

*AULA RENOVATA: THE CAROLINGIAN  
COURT BEFORE THE AACHEN PALACE*

By DONALD BULLOUGH

*Read 24 October 1985*

EINHARD'S *Life of Charlemagne* is the work of a fifty-five-year-old, recollecting, in something less than tranquillity, the time of his young adulthood when he was in the service of a man of undeniable if flawed greatness: a counterpart of the reminiscences of a private secretary in Churchill's War Room or of a White House adviser during the heady days of the Kennedy administration. 'I can write about events because I was there as an eyewitness'; 'and I have another reason for writing—Charles nourished me and gave me his and his children's life-long friendship when I took up residence at his court (*in aula eius conversari coepi*).'<sup>1</sup>

Einhard arrived from the monastery of Fulda, where he had been educated but not professed, in his mid-twenties, just as the previously itinerant Court was settling in its new Palace at Aachen (794). The *topos* of eyewitness authority was no empty one. The body of oral reminiscence, informed or malicious, which one associates with a closed community and which was essential for the writers of *vitae sanctorum*, is barely detectable. Einhard can, it is true, give some account of the Merovingians whom the Carolingian line had replaced in 751, including an anecdote for which he is the only source; and he can be forgiven for failing to recognize (as his unknown informant had presumably done) that the king's travels in an ox-cart were the last echo of Roman provincial governors using the Imperial slow-post, *cursus clabularis*, on their official visitations: for it has taken five hundred years of

<sup>1</sup> O. Holder-Egger (ed.), *Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni* (Scr. rer. Germanicarum, Hanover-Leipzig, 1911), the quotations from the author's Preface, ed. cit., pp. 1-2. For the date of composition (829/30? 825/26?) compare the contributions of K. Hauck and J. Fleckenstein in K. Hauck (ed.), *Das Einhardkreuz* (Abhandl. Akad. Wiss. Göttingen, Ph.-Hist. Kl. ser. 3, no. 87, 1974), esp. pp. 30-1, 116 ff., 174 ff., and H. Löwe, 'Die Entstehungszeit der Vita Karoli Einhard's', *Deutsches Archiv*, xxxix (1983), 85-103.

post-Humanist scholarship to do so.<sup>1</sup> His account of the circle around the king in the quarter century before his own arrival is almost entirely limited to Charles's immediate family—mother, wives, and children who had not died in infancy—with a toned-down account of the rebellion in 792 and its precursor in 785–6. Otherwise he has only a passing reference to the king's first teacher (of *grammatica*), the deacon Peter of Pisa, whom he could never have known, linked with Alcuin, who taught the king the more advanced disciplines and whom Einhard knew in his (Alcuin's) last years at the Court.<sup>2</sup>

'Because nothing has been recorded in writing about Charles's birth, infancy or even boyhood,' Einhard declares at the beginning of his fourth chapter, 'and because no-one seems to be alive who has information on such topics', he is passing over them and proceeding immediately to the monarch's 'deeds at home and abroad'. Since he is necessarily writing about wars which were fought before he entered royal service or, if in his own time at Court, were ones in which neither he nor his immediate associates took part, his account—taking up ten or eleven of the remaining twenty-nine chapters—is drawn essentially from still extant annals, adapted to the requirements of his particular literary genre.<sup>3</sup> Manifestly, Einhard has almost nothing to offer the historian of the pre-Aachen Court, for which in the 820s he would have found no written record and about which he had garnered little—for whatever reason—from the survivors he had once known.

<sup>1</sup> *Vita Kar.*, c. 1 (p. 3); J. M. Wallace-Hadrill 'Gregory of Tours and Bede' [1968], *Early Medieval History* (Oxford, 1975), p. 98. But Einhard does *not* describe 'the last Merovingians trundling round their estates': rather, the king uses the ox-cart for his annual journeys between his one remaining *villa* (questionably identified by Holder-Egger as Montmacq (Oise) on the basis of B. von Simson (ed.), *Annales Mettenses priores* (Scr. rer. Germ., 1905), p. 14) and the *palatium* (Court) which surely changes the point of the story. A quite different interpretation, with no element of Antique survival, is proposed by A. Gauert, 'Noch einmal Einhard u. die letztere Merowinger' in L. Fenske *et al.* (eds.), *Institutionen, Kultur u. Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Josef Fleckenstein* (Sigmaringen, 1984), pp. 59–72.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Kar.*, cc. 18–20 (pp. 22–6); *ibid.*, c. 25 (p. 30). For Einhard's early contact with Alcuin see E. Dümmler (ed.), *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae*, i (Berlin, 1881), 487 (Theodulfi carm. 25), 245 (Alcuini carm. 26), both of 796, cf. 248 (Alcuini carm. 30/ii); *id.*, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epistolae*, iv (Berlin, 1895), 285 (ep. 172) of 799.

<sup>3</sup> Louis Halphen's view that Einhard is not to be taken seriously as a historian or as a biographer depended essentially on a narrowly positivist approach to those chapters: see his *Études critiques sur l'histoire de Charlemagne* (Paris, 1921), pp. 60–103.

Yet, the very form and construction of the *Vita* seem to have favoured the misleading perspective in which the most familiar and vivid evidence for Charlemagne's Court is commonly viewed. Alcuin's letters and his pedagogic writings, Theodulf's and Angilbert's poems, the luxury manuscripts of the Court- and Palace- 'schools', which are predominantly the product of the early Aachen years, of their distinctive new setting, special circumstances and excitements, are used indiscriminately as evidence for a much longer period: both popular and scholarly works are accustomed to speak of 'the Aachen Court' in a decade when Aachen was never visited, and bring together men who never encountered one another—a White House inhabited by Dulles, Marshall, Schlesinger, and Kissinger. The essential pre-conditions of the *post-793* Court, the earlier formation of the individuals who were among its participants and commentators become (to use a metaphor that I like to think would have appealed to Einhard, 'worker in precious metals', Belazeel)<sup>1</sup> a mould which has fused with its casting. But the mould and its making have a history of their own.

When Charles's father Pippin replaced the last of the Merovingians as king of the Franks, 'by authority of the Pope' as Einhard succinctly puts it, his immediate dependents, his *homines*, *gasindi*, or *vassi*, became dependents of a monarch, the circle of clergy and laity hitherto in the service of the power behind the throne was finally transformed into a royal court.<sup>2</sup> In spite of bold claims recently made for it, any aspirations to make this a new kind of court, informed by *sapientia* or *eruditio*, were at best half-hearted and efforts in this direction limited and impermanent. The necessary resources, whether in men or texts, were absent: nor could they easily be gathered from elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Most of the books

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 245, 492; *ibid., Epist.*, iv. 285; *ibid., Poet.*, ii (Berlin, 1884), 377; (Walahfridi *carm.* 23), depending on Exod. 31: 3, 35: 33, 36: 1.

<sup>2</sup> J. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, 1: *Grundlegung; Die Karolingische Hofkapelle* (Schriften der Mon. Germ. Hist., 16/1, Stuttgart, 1959), 10 ff., 32 ff., 229 ff.; Bullough in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, lxxxv (1970), 72 ff.; *id.*, 'Albinus deliciosus Karoli regis: Alcuin at York and the Shaping of the Early Carolingian Court', *Festschrift Fleckenstein* (see p. 268, n. 1), pp. 73-92, here pp. 85 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra* P. Riché, 'Le renouveau culturel à la cour de Pépin III', *Francia*, ii (1974), 59-70. For a supposed translation from the Greek by bp. George of Ostia and Amiens (Riché, p. 67) compare *Festschrift Fleckenstein*, pp. 75-6, n. 9. But for a possibly authentic reminiscence of grammatical activity at Pippin's Court see Berlin(-Dahlem) Staatsbibl. Preussischer Kulturbesitz cod. Diez. B Sant. 66, p. 244 (ll. 10f.), and Bernhard Bischoff's comment in his introduction to the facsimile of this ms. (*Codices Selecti*, 42, Graz, 1973), p. 34.

reported to have been sent to Pippin by the Pope in 758 would have been unintelligible or incapable of effective utilization because the context for doing so was lacking: and nothing more is heard of them.<sup>1</sup> The recorded proceedings of councils of the mid-750s, which defy later distinctions between 'ecclesiastical' and 'secular', and in particular that at Verneuil (Oise) in 755, show that the momentum for reform had not been entirely lost because English missionary influence was no longer welcome at Court; and their probable influence can be traced spasmodically over the next twenty or thirty years. But the fact that the Verneuil decrees alone are transmitted in a pre-800 manuscript (a canon-law collection from the Lake Constance area) and that the group as a whole only re-emerges in very late collections of capitularies serves to underline the difficulty of effective written dissemination at this time and the indifference with which Pippin's initiatives were treated when Charlemagne and his son 'legislated' for church and kingdom in a much more comprehensive way.<sup>2</sup>

The most striking expression of the new-found confidence and authority of the Carolingians may well be the reissue of *Lex Salica* in 763/4, with a new prologue hailing the achievements of the *gens Francorum* as a people chosen of God. Stylistic parallels with the unusually elaborate prologue of the Verneuil *acta* have been noted, both in vocabulary and in the use of *Reimprosa*, the first sign of a conscious literary revival associated with the Court and its members. There are parallels, too, in an untypically formulated royal privilege for the abbey of Prüm in 762. The man responsible for this was a clerical notary, Baddilo, of whom nothing is known before he emerges as the leading figure among writers and authenticators of such documents in 757, and later 'subscribes' in a distinctive version of the writing-office cursive script inherited

<sup>1</sup> W. Gundlach (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii (Berlin, 1892), 529, with B. Bischoff, 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen' [1965], *Mittelalterliche Studien* (hereafter *Mitt. Stud.*) iii (Stuttgart, 1981), 151, n. 14.

<sup>2</sup> A. Boretius (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capitularia*, i (1883), nos. 13-16, cf. A. Werminghoff (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Concilia*, ii/1 (1906), nos. 8, 9, 11. The Verneuil decrees are in Munich clm. 6243 (E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (hereafter CLA), ix (Oxford, 1959), 1255; B. Bischoff, *Die südost-deutschen Schreibschulen u. Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, i (2nd edn., Wiesbaden, 1960), 86-8), fols. 229-32. Note that these folios are part of the original manuscript and not (as might be inferred from R. McKitterick, 'Knowledge of Canon Law in the Frankish Kingdom before 789: the Manuscript Evidence', *Journ. Theol. Studies*, xxxvi (1985), 102), among the additions made at Freising c.800: but the decrees were apparently already available for the Bavarian synod of Ascheim (*ante* 763), *Concilia* ii/1, no. 10, uniquely in the Freising portion of clm. 6243.

from the Merovingians. Baddilo, it has been suggested, is the link between *acta*, *Lex* prologue and privileges.<sup>1</sup> So, the limited resources of Pippin's court, human as well as material, are only too apparent.

