Using and Not Using the Past after the Carolingian Empire

c. 900–c.1050

Edited by Sarah Greer, Alice Hicklin,
and Stefan Esders

USING AND NOT USING THE PAST AFTER THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

Using and Not Using the Past after the Carolingian Empire offers a new take on European history from c.900 to c.1050, examining the 'post-Carolingian' period in its own right and presenting it as a time of creative experimentation with new forms of authority and legitimacy.

In the late eighth century, the Frankish king Charlemagne put together a new empire. Less than a century later, that empire had collapsed. The story of Europe following the end of the Carolingian Empire has often been presented as a tragedy: a time of turbulence and disintegration, out of which the new, recognizably medieval kingdoms of Europe emerged. This collection offers a different perspective. Taking a transnational approach, the authors contemplate the new social and political order that emerged in tenth- and eleventh-century Europe and examine how those shaping this new order saw themselves in relation to the past. Each chapter explores how the past was used creatively by actors in the regions of the former Carolingian Empire to search for political, legal, and social legitimacy in a turbulent new political order.

Advancing the debates on the uses of the past in the early Middle Ages and prompting reconsideration of the narratives that have traditionally dominated modern writing on this period, *Using and Not Using the Past after the Carolingian Empire* is ideal for students and scholars of tenth- and eleventh-century European history.

Sarah Greer is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of St Andrews. Her research explores the relationships between memory and power in the long tenth century.

Alice Hicklin is a post-doctoral fellow at the Freie Universität Berlin. Her research compares legal and diplomatic practices throughout western Europe in the early middle ages.

Stefan Esders is professor of Late Antique and Early Medieval History at the Freie Universität Berlin, specializing in legal history. He has recently co-edited *East and West in the Early Middle Ages: The Merovingian Kingdoms in Mediterranean Perspective* (2019) with Yaniv Fox, Yitzhak Hen, and Laury Sarti.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

USING AND NOT USING THE PAST AFTER THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

C. 900–C.1050

Edited by

Sarah Greer,
Alice Hicklin, and
Stefan Esders

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2020
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2020 selection and editorial matter, Sarah Greer, Alice Hicklin and Stefan Esders; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Sarah Greer, Alice Hicklin and Stefan Esders to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Greer, Sarah (Researcher), editor. | Hicklin, Alice, editor. |
Esders, Stefan, editor.
Title: Using and not using the past after the Carolingian Empire, c.
900-c.1050 / edited by Sarah Greer, Alice Hicklin and Stefan Esders.
Description: New York : Routledge, 2019. | Includes bibliographical
references and index. | Identifiers: LCCN 2019032634 (print) | LCCN 2019032635 (ebook) | ISBN
9780367002510 (hardback) | ISBN 9780367002527 (paperback) | ISBN 9780429400551 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Europe--Politics and government--476-1492. |
Europe--History--476-1492--Historiography. | Middle
Ages--Historiography.
Classification: LCC D116 .U76 2019 (print) | LCC D116 (ebook) | DDC
940.1/44--dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019032634
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019032635

ISBN: 978-0-367-00251-0 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-00252-7 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-0-429-40055-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Swales & Willis, Exeter, Devon, UK

CONTENTS

List of Illustrations *vii*
Notes on contributors *ix*

1 Introduction 1
Sarah Greer and Alice Hicklin

PART I
Past Narratives **13**

2 The future of history after empire 15
Geoffrey Koziol

3 Remembering troubled pasts: episcopal deposition and succession in Flodoard's *History of the Church of Rheims* 36
Edward Roberts

4 In the shadow of Rome: after empire in the late-tenth-century chronicle of Benedict of Monte Soratte 56
Maya Maskarinec

5 Infiltrating the local past: supra-regional players in local hagiography from Trier in the ninth and tenth centuries 77
Lenneke van Raaij

6 After the fall: lives of texts and lives of modern scholars in the historiography of the post-Carolingian world 94
Stuart Airlie

PART II

Inscribing Memories **109**

7 How Carolingian was early medieval Catalonia? 111
Matthias M. Tischler

8 Orchestrating harmony: litanies, queens, and discord in the Carolingian and Ottonian empires 134
Megan Welton

9 Models of marriage charters in a notebook of Ademar of Chabannes (ninth- to eleventh-century) 154
Philippe Depreux

10 All in the family: creating a Carolingian genealogy in the eleventh century 166
Sarah Greer

11 'Charles's stirrups hang down from Conrad's saddle': reminiscences of Carolingian oath practice under Conrad II (1024–1039) 189
Stefan Esders

PART III

Recalling Communities **201**

12 Notions of belonging. Some observations on solidarity in the late- and post-Carolingian world 203
Maximilian Diesenberger

13 Bishops, canon law, and the politics of belonging in post-Carolingian Italy, c. 930–c. 960 221
Jelle Wassenaar

14 Migrant masters and their books. Italian scholars and knowledge transfer in post-Carolingian Europe 241
Giorgia Vocino

15 The dignity of our bodies and the salvation of our souls. Scandal, purity, and the pursuit of unity in late tenth-century monasticism 262
Steven Vanderputten

16 Law and liturgy: excommunication records, 900–1050 282
Sarah Hamilton

Index 303

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figures

4.1 Monte Soratte as viewed from Rome (Photo by author) 57
4.2 Vat. Chigi. F.IV.75, fol. 40r (courtesy of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, with all rights reserved) 60
4.3 Reused architectural elements in the church of S. Andrea (Photos by author) 61
10.1 © The British Library Board, British Library, Arundel MS 390, f. 133r 172
10.2 Diagram of the Arundel 390 Table (created by author) 182

Map

4.1 Monte Soratte and its environs (Map created by Gordie Thompson) 58

Table

5.1 Hagiographical works of local patrons of Trier until the first half of the eleventh century (created by author) 80

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Stuart Airlie is senior lecturer in Medieval History at the University of Glasgow. His research focuses on early medieval political culture. He is the author of *Power and Its Problems in Carolingian Europe* (2012). He is currently completing a book on Carolingian dynastic hegemony as well as one on religious critiques of rulership from 400–1100.

Philippe Depreux is professor of Medieval History at the University of Hamburg. He has published numerous works on early and high medieval political life, written norms, and social and cultural networks. He has recently co-edited *La productivité d'une crise: le règne de Louis le Pieux (814–840) et la transformation de l'Empire carolingien* (2018) with Stefan Esders.

Maximilian Diesenberger is the head of division of Historical Identity Research at the Institute for Medieval Research, Austrian Academy of Sciences. His research interests include medieval identity formation and social cohesion. He is currently finishing a book about morality, pastoral care, and the perception of foreign peoples at the beginning of the tenth century.

Stefan Esders is professor of Late Antique and Early Medieval History at the Freie Universität Berlin, specializing in legal history. He has recently co-edited *East and West in the Early Middle Ages: The Merovingian Kingdoms in Mediterranean Perspective* (2019) with Yaniv Fox, Yitzhak Hen, and Laury Sarti.

Sarah Greer is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of St Andrews. Her research explores the relationships between memory and power in the long tenth century. Her first book, *Commemorating Power: Writing and Rewriting the Past at Gandersheim and Quedlinburg*, is forthcoming from Oxford University Press.

