le Cimetière au village dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne*, for example, the contributors examine the transformation of the Roman Empire into the Middle Ages by surveying the changing relationship between space and Christianity.[112] Florian Mazel proposes that the early medieval dioceses did not inherit their organisational structure from the Roman Empire, but rather underwent a process of territorialisation as early as the tenth century. This territorialised ecclesiastical organisation became the model for later secular polity.[113] Dominique Iogna-Prat demonstrates the debt of modern secular society to the medieval church from another perspective: the distinctive spatial world

[109] For a comparative discussion of the pair of concepts *incastellamento* and *encellulement*, see C. Wickham, *The Mountains and the City: The Tuscan Appennines in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1986), pp. xxiii–xxvi. For a critique of the concept of *encellulement*, see K. Leyser, 'The Ascent of Latin Europe', in K. Leyser and T. Reuter (eds), *Communications and Power in the Middle Ages* (London, 1994), p. 219.
[110] A. Guerreau, 'Quelques caractères spécifiques de l'espace féodal européen', in N. Bulst, R. Descimon, and A. Guerreau (eds), *L'État ou le Roi. Les fondations de la modernité monarchique en France* (Paris, 1996), pp. 85–101.
[111] A. Guerreau, 'Le champ sémantique de l'espace dans la vita de saint Maieul (Cluny, début du XIe siècle)', *Journal des Savants* 2 (1997), pp. 363–419.
[112] Cf. C. Treffort, *Le cimetière au village dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne* (Toulouse, 2015).
[113] F. Mazel, *L'évêque et le territoire: l'invention médiévale de l'espace* (Paris, 2016).

of material-based spiritualisation in the vision of the Carolingian church underwent a 'transfer of sacrality' in the 12th-17th centuries, thus passing its ethos in some way to modernity.[114]

In general, historians agree that in the Middle Ages, the construction of religious, lordly and national spaces of power underwent, by and large, a process of territorialisation in which power overcame its personal character and shifted from being strongly interpersonal to being grounded in a specific territory. In this process, conceptual awareness and memory-imagination played a major role, such as the perception of the forms of church organisation and the memory and imagination of the king as a superior adjudicator; but material factors such as modes of production and life, including land reclamation and the formation of settled villages, must not be overlooked. Political and social acts were also involved, such as the (academically controversial) feudal revolution of the eleventh century and the *Besitzergreifung durch Umschreiten* (seizure by circumambulation) of the kings from the twelfth century onwards.[115]

However, it seems evident that when discussing spatiality, medievalists have traditionally taken a diachronic perspective, examining the development of spatial representations throughout the medieval period, and paying less attention to the synchronic impact of the spatial perceptions as agent on other elements of thinking, including temporal representations. Similarly, while historians have paid attention to *ecclesia*, which played an important role in the process of territorialisation of power, their investigation into whether people's representations of the highly temporal concept

[114] D. Iogna-Prat, *Cité de Dieu, cité des hommes: L'Église et l'architecture de la société. 1200–1500* (Paris, 2016).
[115] H. C. Peyer, 'Das Reisekönigtum des Mittelalters', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 51 (1964), pp. 1–21.

of *ecclesia* were influenced by real or perceived changes in spatiality still seems not to have been asked from the perspective of Koselleck's *Begriffsgeschichte*. This section will therefore attempt to make use of Nithard's *Historiae* for a discussion on this subject.

5.4.2 Temporal Frankish identity and biblical discourse

The key theoretical resources used by the Franks to identify themselves were the two semantic clusters of *gens* and *populus* that surround the concept of *ecclesia*, the meanings of which are defined by the discursive patterns constructed by the Bible and the Fathers and inherited in Nithard's *Historiae*.

Patrick J. Geary argues that the Bible contains 'two models of peoples'. One model, found in Genesis and Exodus, focuses on explaining how humanity diverged from its initial unity into diverse communities. In Hebrew, this sense of people is generally referred to by the term *goyim*, which can be understood as being of a biogenetic nature. Membership of the *goyim* is considered to be objective and immutable, so that the *goyim* belong to an 'eternal natural world'.[116] The Vulgate Bible mostly uses the word *gens* to translate *goyim*.[117] Therefore, *gens* itself does not necessarily refer to pagans. In fact, as far as I can observe and count, of the 53 occurrences of the word *gens* in the Vulgate Bible, it also contains the expression such as *gens Israel*.[118] As the discourse developed, a number of new versions of the interpretation of the origin of *gens* emerged. 'One frequently held theory proposed that the different *gentes* descended from the three sons of Noah, with Shem's descendants receiving Asia, Ham's Africa, and Japheth's Europe.

[116] Geary, *The Myth of Nations*, pp. 52–53.
[117] Cf. *Genesis* 10:32, 22:18, 25:23, 26:4, 35:11, 48:19; *Exodus* 9:24, 19:6, 34:24.
[118] *Judith* 6:2: 'Quoniam prophetasti nobis dicens, quod gens Israel defendatur a Deo suo, ut ostendam tibi quoniam non est Deus, nisi Nabuchodonosor.'

A further theory postulated that there were a total of 72 races, paralleling the 72 apostles sent out by Jesus according to Chapter 10 of the Gospel of Luke in the Vulgate version.'[119] As can be seen, when *gens* is used to refer to people in an aggregate sense, much emphasis is placed on their racially reproductive characteristics, although related genealogical examinations also refer to cultural elements such as common language, customs and traditions. It can be argued that such a model of people constitutes the descriptive narrative part of the Christian discourse system.

Another model of people in the Bible is found in Deuteronomy, Wisdom, and so on, where the Hebrew reference is *am* and is often translated as *populus* in the Vulgate Bible. According to Geary, this model of people is linked to the covenant with God, and the resulting fellowship of faith belongs not to the 'natural world' but to the 'historical world'.[120] It can be argued that it forms the normative evaluative part of the Christian discourse system. Accordingly, the statement that the Israelites were God's specially chosen 'people (*populus*)' is not a declaration of their ethnographic superiority, but rather an emphasis on the example they set for all future generations of Christian believers through their conversion. My observations and statistics show that *populus* and *populi* occur 547 and 386 times respectively, and their usage is roughly of two kinds: first, they refer specifically to Israelites or Jews, mostly in the Old Testament;[121] the second is a general reference to Christians, mostly found in the New Testament. These two uses express the sense that the Israelites were the precursors and demonstrators of conversion to God, and that if other peoples followed the example of the Israelites, a

[119] R. Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31 (2001), p. 45.
[120] Geary, *The Myth of Nations*, p. 53.
[121] Cf. Exodus 1:9, 33:1, 33:5, 36:3; Deuteronomy 4:20, 4:27.

universal Christendom would emerge. In contrast, those who are outside the Christian fellowship are foreigners and pagans who are still mired in worldly life.

Therefore, two oppositions can be found if a comparative analysis is made of the above-mentioned models of peoples in the Bible. One opposition exists between the special and the universal. As a descriptive term, the original ethnic community to which *gens* refers is special, with a different lineage of descent and a wide range of languages, customs and traditions; but as a normative term, the people of God, to which *populus* refers, represents a sacred communion of faith across ethnic boundaries, and is therefore a universal identity. Another opposition exists between the sacred and the earthly. In Augustine's words, the *populus*, in its normative sense, tends towards the 'city of God' in its value orientation, while the natural blood-territorial community described by *gens* remains obsessed with the 'earthly city' and is therefore the object to be saved or converted.

Gens and *populus*, as well as the concept of *ecclesia* that encompasses these two elements, also play a key role in the construction of Frankish identity in Nithard's *Historiae*. For example, Nithard referred to the pagan Saxons as a *gens* and warned that they would 'invade the kingdom to revenge themselves and root out the Christian religion in the area.'[122] Moreover, through his depictions of the wars, it is not difficult to perceive Nithard's different attitudes towards the civil war between the *populus* and the battle against the *gens*. The armed conflict between the Charles-Louis allies and the Lothar-Pippin allies at Fontenoy on 25 June 841 was the culmination of the fratricidal struggle that followed the death of Louis the Pious. Nithard's narrative does not show

[122] 'gens...regnumque sibi vindicaturi invaderent, et christianam religionem his in partibus annullarent'. In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 130, 134.

any joy at the outcome of the victory of his side and the defeat of his enemy. On the contrary, his words reveal the respect, even faint sorrow, that his side has for the enemy:

> After Mass on Sunday they buried friends and enemies alike, the faithful and the faithless, and with equal sincerity comforted as best they could those felled by blows and only half-alive... After that the kings and their followers in their grief over their brother and the Christian people (*frater populusque christianus*) began to ask the bishops what they should do in this situation.[123]

In contrast, Nithard showed no compassion at all in his account of Franks' suppression of the uprising of the Stellinga, the free and semi-free Saxon peasants who had defected from Christianity, and even praised the massacre as 'noble' and 'lawful':

> Louis, however, distinguished himself by putting down, not without rightful bloodshed, the rebels in Saxony who, as I said before, called themselves Stellinga.[124]
>
> Ac the same time too the Stellinga in Saxony rebelled again against their lords. But when it came to battle they were put down in a ·great bloodbath.. And so they who had dared to rise without lawful power perished by it.[125]

Thus, for Nithard, Frankish identity was constructed by relying on pagan others such as the Saxons. The core idea behind this is that the Franks were Christian, held divine cult, and thus were able to attain salvation in heaven. In other words, the Franks belonged to the 'historical world' while the pagans were in the 'natural world': they were the people in a different *civitas*.

---

[123] 'In quo missa peracta, amicos et inimicos, fideles et infideles, pariter sepulturae tradebant; plaga correptos ac semivivos eodem modo pro viribus ex animo refovebant... Post haec reges populique super fratre populoque christiano dolentes, percontari episcopos coeperunt, quid agere super hoc negotio deberent?' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 92.
[124] 'Lodhuwicus etenim in Saxonia seditiosos, qui se, uti praefatum est, Stellinga nominaverant, nobiliter, legali tamen caede, compescuit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 142.
[125] 'Eodem etiam tempore Stellinga in Saxonia contra dominos suos iterum rebellarunt; sed praelio commisso nimia cede prostrati sunt; ac sic auctoritate interiit, quod sine auctoritate surgere praesumpsit. In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 152, 154.

5.4.3 The *unitas* of *ecclesia*

Nithard's temporally political imagination explains why Nithard mentioned many times in his books the division of the Carolingian realm by the kings/emperor, but did not consider that the realm had ceased to exist as a whole. After all, it is the temporal nature of the 'historical world', not the spatial nature of the 'natural world', that maintained the unity of the realm/*ecclesia*. The interpretation of the *unitas* of *ecclesia* in terms of divine temporality can be traced back to the Apostle Paul. In his letter to the Corinthians, Paul stated that

> For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink. (Corinthians 1, 12: 12–13)

Paul's ideas were later further elaborated by Augustine, who repeatedly asserted that the *ecclesia* could not be defined as a physical presence in space; it was not situated within a building, but only in the midst of devout faithful.[126]

This idea that the *ecclesia* was temporally unified was inherited and further developed in the Carolingian period. Many of the clergy at the court of Charlemagne, such as Agobard of Lyons (c. 779–840), believed that this principle of *unitas* must spread to human life in general.[127] When the Frankish realm was regarded as *ecclesia*, and 'without peace, nothing pleases God',[128] it became the duty of the Carolingian ruler, as head of *ecclesia* and *regnum*, to overcome any *discordia* and *dissensio* that ran counter

[126] Lauwers and Ripart, 'Représentation et gestion de l'espace dans l'Occident médiéval (Ve–XIIIe siècle)', p. 14.
[127] R. Faulhaber, *Der Reichseinheitsgedanke in der Literatur der Karolingerzeit bis zum Vertrag von Verdun* (Berlin, 1931), pp. 26–29.
[128] *Capitulare Missorum Item Speciale (802?)*, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. 1* (Hannover, 1883), p. 103.

to the principle of unity. Thus, Bishop Jonas of Orléans (c.760–843), in his *De institutione regia*, noted that 'the royal ministry is especially to govern and direct the people of God with equity and justice, and to strive to bring them peace and harmony.'[129] In a hagiography completed in 822 for Benedict of Aniane (750?–821), who was one of the key figures in the monastic reform of 817, Ardo Smaragdus (? – 843) explicitly stated that Louis the Pious, the 'emperor Augustus' who was now alone in charge of the empire, also ruled over 'the whole Church of Europe'.[130] Therefore, since *ecclesia* and *regnum* were one, the realm should be united as the Church was.

Writting in the wake of Jonas of Orléans and Ardo Smaragdus, Nithard still held the perception that the *ecclesia* maintained its unity, although by this time the territory of the realm had been substantially divided and ruled independently by different Carolingian royal members. When Louis the Pious was restored to power for a secondg time in 834, yet Lothar remained in unchecked control of Italy, Nithard wrote,

> When the emperor was returned to them, a large number of men present were ready to use force in support of the father against the son. They flocked with the bishops and the whole clergy into the basilica of St. Denis, offered praise to God in all piety, placed crown and arms upon their king, and then assembled to deliberate on the remaining matters.[131]

In Nithard's narrative, 'the bishops and the whole clergy' acted in concert. This is a symbolic scene that expresses both *sacerdotes*' support for the emperor in their capacity

[129] 'Regale ministerium specialiter est populum Dei gubernare et regere cum aequitate et iustitia et ut pacem et concordiam habeant studere.' In: Jonas of Orléans, *Le métier de roi: De institutione regia*, ed. and trans. A. Dubreucq (Paris, 1995), p. 198.
[130] 'Gloriosissimus autem Ludoicus res Aquitaniorum tunc, nunc autem divina providente gratia tocius aecclesiae Europa degentis imperator augustus, sanctitatis eius viam compertam, permaxime diligebat eiusque consilium libenter ontemperabat; quem etiam omnibus in suo regno monasteriis prefecit, ut normam salutiferam cunctis ostenderet'. In: Ardo, *Vita Benedicti Abbatis Anianensis*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS* xv: i (Hanover, 1887), p. 211.
[131] 'Plebs autem non modica, quae praesens erat, et iam iamque Lodhario pro patre vim inferre volebat, rege recepto basilicam sancti Dyonisii una cum episcopis et omni clero confluunt, laudes Deo devote referunt, coronam et arma regi suo imponunt, et ad cetera deliberaturi contendunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 20.

as subjects and, by virtue of their sacredness, the assurance that the *ecclesia* would once again be closely united under Louis the Pious. A similar formulation reappears in Nithard's writing after the battle of Fontenoy in 841. In recounting the deliberations within the Charles-Louis camp as to what the significance of the culmination of this fratricidal struggle was, he wrote,

> All the bishops, acting as one man, came together to hold council. A public assembly found that Louis and Charles had fought for justice and equity alone, as God's judgment had made clear.[132]

But what about the *ecclesia*?