Baddilo and his fellow-notaries none the less performed their several tasks in the wider context of a modest group of literate clerics, *cappellani*, who provided the Court with what Einhard would later call *religio Christiana*, the regular cycle of liturgical prayer and sacrament.<sup>2</sup> Their head, Fulrad, simultaneously abbot of St-Denis and a key figure in the negotiations of 749/50, typified the new breed of Carolingian clerical *fidelis*. What he, or anyone else, brought to the forms of worship at the Court we do not know. Before 790, however, courtiers of Charlemagne, in a rare backward glance to the reign of his father, believed that Pippin had introduced a single variety of chant and identical services on the Roman model, following the dramatic visit of Pope Stephen. Modern liturgiologists, conscious of the evanescent and transient nature of music that has no 'score' (although Isidore had long anticipated them), have been sceptical of the notion of Stephen's clergy as musical missionaries bringing Roman *cantilena* to Francia. They have been more ready to see Pippin's intervention, if such there was, in terms of a sacramentary text and the reception of Roman *ordines*—essential to the ordering of services. The possibility that the earliest form of the so-called 'eighth-century, *al.* Frankish, Gelasian sacramentary', which was to circulate well into the next century, was assembled in Pippin's chapel has been canvassed more than once: it remains 'not proven'.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> K. A. Eckhardt (ed.), *Lex Salica: 100-Titel Text* (Germanenrechte, N.F., Weimar, 1953), and especially Eckhardt's Introduction, pp. 42-55. R. Schmidt-Wiegand, "'Gens Francorum inclita": zu Gestalt u. Inhalt des längeren Prologes der Lex Salica' in U. Scheil (ed.), *Festschrift Adolf Hofmeister zum 70. Geburtstage . . . dargebracht*, i (Halle, 1955), 233-50, esp. 244 ff., is, however, sceptical.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Kar.*, c. 26 (p. 30). Fleckenstein, *Hofkapelle* (p. 269, n. 2), ch. 2 and Excursus I is fundamental for the first chaplains and notaries: but he is understandably reticent on their liturgical activities.

<sup>3</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *Capit.*, i, no. 22, cap. 80 (p. 61), where *decertavit* is commonly misunderstood as 'decreed' instead of the correct 'endeavoured, sought to establish'. Cf. H. Bastgen (ed.), *Libri Carolini*, I, 6, *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *Conc.*, ii suppl. (Berlin, 1924), 21-2, and my comments on this passage in *Studies in Church History*, xiv (Oxford, 1977), 33-4; for the reception of Roman *ordines*, magisterially edited by M. Andrieu, see *ibid.*, pp. 34-5. That the mass of St Prix (Praiectus) in all 'Frankish Gelasians' means 'that our copies of the compilation all stem from a book used in Pepin's own chapel' after it had acquired relics of the saint was an *obiter dictum* of Christopher Hohler, *Journ. Eccl. Hist.*, viii/2

[footnote cont. on p. 272]

Yet liturgical books were certainly one of the effective influences on those concerned to raise their own and others' standards of literacy. We can measure the changes that had taken place at court in Pippin's lifetime by comparing his last diploma, dated only a day before his death, with the two privileges or diplomas in the name of the last Merovingian king, Childeric III, and Pippin's own last privilege as *maior*. For the 768 document is preserved in the original and written throughout by the well-documented notary, Hitherius. The script is an immense improvement on the pre-751 examples, in consistency, quality of line, letter-forms, ligatures, spacing, etc. and even over Hitherius's own first document of fifteen years previously. The Latinity of both the freely formulated and the diplomatically standard passages would not have impressed Alcuin, Theodulf, or Einhard: but compared with the waywardness of the pre-751 texts they are substantially correct in number, case, and mood.<sup>1</sup>

We do not know how a change of ruler or a change of dynasty was communicated in the eighth and ninth centuries, although the evidence of changes in the dating clauses of private charters shows that in the smaller ninth-century kingdoms it could be achieved in a surprisingly short space of time. The use of written announcements must always have been very much the exception: and in 768 and 771 the main transmitters were presumably leading laymen (*optimates*) and clerics who had been in attendance when the old king died or at the subsequent accession ceremonies. None the less, from the start of the reign, in spite of the continuing importance of the spoken *verbum regis*,<sup>2</sup> the written word was

(1957), 223: I do not know any *early* evidence that the chapel had such relics. For a very different hypothesis see B. Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary: a Study in Tradition* (Oxford, 1976). This is *not* to say, however, that the sacramentary (or sacramentaries) used in the early Carolingian chapel was not of the type of an 'eighth-century Gelasian', or perhaps of Vatican Reg. Lat. 316, 'the Old Gelasian'. Indeed it is difficult to see what else would or could have been in use before the acquisition of the Hadrianum and the composition of a Supplement to it. Note that Vat. Reg. 316 was written at Chelles (a nunnery with close Court links), was evidently used for some time but with great care, and was eventually—although not necessarily early—at St-Denis.

<sup>1</sup> J. F. Böhmer, E. Mühlbacher, *Regesta Imperii*, i (Innsbruck, 1908/Hildesheim, 1966) (= BM.<sup>2</sup>), nos. 59, 60; E. Mühlbacher (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Diplomata Karolinorum*, i (Hannover, 1906) (= DK.), no. 27, cf. no. 6; facsimiles of all four in A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (eds.), *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*, xv (Dietikon-Zürich, 1986), nos. 597, 595, 602, 598. For Hitherius see below.

<sup>2</sup> A. Dumas, 'La parole et l'écriture dans les capitulaires carolingiens', *Mélanges d'histoire du moyen âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951),

essential to the effective assertion of royal authority, the securing of legal rights to those enjoying the king's favour and the forging or maintenance of links with privileged subjects and fellow-rulers. Its expression required the presence at a court constantly on the move except in the winter months and only intermittently well-housed,<sup>1</sup> of specialist but hardly full-time writers—a term which necessarily embraces both *dictator* and scribe.

Most familiar of those known by their works are the men severally or collectively responsible for the preparation of the familiar royal privileges or 'diplomas', which are often the best and sometimes the only evidence for those temporarily in attendance at Court. The generally accepted view today is that they constituted a distinctive group within the larger body of chapel-clerics, having their own internal hierarchy headed by a man whom it is convenient but sometimes misleading to call a 'chancellor'. Charlemagne inherited from his father as his first 'writing-office head' the Hitherius whose first recorded appearance at Court, anonymously but securely identifiable from his script, was in Pippin's second year (753) and who had taken over from Baddilo only a few months before the old king's death. Initially he had the absolute minimum of subordinates: one or two. It is probably not mere chance that diplomas are entirely lacking from the six to eight months in 770/1 when Hitherius, 'a religious and most discreet man and your and our true *fidelis*', as the Pope put it, was absent in Italy helping to recover lands seized by the duke of Benevento—the first time, so far as we know, that a working chancellor was sent on such a mission.<sup>2</sup> The non-existence of an

pp. 209–16; F. L. Ganshof, *Was waren die Kapitularien?* (Weimar, 1961), pp. 35–40.

<sup>1</sup> BM.<sup>2</sup> nos. 64a–327d; C.-R. Brühl, *Fodrum, Gistum, Servitium Regis* (Cologne, 1968), pp. 18ff. and map I. It seems unlikely that the wooden halls and occasional stone structures of pre-Aachen royal *villae* could have sheltered all the *aulici*; others, and the entire Court when engaged in a military campaign, had to hope for the provision of tents; cf. Bede, in *VII Epistolis catholicis*, ii Petri 1, 13 (ed. D. Hurst, *Corpus Christianorum*, cxxi (1983), 265): *tabernaculo solemus in itinere uti*; T. Bitterauf (ed.), *Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising*, i (Munich, 1905), no. 143 of September 791: *actum in loco situm in tabernaculis prope oppido nuncupante Loriaca*.

<sup>2</sup> DK. nos. 6, 13, 21, 24, 26, 27, 28, 55, 57, 58, 60, 89, 90, etc. with Mühlbacher's prefaces, *ibid.*, pp. 1, 77–8 (index), p. 541, and the comments of Bruckner and Marichal, *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xii (1978), nos. 529, 530, 533, 534 (= DK. nos. 13, 21, 89, 90); *ibid.*, xv (1986), Intro., p. ix, and nos. 602, 603, 604 (= DK. nos. 26, 27, 28, etc.). The Tironian notes which Hitherius uses in his recognition, *al.* attestation, clauses are undoubtedly to be read as *Hi-tae-rius* (and not as in DK.), a spelling which according to H. Menke, *Das Namengut*

[footnote cont. on p. 274

arch-chaplain until Fulrad transferred his allegiance to Charles on Carloman's death (December 771) only underlines the modest scale of chapel and Court at this time.

The emergence of a new drafter of privileges in 772 in the person of Rado, whose origins are as obscure as most of his fellow-notaries, although his name again suggests a Germanic and not a Franco-Gallic background, seems to mark the beginnings of a conspicuous expansion of the writing-office. When Hitherius left it for the abbacy of St Martin at Tours in 776/7, Rado took his place and remained for nearly a decade after he had become abbot of St-Vaast, Arras. By the late 770s four notary-clerics are found sharing the work of 'recognizing' or witnessing diplomas on behalf of the chancellor; and for most of the next decade their number was at least five. The work of engrossing the diplomas involved additionally an unknown number of anonymous scribes, as well as one—Adarulf—whose name is exceptionally recorded in a diploma of December 777 and who earlier that year, when the Court was at Herstal had written the arch-chaplain Fulrad's testament.<sup>1</sup> Their predecessors in Pippin's time must often have received their earliest instruction in 'letters' in some place other than the Court, bringing with them such additional ostentatious skills as a knowledge of 'Tironian notes', the legal shorthand so unexpectedly transmitted from Antiquity.<sup>2</sup> Now, gifted writers of both book and documentary scripts who had acquired their basic

*der frühen Karolingischen Königsurkunden* (Heidelberg, 1980), p. 130, increases the probability of a Germanic origin of the name. As writer of the much discussed *donationis promissio* to the Pope in 774, Hitherius is *religiosus ac prudentissimus capellanus et notarius* [*Caroli regis*] in the *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. L. Duchesne, i (Bibl. des Écoles Franç. d'Athènes et de Rome, 1886), 498); he is never referred to as 'chaplain' in Frankish texts.

<sup>1</sup> Rado and his subordinates: DK. nos. 67, 71, 82, 83, 84, 103, 113, 116, etc., with *ibid.*, pp. 77–8, 541, and *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xii, nos. 531, 532, 535, 537, 538 (= DK. nos. 139, 140, 103, 121, 144), *ibid.*, xv, nos. 612, 613 (= DK. nos. 71, 84a); Menke (p. 273, n. 2), p. 160. Adarulf: DK. no. 118, with *ibid.*, p. 564, the correct reading of the Tironian notes being *A-da-ru-ul-fus*; M. Tangl's edition of the testament in *Neues Archiv.*, xxxii (1906), 207–10 with Taf. Aii; engrosser also of DK. no. 120. For the date of Hitherius's translation to St Martin's see *Festschrift Fleckenstein* (p. 268, n. 1), p. 77, n. (p. 76, n. 12). The 'correction' of the annalistic date 790 for Rado's promotion to the abbacy of St-Vaast to 780, adopted by Fleckenstein, *passim*, Menke, *loc. cit.*, and others, is based on a misreading of the Tironian notes in DK. no. 131, cf. *ibid.*, p. 565 (Tangl).

