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This book is not a conventional political narrative of Carolingian history shaped by narrative sources, capitularies, and charter material. It is structured, instead, by numismatic, diplomatic, liturgical, and iconographic sources and deals with political signs, images, and fixed formulas in them as interconnected elements in a symbolic language of authority, which was used in the indirect negotiation and maintenance of Carolingian authority. The study of this symbolic language allows us to glimpse how people of varying social strata in different regions viewed their rulers and how their views were affected by existing political traditions and by contemporary changes promoted by the Carolingians and their retinues. I hope that such an interdisciplinary study will be comprehensible and useful for a general audience of medievalists—and Carolingianists in particular—less familiar with these non-narrative sources.

Non-narrative sources have been traditionally studied separately, and perhaps some liturgists, numismatists, specialists in medieval diplomatics and sphragistics, and art historians would still argue that these types of evidence are too diverse to be brought together since they require skills too “specialized” to be analyzed effectively by one author. They may also think of my narrative as, in a way, simplifying these types of evidence. My only response to these objections is that in so doing I address a more general audience of historians and medievalists who are less familiar with these sources and demonstrate the ways in which the evidence they provide can be incorporated into a more general historical narrative. At the same time, by revealing how these sources may be analyzed within broader political contexts, I hope that this book is of some interest for students of the above-mentioned specialized disciplines.

This study is a product of ten years of study of the Carolingian period, some results of which have been previously published in English and Russian.¹ The pursuit of this subject has made me an academic

¹ This book will incorporate in a modified or considerably revised form the materials published in English in the following articles: “The Image of Authority in Carolingian
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Map 1. The Carolingian realm
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE OF CAROLINGIAN AUTHORITY

After the murder of Emperor Justinian II in 711 and the usurpation of imperial power in Constantinople by Philippicus, “the Roman people had determined never to receive the name of the heretic emperor, his charters or gold coins of his type—so his image was not brought into church, nor his name brought into the liturgy of mass.”\(^1\) This passage from *The Book of Pontiffs* triggered my interest in the subject of this book. This account has not attracted much attention from scholars, with the exception of Percy Ernst Schramm, who used it in his *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste* (1968) to address earlier imperial prerogatives in Rome—prerogatives later invested in Charlemagne. The significance of this story for Schramm was that it narrated four such prerogatives that the Romans refused Philippicus: first, the Roman people did not date their documents by the year of his imperial rule; second, they did not issue his imperial coins at the Roman mint; third, they did not bring the image of the usurper to the Roman churches; and fourth, they did not mentioned his name in the liturgy.\(^2\)

---


Although when I read this passage for the first time, I was interested in Roman imperial tradition as much as Schramm had been half a century earlier, I found the story it described intriguing for an entirely different reason: here was a striking example of how imperial authority was negotiated between the remote Byzantine ruler and his subjects, the Roman community. This negotiation operated neither through personal and direct communication between a ruler and his subjects, who were known to interact often in accordance with the rules of the political game, nor through actions that truly may be called rituals, although some of them obviously had a ritualistic flavor. Instead, what I saw here was the use of objects and procedures within a specific communicative system, which, in a semiotic sense, may be called a symbolic language. Although both sides were remote from each other, as the Romans and Philippicus were in 711, they seemed to understand this “language,” and recognized that the refusal to accept certain objects and procedures clearly signaled the rejection of the new ruler’s authority. Even if this story did not exactly correspond with real events in Rome, the mere fact that this brilliant passage appeared in The Book of Pontiffs suggests that the anonymous chronicler describing the events of the year 711 was well acquainted with the manner in which the authority of a distant Byzantine emperor was negotiated in early medieval Rome. That this passage was copied almost verbatim in Bede’s chronicle and later in the Frankish annalistic tradition underlined the familiarity of this symbolic language to narrators in eighth-century England and Francia. All these considerations led me to take a closer look at this system of communication; the objects and procedures mentioned in the above-mentioned story structured, to a certain extent, the following study.

The symbolic language of authority as described in The Book of Pontiffs functioned through four main carriers: coinage bearing the name and image of a ruler, official charters naming a ruler with his title and certified with graphic signs of his authority, the image of a ruler designed for public devotion in church, and, finally, the liturgy performed on behalf of a ruler. The public acceptance of these objects

---

3 Bedae chronica maior, 581, in Chronica minora IV V VI VII., vol. 3, ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH, Auctores antiquissimi, vol. 13 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1898), 318. This story was known in Gaul by the early ninth century because the entire passage was repeated in the Frankish annalistic compilation known under the title Chronicon universale, in MGH, Scriptores, vol. 13, ed. Georg H. Pertz (Hanover: Hahn, 1881), 18.
and the participation in these procedures were the visible signs of submission to a ruler. Thus, this was the “language” of creating and maintaining authority, that is, of allowing one side to claim authority and the other side to acknowledge it while both sides of this process were distant from one another.

Charlemagne’s activity in Italy in the late eighth century demonstrates that the media through which this symbolic language of authority operated had not changed much by the Carolingian period. For instance, the Frankish king allowed Grimoald to become duke of Benevento in 788 on the condition that the Lombards shave their chins and Grimoald “order that [his] charters and coins be super-scribed always with characters of his [i.e. Charlemagne’s] name.” Consequently, Grimoald placed Charlemagne’s name on his gold coins (fig. 1) and charters for several years, but did not order the Lombards to shave their beards. Soon thereafter, Grimoald overthrew Frankish control and signaled this change by the removal of Charlemagne’s name from his coins and charters. Another such incident took place in 783, when the Lombard abbot of San Vincenzo al Volturno, Potho, expressed his hostility toward the Frankish ruler by refusing to pray for his sake. Having received this information, Charlemagne immediately intervened and had the troublemaker put on trial at the papal court. In both cases, the sides involved treated charters, coins, and liturgy as the main signals of accepting or rejecting authority. Although the Byzantine tradition of placing an imperial icon in churches was not followed in the West, Schramm pointed out that around the time of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation, his image appeared on the walls of several Roman churches, such as St. Susanna and the Triclinium in

---

2 I discuss this case in more detail in chapter 2.
the Lateran. This practice suggests that the visual representation of a ruler continued to be used, even if on a reduced scale, in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority.

(a) Early medieval politics and modern historiography

Before proceeding any further with an assessment of this symbolic language, I will explore how this study relates to the extensive historiographic corpus of early medieval politics. The following overview is by no means intended to be complete but rather highlights historiographic developments on the subject in the last decades and, more importantly, explains the position of this book vis-à-vis the approaches to early medieval politics that are most influential in English-language historiography.

Percy Ernst Schramm made a tremendous contribution to the field by scrutinizing the images and symbols of medieval rulership and state and by establishing the significance of iconographic evidence—and symbols of authority in general—for the analysis of rulership. The innovative nature of his research was exemplified in Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit, 751–1190 (1928), which still remains an important reference tool for medievalists. The focus of Schramm’s approach was on the medieval idea of the state and the self-image of a medieval ruler. This Hegelian search for an abstract concept of the state has barely survived post-modernist critiques, which have shifted the focus of historical study from abstract ideas and institutions to relations between human agents and specific historical phenomena. Schramm’s research on the self-image of a ruler was based on the assumption—followed by

---


some art historians like Kurt Weitzmann, Herbert Kessler, and Robert
Deshman—that Carolingian and Ottonian monarchs were both patrons
and audience and ordered their own images for personal observation.
However, this premise has been questioned in recent literature since
often we do not know whether rulers were patrons, commissioners,
or receivers, or if they played yet other roles with respect to specific
works of art.9 In addition, the study of iconographic sources is point-
less nowadays without a reference to the particular audiences intended
for each of them.10 Thus, as David Warner observes in relation to the
Ottonian symbols of state, one of the major weaknesses of Schramm’s
approach was “that he tended to examine his witnesses apart from the
specific context in which they were produced (i.e. without reference to
matters of stage or audience).”11 Hence, hardly any current scholars
accept Schramm’s approach, although some continue to adhere uncriti-
cally to his interpretations of iconographic evidence.

The second pillar of the traditional approach to studying medieval
politics is Ernst H. Kantorowicz, whose The King’s Two Bodies (1957)
probably became the most intellectually stimulating study of medieval
political theology in the twentieth century. The breathtaking scope of
Kantorowicz’ interdisciplinary book makes it an exciting reading a
half-century after its first publication.12 The works written within
Kantorowicz’ theoretical framework have usually concentrated on
various concepts of kingship, such as David-centered or Christ-cen-
tered kingship, or on various concepts of political power, such as royal

9 William Diebold, “The Ruler Portrait of Charles the Bald in the S. Paolo Bible,” Art Bulletin 76 (1994): 15. John Lowden, “The Royal/Imperial Book and the Image and Self-Image of the Medieval Ruler,” in Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe, ed. Anne J. Duggan, King’s College London Medieval Studies, no. 10 (London: King’s College, 1993), 240, concludes: “It is only perhaps in the books, commissioned by a ruler for use in a royal context that we might expect to find a ruler’s self-image. But, as we have seen, these may well be books without royal or imperial images, in which other visual strategies were employed to make points about rulership. What we see in a royal/impe-
rial book, therefore, is an image of kingship, rather than the image of a king.”

10 See for instance Hans Belting, Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter: Form und Funkt
ion früher Bildtafeln der Passion (Berlin: Mann, 1995).


monism, Romanism, or Christian universalism. Yet these political or theological concepts were often analyzed as transcendent entities existing within “medieval political thought.” As a result, since the 1980s, this approach has been abandoned for reasons similar to the rejection of Schramm’s approach: such grand narratives tended to reify big ideas and simplify early medieval politics whereas, as Richard Sullivan points out, “the Carolingian concept and practice of empire meant strikingly different things to different people.”

The third author whose institutional approach has had a lasting effect on the historiography of early medieval politics is François-Louis Ganshof. No historian now accepts his thesis that the decline of the Frankish empire was due to Charlemagne’s failure to create governmental structures adequate to control the empire. Yet despite the vehement criticism of this approach by medievalists like Matthew Innes, Ganshof’s general view of Carolingian politics taking place within the framework of administrative institutions is very much alive, although few historians see the Carolingian polity smoothly functioning within its institutional framework. The majority of them, especially those working in the Anglophone world, see Carolingian institutions working within a complex net of local and central politics, conflicts, violence, and personal interactions.

By contrast, Innes’ highly influential work, State and Society in the Early Middle Ages (2000), exemplifies a new historiographic trend that has emerged since the 1990s. This trend shifts the focus of research from central institutions and royal courts, traditionally viewed as the

---

18 See for instance Warren Brown, Unjust Seizure: Conflict, Interest and Authority in an Early Medieval Society (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), who states that his book deals among other things with “how people react to new central institutions and on what the success or failure of those institutions depends” (ix). See also his useful overview of historiography related to early medieval conflict and power (8–11).
locomotives of political power, to localities and local elites. Innes’ concept has been influenced by recent developments in early medieval prosopography,\textsuperscript{19} the proliferation of regional studies (\textit{Landesgeschichte}) revealing the rich world of local politics through charters,\textsuperscript{20} and a new emphasis on the personal nature of political relations in early medieval society.\textsuperscript{21} The resulting approach has been shaped visibly by the tenets of structuralism.\textsuperscript{22} Through a careful narrative of Middle Rheinish politics, Innes offers medievalists an appealing interpretation of “changing political structures” in the early Middle Ages. He argues that due to the ubiquity of direct control over land in that period,\textsuperscript{23} kings had a limited impact on local communities. Instead, a broadly-defined aristocracy monopolized political power at a local level. As a result, political power was diffuse and indirect; it rested on brokerage, patronage, and reciprocity. Furthermore, local elites were its nodal points. In short, “early medieval politics was defined by the mediating role of the aristocracy as the interface between the political centre and the localities.”\textsuperscript{24}

Despite the impact of Innes’ brilliant study stressing the role of localities in early medieval politics, the modern historiography of Carolingian political life is dominated by scholars giving the political center a more prominent role.\textsuperscript{25} Janet Nelson and Stuart Airlie are probably most representative of this mainstream in English-speaking academia, and their works clearly demonstrate that the center played a

\textsuperscript{20} In addition to an overview by Innes, \textit{State and Society}, 7–8, see two regional studies on early medieval politics, which have been published in English since Innes’s book: Brown, \textit{Unjust Seizure}; and Hans J. Hummer, \textit{Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600–1000} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
\textsuperscript{21} Julia M.H. Smith, \textit{Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), is one of the first books in English that highlights the importance of the last two aspects.
\textsuperscript{22} The influence of Michael Mann, \textit{The Sources of Social Power}, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 1:1–3 and 373–99, is most noticeable.
\textsuperscript{23} The dissemination of this thesis in Anglophone medieval studies owes much to the works of Chris Wickham. See especially his most recent study \textit{Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean 400–800} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
\textsuperscript{24} Innes, \textit{State and Society}, 253–9.
\textsuperscript{25} In fact, Innes himself admits that in the second half of the eighth century and the early ninth century, the Carolingians were quite successful in “redefining aristocratic local dominance in terms of office,” ibid., 260. See also idem, “Charlemagne’s Government,” in \textit{Charlemagne: Empire and Society}, ed. Joanna Storey (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 71–89.
pivotal role in early medieval politics via such institutions as the royal court, royal households, and regnal assemblies. Airlie also argues quite persuasively that the activities of the aristocracy were closely linked to “its pursuit of office in the service of the Carolingians,” and that even aristocratic opposition and resentment were expressed within the dynastic framework of Carolingian royalty.

At this point, it is necessary to interrupt these historiographical reflections with a basic question about the methodological principles that form the basis for the current debate about the nature of early medieval, and Carolingian in particular, politics. Namely, what are the distinction and interconnection between political power and political authority? Most political historians know the difference quite well without needing to have it spelled out: political power is connected to material resources and control, while political authority is linked to ideology, legitimation, and legitimacy. Political power relates to the ability of an agent or political body to make others act according to its will. The favorable attitude of others and the maintenance of public order are of less importance in defining political power. As Tom Christiano argues, “it operates completely in the realm of threats.

28 The legalistic distinction between the Roman categories auctoritas and potestas, emphasized by Giorgio Agamben, State of Exception, trans. Kevin Attell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 74–88, is hardly helpful in answering our sociological question, since political authority maybe be expressed in Latin not only as auctoritas, but also as potestas and imperium.
29 The latter link owes much to Weber’s concept of three types of political authority, well known to modern historians. In this concept, authority (Auctorität) is linked to the legitimation of rulership or domination (Legitimitätsgründe einer Herrschaft). See Max Weber, “Politik als Beruf,” in Gesammelte politische Schriften (Munich: Drei Masken, 1921), 396–450, at 396–7. On the recent stress on the process of legitimation, which accentuates the processual character of political power, see Isabel Alfonso and Julio Escalono, “Introduction,” in Building Legitimacy: Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies (Leiden: Brill, 2004), ix–xxiii, at xi–xii.
and offers.” Political authority, in contrast, relates to the ability of an agent or political body to maintain public order and legitimacy in the eyes of others.\textsuperscript{30} As Hannah Arendt argued, “authority precludes the use of external means of coercion; where force is used, authority itself has failed.”\textsuperscript{31} Thus, if we require a simplified definition, then political authority means legitimated political power.

Meanwhile, the basic category of Innes’s concept is not authority, but political power (as defined by Michael Mann\textsuperscript{32})—or, to be even more precise, he speaks in many cases of “structural power” or “networks of power.” Innes argues that in order to understand early medieval politics, one has “to study the generation and transmission of power: that is, to examine the structures of social action, and the political strategies which it was possible to pursue within these structures.”\textsuperscript{33} It is hardly accidental that Innes omits the notion of authority in his book—after all, he speaks of “legitimate power.” This omission connects in part to his aim to leave aside the traditional paradigm of political studies, in which the ruler is perceived as delegating power to aristocrats and office holders. But what is even more important for such a choice is that, in his own words, he is more interested in “the raw bones of power…, naked and unencumbered by their everyday clothing.”\textsuperscript{34} This is precisely the point at which the present study diverges from Innes’ work. No matter how important “the raw bones of power” are, they cannot explain early medieval politics in their totality. To understand the workings of Carolingian politics, we also have to study—figuratively speaking—the “birthmarks, moles, and scars” and “old-fashioned clothing”


\textsuperscript{32} The Sources of Social Power, 1:26–7. In Mann’s definition, political power is primarily linked to state power. (This better explains the title of Innes’s book.) In addition, Mann uses the category of ideological power as a substitute for that of political authority (22–4).

\textsuperscript{33} Innes, State and Society, 9. Here I am on the side of Geoffrey Koziol, who states: “But I no longer thought it was even heuristically valuable to reduce collective social action to some fundamental social structure of social reality. Beliefs, in and of themselves, mattered. Values mattered.” Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992), xiii.

\textsuperscript{34} Innes, State and Society, 129.
of political power. After all, as Stuart Airlie puts it, “the Carolingian empire was an empire that was ruled by Carolingians and assertions of the authority of the reigning Carolingian were definitions of the nature of that community.”

35 In short, while studying a Carolingian polity, we cannot avoid matters related to political authority. In doing so, we have to examine royal rights, duties, and obligations—which were claimed, asserted, and accepted within political culture—to control, to command, or to determine.

There are two major intertwined approaches that structure the modern understanding of medieval royal authority in English-language medieval studies. The first concept, which has been most clearly expressed by Jürgen Hanning and Janet Nelson and is accepted by most historians, points to the crucial role of consensus in relations between early medieval rulers and aristocracy and of consensual politics in the maintenance of royal authority.36 The second approach stresses the significance of ritual in the negotiation and communication of rulers’ authority and, thus, in the creation of political consensus. This approach treats ritual as “a mode of social power, without which such power was, and is, quite literally, inconceivable.”37 Various aspects of the early medieval ritual have been analyzed through the studies of the ritual of supplication, coronation rituals, court ceremonies, ritual in the royal chancery, the ritual of deditio (surrender), or royal adventus (entrance) into a town or monastery.38 In most cases, early medievalists

deal with ways of negotiating authority that can be described as rituals of power, when the ruler was actually present and interacted face-to-face with his subjects. The main proponent of this approach, Gerd Althoff, traces the origins of these early medieval rituals of power to the early Merovingian period; they reached maturity only in the tenth and eleventh centuries. He argues that under the influence of Roman popes, especially in the reign of Louis the Pious and thereafter, the Carolingians gradually adapted ritual communication in their face-to-face interactions with their subjects—first and foremost with the Frankish aristocracy.\(^39\)

In response to the recent emphasis on studying ritual in early medieval narratives, Philippe Buc points to two significant pitfalls inherent to this approach. He argues that methods of modern anthropology are inadequate for the assessment of early medieval rituals, both because scholars have access not to actual ritual practices but texts requiring hermeneutic analysis and because the anthropological concept of “ritual” is alien to medieval political culture and its structures of communication: “For the early Middle Ages and most of late antiquity, simple access to a ritual as historical fact is impossible, if by ‘fact’ one understands ‘event’.”\(^40\) In many cases, historians working with political narratives study not rituals per se, but their descriptions, which are shaped by contemporaneous literary conventions and by the intents and partiality of their authors. The remedy offered by Buc, to ban the word “ritual” from research on early medieval politics, is as extreme as an excessive stress on ritual—as Geoffrey Koziol points out in his vehemently critical response.\(^41\) But any study of royal authority in the early Middle Ages must consider Buc’s general \textit{caveat} against a very broad definition

---


\(^{41}\) Geoffrey Koziol, “Review Article: The Dangers of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study?" \textit{EME} 11 (2002): 367–88, especially at 372–7. He is also right in underlining that many recent models of medieval ritual are more
of ritual, as well as the reductionist interpretations of early medieval politics in terms of ritual. Even Koziol, whose earlier work was shaped by the concept of ritual, has shifted the focus of his recent overview of French political culture from ritual to the fundamental assumptions and presuppositions defining that culture.42

The present study is driven by a similar interest in testing the basic assumptions and presuppositions that define Carolingian political culture, but it will approach them through the study of a symbolic language used in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority. Such a theoretical framework allows me to address three important characteristics of early medieval authority that have been identified in modern historiography: first, the processual nature of royal authority and its legitimation; second, the active role of agency in Carolingian politics, which implied a need for the constant negotiation of royal authority; and third, the historical limitations imposed on such communication by political traditions, as well as the media involved in such process. This framework both shifts the focus of research from rituals and personal interactions to the means and media involved in the indirect communication of royal authority and addresses the fact that the vast majority of the inhabitants of the Frankish realm hardly would have seen the ruler in person, thus excluding them from most rituals of power. Yet, were these inhabitants also excluded from the communication of authority? On the one hand, the symbolical language of authority as presented in Rome in 711 suggests that there were not only means for early medieval Christian monarchs to create and maintain their authority in absentia, but also ways for their subjects to accept or deny this authority without actually seeing these rulers in person. Although in Rome the urban elite affiliated with the pope was behind such a decision, the rejection of coins and changes in liturgy had to affect lower strata of Roman society and to rely on their tacit compliance. On the other hand, historians generally agree that medieval politics were limited to rulers and aristocracy, the latter being defined in quite broad terms.43 Bernd Schneidermüller summarizes this premise: “The


43 For details and references, see Stuart Airlie, “Bonds of Power and Bonds of Association in the Court Circles of Louis the Pious,” in ChH, 191–204; idem, “The
political community of the Middle Ages was not represented by all the inhabitants of a given kingdom. On the contrary, it only consisted of the monarchy, the nobility, and the ecclesiastical elite." To approach medieval political life with a reference to free commoners or lower levels of society is to go against this established paradigm in favor of an anachronistic paradigm. This book by no means intends to reject the accepted model, but it will test the limits of Carolingian political community through the study of the media of indirect political communication like coins and liturgy, which were, in theory, accessible to free commoners.

(b) The symbolic language of authority: Methodological principles

Any structured traditional society may be assumed to have poles of power that tend to influence all, or at least a majority of, social groups. In contrast, the mere existence of a ruler claiming his or her authority is not enough to create a socio-political hierarchy: there must also be subjects ready to accept this authority. Therefore, research on royal or imperial authority consists not simply of the study of rulers and the

---

Aristocracies in the early Middle Ages and regional differences, see Régine Le Jan, Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc (VIIe–Xe siècle): Essai d'anthropologie sociale, Histoire ancienne et médiévale, no. 33 (Paris: Sorbonne, 1995), 59–153; and Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages, 153–258.

44 Bernd Schneidermüller, “Chapter 1. Constructing Identities of Medieval France,” in France in the Central Middle Ages, ed. Bull, 15–46, at 16. This approach is quite different from the modern perception of the Roman Empire, in which effective power “depended on its acceptance by the citizens at large as legitimate, and a complex social apparatus was put in place, with the connivance of the elite among the governed, to ensure that imperial authority was continually asserted,” Jill Harries, Law and Empire in Late Antiquity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 57.

45 This two-way nature of power relations is place common in discussions of modern political sociology. Anthony Giddens has remarked: “Power relations are always two-way; that is to say, however subordinate an actor may be in a social relationship, the very fact of involvement in that relationship gives him or her a certain amount of power over the other.” Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis (London: MacMillan, 1979), 6. According to Giddens, the agents involved in power relations draw upon and reproduce structural properties of domination. Domination is in its turn based on two types of resources, authorization and allocation, and has two corresponding aspects, property and authority. The latter plays, according to Giddens, a fundamental role in traditional societies. See Anthony Giddens, A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism, 2d ed. (Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1995), 28–9, 46–7, and 92–3.
powerful but also of the governed, as many studies on early medieval politics have demonstrated in recent decades. As soon as a ruler is powerful enough to command and punish, dispense favors, and/or be supported by local elites, the subjects comprehend—consciously or not—who holds the highest power in their social environment. Whereas a wild animal is aware of the crucial aspects of its surrounding natural space, like the points of mortal danger or the places of food supply and water resources, a human being in a traditional society—a “social animal,” metaphorically speaking—has in mind a social landscape, in which the points accumulating power are extremely important for social adaptation.

Because of their significance for social adaptation, these “crossroads” of social power are marked by special signs, procedures, and objects, which, once acknowledged by subjects, become the symbols of authority. Since these symbols have a clear communicative function, they can be studied together as a special symbolic language of authority. The methodology of André Grabar, applied to early Christian imagery, helps outline the profile of such a specific language:

Just as there is a language of electricians, sailors, or thieves—all languages of limited use, which are grafted onto the stock of a national language—there is a Christian iconographic language, which does not comprise a complete repertory of original signs appropriate to all possible uses but consists of a limited group of technical terms which, when added to the normal terms of Graeco-Roman imagery of the time, give the image the desired Christian signification.

Three key characteristics of the Christian iconographic language mentioned by Grabar may be, no doubt, applied to the symbolic language of authority: it is certainly a language of limited use, it does operate through a limited group of terms, and it does not exist in a vacuum but rather is added to more general communicative systems and practices to imbue them with special messages.

What was the symbolic language of authority functioning in the early Middle Ages? As pointed out in the previous section, many aspects

46 Lincoln, Authority, 5, argues that “the exercise of authority not only involves but often depends upon the use of nonverbal instruments and media: the whole theatrical array of gestures, demeanors, costumes, props, and stage devices through which one may impress or bamboozle an audience.”

of this symbolic language—especially those involved in the direct communication of authority through face-to-face interactions—have been analyzed thoroughly in medieval studies within the framework of ritual or political *Spielregeln*. In the following pages, I concentrate on the media involved in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority and preserved in four main types of evidence, namely, iconographic, diplomatic, liturgical, and numismatic sources. The essential feature bringing them together is that they present not a written narrative but a material discourse: they all “speak” the language of symbolic signs and images and fixed written formulas. Despite many relevant insights made by liturgists, numismatists, art historians, and specialists in diplomacy in their separate fields, these kinds of evidence have been underestimated relative to the study of early medieval politics and rulership when compared to narrative sources, capitularies, and charter material. Percy Schramm, Ernst Kantorowicz, and Geoffrey Koziol provide exceptions to this trend: the first with his interdisciplinary studies of Carolingian and Ottonian royal images in manuscripts and on seals and coins, the second by bringing together legal, liturgical, numismatic, iconographic, and diplomatic sources in his study of political concepts, and the third by complementing his study of French political culture in the tenth through twelfth centuries with liturgical, diplomatic, and iconographic evidence. Yet the polemic appeal that John Moreland has addressed to historians is still valid for many:

\[\ldots\text{historians must recognize that their exclusive focus on the written sources provides them with access to only one thread in the fabric of human identity—hardly a reliable basis for the reconstruction of the whole.}\]

The non-narrative evidence brought together in the present study is quite different from that of written narratives, and it is therefore less susceptible to the problems inherent in the latter. One problem with written narratives comes from the ambiguous nature of medieval Latin: European peoples communicated in the vernacular, but they used Latin

---

49 I will discuss these insights in the following chapters.
50 Koziol is especially strong in pointing to the intrinsic connection between liturgical and diplomatic formulas. See especially *Begging Pardon and Favor*, 12–3.
51 *Archaeology and Text*, 84.
as a common written language. The process of translation from oral vernacular into a different, written language created many mistakes and misunderstandings as writers expressed their current reality by means of an older, namely classical Latin, vocabulary. As a result, we cannot always understand the meaning intended by the medieval author of a narrative. Another problem with written narratives is that even if the meaning of a written text is unambiguous, there remains the problem of differentiating how adequately it represents the contemporary society. Besides writings, oral and non-verbal forms of communication dominated amongst the illiterate majority.\footnote{As Marco Mostert, “New Approaches to Medieval Communication,” in \textit{New Approaches to Medieval Communication}, ed. Marco Mostert, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy, no. 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 17, points out: “Medieval history does not as yet seem to have grasped the importance of the insights of sociologists of literature, who correctly see the writings as merely one of the forms of communication which may or may not be available in any given society.” For the overview of the historiography of non-written communication developing since the 1970s, see ibid., 15–40.} In the early Middle Ages, narrative sources were written primarily by clerics with a very strong Christian agenda that often distorts our perception of the period. One must agree with Michael Richter’s \textit{caveat}:

\textit{…the written sources which arise in the early Middle Ages from the Christian milieu must be treated very circumspectly. They must not be regarded as necessarily representative accounts of the society in which they originate.}\footnote{Michael Richter, \textit{The Oral Tradition in the Early Middle Ages}, TSMAO (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994), 25. See also idem, \textit{The Formation of the Medieval West: Studies in the Oral Culture of Barbarians} (Dublin: Four Courts, 1994), vii-xi; and Moreland, \textit{Archeology and Text}, 93–4.} 

Non-narrative sources, in contrast, allow a broader view of those social segments that usually are left aside. The final problem with written narratives has become especially evident recently with the demonstration that many narrative texts of the early Middle Ages are in fact the products of later re-interpretation and elaboration.\footnote{See for example, Patrick J. Geary, \textit{Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 177: “This study began with the premise that what we think we know about the early Middle Ages is largely determined by what people of the early eleventh century wished themselves and their contemporaries to know about the past.” A similar conclusion in regard to Carolingian annals was made by Rosamond McKitterick, “Constructing the Past in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Royal Frankish Annals,” \textit{Transactions of the Royal Historical Society}, 6th ser., 7 (1997): 101–29; eadem, “L’idéologie politique dans l’historiographie carolingienne,” in \textit{La royauté et les élites dans l’Europe carolingienne (du début du IXe aux environs de 920)}, ed. Régine Le Jan (Lille: Presses de l’Université, 1998),
distortion undermines the previous, almost unanimous, reliance on narrative sources as the main means of shedding light on the underpinnings of early medieval social and political life.

Unlike narrative evidence, sources like coins or miniatures are direct reflections of their time and did not have an intermediary working in someone’s agenda decades or even centuries after the described events. These sources were both products of early medieval society and active elements in the process of its transformation. This is not to say that non-narrative sources and material evidence are less in need of proper interpretation, that they are a panacea for all problems, or that they are less prone to misinterpretation if taken out of context or used as mere illustrations. Not at all! But coins, charters, miniatures, and liturgical manuscripts have preserved for us the “entanglement” of texts and objects and thus provide an opportunity for “thick descriptions” that allow the past, in Moreland’s words, “to shine through.”


58 Archaeology and Text, 97.
These non-narrative sources speak to us in a language different from that of written sources. They use the language of symbolic objects, legends, monograms, images, and formulas; every historic period, including the Carolingian epoch, has its own symbolic system of expression for a great variety of purposes. The symbolic language employed in the indirect communication of authority was a crucial part of the Carolingian system, using previous Frankish royal and Roman imperial “vocabularies” mixed with new “words” arising at the time. This “language” had various expressions that were apparent in different genres. These differences were due not only to the specific character of a medium, but also the locations at which the sources were created and the social audiences to which they appealed.

It is hardly possible to tackle the issues of audience and the symbolic language of authority in general without first addressing the relation of these issues to the methodological principles of modern semiotics, which have become so integral to research on medieval philology and culture today. Although the principles of semiotics have been applied less often in the study of medieval political authority and rulership, the use of some tenets of semiotics becomes reasonable if we acknowledge Yury Lotman’s concept of a “semiosphere,” or semiotic social space full of different “languages,” existing in society. The symbolic language of authority was one of these, and so the basic categories of semiotics—dialogue, text, audience, message, and code—may be applied to the study of such a language.

If one accepts the axiom that in the long run, a ruler’s position cannot be maintained only with violence or the threat of violence, the notion of dialogue becomes essential. Together with other kinds of


60 Lotman, probably the most famous Russian semiotician, describes “semiosphere” in the following way: “...[S]emiotic space is not a sum of separate languages but a condition of their existence and validity; to a certain extent, it precedes them and constantly interacts with them. In this sense, a language is a function—a clot of semiotic space—and the borders between languages, that are so distinct in the grammatical self-description of a language, appear in semiotic reality blurred and full of intermediary forms. There is neither communication nor language beyond semiosphere.” This is my translation from Yury M. Lotman, Vnutri mysliashchih mirov (Inside thoughtful worlds), in Semiosfera (Semiosphere) (Saint-Petersburg: Isskustvo-SPB, 2000), 250.

61 This approach agrees with that of Thomas N. Bisson, “The ‘Feudal Revolution,’” Past & Present 142 (1994): 6–42, who argues that violence at the turn of the
interaction, this dialogue uses the symbolic language of authority. To be stable, royal/imperial authority needs constant dialogue between the ruler and the subject that lessens any tension that may exist between them. Outbursts of violence on either side thus may be interpreted to indicate the deficit of dialogue. However, in a ritualized form, some acts of violence may also represent a form of dialogue.62

The notion of dialogue emphasizes the mutual nature of communication between a ruler and subject. It differs from the concept of propaganda that accentuates only one side of this process: the messages sent from the royal court to the population of the state. The notion of propaganda implicitly assumes a passive receptive role for the subjects, but, in fact, as an audience, subjects had many ways to react, openly or tacitly, to these messages. When the early medieval ruler and his subjects saw one another, they were able to communicate personally through their participation in rituals ranging from a coronation to a more mundane dinner ceremonial. In this case, there were possibilities for direct dialogue between the two sides. The situation becomes more complicated when the messages came from a remote ruler. In this case, some subjects, members of the upper aristocracy, could communicate back to the ruler by writing a letter; the high clergy could present a precious manuscript in which it was possible to hide an arcane message. Those of lower status, however, could participate in dialogue with the ruler only as part of a social group. This dialogue certainly had a limited character, often reduced to a simple acceptance or rejection of the ruler’s authority through such acts like dismissing the coins of the remote Byzantine ruler in papal Rome in 711. In addition, the sphere of dialogue expanded through the active interpretation by subjects of messages inserted into media like coins, diplomas, or liturgy.

From a semiotic point of view, coins, charters, liturgical texts, and miniatures may be studied together as symbolic texts. To understand them, we must pay attention to what Gabrielle Spiegel, rephrasing Bakhtin, calls the “social logic of the text”:

> Texts represented situated usage of language. Such sites of linguistic usage, as lived events, are essentially local in origin and therefore possess

---

62 On this, see Gerd Althoff, Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde (Darmstadt: Wissenschftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997), especially at 21–125; and Innes, State and Society, 130–4.
a determinate social logic of much greater density than can be extracted from totalizing constructs like “language” and “society.”

If a given text—meaning any carrier of the “language” of authority—shows situated usage of that symbolic language, the “reading” of such a text must reckon with the social context, historical situation, and audience. At the same time, the symbolic texts as mirrors of a situated usage of language are able to demonstrate certain changes and basic tendencies. In short, they make it possible to trace the historical development of this symbolic language.

Lotman’s semiotic method helps us understand the relation between symbolic texts and audience:

The interrelationship between a text and its audience are characterized by mutual activity: the text tries to assimilate the audience and to impose its own system of codes on it; the audience responds in the same way. It looks like the text includes in itself the image of “its” ideal audience, and the audience of “its” text.

If applied to the indirect communication of authority, this approach allows us to view the ruler trying to impose his or her own vision of authority on subjects via royal coinage, diplomas, or other media. Yet the subjects are not passive agents in this dialogue; as an audience, they are able to accept some claims hidden in these media and deny others. As a result, the active role of the subjects gradually corrects the ruler’s presentation of authority. The resulting “image” of royal authority is, in many ways, a compromise between the two sides involved.

Any change of audience also affects the system of codes employed in language. For instance, the conquest of the Lombard kingdom by Charlemagne and the embrace of central Italy by Frankish rulers altered the composition of the audience of Carolingian authority and, together with other factors, provoked the introduction of Roman impe-

---


64 Cf., Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor*, 17.

65 This is my translation from Lotman, *Vnutri mysliashchikh mirov*, 203: “Взаимоотношения текста и аудитории характеризуется взаимной активностью: текст стремится уподобить аудиторию себе, навязать ей свою систему кодов, аудитория отвечает ему тем же. Текст как бы включает в себя образ «своей» идеальной аудитории, аудитория — «своего» текста.”

66 Brown, *Unjust Seizure*, 7, makes a similar point in his discussion of Carolingian conquest: “The response of various groups among the conquered can in turn affect the conquerors as they try to fit their forms of organization and their purposes to a new and constantly changing environment.”
rial tradition—a code, in a semiotic sense—into the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. Thus, Lotman’s approach demonstrates the complicated issue of audiences. One has to discern in the process of the creation of a symbolic text both the ideal and real audiences. The example of royal liturgy can elucidate this distinction: the ideal audience of a liturgical “text” is God, but its practical audience consists of Christian worshipers and the Christian ruler. Therefore, while studying messages in liturgical texts related to royal authority, one must take into account both audiences.

In the end, the only solution to the issue of audiences is to accept that they are differentiated by several criteria. First, as mentioned above, the “text” itself provides us with its ideal and real audiences. Social stratification constitutes the second criteria for the differentiation of audiences. Finally, audiences are different depending on their region and their ethnic identity. For instance, we can hardly consider the Franks and Lombards—gentes with different socio-political pasts and cultural experiences—the same audience. At the same time, we cannot treat these gentes as coherent and stable units.

Most recent studies analyzing ethnic groups of the early Middle Ages depart from the traditional interpretation of ethnic identity as an inherited, objective category and point to its fluidity and dependence on various external factors like specific political circumstances or contemporary discourses. Consequently, gentes increasingly have been viewed as situational constructs fostered by “political ethnicity,” as the phenomena of social psychology, as literary constructs of late classical

---

67 Personally, I prefer the term “gentile” while speaking of identities and political traditions connected to the early medieval gentes. In this book, however, I have chosen not to use this term in order to avoid confusion on the part of readers accustomed to its biblical usage.


and early medieval Latin authors, or as the result of contemporary ethnic discourses. The latter point, made by Walter Pohl—that written “Roman-Christian discourse” rationalized and fostered ethnic identities—is especially important. It identifies a discrepancy between two related but still separate phenomena: the ethnic terms in early medieval discourse available to historians via contemporary written sources and the existence of large social groups whose members to a lesser or greater extent might have shared a common identity. Thus, constantly changing early medieval ethnicities were fixed in the contemporary discourse as coherent, stable, and separate units, described in Latin sources with such terms as gentes or nationes.

Since the symbolic language of authority operated on the level of the convergence of material and written discourses, this study will deal predominantly with gentes as discursive phenomena in early medieval politics: in this discourse, they were treated as major political entities constituting early medieval kingdoms or duchies. Such a gens was a construct (eine abstrakte Einheit) employed in the communication of political authority in the early Middle Ages. The Franks, Aquitanians, Lombards, and “Romans” in Italy were among those political gentes.

---


73 Ibid., 68.


76 For the mid-eighth-century Lombards, “Romans” lived on the territories controlled by imperial Constantinople or papal Rome; see Brigitte Pohl-Resl, “Legal Practice
employed in the symbolic language of authority in the eighth and ninth centuries. In many cases, these constructs hid the political power of the aristocracy, social inequalities, and the strategies of political legitimation. The name of the Franks is a good example of such polysemy in the Carolingian world: while it could refer to the aristocracy on the Frankish mainland, it could also designate the free inhabitants of Francia north of the Loire. In official ideology, the distinction between Frankish free landowners and nobles was less important than the difference between the free and the unfree. Furthermore, in written discourse, this term could also mask the juxtaposition of Neustrian and Austrasian elites or be used as means of political legitimation by the early Carolingians. Thus, an early medieval gens as a coherent unit was a political fiction, but this fictionality did not make it less important for Frankish political culture or less efficient in the communication of royal authority. It was a fiction affecting people’s perceptions as well as basic assumptions and presuppositions within contemporary political culture.

In the first quarter of the ninth century, a new situational construct, populus Christianus (Christian people), began affecting written discourse and the symbolic language of authority. The emergence of a new universalist identity substituting for the multiplicity of gentes was promoted by the Carolingian center to cement a newly-built empire; many Carolingian clergymen eagerly supported and propagated this new imperial identity, which, to a certain extent, paralleled a late Roman one. In the ninth century, however, a “foster-child” of late Roman political culture, a particularistic identity connected to a gens, proved to be strong and politically vibrant, as was demonstrated by the disintegration of the Carolingian empire and the revitalization of old political gentes in political discourse.

Actual communities that were described in concurrent discourse with the category of gens were extremely heterogeneous and dynamic. The

---

77 See Innes, State and Society, 83. He also points out that “both aristocrat and freeholder participated in a single culture. The identity of the free Frank encompassed a very broad section of society.”

members of such communities were influenced by various socio-political experiences and official ethnic discourse. In many cases, this discourse affected people not only in written, but also in material and vocal, forms via objects, signs, oral formulas, and procedures, which promoted a certain identity and defined it in relation to royal authority. Some of these elements could be transmitted from generation to generation through the repetitive enactment of special procedures, the frequent use of written and oral formulas, and the deployment of the symbolic signs of such communities on artifacts like coins. These elements were more conservative and could hide significant political changes. In some cases, they were unevenly accessible to different social groups. But, in many cases, they affected contemporary political culture and the ways in which the sets of political norms, values, and ideas were structured and expressed within a certain gens-based community. Carolingian monarchs had to take this conservative side of political mentalities into account even when developing their own sets of political symbols.

This conservative side of political culture can be analyzed via the hermeneutic notion of the “horizon of expectations,” developed by Hans Jauss.79 Briefly, the “horizon of expectations” is the socio-historical experience of the reader, which affects his or her reading of the text and consequently influences the author. The “horizon of expectations” is useful for analyzing various audiences and how the symbolic messages defined at the Carolingian center might have been interpreted or misinterpreted by them. Moreover, the notion of the “horizon of expectations” might help understand how subjects tacitly participated in the indirect communication of royal/imperial authority and influenced the symbolic language developed at the highest levels of society. One may say that the creation of such authority was, to a certain extent, mediated between the “horizon of expectations” of the subject and the creativity and innovations of the ruler.

The “horizon of expectations” points at differences between the sender and receiver, which modify or sometimes even distort the message on its way from the author to the audience. The notion of a code, on the contrary, emphasizes similarities, enabling communication and connecting the sender and the receiver. There are different semiotic definitions of this term, and studies following Saussurian structural semiotics treat codes as transcendent realities invisibly ruling the real world. My definition of “code” is influenced instead by Lotman’s interpretation of it as an artificial system:

The code does not imply history, that is, it points us instinctively to an artificial language, which is perceived as the ideal model of a language in general. The “language,” on the other hand, subconsciously gives us an impression of a historically long existence. The language is the code plus its history.

Such a definition makes the code an epistemological construct extracted from the semiotic diversity existing in reality—the construct has nothing to do with the deciphering or decoding of the parole. Such a definition makes the code a valuable tool to analyze the symbolic language of authority without obscuring the historical contexts within which it developed. Defined in this way, the code comes very close to the notion of political tradition in a strict sense. When we describe Roman imperial or Merovingian traditions of authority, we usually extract certain political ideas, concepts, signs, and symbols from the ever-changing political culture of their polities. Similar to the notion of political tradition, the use of the term “code” in the present study denotes the groups of similar semantic elements that—in a compressed metaphoric form, that is, through symbols—refer to, are reminiscent of, and thus legitimize certain types of relationships, rights, and obligations between the ruler and his/her subjects. These elements might be expressed

---

81 For the criticism of such approach, see, for example, Pierre Bourdieu, Language and Symbolic Power, trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity, 1991), 37.
82 “Код не подразумевает истории, то есть психологически он ориентирует нас на искусственный язык, который и предполагается идеальной моделью языка вообще. «Язык» же бессознательно вызывает у нас представление об исторической протяженности существования. Язык—это код плюс его история,” Lotman, Kul’tura i vzryv (Culture and Explosion), in Semiosfera, 15.
83 The category of code used in the present study is thus different from the one in a dual-processual theory, according to which a “cognitive code” affects human actions;
through words, signs, imagery, or special procedures. For the intellectual elite, these semantic elements might be expressed through the luxurious imagery of precious manuscripts or the sophisticated wording of political treatises; for ordinary people, they might take more basic and simplified forms of expression like those presented in Carolingian coinage accessible to freemen and people of dependent status. Thus, the notion of “code” refers to commonalities traceable throughout the historic development of the symbolic language of authority. In the Carolingian world, one may see in the non-narrative evidence the co-existence of two or more codes, though, in certain periods, one code seemed to dominate others.

There is still the question of how these sets of common semantic elements—which were expressed through words, signs, imagery, and rituals and described with political traditions or codes—affected the two sides involved. The anthropological concept of habitus developed by Pierre Bourdieu partly addresses this issue. He developed this concept in his study of the North African tribe Kabyles in order to understand the regular patterns of behavior not prescribed by rules or norms.84 The practices produced by habitus as the strategy-generating principle are determined by past conditions, and the collective orchestration of habitus is achieved via the continuous reinforcement that each agent receives from the individual or collective expression of similar or identical experiences. In traditional societies without established systems of education, habitus is transmitted in practice: children are habituated through watching and imitating adults, listening to sayings, myths, and songs, and participating in rites and rituals.85 As a result, the acquisition of habitus is never a rational process separate from one’s identity. This brings us back to the above-used metaphor of a person in traditional


84 “The structures constitutive of a particular type of environment…produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without in any way being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their goals without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary to attain them and, being all this, collectively orchestrated without being the product of the orchestrating action of a conductor.” Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice, Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology, no. 16 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 72.

85 Ibid., 72–95.
society as a “social animal.” If we extend this simile, then *habitus* may be seen as operating through the subconscious level of conditional reflexes, helping the “social animal” adjust to its sociopolitical environment.

Similar to *habitus*, repetition was crucial in the symbolic language in the Carolingian world because it made the ruler’s authority look habitual or natural. Repetitive enactment of the royal liturgy, a constant use of specific titles and signs on objects connecting rulers’ courts with their aristocratic and free subjects, and the symbolic depiction of kings and emperors in different media made their authority an intrinsic part of the sociopolitical landscape. As such, rulers’ authority was integrated into a sociopolitical *habitus*, and its symbolic language dealt with the relations of domination, submission, and legitimation. To trace codes in this language is an attempt to rationalize *habitus*. This makes the code a scholarly construct helpful for understanding power relations existing on the level of habitual practices. Such a sociopolitical *habitus* in which a person had grown up and been socialized created a framework for his/her political assumptions and presuppositions or, as Koziol calls it, “culturally distinctive categories of cognition.” In this manner, a shared sociopolitical *habitus* defined regular patterns of political behavior and decision-making and led to a strong grasp of traditions in early medieval political life.

(c) The main media of the symbolic language of Carolingian authority

After this theoretical digression on some methodological principles related to the study of the symbolic language, I will now address the main media involved in the indirect communication of authority as described in *The Book of Pontiffs*. Neither charters of Philippicus nor his images for liturgical settings have survived. The precise liturgical context in which his name was evoked in church remains hypothetical. But some of his solidi, Byzantine gold coins—which were issued in his name in Constantinople and Syracuse—have survived and are available

---

86 As Bedos-Rezak, “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,” 27, states, texts and images produced in royal chanceries were manipulated “in formulaic combinations the repetitive use of which became instrumental in assuring the continuity of kingship.”

87 “…these cognitive categories in turn shaped the beliefs and ideals of individuals to such an extent that belief itself could become a significant historical force, for example, by making certain kinds of conflict inevitable or certain kinds of actions unthinkable,” Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor*, xiii.
for analysis (fig. 2): the obverse of the coins presented to his subjects a symbolic image of the ruler endowed with such insignia of imperial authority as a crown, orb, scepter, and chlamys, thereby connecting these coins to his imagery in other media. This imperial image is accompanied by a legend, Dominus noster Filepicus multos annos. The first part of the legend, “Our Lord Philippicus,” presents a traditional title of early Byzantine emperors and provides a link to imperial intitulature in his charters. The second part of the same legend was introduced into Byzantine coinage during the second reign of Justinian II (705–711) and represents the acclamation “Many years,” which was used extensively in imperial liturgy in Constantinople. This acclamation, together with the image of a cross-potent on the reverse, suggests that we must see coins—as much as we do diplomas—within a broader context of imperial liturgy. The example of Philippicus’s gold coins clearly illustrates how coins, images, charters, and liturgy “worked” together in a single symbolic language; in addition, it explains why Romans had to reject them to demonstrate that the authority of the imperial usurper was not accepted in Rome.

When we turn from the small political world of papal Rome to the wider Carolingian realm, it is necessary to keep in mind that miniatures with royal imagery, royal charters, liturgical ceremonies, and coins functioned in different contexts and addressed different audiences. In short, royal miniatures were seen mainly by a courtly audience; royal charters

88 Schramm had already stressed in his research connections between rulers’ iconography in different media.
90 See Koziol, Begging Pardon and Favor, 93, who stresses the importance of liturgical settings in our understanding of diplomas as evidence for political history. See also Marguerite Ragnow, “Ritual Before the Altar: Legal Satisfaction and Spiritual Reconciliation in Eleventh-Century Anjou,” in Medieval and Early Modern Ritual: Formalized Behavior in Europe, China and Japan, ed. Joëlle Rollo-Koster, Cultures, Beliefs and Traditions, no. 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 57–79, at 71–7.
91 I follow here Airli’s definition of Carolingian court as meaning “the king and his family and the personnel around them together with the institutions (e.g. the royal
were sent predominantly to the high clergy and lay aristocracy; liturgy was performed by clergymen for the Christian community (the latter including a courtly audience, the lay aristocracy, and freemen who were encouraged to visit certain liturgical ceremonies); Carolingian silver coins were accessible to much of the population, including individuals of dependent status. The sphere of their function and the expected audience defined the forms that symbolic language took in these media and the content of particular messages communicated through them. Again, simply put, the general rule was that the broader the audience, the less sophisticated the symbolic language and the more straightforward its messages.

Carolingian miniatures showed authority through the coded image of a ruler. Drawn by monastic or court painters, they were often designed to be seen and understood by a monarch, courtiers, and the highest nobility, which, taken together, made up a courtly audience. This audience alone was allowed to approach the brilliant image of authority, personified by a ruler, on the pages of precious manuscripts. The communicative function of this imagery lay in its figurative expression of political ideas, notions, and concepts that circulated in the royal retinue and among the highest nobility. A *fastigium* (a gable over the throne of a ruler), imperial orb, scepter, crown, or God’s hand over the head of a ruler portrayed in miniatures, matched the abstract notions of chapel and buildings (e.g. palaces) that housed, served and very often, in their scale and design, expressed the essence of the royal household,” “The Palace of Memory,” 3. I also agree with Innes that the court was “a sociological community” and that the royal household included youthful aristocrats, Matthew Innes, “A Place of Discipline; Carolingian Courts and Aristocratic Youth,” in *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The Proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference*, ed. Catherine Cubitt, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, no. 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 59–76.

92 Throughout this book, I use this term in its broader meaning, as defined by Airlie and Innes. See n. 43.

93 I am fully aware that there were social gradations amongst freemen: most important was probably the distinction between a free owner-cultivator and a freeholder. See Innes, *State and Society*, 83–5. The composition and social coherence of free peasants also varied depending on region, as Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages*, 393–406, demonstrates in his comparison between the middle Rhineland and the Paris basin.

94 I will use the terms “the retinue”/“entourage” of a king to designate a narrow circle of his closest advisors and personal friends who greatly influenced the process of royal decision-making. The use of this term also allows me to avoid the issue of whether an established royal court existed at a certain time or not. For instance, see the question of the existence of Charlemagne’s court school in the 780s in Laurence Nees, “The Plan of St Gall and the Theory of the Program of Carolingian Art,” *Gesta* 25 (1986): 5.
describing rulership that existed in the political discourse of the time. It is impossible sometimes to define which of them, a visual image or an abstract notion, affected the development of the other;\footnote{\textit{It was Percy E. Schramm, \textit{Sphaira-Globus-Reichsapfel: Wanderung und Wandlung eines Herrschaftszeichen von Caesar bis zu Elizabeth II} (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1958), 4, who first made the distinction between the visual appearance (\textit{Gestalt}) and meaning (\textit{Sinn}) of an imperial orb and pointed out that they mutually determined each other. I have analyzed the intertwined nature of symbolic visual elements and corresponding political notions through the study of \textit{fastigium} in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. See Ildar H. Garipzanov, \textit{“Fastigium as an Element of the Carolingian Image of Authority: The Transformation of the Roman Imperial Symbol in the Early Middle Ages,”} \textit{Majestas} 10 (2002): 5–26.}} they mutually influenced one another and, as two sides of the same coin, the visualized notions and verbalized images were inseparable in this process. This connection allowed this imagery to carry political messages to the king, the highest nobility, and monastic communities. During the heyday of Carolingian imagery in the middle of the ninth century, at least two diverse types of iconography existed. The first type presented an ideal image of authority as perceived and propagated at the royal court, while the second was what was expected and propagated by the religious communities in which such imagery was created. Thus, royal imagery provided visual dialogue about Carolingian authority.