> It seemed to them that first they should submit the matter to bishops and priests... These men examined Lothar's deeds from the very beginning ...(and) declared: 'We ask, admonish, and order you on divine authority to take over this kingdom and to rule it in accordance with the will of God'.[133]

In both places, Nithard claimed that bishops and priests shared a common voice, thus implying the consensus of *ecclesia*. This was certainly to legitimise the behaviour of Charles the Bald and Louis the German, and to exclude Lothar from the *ecclesia*. But on the other hand, it should also be seen that Lothar's territorially substantial control of Italy and parts of Francia at this time did not cause Nithard to fear that his claim that the *ecclesia* remained united would be unconvincing to his intended audience, that is, the aristocracy. In other words, in Nithard's view, the Franks were fully able to understand and accept that the realm as a spatial 'natural world' and the *ecclesia* as a temporal 'historical world' were not necessarily coincident.

---

[132] 'unanimes ad concilium omnes episcopi confluunt, inventumque in conventu publico est, quod pro sola iustitia et aequitate decertaverint, et hoc Dei iudicio manifestum effectum sit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 92.
[133] 'Et quidem primum visum est, ut rem ad episcopos sacerdotesque...Quibus ab initio gesta Lodharii considerantibus...aiunt: «Et auctoritate divina, ut illud suscipiatis et secundum Dei voluntatem illud regatis, monemus, hortamur, atque praecipimus».' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 126–27.

5.4.4 Spatiality and temporality: tension and interaction

However, after the reconciliation of Charles the Bald and Louis the German with Lothar in 842, Nithard gave the first and only account of a quarrel between the clergy who to some extent represented the *ecclesia*. This was taking place when the two opposing camps sent their respective bishops to negotiate a peace solution:

> This, too, was submitted to the decision of the bishops. When the bishops from both sides met in the basilica of St. Castor, those of Lothar's party declared that he who sinned in taking the oath could atone for it, and that it was better for them to sin and atone, than for the Church of God to suffer further from rapine, murder, arson, and adultery. Those of Louis' and Charles's party, on the other hand, asked why they should sin against God since it was not necessary. They said that it was better to make peace among themselves, and at the same time send messengers throughout the entire empire to survey it... In total disagreement they all went back to their people, whence they had come.[134]

Nithard's unusual description of the discord within the *ecclesia* may not have been caused by Nithard's disappointment at Charles the Bald's decision to compromise with Lothar and ideologically reintegrate him into the *ecclesia*, since Nithard himself had previously mentioned that 'bishops and priests' were in agreement with Lothar's peacemaking proposal.[135]

In this case, the major factor in the change in Nithard's feelings about the unity of the *ecclesia* may result from the fact that Charles the Bald conceded the land where

---

[134] 'Et hoc quoque ad conferendum episcopis commissum. Qui hinc inde in basilica sancti Castoris convenientes, a parte Lodharii aiebant, si in sacramento quilibet deliquisset, hoc expiare posse, ac per hoc melius esset ut hoc facerent, quam diutius tot rapinas, incendia, homicidia, adulteria, ecclesiae Dei pateretur. At contra hi qui a parte Ludhuwici necnon et Karoli erant, aiebant, dum neutrum necesse esset, cur in Deum peccare deberent? melius esse, ut firmaretur pax inter illos, mitterentque pariter per universum imperium... Qua dissentientes, quique qua venerat, ad suos secesserunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 146, 148.

[135] 'Verumtamen solito more ad episcopos sacerdotesque rem referunt, ut quocumque divina auctoritas id vertere vellet, nutu ipsius libenti animo praesto adessent. Quibus cum undique, ut pax inter illos fieret, melius videretur, consentiunt, legatos convocant, postulata concedunt.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, p. 138.

Nithard's *honores* were located to Lothar in order to reconcile with him, leaving Nithard in a state of deep indignation and disillusionment as he felt his loyalty had been betrayed. However, as we can tell through the text of the *Historiae*, Nithard rarely presented the correlation between his gains and losses of interest and his mood swings in a straightforward manner. This concealment led historians to assume for a long time that Nithard, as a writer, also had a soldierly forthrightness, until Nelson shattered that stereotype.[136] This characteristic of Nithard's writing stems both from his strong self-esteem as a lay noble and from the desire to make his texts seem more objective in order to make them more convincing. Likewise, here again Nithard obscured the relationship between his perceived *discordia* of the ecclesia and his personal interests, replacing it with the interpretation of a grand narrative. In explaining why a division of the realm between Charles the Bald and Louis the German would not undermine the unity of the *ecclesia*, but would cause discord when Lothar was involved, Nithard implied that the reason for this was that Lothar did not have the faith to protect the Christian people and the Christendom. He made a contrast between Louis the German and Lothar:

> In the conflict between Lothar and his brothers, the nobility among the Saxons was divided into two factions, one following Lothar, the other Louis. Since this was how matters stood, and Lothar saw that after his brother's victory the people who had been with him wished to defect, he was compelled by various needs to turn for help anywhere he could get it. So he distributed public property for private use; he gave freedom to some and promised it to others after' victory; he also sent into Saxony to the immense number of frilingi and lazzi, promising them, if they should side with him, that he would let them have the same law in the future which their ancestors had observed when they were still worshipping idols. Since they desired this law above all, they adopted a new name, 'Stellinga', rallied to a large host, almost drove their lords from the kingdom, and each lived as their ancestors had done according to the law of his choice. But Lothar had also called in the Norsemen to help him, had put some Christians under their lordship, and permitted them to plunder others. Louis thus feared that Norsemen and Slavs might unite with the Saxons who called themselves Stellinga, because they are neighbors, and that they might invade the kingdom to revenge themselves and root out the Christian religion

[136] Nelson, 'Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard', pp. 251–93.

> in the area. 'It was especially for this reason, as we noted above, that he went to…and at the same time did all he could to avert other hazards to his kingdom lest this most horrible disaster befall the Holy Church of God... Louis, however, distinguished himself by putting down, not without rightful bloodshed, the rebels in Saxony who, as I said before, called themselves Stellinga.[137]

Through this narrative, Nithard told us that, in contrast to Louis the German, who valiantly and nobly suppressed the pagans and thus defended the *ecclesia*, Lothar was willing to collaborate with the pagans in order to gain an interest in the spatial 'natural world' and undermine the temporal 'historical world'. In so doing, he implied that Charles the Bald's reconciliation with the faithless Lothar was the root cause of the discord that occurred in the *ecclesia*. However, there are hints that this ideological explanation is just a cover for Nithard to hide his true innermost thoughts. When he wrote Book I in October 841, his interests had not yet been betrayed by Charles the Bald. Although Charles had already formed an alliance with Louis the German by this time, Nithard expressed sarcasm at Louis the German's lack of either sufficient faith or ability to protect the *ecclesia*:

> After his (Louis the Pious) son Louis (the German) had been driven back the emperor forced him to buy his way through the land of the Slavs and to flee to Bavaria.[138]

---

[137] 'Sed pars illorum quae nobilis inter illos habetur, in duabus partibus in dissensione Lodharii ac fratrum suorum divisa, unaque eorum Lodharium, altera vero Lodhuwicum secuta est. His ita se habentibus, cernens Lodharius, quod post victoriam fratrum populus qui cum illo fuerat deficere vellet, variis necessitatibus astrictus, quocumque et quomodocumque poterat, subsidium quaerebat. Hinc rem publicam in propriis usibus tribuebat; hinc quibusdam libertatem dabat, quibusdam autem post victoriam se daturum promittebat, hinc etiam in Saxoniam misit, frilingis lazzibusque, quorum infinita multitudo est, promittens, si secum sentirent, ut legem quam antecessores sui, tempore quo idolorum cultores erant, habuerant, eamdem illis deinceps habendam concederet. Qua supra modum cupidi, nomen novum sibi, id est Stellinga, imposuerunt, et in unum conglobati, dominis e regno pene pulsis, more antiquo qua quisque volebat lege vivebat. Insuper autem Lodharius Nordmannos causa subsidii introduxerat, partemque christianorum illis subdiderat; quibus etiam, ut ceteros christianos depraedarent, licentiam dabat. Igitur metuens Lodhuwicus, ne idem Nordmanni necnon et Sclavi propter affinitatem Saxonibus qui se Stellinga nominaverant, coniungerent, regnumque sibi vindicaturi invaderent, et christianam religionem his in partibus annullarent — quamobrem, uti praetulimus, praemaxime...adiit, et in quantum valuit, simul et cetera regni sui scandala, ne hoc nefandissimum malum sanctae Dei ecclesiae deveniret, praecavit...Lodhuwicus etenim in Saxonia seditiosos, qui se, uti praefatum est, Stellinga nominaverant, nobiliter, legali tamen caede, compescuit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 130, 132, 134, 142.

[138] 'A qua Lodhuwico filio eius pulso, per Sclavos itinere redempto eum in Baioariam fugere compulit.' In: Nithard, *Historiae*, pp. 40, 42.

This shift in the image of Louis the German suggests that Nithard may have been using Louis in Book IV only as a contrasting tool to highlight Lothar's lack of faith, rather than as genuine praise that Louis was a Christian soldier of faith and ability. In fact, the account of the Saxons appears itself quite abruptly in the text here, for before this Nithard was speaking of Louis and Charles preparing to divide the realm by setting aside Lothar, and after the Saxons it was Louis and Charles accepting Lothar's plea for peace and negotiating with him. This abruptness reveals, to some extent, the specific purpose of Nithard's arrangement of the Saxons' episode.

All these details suggest that Nithard was trying to cover up something, and what he sought to conceal, in my view, was the real reason for the discord he perceived within the *ecclesia*: the loss of his material interests. As a lay noble growing up in the Carolingian reform, Nithard was certainly aware of the principle that the *ecclesia* as a temporal 'historical world' was separate and above the realm that was a spatial 'natural world'. In his account, therefore, Lothar's occupation of Italy did not prevent the unity of the *ecclesia*. However, once Nithard himself had suffered a loss of land, he was uncontrollably frustrated. And since he could not justify his rejection of Charles's reconciliation and compromise with Lothar on the basis of the spatiality in violation of the Carolingian ideological principle, Nithard expressed his disappointment with Charles's decision on the pretext that Lothar's lack of faith was leading to discord within the *ecclesia*. Consequently, what we see through the *Historiae* is a link between the spatiality of reality and the temporality in thinking.

5.4.5 Conclusion

Section 5.4 is intended to explore, through a textual analysis of the *Historiae*, what factors might have led to a subtle change in the perception of the temporality of *ecclesia* by the Frankish nobility in the mid-ninth century.

The section argues that, like Dhuoda, Nithard believed that the Frankish *regnum*, which as a polity was *ecclesia*, was moving towards fragmentation in terms of people's perception of reality, although its fundamental attributes as a temporal empire intrinsically demanded that it must be internally harmonious and united. Yet the tensions inherent in Nithard's text as a result of his personal experience allow us to see more clearly what it was in the Carolingian fratricide that shook the Frankish aristocracy's confidence in the stability of the Carolingian polity.

The bishops in the *Historiae* at first always appear as united and making collective decisions. This expression of the harmony of the Carolingian *ecclesia* explains why Nithard did not seem to perceive a division of the Carolingian *regnum* despite Lothar's partitioning of Italy. After all, as a temporal rather than a spatial empire, as long as the Frankish nobles who dominated it were Christians, it was not divided by the fact that the *regna* were ruled by different lords. Yet reality eventually puts a damper on the idea. Once Nithard felt that Charles the Bald had 'betrayed' him by giving Lothar the land that the warrior-writer considered his own, the bishops in his *Historiae* appeared as quarrelling with each other, and the Carolingian *regnum* was no longer in harmony. Nithard attempted to explain why the temporal empire was divided with the grand narrative that some of the Christians and their leaders within the Frankish kingdoms

were no longer steadfast in their faith, yet the effects of the spatial shifts in reality on the temporality of the idea are even more pronounced in this disguise.

OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The analysis in this thesis focuses on three texts completed before and after the outbreak of fratricide among the sons of Louis the Pious, but it does not claim to be a political or intellectual history of the first half of the ninth century in the traditional sense. Instead, with the methodological approach of *Begriffsgeschichte* and the three concepts of *res publica*, *familia* and *ecclesia* as the focal point of the study, the intention of this thesis is to contribute to the discussion on the linkages between temporality in the thinking of the Frankish lay nobility in the period and the social context as a whole. Its greater ambition is to incorporate any observable subtle changes into a more comprehensive historical framework.

At a time when interdisciplinary research is becoming increasingly popular, the reduction of historical phenomena to specific indicators through big data processing for analytical treatment is receiving increasing attention from historians. This has, for sure, brought some valuable findings.[1] *Begriffsgeschichte*, however, reminds us of the other side of the coin. The importance of concepts or their critical development often depends not on their frequency of use, but on the extent to which they are debated and elaborated, on their multiplicity of meanings and controversies and their influence at a certain historical period and critical moment, and on their indispensability in observing and

[1] Regarding early medieval examples, Nicolas Perreaux has written a number of interesting articles on the subject, including: N. Perreaux, 'Les mots de la sépulture dans l'Europe médiévale (VIIIe – fin XIIIe siècle): observations complémentaires à partir des corpus numérisés', in M. Lauwers and A. Zemour (eds), *Qu'est-ce qu'une sépulture? Humanités et systèmes funéraires de la Préhistoire à nos jours* (Antibes, 2016), pp. 113–22; N. Perreaux, 'Chronologie, diffusion et environnement des "villae" dans l'Europe médiévale (VIIe–XIIIe siècles): recherches sur les corpus diplomatiques numérisés', in *L'origine des sites monastiques: confrontation entre la terminologie des sources textuelles et les données archéologique* (Auxerre, 2016), pp. 1–43. For other medievalists working in the same field, see: B. Jussen and K. Ubl, 'Die Sprache der Kapitularien. Einleitung', in B. Jussen and K. Ubl (eds), *Die Sprache des Rechts. Historische Semantik und karolingische Kapitularien* (Göttingen, 2022), pp. 9–33.

interpreting social and political situations. This thesis even suggests that in addition to changes in conceptual connotations, the positioning of concepts within the structure of thought is also a focus for attention: something that metric analyses are not capable of.

As the founder of *Begriffsgeschichte*, Koselleck suggested that historians should endeavour to discover how people in history expressed the 'beginnings of the modern world' in everyday language so as to trace a sense of time about 'modernity'. Subsequently, in his study of *geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (basic historical concepts), he examined a series of concepts (e.g. 'progress', 'crisis', 'revolution', etc.) to reveal how the temporality they imply was transformed along with the contemporaries' experience of historical time. What this thesis has endeavoured to do is to borrow and adapt this methodology so that it can serve the study of early medieval history.