<sup>2</sup> D. Ganz, 'Bureaucratic Shorthand and Merovingian Learning' in P. Wormald *et al.* (eds.), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 58–75.



training elsewhere could find a temporary welcome in the chapel, if Godescalc's responsibility for the first Court manuscript—an Evangelistary, securely dated 781/3—and the career of Richbod of Lorsch before he became abbot are rightly so interpreted.<sup>1</sup> But their careers never mingled with the in-service-trained writing-office notaries. The graphic contrasts in the subscriptions to Fulrad's testament would have had many parallels elsewhere. The testator's autograph is in a firm but inelegant semi-cursive hand, with the spelling *capalanus* which would have horrified the next generation. The first witness, Maginarius—Carloman's one-time chancellor, chaplain and Fulrad's future successor at St-Denis—offers a more formal and compressed version of the 'writing-office cursive' script used by Adarulf for the rest of the document.<sup>2</sup> The abbacies with which Hitherius, Maginarius, and Rado were rewarded were not enjoyed by most of their subordinates or their successors: not even by Ercanbald who rated a personal mention in the poetic descriptions of the Aachen Court and had thirty-four years of recorded service in the writing-office.<sup>3</sup>

Less familiar, because the evidence is scantier, are the notaries who formed a distinct 'judicial writing-office' under the authority of the (lay) count of the Palace, specifically to record royal judgments where *fideles* had been in dispute. If it was indeed, as has been argued, a creation of Charles rather than his father, it was a very early one. Where they came from, whether they received their training with the other notaries (whose style of writing they broadly share) and what else they did is simply unknown.<sup>4</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (Munich, 1974), pp. 26–7; id., 'Panorama der Handschriften-Überlieferung aus der Zeit Karls des Grossen' [1965], *Mitt. Stud.*, iii. 7; id., 'Die Hofbibliothek unter Ludwig der Frommen' [1976], *ibid.*, pp. 175–7. *Richbodo* is among the writers of Lorsch documents until July 778 (K. Glöckner (ed.), *Codex Laureshamensis*, ii (Darmstadt, 1933), no. 664; the first document in which *Richbodo abba preesse* is *ibid.*, no. 341 of 24 April 784. For Godescalc's later career see Bischoff, *Mitt. Stud.*, iii. 159, n. 46.

<sup>2</sup> For minuscule elements in Maginarius's writing eight years previously see B. Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums u. des abendlandischen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979), p. 138, n. 98.

<sup>3</sup> *Erchambaldus advicem Radonis*, DK. no. 119 of 778; *Guidbertus diaconus advicem Ercanbaldi*, *ibid.*, no. 217 of 812; *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 487 (Theodulfi carm. xxv): Ercanbald with his 'bina tabella', *Pendula quae lateri manuum cito membra revisat | Verbaque suscipiat, quae sine voce canat*, probably wax tablets on which the *cancellarius* wrote down the royal instructions or *Konzept* on which eventual formal privilege was based. For the name and other references see Menke (p. 273, n. 2), p. 105.

<sup>4</sup> Mühlbacher in DK. p. 78, cf. Bullough in *Festschrift Fleckenstein* (p. 268,

[footnote cont. on p. 276

tempting to credit to a notary of the 'judicial writing-office', which in fact may have been only one person at a time, a substantial part in the drafting of Charles's first capitulary, that 'of Herstal' in 779. Most of its twenty-three unmethodically disposed clauses are concerned with secular transgressions, 'crimes', and many of them seem to be making new laws or extending recently introduced judicial procedures; while an earlier short capitulary for Italy (Boretius's *notitia Italica*), drawn up in haste when Charles rushed to Italy with a minimum following at the beginning of 776, bears the unmistakable stamp of preparation by (secular) notaries, probably from the old Lombard capital Pavia. But the Latinity of the Herstal capitulary in all extant copies—where it is typically the first item in the earliest collections of capitularies—is conspicuously better than that of the *notitiae iudicati* and has some unusual vocabulary: and we should perhaps look elsewhere for its drafters and first scribes.<sup>1</sup> The most elusive of the *aulici* engaged in the preparation and transmission of the written word are those responsible for letters addressed to the Bishop of Rome, to the Imperial and other foreign Courts or, less often, to the king's own *fideles*, clerical and lay. Not only are we ignorant of their names: from the pre-Aachen years we have only a tiny number of their compositions, although at least one of them—the precise guidance

n. 1), p. 85, with nn. 41, 42. Bruckner and Marichal suggest that the writer of the context and date of the Hersfeld privilege, DK. no. 144 of 782, may have been a *Gerichtsschreiber* rather than a Hersfeld monk attempting with only partial success to imitate 'chancery cursive': *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xii, no. 538.

<sup>1</sup> 'Herstal': *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit.*, i, no. 20. For the chapters which 'als "Akte der Gesetzgebung" angesehen werden' see Ganshof (p. 272, n. 2), pp. 126–8; for the procedure *ad crucem stare* in c. 10 (used in a different context in DK. no. 102 of July 775) and its early Carolingian origin see F. L. Ganshof, 'L' "épreuve de la Croix" dans le droit de la monarchie Franque', *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, xxxviii (1967), 217–31. 'Suffraganii episcopi' (who are subject to the metropolitan) in c. 1 seems to be the earliest instance of this subsequently commonplace term; compare the wording of the corresponding passage in Boniface's letter reporting decisions at a synod in 747 (M. Tangl (ed.), *Epistolae Selectae*, i (Berlin, 1916), 164): *Statuimus, quod proprium sit metropolitani iuxta canonum statuta subiectorum sibi episcoporum investigare mores* etc. 'Notitia': *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit.*, i, no. 88, whose *unde . . . presentem deliberationis notitiam pro amputandas intentiones fieri iussimus et nobis relegi fecimus* in the final clauses should be compared with *unde pro amputanda intentione [omnium] huius notitiam iudicatus [-ati] ex iussione* etc. in the *scriptum*-clause in C. Manaresi (ed.), *I Placiti del 'Regnum Italiae'*, i (Rome, 1955), nos. 2–4 of 776/9, etc., and my comments in D. A. Bullough and R. L. Storey (eds.), *The Study of Medieval Records: Essays in Honour of Kathleen Major* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 18–19.

on protocol given to legates to the Pope in 784/5, written in a documentary cursive different from that of most contemporary diplomas—is apparently the Court ‘original’.<sup>1</sup> Yet for much of this period letters were leaving the Court, often in batches, at intervals of one to two months, or even less: and many of them were evidently of considerable length. These are the royal *scripta*, *syllaba* or *apices*, dutifully acknowledged in Papal replies. The latter survive because in 790/1 the king commanded that the letters received from successive popes over a period of fifty years, which were now often damaged and becoming illegible, should be ‘made new and written down’ in book-form: and a (unique) copy of the collection was made a century later.<sup>2</sup> Without a surviving text earlier than c.784/5 or the evidence of substantial direct quotation, attempts to identify the writers of letters from the

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit.*, i, no. 111, *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xvii, no. 655, a clearer illustration in *Journal des Savants* (1971), p. 284 (fig. 8): removed from a binding and incomplete at the end. The script is not dissimilar to that of the Hersfeld privilege, DK. no. 144 (on which see p. 275, n. 4), but with frequent use of the ‘b en ligature à droite’ (J. Vezin in *Journal cit.*, p. 283): and note that the photographs seem to show *probationes* of the ‘chancery’s’ *litterae elongatae* between ll. 7 and 8. The instructions seem to relate to an earlier legation than that of abbot Andreas (questionably identified as an abbot of Luxeuil and otherwise unknown), which prompted a letter from Hadrian in the early part of 786, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii, 607–8 (*Codex Carolinus* (hereafter C.C.) no. 76). Could it have been that of abbots Maginarius and Hitherius, referred to in the Papal letter *Epist.* iii, p. 609 (C.C., no. 77), which surely set out for Rome while the Court was still in Saxony, sc. early to mid 785?, although one would not have supposed that these two needed instructions on protocol. The other letters are: E. Munding, *Königsbrief Karls d. Gr. an Papst Hadrian über Abt-Bischof Waldo* (Texte u. Arbeiten, I/6, Beuron, 1920), text on pp. 3–4, *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xii, no. 543 of post-783/4 (?786/8) (from a Benediktbeuern palimpsest of a possibly Court ‘original’, defective at the end: and note that Bruckner’s comments in *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xii simply ignore the criticisms of the 1920 publication by Levison and Erben, the palaeographical observations of B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen u. Bibliotheken*, i<sup>2</sup> (Wiesbaden, 1960), 32–4, and my own arguments for a different dating and interpretation in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, lxxvii (1962), 625–37); *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iv, 528–9 (no. 20) to queen Fastrada at Regensburg of 791 *ex* (from Paris, B.N. lat. 2777 St-Denis, s. ix *in*); defective): to which can possibly be added *Epist.*, iv, 128, 131 (nos. 85, 87) to English recipients, which are, however, almost certainly post-794 *med.*, and of which Alcuin is the probable author.

<sup>2</sup> The so-called *Codex Carolinus* in the Cologne manuscript, Vienna, Nat. Bibl. lat. 449: ed. W. Gundlach in *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii, 476–653 (where many of the editorial dates require correction). *De imperio* in the elaborate prefatory title must mean ‘relating to the Empire’ rather than ‘from the Imperial Court’: as has been pointed out at intervals since the eighteenth century, imperial letters in this period were invariably in Greek.

Frankish Court must be highly speculative. But analogies with later decades suggest that while humbler men (writing-office hacks) may have been responsible for some letters and instructions, diplomatic correspondence in the modern sense was composed by men of high standing as well as an adequate literary formation, even if the two groups had some formulaic language in common.

The options, especially in the earliest years of the reign, are few. Fulrad is an obvious candidate after 772. He, indeed, is the most conspicuous and possibly most important instance of continuity between Pippin's 'foundation' Court and that of Charlemagne, but in an unusual way. For the abbey of St-Denis was in the part of the kingdom allocated to the younger son Carloman in 768: and in the ensuing division of the old Court, Fulrad with others of the chaplains and notaries joined him. Only after more than three years and the reunification of the divided *regnum* did Fulrad become Charles's arch-chaplain and, through that office and his almost permanent residence at the Court, a potentially influential counsellor of the king. He was more fortunate than many who, having joined the 'wrong' side in 768 (although they may not have had much choice at the time), lost all in 771/2. Other candidates are two bishops who appear intermittently in the sources for the 760s, 770s, and 780s—but more frequently than any other non-chancery figures—and flit through the pages of modern scholarship without ever acquiring more than a shadowy existence: namely, George of Ostia and Amiens; and Willichar, once bishop of Nomentana (near Rome), then 'archbishop of the Gauls' and, briefly, diocesan of Sens. The learning of the first of these is (dimly) discernible, the trust placed in the second after he too had abandoned Carloman's family for king Charles is abundantly evident. A fourth possibility, particularly before 784, is the *religiosus capellanus* Maginarius who was with Hitherius in the Sabina in 781, became abbot of St-Denis in 784 and was again a legate in Italy, negotiating with both the Pope and the duke of Benevento, in 785 and in 787/8. For from the last embassy we actually have fragments of a letter written in Maginarius's name to the king (who at that time was residing at Ingelheim, unexpectedly named by Einhard as the site of one of two palaces begun by Charles) and subsequently preserved, together with a contemporary letter from the Pope, at St-Denis.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Fulrad: Fleckenstein, *Hofkapelle*, pp. 45–8, 62–3, and *passim* (with ample references to the texts and earlier literature), cf. above p. 271. George and Willichar: W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford,

George was an Italian, Willichar on the evidence of his name either a Lombard or a Frank, who like some others had migrated to the Rome region in the 740s. The more detailed evidence for the Court after 793, when the last of the Italians had left, consumed by nostalgia for Mediterranean warmth and wine, has helped to obscure the scale of their presence in the earlier phase, when Anglo-Saxons were still unwelcome or at least absent. The two bishops were joined, after the annexation of the Lombard kingdom and the suppression of a rebellion in 776, by a number of others, some unwillingly—hostages in fact if not in name—some perhaps merely reluctantly. The best known are Fardulf, whose subsequent loyalty to his captor earned him the abbey of St-Denis (793), and two ‘grammarians’, scholar-*littérateurs*. The first is Peter of Pisa, who had previously established a reputation for learning at the court of king Desiderius (as Alcuin later recalled) and who was to remain at the Frankish Court, teaching and writing poetry and perhaps exegesis, until c.790. The second is Paulinus, who already in the early 780s returned with the patriarchal dignity to north-east Italy, well supported by the profits of other men’s infidelity, and in less than two decades achieved distinction as a poet, pastor, and theologian.<sup>1</sup> They were not the only ones. Some years ago I sought to demonstrate that a misread inscription and a misinterpreted letter together provide unusually full evidence for the presence at the Frankish Court already before 774 of another Italian Peter with an interest in book-learning, who was enabled to return to his native Pavia as its bishop in 781, through Charles’s

1946), pp. 127–9; Bullough in *Deutsches Archiv*, xviii (1962), 223–30, with *Festschrift Fleckenstein*, p. 75 and n. 9. Maginarius: DK. p. 61; W. Lüders in *Archiv f. Urkundenforsch.*, ii (1909), 39f.; Fleckenstein, *Hofkapelle*, pp. 59, 76f., 105f.; above, p. 275, and p. 277, n. 1. The letter of 787/8 is *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 655–7 (a new edition, with facsimile, forthcoming in *Ch. Lat. Ant.*, xix).