Sarah Hamilton is professor of medieval history at the University of Exeter. She works on social and religious history in the Latin West in the tenth and eleventh centuries. She is currently preparing a co-authored book with Simon MacLean on tenth-century Western Europe and has recently co-edited *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation* (2016) with Helen Gittos.

Geoffrey Koziol is professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley. His research focuses primarily on West Frankish and proto-French history from the ninth through the early twelfth centuries, particularly those points where political and religious discourses intersect. His most recent book is *The Peace of God* (2018).

Maya Maskarinec is an assistant professor of history at the University of Southern California and the author of *City of Saints: Rebuilding Rome in the Early Middle Ages* (2018). Her research interests focus on the city of Rome and include urban history, hagiography and historiography, legal history, and the afterlife of Rome's Christian and classical heritage.

Edward Roberts is lecturer in Early Medieval History at the University of Kent. He specializes in Carolingian and Ottonian Europe, with particular interests in historiography, bishops, and legal culture. His first book, *Flodoard of Rheims and the Writing of History in the Tenth Century*, was published in 2019.

Matthias M. Tischler received his PhD from Heidelberg (1998) and completed his Habilitation in Dresden (2008/2009). Since 2017 he has been a senior research professor at ICREA, Barcelona. His comparative studies raise questions about the geographical, linguistic, religious, cultural, and mental borders of the multi-layered legacy in the centres and peripheries of medieval worlds. He is the founder and editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Transcultural Medieval Studies* (from 2014) and the book series *Transcultural Medieval Studies* (from 2019).

Steven Vanderputten is a full professor in the History of the early and high Middle Ages at Ghent University. His research is mainly involved with the study of the institutional development, societal embedding, and culture of religious communities between c. 800 and 1200, with a particular focus on monastic groups. His monographs include *Monastic Reform as Process: Realities and Representations in Medieval Flanders, 900–1100* (2013) and *Dark Age Nunneries: The Ambiguous Identity of Female Monasticism*, 800–1050 (2018).

Lenneke van Raaij obtained her research master degree in medieval history at Utrecht University in 2016. She is currently completing her PhD thesis at the University of Exeter, in which she explores the uses of liturgy in constructing local pasts. Her fields of interests include manuscript studies and religious and intellectual culture of the early and high Middle Ages.

Giorgia Vocino is currently a research fellow at the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes (IRHT-CNRS). Her research interests include intellectual history, the history of education and hagiographical writing in early medieval Italy.

Jelle Wassenaar is a PhD student at the Institute of Medieval Research at the Austrian Academy of Sciences. He is currently writing a dissertation on the construction of diocesan and episcopal group identities in tenth-century Europe.

Megan Welton is currently a post-doctoral research fellow at Utrecht University. Her research focuses on early medieval political culture in the Anglo-Saxon, Carolingian, and Ottonian realms, with a particular interest in early medieval queenship.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

1

INTRODUCTION

Sarah Greer and Alice Hicklin[*]

The vision of the figure of Charlemagne, who established an empire of almost a million square kilometres reaching from the frontiers of modern Hungary to the Atlantic, and from the English Channel to central Italy and Catalonia, has been a heady one for those who came after him. In the year 1000, the Roman Emperor Otto III returned to the German heartlands of his empire after a grand tour around his kingdom. He was finally drawn to a site laden with imperial significance: the Carolingian palace complex of Aachen, where the remains of his predecessor Charlemagne had been laid to rest in the cathedral after his death some 186 years earlier. Remarkably the exact location of the emperor's body had been lost to posterity, and consequently Otto ordered that the ground of the cathedral should be ripped up, so that he could look upon the body of his great predecessor. The excavations eventually uncovered the site, and the emperor, accompanied by members of his imperial court, came face to face with his predecessor. According to contemporary reports, the body of Charlemagne was found sitting upright on a royal throne in a crypt below the cathedral, wearing a golden crown and holding a sceptre. Otto reverently removed relics from Charlemagne's body – though all the sources disagree on exactly what these relics were – before reburying him with the greatest honour within the church.[1] This millennial unveiling of one emperor by another reverberated throughout the empire and beyond. What Otto specifically hoped to achieve or convey with his exhumation of Charlemagne is disputed, but its symbolism is nevertheless clear: almost 200 years after Charlemagne's death, the lure of aligning his own empire with the memory of the first post-Roman western

---

[*] The research for this chapter was funded by the 'After Empire: Using and Not Using the Past in the Crisis of the Carolingian World, c.900–1050' HERA project, receiving funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 649307.

emperor brought Otto to Aachen and to the feet of Charlemagne. The Carolingian past, personified by its eponymous and most successful ruler, exerted a gravitational pull on those who came after.[2]

The power of Charlemagne as a political symbol has endured. Remembered from the time of his death to the present day, Charlemagne is linked to a vision of a coherent political entity for the territories that once lay within his empire, and was celebrated on the 1,200th anniversary of his death in 2014 as the 'father of Europe', *pater Europae*.[3] Earlier in the twentieth century, Charlemagne's empire functioned as a point of reference – and perhaps inspiration – for the architects of the European Union as they embarked on the ambitious project of constructing a post-national, post-war Europe in the 1940s and 1950s.[4] Even now, the yearly Charlemagne Prize in Aachen is awarded to those who have served the cause of European unity.[5] Charlemagne's conquests of different areas of Europe that had fractured politically with the collapse of Roman imperial power in the west in the fifth century have long fascinated historians, and these, along with the extensive administrative and ecclesiastic reform programmes begun in his reign and the remarkable flourishing of intellectual life at his court and those of his descendants, have been the subject of an immense body of scholarship.[6]

In contrast, European history after the middle ninth century was for many years often cast as the nadir to Charlemagne's zenith, and as a period of decline preceding the seismic political and cultural changes brought about in the later eleventh century.[7] The eventual fragmentation of the empire in the tenth century was seen as the tragic result of the failures of Charlemagne's descendants, epitomized by the battle of Fontenoy in 841, when Charlemagne's grandsons' territorial disputes escalated into what is widely considered to be the bloodiest battle of the Carolingian era.[8] Over the course of the ninth century the raids of Scandinavian warbands on the coasts and rivers of western Europe, Britain and Ireland destabilized existing power structures to a greater and greater extent, as on the Continent contemporaries lamented the inability of the later Carolingian rulers to assuage their suffering. Iberian and North African warbands drawn from the Islamic caliphates had a similarly transformative effect on the regions they targeted in the Mediterranean: churches were destroyed, outposts built, and alliances made. By the end of the ninth century Magyar raids on the eastern edges of the Carolingian Empire proved debilitating to marcher lords there and in northern Italy; these raids would grow in intensity until the middle of the tenth century. This narrative of Carolingian woes, crowned by the untimely deaths of a number of Carolingian princes, came to a head as the empire splintered into regional kingdoms – East Francia, Lombardy, Burgundy, Lotharingia, Provence, West Francia, and Catalonia – whose magnates famously – according to a contemporary chronicler – elected new kings 'from their own guts'.[9]

The splintering of western Europe into different kingdoms meant that each territory charted its own trajectory of rulership over the following century and a half. East Francia saw the rise of a new Saxon dynasty, the Ottonians, who eventually conquered Lotharingia and Lombardy and claimed hegemony over the surrounding territories of Burgundy and Provence as well as principalities to the east of the Elbe. The new German-Italian Empire that was thus formed over the tenth century went on to be ruled by the Salians, an offshoot of the Ottonian family who had established themselves in the Middle Rhine region, from 1024 through the rest of the eleventh century. While Lombardy ended the tenth century as part of this empire, the immediate post-Carolingian period saw northern Italy riven by internal conflict over who should rule; competing Italian kings and their supporters battled for dominance, which opened the opportunity for external figures to repeatedly interfere in Italian affairs and eventually lay claim to the Italian throne. Southern Italy remained a febrile area for much of the period as well, held by the Byzantine emperors who faced challenges both from the Saxon Roman emperors and the Islamic caliphate, before the watershed change of the Norman Conquest of Sicily in the mid-eleventh century.