It must be acknowledged that narratives are born at the intersection of linguistic representation and political power. It can be argued that in the period I have studied, writers were recognised by power, and the vitality of their narratives depended on the strength of that power, which in turn justified the legitimacy of these narratives and reinforced their authority. However, as writers, they were not directed exclusively to the baton of top-down power, but rather, either consciously or unconsciously, they incorporated their own perceptions and ideas into the texts. Thus, as Louis Marin positioned his book as 'a representation of an episode of the history of representation and power',[2] this thesis also seeks to analyse, with the help of *Begriffsgeschichte*, how the political context in the first half of the ninth century interacted with the writing of the Carolingian lay nobility.

[2] L. Marin, *Portrait of the King*, trans. M. M. Houle (Basingstoke, 1988), p. 15.

The first concept with which this thesis is concerned is *res publica*. In Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, the ability to uphold the *res publica*, that is, the worship of God, was understood to be rulership, and those who possessed it were rulers. But whereas rulership had an atemporal nature, the ruler who was its bearer was temporary. In other words, the divine rulership would not disappear, but would be transferred from a ruler who could no longer maintain it to a new one who was able to uphold it. This transfer explained both the turnover of the Carolingian dynasty to the Merovingian dynasty and the succession of Louis the Pious to Charlemagne.

Yet Dhuoda and Nithard, writing against the backdrop of the social chaos of the mid-ninth century, had a different perception. For Dhuoda, the complexity of the political situation compelled her to make the judgement in her *Liber Manualis* that the ruler, who was supposed to be tasked with upholding the *res publica*, was currently absent in the earthly realm, although she still believed in the eternal presence of rulership in sacred time. Nithard, because of his personal experience, infused the text of *Historiae* with even more tension. In the 'public Histories', the warrior-writer articulated his belief in Charles the Bald as a true ruler in forthright writing. But in the hidden 'private history' Nithard had growing doubts as to whether his lord was actually undertaking his rulership. Finally, like Dhuoda, he had to seek secular kinship as a substitute for faith in his lord's ability to maintain the res publica in order to anchor his loyalty. Thus, in contrast to Einhard, Dhuoda and Nithard did not question the eternity of the *res publica* and the rulership that upheld it, but were sceptical as to whether there were any lords in the earthly realm who could take on this ministry.

The second concept of interest in this thesis is *familia*. In order to justify Louis the Pious's controversial treatment of his royal relatives, in the *Vita Karoli* Einhard constructed a Charlemagne who failed to exert his fatherly authority over his secular relatives and win sufficient love from them as an ideal *paterfamilias* would do, but enjoyed reciprocity and harmony in the spiritual kinship formed with the Frankish Church. In this sense, Charlemagne made an ideal *familia* with the Frankish Church, not with his secular relatives. But on the other hand, it also shows that, in Einhard's view, the Frankish aristocracy of his contemporaries were able to understand and accept the idea that spiritual kinship, which was timeless in its temporality, was separate from temporary secular kinship, and became a substitute for the latter. In this case, the timeless spiritual kinship constructed around the ruler as *paterfamilias* underpinned the internal harmony of the Carolingian *regnum*.

However, Dhuoda, writing in the midst of the political turmoil that followed the *Vita Karoli*, had a different understanding of the relationship between spiritual and secular kinship. In her view, spiritual kinship was not a substitute for secular kinship. Instead, spirituality was inherent in secular kinship. In other words, in the *Liber Manualis*, timeless spiritual kinship and temporary worldly kinship were intertwined and inseparable. It is on the basis of this realisation that Dhuoda made the judgement that her family's suffering was due to her husband's failed handling of secular kinship, especially his failure to respect the authority of his father, which led to the undermining of the worship of God. In contrast to Einhard and Dhuoda, Nithard did not make much reference to spiritual kinship. But like Dhuoda, he did not believe that secular time and sacred time could be separated as they were in the *Vita Karoli*. This is demonstrated by the fact that in the *Historiae*, the failure of Louis the Pious to make his own paternal

authority over the empire under the emperor-father system, and the participation of the women of the royal family in political affairs under the old system and the new regime of confraternity, both contributed to the inability of the Carolingian polity, which assumed the worship of God, to fulfil its own duties effectively.

The third concept on which this thesis focuses is *ecclesia*. In the *Vita Karoli*, Einhard sometimes used *ecclesia* to refer to the Frankish Church, with which Charlemagne had a harmonious and reciprocal relationship, but sometimes it also appeared as Christendom, which existed for the worship of God. These two senses of *ecclesia* differ not only in being narrowly and broadly defined. More importantly, whereas the former *ecclesia* was more spatial, referring to the ecclesiastical institutions established in Frankish territory, the latter *ecclesia* was situated in temporality and was imagined as a community of Christians to be saved. It is from the broader sense of *ecclesia* that Einhard, through subtle words, elaborate plots, and even biblical exegesis and numerology, portrayed an image of Charlemagne as a Christian ruler who ruled the *ecclesia* divinely and brought unity and harmony within it. In this case, *ecclesia* can be considered equivalent to the Carolingian polity, and in other words, the Carolingian empire in its nature can be regarded as temporal rather than spatial.

However, when Dhuoda wrote in the new historical context of the Carolingian fratricide, it is evident that she did not have the same faith in the internal harmony and unity of *ecclesia* as Einhard did. While the Carolingian polity remained essentially temporal rather than spatial in the *Liber Manualis*, paradoxically, this by nature indivisible entity made up of Christians was implied by Dhuoda in her text to be imploding. For this confusion in mindset, Nithard revealed some possible triggers. In the *Historiae*,

ecclesia did not necessarily lose its unity automatically because of political and territorial divisions. Once Nithard lost his land in a self-perceived betrayal, however, the *ecclesia* in his text split. In order to explain how the temporal empire of the Carolingian *regnum* broke up against its essence, Nithard could only disguise it in the grand narrative that some of the Christians and their leaders in the Frankish kingdoms were no longer committed to the faith, although this makes the impact of spatial shifts in reality on the temporality in thinking all the more obvious. After all, it was hard to say that some people's Christian faith was really stronger than others.

To summarise, a synthesis of this study's findings would run as follows. During the period spanning from 817 to 843, encompassing the composition of the three texts *Vita Karoli*, *Historiae*, and *Liber Manualis*, the Frankish lay nobility, embodied by Einhard, Dhuoda, and Nithard, employed concepts as instrumental tools for expressing their ideas and engaging in political discourse, thereby unveiling the temporalities in their thinking. Central to these texts are the concepts of *res publica*, *familia*, and *ecclesia*, which wielded significant influence, their temporal nature evolving in tandem with the spatial and political realities of the era.

The analytical approach of *Begriffsgeschichte* has underpinned this investigation. However, the thesis does not unreservedly adopt the perspective of predecessor historians working within the framework of *Begriffsgeschichte* regarding the evolution of temporality since the Middle Ages. This conventional view posits a rupture between the medieval (or ancient) and modern regimes of historicity, notably observed between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, where salvific history yielded to a vision of progress, delineating a future distinct from the past. The thesis contends that such a

broad perspective obscures the temporal diversity inherent in the early Middle Ages. While refraining from proposing an alternative temporal framework, it poses a pertinent question: can lesser crises, which do not culminate in a complete rupture in the regime of historicity, still foster the emergence of disparate temporalities?

The crisis of succession and civil wars among the Carolingian princes serve as an illustrative case study in this context. Although this crisis significantly influenced the lives of our authors, it did not engender a total structural rupture in temporality. This raises an important methodological question of how subtle differences in conceptual understandings of temporality manifest themselves. The thesis has endeavoured to address this question.

Moreover, the thesis has delved into the perceptions of time and an individual's temporal orientation, examining how the selected writers positioned themselves vis-à-vis the past, present, future, and the overarching continuum of time. Through this lens, the thesis has elucidated the discrepancies among the authors regarding the contemporary roles of rulers, the enduring ideals of *res publica* and rulership, and contemporary notions surrounding the concept of a 'state'. Additionally, it examines the nuances in their interpretations of spiritual and secular kinship, the blurred boundaries within familial and political constructs, and their conception of the Carolingian polity as a Christian community.

It is worth clarifying that while this thesis has focused on the lay aristocracy, this choice is primarily due to limitations in length, and what is feasible within the constraints of a doctoral thesis, rather than an assumption of fundamental differences in thinking

between the lay aristocracy and the clergy or monks. In the context of the Carolingian reforms, initiated by monarchs relying on Christianity, it becomes challenging to draw clear ideological boundaries between them, as evidenced by the libraries maintained by lay nobles. It was common for Frankish lay nobles, especially the magnates, to possess their own libraries stocked with ecclesiastical histories, biblical exegesis, and mirrors for princes commissioned from clerics or monks. In addition to their personal collections, they frequently borrowed books from the libraries of clergy and monasteries. These literary resources served as essential tools in fulfilling their duties entrusted by kings or emperors, and demonstrate that their perceptions cannot have been structurally different from those of their ecclesiastical counterparts.[3]

Shifting focus to the clergy and monks themselves, we can equally find that the boundaries between their ideologies and those of laymen were blurred. Consider the *Epitaphium Arsenii* by the Corbie monk Paschasius Radbertus (c. 790 – c. 860), composed during the same period as Dhuoda and Nithard's works, with its first volume written in 836 and its second volume completed in the mid-850s.[4] Radbertus, akin to Nithard, posited that the *fides* owed to the lords and to God should possess the same eternal nature withi temporality. Like Nithard, he lamented the degradation of the worldly *fides* in his contemporary age, seeing it as becoming increasingly profane and ephemeral, 'because it does not come from the love for God and one's neighbour, but is rather an earthly and bestial oath and a snare of the devil'.[5] Radbertus also echoed Nithard's concerns regarding the concepts of *familia* and *ecclesia*, warning of the

[3] For more on the Frankish lay nobility's exchange with the clergy and monasteries on written sources, see McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 244–70.
[4] For an introduction to the life of Paschasius Radbertus and his *Epitaphium Arsenii*, see de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 102–11. For a systematic study based on the *Epitaphium Arsenii*, cf. de Jong, *Epitaph for an Era*;
[5] 'autem fides non est fides, quia non est ex dilectione Dei et proximi, sed terrena obiuratio animalis et diabolica devinctio.' In: Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, p. 25; de Jong and Lake, *Confronting Crisis in the Carolingian Empire*, pp. 76–77.

Carolingian realm's fragmentation due to the absence of the emperor's paternal authority and the empress's involvement in public affairs. He emphasised the repercussions of such negligence, lamenting that 'if he [Louis the Pious] had cherished or taken care of the people, or of the *ecclesia* of Christ that had been committed to him by God, or certainly the *res publica*, he never would have permitted so many evils to befall the kingdom because of the will or wiles of one woman'.[6] This brief investigation suggests that Radbertus's works could usefully be studied in the same way as those of the lay aristocrats on which this thesis has concentrated, and indeed a more developed *Begriffsgeschichte*-style study of Radbertus's works would be a valuable undertaking, both in its own right, to determine the specificities in his thinking, and for comparison with contemporary lay writers, to find out what they shared and how they differed. Again, however, due to space constraints and the feasibility of a PhD thesis, this work will have to be left for other research.

There is one final question to be considered. Might the findings of the thesis also help us understand how the crisis of the Carolingian empire further unfolded?

In interpreting the political pattern around the eleventh century in the post-Carolingian lands, West suggested that this development is best viewed as the culmination of the Carolingian system, in which the exercise of power became increasingly rooted at the local level, rendering higher levels of co-ordination and governance irrelevant. He writes that, 'the ruling family's monopoly on rule was eventually lost, but in the end this was a mere matter of dynastic accident. It seems more important that had the

[6] 'Quod si aut populum, aut ecclesiam Christi sibi a Deo commissam, certe aut rempublicam diligeret aut procuraret, numquam pro unius femine voluntate vel persuasionibus tanta admisisset mala in reguo quae acciderunt.' In: Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, p. 88; de Jong and Lake, *Confronting Crisis in the Carolingian Empire*, p. 203.

Carolingian project continued, it would have ended in a world dominated by power so formalised and well-defined that it could in some circumstances even be thought of as property, which is more or less exactly what happened.'[7] West thus attributed the formation of the post-Carolingian world primarily to the experiment in 'applied ecclesiology' initiated by the Carolingians, and treats the crisis of rule that occurred in the Carolingian dynasty as a fortuitous wave in this process of transition, with or without which the wave of history would have surged forward along its established course.

However, this thesis seeks to make an addition to West's argument. With the help of *Begriffsgeschichte*, this thesis argues that the political upheavals of the mid-ninth century did to some extent change the temporality in the thinking of the Frankish lay aristocracy, which can be detected somewhat in the comparative study of the *Vita Karoli*, the *Liber Manualis* and the *Historiae*. Specifically, in reaction to the ideological shock of fratricidal war, these nobles, in their scepticism and confusion about the old system, reduced their enthusiasm for the high politics surrounding the Carolingians and increasingly turned their attention to the local and blood relations in which power had become ever more formalised in the Carolingian reforms. This is reflected in the temporality of thinking, where concepts of timelessness gradually lose their aura, while those of temporariness were increasingly valued. This trend may in part foreshadow the arrival of new political formations at the time of the first millennium.