<sup>1</sup> Fardulf: *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 352–4, 524–6; Levison, ‘Das Formularbuch von Saint-Denis’ [B.N. lat. 2777], *Neues Archiv*, xli (1919), 283–304, esp. pp. 287ff.; F. J. Felten, *Äbte and Laienäbte im Frankenreich* (Stuttgart, 1980), pp. 222 f. Peter of Pisa: above, p. 268, and for his grammar, below, pp. 284–5. The *Petrus archidiaconus* named on the display title-page of Brussels Bibl. Roy. ms. II 2572 (copying a Court book?), plausibly the ‘author’ of the commentary on the Book of Daniel (abbreviated from Jerome) and of the abbreviated Diomedes *ars grammatica* (not ‘a bad text’) which are found only here, is usually identified with Peter of Pisa, in spite of *Vita Kar.*, c. 25. Paulinus: DK. nos. 112, 275; *Mon. Germ. Hist. Conc.*, ii/1. 130–42, 177–95; D. Norberg, *L’œuvre poétique de Paulin d’Aquilée* (Kungl. Vitterhets Hist. och Antikvitets Akad. Hadlinger, Stockholm, 1979).

direct intervention with the Pope. Late sources suggest that there were still others.<sup>1</sup>

These two groups, modest enough in size but already growing in reputation and in what was expected from them, were ones which an educated foreign visitor, such as Alcuin of York, would encounter and find congenial on a visit to the Court in the late 770s. It is indeed to them that Alcuin addresses the central sections of his early letter-poem *Cartula, perge*—novel in form and content—written and dispatched after he had returned from a not precisely datable but pre-780 journey undertaken on behalf of the Northumbrian king:

After Echternach take yourself to the *aula regis*. Greet the courtiers, lay and clerical; enlarge on your verses to the king himself. Show warmth to the Italian grammar teachers but beware of their methods. And before you leave for Mainz address the chancellor Rado and other courtiers, Richulf (future bishop of Mainz) and *Raefgot* (the OE version of Rabigaud(us), which would not easily go into a hexameter).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'I vescovi di Pavia nei secoli ottavo e nono', *Atti del 4° Congresso Int. di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1967* (Spoleto, 1969), pp. 317–28, esp. 323–6. Peter's consecration not later than the summer of 781 is clearly established by *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 600 (C.C. no. 70). (The assertion in *Viator*, xvi (1985), 76, n. 40, that I accept a redating of this letter to 784 is an unfortunate misunderstanding: the letters redated to that year are C.C. nos. 66, 67.) But since K. Schäferdiek has produced convincing reasons (*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, lxxx (1969), 292f.) for dating C.C. 97 to 783 or shortly afterwards (rather than c.785, as I suggested in *Deutsches Archiv*, xviii (1962), 226), that becomes the latest date in Peter's recorded career and the *terminus post quem* for the royal letter naming his intended successor (p. 277, n. 1). The earlier date has the advantage that it places bp. Peter's (second) journey to the Papal Court in a period for which the letters in the Codex Carolinus provide no other evidence of Frankish royal embassies. Another Peter, bp. of Verdun already before 781 ('Vescovi di Pavia', p. 324 and n. 27), was an Italian according to the tenth-century *Gesta episcoporum Viridunensium* (ed. G. Waitz, Hannover, 1841), c. 14, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Scriptores*, iv. 44. For a 'chancery' notary possibly of Italian origin see below, p. 290 and n.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i, 220–3 (Alcuini carm. iv). *Raefgot* is not apparently recorded as an OE personal name: but for the first element as the analogue of *Rabi-* cf. (*H*)*Rabanus*, OHG (*h*)*rabān*, OE *hræfn*. As a date for the journey which the poem describes I would favour the autumn of 779 when the Court moved from Herstal to Worms (no staging-point is recorded). A precise *terminus ante quem* would be established if *Raefgot*-*Rabigaudus* could be identified with the abbot of Anisola (St-Calais) of that name, since his successor Ebroin obtained a privilege of *tuitio* and immunity on 17 November 779 (DK. no. 128). But in spite of abbot Rabigaud's employment as a legate to the Pope in 775 (*Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 574, 580–3, C.C. nos. 52, 56, 57), the naming of *Raefgot* between Richulf (probably at this time a *capellanus*: Fleckenstein, *Hofkapelle*, pp. 59f.) and Rado is rather against this identification.

The predominant element at the Frankish Court in Charlemagne's first decade was none the less a very different one, the *proceres* of Alcuin's poem: laymen who in a few cases had previously served the king's father and had chosen to grow old at Court rather than with a family on their own estates; but more typically ones of much the same age as or younger than the king, men with whom he could hunt hard, drink hard, fight hard, and who often died young, falling off a horse, drowned in a fast-running river, or cut down by an enemy. If they survived and avoided the king's wrath they could expect to be rewarded with lands and local office (usually that of count), from which they returned at intervals to take part in military enterprises with a war-band of their own or simply to hear the king's will and exhortations and enjoy the perquisites of attendance on him.<sup>1</sup>

The massed computers of Franco-German prosopographic research can provide us with their names and sometimes their kin-groups but further dim their individuality. The simultaneous presence in the *aula* of men both from the narrower (resident) circle of *vassi* and the wider circle of *fideles* with responsibilities elsewhere is, none the less, often easier to establish than that of non-chapel clerics. Indirectly, as when the Court's residence at Worms in 770 seems to be the occasion of a substantial grant of lands to Lorsch abbey by a layman whose brother is independently recorded as a *fidelis* holding substantial *beneficia* of the king. Directly, when they act collectively as 'judgement finders' at the Court and the notary records their names and sometimes their status. The fullest record, unexpectedly, is in the witness-list to Fulrad's testament, written at Herstal in the winter of 777: no less than seventeen men in this group provide their *signum manus*, compared with one chapel signatory.<sup>2</sup> If the document had been

<sup>1</sup> Bullough, 'Aluinus deliciosus Karoli regis', *Festschrift Fleckenstein*, pp. 84-91; and add to the texts cited on p. 91, T. Bitterauf (ed.), *Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising*, i (Qu. u. Erörterungen z. Bayerischen u. Deutschen Gesch., Munich, 1905), no. 49 of 772: *Ego Hiltiprand peccatis meis immanentibus quod incaute aequitante de caballo cadere contigit ita ut cerebrum rumperem et a medicis desperatus iacerem quibus doloribus coactus.*

<sup>2</sup> K. Glöckner (ed.), *Codex Laureshamensis*, ii (Darmstadt, 1933), no. 1285 of 12 December 770, the donor being Nortbert (*al.* Nortpraht), brother of the royal *fidelis* Otakarus whose former *beneficia* were granted by the king to Fulda in November 779 (DK. no. 127) and was therefore from a family with extensive properties in and around Mainz (F. Staab, *Untersuchungen z. Gesellschaft am Mittelrhein in der Karolingerzeit* (Geschichtliche Landeskunde (Mainz), xi, Wiesbaden, 1975), pp. 381-3), the place to which the Court then moved for Christmas (*Ann. reg. Franc. s.a. 770*); the texts cited in *Festschrift Fleckenstein*,

[footnote cont. on p. 282

prepared at the abbey of St-Denis the signatories would presumably have come predominantly from the community: at Court the claims of social status outweighed those of shared activities and literacy. The sons of this first generation of *vassi* and *fidelis* had opportunities to acquire the elements of literacy and influence on a wider stage not open to their fathers. Yet without their recruitment from different regions, their military skills, the evolving of patterns of formal loyalty without which it would have been impossible to govern the extended *regnum*, and the political and institutional cohesiveness which followed from this, the 'renewal' of the Court could well have been impossible or abortive.

Even for the literate clerics of the older generation, aspiration will not always have been easy to translate into achievement, as the demands of letter-writing in particular put increasing demands on their skills and knowledge, whether of vocabulary or syntax. Their range of reading, and their possible models, even if they had arrived at the Court from one of the religious communities with (by eighth-century standards) a good library was very restricted. At the Court itself books were still virtually unknown. Indeed, apart from liturgical texts, psalters and gospel-books, the only text probably at the Court before 780 is the canon-law collection known as the Dionysio-Hadriana, gifted by the Pope in 774;<sup>1</sup> although the strange pair of texts taken to Rome by

pp. 84–7 and nn., and from the next decade, DK. no. 148 of 782?; *Neues Archiv*, xxxii (1906), 210, and above, p. 274. Similarly, in the next decade the donations to Fulda, E. Stengel (ed.), *Urkundenbuch des Klosters Fulda*, 1/2 (Marburg, 1956), nos. 163–5, written at Paderborn, document several of the landowners attendant on the king in June 785, cf. BM.<sup>2</sup> no. 268b; and compare the witness-list of *UB. Fulda* no. 165—headed by the well-documented (but unlocated) count Hatto and his relative Waluram (father of Hrabanus Maurus)—with those of three donations dated 22 March when the Court was still at Eresburg (*UB. Fulda* nos. 160–2: all written by Weliman who never gives a place-date; BM.<sup>2</sup> 267f) where these names recur. Another of the witnesses to *UB. Fulda*, no. 161, is *Theotrih*. In *Festschrift Fleckenstein*, pp. 87–8, identifying the royal vassal Theodericus of DK. no. 65 and the *Teudrico* of the Fulrad testament witness-list with the *comes propinquus regis* of that name, I had overlooked Staab's alternative identification (*Untersuchungen*, p. 394) with the Theotrich who figures as a landowner in a succession of Lorsch and Fulda charters between 777 and 804.

<sup>1</sup> Carolingian-period Dionysio-Hadriana MSS are most fully listed by R. Kottje in *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, lxxvi (1965), 336 ff., possibly (but doubtfully) pre-800 examples being Paris, B.N. lat. 8921 (CLA., v, no. 574: in *a-b* script), B.N. lat. 11711 (Corbie) and Berlin, Phillips 1749 (CLA., viii, 1063; southern Burgundy)—if indeed this is not the pre-Hadriana text. The earliest ms. with the dedicatory poem is B.N. lat. 11710 of 805 ('doubtless Burgundian':



Peter of Pavia in 781 and repudiated by Hadrian had presumably passed through the Frankish Court, even if—as is possible—they had been acquired in Peter's native city.<sup>1</sup> It is apparent that Peter of Pisa brought with him some sort of Donatus text, although it is hardly possible to characterize it more exactly. For years there is no evidence of independent creative activity in Court circles.