The West Frankish kingdom, on the other hand, cannot truly be described as 'post-Carolingian' until 987. In the century following the deposition and death of Charles the Fat, West Francia saw a legitimate line of Carolingian kings take the throne. However, their position was far from assured; several non-Carolingian kings were drawn from the Robertian/Capetian dynasty over the late ninth and tenth centuries and Carolingian kings needed to manoeuvre with increasing care around the claims of this family as well as other magnates to rule over large areas of the West Frankish kingdom. The Capetians eventually claimed the throne of West Francia definitively in 987, albeit in the face of considerable resistance from the last generation of Carolingian heirs. In contrast, Catalonia, which lay sandwiched between southern West Francia and the Islamic territory of al-Andalus on the periphery of the Carolingian Empire, had a very different experience as Carolingian and even Frankish power in the region dwindled. Local magnates, such as the counts of Barcelona, stepped forward to claim authority in the tenth-century power vacuum.

Another form of Carolingian periphery can be seen in Anglo-Saxon England; while it was never formally part of the Carolingian Empire, it was enmeshed in the institutional and personal networks of the Carolingian realm and retained close links with the Continent. The tenth century saw the successors of King Alfred in Wessex push back against the viking presence that had swept through the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in the ninth century, claiming rulership over a newly created 'English' kingdom. The renewal of viking raids in the late tenth century, however, culminated in a second conquest in the early eleventh century and the accession of Scandinavian kings to the throne. Though the exiled son of Æthelred II, Edward the Confessor, eventually returned the line of Alfred to power, his death without issue ended the line, with the Norman Conquest following months later.

This explosion of new dynasties and territories that sprawled across the former empire and beyond its borders have long been the subject of fervent scrutiny. For earlier historians, influenced by the rise of nationalism in nineteenth-century Europe, the tenth century was the era commonly pinpointed for the origins of the countries that would later become modern nation-states. These origin narratives are prominent in Germany, France, and England, but are visible too in Poland, Norway, Iceland, Denmark, Wales, Scotland, and beyond. Though each of these origin stories differ, the identification of the tenth century as the point of national genesis has nonetheless shaped the overall vision of this period. The long tenth century has thus been seen as a period of chaos and turbulence, from which, eventually, the founding figures of these new nations were able to bring order and stability, creating the structures that would underpin the more recognizable kingdoms of the later eleventh and twelfth centuries. In order for this kind of triumphalist national origin story to function, the tenth century must necessarily lie in the shadows, with its political order characterized as the debris resulting from the collapse of the Carolingian Empire.[10] Fortunately, more recent approaches have moved away from these flawed accounts, recognizing instead the fluidity of this period and the resulting political experimentation. The creation of these new kingdoms is now seen in the light of the uncertainty and various experiments in rulership and government within the tenth century, rather than as part of an inevitable drive towards the nations of modernity.

Yet, while few would still subscribe wholeheartedly to these nationalist views, the legacy of these approaches endures in modern scholarship on the long tenth century. There remains a tendency to consider each territory individually and thus to push narratives of exceptionalism for each. As a result, systematic comparisons of the different regions of tenth- and eleventh-century Europe have been somewhat discouraged. Arguably, the current corpus of scholarship taken as a whole divides the kingdoms of the post-Carolingian Empire more sharply than those living in the tenth century did. Ironically, however, the tendency towards nationalistic scholarship has also encouraged us to view local phenomena as pan-European trends: the kingdoms and principalities of tenth- and eleventh-century Europe are thus at once homogeneous and exceptional.

If the Carolingian Empire is one book-end to the gloomy world of the long tenth century, then the other is provided by the apparently wholesale societal changes that shaped the later eleventh century. The new, 'medieval' order that characterized the twelfth century has cast a shadow that obscures almost entirely the preceding 150 years, turning them, as one commentator observed, into 'a medieval Middle Ages'.[11] Again, the attention of scholars on individual territories has led to the development of different focal points and debates, which have occasionally been applied across all of Europe, despite their rather localized origins. In France, famously, the year 1000 has long been identified as a turning point between the post-Roman world of the Early Middle Ages and the world of the High Middle Ages,[12] a battleground for debates over whether a so-called 'Feudal Revolution' rapidly changed the nature of western European society.[13] Georges Duby and those who followed him focused less attention on the collapse of the Carolingian Empire than on the new forms of lordship that rose up around the turn of the millennium, when local rulers began appropriating power from royal hands.[14] The tenth century played an integral part in such discussions, being closely examined for evidence of when and where the seeds of this later social order were planted.[15]

In Germany, the long tenth century has been overshadowed by the Investiture Contest, a series of convulsions between secular and ecclesiastical powers at the highest level that reshaped kingly and papal authorities and their interactions and brought the 'Early Middle Ages' to their end.[16] The transformation of the Church that began in earnest in the second half of the eleventh century from the impetus of Gregory VII (leading to them being referred to as the 'Gregorian Reforms') drew on ideas that had already taken root in monasteries throughout Europe in the tenth century. In the German Empire, however, the timing of this new reform movement in the later eleventh century offered an opportunity for those who were becoming increasingly frustrated with the Salian dynasty to legitimize new non-Salian rulers. The conjunction of this reform movement with a civil war in Saxony and the rise of several 'anti-kings' sparked a crisis which threatened the basis of the Salian emperors' legitimacy; accordingly, the long tenth century is viewed as a prelude to this fundamental clash between secular and ecclesiastical rulers in the Empire.[17]

In Italy, the collapse of independent power in the long tenth century is seen as heralding the rise of the city-states of twelfth-century northern Italy. With the fragmentation of the Italian peninsula into different areas under the control of external forces, the resulting power vacuums created by absent rulers are thought to have allowed new polities to emerge which were defined by their local nature. This build-up of local, urban power is thus viewed in the light of a collapse of public order in Italy in the tenth century and then linked to the concurrent revival of Roman law in Italy in the later eleventh century and the emergence of a cadre of professional lawyers – with a resulting shift in the nature of Italian documentary culture.[18] In Catalonia, again, the vision of a breakdown of public order in the late tenth/early eleventh century is implicated in ideas of an increasingly feudalized society;[19] and in England, the tenth century's successes were snuffed out by the Norman Conquest of 1066 and the radical restructuring of society which followed.[20] Whether the focus has been on the east or the west, northern Europe or the Mediterranean, looking at the tenth century as the prelude for what lay beyond it in the later eleventh century has led to the impression that the period stretching between 888 and 1050 presents little more than an interval between the lost order of the Carolingian era and the new, more recognizably 'medieval' order of the long twelfth century.