[7] West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution*, p. 263.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts cited

Barcelona, Biblioteca Nacional de Catalunya, Ms. 569, https://manipulus.ucm.es/handle/20.500.12238/95 [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Jena, Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Ms. Bos. q. 6, https://collections.thulb.uni-jena.de/rsc/viewer//HisBest_derivate_00013232/Otto_001r.tif [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Nîmes, Bibliotheque Municipale de Nîmes, Ms. 393, https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc104971r/cN121192 [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. Latin 9768, https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc572968 [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Paris, Bibliotheque nationale de France, Ms. Latin 12293, https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc736087 [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Primary sources

Admonitio ad Omnes Regni Ordines (825), ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. I* (Hannover, 1883), pp. 303–07

Admonitio Generalis, ed. and trans. H. Mordek, K. Zechiel-Eckes and M. Glatthaar, *Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Großen* (Wiesbaden, 2013), pp. 179–239

Agobard of Lyons, *Agobardi Lugdunensis Archiepiscopi Epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. V* (Berlin, 1899), pp. 153–239

Alcuin of York, *Alcuini Epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. IV* (Berlin, 1895)

Altdorfer, A., *Historienzyklus: Alexanderschlacht (Schlacht bei Issus)*, (1529), https://www.sammlung.pinakothek.de/en/artwork/9pL3Qyz4eb [accessed 8 Sep 2023]

Annales Bertiniani, ed. F. Grat, J. Vielliard and C. Clémencet, *Annales de Saint-Bertin* (Paris, 1964)

English trans. J. L. Nelson *The Annals of St-Bertin* (Manchester, 1991)

Annales Regni Francorum, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH SRG 6* (Hannover, 1895), pp. 1–178

English trans. B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970), pp. 37–125

Ardo, *Vita Benedicti Abbatis Anianensis*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS xv: i* (Hanover, 1887), pp. 200–20

Astronomer, *Vita Hludovici Pii Imperatoris*, ed. E. Tremp, *MGH SS rer. Germ., 64* (Hannover, 1995), pp. 123–53

English trans. T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious* (University Park, 2009), pp. 226–302

Augustine of Hippo, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. and trans. G. E. McCracken, *City of God, vol. I* (New York, 1957)

———, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos,* ed. and trans. P. Levine, *City of God, vol. IV* (New York, 1966)

———, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. and trans. W. C. Greene, *City of God, vol. VI* (New York, 1960)

———, *Contra iulianum opus imperfectum (libri I–III)*, ed. E. Kalinka and M. Zelzer, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 85/1* (Vienna, 1974)

———, *De Bono Coniugali, De Sancta Virginitate*, ed. and trans. P. G. Walsh (Oxford, 2001)

———, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. and trans. R. P. H. Green (Oxford, 1996)

———, *De Genesi ad litteram inperfectus liber*, ed. J. Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 28/1* (Vienna, 1894)

English trans. J. H. Taylor, *St. Augustine: The Literal Meaning of Genesis, vol. 2* (New York, 1982)

———, *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*, ed. K. F. Vrba and J. Zycha, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 42* (Vienna, 1902)

———, *De sermone Domini in monte libros duos*, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 35* (Turnhout, 1967)

———, *De trinitate libri quindecim (Libri I–XII)*, ed. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie, *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina 50* (Turnhout, 1968)

English trans. G. B. Matthews and S. McKenna, *On the Trinity. Books 8–15* (Cambridge, 2002)

———, *Enarrationes in Psalmos CI–CL*, ed. E. Dekkers and I. Fraipont, *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 40* (Turnhout, 1956)

English trans. M. Boulding, *Expositions of the Psalms 33–50, vol. 2* (New York, 2000)

———, *In epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus decem*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina 35* (Paris, 1845)

English trans. J. W. Rettig, *Tractates on the Gospel of John 11–27* (Washington DC, 2003)

Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, ed. and trans. J. E. King, *Ecclesiastical History, vol. I* (New York, 1930)

Capitulare Missorum Item Speciale (802?), ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. I* (Hannover, 1883), pp. 102–04

Cicero, *De re publica, De legibus*, ed. and trans. D. Fott, *On the Republic and on the Laws* (New York, 2014)

CIL V. 7453, ed. J. Cholodniak, *Carmina Sepulcralia Latina* (Petropoli, 1857)

Codex Carolinus, ed. W. Gundlach, *MGH Epp. III* (Berlin, 1892)

Codex Justinianus, ed. and trans. F. H. Blume, B. W. Frier, S. Connolly, S. Corcoran, M. H. Crawford, J. N. Dillon, D. P. Kehoe*, et al. The Codex of Justinian: A New Annotated Translation, with Parallel Latin and Greek Text Based on a Translation by Justice Fred H. Blume* (Cambridge, 2016)

Concilium in Austrasia Habitum Q. D. Germanicum, ed. A. Werminghoff, *MGH Conc. II: 1* (Hannover, 1906), pp. 1–4

English trans. A. C. Murray, *From Roman to Merovingian Gaul. A Reader* (North York, 2008), pp. 649–50

Valence, ed. W. Hartmann, *MGH Conc. III* (Hannover, 1984), pp. 351–65

De unctione Pippini regis nota monachi sancti Dionysii, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH SS xv: 1* (Hannover, 1887), p. 1

Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, ed. and trans. M. Thiébaux *Dhuoda, Handbook for Her Warrior Son: Liber Manualis* (Cambridge, 1998)

English trans. C. Neel, *Handbook for William* (Washington DC, 1999)

French trans. P. Riché, *Manuel pour mon fils* (Paris, 1975)

Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, ed. and trans. M. Sot and C. Veyrard-Cosme, *Éginhard: Vie de Charlemagne* (Paris, 2019)

English trans. P. E. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, 1998), pp. 15–40

Epistola Sancti Lupi et Sancti Eufronii Episcoporum, ed. C. Munier, *Concilia Galliae, a. 314 – a. 506* (Turnhout, 1963), pp. 140–41

Gregory I, *Gregorii I Papae Registrum Epistolarum, Mense Maio I. 42*, ed. P. Ewald and L. M. Hartmann, *MGH Epp. I* (Berlin, 1891), pp. 61–69

Haimo of Auxerre, *Homilia XLIX*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latin 118* (Paris, 1852), col. 284B–94B

Hariulf, *Chronicon Centulense*, ed. and trans. F. Lot (Paris, 1894)

Hincmar of Rheims, *De Ordine Palatii*, ed. and trans. T. Gross and R. Schieffer, *MGH Fontes 3* (Hanover, 1980), pp. 32–99

Hrabanus, *De honore parentum et subiectione filiorum*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. V* (Berlin, 1899), pp. 403–15

English trans. R. Gilbert, A. Traves, C. West and T. Zhang, 'Hraban Maur, On honouring parents. 834', *Mittelalter. Interdisziplinäre Forschung und Rezeptionsgeschichte* 5 (2022), pp. 1–33

———, *Epistolae (Nr. 18)*, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Epp. V* (Berlin, 1899), pp. 422–24

Isidore of Seville, *De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento contra Iudaeos ad*

Florentinam sororem, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina 83* (Paris, 1862), col. 449–538A

Jonas of Orléans, *Le métier de roi: De institutione regia*, ed. and trans. A. Dubreucq (Paris, 1995)

Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, ed. and trans. A. Städele, *Die Todesarten der Verfolger* (Turnhout, 2003)

Lupus of Ferrieres, *Epistulae*, ed. P. K. Marshall (Leipzig, 1984)

English trans. G. W. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrieres* (The Hague, 1966)

Mabillon, J., *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti IV. I*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina 106* (Paris, 1851), pp. 109–18

Missi cuiusdam admonitio (801–812), ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. I* (Hannover, 1883), pp. 238–40

French trans. P. Viollet, *Oeuvres chrétiennes des familles royales de France* (Paris, 1870), pp. 26–33

Nithard, *Historiae*, ed. and trans. P. Lauer and S. Glansdorff, *Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris, 2012)

English trans. B. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970), pp. 127–74

Notker, *Gesta Karoli Magni*, ed. H. F. Haefele, *MGH SRG n.s. xn* (Berlin, 1959)

English trans. T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious* (University Park, 2009), pp. 59–118

Opus Caroli regis contra synodum, ed. A. Freeman and P. Meyvaert, *MGH Conc. 2, Suppl. 1* (Hannover, 1998)

Ordinatio imperii, ed. A. Boretius, *MGH Cap. I* (Hannover, 1883), pp. 270–75

Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed E. Dümmler, *Abhandlungen der Preussische Akademie, phil.-hist. Klasse 2* (Berlin, 1900), pp. 18–98

English trans. M. de Jong and J. Lake, *Confronting Crisis in the Carolingian Empire* (Manchester, 2020), pp. 47–223

Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini, ed. E. Dümmler, *MGH Poetae 3* (Berlin, 1881)

Regni Divisio, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause, *MGH Cap. 2* (Hannover, 1897), pp. 20–24

Stephanus II, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le Liber pontificalis; texte, introduction et commentaire,*

Tome 1 (Paris, 1886), pp. 440–62

Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, ed. and trans. J. C. Rolfe, *Lives of the Caesars, vol. I*, (Cambridge, 1914)

Thegan, *Gesta Hludovici Imperatoris*, ed. E. Tremp, *MGH SS rer. Germ., 64* (Hannover, 1995), pp. 168–277

English trans. T. F. X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious* (University Park, 2009), pp. 194–218

Lex duodecim tabularum, ed. and trans. E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin, vol. III*, (New York, 1938)

Ulpian, *Digesta*, ed. T. Mommsen, *Corpus Juris Civilis. vol. I, Institutiones* (Berlin, 1888)

Secondary sources

Abbès, M., 'The Arabic Mirrors for Princes as Witnesses to the Evolution of Political Thought', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden/Boston, 2023), pp. 314–42

Abels, R., 'The Historiography of a Construct: "Feudalism" and the Medieval

Historian', *History Compass* 7 (2009), pp. 1008–31

Aigle, D., 'The Conception of Power in Islam: Persian Mirrors of Princes and Sunni Theories (11th–14th Centuries)', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden/Boston, 2023), pp. 136–59

Airlie, S., 'The Aristocracy', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History (vol. II: c. 700– c. 900)* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 431–50

———, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians* (London/New York, 2020)

———, *Power and Its Problems in Carolingian Europe* (Farnham, 2012)

———, 'The World, the Text and the Carolingian: Royal, Aristocratic and Masculine Identities in Nithard's Histories', in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (New York, 2007), pp. 51–76

Althoff, G., 'Die Bösen schrecken, die Guten belohnen. Bedingungen, Praxis und Legitimation mittelalterlicher Herrschaft', in G. Althoff, H. W. Goetz and E. Schubert (eds), *Menschen im Schatten der Kathedrale. Neuigkeiten aus dem Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1998), pp. 1–99

———, *Die Ottonen: Königsherrschaft ohne Staat* (Stuttgart, 2005)

Althusser, L., *For Marx*. Trans. B. Brewster (London/New York, 2005)

———, *Reading Capital*. Trans. B. Brewster (London/New York, 1997)

Anton, H., *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit* (Bonn, 1968)

Arendt, H., *Between Past and Future* (New York, 1961)

Arieli, J., 'Richard Koebner — Zeitwende und Geschichtsbewußtsein', in R. Koebner, H. D. Schmidt and F. Stern (eds), *Geschichte, Geschichtsbewußtsein und Zeitenwende: Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Nachlaß* (Gerlingen, 1990), pp. 22–48

Ariès, P., *Centuries of Childhood* (London, 1996)

Asmis, E., 'The State as a Partnership: Cicero's Definition of res publica in his work On the State', *History of Political Thought* 25 (2004), pp. 569–98

Aurell, M., *Les noces du comte. Mariage et pouvoir en Catalogne (785–1213)* (Paris, 1995)

Bailey, L. K., *The Religious Worlds of the Laity in Late Antique Gaul* (London, 2016)

Barnwell, P. S., 'Einhard, Louis the Pious and Childeric III', *Historical Research* 78 (2005), pp. 129–39

Bartlett, R., ‘Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity’, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31 (2001), pp. 39–56

Bauer, T., *Lotharingien als historischer Raum. Raumbildung und Raumbewußtsein im Mittelalter* (Köln, 1997)

Becher, M., *Eid und Herrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen* (Sigmaringen, 1993)

Becker, P. A., ‘Duodas Handbuch’, *Zeitschrift fur Romanische Philologie* 21 (1897), pp. 73–101

Bennett, J. M., and C. W. Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A short history* (New York, 2011)

Béranger, J., ‘L’expression du pouvoir suprême chez Tacite’, in C. Nicollet (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l’Antiquité: Mots et réalités* (Paris, 1990), pp. 181–205

Berges, W., *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1938)

Bergson, H., *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Trans. F. L. Pogson (New York, 2001)

Bessmertny, J., ‘Le monde vu par une femme noble au IXe siècle. La perception du monde dans l’aristocratie carolingienne’, *Le Moyen Âge* 93 (1987), pp. 161–84

Bischoff, B., *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979)

Bloch, M., *Les rois thaumaturges* (Paris, 1983)

Böckenförde, E., *Die deutsche verfassungsgeschichtliche Forschung im 19. Jahrhundert: zeitgebundene Fragestellungen und Leitbilder* (Berlin, 1961)

Bödeker, H. E., 'Ausprägungen der historischen Semantik in den historischen Kulturwissenschaften', in H. E. Bödeker (ed.), *Begriffsgeschichte, Diskursgeschichte, Metapherngeschichte* (Göttingen, 2002), pp. 7–27

———, 'Concept – Meaning – Discourse. Begriffsgeschichte Reconsidered', in I. Hampsher-Monk, K. Tilmans and F. van Vree (eds), *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspectives* (Amsterdam, 1998), pp. 51–64

Boodin, J. E., *A Realistic Universe: An Introduction to Metaphysics* (Charleston, 2013)

Booker, C. M., 'An Early Humanist Edition of Nithard's De dissensionibus filiorum Ludovici Pii', *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 5 (2010), pp. 231–58

———, *Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009)

———, ‘The Two Sorrows of Nithard’, in C. M. Booker and A. A. Latowsky (eds), *In This Modern Age: Medieval Studies in Honor of Paul Edward Dutton* (Budapest, 2023), pp. 97–142

Booz, E., *Die Fürstenspiegel des Mittelalters bis zur Scholastik* (Freiburg in Breisgau, 1913)

Born, L. K., ‘The Perfect Prince: A Study in Thirteenth-and Fourteenth-Century Ideals’, *Speculum* 3 (1928), pp. 470–504

———, ‘The Specula Principis of the Carolingian Renaissance’, *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 12 (1933), pp. 583–612

Boshof, E., *Ludwig der Fromme* (Darmstadt, 1996)

Bosl, K., *Die Grundlagen der modernen Gesellschaft im Mittelalter. Eine deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart, 1972)

Bouchard, C. B., ‘The Carolingian Creation of a Model of Patrilineage’, in C. Chazelle and F. Lifshitz (eds), *Paradigms and Methods in Early Medieval Studies* (New York, 2007), pp. 194–220

———, ‘Family Structure and Family Consciousness among the Aristocracy in the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries’, *Francia* 14 (1986), pp. 639–58

———, ‘Images of the Merovingians and Carolingians’, *History Compass* 4 (2006), pp. 293–307

———, *Those of My Blood: Creating Noble Families in Medieval Francia* (Philadelphia, 2001)

Boulding, M., *Expositions of the Psalms* (New York, 2000)

Bratu, C., ‘Mirrors for Princes. Western’, in A. Classen (ed.), *Handbook of Medieval Studies* (Berlin/New York, 2010), pp. 1921–49

Braudel, F., *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II*. Trans. S. Reynolds (London, 1972)

Breisach, E., *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, Modern* (Chicago, 2007)

Brorson, K. S., ‘Histories of Concepts after the Linguistic Turn’, PhD thesis (University of St. Andrews, 2005)