The latterly much-quoted letter (c.775) of Cathwulf which marks the recorded beginning of invitations to the Frankish king to interest himself in secular letters as well as divine, so that he can become like David, Solomon, and other Old Testament kings, was manifestly written by someone not at the Court, and like so much else from the earliest phase of Charles's reign it is preserved uniquely in a St-Denis manuscript.<sup>2</sup> Two years later, the first great assembly of lay *optimates* and senior clerics beyond the limits of the old *regna* was held at Paderborn in Saxony and a new and magnificent church was dedicated to the Saviour. The occasion was marked and commemorated by the composition of a poem, possibly painted on the walls of the church, conceived as a religio-political statement about and for the Frankish king. Traditionally anonymous, it has recently been credited with considerable plausibility to Lul of Mainz and thus also marks the re-entry of Boniface's English disciples into the circle of those influencing the Carolingian dynasty without actually joining its Court. It is not necessary to follow Karl Hauck's characteristically ingenious interpretation in every detail to agree that the poem's central

Bischoff). Dr R. McKitterick's suggestion (*Journ. Theol. Studies*, xxxvi (1985), 108–9) that Berlin(-Dahlem, Preuss. Kulturbesitz) ms. Hamilton 132, with a much-altered text of the Dionysio-Hadriana on fols. 37 seq., the original text in *a-b* script, was written for (arch)bishop Tilpin of Rheims (whose date of death she gives as 800, although his *obit* on 2 September 794 is well-documented) must be rejected: the unpublished text in refutation of a post-Adoptionist heresy on fols. 248 seq.—part of the original manuscript—refers (fol. 249b) to the defeat of the earlier heresy *a christianissimo adque a Deo electissimo imperatore nostro Karolo*; and the rewriting has no obvious links with Rheims. Rheims, Bibl. munic. MS 671 (s. ix 1/4) is a genuinely Rheims text of the Dionysio-Hadriana, preceded (fols. 7 seq.) by a Latin and OHG glossary—unfortunately still unlocalized—and therefore presumably the source of two later ninth-century Rheims MSS, also with the glossary, Paris, B.N. lat. 12445 and Berlin, Phillips 1741.

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 600 (C.C. no. 70), with my comments in *Studies in Church History*, xiv (1977), 42–3 and n. 44. But note that K.-G. Schon has shown that the text published by Pitra as Verecundus's *abbreviatum* cannot be by him since it uses Rusticus's Latin version of the Chalcedon *acta* which was composed in 564/6, and Verecundus died in 552: *Deutsches Archiv*, xxxii (1976), 548–51. See further below, p. 291, and n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iv. 502–5, from Paris, B.N. lat. 2777.

message is that of the Frankish king as a messianic figure who has overcome the demon-worshipping Saxons and led them to salvation in the waters of baptism; the king is the agent of Christ, without whose aid his victory would be meaningless, and in the terrible Last Judgement his heavenly reward is assured.<sup>1</sup>

When finally one of the literate *aulici* made an independent statement and composed a work for wider dissemination, it was of a very different kind: it may be seen as a response to a need implicit in Einhard's account of Charles's acquiring a good knowledge of (spoken) Latin and failing to learn to write,<sup>2</sup> and simultaneously to the needs of those using the written word as an instrument of royal authority. As the old standards crumbled in late Antiquity but the demand for literacy grew, Latin grammarians' *artes grammaticae* proliferated: in Merovingian Gaul between the late sixth and the mid-eighth century not a single such manual was compiled and astonishingly few copied. The special circumstances of the newly converted British Isles, Celtic- or Germanic-language in speech, created a demand which was met partly by acquiring and copying existing *artes*, partly by compiling new ones from this often unwieldy, and to modern eyes repellent and barely intelligible, body of material. Brought to the Continent by missionaries, these new grammars had an equally essential function to perform there: but one of the most distinguished examples, the work of Boniface—only recently in print from its two surviving copies and a fragment of a third—was evidently not what was most needed.<sup>3</sup>

Peter of Pisa had a more limited target, and conceivably a more limited mind, when he wrote a grammar, based predominantly but not wholly, on the *ars minor* of Donatus which, to use a recently

<sup>1</sup> K. Hauck, *Karolingische Taufpfalzen im Spiegel hofnaher Dichtung* (Nachrichten der Akad. der Wiss. in Göttingen: I. Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1985, no. 1), cf. the same author's 'Der Taufort Paderborn u. das *Carmen de Conversione Saxonum*', *Festschrift Paderborn 777-1977*, pp. 15-60 (in 1986 still only in proof: I am grateful to the author for providing me with a copy). The text of the poem in *Taufpfalzen*, pp. 62-5, greatly improves Dümmler's edition, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i, 380-1. For the authorship see *Taufpfalzen*, pp. 56 ff., 67 ff.; and for its significance for the history of the Court cf. Th. Schieffer, *Angelsachsen u. Franken* (Akad. der Wiss. u. der Lit., Mainz: Abhandl. der Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl., 1950, nr. 20), pp. 1510-26.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Kar.*, c. 25 (p. 30). The bold claim that the ivory *tabulae* which the king kept under his pillow survive as the book-covers of St-Gallen cod. 60 has recently been made by J. Duft and R. Schnyder, *Die Elfenbein-Einbände der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen* (Beuron, 1984), pp. 45-53.

<sup>3</sup> V. Law, *The Insular Latin Grammarians* (Studies in Celtic History, Woodbridge, 1982).

proposed terminology, combines the exegetical with the elementary. It has been convincingly demonstrated that the *ars* beginning with the words *Dicit Donatus*, which fills sixty-four pages in a manuscript written in Peter's immediate circle while he was still associated with the Frankish Court c.790, is an expanded and revised version of an earlier *Oratio dicitur elocutio*. Absolute proof is necessarily lacking: but form and content alike point to the conclusion that the latter is a text written by the Italian grammarian not long after he had arrived at the Carolingian Court, and that it brings us as near as we can hope to get to the form in which the king received instruction in the Latin language. (It is not merely frivolous and of no more than anecdotal significance to observe additionally that Peter would almost certainly have taught Charles to speak with the 'soft' Italian pronunciation and not the 'hard' Northern one discernible in Alcuin's poetry and elsewhere.) The later and clearly more accomplished *ars* would then be the product of comprehensive revision in the light of teaching experience and exchanges with other men of learning and literary judgement who joined the Court later.<sup>1</sup>

The newcomers of the 780s, some of the most familiar early Carolingian names among them, joined—and left—a Court notably different in both atmosphere and membership from that of only a few years previously. They were associated with the first generation of Franks educated at Court, although not necessarily at the elementary level or in any formal 'school': men like Angilbert, future royal confidant and abbot, although always reluctant to abandon secular pleasures; or Arno, deacon from Bavarian Freising, who became abbot of St-Amand in 782 and continued to hold that position and frequent the Frankish Court even after he had been consecrated bishop of Salzburg in 785: never a scholar in his own right, he was a friend of scholars and of books, an *animateur* of scribes and librarians.<sup>2</sup> These men did not

<sup>1</sup> Berlin, cod. Diez. B Sant. 66, pp. 3–66, with Bernhard Bischoff's introduction to the facsimile edition (p. 269, n. 3), pp. 15, 27–30; for the origins and date of the manuscript, see *ibid.*, pp. 21–3.

<sup>2</sup> Angilbert: there is no satisfactory documentation of his early life (his son Nithard names two relatives of whom nothing—or virtually nothing—is known: Ph. Lauer (ed.), *Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris, 1926), p. 138); but Pope Hadrian's description of him as someone who *pene ab ipsis infantiae rudimentis in palatio [Karoli] enutritus est* (K. Hampe (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, v. 7, of 792/3 according to A. Freeman, *Viator*, xvi (1985), 65 ff. and esp. 90 ff.) in conjunction with the opening lines of his poem to Peter of Pisa in Berlin Diez B. Sant. 66, p. 220, ed. K. Neff (as on p. 287, n. 3), pp. 163–4, and Alcuin's

[footnote cont. on p. 286]

arrive simultaneously, nor with the declared intention of attaching themselves permanently to the Frankish king: the pull of their homeland or community was still strong. But many of the changes at the Court from which they benefited were willed and not accidental, conscious responses by the king to the military disasters of 778 and subsequent dangerous disloyalty, and to the realization that Carolingian royal authority could be destroyed as quickly as it had been established. Hence the dispatch to the more distant parts of the *regnum* of men of proved loyalty and experience, perhaps creating a gap at Court which would be filled by others from different backgrounds; hence the Herstal Capitulary of 779, with its emphasis on disorder, disobedience and the penalties that should follow. To regard the enhancement of *eruditio* and the patronage of the artists and calligraphers of the first luxury Court manuscript in the early 780s as an extension of the earlier pragmatic responses is neither perverse nor a diminution of their essentially novel character. If the *Lex Dei* of which the king was the agent and would answer for at the judgement seat was to be accepted and effective, it required not only new men and new measures but a deeper understanding both of its own imperatives and of the nature of royal authority.

Both find distinctive if partial expression in the thirty-two dedicatory verses with which Godescalc, writing a new and accomplished minuscule script which will very soon be taught to others, concluded 'his' Evangelistary. They constitute the first poem demonstrably written by an *aulicus* and as an integral part of a book which, unlike most subsequent Court- and Palace-school manuscripts, was designed for use in the royal chapel itself. It has a parallelism of structure with, but also notable differences from, the Paderborn poem of five years previously. Heaven is again matched with the Frankish king's earthly kingdom, but is strikingly described in terms of a colour symbolism linked with the physical appearance of the manuscript. Epithets of kingly virtue that quickly become commonplaces are adapted from earlier Roman epigraphic formulae. And although Godescalc too is commemorating and proclaiming a washing in baptismal waters

reference to him as *filius communis noster* in a letter to Paulinus of Aquileia, *Epist.*, iv. 140, seems to demand that he was at the Court as an *adolescens* in the (late) 770s and early 780s. Arno: best account now in H. Dopsch (ed.), *Geschichte Salzburg, Stadt u. Land*, i. 1-3 (Salzburg, 1981-4), esp. 157 ff., 840 ff., 985 ff.; but for scriptorial activity under Arno, B. Bischoff, *Südostdeutschen Schreibschulen*, ii (1980), 61-73, 98-140 (for the period with which we are concerned here, esp. 64, 98, 102-4).

and the renewal that follows from it (*fonte renascentem et sacrum baptisate lotum*), the reborn, in the font of the Papal Lateran church, are two royal princes.<sup>1</sup>

The importance traditionally ascribed to the king's chance encounter with Alcuin of York on the outward journey to Rome in March 781, largely perhaps because it is a precise date, can be seriously misleading.<sup>2</sup> It is probable that the Northumbrian's arrival at the Court followed rather than preceded that of yet another Italian, Paul the Deacon; and a case can even be made for the view that Alcuin did not join it until several years later. Paul was a man of impeccably Lombard ancestry who had added a solid Latin culture to an unusual familiarity with the vernacular traditions of his people, and already enjoyed a deserved reputation in his native land as a writer of poetry, epigraphic and occasional, and of history. In 782 he travelled from Monte Cassino—not yet the major library it was subsequently to become—with a verse appeal for the release of a brother, prisoner of the Franks since the rebellion of 776. He remained in Francia for about four years, a period which, without the works he wrote or provoked, would be an almost complete blank in the interior history of the Court; and he records incidentally the only authentic anecdote from Charles's own mouth—about his ancestor Arnulf's lost ring subsequently found in the belly of a fish.<sup>3</sup> (Was it recounted in Frankish or in Italianate Latin?)