Important work has nevertheless begun to change our view. There has been a shift in favour of interpreting the period under consideration on the Continent on its own terms and with sensitivity to the interconnectedness of its regions. This scholarship, largely but not exclusively produced within the last thirty years, has shown the potential of the sources to shine light onto a period often shrouded in obscurity. From assessments of individual kings or dynasties to considerations of reform movements, monasticism, diplomacy or documentary culture, little by little the tenth and early eleventh centuries emerge from their reputation as the poor relation to what came before and after, showing themselves to be deserving of serious consideration in their own right.[21]

Across continental Europe, the scale and orientation of polities underwent a seismic shift: kingdoms shrank, principalities grew, and power shifted away from the traditional heartlands of the Carolingians towards new areas. Regions that had been peripheries of the former empire, such as Saxony and Catalonia, now found themselves the centres of new polities. Even the idea of 'Frankishness' that had dominated the empire now broke open into different identities, some new and some far older, whether 'Normans', 'Saxons' or 'Lotharingians'. There was a notable diversification of political authority: in addition to new kings, emperors, and dynasties, local figures of authority asserted themselves, from the emergence of sub-regnal 'dukes' in various kingdoms to the apparently commensurate increase in episcopal authority. Power in areas that had once tended towards administrative centralization – such as West Francia and northern Italy – splintered, while the West-Saxon dynasty of Anglo-Saxon England, ruling over a kingdom newly constructed in the wake of Scandinavian conquest, borrowed heavily from past Carolingian models of power as a means to centralize authority and rejuvenate its literary and cultural milieu.

The Carolingian Empire's heyday may well have ushered in a 'renaissance' of knowledge, art and culture, but the tenth and earlier eleventh centuries saw intellectual breathing space develop as an inevitable outcome of the fragmentation of power. The long tenth century thus offers us the chance to look closely at how authority and legitimacy were consciously constructed in a new political order, and how these constructs reflected, manipulated and rejected the past. At all turns, contemporary writers evinced a need to validate, justify and critique the new forms of authority that rose and sometimes fell within their lifetimes, often with reference to what had come before. As previous consensus on the natures of authority and legitimate power vanished, debate (and disagreement) on these topics intensified. Secular rulers, bishops, abbots, abbesses and their *familiae*, clerics and laypeople all attempted to comprehend the changes that they were experiencing by situating them in ideological frameworks that they already possessed. In particular, they turned to the past in order to comment on the present, a reflection of anxieties about the ever-changing present. Innovations and new ways of ruling, writing or governing might be cloaked in references to the past in order to provide the veneer of respectability and historical precedent for new ideas; equally, the past could be a yardstick against which contemporaries and their actions were measured (and then beaten with, should they fall short). In this era of exceptional change, the past became an increasingly powerful tool to comment on the present.

Historians have not failed to notice the sudden changes to the volume and types of historical sources available after the Carolingian Empire's decline. The many narrative histories that illuminate the Carolingian world, long perceived as characteristic of the Carolingian intellectual project through their connections to royal and imperial court culture, had all ended by the early tenth century.[22] Yet the decline in the first half of the tenth century of this style of history-writing did not leave a void. Across Europe, we witness the growing reification of the past in diverse texts. While long-form historical narratives dwindled, they continued to be read and copied, and after 950 there is a clear revival of this type of historical record, in both traditional and new forms. In England and on the Continent hagiographical texts that commemorated living or recently-deceased holy men and women became an increasingly important medium for relating the past, where before hagiographers tended to focus on saints at considerable historical remove; *Gesta* of bishops, too, surged in popularity. The relationships of new histories to the Carolingian past were complex: some new histories were cast as continuations of ninth-century texts, while others showed little interest in Carolingian history and events, and instead focused more intently on their authors' here-and-now.

Innovations and developments in the field of liturgy can also show us new ways of using the past. These are often at first glance more subtle than those of narrative sources but nevertheless highly revealing, as their authors and compilers consciously manipulated Carolingian models to create new ways of commemorating their communities and celebrating their faith. New genres appeared, such as the pontifical, a collection of rites and texts relating to the office of the bishop, and an important witness to the construction of episcopal authority. Changing attitudes to governance present complex regional and normative interactions with the past in documentary culture: the enormous corpus of Carolingian capitularies, diplomas and charters remained a powerful source of legal authority that were copied, revised and manipulated across the former empire and beyond. At the same time the way kingdoms were governed appears to have radically changed: the application of laws and legal norms changed significantly in response to present needs and practices. Agencies came to rely less on the production of new texts, indicating some kind of rupture with what went before, but also used the past to develop different strategies to justify and support legal claims and normative measures in their present world. Falsified documents attributed to Carolingian rulers offer us insight into when and why Carolingian legitimacy may have been wanted or needed and how the past could be used for present effect, as do invocations of the names of previous kings and their legal decisions in contemporary documents.

The 'crisis' of the Carolingian world therefore produced an abundance of texts and authors who tried to understand the present and forecast or shape the future through reference to the past, even if their forms and functions appear at first glance more inscrutable to the historian of early medieval Europe. Those behind the writing and copying of texts simultaneously viewed their present as marked by uncertainty and change, and used the past with increasing creativity and liberty. Understanding how these two interlocking impulses flowed through narratives and texts of the tenth and earlier eleventh centuries offers us a way to comprehend the period on its own terms more fully. This, of course, is not to view the tenth and eleventh centuries through the lens of the Carolingian era, but instead to try to recalibrate our understanding of this period through looking at how tenth- and eleventh-century individuals themselves thought about their present in relation to their past, whether that meant their immediate predecessors, the Carolingians, or further back still, to Merovingian, Lombard, Roman or Greek precedents.

The following volume uses these contradictory and multivalent conceptions of the past as a way to open up lived experiences without resorting to national or teleological perspectives. The various contributors to this collection explore how insecurity around social, political and religious authority in the period after the collapse of the Carolingian Empire drove creative uses of the past across Europe. The chapters of this collection cover a wide geographical remit, including the former territories of the Carolingian Empire, but also looking east and south to its borders on the Slavic march and in Spain, and north-west to Anglo-Saxon England, a society with deep debts to Carolingian ideas about power and authority in the period under scrutiny. A transnational approach to this period, in which historic and contemporary 'frontier' and heartland regions are perceived to be of equal importance, helps us move beyond traditional narratives of national origins associated with tenth-century Europe. The following presentation of cases ranging from France to Germany, Italy to Flanders, and England to Catalonia, offers a comparative view of history after the Carolingian Empire which serves to break the isolation of these different regional histories.

Our first section, 'Past Narratives', explores the writing of texts explicitly concerned with history, considering how different authors approached the past under the new political realities of the long tenth century. In his contribution, Geoffrey Koziol argues that the evaporation of the Carolingian Empire as a framework for presenting past and present events reoriented historiographical texts in the tenth century. New structures needed to be introduced to fill the gap, with those springing up from ecclesiastical genres finding particular favour in shaping new memories of the past. The three subsequent case studies offered by Maya Maskarinec, Edward Roberts and Lenneke van Raaij tackle this same question in fine detail. Maskarinec examines how an Italian monk offered monastic history as an encouraging alternative to the sad lament of imperial history in Rome. As Roberts shows, Flodoard of Reims also tried to find hope for the future in the stories of the past in his careful presentation of the troubled history of the archbishops of Reims. The timelessness of saintly history provided hagiographic authors in Trier another way to respond to the changing political world around them, which van Raaij outlines in her contribution. Stuart Airlie concludes the section by contemplating our own ongoing attempts to find new structures to understand the past as medieval historians, drawing out how the genre of biography has shaped our view of the long tenth century, and how biographies of medievalists, as well as those of medieval texts, can help us better understand our own perceptions of this period.