Carolingian charters (\textit{diplomata}) created in the royal chancery expressed royal authority through their use of titles, monograms, seals, and bulls. Royal charters communicated authority to their receivers, mostly the Carolingian upper clergy and lay aristocrats, through succinct diplomatic formulas and signs, each element of which contained an important symbolic meaning for contemporaries. Consequently, diplomas with “standardized images and textual formulae of rulership” played a significant role in royal legitimation.\footnote{\textit{Bedos-Rezak, “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,”} 30 and 40.} As Brigitte Bedos-Rezak has observed, “through its discursive and material forms, the diploma projected an image of orthodox kingship, sanctified by God, open to appeal from their subjects, generous where appropriate and, above all, in control of events.”\footnote{Ibid., 39.} It is true that in the eighth and ninth centuries some royal charters were drafted by their recipients on parchment sheets provided by them—or even drawn up in such trusted abbeys as St. Denis (for Charlemagne and Charles the Bald) or St. Martin of Tours (for Charles
the Bald); however, these beneficiaries were not free to change the royal intitulature and the signs of authority. Such elements of royal charters were expected to follow the official diplomatic pattern defined in the Carolingian chancery, and the diplomata drawn up elsewhere had to receive the signs of confirmation of the royal chancery. Although the audience for royal charters could have been extended through public reading, or even holding them aloft, they were hardly capable of reaching a broad audience. (In addition, only a limited audience of direct receivers was able to see the visual signs on diplomata.)

The charters named authority to those who were able to read and hear them; in this sense, the intitulatio in royal charters was the name of the authority claimed by the ruler and his retinue. The titles conveyed authority because they defined, referred to, and pointed at the rights and obligations binding the ruler and his subjects. Nonetheless, Carolingian aristocrats, especially clerics, frequently gave different names to authority in their correspondence with the ruler and the court because they saw these bonds from a different angle. The letters addressed to the ruler demonstrated how the royal authority named by the subjects was as important as the official intitulature developed in the royal chancery. Taken together, these letters and royal charters demonstrate that there existed a constant dialogue about the naming of authority among Carolingian political elites.

When analyzing the signs of royal authority in early medieval charters, it is always necessary to keep in mind that the use of graphic signs differed considerably between royal diplomas and private charters.

---


99 The practice of royal charters drawn by beneficiaries became more frequent in the tenth century, but even these documents were always confirmed by a royal monogram and seal: ibid., 135.


101 By the term “private charters,” I mean the charters produced outside the royal chancery; in most cases, they were produced by agents outside royal administration
Royal diplomas were issued at the royal chancery, and the graphic signs developed there were not only the signs of authenticity but also the signs of authority disseminating political messages formulated at the court. In this respect, early medieval private charters differed considerably from the royal diplomas. Although the process of producing of private charters, as well as the role of preceding oral negotiations on the text of a charter, could vary in different parts of the early medieval West, they all had common features that confirmed their authenticity and enabled them, if necessary, to be used in courts of law. The subscriptio—that is, the final part of a charter, in which the people directly involved in the particular case, the witnesses, and the scribe signed the document—was one of the most important elements of authentication. (As a result of their practical nature and the fact that the people related to the case were more-or-less of similar social standing, early medieval private charters lacked important signs of imperial or royal authority like seals found on royal charters.)

In general, graphic signa in most private charters functioned as the signs of authenticity and identity connected to local audiences.

Although perhaps limited in practice, the mass for a ruler was in theory a ritual open to all Christians. People attended church and became the participants in a solemn spectacle based on liturgical formulas establishing the symbolic ties among God, the ruler, and a subject. Thus, illiterati speaking Romance vernaculars were able to hear the formulas of authority sounded in liturgy (although the introduction of the chancel screen, separating the celebrants of mass from its lay participants, might have become an obstacle to this in the Carolingian period) and these formulas resonated with their own perceptions regarding the role of the ruler in God’s world order. Through participation in the royal liturgy—even as a silent audience—lay people were of course bound symbolically to their rulers, but they also expected their

to corroborate social and economic transactions and rights agreed upon by both sides involved. In addition, the documents issued within a broader royal administration, such as judgments of counts and missi or episcopal acts, are much closer to private charters in form and visual characteristics and are classified as such by diplomatists. For details on their production and use, see Innes, State and Society, 111–8. On the formal differences between “public” charters of kings and emperors (diplomata) and private charters as well as the late Roman origins of such distinction, see Harry Bresslau, Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschlands und Italien, 2 vols, 2d ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1958), 3–5 and 49–53.

kings to follow the rules of the divine order. From Charlemagne’s reign onwards, the Sunday mass was an obligatory ritual for commoners. Missing this mass was not just a religious matter but also constituted a political statement regarding royal authority. Indeed, the Saxon rebellions against Charlemagne often started with the return to paganism and the rejection of the religious practices of their Frankish lords.

Liturgical manuscripts provide us with some insight into how authority was maintained on the liturgical scene. The texts of royal masses in Carolingian sacramentaries\(^\text{103}\) prove that the liturgy of authority consisted not just of the simple dissemination of ideas and concepts devised by the rulers and their advisers. Rather, it represented an ardent quest of its participants, first and foremost, the clerics, to define royal/imperial authority in its relation to God, universal divine order, and Christian believers. The role of lay participants was more receptive, provided that they spoke a *lingua volgare* and were able to grasp the main agenda of a Latin mass. This was not the case in Germanic-speaking areas of the Carolingian realm. There the commoners hardly understood a word of the mass, although the priest in a church could have explained the main theme of a particular mass, as was required by some Carolingian capitularies. Thus, the difference in languages alienated some participants in a mass, although such alienation has itself a communicative function. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that in Germanic-speaking areas, especially to the east of the Rhine, the liturgy of royal/imperial authority developed to a lesser extent than in France.

Although it is difficult to know whether Carolingian silver coins, deniers and obols were available to every inhabitant of the Carolingian state, they were accessible to wide strata of society. The enormous output of Carolingian mints certainly made silver coins a ubiquitous phenomenon in everyday life. For instance, based on the number of dies employed in the production of Charles the Bald’s coins in the Low Countries, D.M. Metcalf\(^\text{104}\) estimates the number of coins in circulation in his reign as no less than fifty million.\(^\text{104}\) This figure is rather too high, but it nonetheless hints at the broad scope of coin circulation in the Carolingian realm. Carolingian legislation on coins corroborates such a

\(^{103}\) For a general overview of this type of liturgical book, see Marcel Metzger, *Les Sacramentaires*, TSMÂO, 70 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994).

perception and makes it clear that not only freemen, but also slaves and people of dependent status (servilis conditionis) handled coins. Another argument in favor of the availability of coins to the majority of population is the appearance of a half denier, an obol, during the reign of Pippin the Short and the visible increase in its production during the time of Louis the Pious. The smaller the fraction of silver coinage, the more accessible it was to those of modest means.

The purchasing power of Carolingian coins also made them accessible to most people. According to Chapter 5 of the Frankfurt Capitulary (794), a person could buy with one denier one or two modius of oats (avena). A modius of barley (ordeum) cost one or two deniers; a modius of rye (sigalum) two or three deniers; a modius of wheat (frumentum) three or four deniers. Furthermore, The Life of Ansgar—written by Rimbert, abbot of Corbie, between 869 and 876—mentions a certain Scandinavian woman arriving in Dorestad, the main northern port of the Carolingian realm, in the mid-ninth century. Her main purpose was to distribute money among the poor, and some pious women joined her

---

105 See for instance a relevant chapter in the Frankfurt Capitulary (a. 794): “5. . . . si quis contradicit eos in ullo loco in aliquo negotio emptionis vel venditionis: si ingenuus est homo, quindecim solidos conponat ad opus regis; si servilis conditionis, si suum est illud negotium proprium, perdat illud negotium aut flagelletur nudus ad palam coram populo; si autem ex iussione sui domini fecerit, tunc ille dominus solidos quindecim conponat, si ei adprobatum fuerit.” Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, ed. Alfred Boretius, MGH, Legum Sectio II (Hanover: Hahn, 1883), 74. For other examples in later Carolingian capitularies, see ibid., 152 and 285; and Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 2, ed. Alfred Boretius and Victor Krause, MGH, Legum Sectio II (Hanover: Hahn, 1897), 15–6 and 301–2. A useful compilation of such clauses in Carolingian capitularies can be found in Ildar H. Garipzanov, Karolingskoye monetnoye delo i rimskaya imperskaya traditciya (Carolingian coinage and Roman imperial tradition) (Kazan: Institut “Otkrutoje Obschestvo”, 2000), 116–35.


107 Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 74. At the time of famine, as it was the case in 806, the prices of grain rose: oats went up to two deniers per modius, barley to three, rye to four, and wheat to six deniers. Capitulare missorum Niumagae datum (a. 806), c. 18, in ibid., 132. Simon Coupland, “Charlemagne’s Coinage: Ideology and Economy,” in Charlemagne: Empire and Society, ed. Storey, 211–29, at 212–3, provides more references to the use of silver coins in small and large transactions and suggests that “coins were in everyday use for many people” (212).

in this mission. Tiring of their charity work, they decided to refresh themselves with wine that cost them four deniers. While the availability of Carolingian deniers and obols might have varied across the realm, these random examples suggest that silver coins were casually used in small transactions.

The designers of royal coins had to reckon with the fact that their numismatic audiences were unfamiliar with political and theological treatises on royal authority and, to make political communication even more complicated, that in many regions of the early medieval West, their audiences were not able to read Latin legends. The Carolingian realm was no exception to this trend. In such an environment, a visual analogy, that is, the imitation of well-known signs and images, was the easiest way to convey a message and to describe the changing nature of rulership. At the same time, the introduction of new visual elements on coins was a risky business because it could not ensure the expected response from the audience. In this situation, the imitation of graphic signs and images from previous numismatic traditions was the surest way to convey messages between the court and “ordinary Franks” of free or dependent status.

Because of the significance of coins as symbols of authority, the new Carolingian dynasty paid more attention to this important tool of legitimation than their Merovingian predecessors had done. In Merovingian Gaul, a monetary system was characterized by the decentralization of minting, and local moneyers were responsible for the production of coins and their design. As a result, the design chosen for a particular issue indicated which symbols were especially popular in a given region.

---


110 For instance, the lack of mints east of the Rhine may have made coins less available there. Carolingian Italy may have represented a similar case. Based on a scarcity of the finds of Carolingian coins in northern and central Italy, Alessia Rovelli has argued that there was a lack of silver coins, especially south of the Po valley, which led to their higher purchasing power and predominant use in large transactions: “Some Considerations on the Coinage of Lombard and Carolingian Italy,” in *The Long Eighth Century*, ed. Inge Lyse Hansen and Chris Wickham, TRW, no. 11 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 195–223, at 207–23.

111 On the decline in literacy in the western part of the Roman empire in late antiquity, leading to “the marginal kind of literacy” in the early centuries of the Middle Ages, see William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 312–22.
and accessible to a local audience.\footnote{Coins could be struck at hundreds of places like a palace, city, oppidum, villa, village, and church. They were produced not in the name of a king, but in that of a monetarius, a moneyer, who was responsible for their quality and weight. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain the number of mints operating during the Merovingian period. For instance, Michael F. Hendy, “From Public to Private: The Western Barbarian Coinages as a Mirror of the Disintegration of Late Roman State Structure,” *Viator* 19 (1988): 65, counts about 600 mints.} Pippin the Short put an end to this by restoring royal control over coinage in 754/5, soon after his royal coronation, and his successors were successful in maintaining this control most of the time up to the late ninth century.\footnote{Chapter 5 of the Vernon Capitulary (755) is indicative of that change: “De moneta constituimus, ut amplius non habeat in libra pensante nisi XXII solidos, et de ipsis XXII solidis monetarius accepiat solidum I, et illos alios domino cuius sunt reddat,” *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 32. For details, see Jean Lafaurie, “Numismaticque: Des mérovingiens aux carolingiens: Les monnaies de Pépin le Bref,” *Francia* 2 (1974): 35–44.} Consequently, in the Carolingian world, the design of coins was decided in most cases at the royal or imperial court, consequently considerably limiting the freedom of local mints in defining numismatic signs and images. In most cases, the royal court sent written instructions about the design of coins to local mints. A clause in the Edict of Pitres of 864 provides an example of such a prescription: “11. On the one side of the deniers of our new coin series, there shall be our name (*nomen*) in a circle and the monogram of our name in the center, while on the other side there shall be the name of a city and a cross in the center.”\footnote{My translation from *Edictum Pistense*, 11, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 2, 315: “Ut in denariis novae nostrae monetae ex una parte nomen nostrum habeat in gyro et in medio nostri nominis monogramma, ex altera vero parte nomen civitatis et in medio crux habeatur.” For detailed analysis of this clause, see Philip Grierson, “The Gratia Dei rex Coinage of Charles the Bald,” in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, ed. Gibson and Nelson, 54–8.} In addition, the coins of the palace mint may have been sent to local mints to be used as models. But even in the Carolingian period, people at local mints could influence the design of coins when the directions from the center were general enough to allow local variations, as probably happened in the reign of Pippin the Short, or when the Carolingian center temporarily lost control over local mints, as most likely was the case in the 840s during the early years of Charles the Bald’s rule.

As a result of strict royal control,\footnote{I have discussed this feature of Carolingian coinage in Garipzanov, *Karolingskoye monetnoye delo*, 36–41 and table 1.} Carolingian coins were not only a means of exchange, but also demonstrated monarchical authority by
disseminating it throughout the realm. As vehicles of authority, they displayed no sign of value but the name and signs of a king, which personified his authority and warranted their value and authenticity. Because of their small size, they could express authority only through a symbolic language of short legends and images. The coins were, allegorically speaking, tiny “metallic royal diplomas,” with a ruler’s name and the other signs—some of them derived from a contemporary diplomatic tradition—proving their authenticity, propagating royal authority, and giving their possessors the right to buy the goods in a given kingdom. To rephrase Benedict Anderson, Carolingian coins were material representations of an imagined “sacred community,” the Carolingian realm, and played a role similar to newspapers in the modern world: they reassured “that the imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life.”

Carolingian coins were intended to make this imagined political community tangible to most people, and all the coins produced in other states that were brought to the Carolingian world had to be melted down to be struck again with the signs of Carolingian authority. In the time of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, this applied to Muslim coinage. With the disintegration of the Carolingian empire after 840, when it was no longer imagined as political unity, this could happen even to the coins of another Carolingian state, as the letter of Lupus of Ferrières written to an Italian bishop in 849 demonstrates; before his visit across the Alps, Lupus asked Bishop Reginfridus to provide him with the coins struck in Italy because those issued to the north of the Alps were no longer accepted there.

---


117 This symbolism was underlined by Philip Grierson, who compares coins with charters and concludes: “But the symbolical element in coin is much greater than that in charters or most other legal documents,” see: “Symbolism in Early Medieval Charters and Coins,” in Simboli e simbologia nell’alto medioevo, 3–9 Aprile 1975, SSCISAM, no. 23 (Spoleto: Presso la sede del Centro, 1976), 601.

118 I have pointed to the similarities between Frankish charters and coins in Garipzanov, “Metamorphoses of the Early Medieval signum,” 424–5 and 452.


The Carolingian deniers differed slightly in their weight and their silver content, which might have enticed users to reject the lighter and poorer coins. At the same time, the rejection of a coin issued by a Carolingian ruler in the marketplace was a delict since it infringed on the rights of the ruler. Starting in 794, the provision against the rejection of coins with the signs of Carolingian authority was often repeated in capitularies. For instance, the earliest provision in the Frankfurt capitulary of 794 listed Charlemagne’s monogram together with proper weight and silver content as indicators of proper royal coinage. Because it was technically almost impossible to make a precise judgment on the weight and silver content of a coin in a marketplace (unless the silver content dropped to a level as low as 30–40 percent), the royal monogram became the main sign confirming proper coinage.

This overview suggests that changes in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority affected its carriers variously because of the different nature of these media and the diversity of their audiences. Yet, in every case, it is possible to trace the sets of basic political assumptions, assertions, and beliefs permeating all four vehicles of authority. These sets of common assumptions and presuppositions—described in the present study by means of the category of code—enabled all the participants in the symbolic theater of authority to communicate, even if indirectly, with one another.

---


Three codes were most visible in the Carolingian language of authority, namely, the “rex Francorum,” pointing to the perceptions of royal authority deriving from the late Merovingian period, the “imperator augustus,” reminiscent of those relations of political authority that existed in the late Roman empire, and the “gratia Dei rex,” reflecting new perceptions of Christian royal authority appearing in the Carolingian period. Although most of the time these traditions co-existed in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority, there were periods when one or another of them came to dominate communication and relegated the others to a secondary role.

In the last half of the eighth century, this symbolic language demonstrated the dominance of common semantic elements deriving from the earlier Frankish tradition of authority. The Carolingians started using the Merovingian royal title “rex Francorum” in their official intitulature from the reign of Pippin the Short; this traditional Frankish title also became the key legend on Pippin’s coinage and the royal coinage of Charlemagne. The title expressed an earlier perception of royal authority as connected to, and legitimated by, the Frankish gens—although these links to the gens in many cases pointed to the Frankish aristocracy. Thus, early Carolingians were kings of and to the Franks. By the middle of the eighth century, this category had also acquired strong Christian connotations. In Christian discourse, the gens Francorum gradually came to be defined as the people who had a special relationship with God. The authority of its king came to be described in terms of the Old Testament rulers, especially King David.

Yet by the beginning of the ninth century, the earlier perception of royal authority as bound to gens no longer corresponded to changing power relations in the expanding Carolingian polity. Consequently, a new set of common semantic elements developed in the symbolic language under the influences of the Mediterranean political culture and of the increasing role of clergymen for Carolingian politics. In the early ninth century, late Roman imperial symbols and signs of authority routinely appeared in Carolingian charters, coinage, seals, and bulls. Furthermore, the new imperial title “imperator Augustus” appeared in Charlemagne’s official intitulature in 801, and later was incorporated into the title legend of the first bull, the creation of which
was an imitation of late Roman and early Byzantine practice. In 813, the expression “*imperator Augustus*” became, for a short period, the title legend in Carolingian coinage.

The emergence of this tradition of authority reflected Charlemagne’s military expansion and coercive Christianization of pagans. It mirrored the increased power of the Frankish ruler after expansion into northern and central Italy, where the introduction of new symbolic elements served practical needs in communicating with Italian subjects and dependants, who were used to the late Roman and early Byzantine “language” of imperial authority. In addition, the development of a new political tradition reflected the growing independence of Carolingian kingship from the traditional legitimation derived from the Frankish *gens*. Instead, the Carolingians and their retinue attempted to bolster their authority by linking themselves to the long-established late Roman imperial tradition, according to which the Christian emperor ruled over the Christian people and had an obligation to protect and promote Christian religion and liberty.

The set of political symbols described as the code “*imperator Augustus*” was elaborated early in the reign of Louis the Pious, when late Roman imperial elements dominated the indirect communication of Carolingian authority on almost every social level. The symbolic language was further modified in the 820s due to several factors, including the increasing political consolidation of the clergy. Carolingian clergymen questioned courtly claims to unlimited imperial authority, which they perceived as bound by both episcopal authority and the interests of the Christian people. Under their influence, Christian symbolism reflecting the clerical vision of imperial authority came to dominate indirect political communication in the 820s and 830s.

The turbulent post-imperial decades after 840 saw the co-existence of still-surviving late Roman imperial semantic elements with the revival of the earlier tradition of royal authority bound to a *gens*. Because of social, economic, and cultural differences among the separate Frankish kingdoms succeeding the Carolingian empire, the symbolic languages of authority employed in each of them were not identical. Regional audiences defined the importance of certain political traditions that better addressed their “horizons of expectations.”

From this semiotic diversity, a new political tradition gradually developed in the post-imperial political space from the 840s to 860s, becoming especially visible in the symbolic language of authority in the West Frankish kingdom of Charles the Bald. His political slogan “*gratia*
Dei rex,” seen in charters from 840 and on coins from 864, became the cornerstone of the new set of political symbols. This code appropriated some semantic elements of the previous symbolic traditions and augmented them with a new “vocabulary.” Henceforth, royal authority was perceived as intrinsically connected to divine grace, which became the prime notion defining rulership and had to be acquired via liturgical means. Thus, by the end of Charles the Bald’s reign, the Carolingian melting pot of political traditions and the needs of real politics produced a definite and succinct system of symbolic formulas, signs and images; the new system had the features that would be inherited by the sacred monarchies of the high Middle Ages and would come to represent the medieval symbolic language of authority.

The concrete forms in which these three major sets of political assumptions and presuppositions were expressed within Carolingian political culture greatly depended on a particular mode of the symbolic language of authority and the situated use of various symbolic “texts.” To take into account these specific contexts, the following chapters deal in turn with each mode of symbolic communication, and the concluding chapter assesses that symbolic language as a whole and summarizes its transformation in a more synthetic way by comparing symbolic “texts” with contemporary written discourse and setting them within their wider political contexts.
CHAPTER TWO

VOX AUCTORITATIS:
THE CAROLINGIAN LITURGY OF AUTHORITY

In capitulario dominico: Statuimus secundum quod in lege dominus praecepit, ut opera servilia diebus dominicis non agantur... ad missa solemnia omnes ad ecclesias ire et laudare dominum in omnibus bonis, quae fecerit nobis, quia et lex nostra multipliciter in ea operante iudicat.


The medieval liturgy can be viewed as a specific type of symbolic communication between the Christian people and God, in which the mass became a central ritual. In a way, eucharistic liturgy established the relations of symbolic gift exchange with the divine, and participants presented the mass as a gift to God and expected remuneration in return. At the same time, liturgy was also a form of communication among Christians that sanctified a certain social order, social roles, and social functions. It therefore played an important role in maintaining

social stability by symbolizing, as Rosamond McKitterick remarks in relation to the Carolingian period, “the essential unity of Frankish society.” As an instrument for stabilizing society, liturgical communication necessarily incorporated the issue of royal authority. The liturgy on behalf of a ruler created symbolic ties among God, the ruler, and the Christians present in church; the participants in that liturgy were intended to be active agents in the liturgical creation and maintenance of royal authority. In Frankish society, which was increasingly Christianized, the liturgy played an especially important role in communicating Carolingian authority. Since, after overthrowing the Frankish royal dynasty of the long-haired kings, the Carolingians did not have a tradition of legitimate kingship, they exploited all available means to bolster their newly-established authority. Although the Merovingians had used the liturgy to negotiate their authority in Frankish society, the Carolingians brought its use to such a high level that Mayke de Jong has argued that “the authority of this dynasty was founded on prayer as well as on military might.”

One particular case illustrates this point. In 783, a Frankish faction of monks inside the monastery San Vincenzo al Volturno accused the abbot Potho—a Lombard by origin who was probably hostile to Carolingian rule—of saying harsh words about Charlemagne and the Franks and refusing to join his monastic fellows during the office in praying for the safety and health of the Carolingian king, as was customary at the abbey. At Charlemagne’s command, Potho was brought before a papal court in Rome but the case was eventually dismissed by Pope Hadrian. As this incident demonstrates, the collective prayer for the

---


3 Mayke de Jong, “Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer,” 650. For the development of the liturgy of authority in the Merovingian period, see Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy*, 21–41; and idem, “The Christianization of Kingship,” in *Der Dynastiewechsel von 751: Vorgeschichte, Legitimationsstrategien und Erinnerung*, ed. Matthias Becher and Jörg Jarnut (Münster: Variorum, 2004), 163–77, at 169–74. However, Hen probably exaggerates the level of its development, arguing that, although the liturgy of authority was an inheritance of late antique and Byzantine traditions, only “the Merovingians harnessed those traditions and anchored them in a complex network of patronage, endowments and liturgical practice”; ibid., 41.

king was considered a specific ritual of loyalty to the distant ruler. The seriousness with which the case was handled suggests that something more general than a mere prayer was at stake; rather, participation in the rite signaled the acceptance or rejection of royal authority.

The prayer for the king in this case was set in a monastic context. This monastic connection may be seen already in 657, when the Merovingian Queen Balthild granted immunity to senior Merovingian basilicae in exchange for prayers for the king and peace. This Merovingian tradition was appropriated by Pippin the Short, who in 753 donated the tolls from the St. Denis fair to the monastery so that the monks would pray for him, his people, and the stability of the kingdom. In Charlemagne’s

---

5 McCormick, “The Liturgy of War,” 5, comes to a similar conclusion: “Clearly, in the closing years of the eighth century, at least some forms of prayer for the ruler were more than personal acts of dynastic or religious devotion. They were acts of loyalty to the monarch. Failure to perform them was grounds for an accusation of infidelitas.”

6 “...ut melius eis delectaret pro rege et pace summì regis Christì clementiam eorìderì,” Vita Sancti Balthildis, c. 9, in Fredegarii et aliorum chronica. Vitae sanctorum, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH, SRM, vol. 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1888), 494. There are a few cases of similar royal requests in Merovingian Gaul of the sixth and early seventh century. For details, see Eugen Ewig, “Gebetsklausel für König und Reich in den merovingischen Königsurkunden,” in Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters, ed. Helmut Maurer and Hans Patze (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1982), 87–99. For other Merovingian examples of the royal concern for prayers on their behalf, see Hen, The Royal Patronage of Liturgy, 38–9; and idem, “The Christianization of Kingship,” 170–2. A later royal charter given to the church of St. Medard of Soissons exemplifies the connection between the Merovingian and Carolingian traditions. In this charter, Charlemagne directly confirms the immunity, which “bona memoriae antecessor noster Clotharius” gave in the seventh century, so that to the monks “melius deteclct pro stabilitate regni nostri domini misericordiam attentìus deprecari,” Pipppini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher, MGH, Diplomata Karolinarum, vol. 1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1996), 108–9.

7 The formula used by Pippin was similar to that of Balthild: “ut eis melius detect pro stabilitate regni nostri vel pro cunctis leudis nostri domini misericordiam attentìus deprecare,” ibid., 10. Early Carolingians took over St. Denis as a special patron of the royal dynasty from the Merovingians, Brigitte Merta, “Politische Theorie in den
time, prayers for the king were expected from most monasteries in his realm. The conquest of the Lombard kingdom led to similar relations with the monasteries of northern and central Italy: in 775, the prayer was required from Farfa, and in 787 from Montecassino and San Vincenzo al Volturno. Thus, the monastic prayer for a ruler, originating from the close relations between a few prominent monasteries and the Frankish ruler on the basis of his donations, had become a required part of monastic routine expected at the majority of Carolingian abbeys.

(a) *In search of the Carolingian liturgy of authority*

Several major approaches have influenced historians dealing with royal liturgy in the Carolingian world. One approach centers on the coronation *ordines* (directions for the conduct of liturgical action) and is based on the assumption that coronation procedures played an important symbolic role in the legitimization of new authority. Starting in the 1930s, coronation *ordines* came under the scrutiny of Percy E. Schramm in his work on the medieval “ideas” of kingship and state.

Ernst Kantorowicz became the first scholar to bring the interest in royal liturgy into Anglophone academia. He stressed the close link between liturgy and Frankish politics:

...in Gaul, liturgy was subjected not only to the judgment of priest and bishop; it was in the last resort the business of the king. Ecclesiastical

---

Königsurkunden Pippins I,” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 100 (1992): 117–23. For Pippin’s similar requests to the abbeys of Fulda and Honau, see *Pippini, Carolomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, 17 and 30. For comments, see Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy*, 54–6. For the detailed analysis of the *Gebetsklausel* in the charters of Pippin the Short, see Merta, “Politische Theorie,” 117–32. Unlike Hen, she argues that the language of the *Gebetsklausel* used in the charters of Pippin the Short visibly changed compared to that of the Merovingians (131).

8 *Pippini, Carolomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, 142 and 211–6. San Vincenzo was granted immunity and the free elections of abbot, so that “eis melius delectet pro nobis uxoribusque nostris ac liberos vel cuncto populo nostro misericordiam dei attentius exorare,” ibid., 213. It is not known whether Charlemagne’s charters formulated a similar request to San Vincenzo before 783, because another charter to San Vincenzo, dated to 775, is considered false. Yet there is a possibility that the prayer for the Frankish king was expected from the community of San Vincenzo in 783 according to an earlier charter.

rites as well as ecclesiastical organization became political matters above all once the substance of kingship itself became churchified.\textsuperscript{10}

Kantorowicz called attention to one kind of litany (a sequence of short liturgical petitions) known as laudes in the Gallo-Roman Church. He argued that the developed form of the lauds, created in Gaul between 751 and 774, was hardly influenced by Rome.\textsuperscript{11} Furthermore, Kantorowicz underlined the importance of coronation and festival laudes for establishing authority. Through these acclamations, a ruler was recognized as the legal lord of the realm.\textsuperscript{12} Using the \textit{Ordines Romani} and the texts of royal litanies, Kantorowicz traced the development of royal lauds, arguing that a Franco-Roman imperial version first replaced the previous Gallo-Frankish one in 816 at the imperial coronation of Louis the Pious.\textsuperscript{13} He concluded that the Carolingian royal lauds were, in general, an indigenous product of Frankish soil.

Since the late 1950s, the prayers and formulas used in coronation masses have been studied in different ways in order to analyze the central political ideas of the early Middle Ages and contemporaneous concepts of kingship.\textsuperscript{14} Nevertheless, as stressed in recent literature,


\textsuperscript{11} The earliest manuscript with a laudes-text is dated to 783–92. See Kantorowicz, \textit{Laudes regiae}, 13–6 and 53–4. He concluded: “The most significant features of early Carolingian ruler worship were hardly borrowed from the Hellenistic-Roman model. The model which was consciously followed, in the eighth century, at least, was the image of the kings of the Old Testament, anointed chieftains of a tribe like the early Carolingians,” ibid., 62. His conclusions have been recently questioned by Mary Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne,” in \textit{The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages}, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 114–61, at 140–3. She argues: “The language of the royal laudes has little to do with Old Testament typology or the New Israel” (141).

\textsuperscript{12} Kantorowicz, \textit{Laudes regiae}, 76–7.

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 104–6.

the approach personified by Schramm and Kantorowicz has certain shortcomings, despite its brilliant insights into early medieval political culture. First, Koziol has pointed out that anointing and festal coronations were rare events hardly capable of influencing ordinary political behavior. Second, Mary Garrison has warned against a tendency visible in some studies of coronation texts “to conflate manuscript texts into ordines which may never have existed independently.” This warning reflects a modern historiographic tendency to study each early medieval liturgical text within its specific context.

Another approach to early medieval royal liturgy was promoted by Gerd Tellenbach in his highly influential article “Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in der Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters” (1935). He shared the interest of his epoch in medieval political ideas, but unlike Schramm, he called attention to another type of liturgical text that could be found in early medieval sacramentaries: books containing all of the orations needed by the minister for the eucharistic service. These included prayers and masses for emperors and kings, in times of both war and peace, and for the protection of the Christian people. He argued that the Roman imperial idea was christianized in late Roman political thought and thereafter strongly influenced early medieval liturgy. Although Roman liturgical language influenced Frankish liturgical texts, Roman prayers and masses were reinterpreted within the Carolingian royal liturgy. Their focus was shifted to the Christian imperial idea, the Christian people, and the gens Francorum who made up the core of that people. This transformation adjusted the conservative language of liturgy to new historical realities.

---

15 Koziol, Begging Pardon and Favor, 298–9.
19 Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church, 46 and 53, defines a similar idea in relation to an earlier reform in the Frankish church with the notion of gens Christiana.
Tellenbach’s masterful study was based on texts from nearly fifty sacramentaries and *ordines* from the seventh to the tenth century, and the appendix with the prayers he analyzed is still useful as a general overview of the topic.\(^{20}\) Even so, liturgical studies since the 1930s have corrected the dates of many sacramentaries that Tellenbach used in his study and brought to light new texts. In addition, the general framework of the Carolingian liturgical transformation used in his article has been revised in large part. Finally, he neglected to pay attention to the places in which the sacramentaries he employed in his analysis were produced. For Tellenbach, the Frankish world was a homogeneous unit, within which liturgical texts could be studied *en masse* as showing the Frankish perception of the Christian imperial idea. The same disregard to context is visible in Tellenbach’s appendix, in which texts are listed as separate prayers\(^{21}\) when, in fact, they are not! In sacramentaries, prayers can be found as particular parts of a specific mass and so must be studied within their liturgical context.

Overall, Tellenbach’s article has paved the way for a broader approach to the early medieval liturgy of authority. In Michael McCormick’s book on “triumphal rulership” (1986), the liturgy of war and victory became the focus of research. In particular, his study of Carolingian *profectio bellica* liturgies and those celebrating victory shows that they became a constant element of Frankish liturgy in the late eighth and ninth centuries.\(^{22}\) McCormick echoes Tellenbach by pointing to the continuity in the type of liturgy he assessed from the late Roman empire to the Carolingian world.\(^{23}\) Thus, his analysis comes to findings quite the opposite of those of Kantorowicz: the early Gallican prayers for royal victory ultimately derived from the liturgies of late antique and Byzantine Rome.

\(^{20}\) There are some errors in his article, which are difficult to avoid while working with such a number of texts. For instance, in the main text he refers to the Sacramentary of St. Denis as produced at the beginning of the ninth century (which is important for his argument), while in the attachment he dates the same manuscript to the middle of the ninth century, ibid., 364 and 388. On the same page of the main text (364), he refers in his argument to the formula *regnum aeterni evangelii*, while liturgical texts use the expressions *regni aeterni evangelium* or *regis aeterni evangelium* (395).

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 392–405.


\(^{23}\) “...the liturgy now served as the primary vehicle for obtaining and manifesting the king’s victory, completing a development begun under the Roman empire four centuries earlier,” ibid., 385.
The third approach to early medieval liturgy, exemplified in Anglophone scholarship by Rosamond McKitterick’s *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms* (1977), has become especially popular since the 1990s. It calls for more specialized studies on different kinds of liturgical texts (penitentiaries, homiliaries, lectionaries, sacramentaries, etc.) and their relationship to society, kingship, and politics. Among recent works examining liturgy as a source for social and political life, Yitzhak Hen’s studies have emphasized the significance of royal patronage in the development of Carolingian liturgy. He analyzes how Merovingian and Carolingian rulers supported the development of liturgy in their kingdoms and traces the development of liturgical court ceremonial and masses for kings and peace. He concludes that, although the Carolingians truly believed in the power of liturgy as the only way to communicate with God, at the same time, they “used the liturgy as a political means of royal propaganda.”

Through liturgy they disseminated political messages and ideology in an attempt to shape the “public opinion,” and this is precisely why they invested vast amounts of landed property and privileges in patronising liturgical activity throughout their kingdoms. In that way the Frankish kings and their advisers disseminated ideas of consensus, solidarity, peace and victory to their subjects, and consequently make their subjects personally involved in the welfare of the kingdom and its rulers.

Hen’s general approach to the study of the liturgy of authority is no doubt innovative, yet his arguments may be questioned at two points. First, Hen’s stress on propaganda draws too much attention to one side of liturgical communication, that is, to the dissemination of liturgical messages from the rulers to the subjects, and leaves aside the correcting...

---


26 Ibid., 151–2.
factor of a liturgical audience and its “horizon of expectations.” The second question is how to speak of political messages disseminated by the Carolingians through royal liturgy if none of these liturgical texts were written by them, but by intermediaries such as monastics and prelates who were both royal servants and interested parties.

By contrast, the present study treats liturgy, first and foremost, as means of symbolic communication, or as Janet Nelson brilliantly defines it, “communication, operating with faith through a symbolic code.” Seen from this perspective, the king’s involvement in liturgical activity was merely one of the communicative channels connecting him to God and his subjects among the clergy and laity. The increasing importance of this mode of communication in the course of the early Middle Ages led to the growing royal concern for liturgy in the Carolingian period; it also explains why the ruler had to participate in liturgical communication as much as he did via other indirect media or face-to-face activities. Therefore, it is hardly appropriate to reduce the variety of royal involvement in liturgy to the notion of royal patronage since the ruler was more than a patron of liturgy: he could participate by attending or processing or being named in prayers. Patronage was simply one of the means of royal participation. It is not accidental that most cases of royal involvement in liturgy, as studied by Hen, dealt with court ceremonial or masses for kings or the prosperity of the entire people and state; the Carolingian rulers were keen on those aspects of liturgy that were directly involved in the creation and maintenance of their authority.

Although the laudes regiae and other coronation or festal liturgical ceremonies were important in the creation of royal authority, they were...

---


28 In addition, Hen’s definition of the patronage of liturgy, which apparently becomes a leitmotif of his book, can also be critiqued as being too broad: “Patronage of culture did not necessarily involve commissioning particular objects or works. It could also be an encouraging, supporting or initiating force which gave rise to artistic and literary creativity. Thus, a ruler who created a political and cultural climate favourable to the arts might well be called a patron, even when no specific object or literary piece can be associated with him or her. Hence, a broader definition of patronage will be used in present study… Patronage is an investment, and people patronise because they expect a return, either spiritual or temporal,” Hen, _The Royal Patronage of Liturgy_, 17.

reserved for royal installation or the rare feasts celebrated in the largest
cathedrals of the Carolingian realm. The liturgy of war and victory was
performed throughout the kingdom, but it was by no means a regular
liturgical element.\(^{30}\) In other words, the lauds and coronation or “mili-
tary” prayers, albeit significant, were only the first liturgical step in the
creation of royal authority. The next step was the repetitive enactment
of a royal liturgy across a realm. Only such a regular “public” liturgy
was capable of making Carolingian authority a habitual phenomenon.
The masses and prayers for kings, brought to scholarly attention by
Tellenbach and recently analyzed by Hen, could have provided that
constant liturgical reinforcement and might therefore have played a
significant role in a repetitive liturgy of authority.\(^{31}\)

While calling the Carolingian liturgy of authority “public,” we have
to keep in mind that it was more restricted from the common people
than in late antiquity due to social divisions between the clergy and
laity, and the spatial divisions within a church between lay participants
in the nave and aisles and the performers of the liturgy at the high
altar or in the choir.\(^{32}\) In addition, Donald Bullough argues that “the
majority of western Europe’s Christian laity would in this period nor-
mally have worshipped, if anywhere, in rural churches.”\(^ {33}\) Worship in
rural or lesser churches was probably based on books like the Brussels
sacramentary, written in the Liège region around 800, which includes
a limited number of masses but not a royal mass.\(^ {34}\) This does not
mean, however, that any given rural church could not possess several
sacramentaries, one of which might have had the mass for kings.\(^ {35}\)

---

\(^{30}\) There are only three known cases when Charlemagne requested general liturgi-
cal services on behalf of his kingdom and his army, McCormick, “The Liturgy of
War,” 6–15.

\(^{31}\) See also Garrison, “The Missa pro principe,” 188–9.

\(^{32}\) Joseph A. Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum
1:82–6, especially at 83.

\(^{33}\) Donald Bullough, “The Carolingian Liturgical Experience,” in Continuity and Change

\(^{34}\) For details, see ibid, 48; and Hen, The Royal Patronage of Liturgy, 14.

\(^{35}\) The catalogue of Reichenau from the first half of the ninth century demonstrates that
every presbyter had his own sacramentary. These sacramentaries were probably
composed for the personal needs of their owners, having been personally ordered or
even copied by them: “Otfrid presbyter missale sibi scribi fecit . . . Ruadhelm presbyter
missale semiscriptum dimisit, quem Ruadhelm perscripsit et donavit,” Gustav Becker, ed.,
Catalogi bibliotecarum antiquae, vol. 1, Catalogi saeculo XIII vetustiores (Bonn: Cohen, 1885), 17.
For instance, the polyptych that describes the estates of the abbey of St. Remi at Rheims, composed in the mid-ninth century, names the Gregorian and Gelasian sacramentaries among the books of the local churches of the monastery. Another example is the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary of Rheinau, which was initially written for secular, non-episcopal, use around 800 and contains a mass for kings.36

There is additional evidence showing that on certain occasions, the mass for the ruler was probably performed in rural churches. The great church councils of 813, which took place in five different episcopal sees, directly ordered that masses for the sake of Charlemagne or his son Louis the Pious be performed by all bishops, priests, and monastic communities of the Carolingian realm.37 There is no conclusive evidence that the decisions of the church councils of 813 on royal masses affected rural churches, but they did not preclude this possibility. In 847, when the council of Mainz decreed that the mass for Louis the German and his family be celebrated by bishops, priests, abbots, and monks in singulis parrochiis, 3,500 masses were performed.38 At this council, twelve dioceses of the archbishopric of Mainz were represented, with about three hundred churches—rural churches were certainly among them—per diocese. But this liturgical performance was an exception and required a special order of the council. Thus, whether royal liturgy was performed in rural churches on a regular basis remains a question without an answer. Given this situation, I must be very cautious with the use of the term “public liturgy of authority,” as it certainly must be qualified. By this term, I mean the royal liturgy that was performed more-or-less regularly and publicly throughout the Carolingian realm—mainly in cathedral and monastic churches, and occasionally in rural or lesser

37 See, for example, the decision of the Council of Arles: “II cap. Ut pro excellentiissimo atque gloriosissimo domno nostro Karolo rege seu liberis eius omnes episcopi, presbyteri seu abbates et monachi in unum collecti, in quantum extremitas nostra praevalet, psalmodia, missarum sollemnia atque laetaniarum officia omnipotenti Deo devotissime exsolverent, decrevimus,” Consilium Arelatense (10–11 May 813), in Concilia Aevi Karolini I, ed. Albert Werminghoff, MGH, Legum Sectio III, Concilia, vol. 2,1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1906), 250.
churches—and was accessible to a much broader liturgical audience than were the royal litanies or coronation masses.

It is also necessary to remember that in the early Middle Ages the regular liturgy of royal/imperial authority, which was accessible to various layers of lay people, was not limited to royal masses. The passage from *The Book of Pontiffs* mentioned in the previous chapter indicates that the Roman people refused to bring the name of the usurper into the liturgy of mass, but it does not refer to a particular mass. It could well refer not only to a royal mass but also the practice of uttering a ruler’s name during mass in general. In fact, liturgical evidence suggests that a prayer for king became a part of the canon of the Roman mass in the late Roman and early Byzantine periods. In the late fourth century, Ambrose of Milan mentioned such prayers (*verbi and sermones*) in his sketch of the Roman Canon (*laus deo, defertur oratio, petitur pro populo, pro regibus, pro caeteris*). It is likely that in late antiquity, the names of rulers were mentioned in intercessory prayers within the Great Prayer, between its parts that became known in the Carolingian period as the *Te igitur* and *Memento*.

A passage from the *Capitulare ecclesiastice ordinis*, also known as *Ordo Romanus XV*, might point to a similar practice. This *Ordo*, assembled by a Gallic monk in the years between 775 and 780, describes a canon of the Roman mass similar to those that were included in most sacramentaries copied in the Carolingian period. Among other things, this text describes liturgical petitions comparable to those mentioned by Ambrose:

---

39 “...nec suum nomen ad missarum solemnia proferebatur,” *Liber pontificalis*, 1:392.


On Sunday, the deeds of the dead are not celebrated, nor are their names recited at mass, but only the names of living kings, princes or priests; or offerings and prayers are rendered for the entire Christian people.”

Although the main objective of this passage is to stress that the dead are not to be commemorated on Sunday, it demonstrates that a ruler’s name could be invoked at mass, Sunday mass in particular. These Sunday masses, as well as those celebrated at other solemn occasions, were public masses, at which lay attendance was expected. Consequently, they were supposed to be conducted publicly in major cathedrals, small chapels, or monasteries. Although the precise liturgical contexts in the above-mentioned cases are not clear, it is very plausible that the names of Byzantine emperors were still included in Rome as part of the intercessory prayers in the canon of the Roman mass in the early eighth century, and it was this tradition that appeared later in *Ordo Romanus* XV. Even though this practice must have been interrupted during the first half of the eighth century as imperial authority gradually faded in Rome, two early Carolingian sacramentaries preserve evidence confirming the existence of such earlier practice.

Two main sacramentary traditions existed in the Carolingian world. The earliest one is the tradition of a Roman presbyteral liturgy preserved

---


46 The tradition of such intercessory prayers including Christian rulers was preserved in the Good Friday Mass. Some early Carolingian sacramentaries ascribed this mass to the liturgy of Jerusalem, which might have explained the peculiarity of such practice; see, for instance, *Sacramentarium Rhenanum*, ed. Anton Hänggi and Alfons Schönherr, Spicilegium Friburgense, no. 15 (Fribourg: Universitätverlag, 1970), 126–8: “Feria VI maiore: Orationes quae dicendae sunt mane in Hierusalem”; and *Liber Sacramentorum Augustodunensis*, ed. Odilo Heiming, CCSL, vol. 159B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1984), 59–61: “Orationes quae dicendae sunt VI Feria Maiore mane in Hierusalem.”

47 For the purpose of this study, I do not need to rehearse all of the details of the sacramentary development in this period; I will avoid special terms such as the *Gelasianum mixtum*, Gregorian of type I or Gregorian of type II, which are used by many liturgists, for two main reasons: there is no scholarly agreement on their usage, and
in the Gelasian and Frankish Gelasian Sacramentaries (the latter are also called Gelasians of the Eighth Century); its attested forms in Frankish Gaul present a mixture of both Roman and Gallican liturgical elements.\textsuperscript{48} The first manuscript that bears witness to this tradition was produced in the middle of the eighth century, and it is represented by many copies of the late eighth century.\textsuperscript{49} The Gregorian sacramentaries belong to a second tradition, that of the Roman papal liturgy; the exemplar was brought into the Carolingian world from papal Rome at the turn of the ninth century. During the course of the ninth century, Gregorian sacramentaries became more widespread than sacramentaries of the Gelasian tradition;\textsuperscript{50} during the ninth century, especially the first half, however, these two sacramentary traditions co-existed in Carolingian libraries. From the mid-ninth century, mixed types of sacramentaries combining elements of both traditions appeared as well.

Two Gelasian sacramentaries produced in Frankish Gaul in the eighth century attest to the earlier tradition of imperial intercessory prayers. The first manuscript is the so-called Vatican Sacramentary (also known as the Old Gelasian Sacramentary), which was copied around 750 in a Frankish nunnery in Neustria (Jouarre or its daughter house, Chelles).\textsuperscript{51} The canon of the mass in this sacramentary has an addition between

\begin{itemize}
  \item these terms are not very important for the study of the masses discussed here and their development.
  \item For a brief discussion of the Gelasian Sacramentary with all references, see Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, 42–8. The historiography of this Frankish Gelasian tradition is discussed in Bernard Moreton, The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary: A Study in Tradition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 1–19. For the description of the manuscripts belonging to this tradition, see ibid., 175–205; and Emmanuel Bourque, Étude sur les sacramentaires romains, vol. 2,1, Le gélasian du VIIIe siècle (Quebec: Laval, 1952), 32–251.
\end{itemize}
the *Te igitur* and *Memento*, written with Tironian notes.\textsuperscript{52} This text comes after prayers on behalf of the pope and the bishop concluding the *Te igitur*; the second part of this note contains an intercessory prayer for a king and the entire people: “God, *memento* our king and the entire people.”\textsuperscript{53} Thus, this passage in Tironian notes makes the text of intercessory prayers in the canon of the mass strikingly similar to the passage from *Ordo Romanus XV* analyzed above. The fact that the reference to the king was written in Tironian notes may suggest that this passage was copied from the original, but it was not intended for liturgical practice. In fact, this reference to a king was almost never copied in later Gelasian sacramentaries; the Sacramentary of Angoulême, written c. 800, seems to be the only exception. The canon of the mass in this sacramentary has an extra sentence at the beginning of the *Memento*: “O Lord, *memento* your servant, our king *N.*”\textsuperscript{54} Unlike most surviving Gelasian sacramentaries that were used in a monastic context, the Sacramentary of Angoulême was produced for episcopal use at the cathedral of Angoulême;\textsuperscript{55} thus, the intercessory eucharistic prayer on behalf of the king (probably Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine at the time when the sacramentary was written) was performed in front of a wider, lay audience.\textsuperscript{56}

Yet this practice is not attested to in other liturgical materials produced in the early Carolingian realm. As I discuss later in this chapter, there is also no mention of kings or emperors in the canon of the mass in the Gregorian Sacramentary, which arrived from Rome in Gaul at the beginning of the ninth century. The naming of Frankish kings was added to the canon of the mass in Carolingian liturgical manuscripts only half a century later. Hence, the early Carolingian liturgy of authority was limited to two major components: first, Carolingian monks

\textsuperscript{52} In the Merovingian and Carolingian periods, the use and knowledge of these notes was especially widespread in Neustria. For details, see Martin Hellmann, *Tironische Noten in der Karolingerzeit am Beispiel eines Perseus-Kommentars aus der Schule von Tours*, MGH, Studien und Texte, no. 27 (Hanover: Hahn, 2000), 21.


\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., XII–XIV.

\textsuperscript{56} It could be performed silently; see below n. 115.
continued the late Merovingian tradition of prayers and other liturgical actions on behalf of a ruler during the office, as the case of Potho demonstrates. Second, a special royal mass could have been performed on behalf of a ruler. The latter case is more traceable in the liturgical evidence, since early Carolingian liturgical manuscripts contain a royal votive mass, which might have been performed in public: *The Mass for Kings* (*Missae pro regibus*). The copyist of *Ordo Romanus XV* could have been thinking of this contemporary royal mass when he mentioned that the names of kings could be recited at mass on Sunday.

(b) *The Gelasian* Mass for Kings (*Missae pro regibus*) and its early Carolingian audiences (c. 750–800)

The orations of this mass were preserved in the vast majority of Gelasian sacramentaries. The earliest manuscript of this tradition is the Vatican Sacramentary, mentioned above. Its sources are the subject of a long debate that is of only minor importance for the present study. What is significant here is that this sacramentary contains the earliest liturgical text with the above-mentioned royal votive mass, *The Mass for Kings*, which was copied in many Carolingian sacramentaries (app. 2). Although Hen cites it as an example of the Merovingian masses for kings, I reiterate here an argument to the contrary advanced by Antoine Chavasse in 1958. He proposed that the text was created for the Sunday mass conducted by Pope Vitalian with the assistance of Emperor

---


58 Ibid., 39–40.
Constance in St. Peter’s on July 9, 663. By this date, Constance’s three sons had been crowned as co-emperors, which agrees with the use of the plural forms *regibus nostris, principes,* and *principibus nostribus* in the Collects and Postcommunion of the mass, and with the singular form *famuli tui* in the Secret and *Infra actionem* since there was only one emperor offering his personal oblation at the mass.\(^5\) Thus, as Chavasse argued, this mass was created in accordance with the particular situation of 663, and it combined among other elements the passages taken from the Verona collection of masses known as the Leonine Sacramentary,\(^6\) and from the Old Gelasian masses *tempore belli,* which were formulated in Roman Italy (app. 1).\(^6\)

Although Chavasse’s concrete attribution of *The Mass for Kings* to a particular liturgical event in Rome may be questioned, the text of the mass provides further evidence in favor of a Roman origin. It has been widely accepted that one of the major features of the Merovingian liturgy were the metaphors and biblical allusions that filled its prayers. It was also more rhetorical and effusive than the relatively sober Roman liturgical texts.\(^6\) Such sobriety is exactly what distinguishes the Gelasian

---

\(^5\) The use of the appellation *rege nostri* in relation to Byzantine emperors was not exceptional if we keep in mind that in imperial liturgy emperors were equated with the kings of the Old Testament. The above-mentioned passage from Ambrose of Milan corroborates this point; see n. 40. In addition, the title *rex* could be the translation of an imperial title in Greek, namely, βασιλεὺς; for details, see Gerhart B. Ladner, “The ‘Portraits’ of Emperors in Southern Italian *Exultet* Rolls and the Liturgical Commemoration of the Emperor,” in *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages: Selected Studies in History and Art,* vol. 1 (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1983), 309–36, at 321. He argued that the liturgical plural forms such as *regibus* derive from an older tradition (322).


\(^6\) Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien,* 510–14. Except in Hen’s work, the Roman origin of this mass has not been drawn into doubt in contemporary historiography. The Roman origin of this mass is also supported by the fact that the Pre-Carolingian Gallican mass books such as the Bobbio Missal or the *Missale Francorum* did not contain the *Missa pro regibus* of the Gelasian tradition. See for references Emmanuel Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains,* vol. 2,2, *Le sacramentaire d’Hadrien, le supplément d’Alcuin et les grégoriens mixtes* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1958), 393–6, and Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy,* 108 and 323–4. The *Missale Francorum,* written in the first half of the eighth century, has the *Orationes et preces pro regibus.* None of them echoes the mass for kings of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary; see L. Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Missale Francorum (Cod. Vat. Reg. Lat.257),* Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes II (Rome: Herder, 1957), 20–1. On the Bobbio Missal, see below.

royal mass from another contemporary mass for the ruler, the Missa pro principe in the Bobbio Missal, which has been firmly set in the context of the Gallican liturgy and might have been produced in Bavaria. The text of the Gelasian Mass for Kings (app. 2) is precise and straightforward, containing only a hidden allusion to the Old Testament (Prov. 21.1), while the mass in the Bobbio Missal is replete with references to biblical personages. The latter beseeches God on behalf of a ruler imitating the kings of the Old Testament. The Gelasian mass, in contrast, centers on the Roman empire, which was created to spread Christianity, and on its rulers—who are called kings as their biblical predecessors, who govern by divine disposition, and in whom the power of empire is invested. These stylistic considerations corroborate Chavasse’s attribution of this mass to Rome. Hence, the refusal of the Roman people in 711 to include the name of Philippicus in the liturgy of mass might have referred to the Gelasian mass, among other liturgical acts.