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

Brown, P., *Augustine of Hippo: A biography* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 2013)

———, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, (Chichester, 2013)

Brown, S., 'Presentism: Stopgap or New State?', in F. Hartog, *Regimes of Historicity: Presentism and Experiences of Time*. Trans. S. Brown (New York, 2015), pp. xiii–xix

Brunhölzl, F., *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, Bd I* (Munich, 1975)

Brunner, O., 'Das "ganze Haus" und die alteuropäische "Ökonomik"', in O. Brunner (ed.), *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1968), pp. 103–27

———, 'Das Fach "Geschichte" und die historischen Wissenschaften', in O. Brunner (ed.), *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1968), pp. 9–25

———, 'Der Historiker und die Geschichte von Verfassung und Recht', *Historische Zeitschrift* 209 (1969), pp. 1–16

———, *Land und Herrschaft. Grundfragen einer territorialen Verfassungsgeschichte Österreichs im Mittelalter* (Brünn/München/Wien, 1943)

———, 'Moderner Verfassungsbegriff und mittelalterliche Verfassungsgeschichte', in H. Kämpf (ed.), *Herrschaft und Staat im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 1–19

———, ‘Zum Begriff des Bürgertums’, *Vorträge und Forschungen* 11 (1966), pp. 13–23

Buck, T. M., *Admonitio und Praedicatio. Zur religiös-pastoralen Dimension von Kapitularien und kapitulariennahen Texten (507–814)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1997)

Bührer-Thierry, G., ‘La reine adultère’, *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 35 (1992), pp. 299–312

Bulst, N., J. Fisch, R. Koselleck, and C. Meier, ‘Revolution, Rebellion, Aufruhr, Bürgerkrieg’, in O. Brunner, W. Conze and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 5* (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 653–788

Busse, D., ‘Begriffsgeschichte oder Diskursgeschichte?’, in C. Dutt (ed.), *Herausforderungen der Begriffsgeschichte* (Heidelberg, 2003), pp. 17–49

———, *Historische semanik. Analyse eines Programms* (Stuttgart, 1987)

Calmette, J., *L’effondrement d’un empire et la naissance d’une Europe: IX. – X. siècles* (Paris, 1941)

Carr, D., *Experience and History: Phenomenological Perspectives on the Historical World* (Oxford, 2014)

Cerquiglini, B., *L'invention de Nithard* (Paris, 2018)

Chandler, C. J., 'Barcelona BC 569 and a Carolingian Programme on the Virtues', *Early Medieval Europe* 18 (2010), pp. 265–91

———, *Carolingian Catalonia: Politics, Culture, and Identity in an Imperial Province, 778–987* (Cambridge, 2019)

Cherewatuk, K., 'Speculum Matris: Duoda's Manual', *Florilegium* 10 (1991), pp. 49–63

Clanchy, M. T., *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307* (Cambridge, 1979)

Claussen, M. A., 'Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority: Dhuoda and the Liber manualis', *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996), pp. 785–809

———, 'God and Man in Dhuoda's Liber manualis', in W. J. Sheils and D. Wood (eds), *Studies in Church History* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 43–52

———, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004)

Collins, R., 'Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds),

Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840) (Oxford, 1990), pp. 363–89

Constable, G., *Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge occidental: Letters and Letter-Collections. Fasc. 17* (Turnhout, 1976)

Contreni, J. J. [review], 'Marie A. Mayeski, *Dhuoda: Ninth Century Mother and Theologian* (Scranton, 1995)', *Speculum* 72 (1997), pp. 1197–98

Conze, W., *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters als Aufgabe für Forschung und Unterricht* (Köln, 1957)

Cordoliani, A., 'Los manuscritos de cómputo eclesiástico en las Bibliotecas de Barcelona', *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia* 23 (1950), pp. 103–30

Costambeys, M., M. Innes, and S. Maclean, *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2011)

Coupland, S., 'A Coin of Queen Fastrada and Charlemagne', *Early Medieval Europe* 31 (2023), pp. 1–13

Couturier, C., '"Sacramentum" et "mysterium" dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin', *Etudes Augustiniennes* 28 (1953), pp. 161–332

Croce, B., *History: Its Theory and Practice*. Trans. D. Ainslie (New York, 1921)

Czock, M., ‘Monks Pray, Priests Teach, Canons Sing and the Laity Listens: The Regula Benedicti and Conceptual Diversity of Sacred Space in Carolingian Discourse’, in D. R. Kramer, É. Kurdziel and G. Ward (eds), *Monastic Communities and Canonical Clergy in the Carolingian World (780–840): Categorizing the Church* (Turnhout, 2022), pp. 355–80

Davis, J. R., *Charlemagne’s Practice of Empire* (Cambridge, 2015)

de Jong, M., ‘Bride Shows Revisited: Praise, Slander and Exegesis in the Reign of the Empress Judith’, in L. Brubaker and J. M. H. Smith (eds), *Gender in the Early Medieval World. East and West, 300–900* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 257–77

———, ‘Charlemagne’s Church’, in J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 103–35

———, ‘Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity’, in W. Pohl, H. Reimitz and S. Airlie (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 113–26

———, ‘The Empire as Ecclesia: Hrabanus Maurus and Biblical Historia for Rulers’, in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 191–226

———, *Epitaph for an Era: Politics and Rhetoric in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2019)

———, ‘Exegesis for an Empress’, in E. Cohen and M. d. Jong (eds), *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* (Leiden, 2001), pp. 69–100

———, ‘Growing up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and His Oblates’, *Journal of Medieval History* 9 (1983), pp. 99–128

———, *The Penitential State* (Cambridge, 2009)

———, ‘The Two Republics’, in R. Balzaretti, J. Barrow and P. Skinner (eds), *Italy and Early Medieval Europe: Papers for Chris Wickham* (Oxford, 2018), pp. 486–500

de Tocqueville, A., *The Ancien Régime and the French Revolution*. Trans. A. Goldhammer and J. Elster (Cambridge, 2011)

Debord, A., *La société laïque dans les pays de Charente, Xe–XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1984)

Delogu, P., ‘Lombard and Carolingian Italy’, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History (vol. II: c. 700– c. 900)* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 290–319

Depreux, P., ‘Ambitions et limites des réformes culturelles à l’époque carolingienne’, *Revue historique* 623 (2002), pp. 721–53

———, ‘Das Königtum Bernhards von Italien und sein Verhältnis zum Kaisertum’, *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 72 (1992), pp.

1–25

———, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)* (Sigmaringen, 1997)

Devroey, J. P., *Puissants et misérables: système social et monde paysan dans l'Europe des Francs (VIe – IXe siècles)* (Bruxelles, 2006)

Devroey, J. P., and M. Lauwers, 'L'"espace" des historiens médiévistes: quelques remarques en guise de conclusion', in T. Lienhard (ed.), *Construction de l'espace au Moyen Âge: Pratiques et représentations* (Paris, 2007), pp. 435–54

Diem, A., 'The Carolingians and the Regula Benedicti', in R. Meens (ed.), *Religious Franks* (Manchester, 2016), pp. 243–61

Dreier, H., *Die deutsche Staatsrechtslehre in der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus. 1. Bericht von Prof. Dr. Horst Dreier, Würzburg* (Berlin, 2001)

Dronke, P., *Woman Writers of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1984)

Dubreucq, A., 'Guillaume de Toulouse et la politique carolingienne en Aquitaine, d'après les sources narratives', in L. Macé (ed.), *Entre histoire et épopée: les Guillaume d'Orange (IXe – XIIIe siècles)* (Toulouse, 2006), pp. 183–206

Dubreucq, O. M., ‘Le De Institutione Laicali de Jonas d’Orléans: édition, traduction, commentaire’, PhD thesis (Université de Paris, 2007)

Duby, G., ‘Histoire sociale et idéologies des société’, in J. Le Goff and P. Nora (eds), *Faire de l’histoire: Nouveaux problèmes* (Paris, 1974), pp. 147–68

———, ‘La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise’, in G. Duby (ed.), *Qu’est-ce que la société féodale?* (Paris, 2011), pp. 7–600

Dutton, P. E., *Charlemagne’s Mustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York, 2004)

———, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln/London, 1994)

Easton, M. G., *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (New York, 2005)

Eberle, P. J., ‘Mirror of Princes’, in J. R. Strayer (ed.), *Dictionary of the Middle Ages. vol. 8* (New York, 1987), pp. 434–36

Ehs, T., ‘Gesellschaftswissenschaft. 2. Othmar Spann’, in T. Olechowski, T. Ehs and K. Staudigl-Ciechowicz (eds), *Die Wiener Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Fakultät 1918–1938* (Göttingen, 2014), pp. 581–90

Emerick, J., ‘Charlemagne: A New Constantine?’, in M. S. Bjornlie (ed.), *The Life and*

Legacy of Constantine (London, 2016), pp. 133–61

Erkens, F. R., '"Divisio legitima" und "unitas imperii". Teilungspraxis und Einheitsstreben bei der Thronfolge im Frankenreich', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 52 (1996), pp. 423–85

———, 'Militia und Ritterschaft. Reflexionen über den Ursprung des Rittertums', *Historische Zeitschrift* 258 (1994), pp. 623–60

Etzemüller, T., *Sozialgeschichte als politische Geschichte: Werner Conze und die Neuorientierung der westdeutschen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945* (Munich, 2001)

Evans, R., 'A Secular Shift in Carolingian History Writing', *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 36–54

Faulhaber, R., *Der Reichseinheitsgedanke in der Literatur der Karolingerzeit bis zum Vertrag von Verdun* (Berlin, 1931)

Febvre, L., 'Les mots et les choses en histoire économique', *Annales* 2 (1930), pp. 231–34

———, 'Parole, matière première de l'histoire', *Mélanges d'histoire sociale* 4 (1943), pp. 89–91

Fichtenau, H., ‘Forschungen über Urkundenformeln’, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 94 (1986), pp. 285–340

Fleckenstein, J., *Die Bildungsreform Karls des Grossen als Verwirklichung der Norma Rectitudinis* (Bigge-Ruhr, 1953)

Foucault, M., *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. A. Sheridan (New York, 1979)

———, *Les Mots et les Choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines* (Paris, 1966)

Fried, J., ‘Der karolingische Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh. zwischen “Kirche” und “Königshaus”’, *Historische Zeitschrift* 235 (1982), pp. 1–44

———, *Die Formierung Europas 840–1046* (München, 1991)

———, ‘“Gens” und “regnum”. Wahrnehmungs- und Deutungskategorien politischen Wandels im frühen Mittelalter. Bemerkungen zur doppelten Theoriebindung des Historikers’, in J. Miethke and K. Schreiner (eds), *Sozialer Wandel im Mittelalter. Wahrnehmungsformen, Erklärungsmuster, Regelungsmechanismen* (Sigmaringen, 1994), pp. 73–104

Gabriele, M., ‘The Historian Hrabanus Maurus and the Prophet Haimo of Auxerre: Experiments, Exegesis, and Expectations Emerging from the Ninth Century’, in M. B.

Gillis (ed.), *Carolingian Experiments* (Turnhout, 2022), pp. 149–64

Ganshof, F. L., 'Charlemagne's Use of the Oath', in F. L. Ganshof (ed.), *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy: Studies in Carolingian History* (London, 1971), pp. 111–24

———, 'Einhard, Biographer of Charlemagne', in F. L. Ganshof (ed.), *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy: Studies in Carolingian History* (London, 1971), pp. 1–16

———, 'Note critique sur la biographie de Nithard', in *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (Bruges, 1930), pp. 335–44

———, 'Note sur les origines byzantines du titre "Patricius Romanorum"', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 10 (1950), pp. 261–82

Gantner, C., 'The Lombard recension of the Roman "Liber pontificalis"', *Rivista di storia del cristianesimo* 10 (2013), pp. 65–114

Ganz, D., 'Einhard's Charlemagne: The Characterisation of Greatness', in J. Story (ed.), *Charlemagne: Empire and Society* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 38–51

———, 'Einhardus Peccator', in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (New York, 2007), pp. 37–50

———, ‘The Epitaphium Arsenii and Opposition to Louis the Pious’, in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds), *Charlemagne’s Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 537–50

———, ‘The Preface to Einhard’s Vita Karoli’, in H. Schefers (ed.), *Einhard: Studien zu Leben und Werk* (Darmstadt, 1997), pp. 299–310

Garrison, M., ‘The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne’, in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61

Garver, V., *Women and Aristocratic Culture in the Carolingian World* (Ithaca/London, 2011)

Geary, P. J., ‘Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages’, in E. Peters (ed.), *Folk Life in the Middle Ages* (Richmond, 1991), pp. 1–17

———, ‘Land, Language and Memory in Europe 700–1100’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999), pp. 169–84

———, *Language and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Waltham, 2013)

———, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, 2002)

———, ‘Vivre en conflit dans une France sans état: typologie des mécanismes de règlement des conflits (1050–1200)’, *Annales* 41 (1986), pp. 1107–33

Gilbert, F., ‘The Humanist Concept of the Prince and the Prince of Machiavelli’, *The Journal of Modern History* 11 (1939), pp. 449–83

Gingrich, A., and C. Lutter, ‘Visions of Community: An Introduction’, *History and Anthropology* 26 (2015), pp. 1–7

Glenn, J., ‘Between Two Empires: Einhard and His Charles the Great’, in J. K. Glenn (ed.), *The Middle Ages in Texts and Texture* (Toronto, 2011), pp. 105–18

Goetz, H. W., ‘The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries’, in G. Althoff, J. Fried and P. J. Geary (eds), *Medieval Concepts of the Past* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 139–65

———, ‘Die Wahrnehmung von “Staat” und “Herrschaft” im frühen Mittelalter’, in S. Airlie, W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 39–58

———, ‘Erwartungen an den “Staat”: die Perspektive der Historiographie in spätkarolingischer Zeit’, in W. Pohl and V. Wieser (eds), *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat* (Wien, 2009), pp. 471–88

———, *Frauen im frühen Mittelalter. Frauenbild und Frauenleben im Frankenreich* (Köln, 1995)

———, '"Nobilis". Der Adel im Selbstverständnis der Karolingerzeit', *VSWG: Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 70 (1983), pp. 153–91

———, 'Regnum: Zum politischen Denken der Karolingerzeit', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung fur Rechtsgeschichte, Germanistische Abteilung* 104 (1987), pp. 110–89

Goldberg, E. J., *In the Manner of the Franks: Hunting, Kingship, and Masculinity in Early Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia, 2020)

———, 'Louis the Pious and the Hunt', *Speculum* 88 (2013), pp. 613–43

———, *Struggle for Empire* (Ithaca, 2006)