A percipient modern critic of Carolingian poetry has noted 'the marked and rapid change' in Paul's verse in these years. Shortly after his arrival he was engaged in a novel form of literary combat, an exchange of barbed, ironic verse-epistles with Peter of Pisa, writing *in persona Karoli regis*. The king might welcome Paul's

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 94-5, a facsimile of Paris, B.N. n.a. lat. 1203, fol. 126v—the first page of the poem—in F. Steffens, *Lateinische Paläographie* (2nd edn., Trier, 1909), pl. 45a; discussion of the 'Godescalc minuscule' in Bischoff, *opp. cit.*, p. 275, n. 1. For the manuscript as a liturgical book see W. Böhne, 'Beobachtungen zur Perikopenreihe des Godescalc-Evangelistars', *Würzburger Diözesangesichtsblätter*, xxxvii-xxxviii (1975), 149-67.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Alcuini*, c. 9; W. Arndt (ed.), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Scr.*, xv/1 (Hannover, 1887), 190; Bullough in *Festschrift Fleckenstein*, pp. 91-2.

<sup>3</sup> M. Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, i (Munich, 1911), 257-72. The standard edition of his poetry, together with that of Peter of Pisa, is K. Neff, *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus* (Qu. u. Untersuch. zur lat. Phil. des M.as., Munich, 1908), where the 'appeal poem' is no. XI (pp. 53-5): there is an excellent translation in P. Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London, 1985), p. 83. The anecdote is in G. Pertz (ed.), *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* (Hannover, 1829), *Mon. Germ. Hist., Scr.*, ii (1882), 264.

presence and literary skill—eventually: but Peter was less enthusiastic about the arrival of a talented newcomer. Yet Paul's uncertainties began to dissolve in his reply; and he was soon moving on to unrestrained praise of the Frankish king:

I am ready to learn by the goodly king's teaching  
Indeed I hope that Your Highness will outshine everyone  
with your luminous intellect, just as you vanquish all  
in feats of arms.

Subsequent exchanges laud more subtly the literary culture of the poets' royal patron; and the last of the replies from the king—apparently written in the winter months of 784/5—although hardly his own composition, seems to come from another pen than that of Peter, not implausibly the recently arrived Alcuin's: if so, at that stage in his association with the king the Englishman was prepared to 'journey to the wars' with him which subsequently he roundly declined to do.<sup>1</sup>

The apparent growing warmth of feeling in Paul's poetry and his undoubted intimacy with the king; his employment as an intermediary with the Pope in 786/7 to obtain for the Court a much-needed new Sacramentary text;<sup>2</sup> his preparation and sending from Monte Cassino of an abbreviated *Festus de verborum significatione*; and a verse-epistle from the king (but undoubtedly composed by Alcuin) in Paul's last years: all suggest that he had overcome his earlier distaste for the man who had defeated and subjected his people and forced him (originally unwillingly) into the monastic life of Monte Cassino; and that he had become an enthusiastic supporter of the efforts for a literary *renovatio* in Francia. When, therefore, Paul finally wrote a long-planned history of the *gens Langobardorum*, he tactfully broke off his narrative at a point at which the disastrous antagonisms between its kings and the Carolingians were still some years away. Another reading is, however, possible. Praise of the Frankish king, although

<sup>1</sup> Godman, *Poetry*, pp. 9–10, 86 ff.; Neff, *Gedichte*, nos. XII, XIII, XVI–XXII; the possibly Alcuin poem, *ibid.*, no. XXIII, seemingly written while the Court was wintering in Saxony, BM.<sup>2</sup> no. 267c–g and the documents cited in n. 2 to p. 281: to be compared with letters of Alcuin in 789 and 798, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iv. 31, 234–5. On the poetic changes see further P. Godman's forthcoming *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry*, which he generously allowed me to read in manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 626 (C.C. no. 89): for the date, against the latterly favoured 784/5 (with implications for the history of the 'Gregorian Sacramentary' at the Court) see my 'Ethnic History and the Carolingians' (next note), n. 6.

not false as we would understand the word, is more a reflection of the situation in which Paul had briefly found himself and of the poetic genre in which his talents were there best displayed. Back in his native land, and his now beloved Monte Cassino, Paul wrote the *Historia Langobardorum* as a statement of faith in the *gens* and its history, which he could follow from its remote beginnings (before that of the historic Franks) in Baltic Germany: the greater happiness of Italy under the Lombards, ruled from a city dignified by ecclesiastical and secular buildings, is implicit, the past inferiority of the Franks in combat explicit. If form and content of the History owed anything directly to Paul's four-year residence at the Carolingian Court, it would be in his acquaintance there with books (including Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*) previously unknown to him.<sup>1</sup>

Frankish writers after Gregory of Tours had laboured, not unsuccessfully, to provide their people with a longer and more respectable ancestry, beginning with the flight from Troy. Acknowledged obliquely by Paul in his *Gesta* of the archbishops of Metz and in an epitaph for a sister of Charles, it is part of the claim to be the leader of a triumphant *gens regalis*, put into the king's mouth by a poet at Court before the end of the decade. The most elaborate documentation of the Trojan origin of the Franks in these years is, however, a manuscript combining an incomplete (but not defective) text of the *Aeneid*, the Latin *Dares Phrygius* and a *Gesta Francorum*: and that book is not from the Court itself but was apparently written at Lorsch in Richbod's earliest years as abbot.<sup>2</sup>

Alcuin later recalled his and Richbod's shared reading of Virgil when they were both at Court.<sup>3</sup> A remarkable collection of the writings of Pagan and Early Christian Antiquity was being assembled there while it was still itinerant from *villa* to camp and camp to *villa*. At the beginning of the decade the king had apparently issued a *sententia* on the subject, an oral or written request. An early acquisition was a text of Diomedes's *Ars grammatica*, from which many quotations of pagan authors had been

<sup>1</sup> See Bullough, 'Ethnic History and the Carolingians: an Alternative Reading of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*', in C. Holdsworth and T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *The Inheritance of Historiography 350-900* (Exeter, 1986), pp. 85-105.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, B.N. lat. 7906, fols. 59-88; CLA., Suppl. 1744; Bischoff, *Lorsch*, p. 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iv. 39, perhaps written c.792 while Alcuin was temporarily back in England.

eliminated, sent as a thank-you present by a man from Worms whom Charles had made abbot of Masmünster. Its literary merits are not great, its practical value—as one of the better works of the genre—is unquestioned: some of its users, however, found it too long and the only early Court copy is a not unskilfully abbreviated version. Peter and Paul quote Calpurnius and Nemesianus in their exchanges and their subsequent transmission strongly suggests initial dissemination from the Frankish Court. All manuscripts of Quintus Serenus's verse *Liber medicinalis*, which enjoyed a hardly deserved popularity in ninth-century and later monastic libraries, descend from an archetype written at the command of the king by a known Court notary of the 780s, who must be assumed to have been skilled in a book-hand as well as documentary cursive script. His contemporary Joseph shows familiarity with parts of the *Anthologia latina* in the version most fully preserved in the (Italian?) *codex Salmasianus*. The *De decem categoriis*, a fourth-century introduction to the concepts and terminology of Aristotelian logic and wrongly attributed to Augustine, was at the Court in time to be exploited for the polemic against the Greek view of images, in the so-called *Libri Carolini*.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence of archetype and citation pales, however, in comparison with the now (thanks to Professor Bischoff) famous book-list added *c.* 790 on blank pages in a grammatical collection from the immediate circle of Peter of Pisa: here are Cicero, Livy, and Sallust; Martial, Horace, and Tibullus (subsequently unknown for centuries); Terence; Servius and Julius Victor; and Claudian. The problems posed by this list are considerable: only two of the works listed there can be shown to have been quoted by writers at Court in the 780s and 790s, while many works which those same scholars clearly had to hand, because they quote

<sup>1</sup> B. Bischoff, 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Grossen' [1965], *Mitt. Stud.*, iii, 149–69. For the abbreviated Diomedes cf. p. 279, n. 1, above. The transmission of the *Liber Medicinalis* is fully described in *Texts and Transmission*, ed. Reynolds (next note), pp. 381–5. An added prefatory poem, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 97f., preserved only in the distinctive ms. Zürich C. 78 (pt. iv), credits the copying to Charles's *famulus Iacobus*, reasonably identified with the notary Jacob who wrote four diplomas in the years 787–92, *DK*. pp. 322, 541. Since 'noteworthily' (Bresslau's phrase) all of them are for Italian recipients it may be that, exceptionally, he was recruited to the 'writing-office' for that specific purpose. It is therefore perfectly possible that he was the Jacob who between *c.* 798 and 816 copied Bede's *De natura rerum* under his own name and a correctly attributed extract from an Alcuin letter into Lucca Bib. Cap. cod. 490 fols. 310–23: the main script is an undistinguished uncial, with lines in cursive (*not* 'chancery' influenced) in the letter.



them at length, are conspicuously absent. The majority are among 'the great unread', until the collection had been dispersed and copied in other centres which were then building on the foundations laid by an earlier Court-trained generation—Livy's Third Decade via Tours, Servius's *De Finalibus* via Corbie, and so on. I have often wondered whether this is not the basis of a puzzlingly selective list: that Peter of Pisa (if it is he), on the point of leaving the Court for his native Italy, wrote down the titles of the works which he found in a book-box or boxes, like compiling a reading list for an undergraduate essay from the books currently on the library shelves. The rationale behind the collection would seem to lie, not in a regard for pagan antiquity and its literary heritage as such, nor in the mere desire for possession (powerful as this may have been), but in the concept of *grammatica*, and the primacy which this discipline held in the minds of the first Court scholars and their pupils.<sup>1</sup>

Thus far, works that are in any sense 'theological', whether exegetic, apologetic, or dogmatic, are notably invisible, except for possibly: the abbreviated account of the Council of Chalcedon sent to the Pope in 781 (we do not know why), Pope Leo I's prefatory letter which was sent in return, and the short text *De imagine Dei* acquired some time in the 780s.<sup>2</sup> Frankish bishops had indeed taken part in the Roman synod of 769 which reputedly dealt with recent developments in the East in relation to images and image-worship and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; and on one reading of the (scanty) evidence their views had already been sought two years earlier at Gentilly: but their reaction must have been similar to that of a traditional Arts professor asked to advise on the choice of a computer—that he has neither the intellectual

<sup>1</sup> Berlin MS Diez. B Sant. 66, pp. 218–19; Bischoff's introduction to the facsimile, pp. 22 f., 38 f. and 'Hofbibliothek', pp. 162–7. The impact of Professor Bischoff's identification and exposition of this list is apparent on innumerable pages of the splendid *Texts and Transmission: a Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford, 1983).

<sup>2</sup> In *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iii. 600, Hadrian tells the king that he is sending him *exemplar epistolae sancti Leonis pontificis ad clericos et nobiles Constantinopolitanos atque populum eiusdem civitatis directae*, identified as P. Jaffé *et al.*, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, i (2nd edn., 1885), no. 443, new edn. by C. Silva-Tarouca, *S. Leonis Magni epistolae contra Eutychis haeresim*, i (Rome, 1934), no. 15, pp. 38–40. Did he really send only this single letter? simply as a supplement to the conciliar material in the Dionysio-Hadriana? For the *De imagine Dei*, in my view a probably fifth/sixth-century text wrongly attributed to Alcuin, see J. Marenbon, *From the Circle of Alcuin to the School of Auxerre* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 30–43, 158–61; Bullough, 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven' in U.-R. Blumenthal (ed.), *Carolingian Essays* (Washington, 1983), pp. 22–31.

involvement nor the knowledge to say anything relevant. Not even the Commentaries of Bede, the last of the Fathers, can be shown to have been read at Court before the last decade of the century, difficult though it is to believe that Alcuin had not brought some of 'the Master's' work with him.