The royal mass of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary was transmitted to the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary (or Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century), assembled in the 760s and 770s, perhaps in the monastery of Flavigny in Burgundy. Some scholars have suggested that the composition of this sacramentary was connected to Chrodegang of Metz, the uncle and ecclesiastical advisor of Pippin the Short, and his efforts to “romanize” the Frankish liturgy. This sacramentary was later copied in Carolingian Gaul and other territories under Frankish control such as Alemannia and Rhaetia. Three facts related to this sacramentary deserve mention. First, as all liturgists agree, the Frankish


64 This is accepted by the majority of scholars, despite Klaus Gamber’s argument in favor of a Ravennate origin. In his opinion, the Gelasianum mixtum, as he called the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary, existed already around 700; Klaus Gamber, “Die ältesten Messformulare für Mariä Verkündigung: Ein kleines Kapitel frühmittelalterlicher Sakramentargeschichte,” in Sacramentorum: Weitere Studien zur Geschichte des Messbuches und der frühen Liturgie, Studia Patristica et Liturgica, no. 13 (Regensburg: Pustet, 1984), 70–1. Moreton, The Eighth-Century Gelasian, 173, suggests a place in the Rhaetian Alps.

65 For details and references, see Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church, 268–9. Chrodegang is known to have created stational churches in Metz in imitation of Rome. A modified Gelasian sacramentary, linked to the stational liturgy of Rome, would have been very useful for such a reform. See Bouley, From Freedom to Formula, 193, n. 145.
Gelasian sacramentaries have a “Benedictine flavor” (this points again to Chrodegang and his efforts to disseminate the Rule of Benedict) and include masses that were celebrated, first and foremost, in monasteries. Next, the sacramentary had a mixed character derived from a blending of Roman and Gallican elements. Finally, The Mass for Kings was the only royal mass included in the Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries; the royal masses from older Gallican sacramentaries were no longer copied. That choice no doubt owed to its Roman origin. As we have seen, the Ordo Romanus XV, composed by a Carolingian monk at approximately the same time as the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary, demonstrated a similar predilection for the Roman liturgy. Thus, the rapid dissemination of the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary with its Mass for Kings was due to a large extent to the reputation of its Roman liturgical source and its adaptation to Frankish use.

The Mass for Kings is preserved in the early Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries, produced around 790–800, but their texts deviate slightly from the Old Gelasian original deriving from Rome (app. 2). Besides having different spellings, two expressions from the original, Romana libertas (Roman liberty) and Romanum imperium (the Roman empire), underwent great changes. The traditional method of liturgists, borrowed from diplomatic studies (Diplomforschung), traces these changes in terms

---

66 On this aspect, see Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church, 114–65.  
67 On the monastic connection of the Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries and their mixed nature, see McKitterick, The Frankish Church, 125–8.  
68 The rapid dissemination of the Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries raises a question about the royal involvement in this process and the general issue of Frankish liturgical reforms. In short, Cyrille Vogel argued that liturgical reforms were promoted by Carolingian kings, beginning with Pippin the Short and intensifying under Charlemagne; Cyrille Vogel, “La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne,” in Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben, vol. 2, Das geistige Leben, ed. Bernard Bischoff (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1965), 217–32; and idem, “Les motifs de la romanisation du culte sous Pépin le Bref (751–768) et Charlemagne (774–814),” in Culto cristiano, politica imperiale carolingia, Congrégazioni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale, vol. 18 (Todi: Presso l’Accademia tudertina, 1979), 13–41. In contrast, Hen, The Royal Patronage of Liturgy, 44–95, has argued that there was no liturgical reform in the reign of Pippin the Short, and that Charlemagne’s liturgical reform was very limited in its scope. Overall, most works in English-language historiography have downplayed the role of Carolingian kings and emphasized the impact of individual clerics in liturgical changes in the second half of the eighth century. See especially McKitterick, The Frankish Church, 118–24; and Frederick S. Paxton, Christianizing Death: The Creation of the Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 92–4. In the same vein, Claussen recently pointed out that the first efforts to romanize the Frankish liturgy were carried out by powerful bishops such Chrodegang, but these efforts did not aim to obliterate local liturgical traditions. See his The Reform of the Frankish Church, 267–70.
of different prototypes, borrowings, and amplifications; when the connection between two formulas is not direct, missing intermediaries are introduced to fill the “genealogical” stemma of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{69} This approach does not, however, take into account the role of the audiences of liturgical texts or the adjustability of liturgical texts to the contexts in which they are used.

The issue of a liturgical audience was addressed by Tellenbach in his analysis of the changes that occurred in early medieval royal prayers. On the one hand, he acknowledged \textit{das Konservatismus der Liturgie}, that is, the persistence of formulaic language in a liturgical text, which accounted for the repeated use of the above-mentioned and similar Roman formulas in a Carolingian context.\textsuperscript{70} On the other hand, he emphasized that in many cases, corrections were introduced to such formulas to accommodate real power relations and make those prayers meaningful to the liturgical communities in which they were performed.\textsuperscript{71}

Thus, to fulfill its communicative function, the liturgical text of authority had to be relevant to its contemporary context because the audience of the mass had its own “horizon of expectations.” In other words, the audience had in mind its own “ideal” liturgical text. Any discrepancy between a liturgical text and its audience’s expectations therefore caused tension, as it did between the Old Gelasian text of \textit{The Mass for Kings} originally intended for a Roman audience and its new Christian Frankish audience. This tension was resolved through certain corrections to the liturgical text that might have been made at the time at which the liturgical text was copied or that could have been added later by another scribe.

The Sacramentary of Chelles, produced at St. Amand around 855, presents an excellent example of how such corrections adjusting liturgical texts to their new contexts occurred. The final part of the \textit{Exultet} (the Holy Saturday blessing of the candle), which starts the first Supplement to the Gregorian sacramentary, originally implored the Lord for the sake of only clerics and the people, together with the pope.\textsuperscript{72}

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{69} For the criticism of this method, see Bouman, \textit{Sacring and Crowning}, 55–8.
\bibitem{70} Tellenbach, “Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke,” 349–56, especially at 356.
\bibitem{71} “Ich halte es vielmehr für gewiß, daß sie durch Korrekturen trotz Beibehaltung des echten Textes solche Gebete für ihre Gemeinden sinnvoll machen und den realen Verhältnissen anpassen wollten,” ibid., 371.
\bibitem{72} “Precamur ergo te domine, ut nos famulos tuos omnem clerum et devotissimum populum, una cum papa nostro beatissimo illo, quiete temporum concessa, in his
\end{thebibliography}
To this passage, a second hand added a phrase in the margins, which was supposed to be read after evoking a pope: “and our most glorious king N. and his most noble offspring” (et glorióssimo rege nostro illo eiusque nobilissima prole). The same changes appear in the Sacramentary of Paris, produced in the Paris region for Notre Dame de Paris around 855. At the same place, a corrector added “et piissimo imperatore nostro illo eiusque nobilissima prole” (and with our most pious emperor and his most noble offspring), but later the word rege was written above, replacing imperatore. Similar two-step metamorphoses, but altering the anonymous illo referring to a pope, occurred in the Sacramentarium Reginensis 337, copied at Lyons around 835: initially, the name Nicholao was written above it, but later, probably after the death of Nicholas I (858–867), his name was erased and substituted with Adriano, referring to Pope Hadrian II (868–872).

The text of The Mass for Kings in the second Sacramentary of Verona, copied from the first Sacramentary of Verona in the mid-ninth century, presents another example of how a liturgical text was updated in this period. The traditional text of the first Collect contains the clause “da servis tuis regibus nostris illis triumphum virtutis tuae scierere” (app. 2). The first scribe copied the beginning of the clause “da servis tuis,” but then he wrote “imperatori nostro il.” implying Lothar I or Louis II. Because of this unanticipated change, he had to correct the beginning of the clause from the plural to the singular form “da servo tuo.” Probably in the late ninth century, a second scribe wrote the word regi over imperatori, but it was not a final correction. In the tenth century, a third scribe added the names “Berengari et Adelb[er]ti r.” over the pronoun il. (illis), probably referring to Berengar II of Italy and his son, Adalbert.

These examples demonstrate that an active liturgical text in the Carolingian period was not unalterable with fixed formulas; rather, it was open to minor changes and corrections necessary to adapt it to a new historical context. Moreover, to fulfill its communicative function, the liturgical text of authority had to be relevant not only to the contemporary context but also to the expectations of its local audience.
From a semiotic perspective, a discrepancy between the liturgical text and its evolving audience would inevitably have caused tension, and such tension could have been resolved only through corrections to that text. It was precisely such a discrepancy that existed in the case of the Old Gelasian text of *The Mass for Kings* originally intended for a Roman audience but addressing new audiences in the early Carolingian liturgy. The texts of this mass surviving from the turn of the ninth century reveal the process by which they were adapted to their liturgical audiences. Who was behind these corrections, whether it was a scribe, the master of a scriptorium, or the leader of a religious community, is of less importance because those amendments did not bear a personal character. It is necessary to add a *caveat* at this point, however, that Carolingian audiences were not as homogeneous as Tellenbach assumed.

The key passages corrected most frequently are the beginning of the first Collect, “O God, protector of all kingdoms and, above all, of the Roman Empire” (*Deus, regnorum omnium et Romani maxime protector imperii*), and the final part of the Secret (the offertory prayer or *Super oblata*) addressing God with the phrase, “secure Roman liberty may serve you” (*secura tibi serviat Romana libertas*) (app. 2 and 4). The Frankish Gelasian Sacramentaries show that these passages, created in a Roman context, came under “pressure” with some liturgical audiences in Gaul in the 790s and around the year 800.75 After all, the abstract notions of Roman liberty and the Roman empire were not always comprehensible to liturgical audiences. Only the earliest sacramentary, the Sacramentary of Prague produced in Bavaria before 794, kept these Old Gelasian formulas intact.76 The later sacramentaries produced in the Frankish realm resolved this tension through the visible transformation of one or both passages.

In the second passage, the later sacramentaries speak not simply of Roman liberty, but also of the liberty of the Christians. This addition agrees perfectly with the Christianizing efforts of Charlemagne’s court, but corrections to the first passage indicate that some liturgical audiences saw the world in different terms: the peoples (*gentes*) were

---

75 Tellenbach, “Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke,” 359–61, connected these changes to the liturgical reform of Pippin the Short. He also thought that the Sacramentary of Gellone, which expresses these changes most clearly, was produced in the third quarter of the eighth century. However, this sacramentary has been re-dated more recently to the 790s.

the basic elements of their socio-political worldview. The Phillipps Sacramentary, produced in Burgundy, where the Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary might have been assembled, still mentions the Roman empire. But the Sacramentary of Gellone, written in Neustria, changed the expression *Romani imperii* (of the Roman empire) to *Romanorum imperii* (of the empire of the Romans)—at that time referring to the Byzantine empire—thus making the Romans the *gens* constituting the empire. The same passage in the Sacramentary of Angoulême, written in Aquitaine, mentions *Romani Francorumque imperii* (the empire, Roman and of the Franks), thus equating the power of the Frankish *gens* to that of the Roman empire.

The historical context in which the Sacramentary of Angoulême was created explains why the reference to Franks was added there. The Astronomer writes that when Louis was made king of Aquitaine in 781, Charlemagne appointed to Aquitaine many abbots, counts, and lower officers (*vassi* ex gente Francorum, entrusting that kingdom to their care. This remark suggests that newcomers from the north took many administrative and ecclesiastical positions in the newly-created kingdom. Hence, Frankishness became especially important in defining aristocratic identity in early Carolingian Aquitaine and might have appealed to the members of local elites joining aristocratic ranks.

The same emphasis on the *gens* is visible in an oration of *The Good Friday Mass* (app. 4). The Vatican Sacramentary presents the original Old Gelasian form with evident Frankish additions, which points to changing needs of a liturgical audience in Gaul as early as the mid-eighth century:

> O almighty everlasting God, who rule over all kingdoms with eternal power, look propitiously and favorably towards the empire, Roman or

---


78 *Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis*, ed. Saint-Roch, 359. It is worthwhile mentioning that the Sacramentary of Angoulême also changed the original gerundive construction *praedicando evangelio* to the gerundium *praedicando* and the noun *evangelium* in the accusative so that the following adjective *Romanum* may be seen as defining this noun (*evangelium Romanum*) instead of the noun following it (*imperium*) (app. 3A).

of the Franks, so that the peoples (gentes) which persist in their savagery may be suppressed by the might of your rightful hand.\textsuperscript{80}

Only the Sacramentary of Angoulême copied this oration without any changes. The Sacramentary of Prague, written in Bavaria—the region that was hostile to Frankish supremacy in the time of Duke Tassilo—omits the Franks altogether.\textsuperscript{81} Other sacramentaries replaced the expression Romanum sive Francorum imperium with ones that name not only the Franks but also the Romans as imperial gentes: Romanorum atque Francorum imperium, Romanorum sive Francorum imperium, or Romanorum imperium.\textsuperscript{82} The most important point demonstrated by the different versions of this mass is that at the turn of the ninth century, the expectations of the mass’ audiences in Neustria, Aquitaine, and even Burgundy still affected the text. The old notion of the Roman empire was replaced with a contemporary one in which empires, as much as kingdoms, needed constituting gentes. The Sacramentary of Gellone, which originated from and was adapted for use in Neustria, most clearly demonstrates the approach, and it also brings radical innovations to The Good Friday Mass: after the prayer for the empire of the Romans and Franks, it introduces two new prayers for a king of the Franks (pro christianissimo rege Francorum) and the kingdom of the Franks (Francorum regnum).\textsuperscript{84} It is impossible to determine who was the author of these prayers, but it

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{80} My translation from Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae, ed. Mohlberg, 66: “Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui regnis omnibus aeterna potestate dominaris, respic propicius ad Romanum sive Francorum benignus imperium, ut gentes quae in sua feritate confidunt dexterae tuae potentia comprimantur. Per.”
\item \textsuperscript{81} Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis, ed. Saint-Roch, 93; and Das Prager Sakramentar, ed. Dold and Eizenhöfer, 52*.
\item \textsuperscript{82} Liber Sacramentorum Augustodunensis, ed. Heiming, 60; Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis, ed. Dumas and Deshusses, B:88; and Sacramentarium Rhenaugense, ed. Hänggi and Schönherr, 127.
\item \textsuperscript{83} As McKitterick, “Nuns’ Scriptoria,” 22, states, the Sacramentary of Gellone was “adapted for use in the diocese of Meaux.” Among other examples of such an approach in the sacramentary, Tellenbach, “Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke,” 406–9, listed the Missa in profectionem hostium contibus in prohelium, which combines short Roman orations with long bombastic Gallican prayers. The latter used metaphors of the Old Testament and mentioned Francorum gentem and Francorum regis.
\item \textsuperscript{84} Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis, ed. Dumas and Deshusses, B:88–9: Oremus dilectissimi nobis et pro Christianissimo rege Francorum, ut deus et dominus noster Jesus Christus dit illi ea sapere que tibi placita sunt, adque contra inimicos sanctae catholicae et apostolice ecclesiae triumphum largiatur victoriae. Omnipotens deus, in cuius manu cor regis geritur, direge Francorum regnum in tua voluntate, adque contra propterviam inimicorum sanctae catholicae et apostolicae ecclesiae dextere tuae iuvamina illi largiari.
is likely that this person included them in *The Good Friday Mass* due to the expectations of a Frankish lay audience.\textsuperscript{85}

 Corrections to the key phrases in the three analyzed passages (app. 4) depended not only on the region in which a sacramentary was copied, but also on the liturgical context of a particular eucharistic prayer. The corrections with respect to the *gentes* pointing to the “horizon of expectations”\textsuperscript{85} of liturgical audiences in Gaul did not affect the Secret or *Super oblata* prayer with its formula *Romana* and/or *Christianorum libertas*. This prayer was called *Secreta* (the Secret) in most Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries, a change that reflected the peculiarity of the contemporary liturgy in Gaul, in which the priest performed the Secret either in a low voice or silently.\textsuperscript{86} This means that, unlike in Rome, liturgical audiences in Gaul did not hear this prayer, and, hence, it was less in need of corrections directed at lay interests or status. In contrast, the Collect with the formula *Romani imperii* was heard by liturgical participants, and this expression was corrected in the sacramentaries produced in Neustria and Aquitaine; nonetheless, it is difficult to judge whether these participants were monks or laymen, or both. The sacramentary produced in Aquitaine, for instance, was used for the episcopal liturgy at the cathedral of Angoulême, and so its prayers were addressed to laymen and clerics. Finally, *The Good Friday Mass* was one of the most solemn events of the liturgical year, in which the participation of the laity, especially lay aristocrats, was expected. Therefore, it is not surprising that it was this mass that experienced corrections as early as the mid-eighth century and kept them in most surviving copies. It was precisely because of a lay audience, and perhaps an aristocratic one, that its prayer asked God to “look propitiously and favorably towards the empire” of the Romans and/or the Franks.

\textsuperscript{85} This sacramentary demonstrates very careless copying of *The Mass for Kings* (app. 2). The copyist appears to have had little respect for the original, partly because of his poor Latin: he often changed the case endings and replaced words, sometimes resulting in changes to the original meaning. The most striking example of these modifications is the ending of the *Infra actionem* prayer, in which the wish is expressed that a king may be blessed with age and kingdom (*aevo augeatur et regno*). The anonymous scribe replaced *aevo* with *tuo* and made the meaning of the whole phrase more elusive. For the detailed description of the manuscript, see ibid., A:VII–XXXIV. These problems with Latin, together with the introduction of significant corrections, permit the suggestion that the copyist was quite close to a less-educated Frankish audience and mirrored its expectations of the liturgical text.

Only from the first decade of the ninth century did references to \textit{gentes} gradually disappear from the Frankish liturgical tradition in favor of a more coherent Christian discourse. This tendency is illustrated by corrections to the above-mentioned oration of \textit{The Good Friday Mass} in the first Sacramentary of St. Gall, written in Rhaetia in the late eighth century. The original version replaced the Gelasian formula \textit{Romanum imperium} (the Roman empire) with \textit{Romanorum imperium} (the empire of the Romans), but later, probably in the early ninth century, another scribe corrected the original form to \textit{Christianorum imperii} (the empire of the Christians). This correction mirrored a new tendency in the Carolingian liturgical language of the early ninth century, in which the Roman empire—after being transformed into the empire of the Romans, or of the Romans and the Franks—was gradually replaced by the empire of the Christians.\footnote{Das fränkische Sacramentarium gelasianum im alamannischer Überlieferung (Codex Sangall. No. 348), ed. L. Cunibert Mohlberg, 3d ed. (Münster: Aschendorff, 1971), 177–8.}

\(\text{(c)}\) \textit{The royal masses of Benedict of Aniane and The Everyday Mass for a King (Missa cotidiana pro rege)}

The early ninth century witnessed considerable changes in the Frankish liturgy of authority. Between 791 and 810, the Gregorian Sacramentary—which was viewed in Francia as a more authentic Roman text—was brought by order of Charlemagne from Rome to Gaul, and the first surviving Frankish manuscript that belongs to this tradition, the Sacramentary of Hildoard, was written in 811–812.\footnote{For a traditional view on the spread of the Gregorian sacramentaries in the Carolingian state, see Emmanuel Bourque, \textit{Étude sur les sacramentaires romains}, vol. 2,2, \textit{Le sacramentaire d’Hadrien}, 75–146.} The Gregorian Sacramentary sent from Rome had basic temporal and sanctoral cycles of masses—that is masses arranged around an annual liturgical cycle and saints’ feasts—but few ferial masses and no votive masses at all. The latter had meanwhile become established parts of Frankish liturgical practice and included among other things a royal mass. This created the need for a supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary, which was composed in the early ninth century.

Until the 1970s, the traditional view, most typically expressed by Emmanuel Bourque, was that the author of that supplement was...
Alcuin. Yet in the late 1960s, Jean Deshusses undermined the main arguments of this hypothesis and presented solid evidence to support the theory that the Supplement was composed in Septimania between 810 and 815 by Benedict of Aniane, the religious advisor of King Louis the Pious in Aquitaine. Deshusses’ theory, accepted by contemporary liturgists, is that Alcuin composed another missal, different from the Supplement, and that there was no centralized dissemination of the Gregorian sacramentaries from the court of Charlemagne. By contrast, King Louis with the assistance of Benedict of Aniane undertook a monastic reform in his kingdom of Aquitaine. As part of these reforming efforts, Benedict might have composed his Supplement based on the Frankish Gelasian tradition and added it to the Gregorian Sacramentary. The first copies of the new Gregorian Sacramentary

89 In Bourque’s opinion, ibid., 147–73, especially at 173, Alcuin compiled the Supplement in the last three years of his life between 801 and 804.


91 On the connection of Benedict of Aniane with the court of Louis the Pious, see Depreux, Prosopographie de l’entourage, 123–30.

92 DéCréaux argues that Benedict of Aniane only started compiling the Supplement; after his death in 821, the work was finished by his pupil Helisachar: “Ainsi Hélisachar, auteur de la préface Hucusque, est-il encore le compilateur de l’entier Grégorien supplé- menté. Celui-ci mérite donc bien le nom de sacramentaire Hucusque, voire, en raison de cette préface, le nom d’Hélisachar,” DéCréaux, ed., Le sacramentaire de Marmoutier, 232. In his opinion, the Sacramentary of Reginensis 337, written in l’Ile-Barbe in 835–836 before his death, presents the final version of the Supplement. No matter when the Supplement was composed, the royal masses included in it most likely were composed between c. 810 and c. 815. The Libellus missae of Gellone and the fragment, published by Gamber, with royal masses identical to those in the Supplement are the key evidence in dating. The Libellus, composed in the monastery of St. Savior in Gellone around the year 810, has a Missa pro regibus similar to that in the Gelasian sacramentaries of the late eighth and early ninth century; Robert Amiet, “Le plus ancien témoin du supplément d’Alcuin: Le missel ‘Excarpus’ composé à Gellone vers 810,” Ephemerides Liturgicae 72 (1958): 97–9 and 106–7. The fact that it was copied in Aquitaine (the region where the Supplement was composed) suggests that Benedict of Aniane corrected this mass after c. 810. In contrast, the fragment published by Klaus Gamber, “Der fränkische Anhang zum Gregorianum im Licht eines Fragments aus dem Anfang des 9. Jh.,” Sanctis erudiri 21
with the Supplement were therefore made in the monasteries affiliated with Benedict of Aniane in Southern Gaul. On the whole, the Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries considerably outnumbered the Gregorian ones in Gaul in the first third of the ninth century. For instance, the catalogue of the library of St. Riquier, ordered in 831, mentions nineteen Gelasians and only three Gregorians.

For his Supplement, Benedict of Aniane corrected *The Mass for Kings* of the Gelasian tradition (app. 3a). Among other corrections, he introduced important changes to the two passages that caused tension in the 790s: the new edition of the mass mentions *Christiana libertas* (Christian liberty) and asks the Lord to protect neither a Frankish nor Roman empire but the *Christianum imperium* (Christian empire). Thus, the gentes constituting the empire in the Frankish Gelasian version are omitted in the Gregorian version of the mass. According to its liturgical formulas, peoples in the Carolingian empire were united as Christians, and not as Franks or Romans—this was the unifying motto. This change allowed subjects to pray for their imperial ruler wherever they lived as long as they were Christians. The modified version thus created an easily conceivable divine social order: God—the Christian ruler—the people living in the Christian empire. This was the message that Benedict of Aniane sent to different audiences in the Carolingian realm. His vision of a new Christian unity was also shared by some members of the clerical elite, as demonstrated by one of the letters written in 817 by Agobard, bishop of Lyons. In this letter, Agobard similarly states that in Christ there is no division into “a gentile and Jew, barbarian and Scythe, Aquitanian and Lombard, Burgundian and Alemannian, (1972–73): 273–4, presents the corrected version of the *Missa pro regibus* and the *Missa cotidiana pro rege* known from the Supplement. Based on paleographic features of the fragment, Gamber argued that it was written in southern Gaul at the beginning of the ninth century. Therefore, the royal masses used in the Supplement must have been composed shortly after c. 810.


McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, 137–8, also points to the significance of “an emphasis on Christianitas” in this as well as other masses of the Supplement.
but Christ is all and in all." To fulfill this vision, the clergy had to lead “the correction of the entire Christian empire” (correctionem totius Christiani imperii), as stated in the preambule to one of the reformatory church councils of 813, the Council of Rheims.

The new Christian agenda permeating the liturgy of authority in the 810s is also evident in the Missa cotidiana pro rege (The Everyday Mass for a King), written by Benedict of Aniane for his Supplement (app. 5), together with the third royal mass Missa tempore synodi pro rege dicenda (The Mass for a King during a Synod). In The Everyday Mass for a King, the ethnic terms dividing the inhabitants of the newly-born Christian empire, like “Frank” and “Romans,” are not mentioned at all. At the core of the mass is a ruler, a servant of God, who is addressed as king only in the Secret.

Unlike The Mass for Kings, The Everyday Mass for a King has a more personal character (app. 3a and 5). The former invokes not only kings and princes, but also the Christian empire, the people who live there, and Christian liberty, making it sound more public and tying kings to their people. The Mass for Kings not only connects a king to his people,
but by the last phrase of the Secret, also gives more importance to the liberty of the Christians than to the safety of the king, who is described as the means to fulfilling a mission rather than its subject. The participants in the liturgy communicate to God on behalf of their kings and their people. God is the protector, first and foremost, of the Christian empire, and kings are the rulers of that empire by divine constitution. The corresponding prayers in *The Everyday Mass for a King* are evidently different in concept. They do not mention the people or Christian liberty but rather focus on the royal figure, who is the guarantor of ecclesiastical peace. *The Everyday Mass for a King* strongly underlines a personal, even intimate, relationship between a ruler and God. The royal office is assigned to the ruler, who receives the government of the kingdom through God’s mercy, and rulership therefore becomes an attribute attached to the personality of a king. This makes a king, in a sense, the royal vicar of Christ.

The differences between the prayers of the two royal masses suggest that they were most likely devised by the author of the Supplement for two different levels of royal liturgy. *The Mass for Kings*, as a public royal mass, continued to be at the center of the eucharistic liturgy of authority. At the same time, the everyday mass, as a personal mass, may have been intended to be performed inside monasteries closely affiliated with Carolingians, initially in Aquitaine and later in other Carolingian regions. Thus, the public mass was a liturgical sign of authority, while the everyday mass may have been a liturgical sign of proximity to a ruler.

The appearance of the latter may also be taken as a sign of an increasing role for liturgy in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority in the early ninth century. The materials of five reform-oriented church councils summoned in the Carolingian empire in 813 support this conclusion. At the opening of the first council, which took place in Arles in May 813, Charlemagne’s *missi* presiding over the council, the archbishops John of Arles and Nibridius of Narbonne, announced that the emperor ordered masses for him and his children to be celebrated on a daily basis in all cities (*civitates*) in which episcopal sees were located as well as in their dioceses.\(^\text{100}\) In response to this

---

\(^{100}\) “...decernit atque instituit, ut tam per omnes civitates vel loca, in quibus sedes episcoporum esse noscuntur, quam etiam per corundem episcoporum dioceses cunctis diebus, quibus idem domnus noster in hac vita superstes exsterit, pro eo vel pro cunctis eius filiis vel filiabus sacrificiorum Deo libamina dedicentur, pia orationum vota solvantur
directive, the council ordered royal masses, psalms, and litanies to be performed; similar decisions were made at the councils of Rheims, Chalon, and Tours.101 There is a clear link between Charlemagne’s request for an everyday royal mass in 813 and Benedict of Aniane’s composition of The Everyday Mass for a King about the same time. The request for such a liturgy was announced at the Council of Arles, where the high clergy from Aquitaine convened—the text of the mass most likely was written in Aquitaine too. Finally, the council ordered a royal liturgy to be performed for King Charles or his sons; this was an anachronistic title for the emperor, but one that correlates with the use of the royal title in the text of The Everyday Mass for a King. The decision contrasts with those of the other councils of 813, which required royal liturgies on behalf of the emperor (pro domno imperatore).102 Thus, the existing evidence supports the suggestion that this mass, and perhaps the whole set of Benedict of Aniane’s royal masses, was composed in relation to the Council of Arles of 813.103

\[
\text{ac cum gratiarum actione superno numini commendentur, ut desideria in eis bona cotidie multiplicentur, adversarium conamina virtutis divinae dexteram et caritatis munere evadant et dignitate pollientes adire mereantur post transitum sidereal mansiones,} \]

Concilium Arelatense (a. 813), in Concilia Aevi Karolini I, 249.

101 Ibid., 250, 257, 285, and 287. On these councils, see McKitterick, The Frankish Church, 12–14.


103 The “Christianizing” corrections to the Missa pro regibus introduced by Benedict of Aniane correspond to the contemporary written discourse and to the language of the church councils of 813 in particular. For instance, the preamble to the materials of the Council of Rheims states: “Primo omnium mediante mense Maio Deo inspirante ab eisdem venerabilibus patribus statutum est secundum consuetudinem ieiunium triduum, quatenus ipso miserante ea, quae ad laudem et gloriam sui sancti nominis et ad mercedem praefati gloriosissimi principis nostri seu correctionem totius Christiani
The changing structure of royal masses in the liturgical communication of Carolingian authority in the 810s was closely related to the evolving composition of liturgical audiences. The preceding discussion has demonstrated that the role of Carolingian monks in the liturgy of authority was important from the very beginning. The Frankish Gelasian Sacramentary, which disseminated *The Mass for Kings* in the early Carolingian world, was composed in a Benedictine abbey and originally designed for a monastic office. The above-mentioned incident with Abbot Potho at San Vincenzo al Volturno also illustrates that a daily prayer and psalm for the Carolingian king was included in the monastic office in the second half of the eighth century. By the early ninth century, some monasteries, such as St. Denis and St. Riquier, already performed daily royal masses, yet such daily masses in the second half of the eighth century evinced especially close relations of those abbeys with the early Carolingians and their entourage. For instance, Fulrad and Maginarius, abbots of St. Denis, were chancellors for Pippin the Short and his sons, while Widmar was appointed abbot of St. Riquier after working in the chancery of the first Carolingian king in the 750s. Such connections suggest that these conspicuous masses were not often open to people outside the Carolingian inner circle.

---

imperii in eo consideranda vel stauenda erant, eo cooperante secundum suam magnam misericordiam et piissimam voluntatem ordinari mererentur,” ibid., 254.


105 This is mentioned in the royal charter given to St. Denis in 755: “...ut eis melius semper delectet pro nos vel filios nostros seu pro stabilitate regni nostri atque Francorum die noctuque incessanter orare vel domini misericordia deprecare et, sicut nobis promiserunt, per singulos dies nomen nostrum tam in missae quam et peculiares eorum oracionibus ad sepulum ipsius sancti Dionisie debeat recitare,” *Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, 13. This request was repeated by Charlemagne in 775, ibid., 145. The royal liturgy at St. Riquier is described in *Initia consuetudinis benedictinae*, 293. On the liturgy of St. Riquier, see Susan A. Rabe, *Faith, Art and Politics at Saint-Riquier: The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995). Angilbert, abbot of St. Riquier, certainly imitated the royal office at St. Denis, which had a special relationship with the Carolingian kings.

Although the monastic connection of *The Everyday Mass for a King* suggests that daily royal masses became even more important in monasteries in the 810s, it is less likely that they were widely open to lay audiences. It is highly possible, at the same time, that in some monastic churches public royal masses were open to the laity on festal days and to lay donors and aristocrats with personal ties to a specific monastery on less solemn occasions. A liturgical *ordo*, *Ordo Romanus XVII*, written by a Frankish monk around 790, seems to fit this picture. This text borrowed the description of the Roman mass from *Ordo Romanus XV*,107 but introduced changes appropriate for monastic life. Instead of Chapter 28 of *Ordo XV*,108 describing the process of receiving offerings from people, the author wrote two new chapters mirroring the customs of different monasteries. In those abbeys where lay people, including women, were allowed to enter, a priest received offerings from them, but in monasteries at which lay people were not present at mass, a priest had to go for offerings to the *sacrarium*.109 Thus, one can conclude that Sunday and festal masses were open to lay people in some monastic churches. The monastic plan of St. Gall, drawn in c. 820, points to the same conclusion: the westwork of its church opened the monastery to lay visitors.110 The excavations of great monastic basilicas such as San Vincenzo al Volturno have also shown that they were grandiose settings in which the presentation of the liturgical language of authority was directed in part toward a lay audience.111

109 “38. Inde vero in monasterio, ubi populus vel feminis licitum est introire, descen- dens sacerdos a sede sua cum diaconibus et accepit oblationes a populo . . . 41. Item in monasterio ubi non ingrediuntur feminine, postquam promitus sacerdos lavaret manus, ingrediuntur sacerdotes cum levitas in sacrario et accipient oblationes,” ibid., 3:180. It seems that in the second case, not only women but also laymen (*populus vel feminine*) did not participate at mass.
111 For the excavations of the monastic church of San Vicenzo al Volturno in the Carolingian period, see Hodges, *Light in the Dark Ages*. For a more elaborated argument
The importance of the participation of lay people at the Sunday mass was repeatedly emphasized in Carolingian capitularies in this period. According to Carolingian legislation, Christian people had to stop their mundane activities on Sundays, gather in church, and pray there from memory; every Christian was obliged to learn by heart the Apostles’ Creed (Symbolum apostolorum), the Athanasian Creed (fides catholica), and the Lord’s Prayer (oratio dominica).\textsuperscript{112} The Capitula ecclesiastica, written by bishop Haito for the clergy in his diocese, confirms these requirements and also demands the active involvement of laity (omnis plebs) in the liturgy.\textsuperscript{113} Yet, as pointed out by Banniard, we must not overestimate the degree of lay involvement based on the evidence of Carolingian normative legislation.\textsuperscript{114} In fact, there are indications that lay participation in a liturgical “dialogue” weakened as the Carolingians increasingly regulated liturgy in the early ninth century.

Bishop Jonas of Orléans, speaking from experience, complained that, although there were lay people who often came to church with pious devotion, there were many more who seldom visited church. While in church, lay people prayed, albeit quite formally; however, those far away from the celebrants, probably in the aisles, were gossiping and telling stories instead of listening to the prayers and psalms.\textsuperscript{115} Based on such

\textsuperscript{112} See, for instance, Synodus Franconofurtensis (June 794), in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 77: “33. Ut fides catholica sanctae trinitatis et oratio dominica atque symbolum fidei omnibus praeedicetur et tradatur”; Capitulare missorum item speciale (a. 802?), in ibid., 103: “30. Ut omnis populus christianus fidei catholicam et dominicam orationem memoriter teneat”; and Capitula de examinandis ecclesiasticis (Oct. 802?), in ibid., 110: “13. Ommibus omnino christianis iubetur symbolum et orationem dominicam discere.” See also Capitulare missorum (a. 802–13), c. 2, in ibid., 147. For details and other references, see Michel Banniard, \textit{Viva Voce: Communication écrite et communication orale du IV\textsuperscript{e} au IX\textsuperscript{e} siècle en Occident latin} (Paris: Institut des Études Augustiniennes, 1992), 369–75.

\textsuperscript{113} Haitonis episcopi Basilensis capitula ecclesiastica (a. 807–23), in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 363: “2. Secundo ibendum, ut oratio dominica in qua omnia necessaria vitae comprehenduntur et symbolum apostolorum in quo fides catholica ex integro comprehendit ab omnibus discatur, tam latine quam barbarice, ut quod ore profittenitur corde credatur et intellegatur.” 3. Tertio intimandum, ut ad salutationes sacerdotales congrue responditio discantur, ubi non solum clerici et Deo dicatae sacerdoti responsionem offerant, sed omnis plebs devota consonna voce respondere debet.”

\textsuperscript{114} Banniard, \textit{Viva Voce}, 375–8, provides evidence showing that many lay people did not, in fact, learn the required Christian “basics.”

\textsuperscript{115} Jonas of Orléans, \textit{De institutione laicali}, I. 11, 13, in PL, vol. 106. “Alii ne hoc ipsum quidem patienter expectant, quod lectiones in ecclesia recitentur. Alii vero nec si recitentur sciunt, sed in remotoribus dominicæ domus locis, saecularibus fabulis
comments, as well as on other ninth-century sources, many scholars have suggested that in the ninth century the laity had limited access to liturgical resources and that the mystery of the mass increasingly became a matter for clerics. Donald Bullough summarized this point in the following statement:

One of the paradoxes of “Carolingian reform” is that the more successful it was in training the clergy in “good Latin,” with a traditional syntax and carefully articulated in ways that served clearly to distinguish it from the “Romance” vernaculars in a direct line of descent from earlier spoken Latin… the less accessible the liturgy of mass and office became to the ordinary faithful in both Romance and Germanic regions.

By the early ninth century, the laity was a passive audience as far as most liturgical texts of the mass are concerned: the laity’s role was to listen but not to speak. (In addition, they were not able to hear all the eucharistic prayers. By the year 800, as Eisenhofer and Lechner have argued, silent prayer might have extended from the Secret to prayers of the canon of the mass, including the prayer of intercession, Teigitur.) It was the clergy and monks who were the performers and active audience of the mass, and they monopolized the liturgy of authority on behalf of both king and subjects. Therefore, the liturgical texts of the masses for a ruler as created and modified in the ninth century increasingly began to match the “horizon of expectations” of the clergy.

The role of the Carolingians and their courtly retinues was not as passive as that of the laity outside their courts. It was the Carolingian rulers who were, first and foremost, interested in the liturgy of authority, and so demanded a prayer on their behalf from all the monasteries of their realm. As Charlemagne’s charters demonstrate, upon the donation of property, the grant of immunity, or the confirmation of previous privileges, most monasteries and episcopal churches in his realm were required to pray for the stability of his kingdom (pro stabilitate regni nostri). After 774, they were to beseech the Lord’s mercy for him and
his family members (pro nos et uxore nostra etiam et prolis domini misericordiam exorare).  

In 813, the liturgy on behalf of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious was required from all churches and abbeys in the Carolingian realm as acknowledgement of the rulers’ authority; in the preamble to the decisions of the Council of Tours, the sentence promising orations (orationes assiduas) for the emperor followed the one demanding the participants be obedient to their ruler and loyal, as promised (promissam fidem). However, the text of the royal mass was not defined by the church councils of 813, and the clause requiring certain liturgical actions on behalf of the ruler differed in the materials of each of them. For instance, in Arles, psalms, masses, and litanies were ordered (psalmodia, missarum sollemnia atque laetaniarum officia); in Rheims, orations and oblations (orationes et oblationes); in Chalon and Tours, simply orations; and in Mainz, such a clause was not included at all. These differences may suggest that royal liturgy was more developed in the south, while in the north and especially in the east, the liturgy of authority was less developed and often confined to a prayer. At the same time, the orations (orationes) requested in Rheims, Chalon, and Tours may have had a broader liturgical meaning and included, among other things, masses.

---

119 For examples from the charters given to the church of Trier and the abbeys of St. Michael of Marsoup, Gorze, St. Denis, Hersfeld, Fulda, and St. Riquier, see Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, 97, 100, 110, 120, 122, 125, 148–151, and 246. The request to pray for the royal family was first introduced in the Gebetsklausel of Pippin the Short’s charters, Merta, “Politische Theorie,” 118.


121 Contemporary Carolingian sources provide several examples of such a use of the term “orationes.” In 769, Charlemagne confirmed for St. Denis the supervision over the small monastery (monasteriolum) of St. Deodat, which was initially given by Pippin the Short, under the condition that ten or fifteen monks had to protect this place and pray without cease for Charlemagne and his father in psalms, masses, other liturgical “orations,” or specific “orations”: “…ea videlicet ratione ut semper ipsi fratres decem aut quindecim per vicem ibidem ipsum locum custodire debeant et ibi assiduae in psalnis et missas et ceteris obsecrationum orationibus vel peculiares orationes pro nobis et pro dommo adque glorioso genitore nostro deum preces exorare die et nocte non desinant,” Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, 81. According to this passage, the term orationes could mean any liturgical act of beseeching God’s mercy, including royal masses. The sacramentaries provide further evidence for this assumption. In the Missale Francorum, 20, the text of different prayers of the Collect, Secret, Vere dignum, and Postcommunion employed in the mass for Merovingian kings and majors has the title “Orationes et preces pro regibus.” Finally, the Sacramentary of Trent, written most likely between 825 and 830, has the almost traditional Gelasian mass for kings, but with the title Oratio pro regibus; see Ferdinand Dell’Oro, ed., Fontes Liturgici Libri Sacramentorum,
It is not certain whether the regular liturgy of authority requested by the councils of 813 was continued throughout the Carolingian empire after the death of Charlemagne. Yet it definitely was expected from Carolingian monasteries, as the materials of the monastic reform of 816–818 demonstrate in obliging every monastic community to sing Psalm 19 for the king during Prime. In 819, the Council of Aachen issued a list of Carolingian monasteries owing certain services to the crown. The first group, fourteen monasteries, had to provide gifts and military service (dona et militiam). The second one, sixteen monasteries, was expected to send only gifts (sola dona sine militia). The third and largest group on the list, fifty-four named abbeys, owed only orations for the safety of the emperor and his sons and for the stability of the empire (solas orationes pro salute imperatoris vel filiorum eius et stabilitate imperii).\(^{122}\) The list of monasteries does not include many abbeys; even St. Martin of Tours and St. Denis are not mentioned. Therefore, the demand for solas orationes refers to something different than the everyday psalm for the king requested of all Carolingian monasteries after the monastic reform and may have included royal masses. Such an assumption is supported by the fact that the third group initially included only eighteen monasteries from northern France and Germany; thirty-six monasteries of Aquitaine, Septimania, Narbonne, and Gascony were added to it later. This selection might exist because the reform of monasteries in the kingdom of Aquitaine began earlier. In fact, by 819, those monasteries were already celebrating royal masses and thus did not require a command to begin. Such an interpretation agrees with the evidence of liturgical manuscripts that demonstrates that the royal masses composed by Benedict of Aniane around 813 originally circulated mainly in southern France (app. 8, nos. 13–5). Thereafter, they were added to the Supplement for his monastic reform. The solas orationes in the capitulary of 819 referred then to eucharistic prayers for the sake of the king, his family, and the stability of the state.

It seems, then, that The Everyday Mass for a King in the Supplement was initially intended to be performed in imperial monasteries under Benedict of Aniane’s influence to guarantee divine support for their

---

ruler. According to the spirit of the monastic reform of 816–818, the culture of these monasteries governed by the Benedictine Rule was intended to unify different parts of the Christian empire; monks—the soldiers of Christ who received proper arms after 816—had to persist in their sleepless spiritual fight for the sake of the unified Christian people and their Christian ruler. Nonetheless, the death of Benedict in 821 hindered the dissemination of his set of royal masses; from the 810s to the 830s, it was copied word for word only in a few places closely affiliated with him and his friends. It became well known in Francia only from the middle of the ninth century (app. 8–9). Such a pattern of dissemination suggests that Louis’ monastic reform was not as centralized or consistent as traditionally thought. It was carried on more through personal contacts and fraternal relations between monastic communities than through the orders of the imperial court and church councils.

This pattern may also indicate that the policy of liturgical standardization formulated in the clerical entourage of Louis the Pious contradicted with local liturgical customs (consuetudines), and a certain part of the lower clergy and monks was reluctant to give them up. These liturgical customs were important for a particular monastic identity, as a petition of the monks of Fulda in 812, repeated in 816, illustrates. In 812, the monks of Fulda sent a petition to Charlemagne asking for his permission to keep their local tradition of prayers, psalms, and vigils. Among them, an everyday prayer for Charlemagne, his children, and for all Christian people was mentioned, including among other things

---


Psalms 50 and 69. Psalm 50 together with Psalm 56 was the Psalm of Repentance, and the David of Psalm 69 is a humble and pathetic king, beseeching God: “I am poor and needy: make haste unto me, O God: thou art my help and my deliverer” (Ps. 69:6). The liturgical message of these psalms was very different from the one formulated by Benedict of Aniane about the same time in his *Everyday Mass for a King*. By conducting these psalms of the repentant and needy David, the monks in Fulda might have expressed their belief that the lay ruler owed constant repentance to the Lord—they thus imposed a general penitential mood upon the liturgy of authority.

Because the clerical advisors of Louis the Pious perfectly understood the significance of the monastic choice of psalms conducted for the sake of the king, the monastic reform in 816–818 attempted to regulate this matter. In 817, the reformatory *Capitulare monasticum* instructed the Carolingian monasteries to recite daily Psalms 50, 53, 56, 66, and 69 for the king and all Christians. The psalms of repentance, however, were sung for all Christians and did not single out the king. The only psalm that had to be sung exclusively for the king was Psalm 19. This psalm finishes with the sentence, “O Lord, save the king and listen to us on the day when we invoke you” (*Domine saluvm fac regem et exaudi nos in die qua invocaverimus te*), which is much closer to the message of *The Everyday Mass for a King*, discussed in the previous section, than either Psalm 50 or 56. Yet the question remains whether this regulation was widely followed after the death of Benedict of Aniane or if its fate was...
similar to his royal set of masses, which, as mentioned above, was copied originally in southern France and made its way northward only in the sacramentaries produced in the kingdom of Charles the Bald.

It is true that all Carolingian rulers from the 840s to the 870s continued the tradition of their predecessors in requesting prayers for themselves and the stability of their kingdoms from their monasteries and episcopal churches. But local clerical communities also played a significant role in defining royal liturgies, and so a formula requesting prayers was often transmitted from earlier to later charters in a given monastery, even if they were issued by different Carolingian rulers. Charters with such requests rarely specify the prayers or psalms to be conducted, and local liturgical traditions probably played a great role in their choice. One example illustrates how the Carolingian liturgy of authority was adjusted to local traditions. In 871, at the time when Louis II attempted to establish himself in the Benevento region, he tried to connect himself liturgically to the main religious center there, the church of St. Michael on Monte Gargano controlled by Bishop

---

130 This regulation of psalms was copied in Legislationis monasticae Aquisgranensis collectio Sancti Martialis Lemovicensis, written before 850; see Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum, vol. 1, 561.


132 See the charters Lothar II and Louis the German given to the Stablo abbey: Lotharii I. et Lotharii II. diplomata, 412; and Ludowici Germanici, Karlomanni, Ludowici Iunioris Diplomata, 205.
Aio of Benevento.133 (The relations between Carolingian kings and St. Denis were, no doubt, his model in this case.) Louis II donated some property to the church of St. Michael on the condition that a mass, as well as prayers at each Hour of the divine office, would be conducted there daily on his and his family members’ behalf.134 In addition, Psalms 66 and 69 had to be sung on behalf of the emperor and his family at Matins and Terce. However, the psalm that was specifically assigned in the time of Benedict of Aniane’s reform to be sung at Prime on behalf of Frankish rulers, Psalm 19, was not mentioned at all.135

(e) Regional variations in royal masses after the reform of Benedict of Aniane (c. 821–877)

Similar to the patchy diffusion of materials from the church councils of 813, the circulation of Benedict’s edition of the masses (app. 8 and 9) points to significant regional differences in the Frankish liturgy of authority and various degrees of its development. The surviving evidence shows that the liturgy was less developed in the Middle Frankish and East Frankish kingdoms than in the West Frankish kingdom, where Benedict’s supplement with his set of royal masses were copied in most sacramentaries (app. 8, nos. 15–32). In a simplified form, masses for rulers differentiated the political authority of Charles the Bald, Lothar I, and Louis the German, as did their diplomas, coinage, and seals.136

133 The importance of St. Michael for the Lombards is evident from the fact that the image and name of this patron saint appeared on coins of the Lombard kingdom from the late seventh century and of the duchy of Benevento from the early ninth century. For details, see Ermanno A. Arslan, “San Michele: Un arcangelo per i Longobardi,” Numismatica e antichità classiche 30 (2001): 273–93.

134 “Pro qua videlicet inconcussa nostre pie devotionis concessione volumus, ut omni tempore per singulos dies pro nobis nostraque dilectissima coniuge ac prole omnique parentela illic missa canetur et die noctuque semper per singulas officiorum horas ter cum propria oratione Kyrie eleison dicatur et in matutinorum explectione Deus misereatur nostri [Ps. 66] ac horae tercie Deus in adiutorium meum [Ps. 69] seu completorium De profundis ubi et ubi eternaliter decantentur;” Ludovici II. Diplomata, 173. Meanwhile, De profundis was listed in 817 among the psalms which had to be sung not for the ruler but pro omnibus defunctis catholicis; see Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 348–9.

135 Ibid., 173.

It is true that in some cases, royal masses were performed in churches across the East Frankish kingdom; the most notable example was the ruling of the Council of Mainz in 847, which was conducted under the aegis of Hrabanus Maurus, by that time archbishop. It ordered that a royal mass be celebrated in every parish of the metropolitan province on behalf of Louis the German, his wife and children. Its description suggests, however, that it had nothing to do with Benedict’s royal masses, which do not mention the ruler’s family members. Indeed, the surviving sacramentaries from the mid-ninth-century East Frankish kingdom do not contain orations for those masses (app. 8, nos. 33–4). Moreover, it is necessary to keep in mind that although the 847 council was summoned by order of Louis the German, the initiative to organize it most likely came from Hrabanus himself. In many sections, the text of this gathering repeated the materials of the Council of Mainz of 813. It is likely that the decisions of the five reformatory councils of that year were still in Mainz at the time of Hrabanus Maurus’ archbishopric and thus were available to him. Therefore, the clause requiring liturgical action on behalf of the king and his family could have been influenced by similar requests expressed in 813.

The surviving sacramentaries from the kingdom of Louis the German do not attest to a regular royal liturgy. They contain neither Benedict of Aniane’s set nor any other regular set of royal masses. The former set could have become familiar in the East Frankish kingdom only at the

---

137 Concilium Moguntium (1 Oct. 847), in Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 843–859, ed. Hartmann, 160: “... oratio pro vobis [i.e. Louis the German] et pro vestra coniuge simulque pro nobis et quinque reformati et quinque de regno adducti—cuius orationis summa est: missarum tria milia et quingenta et psalteriorum mille septingenta—hoc omni devotione postulantes, ut deus omnipotens diuturnam vobis sanitatem ac prosperitatem concedat regnumque vestrum diu stabilitab omni hoste defensionem in terra postque huius vitae terminum in regno celesti gloriam vobis simul cum sanctis suis concedat sempiternam.”

138 In Hrabanus’ letter presenting the decisions of the Mainz Council of 847 to Louis the German, the reference to the ad hoc liturgical action on behalf of the king and his family was followed by complaints about the damages to ecclesiastical property inflicted by the king and his people: “...inhonestum est, ut hoc, quod non solum christianis temporibus a christianis imperatoribus, sed etiam a paganis regibus tempore gentilitatis ad honorem dei collatum est, vestris temporibus in regno vestro permutetur.” Ibid., 161.

very end of the reign of Louis the German, when the Sacramentary of Pamelius was created in northern France for the cathedral of Cologne (app. 8, nos. 33–9). The surviving liturgical evidence thus bears witness to separate liturgical developments in the East Frankish kingdom, as well as to the absence of any royal attempt to disseminate a uniform royal liturgy across it. On the one hand, there is a group of liturgical manuscripts related to the courtly royal liturgy such as Baturich of Regensburg’s pontifical, the Ludwig Psalter, and the Lorsch Rotulus, discussed by Eric J. Goldberg in his study of Louis the German. On the other hand, surviving sacramentaries from such major monastic centers as Corvey, Reichenau, and St. Gaul show rather diverse local developments.

Royal masses in the Sacramentary of Essen, most likely produced in the northern abbey of Corvey, point to the influence of its founding monastery in the West Frankish kingdom, Corbie, in which the royal masses of Benedict of Aniane were known around the middle of the ninth century (app. 8, nos. 18 and 37). At the same time, royal masses in the sacramentaries produced in two southern East Frankish abbeys, St. Gall and Reichenau, do not show any connection to Benedict of Aniane’s tradition (app. 8, nos. 33–5). These texts stressed the roots of kingship in the gens and presented the king as the military leader of the Franks. For instance, the original text of the traditional Gelasian Mass for Kings in the second Sacramentary of St. Gall initially used in the Secret the expression Franchorum libertas (liberty of the Franks), which was corrected later, probably in the late ninth or early tenth century, to Christiana libertas (Christian liberty), the formula of Benedict of Aniane’s tradition. The Postcommunion in the same text initially invoked Romanorum et Franchorum imperium (the empire of the Romans and Franks); only later, probably in the late ninth or early tenth century, were these expressions corrected to Christianum imperium (app. 3B). That these references to gentes in the traditional royal mass were not accidental is demonstrated by orations in a new mass for kings created at St. Gall or Reichenau by the mid-ninth century, which was probably not known

widely outside those abbeys until the tenth century. The Collect of this royal mass in the Sacramentary of Reichenau was borrowed from the previous Gallican Missal of the Franks and beseeched God to protect not a Christian king, but the ruler of the Franks (Francorum rectorem). In addition, the prayers for the Secret and Postcommunion copied the orations from masses for wartime (missae tempore belli), which stressed the military nature of the East Frankish kingship.