From this focus on historically-minded texts, we turn to texts that engaged in the past in other, subtler ways in the section 'Inscribing Memory'. Here, our contributors examine the impact of past exemplars and ideas on various genres of text created after the end of the Carolingian Empire, whether that was through adopting or adapting the wording of past documents or creating new texts or manuscripts that visually imitated Carolingian models. Matthias M. Tischler reveals how border regions like Catalonia created their own expressions of 'Carolingianness', which evolved in response to localized pressures; these could look rather different from the 'Carolingian-ness' of the Frankish heartlands. The development of Catalan manuscript culture of the ninth to eleventh century provides a case study of this process, featuring the development of a hybrid Visigothic-Caroline minuscule. The visual memories held within manuscripts are also explored by Megan Welton in her study of the role of Carolingian and Ottonian royal women in royal liturgy: we can see the hints of discord and dissenting voices over time in manuscripts where queens' names were written down, erased, or replaced. Liturgy promoted a timeless image of the queen's role in the kingdom, but these sources reveal the tensions that liturgical rites were attempting to quell. This attempt to impose harmony is also seen in Philippe Depreux's examination of the wedding charters recorded by Ademar of Chabannes: the use of Carolingian models for these contemporary texts reveals how the past could be drawn on to provide further stability for acts in the present. The final two contributions both examine the explicit attempts of the Salian dynasty to imitate the Carolingians in two different genres. Sarah Greer focuses on the creation of new genealogical tables that sprang up in the tenth and eleventh century, arguing that one unusual royal genealogy can only be understood when set in the context of the Salian court's intense interest in the Carolingians. This interest was also expressed in the obvious modelling of Salian oaths on Carolingian forms, as Stefan Esders outlines; he argues that this was a deliberate decision on the part of the Salian rulers, revealing the conscious shaping of their rulership in imitation of non-Ottonian past practices.

The final section of the volume, 'Recalling Communities', moves away from specific texts to think more broadly about how the past was used to define communities and communal identity in a period where identities were suddenly in flux. The idea of solidarity, unsurprisingly, became an increasing concern to authors in the tenth and eleventh century as they faced the fluid nature of the new political order. Both Max Diesenberger and Jelle Wassenaar address how authors defined and historicized solidarity and what their aims were in promoting these ideas; Diesenberger provides an overview of the development of the rhetoric of solidarity from the late Carolingian era through to the post-Carolingian kingdoms, while Wassenaar provides a targeted case study, exploring the discussions of solidarity in the tenth-century Italian episcopacy. Giorgia Vocino continues the focus on the Italian episcopate, but provides another facet of their community and identity by exploring the networks of masters and students that shaped the Italian intellectual elite. She notes these networks predated the tenth century, providing some continuity after the collapse of Carolingian power and the rise of new polities while also offering opportunities for Italy to develop its distinctive intellectual culture of the eleventh century. The final two chapters turn to examples where the past was being used to shape religious communities through exclusion. Steven Vanderputten addresses the discourses on monastic purity that spread across Europe through the tenth century, emphasizing how authors relied on time-honoured rhetorical traditions to shape their criticism of contemporary communities. In contrast, Sarah Hamilton describes the innovation of a new form of text, the recording of excommunication practices, which only emerged in post-Carolingian Europe. However, Hamilton shows the underlying foundation of ninth-century legislation on these new texts; they were at the same time both innovative and traditional.

Each of our authors draws out how individuals in the long tenth century perceived their present by exploring their depictions of political, legal and social legitimacy in reconstructed versions of the past. Rather than simply treating this period as the sad aftermath of the collapsed Carolingian project, or as the turbulent period that preceded a new social order, this collection of essays considers the tenth and earlier eleventh centuries in their own right, revealing a complex, fluid world where definitions of authority and legitimacy were constantly negotiated.

Notes

1 Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon* 4.47, in Robert Holtzmann (ed.), Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum separatim editi 9 (Berlin: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1935), p. 184ff; *Chronicon Novaliciense* c. 32, in Gian Carlo Alessio (ed.), *Cronaca di Novalesa* (Torino: Einaudi, 1982), p. 182; Ademar of Chabannes, *Chronicon* 3.31 in P. Bourgain with R. Landes and G. Pon (eds.), *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), p. 153; Johann Friedrich Böhmer *et al.*, *Regesta Imperii II: Sachsisches Haus, 919–1024. 3. Abt.: Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter Otto III. (980) 983–1002* (Graz: Böhlau), p. 760.

2 For more on Charlemagne as a model for later rulers, see the commentary and references in Jennifer R. Davis, *Charlemagne's Practice of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 433.

3 On Charlemagne as *pater Europae*, see *Epos Karolus Magnus et Leo Papa*, in *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* 1 ed. by Ernst Dümmler (Berlin: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1881), p. 94, line 504.

4 Desmond Dinan, 'The Historiography of European Integration' in idem (ed.) *Origins and Evolution of the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 345–75 at p. 349.

5 www.karlspreis.de.

6 The literature on Charlemagne and his reign is too vast to outline in full here. Work on his rule continues apace, sparked in part by the 1,200th anniversary of Charlemagne's death in 2014. A small selection of these recent titles includes: Davis, *Charlemagne's Practice of Empire*; Steffen Patzold, *Ich und Karl der Große: das Leben des Höflings Einhard* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2014); Frank Pohle, (ed.), *Karl der Grosse, Charlemagne. Orte der Macht* (Dresden: Sandstein, 2014); Barbara Segelken, (ed.), *Kaiser und Kalifen. Karl der Große und die Mächte am Mittelmeer um 800* (Darmstadt: P. von Zabern, 2014); Philippe Depreux, (ed.), *Charlemagne: du royaume à l'empire* (Chaponnay: Achéodunum, 2014); Johannes Fried, *Karl der Grosse: Gewalt und Glaube. Eine Biographie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2013); trans. by Peter Lewis as *Charlemagne* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016); Anne Latowsky, *Emperor of the World: Charlemagne and the Construction of Imperial Authority, 800–1229* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013); Bernard S. Bachrach, *Charlemagne's Early Campaigns (768–777): a Diplomatic and Military Analysis* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Wilfried Hartmann, *Karl der Große* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010); Rosamond McKitterick, *Charlemagne: the Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

7 Marc Bloch, *La société féodale*, 2 vols., (Paris: Albin Michel, 1939); trans. by L. A. Manyon as *Feudal Society*, 2 vols., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

8 See, for example, Edward Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 2 vols., (2nd ed., Chicago: Encyclopedia Brittanica Inc., 1990), vol. 2, p. 213.

9 Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*, 888, in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 50 ed. by Friedrich Kurze, (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica,

1890), p. 129, translated in Simon MacLean (ed.), *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: The* Chronicle *of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), p. 199.