Gollwitzer, H., 'Zum politischen Germanismus des 19. Jahrhunderts', in Max-Planck-Institut für Geschichte (ed.), *Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel. Bd. 1* (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 282–356

Goosmann, F. C. W., 'Memorable Crises: Carolingian Historiography and the Making of Pippin's Reign, 750–900', PhD thesis (Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2013)

Graus, F., ‘Verfassungsgeschichte des mittelalters’, *Historische Zeitschrift* 243 (1986), pp. 529–90

Gravel, M., *Distances, rencontres, communications: realiser l’empire sous Charlemagne et Louis le Pieux* (Turnhout, 2012)

Green, W. A., ‘Periodization in European and World History’, *Journal of World History* 3 (1992), pp. 13–53

Grimm, J., *Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer* (London, 2018)

Grunin, A., ‘Imaginer l’empire. Étude d’un concept étatique carolingien et evolution du vocabulaire politique dans le royaume et l’empire franc entre 768–840, et dans la Francia occidentalis entre 840–877’, PhD thesis (Université d’Avignon, 2010)

Guenée, B., ‘Des limites féodales aux frontières politiques’, in P. Nora (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1997), pp. 1103–21

———, *States and Rulers in Later Medieval Europe*. Trans. J. Vale (Oxford, 1985)

———, ‘Temps de l’histoire et temps de la mémoire au Moyen Age’, *Annuaire Bulletin de la Société d’Histoire de France* 97 (1976–1977), pp. 25–35

Guerreau, A., ‘Le champ sémantique de l’espace dans la vita de saint Maieul (Cluny,

début du XIe siècle)', *Journal des Savants* 2 (1997), pp. 363–419

———, 'Quelques caractères spécifiques de l'espace féodal européen', in N. Bulst, R. Descimon and A. Guerreau (eds), *L'État ou le Roi. Les fondations de la modernité monarchique en France* (Paris, 1996), pp. 85–101

Gunton, C. E., *The One, the Three and the Many* (Cambridge, 1993)

Hack A. T., *Codex Carolinus. Päpstliche Epistolographie im 8. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2007)

Halphen, L., *Charlemagne et l'empire carolingien* (Paris, 1947)

———, *Vie de Charlemagne / Éginhard* (Paris, 1923)

Hammer, C. I., 'Country Churches, Clerical Inventories and the Carolingian Renaissance in Bavaria', *Church History* 49 (1980), pp. 5–17

———, 'Land Sales in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Bavaria: Legal, Economic and Social Aspects', *Early Medieval Europe* 6 (1997), pp. 47–76

Hartog, F., 'L'apocalypse, une philosophie de l'histoire?', *Esprit* 6 (2014), pp. 22–32

———, *Régime d'historicité. Présentisme et expériences du temps* (Paris, 2012)

Hayes, J. H., and C. R. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook* (Louisville/London, 2007)

Heidegger, M., *Being and Time*. Trans. J. Stambaugh (New York, 1996)

———, *Die Grundprobleme der Phanomenologie* (Frankfurt am Main, 1991)

Heith-Stade, D., 'Dionysius Exiguus', in P. L. Reynolds (ed.), *Great Christian Jurists and Legal Collections in the First Millennium* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 315–33

Hellerma, J., 'Koselleck on Modernity, Historik, and Layers of Time', *History and Theory* 59 (2020), pp. 188–209

Hen, Y., 'The Uses of the Bible and the Perception of Kingship in Merovingian Gaul', *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998), pp. 277–89

Herlihy, D., 'Family', *The American Historical Review* 96 (1991), pp. 1–16

———, *Medieval Households* (London, 1985)

Hirt, B., 'Das Bild des Hirten im Alten und Neuen Testament', in M. Fischer and D. Rothaug (eds), *Das Motiv des Guten Hirten in Theologie, Literatur und Musik* (Tübingen, 2002), pp. 15–49

Hofmeister, A., ‘Weißenburger Aufzeichnungen vom Ende des 8. und Anfang des 9. Jahrhunderts’, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 73 (1919), pp. 401–21

Holenstein, A., *Die Huldigung der Untertanen. Rechtskultur und Herrschaftsordnung (800–1800)* (Stuttgart, 1991)

Houben, H., ‘Visio cuiusdam pauperculae mulieris. Überlieferung und Herkunft eines frühmittelalterlichen Visionstextes’, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 124 (1976), pp. 31–42

Hummer, H. J., *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600–1000* (Cambridge, 2006)

———, *Visions of Kinship in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2018)

Hunt, L., *The Family Romance of the French Revolution* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1992)

Imort, M., ‘“Forestopia”: The Use of the Forest Landscape in Naturalizing National Socialist Ideologies of Volk, Race, and Lebensraum, 1918–1945’, PhD thesis (Queen’s University Canada, 2000)

Innes, M., ‘Charlemagne’s Will: Piety, Politics and the Imperial Succession’, *The English Historical Review* 112 (1997), pp. 833–55

———, ‘The Classical Tradition in the Carolingian Renaissance: Ninth-Century Encounters with Suetonius’, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3 (1997), pp. 265–82

———, ‘“A Place of Discipline”: Carolingian Courts and Aristocratic Youth’, in C. Cubitt (ed.), *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 59–76

———, ‘Practices of Property in the Carolingian Empire’, in J. R. Davis and M. McCormick (eds), *The Long Morning of Medieval Europe* (Abingdon, 2008), pp. 247–66

———, ‘Queenship in Dispute: Fastrada, History and Law’, in E. M. Screen and C. West (eds), *Writing the Early Medieval West: Studies in Honour of Rosamond Mckitterick* (Cambridge, 2018), pp. 230–47

———, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000)

———, ‘Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past’, in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 227–49

Innes, M., and R. McKitterick, ‘The Writing of History’, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 193–220

Iogna-Prat, D., *Cité de Dieu, cité des hommes: L'Église et l'architecture de la société. 1200–1500* (Paris, 2016)

Iogna-Prat, D., H. F. Jolowicz, and B. Nicholas, 'L'œuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre', in G. Lobrichon (ed.), *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre: de Murethach à Rémi, 830–908* (Paris, 1991), pp. 157–79

Janssens, B., 'L'étude de la langue et les citations bibliques dans le *Liber Manualis de Dhuoda: un sondage*', in M. von Uytfanghe and R. Demeulenaere (eds), *Aevum inter utrumque. Mélanges offerts à Gabriel Sanders, professeur émérite à l'Université de Gand* (Steenbrugge, 1991), pp. 259–75

Johrendt, J., '"Milites" und "Militia" im 11. Jahrhundert in Deutschland', in A. Borst (ed.), *Das Rittertum im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1976), pp. 419–36

Jolowicz, H. F., and B. Nicholas, *A Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law* (Cambridge, 1972)

Jónsson, E. M., 'La situation du Speculum Regale dans la littérature occidentale', *Études Germaniques* 42 (1987), pp. 391–408

Jordheim, H., 'Against Periodization: Koselleck's Theory of Multiple Temporalities', *History and Theory* 51 (2012), pp. 151–71

———, ‘Does Conceptual History Really Need a Theory of Historical Times?’, *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), pp. 21–41

———, ‘“Unzählbar viele Zeiten”: Die Sattelzeit im Spiegel der Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen’, in H. Joas and P. Vogt (eds), *Begriffene Geschichte. Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Frankfurt, 2010), pp. 449–80

Jussen, B., and K. Ubl, ‘Die Sprache der Kapitularien. Einleitung’, in B. Jussen and K. Ubl (eds), *Die Sprache des Rechts. Historische Semantik und karolingische Kapitularien* (Göttingen, 2022), pp. 9–33

Kaiser, R., *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht. Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfranzösischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Bonn, 1981)

Kantorowicz, E. H., *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1946)

Kaschke, S., *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen bis 831* (Hamburg, 2006)

Kasten, B., *Adalhard von Corbie. Die Biographie eines karolingischen Politikers und Klostervorstehers* (Düsseldorf, 1986)

———, *Königssöhne und Königsherrschaft. Untersuchungen zur Teilhabe am Reich in*

der Merowinger- und Karolingerzei (Hannover, 1997)

Keefe, S., *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire* (Notre Dame, 2002)

Kempshall, M. S., 'Some Ciceronian Models for Einhard' s Life of Charlemagne', *Viator* 26 (1995), pp. 11–38

Kéry, L., *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400–1140): A bibliographical guide to the manuscripts and literature* (Washington DC, 1999)

Koebner, R., 'Semantics and Historiography', *The Cambridge Journal* 7 (1953), pp. 131–44

Konstan, D., *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge, 2007)

Kortüm, H. H., *Kriege und Krieger 500–1500* (Stuttgart, 2010)

Kortüm, H. H., and D. Geyer, '"I Got Through Those Times Well": Otto Brunner and National Socialism', *German Yearbook of Contemporary History* 5 (2021), pp. 74–114

Koselleck, R., 'Begriffsgeschichte and Social History', *Economy and Society* 11 (1982), pp. 409–27

———, ‘Begriffsgeschichtliche Probleme der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung’, in H. Quaritsch (ed.), *Gegenstand und Begriffe der Verfassungsgeschichtsschreibung* (Berlin, 1983), pp. 7–21

———, ‘Einleitung’, in O. Brunner, W. Conze and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 1* (Stuttgart, 1979), pp. XIII–XXVII

———, ‘“Erfahrungsraum” und “Erwartungshorizont” — zwei historische Kategorien’, in R. Koselleck (ed.), *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main, 1975), pp. 349–75

———, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*. Trans. K. Tribe (New York, 2004)

———, ‘Geschichte, Historie’, in O. Brunner, W. Conze and R. Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland, Bd. 2* (Stuttgart, 1975), pp. 593–717

———, ‘Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe’, *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), pp. 1–37

———, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Trans. T. S. Presner (Stanford, 2002)

———, ‘A Response to Comments on the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe’, in H. Lehmann and M. Richter (eds), *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte* (Washington, 1996), pp. 59–70

———, ‘Richtlinien für das Lexikon politisch-sozialer Begriffe der Neuzeit’, *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 11 (1967), pp. 81–99

———, *Zeitschichten. Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt, 2000)

Koselleck, R., and C. Dipper, ‘Begriffsgeschichte, Sozialgeschichte, begriffene Geschichte. Reinhart Koselleck im Gespräch mit Christof Dipper’, *Neue Politische Literatur* 43 (1998), pp. 187–205

Koziol, G., ‘Authority and Christology in Dhuoda’s Manual’, in C. M. Booker and A. A. Latowsky (eds), *In This Modern Age: Medieval Studies in Honor of Paul Edward Dutton* (Budapest, 2023), pp. 47–96

Krah, A., *Die Entstehung der ‘potestas regia’ im Westfrankenreich während der ersten Regierungsjahre Kaiser Karls II. (840–877)* (Berlin, 2000)

Kuchenbuch, L., *Bäuerliche Gesellschaft und Klosterherrschaft im 9. Jht. Studien zur Sozialstruktur der Familia der Abtei Prüm* (Wiesbaden, 1978)

Lachaud, F., and L. Scordia, ‘Introduction’, in F. Lachaud and L. Scordia (eds), *Le*

prince au miroir de la littérature politique de l'Antiquité aux Lumières (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 2007), pp. 11–18

Lambertini, R., 'Mirrors for Princes', in H. Lagerlund (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy* (Dordrecht, 2011), pp. 791–97

Landes, R., *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034* (London, 1995)

Lapidge, M., *Hilduin of Saint-Denis: The Passio S. Dionysii in Prose and Verse* (Leiden, 2017)

Lauer, P., 'Introduction', in P. Lauer (ed.), *Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris, 1926), pp. v–xix

Lauranson-Rosaz, C., 'Ermengarde, Ava, Ingelberge et les autres... "femmes" de Guilhelmides entre Austrasie et Aquitaine, entres Auvergne et Cluny, du Ville au Xe siècle', in J. P. Renard, D. Riche and J. Teyssot (eds), *La place et le rôle des femmes dans l'histoire de Cluny* (Saint-Just-près-Brioude, 2013), pp. 35–56

———, 'Les Guillelmides: une famille de l'aristocratie d'empire carolingienne dans le Midi de la Gaule (VIIIe–Xe siècles)', in L. Macé (ed.), *Les Guillaume d'Orange, entre histoire et épopée (IXe–XIIIe siècles)* (Toulouse, 2006), pp. 45–84

Lauwers, M., and L. Ripart, ‘Représentation et gestion de l’espace dans l’Occident médiéval (Ve–XIIIe siècle)’, in J. P. Genet (ed.), *Rome et l’état moderne européen* (Rome, 2007), pp. 97–114

Le Goff, J., *Time, Work, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, Trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago/London, 1980)

Le Jan, R., *Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc (VIIe – Xe siècle). Essai d’anthropologie sociale* (Paris, 1995)

———, *Histoire de la France. Origines et premier essor* (Paris, 1996)

———, ‘The Multiple Identities of Dhuoda’, in R. Corradini, M. Gillis, R. McKitterick and I. van Renswoude (eds), *Ego Trouble: Authors and Their Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2010), pp. 211–20

———, ‘Structures familiales et politiques au neuvième siècle: un groupe familial de l’aristocratie franque’, *Revue historique* 265 (1981), pp. 289–333

———, ‘Texte et intertextualité: le Manuel de Dhuoda’, in S. Sato (ed.), *Herméneutique du texte d’histoire. Orientation, interprétation et questions nouvelles* (Nagoya, 2010), pp. 101–08

Leclercq, J. T., ‘Le genre épistolaire au Moyen Âge’, *Revue du Moyen Âge latin* 2

(1946), pp. 63–70

Lefort, C., ‘Société “sans histoire” et historicité’, in C. Lefort (ed.), *Les Formes de l’histoire. Essais d’anthropologie politique* (Paris, 1978), pp. 30–48

Leja, M., ‘The Making of Men, Not Masters: Right Order and Lay Masculinity According to Dhuoda and Nithard’, *Comitatus* 39 (2008), pp. 1–40

Lenclud, G., ‘Traversées dans le temps’, *Annales* 61 (2006), pp. 1053–84

Lévi-Strauss, C., ‘Histoire et ethnologie’, *Annales* 38 (1983), pp. 1217–31

Levillain, L., ‘Les Nibelungen historiques et leurs alliances de familles’, *Annales du Midi* 50 (1938), pp. 5–66

Leyser, K., ‘The Ascent of Latin Europe’, in K. Leyser and T. Reuter (eds), *Communications and Power in the Middle Ages* (London, 1994), pp. 215–32

———, ‘Three Historians’, in K. Leyser and T. Reuter (eds), *Communications and Power in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 19–28

Lo Monaco, F., and C. Villa, *I Giuramenti di Strasburgo: testi e tradizione* (Firenze, 2009)