The surviving sacramentaries connected to the realm of Lothar I and his sons similarly point to the regional diversity of the Carolingian liturgy of authority. They contain either no mass for a ruler at all or only the traditional Gelasian mass for kings with some modifications (app. 3B and 8, nos. 1–5, 7–9, and 11–2). An example of such modification occurs in the Sacramentary of Padua, written most likely at the court of Lothar I in Lower Lotharingia, in which the traditional Gelasian Mass for Kings acquired an additional praefatio. This prayer beseeched the Lord to protect the rulership (principatum) of the kingdom of Franks and allow it to excel over all other kingdoms; this formula matched the imperial aspirations of Lothar I and his court in the 840s, when he tried to dominate the former Carolingian empire. By contrast, sacramentaries produced in northern Italy demonstrate no interest in the Frankish cause (app. 3B, 4, and 8, nos. 2–3), so it seems that the notion of the empire of the Romans preserved its appeal there. The Collect in both sacramentaries of Verona still called God the protector

---

141 Its earliest text probably appeared in the Sacramentary of Reichenau, which was created in St. Gall and was in possession of Reichenau by 866. Around 900, it reached Cologne. See Franz Unterkircher, “Sakramente und Missalien vor 1200 in Österreich,” in *Ecclesia peregrinans: Festschrift für Josef Lenzenweger zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Karl Amon et al. (Vienna: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs, 1986), 47–52, at 49. This text was also copied in the Sacramentary of Constance, written in Reichenau in the third quarter of the ninth century.


143 “VD. Et potentiam tuam suppliciter exorare, cuius regnum est omnium saeculorum, supplicationes nostras clementer exaudi, et Francorum regnum subditum tibi protege principatum, ut in tua virtute fidentem, et tibi placeat, et super omnia regna praecellat.” Deshusses, 2:73.
of Romanorum imperium (the empire of the Romans); the first sacramentary of Verona used the same formula in the Postcommunion. In both sacramentaries, this expression was corrected to Christianum imperium (the Christian empire) only in the second half of the ninth century. Similar to earlier corrections to the text of the Gelasian Mass for Kings, these differences reflected regional differences and the “horizons of expectations” of local liturgical audiences. For an audience in northern Italy, reference to the empire of the Romans in the traditional Gelasian royal mass placed Carolingian rulers within a long-lasting local tradition of imperial authority. In contrast, for liturgical audiences in the East Frankish kingdom and Lotharingia, reference to the Franks was more important in defining Carolingian authority. Hence, the empire, kingdom, or rulership of the Franks (Francorum) strongly influenced the liturgical language of authority used in these regions.

As surviving manuscripts demonstrate, the Gregorians with the Supplement were produced in much larger numbers and in many centers of the West Frankish kingdom of Charles the Bald. In the mid-ninth century, Benedict of Aniane’s set of royal masses—with its stress on the Christian empire and Christian people instead of the Franks and their empire—was copied in the region of Paris and at such important royal abbeys as Marmoutier, St. Amand, and Corbie (app. 8, nos. 16–20). In this period, The Everyday Mass for a King became a widespread phenomenon in West Frankish liturgical practice as it began to be used more actively in a liturgical dialogue.144 The elaboration of its text in the Sacramentary of Le Mans, which was produced in the 850s in the monastery of St. Amand closely affiliated with Charles the Bald, nicely illustrates such a dialogue.145

---

144 “A partir du milieu du IXe siècle, on constate, dans les manuscrits de type Aniane, un phénomène assez curieux: des variantes en grand nombre s’introduisent, qui, tantôt ramènent ces manuscrits à la lettre de l’Hadrianum authentique, tantôt aussi n’appartiennent ni à ce dernier type, ni à celui d’Aniane. D’autre part, ces variantes apparaissent de façon irrégulière dans les divers manuscrits, formant entre eux des groupes très mouvants,” Deshusses, 1:72. Yet he explains this phenomenon by the use of one common text irrelevant to the authentic Hadrianum or the text of Benedict of Aniane.

145 On the sacramentaries of St. Amand, including the Sacramentary of Le Mans, see Jean Deshusses, “Chronologie des grands sacramentaires de Saint-Amand,” RB 87 (1977): 230–7, and idem, “Encore le sacramentaires de Saint-Amand,” RB 89 (1979): 310–2. He proposes the hypothetical dates for those sacramentaries and dates that of Le Mans to c. 851. Yet, his second article, which corrects dates of the sacramentaries of St. Germain-des-Prés and Sens, demonstrates that this dating is tentative. The only points that are firm are that the Sacramentary of Le Mans is the first in the series.
That an intended liturgical audience was the reason for this correction is clear from the fact that the Secret was left untouched while the Collect and the Postcommunion were altered; in other words, only those eucharistic prayers that the audience was able to hear were affected (app. 6). Here, the whole message of the mass experienced a profound transformation. Its Postcommunion copies that of the third royal mass in the set of Benedict of Aniane, *The Mass for a King in Time of Synod*, but replaces the original expression “*famuli tui ill. peccatorum maculas*” with “*peccatorum nostrorum maculas*.” This correction shifts the accent from the sins of the king to those of the liturgical performers. Secondly, it changes the original phrase that the receiving of the sacrament shall “render the people fit for rule according to your will” (*ad regendum secundum tuam voluntatem populum idoneum reddat*). It now reads that the liturgical ceremony shall “render this king fit for rule over the people according to your will” (*illum regem ad regendum secundum tuam voluntatem populum idoneum reddat*). The corrected version of the Postcommunion not only asks God to make the king able to govern, instead of the traditional request to make the people fit for his government, but also emphasizes the role of “the beneficial eucharist,” ministered by priests, in enhancing the royal ability to rule.


and it is close in time to the Sacramentary of Paris, the creation of which is dated to around 855.
mentioned frequently by Carolingian authors like Paulinus of Aquileia, who advised an ideal ruler to follow them to obtain the grace of God.\footnote{Paulinus of Aquileia, \textit{Versus de Lazaro et ad cantandum carmina}, in MGH, PLAC, vol. 6,1, ed. Karl Strecke (Weimar: Böhlau, 1951), 219. For the detailed analysis of these virtues, see Sibylle Mähl, \textit{Quadriga virtutum: Die Kardinaltugenden in der Geistesgeschichte der Karolingerzeit} (Cologne: Böhlau, 1969).} These virtues were also depicted in Carolingian manuscripts. For instance, the First Bible of Charles the Bald, written at St. Martin of Tours in 845, presents the image of David wearing a Carolingian royal crown and playing music to the psalms (fol. 215v). In the corners of the miniature, four personages, embodying the same four virtues, point to David. Throughout this Bible, Charles the Bald is addressed as David; this miniature likewise refers to the young Carolingian king and the virtues that belong to ideal rulership. As Paul Dutton and Herbert Kessler have demonstrated, this Bible was a gift of the monastic community of St. Martin of Tours to Charles the Bald and conveyed an admonitory message to the king.\footnote{Paul Edward Dutton and Herbert L. Kessler, \textit{The Poetry and Paintings of the First Bible of Charles the Bald} (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 98–101. This image is discussed in more detail in chapter 5.} Similarly, the new version of the royal mass was written in the luxurious sacramentary designed as a gift for the West Frankish king and stressed the dangers of royal life, the need to follow the cardinal royal virtues, and the crucial role of liturgy for successful rulership. To understand this message better, we must look at its wider liturgical context in West Francia.

\textit{(f) The liturgy of authority and the court of Charles the Bald}

Surviving liturgical manuscripts support the argument that Charles the Bald took the lead in exploiting the liturgy of authority. He invested much effort and material resources in the promotion of royal liturgy, thus turning it into the “symbolic capital” of his kingship. Like his Carolingian predecessors, he maintained special relations with St. Denis, where an everyday mass for him was celebrated. After all, his first archchancellor, Louis, was abbot of St. Denis.\footnote{See his charter of 862: Tessier, \textit{Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve}, 1:246.} St. Amand became another monastic center that closely connected royal power and the
liturgy of authority. Charles the Bald maintained special relations with this monastery; after 864, only people very close to him, like his son Carloman or his second archchancellor Gozlin, were appointed abbots there.\textsuperscript{150} From the 850s to 870s, its scriptorium made luxurious copies of the Gregorian Sacramentary, which included the set of Benedict of Aniane’s royal masses, for dissemination in the heartland of the West Frankish kingdom (app. 8, nos. 20–6). Furthermore, under the rule of Gozlin, the scriptorium of St. Amand introduced important changes to the set of royal masses composed by Benedict of Aniane. Two new masses were written in the Sacramentary of Sens, produced after Charles the Bald’s imperial coronation at the end of 876.\textsuperscript{151} They contain eucharistic prayers with formulas very close to those often used in royal charters requesting royal prayers (app. 8, no. 26, types MRCPP and MRR).\textsuperscript{152} These parallels, which were not typical of earlier Frankish royal masses, suggest not only that Gozlin was the figure behind the composition of both masses but also that the message was formulated by the entourage of Charles the Bald.

Both new masses, which had the traditional titles of \textit{The Everyday Mass for a King} (\textit{Missa pro rege cotidiana}, app. 7) and \textit{The Mass for a King} (\textit{Missa pro rege}), had to be performed on behalf of the king, the queen, their children, and the people subject or committed to the king. What was their liturgical message? The people, unlike in previous masses, are always mentioned as subject and entrusted to the king; divine mercy comes to the people only through the figure of the king. In addition, similar to the royal masses of Benedict of Aniane disseminated in West Francia, the newly-created masses do not mention the Franks or any other \textit{gens}. In this sense, their texts are as general as possible. Another important feature is the introduction of the queen and royal children in these texts. While the inclusion of the entire royal family


\textsuperscript{151} Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Ms. A 136, fols. 177r–178v.

in royal masses was already mentioned in the decisions of the Council of Mainz of 847, the texts of the two masses written in the kingdom of Charles the Bald are the earliest surviving evidence to this liturgical practice. It seems that with weakening emphasis on gentes as sources of kingship and the growing importance for successful kingship of the grace of God obtained via liturgical means, the bloodline became an important factor of royal legitimation. From the 840s to the 870s, this development led to an increased role for the royal family in general and the queen in particular.

The queen’s new prominence may be seen in other media conveying the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. For instance, the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura, produced between 866 and 875, has the first portrait of a Carolingian ruler accompanied by his queen, probably the second wife of Charles the Bald, Richildis (fig. 64). Slightly earlier, in 856, the first coronation ordo for a queen was composed for the coronation of Judith, the daughter of Charles the Bald. In 866, the first wife of Charles the Bald, Ermentrude, was anointed. As pointed out by Janet Nelson, it was first under the reign of Charles the Bald that “the dynastic element of kingship came to be amplified.” Furthermore, Empress Angilberga, the wife of Louis II, obtained such an influential role in the period between 855 and 875 that they issued the deniers as co-rulers, with the legends Ludowicus imperator (Emperor Louis) on the one side and Angilberga imperatrix (Empress Angilberga) on the other (fig. 3). It was the first time that the name of a queen was placed on a Carolingian coin. This innovation was possibly influenced by Byzantine tradition, which was still powerful in central Italy.

Another example of how St. Amand was involved in the promotion of the liturgy of authority is the so-called Comes Alcuini, a mass lectionary produced in this monastery for the cathedral of Chartres in the third quarter of the ninth century: it included biblical readings for

---

156 See Garipzanov, Karolingskoye monetnoye delo, 34.
royal masses. Unlike other surviving lectionaries written in the ninth century, the *Comes Alcuini* includes a copy of a lectionary supplement, attributed to Alcuin, with biblical readings for sixty-five masses. Among them are the biblical readings *Ad missam regis votivam praesente ipso*, from the *Ecclesiasticus* (fols. 192v–193r), and *Ad regem benedicendum*, from the *Liber secundus regum* (fols. 196v–197r). Other lectionaries composed in the ninth century copied neither these readings for the royal masses nor the lectionary-supplement, which was probably designed primarily for internal use at St. Martin of Tours, where Alcuin had been abbot. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether these two texts were present in the original version of the supplement or were added at St. Amand. No matter when and where these readings were composed, however, that they were copied in St. Amand during the reign of Charles the Bald is an additional indication of the involvement of his royal court, via the monasteries closest to it, in the contemporary blossoming of the regular liturgy of authority.

The activity of St. Amand must be viewed together with other examples of the court of Charles the Bald close ties to the production of texts necessary to establish a regular royal liturgy in the West Frankish kingdom. The first is a gospel-book produced at the Court School of Charles the Bald in 870, the *Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram*. After the main text, it lists Gospel readings for different masses, includ-

---

157 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 9452; for the description of the manuscript, see CLLA, no. 1040 and André Wilmart, "Le lectionnaire d’Alcuin," *Ephemerides liturgicae* 51 (1937): 136–202.

158 A common opinion is that the lectionary-supplement of Alcuin was completed by Helisachar at the court of Louis the Pious in 816. Consequently, in 831 it is mentioned in the catalogue of St. Riquier in Picardy, where Helisachar was abbot from 822. For details, see Germain Morin, “Une rédaction inédite de la préface au Supplément du Comes d’Alcuin,” *RB* 29 (1912): 341–8; and André Wilmart, “Le lectionnaire de Saint-Père,” *Speculum* 1 (1926): 271. Yet the catalogue of St. Riquier mentions only one “lectionarius plenarius a supra dicto Albino ordinatus” and five “lectionarii epistolarum et evangeliorum mixtim et ordinante composite,” Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqvi*, 1:28. This means that the lectionary with the supplement of Alcuin was a rarity for the time. Its absence from the surviving lectionaries composed in the first half of the ninth century supports this conclusion.

159 Michael Herren, “Eriugena’s ‘Aulae Siderae,’ the ‘Codex Aureus,’ and the Palatine Church of St. Mary at Compiègne,” *Studi Medievali* 28,2 (1987): 593–608, has proposed that the *Codex Aureus* was created to commemorate the foundation of the Church of St. Mary in Compiègne. Nikolaus Staubach, *Rex Christianus: Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen*, pt. 2, *Die Grundlegung der ‘religion royale’*, Pictura and Poesis, no. 2 (Cologne: Böhlau, 1993), 269–81, further argues that the manuscript was a foundation gift presented at Christmas, 870, to the church that was intended to imitate Charlemagne’s chapel in Aachen.
ing royal ones. Among them, there are readings for the masses In adventu principum ("Parabola de grano sinapis et de fermento" in Luke, 13:18–30) and Pro regibus ("Iuvenis dives" in Luke, 18:18–30). The second mass is the traditional Mass for Kings, and, therefore, the reading from Luke 18:18–30 could be used together with any contemporary Gregorian or Gelasian sacramentary. The Codex Aureus was used so often—most likely for liturgical purposes—that at the end of the tenth century, it needed to be repaired at the abbey of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, which possessed it at that time.

The second example is an antiphonary (a choir book containing chants for the office) produced in Compiègne between 860 and 877. Traditionally, it has been called the Antiphonary of Charles the Bald and it contains a complete royal office, De susceptione regum, with twelve responsories and fourteen antiphons. Its origin can be linked to the activity of Charles the Bald’s Court School, which was probably also located in Compiègne; this indicates that the antiphonary was used initially in a royal context, either at the court or for the reception of the king in a church. Another argument in favor of the connection of the antiphonary to the court of Charles the Bald is the similarity between the title of the office, De susceptione regum, and that of the Gospel reading, In adventu principum, in the Codex Aureus. Thus, the Comes Alcuini, the Antiphonary of Compiègne, and the Codex Aureus demonstrate that, in addition to the royal masses in sacramentaries, other texts necessary for a regular royal liturgy were produced in West Francia, either at the royal court or places closely affiliated with it.

The third example of Charles the Bald’s court’s influence on the liturgy of authority is a sacramentary fragment from Metz that is now
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160 *Capitula evangeliorum qualiter per anni circum evangelia in Romana leguntur ecclesia* on fol. 120v–126r in Georg Leidinger, ed. *Der Codex Aureus der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München: Faksimile Ausgabe*, 6 vols (Munich: Schmidt, 1921–23). There is no monastic mass in the list; this indicates that the readings and, thus, the Codex Aureus were initially written for use in an urban church such as St. Mary in Compiègne, where the celebration of a public royal mass could be expected. For the details on other *Capitularia evangeliorum* in the Carolingian period, see CLI A, 2:446–465.


162 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 17436; published by Renato-Joanne Herbert, *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, vol. 1, Rerum Ecclesiasticum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes, no. 7 (Roma: Herder, 1963), 366–8. For the detailed description of the manuscript, see ibid., XVII–XIX. On this royal office, see also Andrew Hughes, “The Monarch as the Object of Liturgical Veneration,” in *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Duggan, 381–91.
also associated with the Court School. This fragment, produced around 869 and thought to have been used in Charles the Bald’s coronation in Metz in that same year, introduced an important innovation into the canon of the mass in the final sentence of the *Te igitur* (app. 10). In the traditional Gregorian text, the celebrants of the mass offer sacrifices to God on behalf of the church *una cum* the pope. In the mid-ninth century, as the sacramentaries of Rodrad and Paris show, the last sentence of the *Te igitur* was extended so that the eucharist was offered on behalf of the church not only *una cum* the pope, but also *una cum* all Christians and the local bishop—an indication of the increasing power of Carolingian bishops. The sacramentary fragment from Metz added the king to this list, and in the final version, the eucharist was offered for the church, *una cum* the pope, “our bishop, our king, and all the worshippers of the orthodox, catholic, and apostolic faith” (*et antistite nostro et rege nostro et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus*). This innovation, designed at the Court School of Charles the Bald, appeared in manuscripts written in Corbie and St. Martin of Tours in the late ninth century. During this period, to mention the king in the *Te igitur* gradually became so customary in some
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164 Ibid., fol. 7r.

165 These changes were probably undertaken under the influence of Gelasian sacramentaries. For example, the canon of the mass in the Gelasian sacramentary of Prague, written before 794, already uses the formula “una cum famulo tuo papa nostro N. sedis apostolicae et antistite nostro N. episcopo,” *Das Prager Sakramentar*, ed. Dold and Eizenhöfer, 127*. The *Te igitur* in the canon of the mass written in the Sacramentary of Angoulème and the Phillipps Sacramentary has the formula “una cum famulo tuo papa nostro illo et antestite nostro illo”; see *Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis*, ed. Saint-Roch, 256, no. 1755, and *Liber Sacramentorum Augustodunensis*, ed. Heiming, 147, no. 1283. The first Sacramentary of St. Gall uses the same formula, but adds a correction; “et omnibus orthodoxy atque apostolicae fidei cultoribus,” *Das frankische sacramentarium gelasianum*, ed. Mohlberg, 238, no. 1550. The Sacramentary of Gellone uses both formulas “una cum famulo tuo papa nostro illo, et antestite [sic!] nostro illo,” et in omnibus orthodoxy adque apostolicae fidei cultoribus,” *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, ed. Dumas and Deshusses, 253, no. 1933. The influence of these formulas is evident in the sacramentaries produced for the cathedral of Cologne at the end of the ninth and beginning of the tenth century (app. 10).

166 It seems that the formula “*et omnibus orthodoxy atque catholicae fidei cultoribus*,” which appeared in some Gregorian sacramentaries, and was written earlier in Tironian notes in the earliest Gelasian sacramentary (c. 750), belonged to an earlier Roman canon. For details, see B. Capelle, “Et omnibus orthodoxy atque catholicae fidei cultoribus,” in Miscellanea historica in honorem Alberti de Meyer, 2 vols (Louvain: Bibliothèque de l’université, 1946), 1:137–50.
churches, especially in the West Frankish kingdom, that the formula “et rege nostro” was added in some manuscripts like the sacramentaries of Drogo and Le Mans, which were written earlier in the mid-ninth century and initially did not mention the king in the canon (app. 10). Thus, the name of the king was brought into the canon of the mass in the last decades of the ninth century and the court of Charles the Bald played a crucial role in this process.

On the one hand, this introduction of the name of the king into the canon of the mass was no doubt influenced by the late Roman and early Byzantine tradition of uttering the name of the emperor at mass, mentioned earlier in this chapter. As I will demonstrate in chapter 5, a significant feature of the royal images of Charles the Bald made in the 860s and early 870s is the use of imperial attributes derived from late imperial Rome and contemporary Byzantium. These leanings accord with the gradual revival of Roman imperial elements in the language of authority employed at the West Frankish court in the same period. The edict of Pîtres (864), which was influenced greatly by the Theodosian Code and the Novels of Valentinian III, is the most obvious example. Seen from this perspective, the modification of the canon of the mass undertaken at the court of Charles the Bald seem to imitate the earlier liturgical tradition of imperial authority, which was disrupted in Rome during the first half of the eighth century.

On the other hand, this introduction was transformed by indigenous liturgical developments in the Carolingian world, particularly in West Francia. In a Roman context, the name of a ruler was invoked publicly in front of a lay audience while in a Frankish context, it might have been read silently by the performer of a mass. Moreover, as the early Gelasian texts suggest, in a Roman context, the name of the ruler was remembered in the Memento together with other laymen. The final part of the Teigitur offers the eucharist for the Holy Church, una cum the pope and a local bishop (app. 10). The corrected text of the 860s added the name of the king not to the Memento but the final part of Teigitur. As a result, the king by the grace of God joined the pope and local bishops in relation to the Holy Church of God. This innovation paralleled

---

the introduction of Carolingian royal imagery in religious manuscripts during the mid-ninth century, which I will discuss in chapter 5.

The fact that the court of Charles the Bald was so actively engaged in the development of the liturgy of authority suggests that in the West Frankish kingdom, this represented one of the most important means of communicating royal authority and conveying symbolic messages between the king and his clergy, and from each of them to lay subjects. Through this process, bishops and abbots, communities of canons and monks, were able to send liturgical messages similar to the one communicated by the Romans in 711. In the period of political crisis in the kingdom of Charles the Bald that lasted from 857 to 858, many of his vassals defected to Louis the German. Among them was Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, who demonstrated his changed loyalty by conducting a public mass on behalf of Louis the German and his West Frankish supporters in the royal palace of Charles the Bald at Attigny. Charles the Bald—who was so keen on promoting royal liturgy to bolster his authority—no doubt understood this message because in 858, he did not forget to mention this liturgical betrayal in his indictment against Wenilo.

To summarize, liturgical communication played an increasingly important role in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. This type of symbolic communication was characterized by six main features. The first was the three layers of royal liturgy, which were fully developed by the late ninth century. The earliest layer, monastic prayers on behalf of the ruler, had been already established in seventh-century Gaul, when Merovingian rulers like Balthild initiated special liturgical relations with the major monastic basilicas of the realm. Pippin the Short and Charlemagne extended this liturgical tradition to a larger
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168 On the importance of the political and economic support of the West Frankish church for Charles the Bald, see Janet L. Nelson, “Charles the Bald and the Church in Town and Countryside,” *Studies in Church History* 16 (1979): 103–18.


number of monasteries, especially in newly-conquered lands, turning this practice into a liturgical test of loyalty.

The early Carolingian period also witnessed the spread of an additional, eucharistic, layer of royal liturgy. In the second half of the eighth century, the Gelasian royal mass, earlier designed for a Roman context and performed on behalf of early Byzantine emperors, was gradually disseminated in Carolingian lands north of the Alps. This mass was celebrated more or less publicly and regularly and was, to a certain extent, accessible to some lay people unlike monastic prayers of the divine office. This level of royal liturgy was intensified further in the early ninth century, especially in relation to the reformatory councils of 813. Around this time, an everyday royal mass was added to the liturgy of authority. It is true that daily royal masses were performed previously in abbeys like St. Denis and St. Riquier. These masses, in fact, symbolized the special status of these communities vis-à-vis the Carolingians. The everyday royal mass that appeared around 813, in contrast, was connected to a much broader group of monasteries. In a sense, there was an attempt to establish a twofold structure of royal masses: everyday royal masses in imperial monasteries conducted by monastic communities and public royal masses celebrated across the realm and accessible to laymen. It seems that this liturgical initiative, which was put on hold by the death of Benedict of Aniane, was implemented only during the reign of Charles the Bald.

It was only in his kingdom that the Carolingian liturgy of authority reached its apex. In addition to the two previous pillars of royal liturgy, the final layer was added probably in the 860s, when invocation of a ruler became a part of the Teigitur in the canon of the mass. This innovation was both a renewal of late Roman and early Byzantine liturgical traditions and the result of indigenous Frankish developments; henceforth, royal authority could be invoked symbolically at every mass celebrated according to the corrected version of the Gregorian Canon of the Roman mass. This transformation alone illustrates how important the liturgical communication of royal authority became in the kingdom of Charles the Bald.

When speaking of this echo of Roman liturgical tradition, one must be aware of an important distinction between the liturgy of authority in the late Roman and Carolingian worlds. In the late Roman context, the liturgy of imperial authority was more “public” in the sense that it was a regular part of the eucharistic liturgy publicly celebrated across the empire. In the Carolingian world, in contrast, the liturgy of authority
was linked intrinsically to a monastic context. Pippin the Short and Charlemagne demanded prayers on their behalf from monasteries which were at the epicenter of the twofold regular royal liturgy as envisioned in the 810s. Monasteries were also connected to the royal court and disseminated the liturgical texts necessary for the regular royal liturgy in the West Frankish kingdom. This monastic link was due to the specific nature of Frankish politics but did not make the liturgical communication of royal authority less effective. Indeed, monasteries were the focal points of the Carolingian sociopolitical landscape and, as Innes puts it, they were, “the hubs of regional aristocratic worlds.”

In monasteries, there was an accumulation and redistribution of material resources and “symbolic capital,” as well as the reconfiguration of local power. Consequently, control over such places was important for Carolingian power, and the regular royal liturgy at such places was highly efficient in the symbolic communication of royal authority.

The third important feature of Carolingian royal liturgy was its regional diversity. Going back to the Merovingian period, regional liturgical customs played an important role in the choice of masses and psalms used in royal liturgy. The waves of liturgical reforms connected to the personal activities of, and personal networks created by, influential clergymen like Chrodegang of Metz and Benedict of Aniane did not obliterate local liturgical customs. The rhetoric of liturgical reform could only partly suppress this diversity, especially in the 810s, when a policy toward liturgical standardization was the most visible. Yet these regional differences popped up again in the separate Carolingian kingdoms in the mid-ninth century, and, in some cases, Carolingian rulers had no choice
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171 State and Society, 187. See also Noble, “The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire,” 235–50; and Mayke de Jong, “Charlemagne’s Church,” in Charlemagne: Empire and Society, ed. Storey, 103–35, at 119–31. She writes in this regard: “Control of monasteries had long been a mainstay of aristocratic power, but the Pippinids beat others at this game and gradually became major players in what had once been local and independent aristocratic networks” (120). As David Ganz points in relation to the early Carolingian period, four major monasteries (St. Denis, St. Riquier, St. Vaast, and St. Martin of Tours) “were governed by former chancery chaplains”; Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collection,” 925. This is a clear illustration of the crucial role of monasteries in the Carolingian political world. For this transformation from the Merovingian to Carolingian periods, see Felten, Äbte und Laienäbte im Frankenreich, 111–279.
but to adjust to local liturgical traditions. In this sense, the Carolingian world was not different from the rest of Europe.  

The fourth significant feature of the liturgy of Carolingian authority was the influence of its liturgical audiences on the texts of its eucharistic prayers. Their “horizons of expectations” led to modification of key political messages in the Frankish Gelasian royal mass at the turn of the ninth century. Although in certain cases, the laity participated in those royal masses, the clergy and especially the monks, became the main audience for the liturgical texts of royal authority. The texts of eucharistic royal prayers were modified further during the reforms of the 810s to fit the ideal of the universalistic Christian empire ruled by a Carolingian monarch, a concept propagated actively by the circles closest to Louis the Pious. Nevertheless, this liturgical message had limited circulation in the imperial period, becoming better-known only in the second half of the ninth century, especially in the West Frankish kingdom. At the same time, the liturgical texts of royal/imperial authority deriving from Lotharingia, northern Italy, and East Francia continued to adjust to regional “horizons of expectations.”

Furthermore, this diversity of interactions between the texts of royal masses and their liturgical audiences was especially noticeable in liturgical references to Franks, Romans, and the Christian empire. In the late eighth century, such references to the Romans continued to appear in Burgundy, Rhaetia, Bavaria, and Alemannia; in the first half of the ninth century, however, the references of this kind were limited increasingly to northern Italy. In the second half of the eighth century, liturgical references to the Franks were especially strong in Neustria and Aquitaine; unfortunately, no comparative material for Austrasia survives to test whether this was the case there or not. In the first half of the ninth century, however, the Franks were replaced by the Christian people in the eucharistic royal prayers written in these regions. At the same time, gens or regnum Francorum as a liturgical formula of royal authority became more important east of the West Frankish kingdom in such regions as Lower Lotharingia and Alemannia, in which it was of less significance half a century earlier. These changes clearly illustrate that
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172 Roger Reynolds concludes about this relationship: “By the end of the ninth century liturgical rites in western Europe, whether daily or occasional, were perhaps even more varied and rich than they had been at the beginning of the eighth century”; “Chapter 12. The Organization, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900,” in The New Cambridge Medieval History, vol. 2, ed. McKitterick, 587–621, at 621.
terms like *gens Francorum* or *imperium Romanorum*, attested to in liturgical texts of royal authority, were not fixed in contemporary political discourse. They had a situated usage and could be employed within wider political strategies. For instance, the term “Franks” in the Sacramentary of Gellone could have referred around the year 800 to both the entire free population of Neustria and the “imagined community” of Franks as God’s chosen people, while half a century later the Sacramentary of Reichenau could have used the same term to describe East Frankish aristocrats regardless their ethnic origins and stress their Frankishness in contrast to the West Frankish aristocracy.

Finally, the transformation of royal liturgy in the Carolingian period was intertwined with changing perceptions of kingship, which can be described with reference to three major codes traceable in the symbolic language of authority. Within the first set of common political assumptions, the political world was perceived as made of various *gentes*. In liturgical discourse, stress was placed on the *gentes* chosen by God, first the Romans and then the Franks. Consequently, royal authority was perceived as intrinsically connected to the king’s *gens*. The second set of political presuppositions derived from the political culture of the late Roman and early Byzantine empire, within which the emperor was supreme ruler over the earthly world, or, in a way, the vicar of Christ governing the Christian people. These political assumptions influenced Carolingian liturgical discourse in the early ninth century. With the increasing role of the clergy in liturgical communication in the first half of the ninth century, the assumption that the liturgy bestowed the grace of God upon their ruler gradually penetrated liturgical texts. The latter motif became a foundation stone for a new set of common political presuppositions emerging in the mid-ninth century that expressed the perception that only the regular liturgy of authority guaranteed the Lord’s grace to rulers and their communities. With the division of the Carolingian empire after the death of Louis the Pious, this understanding was expressed clearly via liturgical means in the kingdom of Charles the Bald.

---

CHAPTER THREE

NOMEN AUCTORITATIS:
COMMUNICATION OF AUTHORITY
IN CAROLINGIAN TITLES

Quapropter et nostros ad vos direximus missos, qui ex nostri nominis auctoritate una vobiscum corrigerent quae corrigenda essent.

(Admonitio generalis (a. 789), in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 53.)

Intitulature (*intitulatio*), the official titles of a ruler, was an important mode of communicating early medieval authority; and, hence, constituted another syntactic part of the symbolic language of authority. Carolingian charters, letters, and coins naming the Carolingians demonstrate discrepancy between titles used at the royal chancery, on the one hand, and those employed in local mints and private letters sent to the court, on the other. Subjects living in diverse regions of the Carolingian realm also used different titles to address their rulers. For instance, in northern France, Charlemagne was called king of the Franks, while in Lombardy after 774 he was known, first and foremost, as “Our Lord, King of the Lombards.” Thus, the diplomatic formulas of intitulature provided a constant dialogue on the name of Carolingian authority.

(a) Communicative nature of Carolingian titles

Research on early medieval intitulature owes a great debt to the works of Herwig Wolfram;¹ his studies demonstrate that the titles of early medieval rulers contain, in a latent and concentrated form, rich information about their holders. According to Wolfram, early medieval

intitulatio describes the name, rank, and function of a ruler, as well as his personal and divine Begnadung (endowed virtues) in relation to his function. Yet early medieval titles also articulate royal authority distinctly as relationships binding the ruler, the subjects, and God. Expressions like rex Francorum (king of the Franks) or rex Langobardorum (king of the Lombards) pertain not only to a ruler, but also to his subjects. These titles present not only the ruler’s relationship to a gens, but also its relation to the ruler. Other titles, like gratia Dei rex (king by the grace of God), refer to a third party in the construction of authority in the early Middle Ages, namely, God. As a result, titles also played an important role in the construction of early medieval identities by defining both gentes involved in the creation of royal authority and a subject’s self-perception vis-à-vis his or her ruler and the Lord. Hence, early medieval intitulature described the relationships involved in the creation of authority, and changes in intitulatio usually reflected the modification of roles in these power relations.

Wolfram begins his first work on early medieval intitulatio with a passage from the New Testament, John 1.19–22, in which John the Baptist is asked: “Who are you? . . . What do you say of yourself?” (Tu quis es? . . . quid dicis de te ipso?) The latter question becomes a key issue in Wolfram’s work, which is focused on the Selbtaussage (self-statement) of kings and princes. I begin with a passage from another work written much closer to the Carolingian period, namely, Dudo of St. Quentin’s History of the Normans, dated to the late tenth or early eleventh century. The anecdote describes the conversation that, according to Dudo, took place between the Vikings and Frankish aristocrats in the late ninth century. When ambassadors of the Frankish duke Regnold met the Northmen who had arrived in northern Gaul with their leader Rollo and asked them, “By what title does your chief hold office?” (Quo nomine vester senior fungitur?), the latter answered, “By none, because we are equal in power” (Nullo, quia aequalis potestatis sumus). This response clearly demonstrates the awareness of the early medieval historian that the titles of the ruler, or his or her nomen, reflected the power relations
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2 Wolfram, Intitulatio, 1:12 and 25.
between rulers and subjects. Thus, this story vividly highlights the second aspect of the early medieval *intitulatio*, referred to by Wolfram as *Fremdaussage* (external statement), in which titles reflect the subjects’ vision of their ruler. The political elite clearly understood that through their acceptance of a ruler’s titles, they acknowledged his power and accepted his authority.

Another passage, from a letter of Emperor Louis II sent to the Byzantine emperor Basil I in 871, shows that early medieval rulers were also well aware of the communicative nature of their intitulature. In this passage, Louis II first rejected the Byzantine request that the Carolingian ruler command his subjects not to call him emperor; he argued that it was not appropriate to instruct others what they should call him. He then indicated that other people named him emperor in their letters even without his explicit recommendation to do so. This argument mirrored the contemporary perception that the acceptance of the imperial title by others, expressed via letters sent to the imperial court, legitimized the use of the title and confirmed the corresponding political status. A similar perception is evident in another passage, taken from Einhard’s *Life of Charlemagne*, describing important signs of the Carolingian monarch’s growing status in the Western European political sphere. Among those signs, Einhard mentions how neighboring kings called themselves and Charlemagne in their letters sent to him. Einhard refers, for instance, to letters sent to Charlemagne by Alfonso II, king of Galicia and Asturia, and Irish kings, in which they called him “Lord” (*dominum*) and styled themselves “his vassal” (*proprium suum*), or even “his subjects and servants” (*subditos et servos eius*). Even if this anecdote was invented by the Carolingian author, it evinces that, similar to Louis II, Einhard was fully aware of the symbolic significance of lines of address in letters sent to the Carolingians.

---


6 “...nosque hortaris ut persuadeamus eis, quo nos imperatores appellant. Quod tamen nec ratio dictat nec opus est; primo quidem, quia nobis non congruit alios qualiter nos vocent instruere, deinde vero quia nobis etiam minime suadentibus tam patriarchas singulos quam ceteros homines, qui sub caelo sunt, excepta fraternitate tua, tam honoratos quamque privatos, tali nos novimus appellare cognomine, quotiens eorum accipimus epistolam et litteras,” *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. 5, ed. E. Gaspar et al., MGH, Epistolae, vol. 7 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1928), 387.

7 “Adeo namque Hadefonsum Galleciae atque Asturiae regem sibi societate devinxit, ut is, cum ad eum vel litteras vel legatos mitteret, non aliter se apud illum quam pro-prium suum appellari iuberet. Scottorum quoque reges sic habuit as suam voluntatem per munificentiam inclinatos, ut eum numquam aliter nisi dominum sequi subditos et
Students of diplomatics have paid little attention to this communicative aspect of medieval intitulature. Instead, they have concentrated on the titles developed at court, the activity of chanceries, and the royal diplomas sent out to subjects. Only seldom has it been asked what happened after a charter with royal titles reached the addressee. Nonetheless, this question is reasonable because the reception of the name of authority was not a passive unilateral process: some titles were accepted and used in correspondence, some elements were omitted as insignificant, and some were rejected consciously because the subjects did not accept the claims that lay behind them. In this manner, the name of authority in diplomatic formulas resulted from communication between two sides.

To comprehend how the name of authority was received and understood by subjects, one must analyze how the ruler was named and referred to in the documents composed outside the court, namely, in letters sent to Carolingian monarchs and in private charters referring to them. Heinrich Fichtenau proved the usefulness of this approach in his study of dating principles employed in early medieval private charters. He argued that the dating of these charters represented a compromise between the official intitulatio and their audience in the upper strata of society, a group that was broader than the courtly audience. Fichtenau was interested in how royal titles had been received and transformed...
by this wider constituency. His analysis of the private charters composed in Charlemagne’s reign demonstrated distinct regional differences: the charters drawn up in the kingdom of the Franks referred to Charlemagne as king (rex) or king of the Franks (rex Francorum) without mentioning his other titles: king of the Lombards and patrician of the Romans. Those charters were dated only by his reigning years in the regnum Francorum. In the territories of the conquered Lombard kingdom, by contrast, the composers of charters continued to follow regional patterns similar to those of the previous Lombard kings. Charlemagne was named simply rex, or the compound title “king of the Franks and Lombards” (rex Francorum et Langobardorum) was employed, while the title “patrician of the Romans” (patricius Romanorum) was omitted in most cases as insignificant. The latter was used only in the papal territories in relation to Charlemagne.

Although the introduction of Charlemagne’s imperial title in 801 changed the dating patterns in private charters, the imperial title was not disseminated in a uniform manner from Aachen because it was not popular north of the Alps. Furthermore, the reaction to and comprehension of the new imperial title by regional audiences demonstrate that they often encountered it with much confusion. The simplification of the imperial title by Louis the Pious from 814 did not make these regional differences disappear. For instance, most charters written at Fulda, that is, in the regnum Francorum, continued to call him king of the Franks rather than emperor. Private charters in northern Italy more often called him “Our Lord” (dominus noster), a continuation of earlier Lombard tradition. Thus, Fichtenau proved that Carolingian titles were received and interpreted differently, including being “contested” by regional “diplomatic” audiences, who identified themselves as Franks, Lombards, or Romans. Their reception was influenced visibly by earlier codes or political traditions used in the symbolic language of royal or imperial authority in the seventh and eighth centuries. This practice
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11 “Interessant genug es zu sehen, wie sich diese Wirklichkeit im Denken breiterer Kreise der Urkundenschreiber spiegelt, was rezipiert, was weggelassen oder auch umgebildet,” ibid., 2:501.
13 Ibid., 2:505–8.
14 Ibid., 2:518–22.
demonstrates that the pattern of addressing of rulers was an integral part of a regional sociopolitical habitus, in which inertia was much stronger than the unification policy of the Carolingian center.

While the dating patterns in Carolingian private charters demonstrate how the name of authority was perceived on a local level, the letters sent to and from Carolingian monarchs show how it was communicated between them and their subjects. Mark Mersiowsky has observed that, since the time of Theodor Sickel, mandates and especially letters have been relegated to the margins of diplomatic studies. Traditional diplomatics, with its concentration on the court and the figure of a king, was focused primarily on diplomas and capitularies. Mersiowsky argues, however, that letters played an important role in the communication between the Carolingian court and local elites and therefore deserve much more scholarly attention than they have received.

(b) Inscriptio and intitulatio in Carolingian letters

A few original Carolingian letters and mandates have survived. They do not bear any graphical signs of authority and authenticity because they lost their individual, material importance soon after the information they contained was received, read, and copied, a fact that considerably lessened their chances for survival. One of several


17 Mersiowsky, “Towards a Reappraisal,” 19, writes: “The perspective of classical diplomatics in dealing with early medieval royal charters was and still is that of the monarch.”


20 The destiny of the original copy of the letter of Charlemagne to Hadrian, which survived as a palimpsest page in a later manuscript, is quite typical. See for details Emmanuel Munding, ed., Königsbrief Karls d. Gr. an Papst Hadrian über Abt-Bischof Waldo
undoubtedly authentic letters of the Carolingian kings was addressed to the citizens of Barcelona. Because the letter was sent to the urban community, it acquired a public character and was kept in the archive of Barcelona’s cathedral. This letter of Charles the Bald is devoid of any graphic sign; the invocatio (official invocation) and intitulatio do not use the calligraphic script, littera elongata, that was expected in contemporary Carolingian diplomas. The royal letters nonetheless have certain features that indicate that they were written in the Carolingian chancery as were diplomas. The beginning of every letter has the same structure as the diplomas and starts with the same official intitulature of a Carolingian monarch, which, after 801, was preceded by an official invocation. Therefore, the absence of graphical signs and special scripts in the royal letters is not the result of having an origin different from that of royal charters. It probably indicates, instead, that those letters were not intended to be scrutinized or tested for authenticity, but to be read aloud and heard. The Carolingian title played an important role in the oral presentation of a royal message.

The authority of a Carolingian monarch was presented in the royal letters by several means. As mentioned above, their intitulature almost always used the official titles of the Carolingians. Additionally, the intitulatio preceded the inscription (inscriptio), appellation of the addressee, in the letters sent to subjects. In medieval correspondence, the person of higher status was expected to be named at the beginning of a letter, regardless of whether he was the sender or recipient. Furthermore, in the cases of lay addressees, the inscription directly stated their dependent


23 The correspondence between Byzantine emperors and Merovingian kings in the sixth century illustrates this point. In 584, Childebert II sent a letter to Emperor Maurice with the following address: “Domino glorio, pio, perpetuo, inclito, triumphatore ac semper Augusto, patri, Mauricio imperatore, Childebertus rex,” Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi, 138. Maurice’s reply started with “In nomine domini Dei nostri Iesu Christi. Imperatore Caesar Flavius Mauricius Tiberius…Childeberto, viro glorio, regi Francorum,” ibid., 148. For examples from the high Middle Ages, see Heinrich Fichtenau, “Adressen von Urkunden und Briefen,” in Beiträge zur Mediävistik: Ausgewählte Aufsätze, vol. 3 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1986), 149.
status; for instance, one letter of Charlemagne was addressed to “our faithful man Dungal” (Dungalo fi deli nostro), or one of those of Louis the Pious was sent to “our faithful H.” (H. fi deli nostro). This custom did not apply to the letters sent to high clergy, who, from the early ninth century, were addressed normally as venerable archbishop, bishop, or abbot. One exception to this rule is a letter of Lothar II written in 869 that has an unusual inscriptio, “to venerable archbishop Ado, our faithful man” (Adoni venerabili archiepiscopo fi deli nostro). Evident exceptions from the traditional epistolary pattern were personal letters of Charlemagne to the members of his Palace School, Alcuin and Angilbert, in which their nicknames—correspondingly, David, Albinus, and Homer—were employed.

In addition to Carolingian letters to subjects, there were two other groups of royal correspondence: letters to Roman popes and other rulers. In letters to the Mercian king Offa and Byzantine emperors, Carolingian kings always placed their names before those of the addressees. The equality of relations was expressed by addressing them as brothers, namely, fratri carissimo, dilecto fratri, or dilectissimo spiritualique fratri nostro. When the letters were sent to royal relatives, their kinship was indicated in the address through such inscriptio as “to our most beloved son” (dilectissimo filio nostro) in the letter of Emperor Charlemagne to his son Pippin or “to our most beloved nephew” (dilectissimo nepoti) in the letter of Louis the German to Louis II.

While relations with foreign monarchs were seen from the angle of brotherhood, relations with Roman pontiffs gradually came to be

28 Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 211; and Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 4, 249.
described as ties between a spiritual son and father. The Carolingian name of authority in correspondence between Rome and the Carolingian court developed under the apparent influence of the contemporary Roman popes, who kept introducing new elements to Carolingian titles in the inscriptio of their letters. In the spring of 754, Stephen II personally consecrated King Pippin with sacred oil and granted him the title “patrician of the Romans.” Soon thereafter, Stephen II started adding the element *patricius Romanorum* to Carolingian intitulature in his letters to Pippin the Short, and twenty years later, in 774, it was added to the official title of Charlemagne (app. 11). Roman popes from Stephen II to Leo III also added to their letters the expression “to the most excellent son” (*excellentissimo filio*) before the name of Pippin the Short and Charlemagne. Their own intitulature, *N. papa*, presented another side of the paternal relationship, since in contemporary Greek, *πάπας*
also meant father. After the popes, through their involvement in the confirmation anointment of Carolingian princes, had become their godfathers in 754–767 and 781–791, they also added the expression “to our spiritual co-father” (nosto spirituali conpatri) in their addresses to the Carolingian kings. It seems that Charlemagne was nevertheless reluctant to accept the popes’ paternal vision, for in his letter of 791, he calls Hadrian I “co-father” and, then, “father in Christ”; this hierarchy was repeated in the formula “co-father and also son in Christ” (compater idemque in Christo filius) added to his own intitulature. This order was obviously different from the one used by Hadrian I, who addressed Charlemagne first as “son” and, only in the second place, “co-father.” Yet even this reluctant acceptance of the papal spiritual fatherhood was probably abandoned in Charlemagne’s communication with Leo III, as demonstrated in his only extant letter to the pope, written in 796. The imperial coronation of 800 slightly changed Leo III’s attitude to his relationship with the Carolingian ruler. Although papal letters written in 808–814 still called Charlemagne “son,” Leo’s own intitulature replaced the title “pope” (papa) with “bishop” (episcopus). In those letters, Leo also addressed Charlemagne with the titles of early Byzantine emperors, whose earthly authority was much higher than that of the Roman bishop.

35 Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi, 594; and Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 2, 137; vol. 3, 6, 66, and 87–100. Some of those titles are known from Latin letters to early Byzantine emperors; the title amator Christi is a direct translation of the Byzantine title φιλόχριστος, which can be found in the documents of Byzantine emperors from the sixth century; Karl Schmitz, Ursprung und Geschichte der Devotionsformeln bis zu ihrer Aufnahme in die fränkische Königsurkunde (Amsterdam: Schippers, 1965), 154–5. Percy E. Schramm, “Karl der Große als Kaiser (800–814) im Licht der Staatsymbolik,” in Kaiser, Könige und Päpste, 1:265, wrote about these papal letters: “Leo schrieb also an Karl nach dem Muster, wie seine Vorgänger ihre Schreiben an den Basileus abgefaßt hatten.” Yet the status of Charlemagne in Rome after the year 800 was more ambiguous than the earlier position of Byzantine emperors. For details, see Noble, The Republic of St. Peter, 291–9. His conclusion is that “after 800 the Republic [i.e. papal territory] was an autonomous region within the Carolingian Empire,” ibid., 332.
The reign of Louis the Pious marks a symbolic shift in the power relations between the Carolingians and the papacy, as demonstrated by two letters of the emperor written in 824 and 825. First, the name of pope is placed at the beginning of both letters before the imperial intitulature; this practice, indicating higher authority for the Roman pope, was later followed by other Carolingians. Second, the letter addresses the pope as summo pontifici et universalis papae, which became the customary inscriptio in later Carolingian letters to Roman popes. Third, the superlative forms of the adjectives sanctissimo and reverentissimo in front of the pope’s name further emphasize his increased status. Fourth, Louis adds the element “your spiritual son” (spiritalis filius vester) to his own title and calls the pope “father in Christ” (in Christo patri); thereafter, the Roman popes of the ninth century became the spiritual fathers of their Carolingian spiritual sons. The increasing authority of the popes in relation to the Carolingian kings became most visible during the pontificate of Nicholas I, who humbly styled himself episcopus servus servorum Dei (bishop, a slave of God’s slaves) after Gregory the Great. He also commonly addressed the Carolingians with the phrase dilecto filio (beloved son), glorioso regi (glorious king), or glorioso imperatori (glorious emperor), without the use of the superlative forms of these epithets, as was the norm in the second half of the eighth century. Some Carolingians accepted this new diplomatic vision of power relations with the pope and called themselves his spiritual and most devoted sons.

While the communication of authority in correspondence between the Carolingians and the Roman popes always had a certain degree of ambiguity, the symbolic acceptance of authority in letters sent by

---

36 Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 3, 313; and Concilia Aevi Karolini I, 534. Cf. Wolfram, Intitulatio, 1:97–8. Unfortunately, there is only one extant letter with inscriptio and intitulatio addressed to a pope from the period between 825 and 860. This letter follows the pattern established in 824–25. It is thus difficult to draw definite conclusions on how the power relations between the Carolingians and the popes were developing in this period, especially in view of diminishing papal authority demonstrated by their coinage at the time. For details, see chapter 4.


subjects to their Carolingian rulers was more straightforward. Because almost all surviving letters were written by clerics, we have to restrict our analysis to this social group. Even keeping in mind the limited representative character of those letters, we can see, behind the unanimous “diplomatic” acceptance of Carolingian authority by clergymen, a gradual change in subjects’ attitude in their relation to the ruler, Christian community, and God. At the same time, the *inscriptio* and *intitulatio* in subjects’ letters sent to Carolingian kings employ different codes in the epistolary formulas used to describe the authority of the monarch. The choice of diplomatic formulas depended on the context, that is, where, when, and by whom those letters were written.

In the second half of the eighth century, subjects expressed their unconditional submission to Pippin the Short and Charlemagne by calling them *dominus* and by identifying themselves with such expressions as “the most humble little servant” (*ultimus servulus*) or “subdued to your dominion” (*vestro subditus dominatui*). They addressed their kings as *rex* or *rex Francorum*, thus employing the traditional name of royal authority inherited from the Merovingian period. The honorific epithets “most excellent” (*excellentissimus*), “highest” (*praecellentissimus*), and “most glorious” (*gloriosissimus*) that were applied to the Carolingian kings in these letters had been used previously to address Merovingian kings. There are several exceptions to this trend. One is the letter sent by the Romans and probably drafted in the papal chancery after Charlemagne’s military support against Lombard aggression in 757. With the addition of the element “patrician of the Romans” (*patricius Romanorum*) to the Carolingian royal title, the senders defined Pippin’s desired relation to Rome. Simultaneously, by using the clause *a deo institutus* (instituted by God), they introduced God as the ultimate source of royal prerogatives. This divine authority was established at some expense to royal authority, which was not seen at Rome to be as direct and overwhelming as it was in Gaul. The king’s rule was mediated by God, who was the main sovereign of the papal city. Consequently, the lay ruler was a great victor “instituted by God,” and Rome itself was “protected by God” (*a deo servata*).

---

41 “Domino excellentissimo atque praecellentissimo et a deo instituto magno victori Pippino regi Francorum et patritio Romanorum, omnis senatus atque universa populi generalitas a deo servatae Romanae urbis,” ibid., 509.
Similarly, as demonstrated by extant letters of Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia, from 791 and 800, clerics writing from newly conquered Italian territories refrained from excessively submissive formulas. He identified himself as servorum Domini servus (slave of the Lord’s slaves) and pointed to God’s role in the construction of royal authority with the expressions “crowned with divine clemency” (divina coronante clementia) and “distinguished with triumphal crowns by the largess of the Lord” (triumphalibus largiente domino gloriosus insignito coronis). In the inscriptio, Paulinus used titles like inclyto triumphatori, which in the early medieval West were reserved for late Roman and early Byzantine emperors. This demonstrates that the previous political, cultural, and religious experience of the Italians greatly affected their perception of the new Carolingian rulers. The Roman semantic code of imperial authority, which mirrors the commonalities deeply rooted in the sociopolitical habitus of the Italian peninsula, spread to the north of the Alps soon after the year 800, when many Frankish bishops began addressing their Carolingian emperors with Roman imperial epithets and titles.

The letters sent to Charlemagne in the last years of his life, from 809 to 813, testify to this change. The full official title of the Carolingian monarch is employed only in one letter, written by the bishop of Trier, Amalarius. All others addressed Charlemagne with Roman imperial titles among which imperator and Augustus were the most important. For instance, the bishop of Lyons, Leidrad, used in his inscriptio the titles victori ac triumphatori and semper Augusto (august forever), which were absent in the official Carolingian intitulature but had been applied earlier to the late Roman and early Byzantine emperors. Bishops from Italy were influenced more visibly by the symbolic language of imperial authority customary on the peninsula; Odilbert of Milan and Maxentius of Aquileia, for instance, employed the expression “protected by God”

---


43 See, for example, Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi, 131, for Justinian I.


(a Deo conservato), previously used in Lombard charters. This formula was a direct translation of the Greek term θεοφύλακτος, an epithet used to address early Byzantine emperors. Some bishops north of the Alps were eager to take up these symbolic formulas. For instance, Amalarius of Trier not only used the formula a deo conservato, but also saluted Charlemagne with a traditional imperial acclamation, vita salusque perpetua (long and healthy life), instead of previous greeting formulas like in domino salutem (greeting in the name of the Lord). Yet, the difference between the Italian and the Frankish clergy’s perceptions of imperial authority, hinted at earlier by the letters from the Romans and Paulinus of Aquileia, was still visible in the early ninth century. Whereas Leidrad of Lyons acknowledged that he was a bishop by divine dispensatio and royal miseratio, the bishops from northern Italy continuously stated their submission first and foremost to God by describing themselves with the traditional Gregorian formula servus servorum Dei.