10 For a superb introduction to this historiography, see Timothy Reuter, ‘Introduction: Reading the Tenth Century’, in idem (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume Three, c. 900–c. 1024* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1–24.

11 Conrad Leyser, ‘Introduction: England and the Continent’, in *England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 1–16, at p. 10. On the problematic nature of the term ‘medieval’ altogether, see Timothy Reuter, ‘Medieval: Another Tyrannous Construct?’, *The Medieval Journal* 1 (1998), 1–25. On issues of periodisation see especially Kathleen Davis, *Periodization and Sovereignty: How Ideas of Feudalism and Secularization Govern the Politics of Time* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008).

12 Timothy Reuter, ‘Debating the Feudal Revolution’, in Janet L. Nelson (ed.), *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 79.

13 The literature on this topic is extensive; some major works include: Bloch, *La société féodale*; Jean-François Lemarignier, *Le gouvernement royal aux premiers temps capétiens (987–1108)* (Paris: Picard, 1965); Georges Duby, *Les trois ordres, ou l’imaginaire du féodalisme* (Paris: Gallimard, 1978); Dominique Barthélemy, ‘La mutation féodale a-t-elle eu lieu? Note critique’, *Annales E. S. C.* 47 (1992), 767–77; Cinzio Violante & Johannes Fried (eds.), *Il secolo XI: una svolta?* (Bologne: Il Mulino,1993); Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994). On the debates in historiography see: Dominique Barthélemy & Stephen D. White, ‘The “Feudal Revolution”’, *Past and Present* 152 (1996), 196–223; Timothy Reuter and Chris Wickham, ‘Debate: The “Feudal Revolution”’, *Past & Present* 155 (1997), 177–208.

14 Georges Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1953); Jean-Pierre Poly and Éric Bournazel, *La mutation féodale, Xe–XIIe siècles* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1980); Robert Fossier, *Enfance de l’Europe. Xe–XIIe siècles: aspects économiques et sociaux* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982).

15 For challenges to Duby’s vision, see, for example, Dominique Barthélemy, *La mutation de l’an mil, a-t-elle eu lieu?: servage et chevalerie dans la France des Xe et XIIe siècles* (Paris: Fayard, 1997); Charles West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation between the Marne and Moselle, c.800–c.1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

16 Again, the literature on this is vast. See Gerd Tellenbach, *Libertas: Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932); trans. by Ralph Francis Bennett as *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1940); Josef Fleckenstein, (ed.), *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1973); Horst Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages, c. 1050–1200* (trans. by Timothy Reuter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988); H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII 1073–1085* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998); Hartmut Hoffmann, ‘Canossa – eine Wende?’ *Deutsches Archiv* 66 (2010), 535–69.

17 Some good general introductions are: Gerd Tellenbach, *Die Westliche Kirche vom 10. bis frühen 12. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988); trans. by Timothy Reuter as *The Western Church from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Timothy Reuter, ‘Pre-Gregorian Mentalities’, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994), 465–74; Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Phyllis G. Jestice, *Wayward Monks and the Religious Revolution of the Eleventh Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

18 Paul Fournier, ‘Un tournant de l’histoire du droit: 1060–1140’, *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 41 (1917), 129–80; Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution: the Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); Peter Landau, ‘Wandel und Kontinuität im kanonischen Recht bei Gratian’, in Jürgen

Miethke & Klaus Schreiner (eds.), *Sozialer Wandel im Mittelalter: Wahrnehmungsformen, Erklärungsmuster, Regelungsmechanismen* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1994), pp. 215–33; Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century*. On Italian city-states: Renato Bordone and Jörg Jarnut (eds), *L'evoluzione delle città italiane nell' XI secolo* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1988); Daniel Philip Waley and Trevor Dean, (eds.), *The Italian City Republics* (4th ed., London: Routledge, 2009); Chris Wickham, *Sleepwalking into a New World: The Emergence of Italian City Communes in the Twelfth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015). On southern Italy, see Graham Loud, 'Continuity and Change in Norman Italy: the Campania in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Journal of Medieval History* 22.4 (1996), 313–43; idem., *The Age of Robert Guiscard. Southern Italy and the Norman Conquest* (Harlow: Routledge, 2000).

19 Pierre Bonnassie, *La Catalogne du milieu du X^{e} à la fin du XI^{e} siècle: croissance et mutations d'une société* 2 vols., (Toulouse: Association des Publications de l'Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1975–6); Thomas N. Bisson, 'Feudalism in Twelfth-Century Catalonia', *Publications de l'École Française de Rome* 44 (1980), 173–92; Josep M. Salrach, 'El procés de feudalització (ségles III–XII)', in Pierre Vilar (ed.), *Historia de Catalunya* II (Barcelona: Edicions 62, 1987); Roger Collins, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400–1000* (2nd ed., London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995).

20 On the appearance of the Early Common Law, see now John Hudson, *The Formation of English Common Law: Law and Society in England from the Norman Conquest to Magna Carta* (London: Routledge, 2017).

21 See Karl Leyser, *Medieval Germany and its Neighbours, 900–1250* (London: Hambledon Press, 1982); Heinrich Fichtenau, *Lebensordnung des 10. Jahrhunderts: Studien über Denkart und Existenz im einstigen Karolingerreich* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1984); trans. by Patrick Geary as *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Reuter (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History,* Volume 3; Gerd Althoff and Hagen Keller, *Die Zeit der späten Karolinger und der Ottonen: Krisen und Konsolidierungen 888–1024* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2008); Jonathan Jarrett, *Rulers and Ruled in Frontier Catalonia, 880–1010* (London: Boydell, 2010); Ludger Körntgen and Dominic Wassenhoven, *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Western Europe* (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2011); Gerd Althoff, *Die Macht der Rituale: Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter* (2nd ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2013); Graham Loud, 'Southern Italy and the Eastern and Western Empires, c. 900–1050', *Journal of Medieval History* 38.1 (2012), 1–19; Simon MacLean, *Ottonian Queenship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

22 See commentary in Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London: Longman, 1983), pp. 305–6.

PART I

Past narratives

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

2

THE FUTURE OF HISTORY AFTER EMPIRE

Geoffrey Koziol

Histories written in the reigns of Pippin and Charlemagne were triumphalist grand narratives that chronicled the successes of the Franks and their Carolingian rulers. Histories written under Louis the Pious had fewer triumphs to celebrate; yet what Mayke de Jong has argued about polemics written during Louis's reign applies equally to histories: they were deeply engaged in debates about the Carolingian empire. To a large extent this remained the case under Louis's sons: even when Nithard and Hincmar wrote to criticize kings and magnates, they still wrote in the belief that the Carolingian enterprise mattered historically.[1] So when the dynasty and the empire failed, what did those who wrote history think history was about? What had become the *purpose* of history? What framework now gave history coherence? And the problem was not just the purpose and coherence of the *events* of history. The growing separateness of the Carolingian kingdoms also created a narratological problem about how to *write* history coherently. For example, Ado of Vienne had managed to write a short chronicle that provided a clear, coherent, summary narrative from the Creation to the death of Lothar I in 855. Even his highly abbreviated account of Lothar II's troubles is coherent, if partisan. But in the brief sections he and his continuator wrote about subsequent events, the narrative falls apart entirely, while the continuation ends in an incomprehensible jumble.[2] The same applies to the end of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*, if to a lesser extent. Its entries for its last thirteen years largely focus on Arnulf and Zwentibald but sometimes dash into Italy and the West Frankish kingdom for particular events, interrupted by the sudden irruption of Huns onto the scene and their equally sudden disappearance; and always events seem to end in failures or, worse, massacres.[3] Arnulf subdues Italy and is crowned emperor only to die, leading to a civil war between Louis the Blind and Berengar, one battle following another until Berengar captured Louis by treachery and had him blinded. 'And so', Regino comments, 'at last Berengar acquired the kingdom of Italy, bloodstained by many slaughters'.[4]