We seem very far removed from the contemporary building-up of a wide-ranging Patristic library which can be followed at Lorsch and Salzburg from extant manuscripts, let alone the considerable holdings of Corbie and of the communities for which the nuns of Chelles were working as copyists. A truer measure of the Court's limited aspirations in this direction during the 780s may well be provided by Wigbod's *Commentary on Genesis*, a scissors-and-paste work heavily dependent on Isidore and incorporating material from Augustine's major work on the Old Testament book only through derivative and second-rate early medieval compilations. Yet Wigbod declares his work to have been written at the king's command: and his verse preface, where it is not a straight copy of earlier (Christian) poets, is firmly in the tradition of royal panegyric but with specific praise for his book-collecting activities:

Who can count the great series of books which your decree has brought together from many lands, reviving the writings of earlier Holy fathers (*Sanctorum renovans patrum conscripta priorum*)?<sup>1</sup>

Of about the same time or a few years later are the dialogue Commentary on the Book of Daniel for which Peter of Pisa seems to have been responsible, and Joseph the Deacon's *Commentary on Isaiah*. The latter, as Joseph makes clear in his verse preface, is simply an abbreviation of Jerome's Commentary for those who cannot manage the longer work. Peter (if it is he) might have said the same of his own Commentary. Joseph is not among the more familiar figures living and working at the Carolingian Court, largely because his public career did not last into the Aachen phase: but in a period for which all evidence is scarce, it is comparatively well-documented. An Englishman who had been partly educated in Ireland or an Irishman who had completed his education at York, he had followed Alcuin to the Frankish Court. He emerges from the shadows when with abbot Maginarius of

<sup>1</sup> M. M. Gorman, 'The Encyclopedic Commentary on Genesis prepared for Charlemagne by Wigbod', *Recherches Augustiniennes*, xvii (1982), 173-201. See also my remarks in *Studies in Church History*, xiv (1977), 42, and (for the significance of the prefatory poem) Bischoff, 'Hofbibliothek' (p. 290, n. 1), p. 154.

St-Denis, another deacon and the king's Chief Doorkeeper (a lay courtier of high standing), he was sent to the Papal Court and Benevento in 787/8 to help resolve disputes over property rights in the recently annexed duchy. About the same time he and Alcuin, abandoning anonymity, displayed their 'grammatical' talents in decorative, technically accomplished acrostic poems, modelled on the fourth-century panegyrist Porphyrius. Their linking of images of heavenly and earthly authority had, of course, a deeper purpose; but they were the occasion of a new outburst of literary tit-for-tat, when Theodulf, newly arrived from the ex-Visigothic South and (in the light of later evidence) supremely confident of his own talents, was invited or provoked to exercise them in similar compositions. Finally, Joseph has been plausibly identified as the 'author' of a distinctive list of (verse) *Voces animantium*, transmitted via Monte Cassino to which he may have retired.<sup>1</sup>

The Beneventan legation seems to be the first one in which an *aulicus* took part because of (we must assume) his learning rather than his social standing or office. Shadowy though the picture is, Joseph emerges as a man whose training in *grammatica* made possible an eminently practical reworking of a substantial piece of Patristic exegesis and an early example, if not of 'the intellectual in politics', at least of the scholar in public life.

A strictly contemporary example of the scholar-poet as both participant and commentator, linking the ideal and the actual, is the unidentified 'Irish exile', who commemorated the final overthrow of duke Tassilo of Bavaria and the incorporation of his duchy in the Frankish *regnum*. In the opening verses of his poem, now unfortunately incomplete, the writer's subject is himself, mingling (mock) unease with confidence in his craft. But then he turns to the harsh reality of infidelity to the monarch (a recurrent threat, as Einhard knew), brought on by Satanic influence and finally countered by a king whose authority came from God. Court poetry has moved to the centre of the stage while annalists and writers of letters in their own name are still waiting in the wings.<sup>2</sup>

It is, however, with the great capitulary known as the *Admonitio*

<sup>1</sup> The evidence for Joseph's career is considered more fully in the fifth of my Oxford University Ford Lectures on 'Alcuin: the Achievement and the Reputation', delivered in 1980 and currently being revised for publication. Meanwhile, see Bischoff, *Mitt. Stud.*, i. 239, ii. 296, 302, iii. 164, 221. For Peter's(?) Daniel-commentary cf. above, p. 279, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 396-9; Godman, *Poetry* (p. 287, n. 3), pp. 24-5, 174-9; id., *Poets and Emperors* (p. 288, n. 1).

*generalis* of March 789 that the synthesis of ideology and administrative action is for the first time complete.<sup>1</sup> It is a text which suffers from over-familiarity. It appears to express so well and in such fullness what we believe to be Charles's view of his princely functions that it is easy to overlook its novelty, both in scale and content. When, a few years later, a reference library copy was made for Fulda (or by a Fulda scribe for someone else) it constituted the larger part (fifteen leaves) of a stylishly written twenty-seven-leaf *libellus*.<sup>2</sup> The initial dissemination of such a text presupposes the availability of scribes in considerable numbers, whether found among the *aulici* or in the entourage of the *optimates* who had travelled to the Court. Its formulation would have demanded a long period of discussion and drafting, drawing on the experience and expertise of a range of courtiers. Its Prologue, which finds a model in the actions of the Israelite reformer Josiah, is hardly that of a simple notary, whether 'judicial' or 'chancery'. Alcuin's involvement in at least the final section or sections is demanded on stylistic and textual grounds: and there is an obvious but ill-defined link between earlier clauses and the king's circular letter *de litteris colendis*, for which Alcuin provided the greater part of the text.<sup>3</sup> The Conciliar citations in the first fifty-nine clauses of the *Admonitio* witness to a close and careful study of the Court manuscript of the Dionysio-Hadriana and possibly to intermittent use of some other canonical collection. Later sections show a readiness to challenge the conventions of the older secular law-codes.

The assembly at which this remarkable document was promul-

<sup>1</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit.*, i, no. 22 (giving a very inadequate picture of the manuscript tradition). Recent—brief—discussions of the *Admonitio generalis* are F.-L. Ganshof, *Frankish Institutions under Charlemagne* (Providence, R.I., 1968), p. 5, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 107f.: but a comprehensive analysis to replace that of the great nineteenth-century legal historians is still lacking.

<sup>2</sup> Wolfenbüttel cod. 496a Helmstedt, cf. W. Milde, *Mittelalt. Handschr. aus Wolfenbüttel* (1972), pp. 22–3, Bischoff, *Mitt. Stud.*, iii. 305. The text concludes on fol. 15 with the date-clause which Boretius prints as the opening clause of his *Mon. Germ. Hist., Capit.*, i, no. 23. Fols. 15–27 are an *expositio symboli* inc. *Quero vos fratres karissimi*, using the Apostles' Creed *textus receptus* (precisely in the version of the Sacramentary of Gellone, with *inde venturus iudicare*) and therefore of recent composition, followed by two commentaries on or glossed versions of the *Pater noster*: cf. *Capit.*, i, no. 22, cc. 70, 82.

<sup>3</sup> Bullough, 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven' (p. 291, n. 2), p. 22, n. 44; L. Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne* (Ithaca, 1959), pp. 198–226. Wallach favours a date *post* summer 794, against those who favour an earlier date: 790/3 are in any case excluded because of Alcuin's absence in England.

gated foreshadowed a major change in the way of life of the hitherto itinerant Court. For the first time since the first Christmas of the reign, it took place at Aachen,<sup>1</sup> not obviously the most convenient or congenial of settings for a large gathering, even if (as is probable) there was a nucleus of stone buildings and the visible remains of a Roman bath. Whether the decision was taken at this time to build a much grander complex suitable for the semi-permanent accommodation of a Court of increasing complexity will never be known. Even hints seem to be absent from Alcuin's first major letter-group, written within the next eighteen months, and Einhard is equally silent. All we have to go on, and it is little enough, is that when the king and his Court returned from the South-east in 794 via Frankfurt and a brief expedition into Saxony, they took up their winter, and (as it proved) almost permanent, residence at Aachen and that it remained a building site for at least another decade. Which argues that the foundations had been laid, literally and metaphorically, in the years 789/94.<sup>2</sup>

Precedents and experience (at Pavia, Ravenna, and Benevento) surely carried more weight at this stage than symbolism and symbolic challenge to a distant Emperor. Royal authority—unusually secure if the *Admonitio* is not mere words—could assemble masons, carpenters, and metalworkers at the expense of their traditional employers, as it had earlier assembled books. The *annua munera* which so impressed the Irish poet would have helped pay for both human and material resources, whether as bullion or in the quite prolific epigraphic coinage: many of the donors would have been fully reimbursed when the massive Avar treasure reached Aachen.<sup>3</sup> But the author who could have provided the facts where we now rely on speculation chose not to do so.

Two Christmases and most of the intervening months of 790,

<sup>1</sup> 768/9: BM.<sup>2</sup>, nos. 130e–132. Charles and his Court were briefly at Aachen in early December 777 but moved to Douzy for Christmas and soon afterwards to Herstal: BM.<sup>2</sup>, nos. 213–14. *Aquisgrani palatio nostro* in DK. no. 152 of March 786, which is known only from a seventeenth-century copy, is generally regarded as a misreading of *Attiniaco*.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Braunfels (ed.), *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf, 1965–7), i: articles by Ewig, Gauert, and Kaemmerer; iii: articles by Bandmann, Kreusch and Hugot; and the critical review of this and other literature by L. Falkenstein, 'Zwischenbilanz zur Aachener Pfalzenforschung', *Zeitschr. d. Aachener Geschichtsverein*, lxxx (1970), 7–71.

<sup>3</sup> *Mon. Germ. Hist., Poet.*, i. 396, ll. 1–11; Ganshof, *Frankish Institutions* (p. 294, n. 1), p. 43 and notes; T. Reuter, 'Plunder and Tribute in the Carolingian Empire', *Trans. R. Hist. Soc.*, 5th ser., xxxv (1985), 85–7.

when no military expedition was mounted, were spent at Worms; and it could well have been there that the 'Court book-list' was written down. This was to be the swan-song of the Carolingians' last *urban* residence, although none of the Court's song-birds proclaimed its passing. It was the moment for a Court-educated Frank, Angilbert (now abbot of St-Riquier), to fill the gap left by the deaths of Fulrad and Willichar, and for the recently arrived Theodulf to assume intellectual leadership: while Alcuin was still anonymous or absent and Arno was apparently not yet the trusted figure he was to become at the end of the decade.<sup>1</sup>

The traditional view of the two years (791/3), when the king was uninterruptedly in the German South-east or (briefly) under canvas in the unsettled borderlands along the Danube, is that they were a distraction from the main lines of political development, a marking-time in the teleological progression towards Empire: or, for those who see the incidentals as the true measure of a king, the years in which he started work on, but had to abandon, a link between tributaries of the Rhine and the Danube.<sup>2</sup> Recent studies, proceeding from several different starting-points, suggest that on the contrary this brief period was one in which the new breed of scholar-counsellors, proud of their own learning and jealous for their monarch's God-given authority, set him and his policies in new directions; and in doing so completed a remoulding of the Court which Einhard's generation could take for granted.