All of the tendencies that appear in letters sent to the imperial court in the last years of Charlemagne’s reign developed further under Louis the Pious. In correspondence, subjects commonly called him imperator, Augustus, victor, and triumphator. In this period, those who sent letters often added to existing imperial titles antiquarian expressions that vividly appealed to the Roman past. These formulas were often mixed with Christian references contemporaneously in vogue. For instance, in 816, Claudius, appointed bishop of Turin, called Louis the Pious gratia dei pater patriae; the title pater patriae (the father of homeland) originating in the early Roman empire is modified in this inscriptio by the insertion of the agency of the grace of God. In 826–827, Venerius, bishop of Grado, addressed Louis the Pious as totius orbis orthodoxi terra

---


marique nostro domino (to our lord of the entire orthodox world on the earth and in the sea); this appellation exploits the classical Roman expressions *terra marique* and *orbis terrarum*, but Christianizes the latter.\(^{50}\)

Imperial acclamations also frequently continued to be substituted for traditional greeting forms. For example, after the restoration of Louis the Pious to imperial power in 834, the people of Mainz sent him a letter opening with the classical acclamation *virtus, vita, victoria salusque continua*. In the same year, Hrabanus Maurus began his letter with the imperial acclamation *honor et victoria et salus perpetua*.\(^{51}\)

In spite of these examples of titles and acclamations once reserved for Roman emperors, it would be a mistake to think that those who wrote letters to Louis the Pious necessarily considered him to be their direct *ἐπίγονος* (offspring). Boris Uspensky, in his analysis of the Russian royal title *tsar’,* has shown that the meaning of a title depended greatly on the cultural orientation of society at the time; in different historical contexts, the title *tsar’* could refer to the Byzantine legacy or to that of the Tatar khans.\(^{52}\) For Carolingian literate society in the first decades of the ninth century, Roman imperial titles and acclamations primarily referred to the Christian empire of the fourth and fifth centuries. Just as *pater patriae* was modified by the formula *gratia dei*, Roman titles were adjusted for the Carolingians by stressing the Christian nature of their authority. Already Charlemagne in the last years of his rule, between 809 and 812, was greeted with the epithets “most Christian” (*christianissimus*) and “most pious” (*piissimus*), which were used later for Louis the Pious.\(^{53}\) When they were absent, other expressions with similar meaning could be employed, including ones addressed “to the son of the Holy Catholic Church of God” (*sanctae dei ecclesiae catholicae filio*) and “to the most religious among the Christians” (*Christianorum religiosissimo*).\(^{54}\)

While Carolingian bishops were knowledgeable enough to use Roman titles properly, lower-level clerics may have had only a vague understanding about how to use these titles. For instance, an unknown cleric started his letter to Louis the Pious with the traditional Roman greeting

\(\text{\tiny \(^{50}\) Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 3, 314.}
\text{\tiny \(^{51}\) Ibid., 324 and 416.}
\text{\tiny \(^{52}\) Boris A. Uspensky, *Tsar’ i imperator: Pomazanije na tsarstvo i semantika monarshikh titulov* (Tsar’ and emperor: Anointing to tsar’dom and the semantics of monarchic titles) (Moscow: Jazyki Russkoj Kul’tury, 2000), 34–5.}
\text{\tiny \(^{53}\) Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 2, 537 and 539–40; *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 247; and Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 3, 182, 185, and 313–4.}
\text{\tiny \(^{54}\) Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 2, 597; and Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 3, 153.}\)
ave, reserved for emperors, but invoked him as rex imperator victor auguste, thus mixing the Roman intitulature with a traditional Frankish royal title. Although in the reign of Louis the Pious, the Roman code of imperial authority dominated the diplomatic formulas used among the Carolingian elite, this case suggests that the previous Frankish diplomatic vocabulary was still alive among the lower clergy and Carolingian “gentry,” if we employ the term introduced by Bullough and Innes.

From the 810s to 830s, most men who sent letters continued to acknowledge their humble submission to Carolingian authority through such expressions as servus vester and servulus or even more modestly by using servus modicus and quidam ex ultimis fidelibus servulis vestris (one of your most humble faithful servants). In 826–827, the bishop of Grado, Venerius, used the more independent Italian formula servus servorum dei, but immediately added the humble remark “suppliantly devoted to your service” (in vestro servitio suppliciter devotus). In a similar way, around 835, the abbot of St. Denis, Hilduin, called himself a “humble servant of Christ” (humilis Christi famulus), although he did not forget to mention that he was very devoted to the imperial authority of Louis the Pious. When a letter was addressed to a sub-ruler, however, there was no need for such a remark. In a letter to Pippin I of Aquitaine written in 834, the bishop of Orléans, Jonas, named himself “minimus famulorum Christi famulus” without spelling out any submission formula. Thus, it seems that in the last years of Louis the Pious’ reign, clerical subjects saw themselves increasingly less in direct and unequivocal submission to a Carolingian monarch. Rather, they viewed themselves primarily as subjects of God and servants of the Christian community, and only secondly as subjects of a Christian ruler. The bipolar perception of authority relations between a ruler and clerical subject was gradually dissolving, and a more complicated vision of the relations of authority and submission, involving God as a participant, emerged instead.

This tendency became stronger after 840, when clerics, bishops, and abbots faced the new political reality of the co-existence of several Carolingian sovereigns. The division of the Frankish empire also led

---

55 Ibid., 615.
56 Donald A. Bullough, “Europae pater: Charlemagne and his Achievement in the Light of Recent Scholarship,” EHR 85 (1979): 59–105, at 73–84; and Innes, State and Society, 84–5.
58 Ibid., 313–4.
59 Ibid., 328 and 349.
to increasingly important regional patterns in addressing Carolingian sovereigns. Educated Carolingian clerics were well aware of regional distinctions, and the letters of Hrabanus Maurus, abbot of Fulda and later archbishop of Mainz, nicely illustrate how they coped with this new reality. After 840, Hrabanus supported Lothar I’s cause and thus continued to address the emperor with Roman imperial titles and acclamations, which had been used earlier for Louis the Pious. After 855, Hrabanus employed some of this imperial phraseology, including “magni et pacifico atque coronato regi,” in his letters to Lothar II. None of these formulas can be found, however, in his letters to Louis the German written mostly in the period c. 842–846, when the East Frankish king deprived him of the abbacy at Fulda for supporting Lothar I and Hrabanus sought to regain his office. Hrabanus called Louis the German dominus rex and often used the traditional Frankish epithet excellentissimus. This convention suggests that Hrabanus consciously chose different diplomatic codes, Frankish and Roman imperial, in his epistolary communication with individual Carolingians. In the letters he wrote amidst the turbulent Frankish politics of the 840s to 850s, Hrabanus usually did not include a submission clause; instead, he stressed his direct submission to God with such formulas as “vilissimus servorum dei servus.” The only exception is his letter to Lothar II.

60 “Rabanus excellentissimo imperatori Hluthario virtus, vita et salus perpetua,” ibid., 443; “Incliti orthodoxi Hlotharii Augusti salus sui Hrabani Mauri fatur salutem,” ibid., 475; “Domino serenissimo et excellentissimo imperatori Hludhario Augusto Hrabanus, minimum servorum dei, aeternam in Christo optat salutem,” ibid., 476; and “Amantissimo imperatori Ludhario Augusto salus, victoria et vita perpetua,” ibid., 506. It is important to point out, as does Screen, “The Importance of the Emperor,” 36, that Hrabanus, abbot of Fulda, was the only charter recipient of Lothar I in the area contested between him and Louis the German.

61 “Domino excellentissimo aetque serenissimo regi Hlothario ultimus vestre sublimitatis alumpnus Maurus,” ibid., 506; and “Domino praecellentissimo nobisque dei munere dato, magni et pacifico atque coronato regi Lothario ultimus vestrae servitutis famulus Maurus,” ibid., 515.

written in 855–856, in which he directly accepted the king’s authority by naming himself “ultimus vestrae servitutis famulus.”

The inscriptions in the letters written to Charles the Bald demonstrate a peculiar mixture of Roman expressions like inclytus and piissimus with traditional Frankish ones like rex, excellentissimus, precellentissimus, and gloriosissimus. The only exceptions to this rule are the letters written by the Roman librarian Anastasius after the imperial coronation of Charles the Bald, in which Anastasius referred to the Carolingian ruler with traditional imperial titles. Some Carolingian bishops and abbots of the period, including Hincmar of Rheims and Lupus of Ferrières, started addressing Charles the Bald and other Carolingians with the title glorioso regi (to the glorious king). This rejection of the superlative form gloriosissimus (most glorious), which also occurred in the letters of Pope Nicholas I to various Carolingian rulers, was a diplomatic sign of the growing power of Frankish bishops and abbots.

The letters sent by Carolingian bishops to Charles the Bald and Louis the German testify to the same tendency that became noticeable in the 830s. In this correspondence, bishops like Liudbert of Mainz, Hincmar of Rheims, and Jonas of Orléans continued to affirm their submission to the Christian church and their supreme lord, Jesus Christ, with such formulas as sanctae dei ecclesiae vernaculus (belonging to the Holy Church of God), minimus famulorum Christi famulus (the most inferior servant of Christ’s servants), or plebis dei famulus (a servant of the plebs of God).

Even if a mid-ninth-century correspondent accepted the authority of a Carolingian ruler, he did not refer to himself with the diminutive servulus (little servant), as was customary earlier, but with the more neutral fidelis (faithful). The subject was fidelis, meaning that his submission was based on Christian faith (fides). This dual relationship to the highest authority was spelled out distinctly in a letter of Paschasius Radbertus,

---

63 For examples, see Garipzanov, “Communication of Authority in Carolingian Titles,” 79–80.
the devoted biographer of Adalhard and Wala and their successor as abbot of Corbie. In a letter to Charles the Bald, he described himself as Charles’ “abbot, albeit unworthy, as well as deacon of Christ” (vester eti indignus abbas ac levita Christi).”

Monks’ perception of imperial and royal authority in the mid-ninth century was somewhat less coherent than that of abbots and bishops. The monk Angelome, for example, addressed Lothar I with a traditional imperial inscriptio, while another monk, Bernard, confused imperial and royal titles by addressing Lothar II as “the dearest to me of all Augusts and the highest king” (augustorum mihi carissimo et praecellentissimo regi), thus using the titles rex and Augustus as synonyms. Similar ambiguity may be seen in the letter of Ratramn, a monk from Corbie, sent to Charles the Bald in 850, in which he called the king princeps, instead of the customary rex. Although Angelome did not include a submission clause, he stressed his important liturgical duties to the monarch, especially his prayers for the ruler’s eternal glory. Whereas Bernard described himself as most faithful to Lothar II, he accentuated the supreme authority of God, who installed the king on the throne, and made reference to his prayers for the sake of the king. A similar theme was stressed in a letter from the monastic community of St. Sebastian and St. Medard of Soissons to Charles the Bald, in which the traditional greeting salutem was replaced with the expression “faithful and continuous prayers” (fideles et continuas orationes). This emphasis on prayers and royal liturgy in the diplomatic formulas used by monks accords with the liturgical evidence of the mid-ninth century analyzed in the previous chapter. Here, a point made by Geoffrey Koziol in relation to royal charters is most relevant to this correspondence:

In isolation a diploma is no evidence of any political beliefs. But return the diploma to its liturgical setting and restore it to the world of political

---

67 *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. 4, 135.
69 Ibid., 150.
70 “Praecellentissimo et cum potestatis, tum etiam pietatis insignibus radianti, domino nostro K[arolo] regi devotissima beatorum Medardi et Sebastiani congregatio fideles et continuas orationes,” ibid., 179.
competition from which it issued, and then we can see that the typologies matter.\footnote{Begging Pardon and Favor, 93.}

Taken within a liturgical context, the above-mentioned epistolary formulas revealed the independent status of Frankish monks that derived from their liturgical function in the symbolic communication of Carolingian authority.

The next question concerning this symbolic communication in the Carolingian world is whether the changing perception of royal and imperial authority on the part of clergymen affected rulers and their retinues. To answer this question, we must review changes in official Carolingian intitulature as well as the development of the name of authority addressed to the majority of the population via Carolingian coinage.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(c)] \textit{The name of authority communicated}
\end{itemize}

The official titles of the Carolingian monarchs had both a complete form used by the chancery in royal documents like diplomas, capitularies, and official correspondence, and abbreviated variants, which, as a rule, contained their most essential elements. The official intitulature of the Carolingian chancery represented a stable formula, transferred by notaries to all formal Carolingian documents. The shortened variants of titles were used in informal correspondence, in the signature line of diplomas, and on seals, bulls, and coins. The titles on coins were particularly important, however, because after 754, they were defined in most cases by the royal court; thus, they reflected the decision of a ruler and his advisors. At the same time, they were addressed to most subjects and had to reckon with their “horizons of expectations.” We can assume that the elements of the royal/imperial title on coins, seen by most of the population of the realm, were especially significant for the Carolingians and their subjects. Therefore, it is worthwhile to trace the interrelations among official Carolingian intitulature, titles used in correspondence, and reduced titles employed on coins.

In November 751, Pippin the Short was anointed king, a significant event that was soon reflected in his official titles. From the spring of 752 on, the new title “Pippin, King of the Franks, illustrious man”
(Pippinus rex Francorum vir illuster) appeared in his diplomas and remained constant until his death. Although Stephen II called the Carolingian king “patrician of the Romans” (patricius Romanorum) starting in the year 756, this title did not affect the documents written in the Carolingian court—a sign of the minor role of papal Rome in Carolingian politics of the time. Thus, the complete official title of Pippin consisted of three elements: the personal name Pippinus (Namensstitel), the royal title rex Francorum (Funktionstitel), and the honorable title vir illuster (Rangtitel). That the first two elements were the main ones is demonstrated by the silver coinage of Pippin, which was first struck after the capitulary of 754/5 and contained reduced variants of his official title. (This may suggest that royal anointment by Stephen II was perceived as more important for the establishment of Carolingian kingship than the similar act conducted by Frankish bishops in 751.) This capitulary consisted of the order to strike the name of King Pippin on all Frankish coins. As a result, all obverses of these deniers had the abbreviated form of his name, rex Pippinus for early coins or rex Francorum for later ones (fig. 4). Undoubtedly, this was the only specific requirement regarding the appearance of the coins because there were different variants of Pippin’s name on the obverse, as well as a large variety of reverse forms.


73 The honorable title vir illuster was given to the highest dignitaries of the late Roman empire. Thereafter, this title was applied to the highest dignitaries of barbaric kingdoms as well. The question as to whether this title belonged to Merovingian kings or not is disputed; for different opinions, see Wolfram, Intitulatio, 1:116–27; and Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections,” 914–6. It is more likely that the Merovingians did not have this title at all. As argued by Wolfram, a faulty reading in the Carolingian chancery of the initial line of Merovingian diplomas—that is, N. rex Francorum vir[ibus] in[lustribus]—might have led to the consideration of this element as a part of the Merovingian intitulatio. Hence, this element appeared after the Funktionstitel and not before as it was a norm in the title of Merovingian mayors, inlustre vir maior domus, Wolfram, Intitulatio, 1:210–2. It is also possible that the early Carolingian chancery simply continued to use the title, which earlier belonged to Carolingian mayors of the palace.

74 For more detailed analysis of this coin type and references, see Lafaurie, “Numismatique: Des mérovingiens aux carolingiens,” 35–44; MEC, 203–4; and Garipzanov, Karolingskoye monetnoye delo, 29.
“Rex Francorum” was an old Merovingian title, known from the sixth century onward and taken over by Pippin the Short. In the numismatic evidence, the title *rex* accompanied by a personal name occasionally occurred on Merovingian coins as early as the sixth century (fig. 5). The use of the title *rex Francorum* was, on the contrary, quite unusual: one such an exception is the seventh-century title legend *domnus Dagobertus rex Francorum* that can be found on a gold coin-medallion struck at Limoges on behalf of Dagobert I. Thus, the use of the numismatic title *rex Pippinus* earlier in the reign of Pippin the Short was a direct continuation of Merovingian tradition, while the introduction of the abbreviated title *rex Francorum* was a significant innovation. The second choice unequivocally demonstrates the importance of the political category of *gens Francorum* in the symbolic communication of early Carolingian authority, although this diplomatic formula may have had different connotations depending upon its audience in Frankish Gaul. For some courtly clerics, it invoked the concept of the Franks as a chosen people. For the aristocracy, it suggested that they, acting as a political entity (neither Neustrians nor Austrasians, but *Franci*), opted for King Pippin to rule over them, a choice expressed by proclamation at the Frankish assembly. For those free Franks who either made an army payment (*haribannus*) or regularly fought in Carolingian campaigns, this title called to mind their military obligations and the military nature of Carolingian kingship. For Frankish warriors—like Ripwin from the vicinity of Fulda, whose social activities Matthew Innes has presented in much detail—participation in military campaigns was a source not only of economic hardship but also potentially increased social status.

---

75 See, for example, the titles of King Guntram in his edict on 10 November 585 and Chlothar II in another document of that period, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, nos. 5 and 8. See also the earliest original royal charters, written in the late sixth and early seventh century: *Die Urkunden der Merowinger*, ed. Theo Kölzer, Martina Hartmann, and Andrea Stüldorf, 2 vols, MGH, Diplomata regum Francorum e stirpe Merovingica (Hanover: Hahn, 2001), 1:69 and 76; nos. 25 and 28. For details about this title in the Merovingian period, see Wolfram, *Initiatatio*, 1:109–16. The same title was used on the seals of Merovingian kings at least from the reign of Dagobert II (676–679). For details, see Bedos-Rezak, “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,” 31, n. 31; Andrea Stüldorf, “Gestalt und Funktion der Siegel auf den merowingischen Königsurkunden,” *AD* 47–48 (2001/2): 133–66, at 140–1; and *Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge*, vol. 2, *Les sceaux des rois et de régence*, ed. Martine Dalas (Paris: Archives Nationales, 1991), 80–7, nos. 4–11.


Finally, for those of lower status in Neustria and Austrasia, this formula symbolically pointed to the highest earthly authority in the kingdom of the Franks, who was sufficiently powerful to force them to accept and handle the silver coins on which his title was placed. It was the polysemy of the royal title connected to the Frankish gens that made it so popular in the symbolic language of authority in the early Carolingian period. This formula allowed the early Carolingians and their entourage to claim continuity with the preceding Merovingian period and, at the same time, communicate new contextual meanings that emerged in the second half of the eighth century.

The title *N. gratia Dei rex Francorum vir illuster*, which may have appeared before the death of Pippin in September 768, became the official title of both Carloman and Charlemagne. However, in 774, the capture of the Lombard kingdom caused a change in Charlemagne’s title. The process of creating a new one took just over a year, ending in November 775. Afterwards, and until March 4, 801, Charlemagne was presented by his chancery as “Charles, by the grace of God king of the Franks and the Lombards, as well as patrician of the Romans” (*Carolus gratia Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum et patricius Romanorum*).

The evolution of Charlemagne’s official title between 768 and 775 symbolically reflected the alteration of his political status. No doubt due to the influence of the papacy, the title “illustrious man” was replaced with “patrician of the Romans.” Unlike his father, Charlemagne and his chancery accepted the title that Roman popes had been using to address the Carolingians since the mid-750s; this acquiescence demonstrated

---

78 There is one diploma dated to the last year of Pippin’s reign, July 768, in which he was styled as *Pippinus gratia Dei rex Francorum vir illuster*, see *Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, no. 24; *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, no. 17; and *Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi*, 408. Yet it is also necessary to keep in mind that some diplomatists consider it a ninth-century copy; for details, see Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections,” 922, n. 62. For Carloman’s titles, see *Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, nos. 45–54. This title was Charlemagne’s official one in the period between January 13, 769 and February 19, 774. The element *gratia Dei* is missing only in five diplomas from twenty-five of that period, ibid., nos. 55–79.

79 Ibid., nos. 80–105. For details about the creation of the new title, see Ildar H. Garipzanov, “Titulatura pervyh karolingskikh korele: Karl Velikiy i rimskaya imperskaya tradiciya” (The intitulature of early Carolingian kings: Charlemagne and Roman imperial tradition), in *Antichnost’: miry i obrazy*, ed. V.D. Zhigunin, E.A. Chiglintsev, and I.H. Garipzanov (Kazan: Management, 1997), 47.

80 *Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, nos. 106–96.

81 After the capture of Pavia, Pope Hadrian I and later Leo III addressed Charles as *domino excellentissimo filio Caroli regi Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricius Romanorum* in most letters written up to 801. See for instance *Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi*, 568 and 594; and *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. 3, 6 and 59.
the strengthening union between the papacy and the Frankish king. Furthermore, in early medieval politics, the honorable title “patrician of the Romans” was higher than *vir illuster* and designated a rank lower only than the emperor and consul.82 Finally, the title allowed its owner to interfere more actively in Italian politics. During the sixth and seventh centuries, every exarch, or Byzantine ruler in Italy, was referred to as *patricius et exarchus Italieae*. It is important to note that Charlemagne began to use the title only after he had become the master of Italy by right of conquest. Around 774, Charles renewed an agreement with papal Rome; in this pact, the terms *adiutor* (assistant) and *defensor* (defender), referring to earlier functions of the Frankish king, were replaced with *protector* (patron) and *defensor*. This meant that the nominal authority of the Byzantine empire over the papal lands was replaced by Frankish “patronage.”83 The introduction of the title *patricius Romanorum* was also a gesture aimed at the elite population inhabiting papal lands and the region of Ravenna, since the “Romans” were named as the third *gens*, which, according to the symbolic language of diplomatic formulas, constituted the new Carolingian polity together with the Franks and the Lombards. The use of this title therefore connected Charlemagne to the previous tradition of political authority existing in Italy. That this title was mainly addressed to the Italians and not to the Franks is evident from the fact that it was omitted from the dating line of contemporary Frankish private charters, as well as from the title legend placed on Carolingian coins struck in Gaul in the royal period of Charlemagne’s reign (app. 11; fig. 4 and 6).

Nonetheless, the title *patricius Romanorum* also reflected a vision of royal authority that placed emphasis on the *gentes*. Charlemagne was named patrician of the Romans, but not of Rome or Italy. The same

---

82 The title of *patricius* was introduced by Constantine the Great; it was granted for displaying outstanding merits before the empire and gave authority and prestige to its owners. Later, this title was given to Germanic kings, namely, Odovacar, Theodoric, Sigismund, and Clovis. Afterwards, Byzantine emperors gave it to Arab and Bulgarian rulers. See P.S. Barnwell, *Emperor, Prefects & Kings. The Roman West, 395–565* (Chapel Hill and London: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1992), 45–7.

approach is visible in the second new element of Charlemagne’s title, *et Langobardorum*, which was, no doubt, the result of the traditional political presuppositions widespread in the eighth century, according to which a *gens* was the constituent basis of a kingdom. At the same time, this innovation resulted from Charlemagne’s need to respect the desires of his Lombard subjects, especially lay and clerical elites, on whose behalf his charters could be issued. To earn their loyalty, the traditional Lombard royal title was incorporated into Carolingian intitulature, and the Lombards together with the Franks and the Romans (whatever the latter term meant at the time) were acknowledged as the *gentes* on which the new political entity was based.

The third innovation of Charlemagne’s title was the expression “by the grace of God” (*gratia Dei*). This devotional formula originally appeared in the intitulature of Roman popes in the late sixth century and in that of Merovingian bishops some time later. Since the Carolingian chancery, unlike the Merovingian one, was directed by clerics, they probably applied to royal intitulature the formula known from clerical documents. Herwig Wolfram has argued, on the contrary, that this expression was invented as a new formula of legitimation for the Carolingians and expressed the idea that “*Das Königtum der Karolinger ist ein Regnum von Gottes Gnaden*” (Carolingian kingship is a kingdom by God’s grace). Wolfram also repeated Percy Schramm’s hypothesis that this formula came from the royal anointments of Pippin the Short in 751 and 754, when the magical power of Merovingian long hair was replaced by the sacramental power of the Carolingians.

---

85 For details, see Schmitz, *Ursprung und Geschichte der Devotionsformeln*, 141–53.
86 For details and all references, see Theo Kölzer, “Einleitung,” in *Die Urkunden der Merowinger*, ed. Theo Kölzer, Martina Hartmann, and Andrea Stieldorf, i–xxi, at xvi.
87 As Goffart suggests, “the first Frankish kings seem . . . to have staffed their writing office with laymen,” Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections,” 917. Schmitz, *Ursprung und Geschichte der Devotionsformeln*, 170–80, thinks that this innovation was made by Hitherius, who was the chancellor in the last years of Pippin’s reign and in the earlier years of that of Charlemagne. Schmitz thinks that the title of popes was taken as a model. Yet the expression *gratia Dei rex* is found in Anglo-Saxon charters and on a Lombard crown dated prior to 768. Therefore, there is a possibility that the introduction of this formula was undertaken under Anglo-Saxon and/or Lombard influence. On Hitherius (Itherius), see Felten, *Abte und Laienäbte*, 230–1; and Donald A. Bullough, “*Aula renovata*: The Carolingian Court before the Aachen Palace,” in *Carolingian Renewal*, 123–60, at 127–8; and Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*, 751–987 (London: Longman, 1983), 81.
88 See Wolfram, *Intitulatio*, 213–7; Percy E. Schramm, “‘Mythos des Königtums: Eine Einführung in das Problem: Monarchie in Europa,” in *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 1:72; and
In contrast, Heinrich Fichtenau strongly opposed this thesis: in his opinion, the anointment in the mid-eighth century was a simple liturgical gesture, which, in the eyes of contemporaries, did not bestow divine grace upon the king. He also repeated Schmitz’s idea that the introduction of the formula owed to the composition of Carolingian diplomas under the supervision of a clerical chancellor. Fichtenau’s interpretation has been supported by most recent scholars revisiting the issue of the medieval anointment tradition, especially Arnold Angenendt, Janet Nelson, and Boris Uspensky. Uspensky, in particular, has argued that the royal anointment originated from the ritual of post-baptismal confirmation, which in the Roman church could be performed only by a bishop. As opposed to baptism, it could be performed late in the life of a Christian, while in the East both rituals were performed by a priest immediately after a child’s birth. Before the eighth century, the Gallican church did not use the procedure of episcopal anointment for confirmation; this ritual, which was known earlier in the Anglo-Saxon church, had disseminated in the Frankish territories under the influence of Boniface and influenced the royal anointment of Pippin the Short by Frankish bishops in 751. Thus, the introduction of the formula...
almost two decades after this event did not mirror any theory of the divine rights of royalty and, accordingly, was not used on royal media like seals or coins. Its introduction marked the first attempt by high clergy working in the royal chancery to use diplomatic formulas of intitulature to define royal authority in relation to God.

Yet the lower clergy probably had a only vague understanding of what this expression actually meant. For instance, Cathuulf, a cleric of an Anglo-Saxon origin, addressed Charlemagne in a letter written around 775—this means that he had a chance to see the official intitulatio of Charlemagne—"to most pious Lord King, highest by the grace of God" (domino regi piissimo, gratia dei celsissimo). In this appellation, the author of the letter separated the expression "by the grace of God" from the royal title and made it a simple attribute of the adjective "highest."91 The letter with this poetic title apparently did not create any difficulties for the recipient since it was copied at the royal abbey of St. Denis.92 Such a history of transmission emphasizes once more that for most Franks of the time, Charlemagne was not a king through the grace of God, but through ties to his political gens, the Franks.

Additionally, in the correspondence and documents related to church life like the Admonitio generalis (789), the official title of Charlemagne received the new element of "a defender of the Holy Church of God" (defensor sanctae Dei ecclesiae).93 Keeping in mind too that in one of his letters Alcuin calls himself "a little humble son of the Holy Mother-Church" (humilis sanctae matris ecclesiae filiolus), we can better understand how Charlemagne’s court in the late 780s and 790s saw the nature of his power relations with the Carolingian clergy. He was their lord, and they were his humble servants because he was a defender of the


91 Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 2, 502. It is important to mention that the letter of Cathuulf is considered the first example of the Fürstenspiegel, dealing with the contemporary political theory. See Morrison, The Two Kingdoms, 10–1. For a detailed analysis of this letter and its language, see Garrison, “Letter to a King,” 310–12 and 323–5; and Joanna Storey, “Cathwulf, Kingship, and the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis,” Speculum 74,1 (1999): 1–21.

92 Ibid., 317.

Christian Church, of which they were humble children. Thus, we can see here new elements of religious legitimation added to the previous Merovingian tradition of royal authority. The symbolic connection of these two traditions was fulfilled in the name of the Old Testament King David, after whom Charlemagne was named frequently in the years following the Frankfurt Council (794); David was also the pseudonym of Charlemagne in his Palace School and was used in his correspondence with its members. Nevertheless, we must be aware that such an understanding of Charlemagne’s authority was probably restricted to a small circle of his friends like Alcuin and Angilbert and the high clergy at the royal court. For the majority of his Frankish subjects, he was *rex Francorum*, whose authority was founded on his connection to the gens. The sophisticated expression of religious legitimation was alien and most likely unknown to them, as the title legend on Charlemagne’s coinage amply demonstrates.

Between 771 and 793/4, this legend was reduced to the king’s name, Carolus, which was the only symbol of royal authority on Charlemagne’s deniers (fig. 6). The personal name had a primordial relation to the intitulature. In the early Middle Ages, it had a numinous connection to its holder, and its cognizance gave, in magical thought, power over its bearer. That is why the ruler’s name was the subject of an official norm, designed in his chancery, which was barred from being changed at the whim of a scribe. However, the ruler’s name could be affected by a change in his status. For instance, after the imperial coronation of 800, Charlemagne’s name began to be written in the chancery with the initial K, which was thought to be appropriate for an imperial

---

97 For details and related bibliography, see Mark Mersiowsky, “Graphische Symbole in den Urkunden Ludwigs des Frommen,” in GSMU, 367.
monarch. The name of Louis the Pious underwent a similar transformation. On the earliest of his coins, struck in Aquitaine between 781 and 793/4, his name is spelled as *Hludvih*, which is close to the original East Frankish form. By contrast, royal charters issued in 794 and 808 name him *Hlodoicus*. Yet, after Louis became the sole emperor in 814, his chancery created a Latin form of his name, *Hludowicus*, which was used constantly in his charters and coinage. Thus, elevation to imperial status affected the official personal names of the Carolingians, whose original Germanic forms were modified into Latin.

The significance of a personal name is clearly visible in the Frankish tradition of royal intitulature. The initial position of a name was a specific feature of Frankish titles—it contrasted with Roman titles in which the element “emperor” (*imperator*) or “our lord” (*dominus noster*) stayed in the first position. Moreover, the Frankish title had a personal character: similar to the importance of the initial position in letters, the original name preceding other elements showed its significance. This tradition was not, however, common south of the Alps. After the conquest of the Lombard kingdom, tremisses (gold coins) continued

---


101 For details, see Menke, *Das Namengut der frühen karolingischen Königsurkunden*, 144–6 and 455–6.

102 This was the reason that the rank of emperor was not mentioned in 806 with the division of the empire; it did not owe to Charlemagne’s hesitation concerning further destiny of the title as Folz supposed, *The Concept of Empire in Western Europe: From the Fifth to the Fourteenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold, 1969), 24. The personal character of the title enabled Charlemagne to crown his son Louis as an emperor in September 813.
to be struck in former Lombard mints in the 770s. The title legend on them, *Dominus noster Carolus rex* (Our Lord, King Charles), repeated the title legend of the last Lombard king, *Dominus noster Desiderius rex*.

The similar legend *Dominus Carolus rex* appeared on the tremisses of Benevento, where Charlemagne was temporarily accepted as suzerain between 788 and 791; that he was named “lord” instead of “our lord” indicated his limited authority in Benevento (fig. 1). These legends, taken together with the overall design of the gold coins, suggest that the mints located on former Lombard territories followed earlier Lombard numismatic tradition and, thus, were oriented, at least initially, to the Lombard audience sufficiently wealthy to handle those coins. To these Lombards, the numismatic “clothing” of Carolingian authority presented Charlemagne as their king, the successor of Desiderius. (One *caveat* must be added here: coinage in the Lombard kingdom as well as in the duchy of Benevento was always influenced strongly by Byzantine custom, and therefore, it makes sense to speak of a Byzanto-Lombard numismatic tradition in northern and central Italy.)

Not only the title but even the name of the Frankish king was affected by Italian audiences. In the dating rubric of some Italian charters, the name of Charlemagne, which is given in the ablative case, is spelled *Carulo*. It might have been considered a simple mistake by a scribe but for the fact that we know that the spelling preferred in Byzantium was Κάρουλος or Κάρουλλος. In these cases, the name of Charlemagne

---

103 Ernesto Bernareggi, “La monetazione aurea di Carlomagno in Italia,” *Numismatica* 3,3 (1963): 155, thinks that those coins were issued at the time when a Carolingian army was besieging Pavia in 773–774. Yet Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 507 and 514–5, argues that they were probably also issued in the years after the conquest. It was likely the capitulary of Mantua (781) that introduced Carolingian silver coins to Italy. See also Rovelli, “Some Considerations,” 205–6.


107 For examples, see the charters of Lucca (774, 789, and 794) and Pisa (804) ChLA, vol. 38, no. 1047; vol. 39, nos. 1126 and 1141; vol. 58, no. 1.

(Carulo) was probably affected by north Italian audiences, who were familiar with its Byzantine transcription. A similar source of influence is visible in the transcription of the personal name of Louis the Pious and Louis II in Italy. The combination of consonants *hl-* at the beginning of the word, which sounded normal to a Germanic ear, was alien to a person speaking literary or vulgar Latin in the ninth century. Consequently, papal-imperial coinage used the spelling of the Carolingian names with an *l-*, which was more familiar to an Italian ear; for instance, the coins of Leo III and Stephen IV struck in 814–817 modified the name of Louis the Pious seen on his charters of 794 and 808 to Lodoichus. On later coins, the official imperial name of Louis the Pious, *Hludowicus*, was transformed to *Ludowicus*, which was also used on papal-imperial coins in the reign of Louis II. The same name form was employed in the coinage of Louis II in Benevento, struck in 866–871. Although private charters written in Italy in the ninth century followed the official form *Hludowicus*, the initial consonant *H-* is unlikely to have been pronounced. This use of the mute *H-* in imperial names, for instance, accounts for an anomaly in a charter of 877 from Lucca, which is dated from the reign of Charles the Bald and names him *Hkarolus*. Only in 793/4 did the title legend on new Carolingian silver coins widen to “Charles, king of the Franks” (*Carolus rex Francorum*) (fig. 7); this
was the first time that the legend *rex Francorum* appeared in full form on regular Frankish coinage. The new deniers (*novi denarii*) were introduced by the monetary reform that took place most likely in the fall of 793 or the winter of 793/4 and were mentioned in the materials of the largest assembly of Charlemagne’s reign, which was held in May 794 at the place called *Franconofurt* (“ford of the Franks”).

The design of these new coins remained unchanged until 813 in spite of all the modifications of Charlemagne’s intitulature after the year 800. However, even this numismatic legend did not reflect the full changes in the official title of Charlemagne but instead repeated the title on Charlemagne’s seal used from 769. As mentioned above, this formula complied with the previous Frankish tradition of royal authority and satisfied the “horizons of expectations” of diverse Frankish audiences. The Franks, victorious in war and pious in ecclesiastical matters—not the Lombards or the Romans—were the real power-base of Charlemagne’s authority; therefore, the legend designed at the royal court and introduced throughout the Carolingian realm fully conformed with their beliefs.

The new deniers introduced in 793/4 provide an excellent opportunity to look more closely at the historical contexts of numismatic title legends (map 2). Numismatists have so far identified thirty-four mints that issued the royal coins of Charlemagne between 793/4 and 813. Although a few mints might have been left unnoticed in our numismatic records, the number that we have is sufficiently representative to analyze the distribution patterns of Carolingian mints at the turn of the ninth century.

Four clusters of mints can be observed aside from the major northern emporia, Dorestad and Quentovic, at which

---


114 For details on this reform and the coin type introduced, see Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 507–11; Coupland, “Charlemagne’s Coinage,” 218–23. Stanislaw Suchodolski, *Moneta i obrót pieniężny w Europie Zachodniej* (Wroclaw: Ossolineum, 1982), 192–201, argues that this reform was undertaken in 790, but most numismatists follow Grierson on this matter.

115 For Charlemagne’s royal seal, see Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 34–5 and 148–9; and Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge, vol. 2, ed. Dalas, 95, no. 16.

Map 2. Carolingian mints between 793/4 and 813
tolls paid in foreign coins or hack silver had to be reminted,\textsuperscript{117} and two towns in northern Aquitaine, Melle and Bourges, at which silver from the main argentiferous mines of the Carolingian realm near Melle, was minted.

The first cluster of mints in the middle Rhine region (Mainz, Cologne, and Trier) points to the original home base of the Carolingian dynasty. The second around the Seine basin (Rouen, St. Denis, Chelles, Sens, Laon, Châteaudun, Orléans, and Tours) indicates the region in which the Carolingians were establishing themselves in the eighth century. The marginal output of some of these mints, as well as the disappearance of half of them in the reign of Louis the Pious (St. Denis, Chelles, Châteaudun, and Laon), seems to suggest that their economic role was rather negligible. \textit{The Chronicle of Moissac} records that Charlemagne summoned two great assemblies in the year 800 before his trip to Italy to receive the imperial title: the first (\textit{magnum concilium et conventum populi}) in Tours in May and June and the second (\textit{congregavit optimates et fideles suos}) in Mainz in August. Each city had a mint and was connected to the Neustrian and Austrasian clusters just discussed. In the first assembly, all three royal sons of Charlemagne were present, and the chronicle reports that he set the kingdom in order for his sons (\textit{disposuit regnum filiis suis}).\textsuperscript{118} Considering that the initial decision to accept the imperial title most likely goes back to the meeting in Paderborn in 799,\textsuperscript{119} it seems that the assemblies were gathered in these two regions in order to discuss this matter with the Frankish aristocracy and receive their formal approval. From this perspective, the propagandistic appeal of Charlemagne’s coins to Frankish identity and the authority of Charlemagne connected to the Franks was obviously useful in the regions to the north of the Loire in which the mints were concentrated. Such a message was no doubt welcome there, especially among the members of Neustrian and Austrasian aristocracy.

Further south from Neustria and Austrasia, two other clusters of mints are noticeable. The one in northern Italy corresponds fairly


\textsuperscript{119} I discuss this decision in more detail in chapter 6.
well to the region controlled by a son of Charlemagne, Pippin, king of Italy. Milan and Pavia were the main centers of his kingdom, and one would expect to see many Franks in the aristocratic entourage of Pippin. Treviso on the eastern edge of Pippin’s kingdom was the gateway to the east, where tolls provided steady income from growing international trade via the Adriatic. Although Lucca and Pisa had mints from the Lombard period, they provided just jots and tittles of Carolingian coinage in northern Italy. The mint of Ravenna was far from Pippin’s heartlands and produced coins with a different title legend than other mints, namely, the abbreviated title “Charles, king of the Franks and the Lombards, and patrician of the Romans” (Carolus rex Francorum et Langobardorum ac patricius Romanorum). This unusual coin issue echoes the contemporary intitulature, admitting the political rights of the two other gentes and their elites in Charlemagne’s realm. It suggests that an exclusive stress on the Franks was less popular in the former capital of the exarchate.

The second southern cluster is located in the southwestern regions of the Carolingian realm on the border with the emirate of Cordova, where another son of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine, was most active in those years. Toulouse, Narbonne, and Arles had the most prolific mints there. Toulouse was an important administrative center in the kingdom of Louis. At Narbonne and Arles, as well as Marseilles, tolls were collected from merchants coming from Spain and the Mediterranean in general. Farther south along the coast, four mints were established in newly conquered Spanish territories: Ampurias, Gerona (captured in 785), Roda, and Barcelona (conquered in 801). In economic terms, these four mints played only a marginal role, so the issuance of coins there predominantly served to celebrate military successes of the Franks. In general, the overall picture of minting in the sub-kingdoms of Aquitaine and Italy is one limited to places

---

120 MEC, 208 and 644. This unusual issue also had a monogram of Charlemagne in Greek, which I discuss in chapter 4.

121 For instance, Astronomer informs us that Louis held a placitum generale in Toulouse in 790 and 797. He also mentions Louis’ visits to Agen in 798 and 810 and his trips to Gascony: Dax must have been on his itinerary. Astronomus, Vita Hludowici imperatori, 299, 306, 308, and 333.


123 Barcelona is an exception since it had a toll station and hence a steady income of Muslim dirhems, which had to be reminted.
under firm personal control of Charlemagne’s sons and their Frankish followers, who were given administrative offices including control over minting. The propagation of their supreme ruler as king of the Franks gave them the authority to establish themselves in these sub-kingdoms in the 790s and the first decade of the ninth century.

The absence of mints is as indicative as is their presence. They were absent not only in Saxony, Thuringia, and Bavaria, the regions less accustomed to the use of coined money, but also in Burgundy, Alsace, and Rhaetia, where the use of coins in transactions was expected. The absence of mints in these lands can be explained by the fact that there was no royal household residing there, unlike in southern Aquitaine and northern Italy. After all, minting was a lucrative royal business to be given away. Yet one must also wonder whether this absence of mints may indicate that the propagation of Carolingian authority linked to the gens Francorum was less important in these regions. As shown in the previous chapter, around the time when the title legend rex Francorum appeared on Carolingian coins, a similar pressure from Frankish lay audiences, and an aristocratic one in particular, led to the introduction of the notion of gens Francorum into the texts of the contemporary royal mass copied in Neustria and Austrasia. This category, in contrast, did not appear in Bavaria, Burgundy, and Rhaetia. As in the case of Philippicus’ coins, this correspondence points to the close connection between the design of Carolingian coins and contemporary liturgy.

The correlation between the title legend on coins and the official, diplomatic title of Charlemagne was interrupted after 25 December 800, when Charlemagne was crowned as emperor. In the next year a new title—Karolus serenissimus Augustus a Deo coronatus magnus pacificus imperator.  

124 The first position of a personal name in intitulatio, as mentioned earlier, was a feature of the Frankish, not Roman, tradition.
125 The title of Augustus was traditional for Roman and early Byzantine emperors. However, the adjective serenissimus was never mentioned together with this title. The expression pius felix invictus Augustus was used by Diocletian, perpetus Augustus by later Roman emperors, and semper Augustus by Byzantine ones. For analysis of the expression serenissimus Augustus, see Wolfram, Intitulatio, 2: 30–7.
126 The term imperator was usually mentioned twice in the Roman imperial title, as a praenomen, meaning the possessor of imperium, and as an honorable title describing a victorious general, A.B. Egorov, “Problemoy titulyatory rimskikh imperatorov (The problems of Roman emperors’ titles),” Vestnik Dreveny Istorii 2 (1988): 169. In Byzantium, the definition imperator, with the second meaning, was replaced by the expression victor ac triumphator. For example, the title of Emperor Maurice in his letter (585 or 590) to the Frankish king Childerich II was “imperatore Caesar Flavius Mauricius Tiberius, fidelis in Christo, mansuetus, maximus, beneficus, pacificus… pius, felix, incleti victor
Romanum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum (Charles, most serene August, great pacific Emperor coronated by God, governing the Roman empire, who is, by God’s mercy, King of the Franks and Lombards)—appeared in his imperial documents; the latest surviving charter using this title was issued in May 813. The new intitulature essentially presents a combination of two main parts: a newly acquired imperial title and the old royal one. The first one did not simply copy late Roman and early Byzantine prototypes, but rather followed the pattern of the imperial title used in acclamations and for dating in Italian charters, which was therefore more familiar to Italian audiences. This means that the new title neither ac triumphator, semper Augustus,” and the Frankish king Theodobert I addressed Justinian I at that period (547) as “Domino inlustro, inclito triumphatori ac semper Augusto Justiniano imperatore”; see Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi, 131 and 148. In contrast, the expression a deo coronatus magnus pacificus imperator was often used in Italy for dating after the reigns of Byzantine emperors. For details, see Peter Classen, “Romanum gubernans imperium: Zur Vorgeschichte der Kaisertitulatur Karls des Großen,” DAEM 9 (1951): 103 and 109–10.

The expression Romanum gubernans imperium occurred at the time of Justinian and was used in some forms of solemn oaths in the territory of Italy up to the mid-eighth century. As Classen, “Romanum gubernans imperium,” 107–21, argued, Charlemagne’s notaries probably found this formula in the archive of Ravenna, where it was used from the sixth century, and where Charlemagne and his retinue stayed in May 801. This formula, describing the Italian sphere of Charlemagne’s authority, replaced the title patricius Romanorum, which was previously used for that purpose.

The origin of this formula goes back at least to the reign of Pippin the Short. The aenga of a royal charter given to the abbey of Prüm in 762 states: “Et quia reges ex deo regnant nobisque gentes et regna pro sua misericordia ad gubernandum commisit....” Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, no. 16. This exceptional aenga, a rather unique statement for the period, is attributed to Baddilo, a notary in the royal chancery. For all details and references, see Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 131–3.

Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata, nos. 197–218. For details, see Garipzanov; Karolingskoye monetnoye delo, 64–8.

The conscious unwillingness of Charlemagne to copy the Byzantine tradition is testified by papal documents from that time. Leo III always addressed Charlemagne with a title close to Byzantine usages, that is, “Domino piissimo et serenissimo, victori ac triumphatori, filio, amatori Dei et domini nostri Iesu Christi Karolo Augusto,” Epistolae Karolini Aevi, vol. 3, 87–100. Yet Charlemagne never used this title in his own documents. This difference in use of the imperial titles actually reflected alternate understandings of the nature of the empire in Aachen and Rome. While in Aachen, the new empire was considered a new political form for the Frankish state; Leo III was eager to make the new Frankish empire an heir of the former Christian Roman empire with the capital in Rome. In 801, that is, immediately after Charlemagne’s imperial coronation, the papal chancery began dating its documents by the years of the imperial reign of the Carolingian ruler in the same mode as the reign of Byzantine emperors used for dating in Rome before the 770s, Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi, 96–7.
claimed Roman heritage nor pretended to Byzantine legitimacy, but rather attempted to address simultaneously several main audiences of his realm, that is, the Franks, the Lombards and the “Romans” in Italy who did not share Lombard identity and whose political assumptions and suppositions were influenced by the late Roman and early Byzantine past.

At the same time, the diplomatic formula of the new imperial intitulature was influenced by contemporary liturgy, namely Charlemagne’s intitulature used in the Frankish royal litanies. In addition, the Gelasian royal mass called God protector of the Roman empire (Romanum imperium) and referred to the Lord’s mercy (aures misericordiae tuae) necessary for successful rule (app. 2). For those familiar with this broader liturgical context, the new intitulature asserted that Emperor Charlemagne governed the Roman empire, which God created and protected for “preaching the Gospel of the eternal kingdom.” It stressed that two particular gentes, the Franks and the Lombards, and their corresponding kingdoms were entrusted to King Charlemagne by God’s mercy.

The new intitulature of Charlemagne, which sought to combine the new imperial status of the Frankish ruler in Italy with his royal authority based on gentes, must have been very confusing for many Frankish contemporaries, especially the laity, since he claimed to be emperor and king at the same time. This assertion might have been nonsensical to audiences accustomed to more traditional ways of describing monarchical authority, and so it was probably not widely used in the Frankish hinterland outside of the Carolingian chancery. Most importantly, the new title was not communicated to the majority of Charlemagne’s subjects through coinage, which employed the old Frankish code of royal authority up to 813. The use of the royal Frankish title on Carolingian coins after the imperial coronation is as revealing as the introduction of this title in 793/4: for a majority of Charlemagne’s subjects, especially in Frankish Gaul, he still remained king of the Franks.

---

131 The basic component of the imperial title also repeats the words of the imperial acclamation, “Karolo serenissimo Augusto a Deo coronato, magno pacifico imperatori, vita et victoria,” used at Christmas 800. This acclamation, in its turn, derives from the Frankish royal litanies used in the 790s, “Carolo excellentissimo et a Deo coronato atque magno et pacifico regi Francorum et Langobardorum ac patricio Romanorum vita et victoria.” For details, see Kantorowicz, Laudes regiae, 15, 42, and 84; and Folz, The Coronation, 146 and 153. See also Bedos-Rezak, “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,” 35, for the “congruence between liturgical and diplomatic vocabularies” in the documents produced by the Frankish kings.
In contrast, the clerical elite, as their letters to Charlemagne demonstrate, began to use, partly under papal influence, the Roman-Byzantine diplomatic code to describe Carolingian authority. Additional evidence for the dominance of this code among the courtly clergy was a change in the dating practice of official diplomas. Clerics in the Carolingian chancery started using an indiction, which was the basic chronological unit in the late Roman and Byzantine empires, in its dating practice from 802 to 840. Another witness to this tendency is Charlemagne’s title on the imperial bull, *Dominus noster Karolus imperator pius felix perpetuus Augustus*, which was issued some time between 801 and 813 (fig. 50). This title had clear analogues in the titles of late Roman emperors. The epithets *pius* and *felix* had already occurred in the title of Diocletian at the end of the third century. From the fourth century on, they were used in imperial titles on coins. The formula *Dominus noster N. pius felix Augustus* had appeared on coins of Valens, Arcadius, Honorius, and Theodosius II (fig. 52). The adjective *perpetuus* was introduced by Emperors Avitus in the West and Leo I in the East.

The imperial diplomatic code became dominant in the Carolingian court in the last years of Charlemagne’s reign and the first years of

---

132 The Byzantine indiction was a fiscal period of fifteen years, starting from September 1. It was used until 823; after this date, the indiction starting with Christmas or January 1 was used as well. After the death of Louis the Pious in 840, the latter together with the *indictio Bedanae* starting on September 24 became predominant, although the Greek indiction was put in practice again in the chancery of Lothar I after 849. See Georges Tessier, *Diplomatique royale française* (Paris: Picard, 1962), 99; and Harry Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*, 4th ed., vol. 2 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968), 409–11.

133 *Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge*, vol. 2, ed. Dalas, 97, no. 18. The late Roman tradition is visible in other features of this bull: Percy E. Schramm, “Die beiden Metallbullen Karls des Großen,” in *Kaisers, Könige und Päpste*, 2:21–5; and idem, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 149. The reverse of the bull bears the image of a gateway surmounted by a cross with the legend ROMA below, accompanied by the circular inscription RENOVATION ROMAN[ī or orum] IMPERII, ibid., 39. Based on this, Schramm argues that this bull expressed the concept of the revival of the Roman empire legitimized through its ancient capital of Rome. Yet one has to be careful in drawing any definite conclusions based on this bull which survives in only one damaged exemplar. This exemplar was not attached to any charter: therefore, it is impossible to say precisely when between the years 801 and 813 it was issued. Finally, there is a possibility that it could have been attached only to documents sent to Italy and was addressed primarily to the Italian audience. I discuss this bull in more detail in chapter 5.

134 Egorov, “Problemy titulatury,” 169–70; Timothy David Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 23. For example, the title of Maxentius on his coins was *imperator Maxentius pius felix Augustus*.

In 812, Charlemagne’s imperial status was acknowledged in Constantinople, but he had to take away elements of his *intitulatio* that might offend the Byzantine βασιλευς τῶν Ῥωμαίων (emperor/king of the Romans). In a letter of 813 to Emperor Michael I, Charlemagne’s title was abbreviated to *Karolus divina largiente gratia imperator et Augustus idemque rex Francorum et Langobardorum* (Charles, by the largess of divine grace Emperor and August as well as King of the Franks and Lombards). He did not use here the expressions *Romanum gubernans imperium* and *a Deo coronatus*, which might have been considered infringements on the Byzantine sphere of authority. The imperial chancery of Louis the Pious continued the process of reduction of the imperial title: in 814 a new formula, *Hludowicus divina ordinante providentia imperator Augustus* (Louis, by the ordinance of divine providence Emperor August), was created. It existed with only slight change until Louis’ death in 840.

(d) **Standardization of Carolingian intitulature and the growing significance of the symbolic formula of legitimation**

This form of intitulature—the name, legitimation formula, and the title *imperator Augustus*—became traditional for Carolingian emperors. Here, the formula coined by Innes in relation to early medieval scribal practices—“standardization guaranteed legitimacy”—is most relevant. Differences in successive rulers’ *intitulatio* was expressed through a specific legitimation formula: *divina ordinante providentia*, for instance, stressed the role of divine providence for Louis’ government (app. 11). A legitimation formula defining monarchic authority in relation to God became the main individualizing feature of Carolingian intitulature, which evinces the growing importance of this diplomatic element in the

---

136 *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. 2, 556. It is possible that Charlemagne’s perception of his empire, reflected in his imperial titles, changed by the end of his reign. However, it is hardly possible to agree with Folz’s opinion, *The Concept*, 24, that Charlemagne’s perception passed from a Roman imperial concept to a Frankish imperial one. Extant evidence demonstrates that, from the very beginning, his empire was proclaimed as the heir of Frankish and late Roman traditions, and that the role of Roman imperial elements in the representation of the new empire increased in the last years of Charlemagne’s reign.