Then there is the assassination of Fulk of Reims, and Odo's execution of Walcher, and the treacherous murder of Eberhard by the son of Gerulf, to say nothing of the uprising against Zwentibald and Zwentibald's death. Not least there was the Babenburg feud that arose over what Regino calls 'the smallest and most trivial matter'. Again quoting Regino, it, too, ended 'in mutual slaughter. A countless number on each side perished by the sword, hands and feet were lopped off, and the regions subjected to them were completely devastated by plunder and burning'.[5]

Stuart Airlie has written eloquently on some of the issues that underlay these aspects of Regino's *Chronicle*. In his words, the *Chronicle* shows that Regino

> was thinking what was nearly unthinkable for the actors in his text, namely, that the crisis of the system of Carolingian dynastic hegemony … revealed that this system, even at its height, was just another transient historical arrangement.[6]

To this lucid statement one might only add that the problem was not just a failure of Carolingian dynastic leadership. It was a failure of the entire Carolingian programme for the creation of a Christian society, and the failure of an assumption that the course of history had been leading towards the Carolingian empire so that it might create such a society. It might also be suggested that one reason the great wealth of Carolingian historical writing ends in the later ninth century — leaving Regino nearly alone in undertaking a major historiographical enterprise – was precisely this problem: the purpose of history – history understood both as events and as the recording of events – had become opaque.

This realization raises a central question that must be addressed by anyone who would understand 'the transformation of the Carolingian world': how did contemporaries deal with this new opacity of history? How did they think about the unthinkable?

To continue with Regino, the best known aspect of his paradigm for understanding historical failure was his repeated emphasis on *fortuna*. The wheel of fortune rises and falls, carrying rulers with it – and by extension not only rulers but their kingdoms and empires as well.[7] It is also well known that although Regino was writing a kind of universal chronicle, he differed markedly from other Carolingian practitioners of the genre like Ado of Vienne and Frechulf of Lisieux, for he did not go back to Adam but began with Augustus and the foundation of the Roman empire.[8] One possible reason was that to make his point Regino did not need the succession of four world empires or the six ages of man, because those models of succession implied that history was *going* someplace, that the present was the culmination of the past. But Regino was no longer sure that history was going anywhere at all.[9] His view of history was what Hayden White would have called 'satirical': just one damn thing after another, in fact the same damn thing after another.[10] Moreover, since Regino's real purpose was to understand the historical place of the Carolingian empire, and since the Carolingian empire was imagined as a prolongation of the Roman empire, Regino could make his point simply by beginning with Augustus. Indeed, omitting the three empires prior to the Roman clarified the issues immensely. For the Assyrian, Persian, and Greek empires had risen and fallen before Christ's birth and the redemption of humankind, whereas the story of the Roman empire was the story of Christ's birth, humanity's redemption, and the creation of a Christian empire under Christian emperors.[11] Thus, Rome's failure established a different imperial model: history could become the story of the impossibility of a truly Christian empire.

In writing his history of Rome Regino relied on just a handful of works. The most important of them was Bede's *De ratione temporum*, specifically, the Eusebian-type chronicle that makes up Chapter 66 of *De ratione*.[12] But even though Regino closely followed Bede's sequence of events, he radically abbreviated Bede's accounts. The result was to give Regino's version of Roman imperial history a much different cast than Bede's. One sees this in the way Regino's *Chronicle* opens: in the forty-second year of Caesar Octavian, Jesus Christ, the son of God, was born, his birth proclaimed by angels and visited by shepherds.[13] What Regino left out was Bede's Eusebian framing of the event: in Bede's account, Christ was born the very 'year in which the movements of all the peoples throughout the world were held in check, and "by God's decree Caesar established genuine and unshakeable peace"'.[14] In other words, Bede followed a typical Christian historiographical model which went back to Melitus of Sardis that required the Roman empire for God's unfolding, providential historical plan. Regino completely ignored the model, and with it, discarded the empire's foundation as a linchpin of a knowable providential plan for history.

Or take the two historians' accounts of the reigns of Vespasian and Titus. Bede notes the emperors' suppression of the Jewish revolt, their conquest of Judea, and Titus's destruction of the Temple. But he also speaks of what he calls Vespasian's 'great deeds' (*magnorum operum*) which included not only his conquest of Britain but also his building of the Colossus of Rome – 107 feet high, a fact which Bede took from Jerome. And from Eutropius Bede took his description of Titus as 'a man so admirable in all forms of virtue that he could be called the love and delight of humankind.'[15] None of this praise is in Regino. Instead, he provides the dates of Vespasian's rule, states that 'the kingdom of Judea was overthrown and the temple destroyed by Titus', then adds: 'It was during his reign that Bishop Apollinaris, sent to Ravenna by the blessed Peter, was martyred'.[16]

Granted, Regino is providing an epitome of Bede's epitome, so his accounts are always much briefer than Bede's. Yet for that very reason his distinctive pattern is always much more obvious. Emperors do nothing in Regino's narrative but provide occasions to highlight the glories of martyrs. Over and over, Regino simply gives the dates of imperial reigns, then writes immediately of the martyrdoms that occurred under them. Thus, in writing of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, Bede mentions their unusual joint rule, their victories against the Parthians, and a plague that struck Italy and Rome. He notes Marcus Aurelius's establishment of his son as emperor. He writes that during Marcus's reign Melitus of Sardis sent his apology for Christianity to the emperor, and the king of Britain wrote to Pope Eleutherius asking to become a Christian, and Bishops Apollinarus of Hieropolis and Dionysius of Corinth lived. Folded into this mass of information documenting the steady expansion of Christianity, and without any particular emphasis, Bede adds that there was a persecution in Asia in which Polycarp and Pionius were martyred and that 'in Gaul as well many gloriously shed their blood for Christ'.[17] Though it is based on Bede, Regino's account is entirely different. He gives a simple statement that Marcus Aurelius ruled with Commodus for nineteen years and one month, then writes: 'In these times and those mentioned above the following were martyred'. He now names twenty-six individual martyrs, adding that there were, in addition, fifty unnamed martyrs in Armenia and forty-eight from Lyon, to say nothing of the seven sons of Felicity.[18]

Regino does this consistently. He ignores the virtues of emperors and the great successes of the empire, leaving only a bloody trail of martyrs. Just as interesting, this continues to be the pattern after Constantine. Bede, of course, lavishes attention on Eusebius's great hero, writing of Constantine's conversion; the council of Nicaea; the emperor's building of basilicas in Rome and elsewhere in honour of the Cross, Peter and Paul, John the Baptist, and various martyrs; the emperor's desire to establish a great new capital named after him; and finally his order that pagan temples be closed, adding that he executed this order 'without killing anyone'.[19] Regino omits nearly all of this. Instead, he focuses his attention on Pope Sylvester, even asserting that the council of Nicaea was summoned at *his* direction, not Constantine's, and strongly implying that although the cross of Christ was found during Constantine's reign it was *not* found by his mother Helena.[20] And far from Constantine's conversion representing a culminating moment of Christian triumph, it simply inaugurated a different kind of persecution under Christian emperors and new martyrs under Constantine's sons and later Julian.[21] Then begins an entirely new set of travails: the Huns attacking the Goths, who waste Thrace; Goths, Vandals and Alans attacking Italy and Gaul; the Goths sacking Rome; Vandals, Alans and Goths devastating Africa; and the Vandals finally capturing Carthage.[22]

So in Regino, the unification of the world under the Roman empire changed nothing. The conversion of Constantine changed nothing. The only constant in Christian history is that every success is followed by failure, and there is *always* persecution and martyrdom.