Löfstedt, B., ‘Zu Dhuodas Liber manualis’, *Arctos. Acta Philologica Fennica* 15 (1981), pp. 67–83

Lorenz, S., ‘André Lalande, Henri Bergson und die “Fixation du langage philosophique”: Zur Vorgeschichte des “Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie”’, *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 38 (1995), pp. 223–35

Löwith, K., *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago, 2011)

Maass, R. W., ‘Political Society and Cicero’s Ideal State’, *Historical Methods* 45 (2012), pp. 79–92

MacLean, S., ‘Apocalypse and Revolution: Europe around the Year 1000’, *Early Medieval Europe* 15 (2007), pp. 86–106

———, *Kingship and Politics in the Late Ninth Century: Charles the Fat and the End of the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2003)

Manitius, M., *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters, vol. 1: Von Justinian bis zur Mitte des zehnten Jahrhunderts* (München, 1911)

Marin, L., *Portrait of the King*. Trans. M. M. Houle (Basingstoke, 1988)

Markus, R. A., *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990)

Marlow, L., 'Royal Power and Its Regulations: Narratives of Hārūn Al-Rashīd in Three Mirrors for Princes', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 343–75

———, 'Surveying Recent Literature on the Arabic and Persian Mirrors for Princes Genre', *History Compass* 7 (2009), pp. 523–38

Martin, J. P., 'Res publica, libertas et principat', in G. Constable and M. Rouche (eds), *Auctoritas: Mélanges offerts à Olivier Guillot* (Paris, 2006), pp. 35–44

Martín, R., and V. Eugenia, 'Los salmos bíblicos como enseñanza en el Manual de Dhuoda', in M. P. Gonzalez (ed.), *Actas del III Congreso Hispánico de Latín Medieval* (Léon, 2002), pp. 447–56

Mayer, T., 'Die Königsfreien und der Staat des frühen Mittelalters', in *Das Problem der Freiheit in der deutschen und schweizerischen Geschichte* (Sigmaringen, 1955), pp. 7–56

Mayeski, M., 'The Beatitudes and the Moral Life of the Christian: Practical Theology and Biblical Exegesis in Dhuoda of Septimania', *Mystics Quarterly* 18 (1992), pp. 6–15

———, *Dhuoda. Ninth Century Mother and Theologian* (Scranton, 1995)

Mazel, F., *L'évêque et le territoire: l'invention médiévale de l'espace* (Paris, 2016)

McKitterick, R., *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989)

———, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008)

———, 'Charles the Bald (823–877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning', *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), pp. 28–47

———, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977)

———, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London, 1983)

———, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004)

———, 'The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals', *The English Historical Review* 115 (2000), pp. 1–20

———, 'Introduction: Sources and Interpretation', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History (vol. II: c. 700– c. 900)* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 3–17

———, 'Latin and Romance: A Historian's Perspective', in R. Wright (ed.), *Latin and*

the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages (London, 1991), pp. 130–45

———, *Rome and the Invention of the Papacy* (Cambridge, 2020)

———, 'Some Carolingian Law-Books and Their Function', in B. Tierney and P. Linehan (eds), *Authority and Power. Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann on His Seventieth Birthday* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 13–27

———, *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe* (Cambridge, 1992)

McSheffrey, S., *Love and Marriage in Late Medieval London* (Detroit, 1995)

Meens, R., 'Children and Confession in the Early Middle Ages', *Studies in Church History* 31 (1994), pp. 53–65

Mehring, R., 'Begriffsgeschichte mit Carl Schmitt', in H. Joas and P. Vogt (eds), *Begriffene Geschichte: Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Berlin, 2011), pp. 138–68

Meyers, J., 'Dhuoda et la justice d'après son Liber Manualis (IXe siècle)', *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* 25 (2013), pp. 451–62

———, 'Éginhard et Suétone: A propos des chapitres 18 à 27 de la Vita Karoli', in M.

Goullet and M. Parisse (eds), *Les historiens et le latin médiéval* (Paris, 2001), pp. 129–50

Miller, D. H., 'The Roman Revolution of the Eighth Century: A Study of the Ideological Background of die Papal Separation from Byzantium and Alliance with the Franks', *Mediaeval Studies* 36 (1974), pp. 79–133

Mitteis, H., 'Formen der Adelsherrschaft im Mittelalter', in H. Mitteis and L. Petersen (eds), *Die Rechtsidee in der Geschichte. Gesammelte Abhandlungen und Vorträge* (Weimar, 1957), pp. 636–68

Moesch, S., *Augustine and the Art of Ruling in the Carolingian Imperial Period* (London, 2019)

Morrissey, R., *Charlemagne and France: A Thousand Years of Mythology*. Trans. C. Tihanyi (Notre Dame, 2003)

Motzkin, G., 'On Koselleck's Intuition of Time in History', in H. Lehmann and M. Richter (eds), *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 41–46

———, 'On the Notion of Historical (Dis)Continuity: Reinhart Koselleck's Construction of the Sattelzeit', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 1 (2005), pp. 145–58

Müller, E., *Nithard vier Bücher Geschichten* (Leipzig, 1911)

Müller, E., and F. Schmieder, *Begriffsgeschichte und historische Semantik. Ein kritisches Kompendium* (Frankfurt, 2016)

Murray, A. C., 'Post vocantur Merohingii: Fredegar, Merovech, and "Sacral Kingship"', in A. C. Murray (ed.), *After Rome's Fall. Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History* (Toronto, 1998), pp. 121–52

———, 'Should the Middle Ages Be Abolished?', *Essays in Medieval Studies* 21 (2004), pp. 1–22

Naoki, K., 'Augustine's Scriptural Exegesis in De sermone Domini in monte and the Shaping of Christian Perfection', in G. Dunn and W. Mayer (eds), *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies Inspired by Pauline Allen* (Leiden/Boston, 2015), pp. 225–47

Nelson, J. L., 'Aachen as a Place of Power', in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), XIV: pp. 217–41

———, 'Bad Kingship in the Earlier Middle Ages', in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), VIII: pp. 1–26

———, ‘Carolingian Royal Funerals’, in F. Theuws and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 131–84

———, *Charles the Bald* (London, 1992)

———, ‘Dhuoda’, in P. Wormald and J. L. Nelson (eds), *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 106–20

———, ‘Dhuoda on Dreams’, in C. Leyser and L. Smith (eds), *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400–1400: Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser* (New York, 2011), pp. 41–54

———, ‘Dhuoda’s Context’, in L. Jégou, S. Joye, T. Lienhard and J. Schneider (eds), *Faire lien. Aristocratie, réseaux et échanges compétitifs: Mélanges en l’honneur de Régine Le Jan* (Paris, 2015), pp. 453–64

———, ‘Did Charlemagne have a Private Life?’, in D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (eds), *Writing Medieval Biography, 750–1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 15–28

———, *The Frankish World, 750–900* (London, 1996)

———, ‘History-Writing at the Courts of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald’, in A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (eds), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna,

1994), pp. 435–42

———, ‘Inauguration Rituals’, in P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (eds), *Early Medieval Kingship* (Leeds, 1977), pp. 50–71

———, *King and Emperor: A New Life of Charlemagne* (London, 2019)

———, ‘Kingship and Empire’, in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 211–51

———, ‘La cour impériale de Charlemagne’, in R. Le Jan (ed.), *La royauté et les élites dans l’Europe carolingienne* (Villeneuve d’Ascq, 1998), pp. 177–91

———, ‘Le partage de Verdun’, in M. Gaillard, M. Margue, A. Dierkens and H. Pettiau (eds), *De la mer du Nord à la Méditerranée. Francia Media. Une région au couer de l’Europe (c.840–c.1050)* (Luxembourg, 2011), pp. 241–54

———, ‘Nobility in the Ninth Century’, in A. Duggan (ed.), *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 43–51

———, ‘On the Limits of the Carolingian Renaissance’, *Studies in church history* 14 (1977), pp. 51–69

———, ‘Organic Intellectuals in the Dark Ages?’, *History Workshop Journal* 66 (2008),

pp. 1–17

———, ‘Parents, Children, and the Church in the Earlier Middle Ages’, *Studies in Church History* 31 (1994), pp. 81–114

———, ‘Public Histories and Private History in the Work of Nithard’, *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp. 251–93

———, ‘Revisiting the Carolingian Renaissance’, in H. Reimitz and J. Kreiner (eds), *Motions of Late Antiquity: Essays on Religion, Politics, and Society in Honour of Peter Brown* (Turnhout, 2016), pp. 331–46

———, ‘Why Were There So Many Different Accounts of Charlemagne’s Imperial Coronation’, in J. L. Nelson (ed.), *Courts, Elites, and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages: Charlemagne and Others* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. XII:1–27

Neuman, M., ‘Carolingian Monastic Writers and the Ninth-Century Jewish Question’, *The American Benedictine Review* 42 (1991), pp. 251–81

Nicholas, D. M., ‘New Paths of Social History and Old Paths of Historical Romanticism an Essay Review on the Work and Thought of Otto Brunner’, *Journal of Social History* 3 (1969), pp. 277–94

Noble, T. F. X., ‘Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the

Charlemagne Legend', in M. Gabriele and J. Stickey (eds), *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages* (New York, 2008), pp. 3–21

———, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2011)

———, 'The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious', *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), pp. 235–50

———, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984)

——— [review], 'Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (eds), *The Uses of the past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000)', *Speculum* 77 (2002), pp. 1307–09

Nora, P., 'Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire', *Representations* 26 (1989), pp. 7–24

O'Brien, C., 'Empire, Ethnic Election and Exegesis in the Opus Caroli (Libri Carolini)', *Studies in Church History* 54 (2018), pp. 96–108

———, 'Chosen Peoples and New Israels in the Early Medieval West', *Speculum* 95 (2020), pp. 987–1009

Oexle, O., '"Begriffsgeschichte" — Eine noch nicht begriffene Geschichte',

Philosophisches Jahrbuch 116 (2009), pp. 381–400

Olivier, G., 'Une "ordinatio" méconnue: le capitulaire de 823 – 825', in P. Godman and C. Roger (eds), *Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 455–86

Olsen, G. W., 'One Heart and One Soul (Acts 4.32 and 34) in Dhuoda's "Manual"', *Church History* 61 (1992), pp. 23–33

Olsen, N., *History in the Plural: An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck* (New York, 2012)

———, 'Reinhart Koselleck, Karl Löwith und der Geschichtsbegriff', in C. Dutt and R. Laube (eds), *Zwischen Sprache und Geschichte: Zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks* (Göttingen, 2013), pp. 236–55

Oudart, H., 'La fidélité au prince au temps de Louis le Pieux', in J. Quaghebeur, H. Oudart and J. M. Picard (eds), *Le Prince, son peuple et le bien commun* (Rennes, 2013), pp. 319–48

Palti, E. J., 'Reinhart Koselleck: His Concept of the Concept and neo-Kantianism', *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6 (2011), pp. 1–20

Patzold, S., 'Die Bischöfe im karolingischen Staat. Praktisches Wissen über die

politische Ordnung im Frankenreich des 9. Jh.', in S. Airlie, W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 133–62

———, 'Eine "loyale Palastrebellion" der "Reichseinheitspartei"?: Zur "Divisio imperii" von 817 und zu den Ursachen des Aufstands gegen Ludwig den Frommen im Jahre 830', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2006), pp. 43–78

Perreaux, N., 'Chronologie, diffusion et environnement des "villae" dans l'Europe médiévale (VIIe–XIIIe siècles): recherches sur les corpus diplomatiques numérisés', in *L'origine des sites monastiques: confrontation entre la terminologie des sources textuelles et les données archéologique* (Auxerre, 2016), pp. 1–43

———, 'Les mots de la sépulture dans l'Europe médiévale (VIIIe – fin XIIIe siècle): observations complémentaires à partir des corpus numérisés', in M. Lauwers and A. Zemour (eds), *Qu'est-ce qu'une sépulture? Humanités et systèmes funéraires de la Préhistoire à nos jours* (Antibes, 2016), pp. 113–22

Peyer, H. C., 'Das Reisekönigtum des Mittelalters', *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 51 (1964), pp. 1–21

Phelan, O. M., 'The Scope of Fidelity in Nithard's Ninth Century', *Viator — Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 48 (2017), pp. 21–47

Pohl, W., 'Disputed Identifications: Jews and the Use of Biblical Models in the

Barbarian Kingdoms', in Y. Hen and T. F. X. Noble (eds), *Barbarians and Jews: Jews and Judaism in the Early Medieval West* (Turnhout, 2018), pp. 11–28

———, 'Staat und Herrschaft im Frühmittelalter: Überlegungen zum Forschungsstand', in S. Airlie, W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (eds), *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Wien, 2006), pp. 9–38

Poisson, J.-M., 'De la villa au castrum: l'habitat rural dans la châtellenie dauphinoise d'Albon, de la fin de l'Antiquité au XIIe siècle', in L. Feller, P. Mane and F. Piponnier (eds), *Le village médiéval et son environnement* (Paris, 1998), pp. 571–86

Polanichka, D. M., and A. Cilley, 'The Very Personal History of Nithard: Family and Honour in the Carolingian World', *Early Medieval Europe* 22 (2014), pp. 171–200

Pomian, K., 'L'heure des "Annales": La Terre – les hommes – le monde', in P. Nora (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris, 1997), pp. 903–52

Prinz, F., 'Bayerns Adel im Hochmittelalter', in F. Prinz, A. Haverkamp and A. Heit (eds), *Mönchtum, Kultur und Gesellschaft: Beiträge zum Mittelalter* (München, 1989), pp. 17–82

Rabe, S. A., *Faith, Art, and Politics at Saint-Riquier: The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert* (Philadelphia, 1995)

Raymond-Dufour, M., ‘Les trajectoires dans le temps: réflexion sur le concept de ‘régime d’historicité’, *Conserveries mémorielles. Revue transdisciplinaire* 15 (2014), https://journals.openedition.org/cm/1835#quotation [accessed 2 June 2023]

Reither, D., *Rechtsgeschichte und Rechtsgeschichten: Die Forschung über Fehde, autonome Gewalt und Krieg in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Marburg, 2009)

Reuter, T., ‘Introduction’, in T. Reuter (ed.), *The Medieval Nobility: Studies on the Ruling Classes of France and Germany from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century* (Amsterdam/Oxford, 1979), pp. 1–16

Rey, A., *Révolution. Histoire d’un mot* (Paris, 1989)

Reynolds, P. L., *How Marriage Became One of the Sacraments: The Sacramental Theology of Marriage from its Medieval Origins to the Council of Trent* (Cambridge, 2016)

Reynolds, S., *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford, 1996)