139 For the analysis of those devotional formulas, see Wolfram, *Intitulatio*, 2:58–76.
symbolic communication of the Carolingians and their retinues with the lay and clerical recipients of royal charters. The significance of this element was clearly expressed in the crisis of 833–834: after Louis the Pious first abdicated and was later reinstated in his imperial position, it was deemed necessary to change the devotional formula of his intitulatio from *divina ordinante providentia* to *divina repropitiante clementia*. It was through the propitiation of divine clemency that he was brought back to imperial power. Thus, the trend of bringing God into the relations of authority, visible in some letters sent by clerics to the Carolingians as early as the late eighth century, gradually affected official intitulature. In the resulting diplomatic formulas, Carolingian rulers, as the legitimate successors of Roman-Christian emperors, symbolically acquired divine guidance and clemency. Nevertheless, it would be presumptuous to argue that these formulas claimed exclusively the divine origin of rulership. Instead, the changes in 813–814 testified to the decreasing role of the Frankish tradition of authority: at the imperial court, the mighty *gens Francorum* was no longer considered the main source of legitimation for monarchic authority. The emperor was presented to the receivers of his diplomas as the sole ruler of the Christian empire, following traditions of the Christian emperors of the fourth and fifth centuries, installed on the throne by God’s mercy.

The transformation of the imperial intitulature in 813–814 immediately affected the title legend in Carolingian coinage, spreading for the first time the Carolingian imperial title to the entire population. Initially, it had the form *dominus noster Karolus imperator Augustus rex Francorum et Langobardorum* (Our Lord Charles, Emperor August, King of the Franks and Lombards) (fig. 8). This form resembles the title of Charlemagne from his letter to Michael I in 813—aside from the fact that the epistolary title includes the devotional formula *divina largiente gratia*. Yet very soon, in the mints to the north of the Alps, it was shortened to the legend *Karolus imperator Augustus* (fig. 9), and it seems that the dies that were used to strike coins with such a title were sent from the imperial

---

140 It is difficult to say whether this intitulature appeared in his diplomas in the last year of his life, because the last surviving diploma was issued on 9 May 813, eight months before his death, *Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, no. 218. Nonetheless, the striking similarity between the title used in the letter and title legend on Charlemagne’s imperial coins suggests a change in official intitulature in the summer or fall of 813.
court at Aachen. This short title legend was continued on the silver coins of Louis the Pious struck in 814–818 (fig. 10). This reduced form was similar to the title legend imperator N. Augustus on Roman coins issued in western imperial mints like London, Trier, Lyons, and Rome in the second half of the third and early fourth centuries. Despite of this similarity, the title legend on Carolingian coins was not directly copied from Roman prototypes, but rather was an abbreviated form of the intitulature developed in the imperial chancery. Thus, the set

141 In his early article, “Money and Coinage,” 501–36, Grierson proposed 806 as the year of transition from royal to imperial coinage, but in more recent work, MEC, 208–9, he has accepted Lafaurie’s opinion that the new imperial type was not struck until the official recognition of Charlemagne’s imperial title by Byzantium in 812. This argument was proposed by Jean Lafaurie. However, it is not entirely persuasive, as Charlemagne used the imperial title in his diplomas from 801 in spite of the absence of official recognition from the Byzantine side. Jean Lafaurie, “Les monnaies impériales de Charlemagne,” Comptes-rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres 1 (1978): 162–4, added the second, and more important, argument, that the statistical comparison between the previous royal coinage of Charlemagne and the imperial one led to the conclusion that the imperial coins of Charlemagne must have been struck during the years 812–814. This argument is more plausible, and for this reason, the later date is preferable; see also Coupland, “Charlemagne’s Coinage,” 223–7. Yet I have argued elsewhere that 813 is a more likely date for the beginning of the imperial issue; see Ildar H. Garipzanov, “Karl den Stores kejsermønter i Norge og Sverige—Forslag til nydatering,” Nordisk Numismatisk Unions Middelalderblad 2005, no. 4: 140–3; and idem, Karolinskoje monetnoye delo, 22–3, 30–1 and 69. Cf. Bernd Kluge, “Nomen imperatoris und Christiana religio: Das Kaisertum Karls des Großen und Ludwigs des Frommen im Licht der numismatischen Quellen,” in 799—Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit: Karl der Große und Papst Leo III. in Paderborn: Beiträge zum Katalog der Ausstellung Paderborn 1999, ed. Christoph Stiegemann and Matthias Wemhoff (Mainz: von Zabern, 1999), 82–94, at 85–7, who still insists on the early date (806) for the beginning of Charlemagne’s imperial coinage.

142 For details about this coin type, see Coupland, “Money and Coinage,” 24–7. See also MEC, 213. However, Grierson and Blackburn, along with Depeyrot, date this type to 814–819. The arguments of Coupland for 818 as the last year of this type seem to be more persuasive. A date of 818 can be reconstructed on the basis of the imperial edict from the winter 818/9 with the capitulum “De nova moneta.” See Simon Coupland, “La chronologie des émissions monétaires de Louis le Pieux (814–840),” Bulletin de la Société Française de Numismatique 43 (1988): 431–3.


144 The location of the personal name before the titles imperator and Augustus repeats the diplomatic tradition of the Carolingian chancery but not the title legend on Roman coins, where the personal name goes after the title imperator.
of diplomatic formulas described by the code \textit{imperator Augustus}, which communicated the authority of a Christian emperor over his Christian subjects and used the “vocabulary” of the late Roman and early Byzantine empires, became dominant in most royal media like charters, letters, and coins expressing the name of authority. As the addresses in the letters sent to Louis the Pious demonstrate, the same code permeated the symbolic language of clerical subjects, although among the lower clergy it was often tainted with earlier political vocabulary.

The new distribution pattern of Carolingian mints from 814 to 822 corresponded to the change in the previous year of the name of Carolingian authority as propagated via coinage (map 3). After reference to the king of the Franks had been replaced with one to the Christian emperor, mints no longer remained disproportionately concentrated in the Frankish hinterlands of Austrasia and Neustria, and regions in which Carolingian sub-kings, accompanied by Frankish aristocrats, had established themselves. For one, some marginal mints in the clusters discussed earlier ceased to function. In the last two decades of Charlemagne’s reign, moreover, new mints opened in the regions previously lacking them like Burgundy, Alsace, Rhaetia, and Bavaria. These developments brought about more even distribution of the imperial mints throughout the realm.

From 814, the seals and bulls of Louis the Pious bore the shortened form of the title \textit{Hludowicus imperator};\footnote{Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge, vol. 2, ed. Dalas, 98–100, no. 19–21.} the same title legend appeared on the coins of Louis the Pious only in 818 (fig. 11). Later, this legend became the main expression of imperial authority on Carolingian coins and was imitated on the coins of Lothar I and Louis II.\footnote{For details on the coinage of Louis the Pious and Lothar I, see Coupland, “Money and Coinage,” 23–54; idem, “The Coinage of Lothar I (840–855),” Numismatic Chronicle 161 (2001): 157–98; and MEC, 212–9, 223–5, and 252–3.} The initial change of the title on coins can be explained by the fact that the title \textit{augustus} was reserved for Lothar I, who used it in his official documents and coinage from 822.\footnote{Lotharii I et Lotharii II Diplomata, nos. 1–12, 51–78. For details about this development, see Tessier, Diplomatique, 87.} Thus, this title indicated a person who stood in a political hierarchy immediately after the emperor. However, this late Roman and early Byzantine distinction between the \textit{imperator} as supreme ruler and the \textit{augustus} as his co-emperor disappeared after the death of Louis the Pious, or even earlier, after 833, when Lothar I started using...
Map 3. Carolingian mints between 814 and 822
the title *imperator Augustus* in his diplomas—a practice later inherited by Louis II\(^{148}\) (app. 11). The disappearance of this distinction might have also been a response to the “horizon of expectations” of clerical and aristocratic audiences, which kept using the titles as synonyms regardless of the emperor’s status.

After 814, the intitulature of Carolingian kings usually consisted of three elements: the name, legitimation formula, and the royal title (*rex*).\(^{149}\) Yet this tradition was by no means consistent. The *intitulatio* of Carolingian sub-kings in Aquitaine provides an illustrative example. In 781, Louis the Pious became king of Aquitaine; two surviving charters issued in his chancery in 794 and 808 preserved his early royal title: “Louis, by the grace of God King of the Aquitanians” (*Hlodoicus gratia Dei rex Aquitanorum*).\(^{150}\) This intitulature was modeled after that of Louis’ father, King Charles. The formula the charters employed announced the Aquitanians as another constituent *gens* of the Frankish realm and was primarily addressed to Frankish, Aquitanian, and Visigothic aristocrats in Aquitaine.

Louis’ royal formula was continued in the intitulature of his son, Pippin I of Aquitaine, who began to use the title *Pippinus gratia Dei rex Aquitanorum*, immediately or some time after his coronation in 817.\(^{151}\) This title without the formula of legitimation appeared on his commemorative coins (fig. 12), which were most likely distributed among the participants of Pippin I’s coronation. This pattern suggests that the title *rex Aquitanorum* in those years was still addressed to regional elite of mixed ethnic origins. His son Pippin II of Aquitaine inherited his intitulature in his diplomas;\(^{152}\) in the 840s, he used almost the same

\(^{148}\) *Lotharii I et Lotharii II Diplomata*, nos. 13–139, 78–311; and *Ludowici II. Diplomata*, nos. 1–69.


\(^{150}\) *Diplomata Karolinorum*, vol. 2, nos. 27–8.


\(^{152}\) Two diplomas dated to 847 and 848 have survived: *Diplomata Karolinorum*, vol. 8, nos. XXIII and XXIV.
legend *Pippinus rex Equitanorum* on his coins issued in Aquitaine (fig. 13).\(^{153}\) It appears that when Charles the Bald made his son Charles the Child king of Aquitaine (855–864), his palace mint struck a special issue in the name of the younger king; the title legend imitated the one from the coins of Pippin II of Aquitaine, *Carolus rex Equitanorum*.\(^{154}\) Yet, only the coins of Pippin II of Aquitaine were widely disseminated, and thus, the title claimed by him was addressed to a much wider Aquitanian audience than those of other Carolingians. The use of this formula demonstrates that all sub-kings of Aquitaine—and especially Pippin II of Aquitaine, whose position in the region was especially vulnerable—always felt it necessary to define their royal authority with symbolic reference to the Aquitanians as the political *gens* constituting their kingdom. However, the failure of Pippin II of Aquitaine to secure his hold in the region makes it doubtful that the reference reflected the existence of a strong Aquitanian identity.\(^{155}\)

A similar political rationale might have been behind the early title of Louis the German, king of the Bavarians, employed in his diplomas in the years 830–833: “Louis, by the largess of divine grace King of the Bavarians” (*Hludowicus divina largiente gratia rex Baioariorum*).\(^{156}\) When Aquitanians and Bavarians were incorporated into the Carolingian realm in the second half of the eighth century, they temporarily disappeared from the diplomatic formulas of authority. This partly resulted from the fact that, prior to Frankish conquest, they were led by dukes, not kings. Therefore, their names did not have to be incorporated in the royal titles of Pippin the Short or Charlemagne. Yet both regions formerly had Christian rulers, unlike the pagan Saxons, who did not become a political *gens* in the Carolingian realm. Both regions had established regional elites and thus were considered coherent political

---


\(^{154}\) Depeyrot, *Le numéraire carolingien*, no. 748.

\(^{155}\) As Roger Collins points out: “Neither in 832 nor in 839 did a sense of solidarity manifest itself within the kingdom, nor was Pippin II able to mobilize any form of Aquitanian ‘national’ sentiment in his unsuccessful struggle with Charles the Bald, who, unlike Louis the Pious, had no prior association with the kingdom,” “Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine,” 387. The Aquitanian aristocracy could be similar to the aristocracy in Provence, whose Frankish and local roots and “ethnic leadership,” as well as relevant historiography up to the mid-1980s, have been thoroughly analyzed in Geary, *Aristocracy in Provence*.

\(^{156}\) See *Ludovici Germanici, Karlomanni, Ludowici Iunioris Diplomata*, nos. 2–12, 2–14.
units by contemporaries: Carolingians had to take these factors into consideration. For example, when Charlemagne launched a war against the emirate of Cordova, he secured his base in southern Gaul by crowning his young son Louis king of the Aquitanians. Louis and his court became the source of royal favor for local elites, and military campaigns against Cordova provided them with a source of plunder. Similarly, soon after Louis the German became king of Bavaria and established his position in his sub-kingdom and among local aristocrats in the turbulent years of 830–833, his diplomatic formula of authority presented him as king of the Bavarians. It was only after the crisis of 833–834, when Louis the German began to claim rule over East Francia and thus over the Franks, that he abandoned his title stressing his link to the Bavarian aristocracy.\textsuperscript{157} Despite regional differences, both cases point to common assumptions shared by regional elites and Carolingian courts. According to these expectations, royal authority in a given kingdom had to be linked to its dominant political \textit{gens} and hence to the regional aristocracy. This was not a matter of ethnicity, however, since the elite could have had different ethnic origins, as was the case in Aquitaine.

Charles the Bald took over the old legitimation formula of Charlemagne preserved in the chancery of the Aquitanian sub-kingdom.\textsuperscript{158} In addition, he was the first Carolingian whose chancery put the legitimation formula \textit{gratia Dei} on his seals and bulls (app. 11).\textsuperscript{159} It is important to note that Charles the Bald took his legitimation formula from Aquitaine, where it was used by the Carolingian sub-kings starting with his father. It was precisely this region where the monastic reform of Benedict of Aniane started under the aegis of Louis the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{157 For details, see Goldberg, \textit{Struggle for Empire}, 57–77. It is necessary to emphasize here that many Frankish and Alemannian aristocrats who came to Bavaria with Louis the German very soon began to be called Bavarians, and their support continued to play a crucial role after the title of King of the Bavarians was left aside by Louis the German. See Roman Deutinger, \textit{“Hludovicus rex Baiuariae. Zur Rolle Bayerns in der Politik Ludwigs des Deutschen,”} in \textit{Ludwig der Deutsche und seine Zeit}, ed. Hartmann, 47–66, at 53 and 61–6.}
\footnote{158 This continuation is not surprising considering that some chancery clerics like Joseph switched sides between the Pippins and Charles the Bald. For details, see Worm, \textit{Karolingsche Rekognitionszeichen}, 1:97–8.}
\footnote{159 For details and references, see Schramm, \textit{Die deutschen Kaiser}, 165; \textit{Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge}, vol. 2, ed. Dalas, 103 and 107, nos. 24–5 and 29; and Keller, \textit{“Zu den Siegeln der Karolinger,”} 410–1. He writes: \textit{“Er prägte damit die westfränkische Tradition, während in den anderen Teilreichen die Gottesgnadentitulatur im Siegel erst viel später üblich wurde,”} ibid., 411.}
\end{footnotes}
Pious. This is where, as the preceding chapter has demonstrated, the royal liturgy of authority became especially developed in the 810s, before it blossomed in the kingdom of Charles the Bald. Thus, the establishment of the diplomatic formula *gratia Dei rex* in different media deriving from Carolingian chancelleries took place side by side with the growing importance of the royal liturgy in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority. The innovation reflected the aspirations of the high clergy, clearly expressed in the addresses used in some letters sent to the Carolingians to bind this authority to the supreme power of God. These intertwined developments matured by the mid-ninth century, when they were clearly expressed in the titles of Charles the Bald in his charters and on his seals, bulls, and coins. They announced the Lord’s grace as the ultimate source of royal authority.

Hence, “Charles, King by the grace of God” (*Karolus gratia Dei rex*) was the official intitulature of Charles the Bald used in his diplomas from 840 to 875. The mint at his court issued coins that employed this intitulature, but without the devotional formula, *Carolus rex* (fig. 14). While some of the mints of his realm followed this title legend from 840 to 864 (fig. 15), many others placed another formula on his earlier coins, namely, *Carolus rex Francorum*, which repeated the one used in Charlemagne’s coinage from 793/4 to 813 (fig. 16). Charlemagne’s coins of this period were imitated so diligently at some mints that it is often difficult to make the distinction between them and early coins of Charles the Bald. As Simon Coupland has noted, the use of various coin types and title legends in the early coinage of Charles the Bald demonstrates that the young king did not exercise much control over his mints, which retained a certain degree of autonomy in defining the design of their coins. Thus, the decision to imitate Charlemagne’s coin design was most likely made at local mints.

The use of different title legends by Carolingian mints in the time of Charles the Bald can be explained by two main reasons. First, some mints might have simply imitated the obverse design of the royal coin-

---


The age of Charlemagne. (It is even possible that some mints could have used the same dies that were earlier employed to strike Charlemagne’s royal coins, since we do not know whether older dies were destroyed with the introduction of a new coin series.) At the same time, the choice between two legends might have been influenced by the expectations of local audiences. Some mints south of the Loire—which was the border between Aquitaine and the initial West Frankish kingdom—like Clermont, St. Martin of Tours, and Bourges, used the legend *Carolus rex* more frequently. The mints in the Frankish hinterland like Rheims and Sens, in contrast, more often employed the legend *Carolus rex Francorum*. These two patterns are not strictly divided between West Francia and northern Aquitaine, which could have been the case if they were directly prescribed from the court of Charles the Bald.

For instance, most coins struck in Paris have the title legend *Carolus rex Francorum*, but one issue, the reverse of which copies the coins of Louis the Pious issued at this mint in 818–822, uses the formula *Carolus rex*. Similarly, contrary to the southern pattern, the title legend *Carolus rex Francorum* is used on some coins struck at Melle in Aquitaine. This means that the choice of a title legend in each particular case was influenced by particular circumstances that remain unknown to us; it is nonetheless impossible to explain the existence of these two patterns only by personal preferences of a few moneyers or officials in charge of local mints. It seems that the choice of a title legend in each mint was in many cases defined by the “horizon of expectations” of a local audience (local aristocracy and freemen), to which people in charge of mints and local moneyers belonged themselves, and thus mirrored a local sociopolitical *habitus*. A predilection for the title *rex Francorum* at some mints north of the Loire probably echoed the perception, still deep-rooted in the Frankish hinterland, that Frankish royal authority was connected to its *gens*. The title simultaneously reminded its audiences of the legacy of the most glorious king of the Franks, Charlemagne. Thus, a broader Frankish audience, and not exclusively the royal court and high clergy, initially defined the symbolic name of authority on the early coins of Charles the Bald. Since he became a king in the old

---

Frankish territories where he did not have close connections with local elites, he at first had no choice but to accept his subjects’ perception. This interpretation corresponds to the motto that appeared on the royal bull of Charles the Bald: *Renovatio regni Francorum.* After all, the invocation of *gens Francorum* still mattered in the indirect communication of authority to aristocracy, gentry, and freemen in West Francia.

In the second half of his reign, when Charles the Bald came into full control of West Francia and Aquitaine and restored the grasp of his royal court over coinage, he undertook a “revolutionary” change in the title legend on his coins. In 864, the name of the king was dropped—the royal monogram was used instead—and it was supplemented by his official legitimation formula. This title legend *gratia Dei rex* became the most popular among the later Carolingians. The first appearance of a legitimation formula on the Carolingian coins was a logical consequence of the increasing role of this element in Carolingian intitulature in general, and in that of Charles the Bald in particular. As mentioned earlier, from the reign of Louis the Pious the legitimation formula became the only individualizing element of Carolingian intitulatio, while all other elements became more-or-less stable. The legend *gratia Dei* could replace the name of Charles the Bald on his coins only because, in the eyes of his retinue, there was only one king by the grace of God—the ruler of the West Frankish kingdom. He could be called in this way because it was in his kingdom that the liturgical communication of the grace of God was brought to a qualitatively new level in the Carolingian world.

The formula *gratia Dei* in the Carolingian titles of the mid-ninth century had a different meaning from its use in Charlemagne’s intitulature. Heinrich Fichtenau argued that by the mid-ninth century this formula was closely connected to the ruler’s anointment ceremonial developed under the guidance of Hincmar of Rheims. Charles the Bald was first anointed as king in Orléans in 848. When he was elevated as ruler

---

166 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 165.
167 For detailed analysis of this coinage and its possible connection to the payments of Danegeld, see Grierson, “The *Gratia Dei rex* Coinage of Charles the Bald,” 52–3 and 60–1; and MEC, 232–3. As for the development of Charles the Bald’s title legend after his imperial coronation at the end of 875, it can hardly be interpreted, because there was not enough time for its consolidation; only thirteen mints struck coins with different forms of an imperial title (app. 11). See ibid., 233.
of Lotharingia in 869, his anointment with unction, performed by Adventius of Metz and Hincmar of Rheims, played a key role in the royal installation again. This rite differed from the anointments of the earlier Carolingians: Charlemagne was most likely anointed at the time of his imperial coronation in 800, but neither official narratives in Aachen and Rome, like The Royal Frankish Annals and The Book of Pontiffs, nor other media produced in relation to Charlemagne’s court, considered this ritual noteworthy. Moreover, the formula gratia Dei disappeared from his intitulature after 800. Louis the Pious and Lothar I were anointed as emperors by Roman popes, in 816 and 823 respectively, several years after their imperial coronation was conducted by the ruling emperors according to early Byzantine tradition. Neither of them used the formula gratia Dei in their imperial titles, but, in 850, Lothar I sent his son Louis II to Rome, without crowning him in advance, to be anointed by Leo IV. From then on, the inaugural anointment of emperors at Rome came to be considered a required condition of legitimate installation in the imperial office. In 871, Louis II asserted in his letter to Basil I that Frankish princes, starting with Charlemagne, began being called emperors only after papal anointment with holy oil (oleum

“Inauguration Rituals,” in Early Medieval Kingship, ed. Peter H. Sawyer and Ian N. Wood (Leeds: University of Leeds Press, 1977), 50–71, at 60–2; and Guy Lanoë, “L’ordo de couronnement de Charles le Chauve à Sainte-Croix d’Orléans (6 juin 848),” in Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe, ed. Duggan, 41–68. Since Charles the Bald had not been anointed earlier, the ritual in Orléans related to his entire kingdom and not only to Aquitaine.


170 Theophanes, writing in Byzantium in the early ninth century, mentioned Charlemagne’s anointment “with oil from head to foot”; see The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, ed. Mango and Scott, 649. In addition, The Annals of Lorsch and The Chronicle of Moissae state that the Charlemagne was elevated to imperial status cum consecratione by Leo III—which most likely referred to the ritual of anointment. Annales Laureshamenses, a. 801, in MGH, Scriptores, vol. 1, ed. Georg H. Pertz (Hanover: Hahn, 1826), 38; and Chronicon Moissiacense, a. 801, 305–6. For details, see Bautier, “Sacres et couronnements,” 20–3.

171 This point is made by Nelson, “Inauguration Rituals,” 59.

172 For more detail, see Bautier, “Sacres et couronnements,” 26–32.
The title of Louis II in his diplomas, *Hludowicus Dei gratia imperator Augustus*, also confirms the connection between the anointment and the formula “by the grace of God,” as seen in the case of Charles the Bald. Thus, in the 850s and 860s, the diplomatic formula *gratia Dei* came to indicate symbolically a special blessing of a ruler to a certain extent connected with the ritual of anointment. Henceforth, Charles’ authority was perceived at his court and among clergymen in the West Frankish kingdom as based on divine grace and liturgical proximity to God more than on ties with his *gens* or a Roman imperial legacy.

This formula also meant that Charles the Bald and his entourage accepted the message sent by the Carolingian clerical elite that God had to be the third main participant involved in the symbolic communication of authority. The ruler was less in need of a legitimizing connection to his political *gens*. The Roman code of authority—expressing the absolute power of a Christian ruler, a replica of Christ, over his subjects—was left aside as well. The ruler was equal to his subject, in the sense that they both were bound by the same divine rules and governed by the same Lord. The ruler was nonetheless above his subject because he was chosen to rule by God and possessed his grace. This change gave birth to a perception, which later became an ideological cornerstone of medieval royalty, that rulership possessed a divine nature and divine rights. This transition occurred under the strong influence of the Carolingian clergy, who acquired an especially prominent liturgical role in the kingdom of Charles the Bald. Because the grace of God was to be maintained through liturgy, the clergy acquired the primary role in a new triangle of authority and found its niche in Carolingian politics. The bishops were able to transfer the grace of God through the ritual of anointment, as Hincmar did in 869; monks and priests were able to communicate royal authority through masses and prayers. Thus, when in 864 the formula *gratia Dei rex* appeared on the coins of Charles the Bald, it propagated the name of authority that had been already shared among the king, his retinue, and the clergy, to the majority of his subjects capable of reading it.

---

173 “Nam Francorum principes primo reges, deinde vero imperatores dicti sunt, hii dumtaxat qui a Romano pontifice ad hoc oleo sancto perfusi sunt. In qua etiam Karolus Magnus, abavus noster, unctione huicmodi per summum pontificem delibutus primus ex gente ac genealogia nostro pietate in eo habundante et imperator dictus et christus Domini factus est.” *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, vol. 5, 389. For more details on this issue and all bibliography, see Uspensky, *Tsar’i imperator*, 18–22. For more on this letter, see chapter 6.
The analysis of Carolingian titles in this chapter suggests that they were actively used in the indirect communication of authority via media like royal charters, letters sent to and from the court, and coins. This communication that involved fixed diplomatic formulas symbolically describing Carolingian authority was characterized by five main features. First, the use of these formulas greatly depended on the type of object on which they were placed. The official intitulature of royal charters was created in Carolingian chanceries and was the subject of high standardization. As a result, most changes in the formulas of intitulatio expressed important changes in the perception of royal/imperial authority by Carolingians and their retinues and also communicated these changes to the direct receivers of these charters, mainly the Carolingian lay aristocracy and high clergy. The Carolingian titles that were placed on documents composed outside royal chanceries, like the letters of clergymen sent to Charlemagne, were more flexible, representing the symbolic vision of royal/imperial authority that the literate elite communicated to the Carolingian courts. In most cases, title legends on Carolingian coins were defined at the Carolingian courts and ultimately derived from official intitulature. Yet due to the small size of these coins, they had abbreviated forms of intitulature. On the one hand, the choice of a title legend for a coin series could show what titles were considered especially important at the court. On the other hand, Carolingian coins were accessible to the majority of population in the realm and thus had to reckon with the “horizons of expectations” of people of lower social standing. In many cases, both factors were of importance. They can explain, for instance, why the devotional formula of legitimation, which had become a permanent feature of Carolingian intitulature since 768 and seemed to be so important for Carolingian clergymen in royal chanceries and beyond, was placed on coins first almost a century later in 864. Finally, when local mints were free to choose a title legend for their coins, their choices allow us to glance at assumptions and suppositions about royal authority in local political cultures in the social layers below the aristocracy and high clergy.

Second, the nomen auctoritatis was not simply devised at the royal court as the self-perception of the ruling Carolingians to be propagated to their subjects. This name of authority was the result of three different processes. A ruler and his advisors tended to express by his intitulatio the place he claimed in the political hierarchy of Europe. Furthermore, titles as products of the chancery developed under the strong influence of previous diplomatic traditions of authority, in particular, the Roman
imperial and Merovingian royal traditions. And last but not least, titles were visibly affected by subjects’ perceptions, especially those of the clergy, of rulers’ authority. Different audiences saw such authority differently, and consequently they referred to Carolingian rulers with varying titles. In some cases, kings and their advisors accepted those titles in order to adjust to the “horizons of expectations” of different regional or social audiences. In other cases, the Carolingians tried to impose on subjects diplomatic formulas symbolically expressing certain claims.

Third, the meaning of diplomatic formulas—especially those that were used for centuries—depended much on context. As Brigitte Bedos-Rezak argues, “formulae and repetitions may imply cultural gaps and loss of meaning”174—although “change in meaning” is probably a better description of this process. Therefore, to understand the meaning of a diplomatic formula, we must look at the contexts within which it was used—most importantly, as emphasized by Koziol, its liturgical context. When the formula gratia Dei appeared in Charlemagne’s chancery in 768, it was limited to the intitulatio of his royal charters and expressed the growing role of the upper clergy in defining Carolingian authority. When the same formula was used in the intitulature of Charles the Bald, it appeared not only in royal charters, but also on royal seals, bulls, and coins. In the same period, royal charters began referring actively to divine sanctions against people violating them.175 Most importantly, this diplomatic formula gained great importance in various media linked to the court of Charles the Bald at a time when the liturgy of authority reached its nadir in the West Frankish kingdom. Similarly, the meanings of the formula rex Francorum in the 790s and Roman imperial titles in the 810s become more apparent when placed in their liturgical contexts.

Fourth, the analysis of royal titles in different media circulating across the Carolingian realm suggests the significance of regional variations in their use, most noticeably in northern Italy versus the rest of Carolingian lands. The Carolingian territories north of the Alps also demonstrate regional varieties, especially in the ninth century: the distinction between Aquitaine and the Frankish lands north of the Loire was significant.

174 “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,” 27.
Fifth, Carolingian titles in letters, diplomas, and coinage demonstrate three different diplomatic codes of authority employed in intitulature between 751 and 877: “rex Francorum,” dominant in the second half of the eighth century and still discernable in the Frankish hinterland in the ninth century; “imperator Augustus,” originating from Italian territories and spreading north of the Alps in the first half of the ninth century; and “gratia Dei rex,” a set of common semantic elements, the first of which had already appeared in the second half of the eighth century, but which frequented various media in the mid-ninth century, especially those produced in the West Frankish kingdom.

Finally, the development of Carolingian titles and the diplomatic codes of authority unravels the changing perception of royal/imperial authority among the Frankish king, his retinue, and his subjects, as well as changing assumptions and suppositions regarding Carolingian authority in contemporary political culture. Initially, such authority was perceived as linked to a constituent gens—in the case of the early Carolingians, the Franks—and legitimated through this connection. The royal authority of Pippin the Short and Charlemagne was accepted by the Franks with the expectation that the kings had to follow Frankish laws and customs. The gens, an imagined political community, was a transcendent entity that legitimated and “sacralized” royal authority. Charlemagne’s conquests widened the number of gentes under his rule. The Carolingian court responded to this challenge first by the mechanical inclusion into the diplomatic name of authority of the most prominent peoples entering Carolingian politics and the creation of a hierarchy of gentes in political discourse. The Franks, Lombards, and Romans became the most prominent political gentes. The Romans, via association with papal Rome and the Roman empire, were created by God to spread “the Gospel of the eternal kingdom,” as stated in the Gelasian royal mass. The Lombards, because of the long history of their kingdom for two centuries, were also to be reckoned with. The Franks, by virtue of their military triumphs, were recognized by some clergymen at Charlemagne’s court as recipients of special divine protection. Some gentes, like the Aquitanians, were accepted as the constituent basis of a Carolingian sub-kingdom, whereas others, like the Alemannians, did not acquire such a political status. Pagan gentes were at the bottom of this hierarchy and were doomed like the Avars to be destroyed or like the Saxons to be christianized ruthlessly.

Yet, as the title patricius Romanorum and the letters from Italy have demonstrated, this Frankish approach did not work particularly well in
Italy. At the same time, the highest clergy, especially those clerics who were closely affiliated with Charlemagne’s court, began to develop a new vision of royal authority based on parallels with the Old Testament king David ruling the chosen people. The “Christianization” of Carolingian authority advanced further after the imperial coronation in 800. As a result, mention of the *gentes* disappeared from the symbolic formulas of authority employed in communication between the court and Carolingian clergymen. All the subjects of the Carolingian empire were supposed to be united as Christians submitting to the Christian ruler, a legitimate successor of the late Roman and early Byzantine emperors. The new ruler was named *semper Augustus* and because of his proximity to the divine as the vicar of God no longer needed constituent political *gentes* for his authority. This idealistic vision was challenged by the disintegration of the Carolingian empire and the growing consciousness of Carolingian clergy. In the mid-ninth century, the clergy—including popes and Carolingian bishops, abbots, and monks—pointed in “diplomatic” discourse to God as their primary Lord and his grace as a prerequisite for legitimate rulership. The clergy controlled this relationship through liturgy and, consequently, claimed a leading role in the creation and maintenance of royal/imperial authority. At the court of Charles the Bald, in particular, the clergy propagated this concept among his lay subjects—aristocracy, gentry, and freemen—who no doubt retained the perception that royal authority was bound to the *gens Francorum*. 
CHAPTER FOUR

SIGNUM AUCTORITATIS:
CHANGING SIGNS OF CAROLINGIAN AUTHORITY

Et ut haec nostrae donationis ac cessionis auctoritas maiorum in posterum roborem obtineat, manus nostre monogrammate augustaliter insignatam.

(Ludovici II. Diplomata, 199.)

Graphic signs in royal charters and coinage, as well as those found in some manuscripts, constituted a third syntactic part of the symbolic language of authority. The use of these signs in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority varied depending on different media and their corresponding audiences: elaborated signs in royal charters were addressed primarily to aristocracy, highly symbolic signs in manuscripts communicated predominantly to clergy, and signs on coins were simplified to make them accessible to as broad an audience as possible. These media demonstrate that Carolingian rulers not only employed different symbols to convey messages developed at court, but also adapted the signs of authority that were most appealing to their audiences to communicate their authority most effectively.

Traditionally, formal diplomatics categorized charters as legal documents, and within this legal perspective, various signs in charters were frequently considered of minor importance. As a result, labeled as graphic elements of the charter, such signs were quite often pushed to the margins of diplomatic studies.1 This approach to early medieval diplomatic signs began to change in recent decades as the surviving early medieval charters composed before the ninth century became

---

1 This was especially the case in Germany. For instance, the classical German handbook in diplomacy by Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschlands und Italien*, dedicates just a few pages to the *signum manus* in medieval charters, vol. 2, 206–12. For the detailed analysis of this traditional approach with relevant references, see Worm, *Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen*, 1:12–4. At the same time, graphical elements in medieval charters were much better studied in France; see, for example, another classical edition in diplomacy: Arthur Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique*, Reprint (New York: Franklin, 1965), 551–2 and 591–621.
available to many scholars for visual observation in the first series of *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*. Growing interest in those graphic signs culminated in the development of diplomatic semiotics in the 1990s, actively propagated by the School of Peter Rück in Marburg. Peter Rück stated that the task of diplomatic semiotics was to study the charter as a communicative system of written, graphic, and material signs. Accordingly, he defined them as codes in a communicative process. Since 1994, works on such medieval signs have appeared regularly in the series *Elementa diplomatica* published under the aegis of Peter Rück and his *Institut für Historische Hilfswissenschaften* in Marburg. For instance, in a recent volume of the series (2004), Peter Worm has undertaken a detailed study of the subscription signs used by chancery scribes in Carolingian royal charters, tracing their gradual transformation in the eighth and ninth centuries. He has argued that these signs were intrinsically linked to their surrounding diplomatic contexts in royal charters and wider political contexts in which the charters functioned, and has concluded that the subscription signs carried political messages to the receivers of royal charters, especially illiterate recipients.

In addition to graphic signs drawn in charters, such material signs as seals affixed to early medieval (mostly royal) charters have become the objects of intense scholarly research in the past two decades. The studies of Brigitte Bedos-Rezak on medieval seals, influenced by semiotic anthropology and recent developments in French diplomatics, have been especially important in English-language academia. She

---


3 One of the first pioneering works in this development was Rück, “Die Urkunde als Kunstwerk,” 311–33. The development of diplomatic semiotics resulted in the international collective monograph *Graphische Symbole in mittelalterliche Urkunden: Beiträge zur diplomatische Semiotik*, ed. Peter Rück, *Historische Hilfswissenschaften*, no. 3 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1996) [henceforth GSMU]. The contributors to this volume shed light on different types of graphic signs employed in medieval charters like crosses, monograms, chrismons, and *rola*.


5 “Unter den Zeichenbegriff fällt alles, was in einem Kommunikationsprozeß als Code dienen kann,” ibid., 15.

summarizes the changing use of royal seals in the early Middle Ages in the following manner:

... seal usage was consistently articulated around the concept of kingship, evolving from a symbolic usage in Merovingian times, to ritualistic and administrative uses for the first Carolingians, to formulaic usages in the time of the later Carolingians, the Robertians and the early Capetians, and finally, to institutional uses in the time of Philip Augustus.  

Andrea Stieldorf’s recent study of Merovingian seals has partly corroborated this conclusion: while Merovingian seals functioned as symbols of royal legitimation and authority, the seals of the early Carolingians were, first and foremost, administrative means of authentication. In a similar vein, Hagen Keller has recently pointed to the changing use of royal seals from the early to later Carolingians. His overall conclusion agrees with the main trend of recent research: Carolingian and Ottonian seals, together with the other graphic elements of royal charters, played an important role in the communication between the king and the recipients of these charters; changes in communication patterns can thus be seen as a crucial factor shaping the appearance and form of charters. The recent research on diplomatic signs in early medieval royal charters strongly suggests that these signs were as important a channel of communicating authority in the Carolingian period as the liturgy and intitulature.

---

7 “Ritual in the Royal Chancery,” 27–8. In the eleventh century, seal usage spread from kings to nobles; Brigitte Bedos-Rezak argues both that the increasing use of seals in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was intrinsically connected to concurrent developments in prescholastic thinking and that medieval seals were not only the signs of authority and authenticity as in the early Middle Ages, but also signs of medieval identity; “Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept,” 1489–533.

8 “Gestalt und Funktion der Siegel,” 160–4.


10 “Die Veränderungen in der äußeren—textlichen und bildlichen—Gestaltung der Diplome sind wohl als fortschreitende Anpassung an eine neue Kommunikationssituation zu verstehen, in der das Dokument nicht nur als Textträger eine Rolle spielt,” ibid., 434.
Recent advances in diplomatic semiotics also widen the research horizons of diplomatic studies by bringing into focus the topics that previously attracted less attention. The functional use of the cross and monogram as signatures in the early Middle Ages, and in the Carolingian period in particular, is an area that needs further attention. The most obvious example is Charlemagne’s cruciform monogram, which is probably the most famous *signum* of an early medieval ruler and is depicted on the covers or front pages of many books dealing with Carolingian history. One recurrent problem in previous attempts to interpret symbols of this type has been the unfamiliarity of authors with the development of monograms and other signs of authority in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages on charters and coins. To understand what the introduction and use of Charlemagne’s monogram as well as the *signs* of his successors really meant, we must be aware of the main monogrammatic traditions available to their designers. Such an approach can demonstrate what specific traditions and elements were chosen in the process of creation; these choices can tell us in turn about the concurrent political culture in which certain signs were preferred above others. With this premise, the study of the cross and monogram functioning as signatures in early medieval Europe, regardless of the media in which they were used, can be especially fruitful for research on the symbolic language of Carolingian authority.

These graphic signs played an important role in the indirect communication of authority. Placed on charters and coins, they addressed different audiences and were affected by them as much as by the name of authority. An episode from my own life illustrates how a signature must comply with its audience. Soon after my arrival in the U.S., I went to a bank to cash my first paycheck. I signed it with my customary signature in Cyrillic, which I had been using in Russia for many years, and passed the check over to a clerk. She looked at it and said that it had yet to be signed. My efforts to prove that this was my “real” signature were unsuccessful. Finally, the clerk asked me to write my name in English, which she accepted as my signature. Thereafter, I followed her advice and wrote my name in English instead of using my “real” signature whenever I was asked to sign a document. This story, separated from the Carolingian epoch by many centuries, nevertheless indicates one consistent attribute of the signature: it must be relevant to the audience and the signer. The signature says just as much about the person writing it as the people who accept this chain of letters or
strokes as a signature. Hence, the first logical question to pose is what was taken for a signature in early medieval Europe.

(a) *The developments of the early medieval signum before the reign of Charlemagne*

The publication of all surviving charters of the sixth through ninth centuries in the *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores* (of which more than seventy volumes have been published so far) demonstrates that the sign of a cross was frequently drawn in the early medieval West to function as the sign of invocation or signature. It is necessary to point out here that there were two types of signatures existing in that period. The first type was an elaborated *subscripsi* sign, employed by scribes, chancellors, and some clergymen; it was used to authenticate a charter and belonged to the sphere of arcane diplomatic writing rather than to the world of signs accessible to most people. It is therefore beyond the scope of this study.\(^{11}\) The second type was designated a *signum* or *signum manus* and used by commissioners and witnesses of a charter. The sign of cross was a *signum manus* used in most early medieval private charters regardless of region and century.\(^{12}\) Other types of *signum manus* were extremely rare.\(^{13}\)


\(^{13}\) For their list, see Garipzanov, “Metamorphoses of the Early Medieval *signum*,” 457.
The sign of a cross had a long history before its blossoming in the early Middle Ages. In antiquity, the cross first appeared as a sign of luck in the Near East. In the second and third centuries, it was appropriated as Christian symbolism, quickly becoming popular because of its polysemantic nature. From its pre-Christian meaning, the sign of a cross just as a crossing gesture acquired its protective and banishing power. For Christians, it was also the Greek letter Chi, the first letter of the name of Christ. Augmented by the symbolism of the Crucifixion, it became the symbol of Christ, his passions, and salvation. Thus, the cross—an easily drawn symbol—became by the early Middle Ages the prime signum and most frequent signature of Christians.

The early medieval tradition of using a cross as a signum manus is evident in Merovingian private charters written in the seventh and eighth centuries, although many people, especially clergymen, signed with subscriptio signs. A notary usually wrote the subscription line and left an empty space between the word signum and the name of an illiter-

---

17 According to Franz Joseph Dölger, “Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichen III,” Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum 3 (1960): 5–16, at 5, the cross was a kind of Wappenzeichen of Jesus. Furthermore, with the development of theology, it acquired additional new meanings. For instance, among surviving school notes of the third century from Egypt is the statement “the most significant basis of thought is the script.” A different hand added another sentence at the turn of the fourth century: “but the beginning of the script is the cross,” ibid., 7. For the use and symbology of the cross, see Jörn Staecker, Rex regum et dominus dominorum: Die wikingerzeitliche Kreuz- und Kruzifixanhänger als Ausdruck der Mission in Altdänemark und Schweden (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International, 1999), 43–66.
18 The papyrus documents from sixth- and seventh-century Ravenna undoubtedly demonstrate this. For details, see Garipzanov, “Metamorphoses of the Early Medieval signum,” 422–3.
19 For examples of the sign of a cross drawn as signature in the Merovingian charters of the late seventh century, see ChLA, vol. 13, no. 571; vol. 14, no. 582. See also Hartmut Atsma and Jean Vezin, “Graphische Elemente in den in zeitgenössischer Form überlieferten Dokumenten des Merowingerreichs,” in GSMU, 319–33. They write: “Unterzeichnungen, die mit dem Wort signum eingeleitet werden, enthalten sehr oft ein Kreuz. Andere Zeichen sind an dieser Stelle wesentlich seltener. Das Kreuzzeichen wird immer so platziert, daß es zwischen dem regelmäßig abgekürzten Wort signum und dem nachfolgen Namen des Unterzeichners steht” (322). For examples of various subscriptio signs and graphic crosses used side by side in Merovingian private charters, see ChLA, vol. 13, no. 563; vol. 14, nos. 580, 582, and 594; vol. 19, no. 670.
ate signer, who then added the sign of a cross. Two early Carolingian charters clearly indicate that, in most cases, the sign of cross was drawn by commissioners or witnesses themselves. The first example is a charter of donation written at the monastery of St. Germain-des-Prés in 794. It is obvious that the crosses in the signing lines of two lay donors were drawn by hands that were not accustomed to writing. These signatures visibly differed from geometrically perfect signing crosses of twelve preceding witnesses, who were most likely monks of the monastery in question. Another example is a private charter from Gaul confirming an act of sale in 769. Twenty witnesses signed the charter, all but one with crosses, but two signing lines—signum Guntardo and signum Aldoino—lack any signing symbol at all. In the second case, the entire signing line was marked off by the scribe. This suggests that the charter was written in advance and that Guntardus and Aldoinus for some reason had missed the signing ceremony. That the sign of a cross had to be drawn by a signer and not a notary is also the most likely explanation why, in some copies of early medieval private charters, notaries did not copy the cross-signature but left an empty space instead.

The evidence of Merovingian coinage corresponds with the presence of a signing cross in contemporary charters. The cross became a dominant reverse image in Merovingian gold coinage in the seventh century. The reverse legend is, in most cases, the name of the moneyer responsible for the issue of a coin. The name mostly takes a dative form, most likely the dative of possession—for instance, Mauro monetario or Laurufo monetario—similar to that in the subscription line of private charters, in which the name of a signer in the construction “signum + N.” most often takes a dative form. Therefore, the reverse

---

20 The only difference in the charters of the eighth century from St. Gall is that the cross was drawn before the word signum. See, for instance, a subscription line from a donation charter composed in Illnau (745): “Actum in villa, qui dicitur Illnauvae, publici presentibus, quorum hic signaculo contenuntur. + signum Lanthberto, qui hanc tradicionem fieri adque firmare rogavit . . .,” ChLA, vol. 1, no. 41.
21 ChLA, vol. 16, no. 649.
22 ChLA, vol. 15, no. 609.
23 For example, see ninth- or tenth-century copies of private Lombard charters issued at Pavia in c. 762 and at Verona in 745, ChLA, vol. 58, no. 15; vol. 59, no. 1.
24 Merovingian cross pendants are another example pointing to the widespread use of the symbol of the cross. For details and all references, see Staecker, Rex regum, 75–8.
of Merovingian coins could be read as the *suscriptio* of the moneyer, and a cross on the reverse as his personal signature. This practice might indicate why Merovingian coinage presents so many diverse types of crosses. When used as a signature, a cross had to differ from others rather than resemble them. This phenomenon might be explained by the fact that Merovingian moneyers were personally responsible for the issue of coins. Just as a signer in a Merovingian private charter confirmed the transaction recorded by putting the cross and his name on reverse, a moneyer also verified that the coin had proper weight and gold content. The obverse usually presented the name of the place at which the coin was produced, thus making any similarities with private charters even more striking. To a certain degree, then, a Merovingian gold coin was a tiny metal “charter” signed by a moneyer.

Merovingian charters also contain graphic *signa manus* other than crosses, including initials and monograms. As a rule, such signatures belonged to Merovingian kings and noblemen. The private charter of Chlotild, written in 673, presents the signatures of Merovingian nobles. Most of them used the cross, but in two cases, other graphic signs were also used. In one case, *vir illuster Ermenrigus* signed with the first capital initial of his name; in the other, a certain *Ursinus* used the capital A as signature. The use of a letter, different from the initial, had a parallel in contemporary Merovingian silver coinage; for instance, the moneyer Betto of Poitiers made the capital E the reverse type of his deniers. In the same mint, the capital A was a very popular reverse type in the first half of the eighth century.

26 For details on Merovingian moneyers, see MEC, 97–102.
27 Most Merovingian private charters provide the name of a place in which a charter was composed before a date and after the introductory word *actum*. See, for instance, two private charters of the seventh century in ChLA, vol. 13, nos. 569 and 571.
28 ChLA, vol. 13, no. 564. Ermenrigus’ signature is very different from the hand of Rigobertus, who wrote this charter; for details, see Atsma and Vezin, “Graphische Elemente,” 323.
29 For examples, see Georges Depeyrot, *Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge du denier* (Wetteren: Moneta, 2001), 108–15. The use of the capital A as signatures might have been encouraged by its additional symbolic Christian meaning because God was considered the alpha and omega—the first and the last letters of the Greek alphabet—that is, the beginning and the end of everything. Due to their symbolical meaning, the alpha and omega were added as pendants at the side arms of crosses in early medieval architecture, funeral engravings, miniatures, and coins.
The monogram found on Merovingian charters and coins was traditionally a sign of higher status, so it was used by Merovingian kings as their *signum manus* in some royal charters of the seventh century. As such, the monogram functioned as the sign of royal authority. This continued an early Byzantine tradition: the imperial monogram had been used as a reverse type on Byzantine copper coinage from the mid-fifth century. Imperial monograms usually gave the name of an emperor in the genitive case, the genitive of possession, because they came to be considered the ruler’s personal *signum*, much as the cross became a common signature for an ordinary Christian.

The imperial monogram first appeared on copper coins of Theodosius II struck in Constantinople and Nicomedia in the years 445–450 (fig. 17). In the West, the imperial monogram first appeared on copper coins of Libius Severus (461–465) issued in Rome. The first imperial monograms were “box” monograms, which were based on a square capital letter, most frequently H, N, and M. Some Germanic leaders elevated to royal power in the former western provinces of the Roman empire took over this tradition of the box monogram in the late fifth century. However, they put their royal monograms not on copper, but on silver coins. One of the earliest royal monograms appeared on the silver coins of Odovacar issued in Ravenna.

---


31 For the earlier history of the monogram broadly defined, see Gardthausen, *Das alte Monogramm*, 1–72. He stressed the differences between a Byzantine monogram and that used in antiquity, ibid., 110: “Das byzantinische Monogramm ist eine direkte Fortsetzung des antiken; und doch ist seine Ausführung eine andere. Im Altertum verzichtete man auf Vollständigkeit und begnügt sich, die ersten oder die wichtigsten Buchstaben im Monogramm wiederzugeben. Die Byzantiner dagegen wünschten das ganze Wort auszudrücken, selbst die Flektionsendung, die im Altertum nur selten berücksichtigt wurde. Das byzantinische ist also umfangreicher, aber außerdem ist es christlich geworden, durch Verwendung des Kreuzes.” See also Rück, “Beiträge zur diplomatischen Semiotik,” 28.


After the Ostrogoths arrived in Italy, royal monograms became a common reverse type on silver and copper coins of their kings (fig. 18). The Ostrogothic monogrammatic tradition penetrated north of the Alps in the first half of the sixth century, when royal monograms appeared on coins of the Burgundian kings Sigismund (516–524) and Gundomar II (524–532), struck in southeastern Gaul. After the Franks conquered the Burgundian kingdom, the tradition of royal monograms was temporarily continued in Merovingian coinage in Provence. The coinage of Marseilles issued in the name of the three Frankish kings—Theodebert I, Theodebald I, and Charibert I—in 537–567, bears their monograms following the traditional imperial model. That the monogram as an important sign of royal authority was initially accepted only in Italy and Burgundy, but not in Visigothic territories and northern Gaul, is confirmed by surviving early medieval seals. The seals of the Frankish king Childeric I (d. 481) and the Visigothic king Alaric II (484–507) are void of monograms, while an amethyst gem, plausibly attributed by Percy Schramm to the Ostrogothic king Theodoric the Great, has a monogram similar to those struck on his coins.

The absence of royal monograms in Visigothic and Merovingian coinage is not very surprising if one keeps in mind that the imperial monogram arrived in the West only after Spain and Gaul had fallen under the control of Visigothic and Frankish rulers. Coins with imperial monograms were never struck at western Roman mints except those of Italy, Syracuse, and Carthage. The imperial monograms were imprinted on copper coins which were primarily confined to local markets and had no purchasing value beyond the Byzantine empire.

34 MEC, 36. For examples, see Warwick Wroth, Western and Provincial Byzantine Coinage of the Vandals, Ostrogoths and Lombards and the Empires of Thessalonica, Nicaea and Trebizond in the British Museum (Chicago: Argonaut, 1966), 43–97. Under the influence of the Ostrogoths, the royal monogram was accepted in the silver coinage of the last Vandal king, Gelimer (530–534), before his kingdom was demolished by the Byzantine army. See Wolfgang Hahn, Moneta imperii Byzantini, vol. 1, Von Anastasius I. bis Justinianus I (491–565) (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1973), 95.

35 MEC, 36 and 76–7.

36 Georges Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge de l’or, 4 vols (Wetteren: Moneta, 1998), 85, nos. 18–20; Maurice Prou, Catalogue des monnaies françaises de la Bibliothèque Nationale. Les monnaies mérovingiennes, 2d ed. (Graz: Druck-u. Verlagsanst, 1969), nos. 57–59 and 65. Similar to the imperial, Ostrogothic, and Burgundian monograms, those on the coins of Marseilles were placed inside a wreath.

Thus, the population of Spain and Gaul, unfamiliar with this recently invented imperial symbol, was unprepared for the reception of the monogram as a sign of authority. Consequently, royal monograms were not employed in Merovingian and Visigothic coinage of the sixth and early seventh centuries. Finally, after Justinian I (527–565) destroyed the Ostrogothic kingdom, in which the royal monograms on coins claimed authority comparable to that of a Byzantine emperor, the royal monograms entirely disappeared from the coinages of the Germanic kingdoms for a century.

The reign of Justinian I witnessed another important change in the use of monograms: a cruciform monogram was introduced on his coinage in eastern mints during the last five years of his reign (560–565). During the reigns of Justin II (565–578) and Maurice (582–602), cruciform monograms appeared on the coins of Carthage. Although the third type of imperial monogram (the “bar” monogram in which the letters are added at the top and bottom of an elongated vertical bar of the main letter) was predominant in the seventh century, the cruciform monogram remained a common reverse type in Carthage and Syracuse. These mints continued to use the cruciform and bar imperial monograms several decades after their use had been abandoned in the east in 685; the mint of Carthage employed them up to its final fall in 698, and that of Syracuse used the cruciform monogram until 720.