Seen in this light, another characteristic of Regino's *Chronicle* may take on a different meaning than it is usually given. For the decades between the death of Charles Martel and the death of Charlemagne Regino simply copied out the *Royal Frankish Annals* (*RFA*), nearly verbatim. These annals are, of course, the epitome of Carolingian triumphalist history. But Regino sandwiched them between two very different kinds of historical narratives – his history of the Roman empire and that of the contemporary Carolingian empire – and in the latter as in the former, triumph is invariably followed by or accompanied by martyrdom, dissension, and failure. This placement of the *Royal Frankish Annals* between two histories of imperial failure almost demands that a reader interpret the *Annals*' grand narrative differently, not as a turning point of history but as only another transient moment when the wheel of fortune lifted the Franks to the heights before their inevitable fall.

Regino's distinctly untriumphalist interpretation of Christian empire renders one of his rare changes to the *RFA* exceptionally significant. He added an interesting fable about Carloman, the brother of Pippin the Short who resigned as mayor of the palace to become a monk at Monte Cassino. The fable depicts Carloman as a perfect monk, perfect especially in humility, as he undertook the most self-abasing tasks without complaint, even patiently suffering insult and physical abuse without ever revealing his true identity. In this tale, when Carloman had first knocked on the door of the monastery and was brought into the abbot's presence, he immediately fell to the ground, 'declaring that he was a murderer and guilty of all sorts of crimes, and he begged for mercy and asked for a place of penance'.[23] Presumably, the crimes and murders requiring penance were some discreet or garbled reference to his massacre of Alamans at Cannstatt. Regino seems to allude to it earlier, though the allusion is too broad to be certain (and in any case, it came verbatim from the *RFA*). But what is important is that for Regino Carloman, not Pippin, was the exemplary figure of the dynasty, for after doing what kings did by conquering and killing, he sought a life of penitential atonement – as a monk.[24]

Recently, Charles West has argued that Regino's understanding and writing of history were shaped by what he had read. Although one can only agree, the most important influences on Regino may not have been those West identifies: the *Royal Frankish Annals* and the materials on Lothar II's divorce collected by Adventius of Metz.[25] The most important influences were surely Bede's *De ratione temporum* and, alongside it, Justin's *Epitome* of Pompeius Trogus's *Philippic History*.[26] The former gave him a brief, accepted, completely orthodox account of Roman imperial history. The latter gave him a model for an explicitly un-Providential historical narrative. Reading Bede through the prism of Justin, Regino was able to write a history of the Roman empire that could serve as a prototype for a different history of the Carolingian empire. For his additions and subtractions to Bede's 'Greater Chronicle' turned his own history into an illustration of the ultimate failure of worldly political power and the inevitable sinfulness of those who wield such power. And much more than in Bede's chronicle, in Regino's history the Church appears most resplendent in the suffering of its martyrs and confessors.

Regino's recasting of Bede's account of Roman imperial history raises an important point. As Rosamond McKitterick has reminded us, the history of the Roman empire and its intertwining with the history of the Church remained the touchstone for Carolingian historical writing throughout the entirety of the ninth century.[27] This does not mean, however, that chroniclers drew the same lessons from Roman history or described the relationship of Church and empire in the same way. To understand just how differently Roman imperial history had been read earlier in the century, one might compare Regino's treatment with that of Frechulf of Lisieux's *Histories*.[28] Admittedly, the two works are not exactly comparable. Where Regino began with Augustus, Frechulf began with Adam and followed Eusebius and Orosius in adopting the schema of the four world empires, the very schema Regino's focus on Rome allowed him to ignore. And where Regino continued his Roman imperial history to its Carolingian prolongation in his own day, Frechulf ended his history in the early seventh century, with Franks and Lombards destroying the last remnants of the western Roman empire and the Roman pontiff formally recognized as the head of the universal church.[29] Yet the two works overlap in treating the beginnings of the Roman empire, and here their treatments are strikingly divergent. For in pronounced contrast to Regino, Frechulf's Augustan Rome is a grand construction, preordained by God the Father for the birth of His Son. Borrowing heavily from Eusebius, Orosius and others, Frechulf does describe the glories of the martyrs and the wisdom of the 'doctors' of the early church. But Eusebius and Orosius had also treated Roman imperial power, since it was a building-block of God's providential history. Frechulf adopted these stories also.[30] Above all, when writing of the early Roman emperors he quoted the *Epitome de Caesaribus* of Pseudo-Aurelius Victor, doing nothing to mask that work's proudly secular outlook, since pagan political virtues and vices were equally Christian virtues and vices. Thus, Frechulf's sections on Augustus offer a lengthy catalogue, taken from the *Epitome*, of the first Roman emperor's great military deeds and administrative reforms. Frechulf also insists on Augustus's virtues: he refused the title of 'lord', believing it unfitting for a ruler of free men; he was faithful in friendship; he was a lover of poetry and eloquent himself; he was a careful lawgiver and a great builder of monuments. The specifically Christian element Frechulf adds to the *Epitome* is a criticism of Augustus's lasciviousness (illustrated by his divorcing his wife Scribonia).[31] The same emphases are found in Frechulf's treatment of Augustus's successors, again largely borrowed from the *Epitome* (though Orosius had told many of the same stories). For example, although Tiberius was eloquent and knowledgeable in letters he did not inspire trust, for 'he pretended to want what he did not and … seemed gracious to those he actually hated'. Over time, he became increasingly intolerant of opposition and caused the deaths of senators, prefects, and even his own sons.[32] Caligula was nothing but a lewd tyrant, committing incest with his own sisters, demanding that he be worshipped as a god, and killing members of the nobility before being killed by his own palace guard.[33] Claudius obeyed only his belly and his lust while allowing himself to be commanded by his wives and freedmen.[34] Nero was even worse, not just lustful but wanton and greedy, and so depraved that he set Rome on fire just for the spectacle of seeing the city burn.[35] Models of imperial virtues return with Vespasian and his son Titus, who conquered Jerusalem and razed its walls and the Temple, then celebrated a triumph at Rome the likes of which had not been seen in the 320 triumphs staged since the city's founding, for this was a triumph not merely over foreign peoples but over the enemies of God. Having brought peace to the entire world, Vespasian then had the gates of the temple of Janus closed for only the sixth time in Rome's history. Vespasian's particular political achievements were much like those of Augustus: he pacified rather than punished enemies, repaired Rome's buildings, restored the empire's cities, and built and strengthened its roads. As for