It is of marginal importance, although symptomatic, that 791 was the year in which the *Codex Carolinus* was written, giving employment (one imagines) to a number of Court scribes, or that it is most probably about this time that the 'Royal Annals' become a contemporary record of events. It is perhaps of rather

<sup>1</sup> Worms: BM.<sup>2</sup>, 303b-311a. Angilbert: the only evidence for the date of his appointment to St-Riquier (conventionally, as 'lay-abbot') is Alcuin's letter from England in 790, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epist.*, iv. 35: *Saluta et Engelberhtum filium, nunc vero ex filio patrem*. The *Annales regni Francorum* record missions to Rome by Angilbert in 792 and 796 (s.aa., ed. F. Kurze, pp. 90, 98, in the second of which he is *dilectus abbas*); supposed evidence of his journeying to Italy between those dates depends on Dümmler's dating of two of Alcuin's letters, *Epist.*, iv. 66f., 68f., which is almost certainly mistaken (the letter to Hadrian was probably never sent because of the Pope's death), cf. *Viator*, xvi (1985), p. 72 and n. 29. Theodulf: for the date and circumstances of his arrival at the Court see most recently E. Dahlhaus-Berg, *Nova Antiquitas et Antiqua Novitas* (Cologne-Vienna, 1975), pp. 180-6, cf. 7, with references to previous literature (especially Schaller and Freeman).

<sup>2</sup> H. H. Hofmann, 'Fossa Karolina' in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk* (p. 295, n. 2), i. 437-53; id., *Kaiser Karls Kanalbau* (Sigmaringen, 1969).

more significance that the years 792/4 saw a successfully accomplished reform of weights and measures and coinage.<sup>1</sup> Residence at Regensburg, with its ducal *curtis* and associated cult-building, will at least have confirmed the plans for an Aachen palace with great hall and chapel. Of incomparably greater consequence were events that had taken place beyond the limits of the *regnum* but now impinged on it and demanded a response: for both raised issues of Christian doctrine (to which the Frankish kingdom, unlike the now defunct Visigothic kingdom, had not previously made any measurable contribution), and one raised issues of high politics. Archbishop Willichar's intervention in Spain in the early 780s had been prompted by reports of heresies whose bizarreness would have made them a threat only if they had gained popular adherence, which evidently they did not. But the enunciation of seemingly novel views of the nature of the Sonship of Christ by a leading ecclesiastic was quite another matter; and the development of these doctrines by a bishop in the Pyrenean region which had latterly been annexed by a *fidelis* of the Frankish king would have been difficult to ignore even had the level of Patristic learning been even lower than it was. Is the reference to the '*pseudo-doctores* who have recently come among us' in the concluding sentences of the *Admonitio generalis* a first official recognition of the threat to orthodoxy? It is difficult to be sure, although I am inclined to think so. Alcuin makes no reference to 'Adoptionism' in his letters from Northumbria between 790 and 792: but by the summer of that year the issue had concerned some person or persons at Court sufficiently for Bishop Felix of Urgel to be brought before an assembly of bishops at Regensburg (under the king's personal presidency if, at a later date, Alcuin was rightly informed), and then conducted to Rome for final judgement by Pope Hadrian.<sup>2</sup> Yet at this date the heterodoxy prompted neither polemical nor doctrinal literature from the Frankish side, although the situation was apparently already changing a year later.

A quite different, even dramatic, response was provoked by the Latin version of proceedings at the Second Nicene Council in 787, when it reached the Frankish Court at Worms or Regensburg

<sup>1</sup> P. Grierson, 'Money and Coinage under Charlemagne' in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk*, i. 501 ff., esp. 509-11, 527-30; A. Verhulst, 'Karolingische Agrarpolitik: das Capitulare de Villis u. die Hungersnöte v. 792/93 u. 805-6', *Zeitschr. f. Agrargesch. u. Agrarsoziologie*, xiii (1965), 175-89, esp. 178-9.

<sup>2</sup> Bullough, 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven' (p. 291, n. 2), pp. 39f.; Alcuin, *Adversus Elipandum libri IV*, I, 16 (*Pat. Lat.*, ci, 251); *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *Conc.*, i. 203-4.

(790/1). It has always been assumed that it was sent there by Pope Hadrian. Recently, to account for the Franks' extraordinary misunderstanding of the status of the Latin *acta*, an 'unknown agency' has been invoked. It is theoretically possible that a casual visitor to Rome or the monks of Farfa who petitioned the king for a confirmation of their abbey's rights in August 791 had somehow acquired a copy: but the preciousness and rarity of books of such size and difficulty are notorious. I still prefer to believe that Hadrian *did* send it, as a 'normative' text like the collection of canon law in 774 or the Gregorian Sacramentary in c.787/8, and that he had no reason to expect a scholarly rebuttal.<sup>1</sup>

The doctrine of images and the claims of authority made by the Greeks aroused the ire of the king and his Court, reputedly in a public reading: and the learned and assertive Theodulf was entrusted with the reply. He and his unknown collaborators approached their task with unprecedented zeal, exploiting an impressive range of texts that were already to hand; seeking out others to find appropriate *testimonia*: and searching for still others in vain. When Angilbert conducted Felix to Rome in 792 he took with him a preliminary statement in eighty-five chapters, of which the last twenty-five were clearly a late addition. Work was then begun on a definitive reply organized into four books, for the production of which Court scribes now well-practised in minuscule were employed. Theodulf's individual approach to the propositions in the *acta* and his choice of testimonies did not always earn the approval of others, and the manuscript text of the *Opus contra synodum* (our *Libri Carolini*) was subjected to considerable revision, with deletions, excisions, and substitutions. Alcuin in distant Northumbria was invited to comment and probably supplied valuable material for the fourth book.

<sup>1</sup> A. Freeman, 'Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the *Libri Carolini*', *Viator*, xvi (1985), 65–108, here 75–81. The Farfa diploma, DK. no. 171 of August 791, was petitioned for by abbot Mauroald (a Frank, from Worms) *per religiosos monachos suos, Laurentium videlicet presbiterum et Decorosum medicum nec non Alibertum*: for Farfa as a monastery in Papal territory—the Sabina—yet continuing to receive Frankish royal privileges see T. F. X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: the Birth of the Papal State 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984), pp. 156 ff. The fact that the narrative sections of the *vita Hadriani* in the *Liber Pontificalis*, originally unusually full, end abruptly with the order for a translation of the Greek *acta* and its depositing in *sacra bibliotheca* (ed. L. Duchesne, i. 512), and therefore have nothing to say on (e.g.) the condemnation of Felix seems to demand rather more explanation than it has hitherto received: was there a change in Franco-Papal relations at this time, reflected also perhaps in the refusal to consecrate Waldo (Munding, *op. cit.* (p. 277, n. 1); Bullough in *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, lxxvii, 625–37)?



When the whole text had been completed, much less elegantly than it had begun, it was read aloud in the king's presence, receiving approving comments (preserved in marginal Tironian notes), which have persuaded those who have not looked at them too closely that the king was a theologian in his own right, a new Justinian in fact. The book-learning and technical scholarship that inform the whole work were immediately responsive to a letter newly received from the Spanish bishops in defence of 'Adoptionism': doubts aroused about the authorship of texts credited by them to Jerome prompt a correction to a citation in the *Libri Carolini*. Changes in the choice of creed to introduce Book III and an amplification of a short section relating to the Holy Spirit seem similarly inspired. The collective achievement, the picture of a Court in action as a place of vigorous debate on complex theological, philosophical, and political issues, needs no additional gloss.<sup>1</sup>

The debate on 'Adoptionism' continued, increasingly personalized, until the end of the century. That on images came to an abrupt and unexpected end when (if we accept a recent and convincing reconstruction of events) a considered, detailed reply to the preliminary Frankish statement showed that Pope Hadrian identified himself wholly with the Byzantine position: thus confirming and not, as so often supposed, reversing the traditional relationship of Pope and Frankish king. The Council of Frankfurt was still able to claim, pragmatically as well as theoretically, that it was a Universal Council under Frankish royal presidency. The first luxury manuscript on which work was undertaken when the Court took up residence at Aachen, not improbably the first since the Godescalc Evangelistary, was intended for Hadrian. A Psalter with additional material, it limited its images to the ivory covers: but more specifically its appendix of creeds, the first of its kind and substituting for the unread *Libri Carolini*, was a pointed if tactful reminder of where the Church's doctrinal truth was deposited.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. Freeman, 'Theodulf of Orleans and the *Libri Carolini*', *Speculum*, xxxii (1957), 663-705; id., 'Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini*', *ibid.*, xl (1965), 203-89; id., 'Further Studies in the *Libri Carolini*, iii: the marginal notes . . .', *ibid.*, xlvi (1971), 597-612, with the new chronology and interpretation of the Frankish response to the Papal response to the Court *capitulare* in *Viator*, xvi (1985), pp. 65 ff. For Alcuin's contribution see 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven' (p. 291, n. 2), pp. 33-8. Evidence of a correction to the manuscript text of the *Libri* prompted by a mis-attributed citation in the bishops' letter, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Conc.*, ii. 112, was reported in a personal letter from Mr P. Meyvaert and will be the subject of a future publication.

<sup>2</sup> 'Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven', pp. 46-7; L. Nees's review of the

[footnote cont. on p. 300]

The new and permanent setting for the Court provided new opportunities and new resources. Constantinople, even if it was aware of what was going on, would hardly have been impressed: but those around the king, still moving within restricted horizons, might persuade themselves that it should be. The survivors of the pre-Aachen generation were able to choose whether they applied their acquired skills to instructing a younger generation, extending their own and their pupils' intellectual awareness into hitherto neglected areas (*dialectica*, for example); revelling in a self-indulgent way in their own literary talents, certain of an informed audience; or enhancing their royal patron's sense of his unique *auctoritas*. Those whose talents were limited to fighting, even more those whose fighting days were past, were for the moment pushed to the margins and might become an (uncomprehending) object of caricature, like the unfortunate count Wicbod. Royal *vassi* were now typically 'landed'.<sup>1</sup> Those who wished to exercise influence on their infrequent visits to the Palace would surely have had to demonstrate that they were effective administrators (in the manner of the old Colonial District Officers rather than the modern bureaucrat) of their counties or other territories. The circle of resident scholars contracted sharply after the composition and circulation of the several poems which are the most vivid, but not the most substantial, documentation of the Aachen Court. A younger generation, mostly the beneficiaries of an education in their own communities by teachers who were at least aware of what had been accomplished in the 780s, came forward to fill the gap and to make their own statements in the early years of the new century. For most of them the preferred medium was still verse.

Einhard's debt was finally paid in prose 'lest Charles's illustrious deeds, hard for men of later time to imitate, . . . be wrapped in the darkness of oblivion'. If he was himself oblivious of the achievements of the quarter century before his arrival at the Court, without which his own response could not have taken the form it did, he cannot fairly be criticized. Most of the men who had helped to make them were gone and with them the possibility of testimony. The chapel and its bronze doors and grilles were more exciting to Einhard, more worthy of praise, than any

facsimile-edition of Vienna, Nat.-Bibl. cod. 1861, the 'Dagulf Psalter', with introduction by K. Holter (Codices selecti, lxi, Graz, 1980), in *Art Bulletin*, lxxvii (1985), 681-90.

<sup>1</sup> But the continuing importance of 'household' vassals should not be underestimated.

defence of the orthodox definition of the Second Person of the Trinity or even the creative skills of fellow-writers. He may have been wrong. Mr Godman, for one, is seeking to persuade us that the 'renaissance in Carolingian poetry is among the most impressive, and least recognised, achievements of Charlemagne's reign'. But generations of visitors to Aachen, the most conspicuous and enduring monument of the early Carolingian *aula renovata*, will probably continue to agree with Einhard.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For comments and discussion I am indebted to A. Corrêa, A. Freeman, P. Godman, P. Meyvaert, and L. Nees. The late Michael Wallace-Hadrill was unable to be present at the delivery of this lecture and sadly did not live to see it in print. My debt to him and his sharp criticisms over thirty-five years cannot be adequately reflected in the occasional references to his published work.