The absence of a royal monogram in Merovingian royal coinage does not necessarily mean that it did not exist in Merovingian royal charters of the sixth century, which unfortunately have not survived. The royal monogram was already present in the earliest surviving Merovingian royal charter written in the first half of the seventh century. The charters of Chlothar II (584–629) and Clovis II (639–657), written in 625 and 654 respectively, employed box monograms as royal signatures. Both monograms are based on the capital H, with other

38 Fink, “Das frühbyzantinische Monogramm,” 77.
40 For a general overview of the use of royal monogram “als Ersatz für die Königsunterschrift” in the Merovingian charters, see Wilhelm Erben, Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunden des Mittelalters in Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1907), 146–7.
41 ChLA, vol. 13, nos. 552 and 558. See also the monogram of Chlothar II in his charter to St. Denis, ChLA, vol. 13, no. 550. Atsma and Vezin, “Graphische Elemente,”
letters in a cursive form attached to this base. The use of cursive letters in the Merovingian monograms indicates that they were most likely the internal development of royal chanceries without any connection to contemporary coinage. This agrees with the absence of monograms on Merovingian royal seals, the designs of which were visibly influenced by contemporary coinage.\(^{42}\) The peculiar feature of the latter monogram—it incorporates not only the letters of Clovis II’s royal name but also his title *rex*—is a good indication of changes in the use of monograms in mid-seventh-century Gaul (fig. 19). The monogram of Clovis II embraced the royal title because, by that time, monograms in charters were no longer an exclusive attribute of Merovingian kings. The same charter in which the monogram of Clovis II is drawn includes the monogram of the Neustrian major Radobert (fig. 20), which joined the capital letters *R* and *A* and the cursive letter *d*.

Another encroachment upon the use of the royal monogram as an exclusive sign of authority of the long-haired kings arose from the gradual dissemination of urban monograms in Merovingian coinage during the mid-seventh century. This practice was connected with similar developments in Italy and Spain. The first urban monogram was placed on the copper coins of Ravenna between 536 and 554, when Italy was the battlefield of Byzantine and Ostrogothic armies.\(^{43}\) In the political chaos, the Ravenna mint used the urban monogram instead of those of the contemporary Byzantine emperor or Ostrogothic king. Yet the heyday of the urban monogram in the West came in the second half of the seventh and the first half of the eighth century. From the mid-seventh century, under the influence of the cruciform imperial monogram, similar types began to be employed on coins of the city of Rome and some Visigothic cities to present the name of an urban mint. The cruciform urban monogram appeared on silver coins struck in Rome, where it was in use for a century (fig. 21).\(^{44}\) The same type

---

323, argue that the use of the monogram as a signature might have been quite frequent in Merovingian royal charters.

\(^{42}\) See for details Stieldorf, “Gestalt und Funktion der Siegel,” 133–66. She argues that the royal image functioned as the main symbol of authority on Merovingian seals. At the same time, she thinks that the design of Merovingian royal monograms on charters derives from coinage (147). See also Kölzer, “Einleitung,” xx.

\(^{43}\) The exact date when this monogram was introduced to the coinage of Rome remains uncertain. O’Hara, “A Find of Byzantine Silver from the Mint of Rome,” 105–40, at 106–7, dates the first Roman coins with this monogram to 641. Yet Cécile Morrisson and Jean-Noël Barrandon, “La trouvaille de monnaies d’argent byzantines
of a monogram appears in Visigothic gold coinage of the reign of Chindasvinth and Reccesvinth (649–653) and became the most frequent coin type during the reign of Egica and Wittiza (698–702) (fig. 22). U

Urban monograms were rarely used on gold Merovingian coins struck before the 670s. The only exception was the coinage of Rodez (a city in Aquitaine near Visigothic Septimania) struck in the mid-seventh century, in which the box monogram became a regular reverse type. Unlike on the coinage of the city of Rome or of Visigothic Spain, the box monogram became a dominant type of monogram on Merovingian coinage. The only exception to this rule in Merovingian gold coinage was an urban monogram on the coins of Nantes, which followed the pattern of the contemporary Byzantine bar monogram.

The urban monogram became a more frequent reverse type on Merovingian silver coinage which replaced gold in the 670s. In the late seventh and early eighth centuries, box monograms were used to designate an issuing city, as demonstrated by the coins of Metz, Melle, Clermont-Ferrand, Tours, and Arles. Some ecclesiastic mints put on their coins the monograms of their patron saints like St. Hilaire (Poitiers) or St. Martial (Limoges). Finally, personal monograms appeared in Merovingian coinage in the late seventh century. Although some of the persons whose names are presented by these monograms are unknown, the vast majority of the monograms belonged to the members of Merovingian lay and clerical nobility, a fact that mirrored their growing political authority in the kingdom. For instance, the coins struck at St. Denis present the names of two its abbots, Aino (692–697) (fig.

---


For more examples, see George Carpenter Miles, The Coinage of the Visigoths of Spain, Leovigild to Achilla II (New York: American Numismatic Society, 1952), nos. 346–9, 455, and 477.

Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge de l’or, 3:101 and 168; 4:46–9; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, nos. 243 and 327. 

Ibid., 3:6; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, no. 537.

Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge du denier, 45, 103–4, 124–7, and 142–3; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, no. 2839. For the summary of Merovingian monograms discussed in this paragraph, see Garipzanov, “Metamorphoses of the Early Medieval signum,” 460–2.

Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge du denier, 118 and 135; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, nos. 1949 and 2239.
23) and Aigulf (697–706). On the coins of Paris, the first two letters of the name of its bishop Sigofried were added to the anchored cross, a traditional type of Merovingian coinage. Yet Provence, the region in which the use of monograms as a sign of authority went back to the early sixth century, experienced a “monogrammatic” revival in the early seventh century. At this time, semi-independent rulers like the patricians Nemfidius (c. 700–710) and Antenor II (c. 715–726) put their monograms on the coins of Marseilles and Arles, respectively.

With the increasing use of box monograms by the Merovingian nobility in the late seventh century, the royal box monogram no longer was the unique sign of superior authority it had been in the sixth and early seventh centuries. Partly for this reason and partly because of the popularity of subscripsii signs among scribes and clergymen in the late Merovingian period, the use of royal monograms was abandoned in the Merovingian chancery in the last quarter of the seventh century. In the charters of the son of Clovis II, Theuderic III (675–691), the earliest of which was composed in 677, the monogram of the royal name was replaced by a subscripsii sign, an authentication of the Merovingian chancery. During this period, royal wax seals affixed to diplomas became the main sign of royal authority, but even this sign mainly symbolized the office of referendarii.

As a result of such developments, after his elevation to royal status in 751, Pippin the Short did not possess a developed system of political signs to communicate his newly acquired status on coins and diplomata. The Carolingian king continued to use a cross as his signature in his
royal charters, a practice that was easily comprehensible and appealed to his subjects. For the Franks, as noted above, a cross was a traditional signum in Frankish Gaul. The only change affected the shape of the cross-signature. Instead of a simple cross, probably drawn by Pippin himself for his signature in the only surviving original charter of the mayor, royal charters (fig. 24) employed a more elaborated royal cross-signature, known from Anglo-Saxon charters of the late seventh and early eighth century. This imitation is not surprising considering the active political, economic, and religious contacts between Frankish lands in northern Gaul and the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms across the Channel, as well as likely insular influence on the ritual of royal anointment discussed in the previous chapter. The same type of a cross continued to be used for signatures in the chancery of Carloman (768–771). As for wax seals, the early Carolingians used them as personal means of authentication, similar to the use of private seals of the high aristocracy.

The coins of Pippin the Short, by contrast, followed the previous Merovingian monetary tradition of placing the monogrammatic name of an issuer on a coin. After 754/5, the reverse of his coins had an abbreviation of his name, R P or Rx P (Rex Pippinus), and later R F or Rx F (Rex Francorum) (fig. 4). The sign of contraction was placed over these abbreviations, which, in a broad sense, may be called monograms. At the same time, the monograms of other leaders of the kingdom disappeared from coinage that came back under royal control in 754/5. The return of the monogram to the sphere of royal signs of authority used on coins clearly demonstrated to a broad Frankish audience the

---

55 In Carolingian royal charters, it was always named signum and used in the formula of corroboration of “le précepte classique”; see Bautier, “La chancellerie et les actes royaux,” 47.
56 Atsma and Vezin, “Graphische Elemente,” 322.
57 See ChLA, vol. 12, nos. 529–30; vol. 15, nos. 595, 598–600, and 602–4. The king himself connected four arms of the cross by a dot or stroke; see Erben, Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunden, 147. For Anglo-Saxon examples, see the charter of Hlothar, the king of Kent (679), and that of Aethelbald, the king of Mercia (736), ChLA, vol. 3, nos. 182–3. It is difficult to agree with Ruth Schmidt-Wiegand, “Die rechtshistorische Funktion graphischer Zeichen und Symbole in Urkunden,” in GSMU, 74, who calls the cross-signature of Pippin a “monogram.”
59 ChLA, vol. 47, no. 1464.
60 Stieldorf, “Gestalt und Funktion der Siegel,” 162–3.
61 MEC, 204; for details, see Jean Lafaurie, “Numismatique: Des mérovingiens aux carolingiens,” 26–48.
increasing power of the Carolingian dynasty. The different forms of Pippin the Short’s “monogram” also prove that it was not based on a direct model sent from the court to mints, but rather on an instruction to place the initials of his name on coins. At the beginning, moneyers not only placed his initials R and P on a coin, but also connected them so that they look like the box monograms known to the Franks from late Merovingian deniers.

This revival of the monogram as an important sign of royal authority did not immediately affect charters, in which the use of monograms was abandoned at the turn of the eighth century. It was almost two decades after the establishment of the Carolingian royal dynasty before a first monogram, the cruciform monogram of Charlemagne, emerged as a royal signum in diplomas: in 769, his chancery introduced the cruciform monogram of Charlemagne, which remained without change throughout his reign (fig. 25). In this monogram, four consonants, K, R, L, and S, were attached to the ends of cross-arms, while three vowels, A, O, and V, were joined at the central rhomb of the cross.

---

62 ChLA, vol. 12, nos. 531–41; vol. 15, nos. 608, 609, 612–8, 620, and 625–8; vol. 25, no. 797. The same royal monogram was used on almost all original charters of Charlemagne, see Diplomata Karoliorum, ed. Lot, Lauer, and Tessier, vol. 1, Pépin le Bref, Carloman, Charlemagne (Paris: Didier, 1936). The standardization of the Carolingian monogram came from its functions as an official confirmation sign of the chancery and the figural representation of the ruler. For details, see Mersiowsky, “Graphische Symbole in den Urkunden Ludwigs des Frommen,” 367–9 and 381. The introduction of Charlemagne’s monogram was accompanied with other changes in the format of royal charters. The clause ben. val. at the end of Merovingian charters was transformed on the charters of Pippin the Short and Carloman but disappeared on the charters of Charlemagne; see Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen, 1:32–4. Cf. Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections,” 916 and 922.

63 From the very beginning, Charlemagne’s monogram might have appeared not only on his charters but also on his royal bulls, of which only a lead specimen has survived; see Schramm, “Die beiden Metallbullen Karls des Großen,” 17–21; and idem, Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige, 35–6 and 148. The attribution of this bull to the reign of Charlemagne was rejected by Bautier, “La chancellerie et les actes royaux,” 52; and Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge, vol. 2, ed. Dalas, 105, no. 27. This specimen might well have been produced in the chancery of Charles the Bald.

Despite the familiarity of Charlemagne’s monogram to almost every medievalist, it has not attracted much scholarly research and its origins have not been properly addressed in scholarly literature. At the beginning of the twentieth century, M. Strzygowski, as well as several other scholars after him, argued that this monogram was similar to a double monogram of the Armenian Patriarch Narses (640–661). Based on this, they proposed that Charlemagne’s monogram was developed under Syrian-Greek influence, due to the hypothetical presence in the royal chancery of an anonymous Syrian speaking Greek.\textsuperscript{65} J. Lechner immediately raised his voice against this hypothesis, asserting that the monogram of the type that appeared in Charlemagne’s charters had been employed earlier in Italian, Merovingian, and Byzantine coinage. Unfortunately, he did not provide much evidence to support this statement, which has been frequently taken for granted by other medievalists: he mentioned only one coin of Gredaca in Gaul with a cruciform urban monogram. In addition, he did not see much difference between the cruciform monogram of Charlemagne and the box monogram seen on Merovingian coinage and charters.\textsuperscript{66}

At the same time, the above overview of graphic signs in Frankish charters and coins before the reign of Charlemagne shows that its


design did not derive from local Frankish tradition. The closest parallels to this newly invented sign of royal authority can be found south of Gaul. As mentioned above, the urban cruciform monogram became popular in the coinage of Visigothic Spain and the city of Rome from the second half of the seventh century. After Visigothic Spain had been conquered by Muslim armies in the aftermath of 711, the cruciform urban monogram continued to be used in the coinage of Narbonne (fig. 26), until it was conquered by the Muslims in 720 at earliest. The ruler of Marseilles in the 700s, Patrician Nemfdius, put the cruciform monogram of his name on urban coins, but this type of monogram was not used in Marseilles later on. Similar to Charlemagne’s monogram, both monograms from southern Gaul have a central rhomb connecting the arms of the cross, but the main difference is that the letters are not attached to the arms at the same horizontal and vertical dimensions. To read each letter, one should consequently turn the coin 90 degrees clockwise. This difference makes Charlemagne’s monogram closer to the cruciform monogram on Visigothic coinage. Another mint where the cruciform monogram was used to spell out the name of a local ruler was that of Rome. Until the 1980s, the beginning of papal issues was identified with the pontificate of Hadrian I (772–795). Yet the hoard of Roman-Byzantine coins of the seventh and eighth centuries found in the Tiber near Rome in 1980 proved that the start of papal issues of Roman-Byzantine silver coins should be dated earlier, at least to the pontificate of Tiberius III (698–705). The reverse of his coins has a cruciform monogram uniting the letters.


68 Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge du denier, 149; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, nos. 1548–55.

69 This hoard was initially described by O’Hara, “A Find of Byzantine Silver,” 105–40; and idem, “The Last Three ‘Byzantine-Papal’ Siliquae from the Find of Silver from the Mint of Rome,” Numismatic Circular 100,4 (1992): 111–2. Yet his dating of some issues based on the stylistic features of the imperial bust on the obverse was hardly satisfactory. His dates were corrected by Morrisson and Barrandon, “La trouvaille de monnaies d’argent byzantines,” 149–65, based on the content analysis of these coins for their percentage of silver and other metals. This analysis shows the gradual decrease of the silver content in papal coins from approximately ninety percent in the second half of the seventh century to about thirty percent in the pontificate of Gregory III (730–741), until it plummeted to just ten percent at the time of Stephen
R and M, designating Rome, with the letters T and B for the name of the pope.70 The next papal cruciform monogram can be firmly attributed to Gregory III (730–741): four letters of his name, G, R, E, and O, are attached to the cross-arms (fig. 27).71 To date, there is no evidence that the papal cruciform monogram was used after 741, a circumstance that may well relate to specific political circumstances of these pontificates. However, new finds of papal-Byzantine coins might change this perception in the future.72

The monogram of Charlemagne, the symbolic sign that was designed by chancellor Hitherius or someone under his control, can thus be interpreted on several levels. First of all, the shape of the monogram, no doubt, rested on precedents from the western Mediterranean, where the cruciform monogram was widespread in the early eighth century. More specifically, Charlemagne’s monogram might have mirrored the growing contacts with papal Rome, where the cruciform monogram was used by popes. Its appearance on Carolingian charters happened immediately after the introduction of the new element gratia Dei to the Carolingian intitulature, the element that might have also imitated the title of Roman popes.73 The use of the letter K in the monogram, while the king’s name in his charters was spelled as Carolus, points not only toward Rome but also the Byzantine world, where the Latin C in a monogram might have been misspelled as the Greek Σ. That is why monograms of early Byzantine emperors of the sixth and seventh centuries, which often mixed Latin and Greek letters, never used the

---

71 Allen G. Berman, *Papal Numismatic History: The Emancipation of the Papal State*, 2d ed. (South Salem, NY: Attic Books, 1987), 44, dates these coins to the last years of his pontificate, c. 740–41. Yet they could have been minted from the beginning of his rule as well, since Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, 40, argues that “the creation of a papal Republic may be dated to the years between 729 and 733.” The use of the papal monogram was one of the signs of the gradual emancipation of the papacy from Byzantine control in the late seventh and first half of the eighth century. See ibid., 15–60.
72 The known silver coins of Stephen II (752–757) used, instead, a bar monogram with all the letters of his name, while on those of Stephen III (768–772), his name was presented through the mixture of a traditional bar monogram with a box monogram—the latter was still frequently used to express the name of a mint in contemporary Frankish coinage. See O’Hara, “A Find of Byzantine Silver,” nos. 14–6 and 25. This might indicate that the growing links of papal Rome with the Carolingians affected the papal sign of authority and caused it to be directed toward a Frankish audience.
73 For details, see chapter 3.
Latin letter C.\textsuperscript{74} This visibly contrasts with Visigothic coinage which used only Latin letters, including the letter C, in urban monograms (fig. 22).

Byzantine influence becomes more apparent if we look at the contemporary Byzantine lead bulls—they are normally called seals in a Byzantine context because their purpose was to seal a document—which were frequently used by the lay and clerical elite. These lead bulls began to use cruciform monograms already by the seventh century, but unlike in coinage, their primary function became the expression of a Christian invocation. The most popular among them (fig. 28) invokes Virgin Mary, \textit{θεοτόκε βοήθει τῷ σῷ δούλῳ} (Mother of God, help your slave).\textsuperscript{75} Similar to the monogram of Charlemagne, it has the Greek letter K attached to the left arm of the cross. Another similarity is the use of the rhomb with a stroke inside at the center. The Byzantine exarchs of Ravenna—who, like Charlemagne, possessed the title of patrician—had this cruciform invocative monogram on their lead bulls from the mid-seventh century until the Lombard conquest of the exarchate in 751.\textsuperscript{76} In the eighth and ninth centuries, this monogram was similarly used on the lead bulls of the highest Byzantine officials in adjacent regions like Calabria and Sicily.\textsuperscript{77} Carolingian diplomatic contacts with Italy in the third quarter of the eighth century make very plausible the possibility that these lead bulls were known in the Carolingian chancery by 768, when Charlemagne’s monogram was designed.\textsuperscript{78} Formally, the cruciform monogram on Byzantine lead bulls

\textsuperscript{74} It is difficult to agree with Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm.” 267, that the use of the letter K in Charlemagne’s monogram, introduced in 768, and the title legend on coins of Constantine the Great demonstrates “Karls Verständnis als ’neuer Konstantin’ und seine Einbindung in die Tradition der römischen Kaiser.”

\textsuperscript{75} Vitalien Laurent, \textit{Les sceaux byzantins du Médailier Vatican} (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1962), pl. XLIII, type V.

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., nos. 100–3. The parallel between lead bulls of the patricians and exarchs of Ravenna and the royal bull of Charlemagne corresponds with the title of Patrician of Romans with which Pope Stephen III addressed Charlemagne at the time when the bull and Charlemagne’s monogram were designed. In 774, Charlemagne included this title in his official intitulature, and by that time, he already had his own lead bull corresponding to a new status.


\textsuperscript{78} Innovations in the design of Carolingian seals support this thesis as well. While the legend on Merovingian seals includes only the name and title of a king, Carolingian ones, starting with the reign of Charlemagne, include a religious invocation
differs from Charlemagne’s since the former presents a religious invocation, while the name of an officer is expressed with an inscription. Yet Charlemagne’s monogram, with the letter R located at the upper arm of the cross, can be also viewed as an arcane invocation of Christ, since the cross with the Greek P or Latin R (fig. 29) attached to the upper arm creates a christogram, the abbreviation of Christ’s name. The christogram began to be used frequently in Byzantine coinage of the sixth century and became a popular reverse type on Merovingian coinage in the late sixth and seventh centuries.

Thus, the various political and theological meanings of Charlemagne’s monogram suggest that its author was acquainted with Christian, papal, Byzantine, and Visigothic signs of authority. Chancellor Hitherius, with fifteen years of experience in royal service by 768, is a very probable candidate. From a more general perspective, the design


79 For a general overview of this “Christusmonogramm” in the early Christian period and its use in the Latin West, see Gardthausen, Das alte Monogramm, 76–83 and 142. Dölger, “Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichen III,” 8, after Viktor Gardthausen, even called it “eine Art Monogramm Christi.”


81 See, for instance, Depeyrot, Le numéraire mérovingien: L’âge de l’or, 2:41, 51, and 99; and Prou, Les monnaies mérovingiennes, no. 1036. Similar to the cross, the christogram could be used as a signature as demonstrated in a mid-eighth-century copy of a Lombard charter, in which the royal gasindus Roduald used a christogram with the Latin letter R as his signature: ChLA, vol. 30, no. 907. Such a christogram let the signer use a graphic sign with his first initial and invoke the name of Christ at the same time.

82 On his likely connection to significant changes in Charlemagne’s charters, see Ganz and Golliart, “Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections,” 922. Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen, 1:28, points out that with his long experience at the chancery, which lasted almost quarter a century (753–776), Hitherius was “eine der prägenden Figuren der frühkarolingischen Kanzlei; er gewährleistet dort Kontinuität auch während der Herrscherwechsel der 760er und 770er Jahre.” Hitherius’ ability to innovate is visible in changes in the official royal intitulature undertaken in the final year of his service in the chancery of Charlemagne in 774/5 (he became abbot of St. Martin of Tours in 775, but Rado might have replaced him as chancellor only in 776),
of Charlemagne’s monogram indicates the gradual acquaintance of his retinue with the Mediterranean graphic symbols of authority. Therefore, compared with the use of the cross-signature deriving from the Anglo-Saxon diplomatic tradition in diplomas of Pippin the Short and Carloman, the new design of the royal signum can be taken as an indication of the gradual re-orientation of Charlemagne’s entourage toward southern traditions of authority.

The new Carolingian sign of authority was also designed with political elites in the western Mediterranean and, in particular, Italy in mind. To its Italian audiences, the new royal symbol presented Charlemagne in familiar terms not as a Germanic outsider, nor as a northern barbarian, but as an inner part of the Mediterranean political milieu. In this sense, it is necessary to remember that Pippin the Short had already campaigned in Italy, and that Charlemagne’s monogram appeared just three years before the Lombard war (772–774), which brought the Carolingians the direct control of northern Italy. However, this monogram should be taken as an indication of growing interest in Italy in general, rather than of a specific political plan on the part of Charlemagne and his entourage. Although the Frankish recipients of royal charters, especially lay recipients, were less capable of deciphering all the meanings of Charlemagne’s signum, they were able to see the uniqueness of such a graphic sign, which did not exist in contemporary Frankish private charters, and therefore take it, together with the wax seal, as a specific sign of royal authority.

A broader Frankish audience was not made familiar with this sign of Charlemagne’s authority until 793/4, when this monogram began to be imprinted on Carolingian coins. Yet, there are reasons to believe that even this later introduction of the cruciform monogram to the media addressed to the majority of the Carolingian subjects was undertaken under the influence of northern Italian mints and their local audiences. These mints had used monograms, the meaning of which is still under discussion, on their silver coins under the Lombard kings prior to 774 (fig. 30). Most numismatists think that this monogram presents the first letters PER of the name of the Lombard king Perctarit (672–688) and, consequently, they date the introduction of this coinage to his reign.83 It

---

83 MEC, 66–7.
is beyond doubt, however, that coins with this monogram continued to be struck until the third quarter of the eighth century. Regardless of whether this coinage appeared in the reign of Perctarit or, indeed, began only during the reign of Desiderius (757–774), the royal monogram at the time of the last Lombard king might have meant DEsiderius ReX. This monogram corresponded to the contemporary monogram of Pippin the Short seen in his coinage (fig. 4). This was probably one of the reasons that in the 780s, the royal monogram Rx F continued to be struck on the reverse of the Carolingian coins—together with the legend CAROLVS on the obverse—in Italian mints like Milan and Treviso, despite the fact that the royal monogram was no longer used on Frankish coins in Gaul. This suggests that from the very beginning, Carolingian coinage in former Lombard mints complied with local numismatic traditions by using signs that were more familiar to local audiences.

In Treviso, the Rx F monogram was abandoned only around the year 790 in favor of Charlemagne’s monogram of the kind employed in his charters, the first time it appeared anywhere on coinage. This innovation was not undertaken under order of the Carolingian court, but rather represented a local initiative, because otherwise it is impossible to explain why the change occurred only in this city. The Treviso case clearly demonstrates the impact of a local audience on Carolingian signs of authority: it must be remembered that Treviso was located very close to Venice, which, by that time, had become the main channel connecting the Byzantine world with the Frankish realm. Therefore, the Byzantine, as well as Lombard, use of monograms as a sign of authority and piety must have been well known to, and even expected by, the urban elite.

---

85 Ibid., 207–8. Cf. Coupland, “Charlemagne’s Coinage,” 216–7, who argues that this monogram was also used in un unidentified mint outside Italy.
86 The presence of this coin in the Sarzana hoard, deposited around the year 790, is the key to its dating. For details, see Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 515; and Jean Lafaurie, “Le trésor carolingien de Sarzana-Luni,” in Les monnaies et médailles racontent l’histoire de France (Paris: Hôtel de la Monnaie, 1972), 23–38.
87 The monogram of Charlemagne, badly executed, also appeared on gold coins with the legend VCECIA usually dated to the 770–780s. This mint legend is traditionally thought to refer to the mint of Uzès in Provence, but it might have also referred to Flavia Vincencia, modern Vicenza, 50 km southwest of Treviso. See Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 531–2. Cf., Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 266.
At approximately the same time, an unusual monogram of Charlemagne appeared on the silver coins of Benevento after Duke Grimoald accepted the suzerainty of Charlemagne over his duchy in 788 and agreed to place the name of the Frankish king on Beneventan coins and charters. The deniers of Grimoald struck in those years have the monograms of both the king and the duke. The name of the latter is expressed by a traditional box monogram, while the name of Charlemagne, in contrast, is conveyed by a cruciform monogram different from the official charter form (fig. 32). To the lower arm of the cross, the ligature of the title rex is added, similar to that on the silver coins of the last Lombard kings. After all, Charlemagne took their place in Beneventan politics. The appearance of a peculiar monogram of Charlemagne on the Beneventan deniers thus owed more to the expectations of the local Lombard audience, familiar with the use of monograms by rulers in Lombard Italy and the Byzantine realm in general, than to a direct instruction from the Frankish king who surely would have indicated what type of monogram had to be placed on coins.

Only a few years after Charlemagne’s monogram had first appeared on the coins of Treviso was it applied universally to Carolingian coinage in 793/4. As Philip Grierson noticed, the pattern of new Carolingian coins ultimately derives from the mid-eighth-century Lombard coinage. This means that the introduction of a new reverse type, Charlemagne’s monogram, might have been undertaken under the influence from northern Italy and may be considered a maneuver toward Italian audiences including the Lombards. Yet, the new deniers satisfied the expectations of a Frankish audience as well: their obverse type was a cross (very often placed together with the legend Carolus rex Francorum, the importance of which for the Franks and their aristocracy has been stressed in the previous chapter) that might have been seen as his alternate signum (fig. 7). As mentioned earlier, the cross was the main type of signature in pre-Carolingian Europe. The evidence of early Carolingian private charters from Gaul shows that in the reign of Charlemagne, it

---

88 Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 509, no. 42.
89 As a result, the title legend DOMinus CARolus ReX, following the Lombard tradition of intitulature (with other numismatic features fitting the traditional Beneventan pattern), appeared on gold coins of Benevento between 788 and around 791 (fig. 1), ibid., 535–6; and MEC, 210.
became, with rare exceptions, the only *signum* used. In this situation, it is very likely that most of his subjects might have taken the cross on Charlemagne’s coins, placed together with his name, for his signature. Thus, these coins essentially presented to their audiences two signatures of Charlemagne: the cross for a predominantly illiterate population and the monogram for a more educated audience. Yet even the latter had some problems with Charlemagne’s monogram.

On some coins, the Greek letter \( \text{K} \) was replaced by the Latin \( \text{C} \), which was more familiar to die engravers in the Latin West (fig. 33). At the same time, in Ravenna, the former capital of the Byzantine exarchate, the new coins were affected by eastern influence. They had the official monogram of Charlemagne on one side and his monogram in Greek on the other. The latter is a box monogram based on the letter \( \text{K} \) and presents his name in Greek, \( \text{Κάρωλος} \) or \( \text{Κάρουλος} \). The corresponding legend presents the Italian part of Charlemagne’s intitulature, namely, “(King) of the Lombards and patrician of the Romans” (*Langobardorum ac patricius Romanorum*). The unusual design of the Ravennate coins suggests that the moneyers responsible for their issue at the local mint kept in mind two different audiences, Latin-speaking Franks and local inhabitants who were well acquainted with Greek. These examples demonstrate that Charlemagne’s sign of authority, initially designed in his chancery, experienced modifications on a local level so as to be relevant to wider populations that used Carolingian coinage.

Charlemagne, having re-established the authority of Frankish kings, restored the royal “monopoly” on the use of the monogram. Even his royal sons, not unlike other Franks, used a simple cross to sign the charters issued at Charlemagne’s court, as the 799 charter of Aachen of Charlemagne’s sister Gisela shows. Charlemagne’s sons, Louis, king of Aquitaine, Pippin, king of Italy, and Charles the Younger, signed this charter as witnesses with crosses. Only in those cases when royal

\[ \text{SIGNUM AUCTORITATIS} \]
sons operated in their semi-autonomous sub-kingdoms could they use a royal monogram as their *signum*, as suggested by a surviving charter of Louis the Pious issued at his Aquitanian court in 794. In this charter, his chancery used a cruciform monogram constructed after the pattern of Charlemagne’s as royal *signum*.\(^94\) The only difference was the substitution of the Greek K with Latin C. This example indicates that Carolingian sons elevated to sub-kingdoms took over personal monograms among other signs of royal authority, a practice that continued in the ninth century.

\[c\] A Roman imperial “revival” of the Carolingian signum (800–830s)

The Carolingian sign of authority was transformed after Charlemagne’s imperial coronation. By 808, the chancery of Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine, abandoned the cruciform royal monogram used in the late eighth century and designed a new box monogram based on the first letter of the king’s name H (fig. 34).\(^95\) After 814, this monogram acquired a standard form and was used as his signature on more than half of the surviving charters of Louis the Pious written between 814 and 840 (fig. 35).\(^96\) Mark Mersiowsky thinks that the chancery of Louis developed the H-shape monogram because it better suited his name than the previous cruciform one.\(^97\) Nevertheless, it is impossible to explain the change of Louis’ monogram from a cruciform shape to a box type only on the basis of convenience; one can even argue that

---


\(^95\) *Diplomata Karolinorum*, vol. 2, no. 28; and Mersiowsky, “Graphische Symbole,” fig. 29.

\(^96\) See *Diplomata Karolinorum*, vol. 2. Almost all charters of Louis the Pious with the monogram had a special formula in the *Corroboratio*, indicating it as a personal signature, such as *manibus propriis subter firmavimus*. The monogram was so compelling a sign of authority that it was rife in later copies of Carolingian diplomas. For more details, see Mersiowsky, “Graphische Symbole,” 367–8 and 377.

\(^97\) Ibid., 351–3.
the original cruciform monogram was as convenient as the box one. It is more likely that this transformation reflected concurrent changes in the symbolic language of authority, marked by the adoption of Roman imperial tradition.\textsuperscript{98} It is hardly accidental that the first surviving charter with the box monogram was written in 808, when Helisachar became chancellor of Louis in Aquitaine; Helisachar moved to Aachen with his ruler in 814 and remained imperial chancellor until 819.\textsuperscript{99} Since he was the official under whose guidance the imperial format of the charters of Louis the Pious had been established,\textsuperscript{100} Helisachar must have been closely connected to, if not responsible for, the creation of Louis’ H-form monogram.

Similar H-type monograms had been employed on early Byzantine and Ostrogothic coins in the second half of the fifth and the early sixth century. Among them, the monogram of Emperor Theodosius II is the closest match (fig. 17). Similar to the monogram of Louis the Pious, it has a small letter O over the horizontal bar, while the monograms of other monarchs usually place the letter S over the horizontal bar and attach the letter O to one of the vertical bars (fig. 18). The horizontal bar in the monogram of Theodosius II extends beyond the right vertical bar to complete the letter E, which creates a ligature with the base letter H. The earliest examples of the monogram of Louis the Pious repeat this extension of the horizontal bar, although phonetically there was no need for it since the name of Louis the Pious does not contain the letter E, and attach the letter S to the right end of the extended horizontal bar (fig. 34 and 36). Later on, this rudimentary extension disappears entirely from the monogram (fig. 35). The earliest examples of Louis the Pious’ monogram also demonstrate the problem that notaries had with the location for the letter I. Initially, it was placed between the letter O and the horizontal bar (fig. 34). Then, in April 814, it was attached in the form of a vertical stroke to the horizontal bar. Finally, by August 814, it was set as a separate letter below the


\textsuperscript{99} For details and all references, see Worm, \textit{Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen}, 1:45–8.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 57.
This unstable position of the letter I in the earliest charters clearly indicates that it was not present in a possible prototype, an observation that also corresponds to the monogram of Theodosius II.

The imitation of early Byzantine monograms of the second half of the fifth and the early sixth centuries, particularly the monogram of Theodosius II, matches other changes in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority during those years. Charlemagne’s cruciform monogram disappeared from his last imperial coinage (813–814) and was replaced by the imagery seen on late Roman coins struck in Gaul in the late third and early fourth century. As shown in chapter 3, from 814 the charters and coins of Louis the Pious employed a new imperial title that echoed imperial intitulature of the late Roman empire. As demonstrated in chapter 2, at approximately the same time, the masses for rulers were modified from a purely Frankish context and became prayers for the universal rulers of the Christian empire. In addition, between the years 807 and 809, a new abbreviated version of Bede’s world chronicle was composed close to the Carolingian court; this text presented the Carolingians as the legitimate successors of the Roman emperors. In the same years, Roman imperial motifs also influenced courtly art. Thus, the box monogram of Louis the Pious, analyzed together with contemporary changes in other media, shows that around the year 810 the late Roman tradition—or in other words, the code “imperator Augustus”—strongly influenced the indirect communication of authority from Carolingian courts. The use of this tradition created symbolic parallels between the Carolingian emperors and their Roman forebears like Constantine and Theodosius II.

---

102 Garipzanov, Karolingskoe monetnovo, 68–70; and idem, “The Image of Authority in Carolingian Coinage,” 197–218.
103 Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionsszeichen, 1:44, states in this relation: “Seit Beginn seiner Herrschaft zeugen die Urkunden Ludwigs ein organisiertes, ‘kaiserliches’ Erscheinungsbild, das von einem neugefassten, die kaiserliche Würde betonenden Formular begleitet wird.”
105 For details and references, see Garipzanov, “David, imperator Augustus, gratia Dei rex,” 93–4; and Deborah Mauskopf Deliyannis, “Charlemagne’s Silver Tables: The Ideology of an Imperial Capital,” EME 12,2 (2003): 159–78.
The imperial monogram of Louis the Pious was used only in his charters, whose main recipients were the lay and clerical elite. The monogram was not used on contemporary coinage, probably because the broad Frankish audience signing private charters with the cross was not as responsive to new imperial signs of authority as were the elite. Because of the same need to comply with a larger audience, Roman imperial imagery was abandoned in the coinage of Louis the Pious in 818 in favor of a more traditional “subscriptional” obverse: the legend *Hludowicus imperator* and the sign of a cross (fig. 11). The cross appealed to a contemporary Carolingian intellectual elite, too, although their understanding of this sign was more sophisticated. This “subscriptional” obverse was continued until the emperor’s death in 840 (fig. 32). The same pattern of the obverse—a personal name and title together with the sign of a cross—was employed on the coins of Lothar I and Lothar II in the Middle Frankish kingdom between 840 and 869.

The use of the H-form monogram as a signature in official documents became an important sign of the independent authority of the sons of Louis the Pious. Paschasius Radbertus, in the second book of the *Life of Wala* (also known as the *Epitaphium Arsenii*), written in the 840s, describes Lothar I arguing against his father that Louis the Pious established his son as co-emperor with all power and honor and “*in omni conscriptione et...*”

---

106 The reference by Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 283, to the Dorestad coin hoard, deposited about 822 and found in 1845/6, is an obvious mistake in relation to the monogram of Louis the Pious since no coin with this monogram was struck during his reign. For the coins found in the Dorestad hoard, see L. de Coster, “Explications faisant suites aux précédents notices sur l’attribution à Charlemagne de quelques types monétaires,” *Revue belge de numismatique*, 3d ser. 1 (1857): 30–54, at 34–6.

107 For examples from the late eighth century, see n. 91.

108 See, for instance, the work by Rabanus Maurus, *In honorem sanctae crucis*, in CCCM, vols. 100–100A, ed. Michel Perrin (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997). The fact that the adoration of the cross became so ubiquitous a phenomenon in the Carolingian empire can be seen soon after 817 in the decision by Bishop Claudius of Turin to remove crosses and images from the churches in his diocese because of, in his opinion, excessive public reverence to them. Yet this decision immediately caused the resentment of Frankish bishops. For details, see Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and Art of Christ’s Passion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 120. For details on the place of the cross in Frankish christological discourse at the time of Louis the Pious, see ibid., 118–31.

109 For details, see chapter 3.
nomismate.”  

Allen Cabaniss translated the latter expression as “on every document and coin,” since the word nomisma deriving from classical Greek usually means “coin.” However, in Carolingian texts, coins were normally designated with other terms, namely, nummi or denarii. Nomisma is an extremely rare term in the Carolingian capitularies. To the best of my knowledge, it is used only once in the materials of the Frankfurt Council of 794, in the passage dealing with new coinage. Yet, in this passage (si autem nominis nostri nomisma habent), the term probably has its second meaning of a stamp, image, or impression on a coin: “if they [i.e. coins] have a stamp of my name.” By this definition, nomisma definitely describes Charlemagne’s cruciform monogram. Therefore, Pachasius Radbertus’ passage might have referred to impressions of Lothar’s image on his commemorative issue of 823 and/or of his name—that is, his monogram—on his charters.

This interpretation corresponds to the fact that after Lothar I had become a Carolingian sub-ruler in Italy in 823, his charters began to use an H-form monogram similar to that of his father (fig. 38). Three new letters of Lothar I’s name, T, R, and A, were added to the previous pattern. Initially, the letter O was placed above the horizontal bar as in the father’s monogram, but, later on, this letter was moved below the bar pushing up the letter A. The reason for this shift was

---


112 This passage has been discussed in chapter 1, n. 122.

113 For details on this portrait issue of Lothar I, see Coupland, “The Coinage of Lothar I,” 160–4.

114 See the earliest surviving charter issued in 825: ChLA, vol. 57, no. 13. On the similarity of the charters of Lothar I with those of his father, and on notaries like as Daniel moving from the chancery of Louis the Pious to that of Lothar I after 840, see Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen, 1:55–6 and 59–63. It is necessary to remember that Lothar I did not spend much time in his regnum Italiae in the 820s. For details, see Jörg Jarnut, “Ludwig, Lothar I, und das Regnum Italae,” in ChH, 349–62, at 352–6.

115 See, for instance, the charter of Lothar I issued on 21 February 835: ChLA, vol. 53, no. 5.
probably the rules of monogram design at the time. The initial H was the base of the monogram, while the first letters of the imperial name HLVDOVVI and HLOTHA were attached to the left vertical bar. The letters O and I in the name of Louis the Pious and A and O in that of Lothar I were set to the right of the letters they followed in the names, D and V in the first name and T and L in the second one. The second parts of the names CVS and RIVS were attached to the right vertical bar.

This predilection in the Carolingian chanceries from the 810s to 830s for an H-shape monogrammatic signum as a sign of authority is best testified to by the charters of Pippin I of Aquitaine. Such a signature was absent in his diplomas prior to the upheaval of 833–834. Yet with the increasing authority of the sons of Louis the Pious that resulted from those events, the chancery of Pippin I devised an H-shape monogram (fig. 39), imitating the blueprint of those of Louis the Pious and Lothar I. Because the name Pippinus lacks the letter H, his monogram uses the letter N as a base. Yet the diagonal bar of this letter is drawn almost horizontally to make it look like the capital H. Similar to the monograms of his father and brother, that of Pippin I incorporates all of the letters in his name and places separate letters above and below the horizontal bar to the right from the letters they follow in the name. The appropriation of the box monogram by the royal sons of Louis the Pious, together with the changing format of their charters, was a clear sign of their political “emancipation.”

After the creation of this monogram, the creative development of the monogrammatic signum in the Carolingian chanceries stopped for half a century. The later Carolingians were named after their fathers and grandfathers and inherited monogrammatic signatures together with their ancestral names. These H-form signatures were taken over by Louis the German, the sons of Lothar I—Lothar II and Louis II—and

---

116 See Diplomata Karolinorum, vol. 8, nos. XVI–XXII. Similarly, notaries of Pippin I of Aquitaine imitated subscript signs used in the imperial chancery in the 820s. For details, see Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionssignaturen, 1:77.

117 For details and references, see ibid., 80 and 92.
Pippin II of Aquitaine. They used them in their charters but, similar to their parents, did not place them on coins.

(d) The signs of Carolingian authority in Italy (800–870s)

The papal-imperial coinage—that is, the coinage issued in the name of popes and Carolingian emperors—which emerged in Rome after the year 800, presents a good example of how signs on coins were used in communicating authority by the papacy. Roman popes and their entourages had their own perception of Carolingian rulership and the division of authority between the Carolingians and popes in the Republic of St. Peter; through the masterful use of signs on coins, clerical politicians were able to communicate this vision and send political messages as explicit as in their correspondence with the Carolingian court. Since this vision was dissimilar from the one in the Frankish hinterland, the Carolingians were presented in Rome via signs of authority different from those used in the north.

Papal-imperial coinage of the ninth century was the only coinage related to the Carolingian realm that constantly employed monograms. Since the ninth century, popes had not employed a signature monogram

118 See Johann Ludolf Walther, *Lexicon diplomaticum: Abbreviationes syllabarum et vocum in diplomatibus et codicibus* (Goettingen, 1752) (Reprint, Hildesheim: Olms, 1973), tab. 3 (for Louis the German); ChLA, vol. 58, no. 21 (for a charter of Louis II); and *Diplomata Karolinarum*, vol. 8, nos. XXIII–XXIV (for the charters of Pippin II of Aquitaine). This continuation of monogrammatic tradition was paralleled by continuity in chancery personnel from the Carolingian fathers to their sons. For details, see Worm, *Karolingische Rekognitionszeichen*, 1:65–70, 81, and 93. The role of monograms in royal charters further increased in the tenth century, especially in Gaul where, with the diminishing role of the *subscripsi* sign, the royal monogram “dient als Zeichen des Königswillens und von nun an zusammen mit dem Siegel zur Rechtsicherung” (1:135). See also Oliver Guyot-jeannin, “Le monogramme dans l’acte royal français (Xe—début du XIVe siècle),” in GSMU, 293–317, at 297–9.

119 The coins of Louis the German struck in Mainz were the only exception to this rule. This particular mint used his monogrammatic signature as a coin type. Yet the rarity of these coins of Louis the German, which might be easily confused with the coins of later Carolingian kings with the same personal name, hinders one from reaching a conclusion about this phenomenon. See MEC, 226–7; and Morrison and Grunthal, *Carolingian Coinage*, no. 594.

120 For a general overview, see MEC, 263–4. For a more detailed description, see Berman, *Papal Numismatic History*, 67–74.
in their chancery, the monograms seen on papal-imperial coins were based instead on previous numismatic traditions. At the same time, the contemporary Roman vision of papal authority in relation to the Carolingians greatly influenced the choice of a particular design for a coin. The earliest monograms used in the joint coinage of Leo III and Charlemagne (801–814) repeated stylistically the monograms of popes from Roman-Byzantine coinage of the late seventh and eighth centuries. For example, Leo III used the cruciform monogram LeO PAPA, while the imperial side has the legend Carolus with the bar monogram ImperAtor. This joint coinage of Leo III was continued in the first years of Louis the Pious’ reign, when the name of Charlemagne was replaced with that of his son.

The first feature of papal-imperial issues of the ninth century is that only the name of a pope was always expressed through a monogram or monogram-like graphic structure. The name of an emperor was given instead through a circular title legend, and the accompanying monogram presented his main title imperator (fig. 40) or later the honorific title pius. Accordingly, the use of monograms stressed the authority of popes, while the authority of a Carolingian monarch was restricted to his imperial prerogatives—his authority was accepted only because he was the pious emperor of the Christian empire, not because he was a Frankish king. This disharmony of monograms on the papal and imperial sides of the coinage increased through the use of box monograms imitating early Byzantine imperial ones by Stephen IV (816–817), Eugene II (824–827), and Valentine (827). Popes Paschal I (817–824) and Eugene II even replaced the imperial monogram with the cruciform urban monogram ROMA, thus stripping the imperial side of the joint coinage of even such a moderate sign of authority.

---

121 See Thomas Frenz, “Graphische Symbole in päpstlichen Urkunden (mit Ausnahme der Rota),” in GSMU, 399–406. For an example of Leo IV’s diploma written in 850, see Franz Steffens, Lateinische Paläographie (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929), no. 58.
122 MEC, nos. 1042–5 and 1514.
123 Muntoni, Le monete dei papi, 4.
124 See the coins of Stephen IV (816–817) and Valentine (827) with Louis the Pious, Allen G. Berman, Papal Coins (South Salem, NY: Attic Books, 1991), nos. 16 and 19.
125 See the coins of Gregory IV (827–844) with Louis the Pious and Lothar I, and Sergius II (844–847) with Lothar I, ibid., nos. 20–5; and MEC, nos. 1034–9, 1040, and 1046.
126 Ibid., nos. 1048–52.
as the monogram *imperator*.\(^{127}\) This transformation of the numismatic signs of authority in the first quarter of the ninth century corresponds with similar changes in papal-imperial correspondence from Leo III to Eugene II discussed in chapter 3. Both processes took place in the first part of the reign of Louis the Pious, when his imperial court, leaning on the symbols of the late Roman empire, kept its distance from contemporary papal Rome.\(^{128}\)

After 827, papal-imperial coinage demonstrates the decreasing authority of Roman popes. In the period of 827–858, popes stopped using box monograms. Instead, they made use of coin types similar to those employed in Rome in the eighth century, that is, the first letters of their name and title in several lines\(^{129}\) and/or cruciform monograms (fig. 40).\(^{130}\) Another sign of increased imperial authority was the rejection of the **ROMA** monogram on the imperial side, which was replaced once again by the title monogram *imperator* or *pius*.\(^{131}\) This temporary restoration of imperial authority more or less corresponds with the period in which Lothar I gained firm control over his Italian kingdom in the late 820s and early 830s and became powerful enough to confront his father in 833–834.\(^{132}\) The proximity of Lothar I’s court in northern Italy made Carolingian authority the one with which to be reckoned.\(^{133}\)

---

\(^{127}\) Muntoni, *Le monete dei papi*, 4–5. For a later example of this monogram, see fig. 41.


\(^{130}\) See the coins of Gregory IV with Louis the Pious, Leo IV (847–855) with Lothar I, and Benedict III with Louis II, ibid., nos. 20, 25, and 29–30.


\(^{132}\) For details, see Jörg Jarnut, “Ludwig, Lothar I, und das Regnum Italiae,” 356–62. Jarnut thinks that from 829 Lothar I was in fact “*imperator Italiae*” (361). Lothar’s legislation in Italy in these years showed a very high level of independence from his father. For details, see Mathias Geiselhart, *Die Kapitulariengesetzgebung Lothars I. in Italien*, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, no. 15 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2002), 7–14 and 247–50.

\(^{133}\) These changes in papal-imperial coinage probably had some connection to the *Constitutio Romana* imposed on papal Rome in 824. According to this document, Romans as well as the pope himself were obliged to swear an oath to the Carolingians. For the discussion of the document and the oath and all references, see Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, 308–22. There is evidence that this oath was sworn by Eugene II, Gregory IV, Sergius II, and Leo IV in the period between 824 and 855, ibid., 314–5. Thus,
Both the death of Lothar I and the pontificate of Nicholas I (858–867) restored the shackled authority of the Roman popes. As a sign of the strengthening position of the pope as a quasi-imperial monarch in the pontificates of Nicholas I and Hadrian II (867–872), the box monograms of their names, a traditional signum of late Roman and early Byzantine emperors, reappeared on papal-imperial coinage, and the title monograms of the Carolingian emperors were once again replaced with that of ROMA (fig. 41). As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Nicholas I addressed the Carolingians as inferior rulers, and his joint coinage sent a message driven by the same spirit of superiority.

As much as the changing use of monograms in papal-imperial coinage of the ninth century communicated the evolving attitudes of papal Rome toward Carolingian imperial authority, the constant use of these sigma also tells us about another audience, the population of papal Italy accustomed in the previous centuries to seeing rulers’ monograms on coins. The same was probably true for small states adjacent to the papal territory like the duchy of Benevento. Its coins struck after 817 repeatedly used cruciform monograms of the dukes, reminiscent of Charlemagne’s monogram (fig. 43). This tradition was so strong that, after Louis II had gained control over Benevento in 866–871, the cruciform monogram of Augustus (fig. 3), together with his title legend Ludowicus imperator, appeared on some of his coins struck there. The choice of the monogram was aimed beyond doubt at the local audience because it matched the pattern of the previous cruciform monograms of Beneventan dukes, and bore no likeness to the traditional H-shape monogram used as signature in his contemporary charters. It does

the changes in the use of monograms most likely reflected the declining authority of Roman popes resulting from the Constitutio Romana.

134 Muntoni, Le monete dei papi, 8–10; and Berman, Papal Numismatic History, 71–3, nos. 1105–7, 1111–2, and 1118.

135 Italians could see monograms not only on coins but also public buildings. For instance, in early medieval Ravenna, box monograms were seen on the capitals of some columns of St. Vitale, see Benedictus Bacchinius, Observationes ad vim Sancti Ecclesiae, in PL, vol. 106, col. 0590. In the Lateran, a cruciform monogram of Leo III similar to that used in his coinage was drawn on a wall in the Aula Leocina built in the pontificate of this pope, Early Medieval Art, 300–1150: Sources and Documents, ed. Caecilia Davis-Weyer (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971), 90–1.

136 The name of his wife Angilberga was on the reverse of those coins, yet the central field was filled not with a monogram, as on her husband’s side, but with the title Augusta in two lines (fig. 3); see MEC, 71–3. Thus, the hierarchy of the coin types visibly indicated the main ruler and his co-ruler for the local audience. This title points to Byzantine influence: in the contemporary Byzantine empire, the wife of an
not matter whether the monogram of Louis II on Beneventan coins was designed at his court or the local mint; since he was in full control of the city, its use on these coins could have taken place only with the direct permission or silent compliance of Louis II and his entourage. The use of the monogram was influenced by the local tradition, so targeting the local audience corresponded to his desire to establish himself in this region. This policy is clearly demonstrated by his attempt in 871 to create liturgical ties with the patron saint of the region, St. Michael, as well as with the main religious center there, the church of St. Michael on Monte Gargano. As demonstrated by Peter Worm, in the same years, the norms of Italian private charters, which represented the diplomatic expectations of local audiences, began to influence the suscriptio in the diplomas of Louis II. The same “horizon of expectation” of local Italian audiences led to another important change: bulls became the crucial element of corroboration, instead of the subscripsti sign of the Carolingian diplomatic tradition.

The crucial role of the local audience is also evident in the revival of signs reminding us of Lombard identity: the coinage of Louis II in Benevento used a “Lombard” cross (a variant of the cross potent) and an eight-arm cross (fig. 42), both of which were frequent signs on the coins of the Lombard kingdom in the eighth century and on the earlier coins of the Lombard duchies of Benevento (figs. 43–4). These usages survived after the Frankish conquest. The “Lombard” cross also continued to serve as signum manus in private charters written in the former Lombard territories in Carolingian Italy. A modified “Lombard” cross may also be seen on the coins of Louis the Pious of the Christiana-religio series (822–840), which were attributed to Milan. The coins of this series had the same design throughout the Carolingian empire (fig. 37), but local die engravers were still able to imprint the sign relevant to the local audience without breaking the instructions sent from the imperial center. Consequently, it is not surprising that

---

137 For details, see chapter 2.
139 For the examples of their use on previous Lombard coins, see MEC, nos. 319, 1105–7, and 1121.
140 Treviso, June 829: ChLA, vol. 59, no. 6. Alfiano, 19 April 836: ChLA, vol. 56, no. 3.
141 Coupland, “Money and Coinage,” 43, plate III.
Louis II exploited these Lombard symbols to make his authority look more traditional and therefore more acceptable to the local audience. These examples vividly demonstrate how, in some regions, the tastes and expectations of local audiences affected the communicative signs of Carolingian authority.