———, ‘Nations, Tribes, Peoples, and States’, *Medieval Worlds: Comparative & Interdisciplinary Studies* 2 (2015), pp. 79–88

Riché, P., *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe* (Philadelphia, 1993)

Richter, M., ‘Begriffsgeschichte and the History of Ideas’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 48 (1987), pp. 247–63

———, *The History of Political and Social Concepts: A Critical Introduction* (New York, 1995)

Rosenwein, B. H., *Love: A History in Five Fantasies* (Cambridge, 2021)

Roth, P., *Geschichte des Benefizialwesens von den ältesten Zeiten bis ins Zehnte Jahrhundert. Neudruck der Ausgabe Erlangen 1850* (Aalen, 1967)

Ruys, J. F., ‘Mater Litterata: Considerations of Maternity and Latinity in the Post-Medieval Reception of Dhuoda’s Liber manualis’, *New Medieval Literatures* 10 (2008), pp. 191–220

Saller, R. P., *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge, 1994)

Schade, H., ‘Studien zu der Karolingischen Bilderbibel aus St. Paul vor den Mauern in Rom’, *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch* (1960), pp. 15–48

Schäfer, D., *Geschichte und Kulturgeschichte* (Jena, 1891)

Schinkel, A., ‘Imagination as a Category of History: An Essay Concerning Koselleck’s Concepts of Erfahrungsraum and Erwartungshorizont’, *History and Theory* 44 (2005),

pp. 42–54

Schmale, F.-J., ‘Brief, Briefliteratur, Briefsammlungen’, in *Lexikon des Mittelalters* (Munich/Zurich, 1983), pp. 652–59

Schmid, K., ‘Zur Problematik von Familie, Sippe und Geschlecht, Haus und Dynastie beim mittelalterlichen Adel. Vorfragen zum Thema “Adel und Herrschaft im Mittelalter”’, *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 105 (1957), pp. 1–62

Schmid, K., and J. Wollasch, *Gedächtnis, das Gemeinschaft stiftet* (München, 1985)

———, *‘Memoria’. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter* (München, 1984)

———, ‘Societas et Fraternitas. Begründung eines kommentierten Quellenwerkes zur Erforschung der Personen und Personengruppen des Mittelalters’, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 9 (1976), pp. 1–48

Schmidt-Wiegand, R., ‘Eid und Gelöbnis, Formel und Formular im mittelalterlichen Recht’, in P. Classen (ed.), *Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1977), pp. 55–90

———, ‘Stammesrecht und Volkssprache in karolingischer Zeit’, in R. Schmidt-Wiegand, D. Hüpper and C. Schott (eds), *Stammesrecht und Volkssprache. Ausgewählte*

Aufsätze zu den Leges barbarorum (Weinheim, 1991), pp. 148–80

Schmitt, C., *Constitutional Theory*. Trans. J. Seitzer (Durham/London, 2008)

Schmitt, É., *Le mariage chrétien dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin: une théologie baptismale de la vie conjugale* (Paris, 1983)

Schneider, R., *Brüdergemeine und Schwurfreundschaft. Der Auflösungsprozeß des Karlingerreiches im Spiegel der caritas-Terminologie in den Verträgen der karlingischen Teilkönige des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1964)

Schneidmüller, B., *Die Welfen: Herrschaft und Erinnerung (819–1252)* (Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln, 2000)

Schroeder, N., *Les hommes et la terre de saint Remacle: histoire sociale et économique de l'abbaye de Stavelot-Malmedy, VIIe–XIVe siècle* (Bruxelles, 2015)

Schulze, H. K., 'Reichsaristokratie, Stammesadel und fränkische Freiheit: Neuere Forschungen zur frühmittelalterlichen Sozialgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift* 227 (1978), pp. 353–73

Schütz, C., 'Einleitung', in M. Puzicha (ed.), *Kommentar zur Benediktusregel* (München, 2015), pp. 13–46

Screen, E., ‘The Importance of the Emperor: Lothar I and the Frankish Civil War, 840–843’, *Early Medieval Europe* 12 (2003), pp. 25–51

Sedlmeier, F., *Die laienparänetischen Schriften der Karolingerzeit: Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Texten des Paulinus von Aquileia, Alkuins, Jonas’ von Orleans, Dhuodas und Hinkmars von Reims* (Neuried, 2000)

Semmler, J., *Der Dynastiewechsel von 751 und die fränkische Königssalbung* (Düsseldorf, 2003)

———, ‘Zeitgeschichtsschreibung und Hofhistoriographie unter den frühen Karolingern’, in J. Laudage (ed.), *Von Fakten und Fiktionen* (Köln, 2003), pp. 135–64

Severy, B., *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire* (London, 2003)

Shimahara, S., ‘Charlemagne, premier souverain chrétien commanditaire d’exégèse biblique?’, in R. Grosse and M. Sot (eds), *Charlemagne: les temps, les espaces, les hommes* (Turnhout, 2018), pp. 101–17

Sot, M., ‘“Renovatio”, renaissance et réforme à l’époque carolingienne: Recherche sur les mots’, in M. Balard and M. Sot (eds), *Au Moyen Âge, entre tradition antique et innovation* (Grénoble, 2009), pp. 117–40

Späth, T., and B. Wagner-Hasel, *Frauenwelten in der Antike: Geschlechterordnung und*

weibliche Lebenspraxis (Stuttgart/Weimar, 2016)

Steiner, A., 'Guillaume Perrault and Vincent of Beauvais', *Speculum* 8 (1933), pp. 51–58

Stevenson, T., 'Greek and Roman Writers on the Virtues of Good Rulers: Praise, Instruction, and Constraint', in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the 'Mirrors for Princes' Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 44–73

Stofferahn, S., 'The Many Faces in Dhuoda's Mirror: the Liber manualis and a Century of Scholarship', *Magistra* 4 (1998), pp. 89–134

Stone, R., 'Carolingian Domesticities', in J. M. Bennett and R. M. Karras (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 229–45

———, '"In What Way Can Those Who Have Left the World be Distinguished?": Masculinity and the Difference between Carolingian Men', in C. Beattie and K. Fenton (eds), *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages* (London, 2010) , pp. 12–33

———, 'Masculinity without Conflict: Noblemen in Eighth and Ninth Century Francia', in J. Arnold and S. Brady (eds), *What is Masculinity? Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. 76–93

———, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2011)

———, ‘Spiritual Heirs and Families: Episcopal Relatives in Early Medieval Francia’, in A. Höfert, M. Mesley and S. Tolino (eds), *Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Eunuchs and Bishops in the Pre-Modern World* (London, 2018), pp. 129–48

Stover J., and G. Woudhuysen, ‘Einhard and the Historia Augusta’, *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 33 (2023), pp. 1–16

Störmer, W., *Früher Adel. Studien zur politischen Führungsschicht im fränkisch-deutschen Reich vom 8.–11. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1976)

Suchan, M., *Mahnen und Regieren. Die Metapher des Hirten im früheren Mittelalter* (Berlin/Boston, 2015)

Taylor, A., *The Shape of the State in Medieval Scotland, 1124–1290* (Oxford, 2016)

Tellenbach, G., *Königtum und Stamme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches* (Weimar, 1939)

———, ‘Vom karolingischen Reichsadel zum deutschen Reichsfürstenstand’, in T. Mayer (ed.), *Adel und Bauer im deutschen Staat des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1943), pp. 22–73

Thompson, J. W., and B. J. Holm, *A History of Historical Writing* (New York, 1942)

Thomson, M., 'The Original Title of the Historia Augusta', *Historia: Journal of Ancient History* 56 (2007), pp. 121–25.

Tietze, P., '"Zeitwende": Richard Koebner und die Historische Semantik der Moderne Schwerpunkt: Der Erste Weltkrieg', *Jahrbuch des Simon-Dubnow-Instituts* 13 (2015), pp. 131–66

Tischler, M., *Einharts "Vita Karoli". Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption* (Hanover, 2001)

———, 'From Disorder to Order: The Scientific Challenges of Early Medieval Catalonia for Twenty-First-Century Medieval Studies', in M. Breitenstein and J. Sonntag (eds), *Disorder. Expressions of an Amorphous Phenomenon in Human History* (Münster, 2020), pp. 93–140

Toubert, P., 'Conclusion', in R. Le Jan (ed.), *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne* (Villeneuve d'Ascq, 1998), pp. 519–26

———, 'L'institution du mariage chrétien, de l'antiquité tardive à l'an mil', in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1998), pp. 503–50

———, ‘La théorie du mariage chez les moralistes carolingiens’, in *Il Matrimonio nella Societá altomedievale* (Spoleto, 1977), pp. 233–85

Treffort, C., *Le cimetière au village dans l’Europe médiévale et moderne* (Toulouse, 2015)

———, ‘Nithard, petit-fils de Charlemagne: note sur une biographie controversée’, *Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Picardie* 158 (1994), pp. 415–34

Trompf, G. W., ‘The Concept of the Carolingian Renaissance’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34 (1973), pp. 3–26

Turner, J., *The Structure of Sociological Theory* (New York, 2002)

Ubl, K., ‘Carolingian Mirrors for Princes: Texts, Contents, Impact’, in N.-L. Perret and S. Péquignot (eds), *A Critical Companion to the ‘Mirrors for Princes’ Literature* (Leiden, 2023), pp. 74–107

Ullmann, W., ‘The Bible and Principles of Government in the Middle Ages’, in *La bibbia nell’alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 1963), pp. 181–228

van Rhijn, C., ‘Manuscripts for Local Priests and the Carolingian Reforms’, in S. Patzold and C. v. Rhijn (eds), *Men in the Middle: Local Priests in Early Medieval Europe* (Berlin, 2016), pp. 177–98

Vernet, A., ‘Un nouveau manuscrit du “Manuel” de Dhuoda (Barcelone, Biblioteca central, 569)’, *Bibliothèque de l’École des Chartes* 114 (1956), pp. 18–44

Villa, C., ‘Nithard dalla storia alla leggenda famigliare’, in F. Lo Monaco and C. Villa (eds), *I giuramenti di Strasburgo: testi e tradizione* (Firenze, 2009), pp. 3–20

Vocino, G., and C. West, ‘On the Life and Continence of Judges: The Production and Transmission of Imperial Legislation in Late Ottonian Italy’, *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome. Moyen Âge* 131 (2019), pp. 87–117

von Giesebrecht, W., *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit. Bd. 1, Gründung des Kaiserthums (Chinese version)*. Trans. R. Qiu (Changchun, 2019)

von Knonau, G. M., *Über Nithards vier Bücher Geschichten: Der Bruderkrieg der Söhne Ludwigs des Frommen und sein Geschichtschreiber* (Leipzig, 1866)

von Padberg, L. E., *Christianisierung im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 2006)

von Renthe-Fink, L., ‘Geschichtlichkeit’, in J. Ritter, K. Gründer and G. Gabriel (eds), *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie Bd.3* (Basel, 1974), pp. 404–08

Waitz, G., *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* (Kiel, 1844–1878)

Wallace-Hadrill, J. M., *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent*

(Oxford, 1971)

——— [review], ‘Arnold H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1964)’, *The English Historical Review* 80 (1965), pp. 785–90

———, ‘The Via Regia of the Carolingian Age’, in B. Smalley (ed.), *Trends in Medieval Political Thought* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 22–41

Wandruszka, A., ‘Otto Brunner — Forscher und Lehrer’, *Annali dell’Istituto Storico Italo-Germanico in Trento* 13 (1987), pp. 377–88

Ward, E., ‘Agobard of Lyons and Paschasius Radbertus as Critics of the Empress Judith’, *Studies in Church History* 27 (1990), pp. 15–25

———, ‘Caesar’s Wife. The career of the empress Judith’, in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds), *Charlemagne’s Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 205–27

———, ‘The Career of the Empress Judith, 819–43’, PhD thesis (King’s College London, 2003)

Ward, I. S., ‘The Oath of Loyalty and the Post-Carolingian Transformation, c.830–1000’, PhD Thesis (Princeton University, 2018)

Wehlen, W., *Geschichtsschreibung und Staatsauffassung im Zeitalter Ludwigs des Frommen* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1970)

Weinrich, L., *Wala, Graf, Mönch, Rebell. Die Biographie eines Karolingers* (Lübeck/Hamburg, 1963)

Wemple, S. F., *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500 to 900* (Philadelphia, 1985)

Werminghoff, A., 'Die Fürstenspiegel der Karolingerzeit', *Historische Zeitschrift* 89 (1902), pp. 193–214

Werner, K. F., 'Important Noble Families in the Kingdom of Charlemagne', in T. Reuter (ed.), *The Medieval Nobility* (Victoria, 1978), pp. 137–202

———, 'La "conquête franque" de la Gaule: itinéraires historiographiques d'une erreur', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 154 (1996), pp. 7–45

West, C., 'Pope Leo of Bourges, Clerical Immunity and the Early Medieval Secular', *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 86–108

———, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation between Marne and Moselle, c.800–c.1100* (Cambridge, 2013)

Whelan, R., ‘After Augustine, After Markus: The Problem of the Secular at the End of Antiquity’, *Early Medieval Europe* 29 (2021), pp. 12–35

White, S. D., *Feuding and Peace—Making in Eleventh-Century France* (Aldershot, 2005)

———, ‘Feuding and Peace—Making in the Touraine Around the Year 1100’, *Traditio* 42 (1986), pp. 195–263

———, ‘“Pactum... Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium” — The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France’, *The American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978), pp. 281–308

Wickham, C., *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800* (Oxford, 2005)

———, *Medieval Europe* (New Haven, 2016)

———, *The Mountains and the City: The Tuscan Appennines in the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1986)

Wollasch, J., ‘Eine adlige Familie des frühen Mittelalters’, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 39 (1957), pp. 150–88

Wood, I., *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (London, 1993)

———, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2013)

Wormald, P., 'Lordship and Justice in the Early English Kingdom: Oswaldslow Revisited', in W. Davies and P. Fouracre (eds), *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 114–36

Yorke, B., 'Anglo-Saxon Gentes and Regna', in H.-W. Goetz, J. Jarnut and W. Pohl (eds), *Regna and gentes. The relationship between late antique and early medieval peoples and kingdoms in the transformation of the Roman world* (Leiden/Boston, 2003), pp. 381–407

———, 'The Reception of Christianity at the Anglo-Saxon Royal Courts', in R. Gameson (ed.), *St.Augustine and the Conversion of England* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 152–73

Zotz, T., 'Ludwig der Fromme, Alemannien und die Genese eines neuen Regnum', in G. Köbler and H. Nehlsen (eds), *Wirkungen europäischer Rechtskultur. Festschrift für Karl Kroeschell zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich, 1997), pp. 1481–99