The monograms on coins of central Italy did not repeat any part of a coin legend, making their use different from those of the Frankish territories further north. They were designed to be read together with the legend, while on the royal coins of Charlemagne in 793/4–813, the monogram was an additional sign, duplicating a part of the title legend. This suggests that in Italy, the monograms of rulers were not their signatures and were expected to be “read” by local audiences as a part of an inscription, a fact that facilitated their frequent use in coinage. Additional evidence for such employment of monograms comes from a letter composed in Lucca by Bishop Peter to Bishop John in 827/8. In the concluding address of the letter, “the most beloved brother John,” the name of the recipient is written with a box monogram (fig. 45) very similar to those seen on the coins of Pope Eugene II, Nicholas I, and John VIII. This practice indicates that in Italy, monograms understandable to local audiences could express not only the names of popes and lay rulers but also those of local bishops.

This phenomenon was partly due to audiences in Italy being accustomed to the monogram as a sign of authority since late antiquity. It could have been also connected to a higher level of literacy in Italy than in the Frankish hinterland. Without going too much into the contemporary debate on literacy and orality in Carolingian Francia, I want to point out that I refer here to only one aspect of literacy, namely the ability to write one’s name in a document. The early medieval charters published in Chartae Latinae Antiquiores seem to suggest different patterns in Italy and Gaul: in sharp contrast with the signing lines in

---

144 On this aspect of literacy, see Harris, Ancient Literacy, 4.
private charters from Gaul, for instance, almost all witnesses of the private charters composed in Salerno were able to write their signing lines themselves. The use of monograms in Italy also indicates that local audiences were able to read monograms letter-by-letter. Whether this ability can be taken as evidence of a higher level of literacy in Italy than Gaul is a question outside the parameters of this study.

North of the Alps, by contrast, monograms were expected to be understood as a sign of authority. Because the broad Frankish audience was less accustomed to deciphering monograms, they became an additional and often redundant element on coins struck in Gaul in the first half of the ninth century. Yet during the 860s and 870s, the royal monogram gradually transformed into an arcane sign of an anonymous ruler by the grace of God. This metamorphosis is most evident in the coin issues of Charles the Bald and subsequent West Frankish rulers.

(e) The use of monograms to the north of the Alps and the birth of “medieval” signs of authority (840–870s)

The development of signs of authority north of the Alps was quite different than in Italy. After Charles the Bald became king of the West Frankish kingdom, his chancery took over the cruciform monogram of Charlemagne, which remained his traditional signum in charters throughout his reign. The cross, at the same time, remained the main graphic sign of authority addressed to the broad Frankish audience in his coinage. Before 864, this coin type accompanied a title legend whereas later it was supplemented by a mint legend. The use of the royal monogram on Charles’ coins also differed in the period 840 to 864, when the monogram was an exception on the coins struck to the north of the Loire. From 864 to 877, it became more common.

The only mints that can be firmly identified as having placed the monogram of Charles the Bald on the reverse of coins together with a mint legend were those of Aquitaine including Bourges, Melle, and

---

145 For private charters from Salerno, see ChLA, vol. 50–2. For examples from Gaul, see n. 91. As Nicholas Everett, *Literacy in Lombard Italy, c. 568–778* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), argues, Lombard Italy did not differ much in terms of literacy from other parts of Italy in the eighth century.

146 Although the monogram of Charles the Bald often looks more robust than that of his grandfather, it retained the basic pattern of its predecessor. For examples, see *Diplomata Karolinorum*, vol. 3–5.
Toulouse.\footnote{Coupland, “The Early Coinage of Charles the Bald,” 125–6. Cf. MEC, 232; and Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 270–1. Aquitanian mints probably remained autonomous and kept their coin types even after the reform of the coinage by Charles the Bald in 864, Coupland, “The Early Coinage of Charles the Bald,” 154.} In light of Simon Coupland’s observation (discussed in chapter 3) that in this period the court of Charles the Bald did not exercise effective control over his mints and that the mints were thus capable of adopting different previous designs for the coins issued in his name, the choice made at the Aquitanian mints indicates the tastes of a local audience more familiar with the Mediterranean monogrammatic tradition. This conclusion is supported by the coinage of Pippin II of Aquitaine, struck most likely in a short period of his control between 845 (or earlier in southern Aquitaine) and 848. The reverse of his coins used a royal cruciform monogram (fig. 13),\footnote{Coupland, “The Coinages of Pippin I and II of Aquitaine,” 203. Cf. Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 272–3.} very different from the one employed in diplomas for the signum line; they took over the box monogram of his father (fig. 39).\footnote{See Diplomata Karolinorum, vol. 8, nos. XXIII–XXIV.} The use of the cruciform monogram different from that of his chancery—regardless of whether it was designed in court or in mints—was a concession to the “horizon of expectations” of the local audience. Pippin II and his retinue, competing with Charles the Bald for the political support of the Aquitanians, especially the aristocracy, had to employ every possible sign of royal authority to draw them to their side.

Unlike the cruciform monogram of Charlemagne, that of Pippin II sets letters in a clockwise pattern that is reminiscent of similar monograms on the coins of Narbonne (fig. 26) and Nemfidius of Marseilles designed in the early eighth century. Thus, the predilection of Aquitanians for cruciform monograms might have had deep roots. At the same time, the use of royal monograms in Aquitaine in the 840s and 850s corresponded with Charlemagne’s numismatic tradition. On the coin reverse it remained an additional sign of royal authority, while the obverse kept the traditional Frankish pattern of the sign of a cross surrounded by a ruler’s name and title.

Only after the monetary reform of 864 did Charles the Bald order mints to place his monogram on the obverse of his coins together with the title legend gratia Dei rex (figs. 46–7).\footnote{Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 2, 315.} It was the first time in
Carololingian coinage north of Alps that the personal name of a ruler was dropped out of the title legend and expressed only by the monogram, as was customary in Rome and Benevento. Yet, considering the absence of an established tradition of monograms as substitutes for names and titles in Gaul, the cruciform monogram of the name Karolus was likely not intended to be deciphered by a viewer letter-by-letter as monograms in central Italy probably were. This reform reflected instead a profound change in the use of the Carolingian sign of authority in coinage. On the coins of Charlemagne, the monogram was an additional sign of authority addressed to the intellectual elite, predominantly clergy, while most Franks would have been satisfied with the sign of a cross surrounded by the name of their king. On the coins of Charles the Bald after 864, in contrast, the monogram substituted for the personal name of the king, who ruled by the grace of God. His name was hidden by the cruciform monogram as that of God in religious texts was “protected” by a contraction.151 The broad Frankish audience surely understood that this monogram was the graphic sign of royal authority, but only a chosen few were able to decipher it letter-by-letter. Accordingly, the ruler became anonymous for most subjects except educated clerics. In a sense, he was an abstract king whose authority came from God and whose personal name no longer had much importance.

The consistent use of the cruciform monogram on Charles the Bald’s coins after 864 also addressed the “horizon of expectations” of Frankish clergy in the mid-ninth century. Religious manuscripts of that time frequently employed christograms and cruciform monograms of Christ’s name in book illustrations or margins.152 Christ was the Supreme Lord

151 The best example of this tendency to hide the name of the ruler with a monogram is the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura (c. 870–871), Rome, Abbazia di San Paolo f.l.m. At the beginning of the manuscript on fol. 1r, the king is depicted holding an orb with a cruciform monogram (fig. 64). This unique monogram does not repeat the official one of Charles the Bald. Modern scholars have deciphered it in different ways; variations in form underline the fact that the monogram was legible only to a narrow circle of contemporaries familiar with its arcane meaning. For details, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, “The Carolingian King in the Bible of San Paolo fuori le Mura,” in Late Classical and Medieval Studies in Art and Literature in Honor of Albert Mathias Friend, Jr., ed. Kurt Weitzmann (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954), 287–300.

152 See, for instance, these symbols in the Grandval Bible in Wilhelm Koehler, Die karolingischen Miniaturen, vol. 1, Die Schule von Tours, pt. 2 (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1933), fig. 46f. Hrabanus Maurus included a christogram, which he called a monogram, in the illustrations of his work In honorem sanctae crucis and underlined the significance of this sign for Christians: “Sed maiore dignitate nunc a Christianis ad exprimendum nomen Christi assumitur, quasi duae litterae primae nominis eius uno
of the clergy, so they repeatedly drew the sign of God’s authority, not that of their earthly lord, in the objects defining their identity. One of these examples is the Gospels of Lothar produced in St. Martin of Tours in the mid-ninth century; some of its initial pages and canon tables are embellished with depictions of the cruciform monograms of Christ reminiscent of contemporary Byzantine seals invoking Christ. Thus, the Gospels were “sealed” with the monogram of Christ, the primary lord of the clergy, similar to royal diplomas confirmed with rulers’ monograms.

Since religious monograms appeared on the pages of manuscripts and other objects, their knowledge became a part of “sacred” knowledge of the clerical elite. As a result, in his work De inventione linguarum, Hrabanus Maurus dedicated a paragraph to the monogram, which he defined as a collection of letters (congeries litterarum)—this was the first known definition of a monogram in the early medieval West. He mentioned monograms on wall and curtain drawings and drew some examples; all of them were the cruciform monograms of biblical personages and religious terms like dominus, sanctus, Mattheus, or Paulus. Because the meaning of each monogram was not familiar even to an erudite Frankish reader, Hrabanus believed it necessary to supply each of them with its meaning (signification). Thus, a cruciform monogram became a visual attribute of the divine that needed to be deciphered; therefore, the use of this monogram by the ruler made him, in the eyes of clerics, closer to the divine and symbolically transformed him into a gratia Dei rex.

For the majority of the Franks, who were unable to sign charters except with a cross and could hardly decipher a monogram, Charles the Bald’s symbol, although recognizable as a sign of royal authority, was illegible as a monogram. On some mints, the letter K or C of the monogrammate simul sint comprehensae, id est, X et P,” Rabanus Maurus, In honorem sanctae crucis, CCCM, vol. 100, ed. Perrin, 173 and 271.

153 Koehler, Die karolingischen Miniaturen, vol. 1, pt. 2, 103b, and 104b. Another example of the religious manuscript in which the christogram was frequently drawn in margins is the commentary to the Gospels by Christian of Stablo, copied in the Frankish hinterland at the end of the ninth century: Wolfenbüttel, Herzog Augusta Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 47 Weiss.


155 Ibid., col. 1581–4.
monogram was replaced by $H$.\textsuperscript{156} All of those mints were located in the Frankish hinterland between the Seine and Meuse, where the use of the royal monogram was not traditional in the past.\textsuperscript{157} It is very likely that the moneyers making dies simply copied the model sent from the court without real understanding of the monogram letter-by-letter. When Charles the Bald became king of Lotharingia in 869, about thirty mints striking his post-reform coins were opened there. Even after a few of these mints had been ceded to Louis the German in 870, they continued to use the monogram of Charlemagne and Charles the Bald, $Karolus$, with the title legend $Hludowicus$ $rex$.\textsuperscript{158} Local lay audiences evidently considered this monogram a general symbol of royal authority irrelevant to a king’s name. In the following decades, Charlemagne’s monogram gradually became another graphic sign of royal authority as it was employed repeatedly on the coins of later Carolingians like Charles the Fat (881–887) and Charles the Simple (897–922). Modern numismatists equipped with magnifying glasses and other special tools have problems making a distinction between the coins of the different monarchs named Charles; ordinary people living in the Frankish realm were likely to have been less proficient in making this determination. Even the royal monogram on the coins of King Raoul (923–936), belonging to the Robertians, is so similar to Charlemagne’s monogram that only numismatists are able to decipher it as $Rudolfus$.\textsuperscript{159} Thus, the numismatic monogram of the ruler, designed in the early Byzantine period to make the sign of authority of a particular monarch uniquely different from others, turned into the general graphic sign of a $gratia$ $Dei$ $rex$.\textsuperscript{160}

\textsuperscript{156} For details on the use of different variants of the monogram, see Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 270–2.
\textsuperscript{157} The only mint outside this region was that of Orléans, ibid., 283–6.
\textsuperscript{158} MEC, 233.
\textsuperscript{159} For details on late Carolingian coinage, see ibid., 227 and 240–58.
\textsuperscript{160} Other monograms employed in Carolingian coinage in the late ninth century similarly witnessed the rupturing of links with early Byzantine monogrammatic tradition. The basic principle of a Byzantine monogram, that is, to place the letters in a complex connected system, was rejected. In the 870s, there was a growing tendency to break a strict geometrical structure of the cruciform monogram and place the letters without an organizing graphic system. This tendency reached its apex in the graphic signs of King Odo (887–898), which often cannot be called a monogram in a strict sense of the word (fig. 48). For details, see Haertle, “Anmerkungen zum karolingischen Münzmonogramm,” 274–81 and 288–91.
In summation, graphic signs of authority on royal charters, seals, and coins were an important part of the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. The use of these symbols in the Carolingian world, especially those of the cross and monogram, were characterized by four main features. First, although graphic signs and their developments in such different media as charters and coins have been studied in most cases separately, the preceding analysis suggests that early medieval signs of authority must be analyzed by looking at coins, charters, and seals together. The development of graphic signs of authority on coins and in the royal signum line of diplomata mutually influenced each other. Carolingian chancellors and notaries found sources of inspiration for royal monograms on earlier coins, and many Carolingian coin series were most likely designed in royal chanceries.

Second, in all media mentioned above, graphic signs functioned as symbolic elements in the indirect communication of authority, and their designs and use were shaped by both their “authors” and intended audiences. In this sense, the cross and monogram on Carolingian charters, coins, and seals were elements connecting the Carolingians and their subjects. At the same time, it is necessary to keep in mind that royal and imperial coins and diplomata were addressed to different audiences. Coins presented monarchical authority to every recipient, as diplomas did, but unlike them, the coins disseminated signs of authority to broader audiences. Consequently, early medieval royal coins and charters often showed different patterns of symbolic communication between a ruler and regional and social groups in his realm. Since early medieval coins addressed much broader audiences than charters did, the use of the signs of authority on the former differed considerably from the latter.

Third, the production, use, and meaning of graphic symbols in indirect communication were not fixed and changed considerably in response to evolving political circumstances and audiences. Initially, the graphic sign of Carolingian authority followed the earlier Frankish tradition of a cross as signature. The signing cross of Pippin the Short and Carloman, similar to the signatures of Anglo-Saxon kings, was comprehensible and appealed to all levels of Frankish society. On the coins of Pippin the Short, by contrast, the monogrammatic name and/or title of the ruler replaced the monograms of local magnates, thus demonstrating restored royal authority to a wide Frankish audience.
Yet very soon thereafter, in 769, a new cruciform monogram—similar to those struck on the coins of southern Gaul and Rome in the first half of the eighth century—was invented at the royal chancery to express the increasing importance of southern policy for the Carolingians and their growing contacts with papal Rome. This monogram also imitated the cruciform invocative monogram used on lead seals of the highest Byzantine officials in Italy and Sicily in the eighth century. Therefore, its adoption signaled the adjustment of the Carolingian chancery to the world of Western Mediterranean diplomatics. Finally, the introduction of the cruciform monogram, which had a christogram as its blueprint, reflected the growing role of clergy in the Carolingian chancery and Frankish society in general. The new signature of Charlemagne was addressed to new audiences— Aquitanian, Italian, and Lombard elites—who entered the Frankish realm in the third quarter of the eighth century. For nearly twenty-five years, the new sign of authority was not placed on Carolingian coins which presented the traditional sign of a cross to a broad Frankish audience. The cruciform monogram appeared on Charlemagne’s coins only in 793/4 under the influence of northern Italian mints, thus demonstrating the growing Italian dimension of Carolingian politics. His new coins nonetheless also kept the sign of a cross more comprehensible to ordinary subjects.

The imperial coronation of 800 rapidly affected the Carolingian signa. During the period from the 810s to 830s, cruciform monograms were replaced in Carolingian chanceries by the H-form imperial monograms of Louis the Pious, Lothar I, and Pippin I of Aquitaine. These monograms imitated the imperial monogram of Theodosius II and were one of the signs manifesting the prominence of the new code “imperator Augustus” in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority employed in the communication between the court and lay and clerical elites. The use of this political tradition provoked hardly any response from the broad Frankish audience, and the imperial monogram did not appear in media addressed to it. Carolingian coinage continued to use the “subscriptional” cross as its main type in those years, and monograms were used only in the coinage of central Italy, where the local audience was better prepared to encounter this graphic sign of authority.

After 840, the chanceries in separate Frankish kingdoms continued to employ the earlier monogrammatic signatures. From this time, the use of cruciform and box monograms carried no other message other than continuity with the previous political tradition of Carolingian authority.
Coinage, which was less bound by the strict norms of the chancery and more oriented toward broad audiences after the disintegration of the Carolingian empire, was another matter. In the preceding four decades, the Carolingian emperors had firmly controlled coinage and its design. Carolingian coins had the same design throughout the empire, carrying unifying Christian messages from the imperial court to all regions regardless of their different audiences. However, this one-way communication of the Carolingian signs of authority did not succeed in eliminating regional differences, and the dissolution of the Frankish empire made diversity in the numismatic use of monograms and other signs of authority even stronger.

This practice points to the fourth main feature of the use of signs of authority in the Carolingian realm: diverse regional audiences were acquainted with graphic signs and deciphered them differently. The most important characteristic of such regional diversity throughout the Carolingian period was a distinct north-south split in handling graphic signs of authority. After 840, three major areas of diverging practice became visible in the coins of the separate Frankish kingdoms.

In Italy, not only Roman imperial but also Italo-Lombard signs of royal authority were frequently used. The Roman popes continued the previous monogrammatic tradition on their coins; the box monograms of Nicholas I and John VIII demonstrate the papal claim to authority comparable to the imperial one. Although Emperor Louis II, whose kingdom was limited to northern and central Italy, used basic signs of Carolingian authority, the need for stronger ties with local communities forced him to bring back on his coinage the previous symbols of the Lombard political gens. In the East Frankish kingdom, which had few mints, signs on coins were hardly used to communicate royal authority. Finally, in the West Frankish kingdom, the signs on coins demonstrated the increasing role of Frankish clergy in the symbolic communication of Carolingian authority. In 864, the royal cruciform monogram was re-introduced on coins to address, first and foremost, a clerical audience. Henceforth, the royal monogram became an arcane sign of an anonymous ruler equated with biblical figures who possessed similar monograms. It presented him to a broad Frankish audience as a gratia Dei rex. Thereafter, the “king’s two bodies”—in the famous formulation of Ernst Kantorowicz—had two different signs of authority. The king’s human body had a particular signature used in diplomas addressed to the elite who maintained personal relations with him. The king’s sacred body, given to him through God’s grace, had the generalizing
monogrammatic sign. The latter was employed on coins available to all subjects—although only educated clergymen were capable of deciphering it—and was less affected by changes of particular rulers. These metamorphoses of the early medieval royal signum signified the increasing role of God and the clergy in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority in the second half of the ninth century.
CHAPTER FIVE

IMAGO AUCTORITATIS:
VISUAL DIALOGUE ON CAROLINGIAN AUTHORITY

Pictus habetur ob hoc necnon rex pagina in ista,
Ut quisquis vultum Augusti hic conspexerit umquam
Supplex ipse “deo” dicat “laus cunctipotenti…”

(Carmina varia, in MGH, PLEC, vol. 2, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin: Weidmann, 1884), 671)

Royal iconography constituted a fourth mode of the symbolic language of authority. The significance of such imagery is not unique to the Carolingian period, since the image of the monarch has played an important role in many historical epochs, societies, and states, yet the reasons for such significance has differed in each period.¹ In the late Roman and early Byzantine empire, images of emperors—their sculptures, busts, and portraits—were always on display for public worship.² Because the power of imperial magistrates ultimately originated from the imperium of the emperor, the image of the latter endowed the places where this power was exercised with imperial authority.³ It was believed that the emperor himself, or the “idea” of the emperor, was


³ Severian of Gabala, De mundi creatione. Oratio VI, in Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne, vol. 56 (Paris, 1859), 489E, describes such a role of imperial imagery in seventh-century Byzantium: “Consider how many magistrates there are over the whole earth. Now, since the emperor cannot present to all of them, [instead] the emperor’s image must be present in courtrooms, marketplaces, public halls, and theatres. The image must be present in every place where a magistrate exercises his power so that his actions are endowed with authority. For since he is a man, the emperor cannot be present everywhere.” The translation is from Paul Corby Finney, The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 86.
present through his image, and if, after death, he was sentenced to the *damnatio memoriae*, his images did not outlive their prototype for long and thus were obliterated by the throngs of his former subjects throughout the Empire. This common belief in the transcendent connection between the emperor and his image was expressed by Athanasius of Alexandria (328–373), who compared it to that of the Father and Son in the Trinity:

In the image [of the emperor] there is the idea (εἰδὸς) and form (μορφή) of the emperor…. The emperor’s likeness is unchanged in the image, so that who sees the image sees the emperor in it, and again who sees the emperor, recognizes him to be the one in the image…. The image might well say: “I and the emperor are one.” “I am in him and he is me.”….Who therefore adores the image adores in it also the emperor. For the image is the form of the latter and his idea.4

In this milieu, the imperial portrait became an icon that was brought to church for religious adoration.5 Iconoclasm did not affect this tendency as the use of imperial icons was never questioned in this period.6 In early eighth-century Rome, this became one of the principal acts marking the acceptance of the authority of a new Byzantine emperor. If this authority was not acknowledged—as happened in the case of Philippicus in 711—the icon of an emperor was not allowed in church.7

Rulers’ imagery on coins, especially on gold *solidi*, represented an important imperial prerogative; such images were also considered by contemporary authors, starting with Augustine, as possessing a numi-

---


6 Ladner, “The Concept of the Image,” 20, after the study of contemporary treatises, concluded on this subject: “Neither the friends nor the enemies of the images in eight- and ninth-century Byzantium questioned the use of imperial images or their adoration…”

7 According to Percy E. Schramm, “Die Anerkennung Karls des Großen als Kaiser (bis 800),” 23, “Nach altem Brauch übersandte jeder neue Herrscher nach Rom sein Bildnis, das nach der ihm in Stellvertretung des Kaisers gebührenden Ehrung in der Kirche S. Cesario (auf dem Palatin) verwahrt wurde. Diese Recht verweigerten—wie wir sahen—die Römer dem Kaiser Philippikos….“ This right was returned to Emperor Leo III later, although by the middle of the eighth century, this practice no longer existed.
nous power.\(^8\) Testimony to such spiritual power is the popularity in late antiquity of a parable referring to Luke, 15:8, which describes a woman who has found a coin while cleaning the house and states that the soul is liberated from the dust of sins through penitence just as the imperial or royal image on the coin is found by means of sweeping the floor.\(^9\) In another passage, which was also cited frequently in the early Middle Ages, Augustine invested certain spiritual power in the imperial image by drawing a parallel between the relationship of the imperial image on coins to the emperor and that of a human to God; just as the imperial image differed from the real emperor but possessed his numinous power, a human being was potentially open to divinity through similitude to God.\(^10\) In late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, this perception of the spiritual significance of rulers’ imagery on coins was not limited to a small group of Christian intellectuals; coins with imperial portraits thus became a specific type of a talisman defending their owners from various dangers and threats.\(^11\)

---

\(^8\) For details and references on the imperial portrait on coins as a symbol of authority, see Stieldorf, “Siegel auf den merowingischen Königsurkunden,” 144–6.

\(^9\) “Poenitentia quotidiana suadetur familiaribus exemplis. Et ut de rebus quas quotidie in oculis habemus capiamus exemplum, quis hodie invenitur ita inutilis vel ignavus, qui non omni die domum suam scopis mundari faciat? Quis est, qui equos suos super stercora sua semper stare permissat? Rogo vos, fratres, de minimis magna conjicite; nec vobis incongruum videatur quod de scopanda domo facimus mentionem: quia de hac re ipse Dominus in Evangelio dixit, quod mulier illa quae drachmam perdiderat, ubi domum suam scopis mundavit, statim drachmam quam perdiderat invenire promeruit [Luc. 15:8]. In drachma nummus intelligitur; in nummo imago imperatoris agnoscitur: quomodo ergo quando domus scopatur, imago imperatoris invenitur in drachma; sic anima, quando vitiorum sordibus per fructuosam poenitentiam liberatur, imago imperatoris in illa agnoscitur,” Auctor incertus [Augustinus Hipponensis?], \textit{Appendicis Classis IV. Sermones de diversis}, CCLIX, 2, in PL, vol. 39, col. 2224. This parable was later rephrased by Ambrosius Mediolanensis, \textit{Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam}, VII. 211, in Giovanni Coppa, ed., \textit{Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis opera}, vol. 12 (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1978), 256: “Non otiosum etiam quod mulier illa dragma laetatur inventa. Non mediocris haec dragma est, in qua principis est figura. Et ideo imago regis, census ecclesiae est. Oves sumus, oremus ut super aquam refectionis nos conlocare dignetur; oves, inquam, sumus, petamus pascua; dragmas sumus, habeamus pretiun; filii sumus, festinemus ad patrem.”


Unlike in Byzantium, rulers’ images in the Frankish world did not possess such an intimate connection to real monarchs and were not an object of adoration. Frankish opposition to the Byzantine concept of rulers’ deification matched Charlemagne’s controversy with Constantinople over the general use of icons in the late eighth century. Consequently, the Byzantine tradition of rulers’ icons remained alien to the Carolingian world. Among the Franks, rulers’ images did not possess such an intimate connection to real monarchs, playing a more limited role in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority. The imagery of Carolingian kings and emperors showed instead the symbolic image, *imago auctoritatis*, bearing both evident and allegorical visual symbols of authority. To a high degree, the symbolism of rulers’ portraits depended on the media in which they were used and the audience at whom they were directed.

Royal imagery in miniatures, addressed to the king and/or the Carolingian elite, was both highly symbolic of and closely linked to contemporary discourse on Carolingian rulership. The “reading” of this imagery required a viewer to have a certain level of theological and literary knowledge. The “translation” of changing political notions into the language of painted imagery demanded the gradual introduction of new visual elements that kept the depiction of authority relevant to new discourses. Visual “texts” were able to convey different authors’ messages adapted in the wake of changing political discourse, thus promulgating.

---

a constant visual dialogue on royal/imperial authority. The gradual changes in royal imagery presented in miniatures reflected, therefore, the concurrent modification of the symbolic language of authority employed in the upper strata of Carolingian society. These alterations also mirrored shifting perceptions of royal/imperial authority and its relation to God and the Carolingian elite.

In contrast to royal portraits in miniatures, imagery on Carolingian coins was addressed to a much broader, probably predominantly illiterate audience that was unfamiliar with written discourse on royal authority. A visual analogy, namely the imitation of recognizable models from older coins, was the simplest way to communicate with such an audience. The imitation of the patterns of Roman or Frankish coins signaled to “ordinary Franks” the adherence of their rulers to the corresponding traditions of political authority. However, it would be naïve to think that a broad Frankish audience was fully aware of what each tradition precisely meant. Apart from a set of basic ideas, each tradition probably was not clearly defined at the grass-roots social level and was subject to regional interpretations.

Carolingian royal iconography has been a subject of long-lasting scholarly interest especially on the part of art historians. Yet this topic has been analyzed less frequently within a broader political context or a comparative study of this imagery in different media.13 Meanwhile, evidence of coins, bulls, and seals may shed new light on the debate on Carolingian royal imagery, which until now has been based primarily on the analysis of works of art. Nonetheless, such a comparative study of royal iconography will be productive only if we pay enough attention to the diverse contexts in which this imagery was used, as well as the different audiences to which coins, seals, bulls, and miniatures were

---

13 In this historiographic corpus, three works have to be mentioned from the start. Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, provided scholars with the fullest collection of Carolingian rulers’ imagery in different media, but he left the issue of audience and function of this imagery unanswered. Donald A. Bullough, “Imagines regum and their Significance in the Early Medieval West,” in *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), 39–96, surveyed royal imagery throughout the early medieval West, but unfortunately did not analyze royal images in Carolingian legal manuscripts and mural paintings nor did his study extend beyond the 840s. The matter of the functional role of royal imagery has been addressed by Nicholaus Staubach, *Rex christianus*, pt. 2, 221–81, in relation to three depictions of Charles the Bald produced around 869–870. Yet in spite of his detailed analysis of their role as royal propaganda and their relation to contemporary political discourse, Staubach leaves aside the crucial issue of audience.
addressed. With such caveats in mind, the study of royal imagery focusing on its audiences, functions, and relation to contemporary political discourse can bring about a better understanding of its role in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority.

(a) The portrait image on coins

Early Carolingian coinage continued the late Merovingian numismatic tradition of not including rulers’ imagery. This does not, however, indicate an “aniconic” agenda among the early Carolingians and their retinue; they merely used traditional coin types without adopting royal imagery until the early ninth century, when portrait images first appeared on imperial silver coins of Charlemagne in 813. The obverse of these deniers contained a monarch’s bust in profile facing right, wearing a laurel wreath and dressed in an imperial Roman military cloak, the paludamentum (fig. 9). After the death of Charlemagne, this model was passed to Louis the Pious’ imperial coins (fig. 10), struck in 814–818. Besides imperial deniers, obols with the same profile bust were introduced. In addition to this regular coinage, gold medallions bearing an analogous portrait image were struck in celebration of Louis the Pious’ imperial coronation in 816. Parallel to the portrait coinage of Emperor Louis there was a small commemorative issue of coins of Pippin I in Aquitaine (817) on which appears a portrait of poorer quality (fig. 12) that does not imitate those minted in the Palace.

After 818, portrait coins almost entirely disappeared from Carolingian coinage and were minted only occasionally thereafter. The first such case occurred in 823, when a portrait coinage for Lothar I was minted at the imperial palace and probably in Milan and Pavia. This issue commemo-

15 In addition to silver deniers, a unique gold coin struck in Arles with the same design is now known. For details on this coin, see Peter-Hugo Martin, “Eine Goldmünze Karls des Grossen,” Numismatisches Nachrichtenblatt 8 (1997): 351–5; and Garipzanov, “The Image of Authority in Carolingian Coinage,” 208.
16 Grierson argues that Pippin I of Aquitaine “would never have minted at all”; MEC, 195. However, Coupland, “The Coinages of Pippin I,” 197–9, provides a strong argument for the attribution of this issue to 817.
rated his coronation in Italy on Easter 823. The next appearance of the portrait image was inspired by the events of 833–834, when Lothar I rebelled against his father. A unique gold medallion was struck by Lothar I, the obverse of which followed the model of the gold medallion of Louis the Pious but with the bust facing left. It was, in fact, the last gold coin minted in the Carolingian realm. The third case was related to the coinage of Aquitaine in the middle of the ninth century and probably also had a commemorative nature. After the capture of Bourges in early 848, Pippin II of Aquitaine struck coins with the traditional Carolingian portrait image facing right and the title legend \textit{Pippinus Rex} on the obverse. This coinage was only produced for a short period because of the reconquest of the city by Charles the Bald at the end of the 840s. The coins of Charles the Bald minted in Bourges immediately after the reconquest also had a portrait bust on them. The coin model of Pippin II was no doubt used in this case, but in order to make the change of rulership more visible to a viewer, the bust on the obverse faced left. Such a model was not repeated in other mints during the reign of Charles the Bald.

In summary, then, a bust as the main obverse image existed on Carolingian coins only for a limited time between 813 and 818. After a new coin series with other signs of Carolingian authority was introduced in 818, the coins with the imperial portrait were demonetized

\footnotesize{17 For the attribution of these portrait coins to 823, see Coupland, “Money and Coinage,” 45–8; and idem, “The Coinage of Lothar I,” 160–4.
18 The obverse of this medallion followed the type of Louis the Pious’ commemorative issue, but the reverse has the image of a standing warrior holding a spear and shield with the legend \textit{Vita et Victoria}. It is similar to coins of Louis the Pious struck in 814–18, but a title used here, \textit{Dominus Noster Lotarius Imperator Avgustus}, indicates that it was struck later, possibly during the period of Lothar’s rebellion in 833–834, to celebrate his temporary victory over his father. Morrison proposes that the medallions with the legends \textit{MVNVS DIVINVM} and \textit{Vita et Victoria} were produced in 825 after the Synod of Paris, Karl F. Morrison, “The Gold Medallions of Louis the Pious and Lothar I and the Synod of Paris (825),” \textit{Speculum} 36 (1961): 599. See the critique of this interpretation by Philip Grierson, “La date des monnaies d’or de Louis le Pieux,” \textit{Le Moyen Âge} 69 (1963): 67–74. This medallion has the image of a warrior very similar to the ones on triumphal issues of Roman emperors. The fact that the portrait bust faces left, that is, in the opposite direction from the usual portrait image on coins of Louis the Pious, could be a visual symbol of the political confrontation between Lothar I and Louis the Pious.
20 As Simon Coupland notes, this coin model was replaced by the monogram type in the 850s, ibid., 128–9.
(that is, effectively taken out of circulation) and became less accessible for a broad audience. Thereafter, the royal portrait was used only rarely—mostly in commemorative issues, which were most likely distributed among aristocrats participating in corresponding solemn events—until this practice ceased altogether at the middle of the ninth century. During the whole of that period, the portrait image had practically the same design, with the monarch’s profile facing right dressed in a *paludamentum* and wearing a laurel wreath. Such a design was not found on contemporary Byzantine coins. The features of the clothing are characteristic of imperial military costume on Roman coins issued in the period between Constantine the Great and the death of Justin II in 578. A Roman emperor wearing this costume was usually described as *imperator militans* and *salvator mundi*.  

The features of clothing in Carolingian imperial coins should be discussed in light of the three different types of imperial costume shown on late Roman coins: the above-mentioned military costume; the imperial state costume, a chlamys with a tunic underneath; and the consular costume characterized by *trabea triumphalis* (a special type of toga ornamented with jewels). The last costume became the most popular on Byzantine coinage after 578; however, the Roman *trabea* on this coinage were transformed into the Byzantine *loros* (a long strip of cloth ornamented with precious stones and draped around the upper body). Starting in the ninth century, there was a transition to the imperial state costume, although a chlamys sometimes occurred on Byzantine coins of the previous centuries. These observations evince...

---

21 George P. Galavaris, “The Symbolism on the Imperial Costume as Displayed on Byzantine Coins,” *Museum Notes* 8 (1958): 101, interprets this costume: “He is *militans* in the sense that he fights in the name of Christ to win the world for Christ and *salvator* in the sense that he brings to the world salvation from the tyranny of paganism.” Galavaris underlines that *imperator militans* was, in fact, an exclusively Roman conception, ibid., 104. The use of the *paludamentum* and the laurel wreath has been analysed by Pierre Bastien, *Le buste monétaire des empereurs romains* (Wetteren: Numismatique Romaine, 1992), 1:61–80 and 235–57.

22 The imperial state costume appeared already on some gold coins of Constantine the Great, see Bastien, *Le buste*, 3: plate 168.


that the dress on Carolingian coins differed from that on contemporary Byzantine ones and thus imitated only late Roman analogues.

The next important difference between Carolingian and Byzantine portrait images pertains to the bust. From the end of the sixth century, Byzantine solidi contained a bust en face (fig. 2), while all Carolingian busts were in profile according to Roman tradition. Furthermore, an iconographic difference may be noted. Byzantine portraiture represented rather a schematic ideal image, a portrait symbol, of an emperor, unrelated to any real person. In contrast, the Carolingian portraits on some coins struck at the palace mint, and especially on coin medallions, were realistic three-dimensional representations of living monarchs. The same portrait realism had been visible on Roman coins until the mid-fourth century. Afterward, a process of the gradual depersonalization of the imperial portrait turned the image into the symbolic depiction of the bearer of imperial power.

Thus, it seems that the portrait image on Carolingian coins imitated antique Roman exemplars. Grierson proposed that the model for the first imitation of Charlemagne was a Roman coin of Constantine the Great because the laurel wreath on the head of an emperor on coins later than Constantine I was replaced by a diadem, while earlier portrait images contained only the head and neck but not the

---

25 Small fractions of Byzantine gold coins, tremisses, struck in western mints such as Syracuse had a profile bust up to the end of the seventh century, but this is of different type from the Carolingian image and has elements like a cap of lion’s skin.

26 There is, for example, similarity between the main features of the face of Lothar I (the form of the nose, eyes, and moustache) on his gold medallion of 833–834 and those in the miniature of the Gospels of Lothar (849–851). Because it is rather unlikely that an artist of the Gospels of Lothar copied the coin medallion struck two decades earlier, and because it is impossible that these two masterpieces could have had the same model, there can be only one conclusion: the medallion, as well as the miniature, were attempts at the reproduction of the features of Lothar I. The problem of the realism of Carolingian portraiture is still debated. For a different point of view and references, see Genevra Kornbluth, “The Seal of Lothar II: Model and Copy,” *Francia* 17 (1990): 62.


shoulders. However, an earlier date can also be proposed, for there are some Roman coins of the third century with a full bust like the bronze sestertius of Gordianus III. Jean Lafaurie proposes that a coin of Diocletian was the prototype to which a die-maker attempted to introduce realistic portrait features of Charlemagne. There are other possible prototypes like the coins of Constantine I struck in Trier (fig. 49) or Arles. It should be remembered that the portrait image on the obverse of the imperial coinage of Charlemagne was accompanied on the reverse by the images of a Christian basilica (fig. 8), gateway, and ship (fig. 10), which may have been copied from Roman coins struck in Gaul or northern Italy at the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries. Likewise, the bust could have been imitated and prototypes for the first portrait images on Carolingian coins sought on Roman coins minted at the same time.

In addition, it is possible that the choice of a laurel wreath on the head of the bust was not accidental. In Rome, it was the symbol of the goddess of peace, Pax, and was given to victorious generals who brought peace to the Romans. Therefore, the laurel wreath, together with the

30 Grierson, “Money and Coinage,” 518–7. This point of view was followed by Bullough, “Imagines regum,” 64. However, ten years later, Grierson was less certain, “Symbolism,” 633–4. He said at Spoleto: “I am at the moment somewhat sceptical of the possibility of the portrait of Charlemagne having been inspired by one of Constantine. The differences are very striking, and much more evident than the resemblances. The most characteristic coin-portraits of Constantine are those which show him looking upwards and with his head cut short at the neck, with no cloak covering shoulders and bust. Further, on the main series of his portrait coins Charlemagne wears a laurel wreath and not a diadem, while Constantine tends to be either bare-headed or helmeted.”
31 Abramzon, Money, pl. 25.
32 “Les monnaies impériales,” 166.
34 For details, see Garipzanov, “The Image of Authority in Carolingian Coinage,” 199–207. Peter Berghaus, “Die Darstellung des deutschen Kaiser und Könige im Münzbild, 800–1190,” in Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, 137, gives other examples demonstrating that Roman coins of the third century, struck in Gallia and Germania, were imitated in German coinage in the tenth and eleventh centuries.
35 Abramzon, Money, 364. The laurel wreath was used as a portrait element on Roman coins from the late first century B.C. until 340. Some mints like Lyon used this element up to 349. See, for details Bastien, Le buste, 1:62–3 and 68.
paludamentum, symbolized a peacemaking emperor and corresponded to one of Charlemagne’s imperial titles: pacificus imperator.

Carolingian manuscripts shed light on the technicalities of this imitation. The codices produced by the Tours school between 844 and 851 were replete with imitations of Roman coins with profile heads characteristic of the first and second centuries. They also contained copies of christograms borrowed from mid-fourth-century Roman coins. In both cases, Roman coins were used as a source of symbols of prestige and authority. Moreover, the variety of different types of Roman coins from which they copied suggests the range of models available to die-cutters in that period. Therefore, portrait images used in Carolingian imperial coinage were not the result of chance but rather represented a conscious choice to copy an image of authority that suited the demands of the period. The profile image on the imperial Carolingian coins was probably selected because it was similar to the numismatic image of the Christian emperor Constantine, who was perceived as an imperial predecessor of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious due to his victorious introduction of Christianity to Roman pagans. Between 813 and 818, this image was considered at the Carolingian court—at that time coin types were defined at the imperial center—the most appropriate for propagating the message of imperial authority and Christian universalism.

Thus, in the 810s, the minting of portrait coins, directed from the court, was one of the means of communicating symbolically the imperial legitimacy of the Carolingian dynasty to a broader audience. In this process, Carolingian deniers and obols imitated late Roman coins struck in the same region. This practice served the purpose of making Carolingian imperial coins with the emperor’s portrait recognizable as “Roman” to this audience. Such a ready visual analogy asserted continuity with the authority of late Roman emperors like Constantine the Great and disseminated a new image of Carolingian authority by breaking earlier ties with the gens Francorum.

The rapid abandonment of the imperial portrait in coinage in 818—when it was substituted with the image of a cross—represented a return to the traditional ways of communicating Carolingian authority to the majority of population; the imperial/royal portrait as a visual symbol of authority was never communicated in the Carolingian world.

as widely as in late Rome or early Byzantium. The sphere in which the late Roman visual tradition was employed shrank to the imperial court, in which the portrait was occasionally used on small commemorative issues. The first explanation for these differences between the output of the court mint and those of other mints after 818 is that it required very skillful die-engravers and took more time and effort to produce good quality dies for portrait coins. Local mints most likely did not meet these requirements. The commemorative issue of Pippin I of Aquitaine best illustrates this: probably produced at Bourges, its crude portrait is more reminiscent of Merovingian imagery than Roman precedents (fig. 12).

A second factor that should also be taken into consideration is that the portrait coins caused an undesirable response in a broader audience, especially on the fringes of the Carolingian realm where they were used as ornaments and talismans. Roman and early Byzantine portrait coins were often used as charms in early medieval Europe; the older a coin was, the more efficacious a talisman it was for its holder. For instance, coins with the portrait of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, were held in especially great esteem in Byzantium. Therefore, coins bearing imperial portraits that imitated earlier Roman models might have been considered more valuable spiritually because of their similarity to these precedents. Some of them were pierced or had special attachments so that they could be worn on a necklace or a fibula (fig. 9). In pagan northern Europe, these portrait coins were often imitated on gold medallions that very likely functioned as talismans. Hoard evidence, too, indicates that portrait coins of Louis the Pious were kept by people long after 818 when this monetary type was officially taken out of circulation and replaced with new issues. Peoples’ investment of the portrait coins with magical powers might have been unexpected and undesirable for the Carolingian court, which at

37 See especially ibid., 1040–1.
38 For examples, see ibid., 1044. Constantine’s portrait coins were respected in the medieval West as well. For instance, a ninth-century gold medallion framing a Constantinian coin was found in Utrecht, Berghaus, “Die Darstellung des deutschen Kaiser,” 137.
39 See, for instance, MEC, no. 757; and Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, no. 1b.
40 For instance, the hoard of Brioux in Aquitaine, deposited in the 840s, had many coins of Pippin II of Aquitaine and Charles the Bald, but only one coin of Louis the Pious, namely, the one with the imperial portrait. Another hoard deposited in the same period in Achlum, Frisia, also had a portrait coin of Louis the Pious, see Morrison and Grunthal, Carolingian Coinage, 348–9.
the time was deeply involved in Christian reform. A Christian agenda might have also played a role in the replacement of the imperial portrait with the venerated sign of a cross.

A third factor to keep in mind is that, as pointed out in chapter 4, the vast majority of people in the Carolingian realm north of the Alps at this time traditionally drew a cross to sign documents. Therefore, the abandonment of Roman imperial imagery in 818 in favor of the sign of a cross might have better complied with their “horizon of expectations”. Emphasis on a Christian symbol instead of an imperial portrait corresponds to the last, but not the least, factor: in the court itself, the opinion of which values had to be communicated to ordinary people through coinage had probably changed. In those decades, Carolingian intellectuals expressed a changing perception of rulers’ imagery on coins. Several passages from the glossa on the Liber Psalmorum by Walafrid Strabo (c. 809–849), whose life was connected to the monasteries of St. Gall and Reichenau, provide snapshots of this transformation. He first repeats the old parable of the drachma found by a woman cleaning the house, but strips the image of a king of any spiritual power by pointing out that he is simply a man.41 Then he rephrases the above-mentioned passage of Augustine referring to imperial coins (in nummo imago imperatoris). While discussing the name and image of the king on a coin (in nummo... nomen et imago regis), Walafrid speaks of Christ and not of an earthly ruler, as the patristic author did earlier.42 Finally, the Carolingian author offers a metaphorical interpretation of the image of the heavenly King on a denier: the light of his appearance and his allegorical image is the sign of cross.43

41 “Venit mulier, sapientia Dei, quae drachman, ubi est imago regis, id est hominem, perdiderat; accendit de se lucernam, quae de luto est, id est carnem, et nocte illuminata invenit drachman,” Walafridus Strabo, Glossa ordinaria. Liber Psalmorum, Psalmus CXXXVIII, 11, in PL, vol. 113, col. 1060B.
42 “In veteri lege (Deut. X.) Pascha, Pentecoste, scenophégia, tres praeципuæ solemnitates, in quibus præceptum ut nemo vacuus in conspectu Domini apparet. Vacuus est, qui in se Christum non habet, qui est fundamentum, quod nemo mutare valet. Inde est quod illis tribus solemnitatibus fidelis populus nummum offert manuali oblatione, interiorem signiÁEiens. In nummo enim nomen et imago regis. Quisque ergo spiritualiter nummum offerat, ut nomen regis, id est Christi, in se habeat, a Christo Christianus dictus; et imaginem, id est animam, lumine vultus ejus insignitam Deo exibeat,” in ibid., Psalmus CXVII, 27, in PL, vol. 113, col. 1041B.
43 “Signatum est super nos lumen, etc.” (Aug.) Hoc lumen est totum, et verum hominis bonum, quo signatur, ut denarius imagine regis. ‘Lumen.’ (Aug.) Lumen, id est, luminosus vultus, et illuminans nos, imago qua cognosceris. (Cass.) Vel: Crux nobis impressa est, in signum regis nostri, quae est lumen vultus: quia in talibus radiat Deus.
Thus, the substitution in 818 of the imperial portrait (imaginis regis, id est hominis) on coins with the sign of a cross (imagine, luce atque signo Christi) echoed the modification of patristic tradition regarding rulers’ imagery by some Carolingian intellectuals.44 This change signified that the Carolingian imperial court, dominated by clergy, turned or, more accurately, returned to Christian values from its stress on Roman imperial elements in its indirect communication with a broader audience.45 This transformation was most obviously symbolized by the image of a Christian basilica with the surrounding legend Christiana religio (this legend contains the nomen Christi, since, to paraphrase Walafred, a Christo Christiana dicta), which was used on some imperial coins between 813–818. Between 822 and 840, in fact, it became the only reverse type on the coins of Louis the Pious (fig. 37).46 From this time forward, coinage bore the nomina and signa of both a Carolingian ruler and Christ.

(b) The portrait image on seals and bulls

The portrait images on Carolingian seals and bulls had a different function and addressed different audiences than images on coinage. The sphragistic images were intended for a limited social group: the receivers of royal diplomata, that is, the Carolingian lay aristocracy and

---

44 This transformation had already begun in the late eighth century in the work of Theodulf of Orleans, who argued in the Libri Carolini that “the Cross of Christ embodies a mighty mystery; the sign of the Cross invokes that same great mystery” and that “images are utterly unworthy even to be mentioned in connection with the Cross,” Freeman, “Scripture and Images in the Libri Carolini,” 194. In spite of Alcuin’s negative reaction to the extremely aniconic approach of Theodulf, the fact is that from 793/4 to 813, a cross and not an image remained the main coin type in Carolingian coinage.

45 One example demonstrating how the sign of cross caught the imagination of clergy is provided by the Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis, written approximately at that time: “Anno incarnationis dominicae 806, pridie Non. Iunii, luna 14. signum crucis mirabili modo in luna apparuit feria 5. prima aurora incipiente, quasi hoc modo +.” MHG, Scriptores, vol. 1, ed. Georg H. Pertz (Hanover: Hahn, 1826), 103.

the upper clergy. In this situation, the main purposes of sphragistic imagery could have been to confirm the authenticity of a charter, function as a symbol of royal authority, and demonstrate continuity or change in rulership. Thus, the first Carolingian royal seals without doubt demonstrated dynastic disruption to their viewers by using the profile bust. Merovingian seals presented their viewers the frontal image of a Frankish king—a recognizable symbol of supreme authority deriving from late Roman and early Byzantine numismatic tradition—whose royal authority was indicated by long hair.

Initially, the early Carolingian royal chancery used seals with Roman gems bearing profile busts of classical mythological personages (like Bacchus), philosophers, and emperors. The chancery of Charlemagne, where two different seals were used, developed this tradition further. The first seal appears on his documents only twice (in 775 and 812) and, similar to the seals of Pippin and Carloman, was made of a Roman gem with the profile image of a pagan personage, Jupiter Serapis. The main seal of Charlemagne framed a second-century Roman gem with the profile of an emperor or philosopher facing right. The Carolingian framework, surrounding the gem, contained a legend beseeching Christ to protect Charlemagne, king of the Franks (Christe, protege Carolum regem Francorum). This design was very different from seals of fifth- and sixth-century Germanic rulers as well as of seventh- and early eighth-century Merovingian kings, which were cut as a single piece.

This change could have reflected decay in engraving skills in the early Carolingian world; however, the quality of Merovingian royal seals is


50 Ibid., 95–6, nos. 16–7. It is difficult to determine whom the portrait represents. Among different identifications, Emperor Commodus, Antoninus Pius, and a classical philosopher have been mentioned; see Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, 34–5 and 148–9.

also much inferior to that of late Roman gems. Therefore, it is more likely that the early Carolingian practice derived from the concurrent sphyragistic tradition of the higher aristocracy, to which Carolingian mayors originally belonged.\footnote{No contemporary seal of Frankish magnates survives, yet the use of similar profile busts on late Merovingian coins issued by independent magnates leaves open the possibility that antique gems were used as seals at the time. See Schramm, \textit{Die deutschen Kaiser}, 34; Tessier, \textit{Diplomatique royale française}, 77; and Stieldorf, “Siegel auf den merowingischen Königsurkunden,” 162–3.} This practice was known among Merovingian bishops as early as the late fifth century: in 494, for instance, the bishop of Vienne, Avitus, wrote a letter to bishop Apollinarius, commissioning a seal and describing how it must be executed. Its pattern reminds us of Charlemagne’s main seal: a small gem with an image—in the earlier case, the heads of dolphins—was put into a metal frame with a circular inscription naming its owner. The only difference is that part of the image, the tails of the dolphins, was engraved on the metal frame adjacent to the gem.\footnote{“Signatorium igitur quod pietas vestra non tam promittere quam offerre dignata est, in hunc modum fieri volo. Annulo ferreo et admodum tenui, velut concurrentibus in se delphinulis concludendo, sigilli duplicis forma geminis cardinulis inservat. Quae ut libuerit vicissim, seu latitabunda, seu publica, obtutibus intuentium alterna vetustis lapilli vel electri pallentis fronte mutetur….Si quaeras quid insculpendum sigillo: Signum monogrammatis mei per gyrum scripti nominis legatur indicio. Medium porro annuli, ab ea parte qua volae clausae vicinabitur, delphinorum quorum superius capita descripsimus, caudae tenebunt. Quibus lapisculus ob hoc ipsum quae situs, oblongus scilicet et acutis capitibus formatus indetur. Ecce habes quoddam tantummodo speculum dogmatis exsequendi,” Avitus Viennensis, \textit{Epistolae. LXXVIII}, in \textit{PL}, vol. 59, col. 0280B–0281A.} It is possible that similar seals were used by Frankish bishops and abbots later on, meaning that this practice might have eventually influenced Charlemagne’s chancery run by clerics. It is unlikely, therefore, that the early Carolingian seals were a Romanizing by-product of the “Carolingian Renaissance,” as some scholars have argued.\footnote{For the latest expression of this opinion, see Keller, “Zu den Siegeln der Karolinger,” 406. In contrast, after studying Carolingian gems, Geneva Kornbluth has argued that Roman styles might have served devotional needs: “The gems’ imagery shows no single overall program that might be linked to the imperial aspiration of the courts. If this is art for the elite, it is art for a remarkably diverse and widespread elite. It cannot be understood as supporting an ideal of imperial unity….The gems are not, then, a ‘Renaissance’ phenomenon, as that term was formerly used, and they cannot ultimately support the old definition of Carolingian culture,” \textit{Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire} (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 4.} Thus, portraits on early Carolingian seals of the second half of the eighth century might have demonstrated not only a break from
the traditions of the Merovingian kings, but also an affinity with the Frankish aristocracy, the gens Francorum of the sphragistic tradition.

The first innovation in the sphragistic portrait image was introduced on the imperial lead bull of Charlemagne (fig. 50). Its obverse, with a crowned bust of the emperor in three-quarter profile, with a lance and shield, might have imitated a silver medallion of Constantine the Great struck in 315. However, a similar imperial image appeared frequently on imperial solidi (gold coins) of the fifth and sixth centuries, including those of Theodosius II (fig. 51). The influence of late Roman imperial tradition on this bull is corroborated by other features like Charlemagne’s title, which has clear analogies in those of late fourth- and fifth-century Roman emperors. Finally, the legend on its reverse states “the renewal of the Roman empire.” The obverse of the bull addressed the Carolingian elite with a clear visual parallel between late Roman imperial and Carolingian images of authority, thereby presenting Charlemagne as a legitimate successor to the Christian Roman emperors.

Unfortunately, because the only surviving exemplar of this bull is damaged and not attached to any charter, it is difficult to determine when exactly it began to be used in the period between the imperial coronation in 800 and the death of Charlemagne in early 814. Any effort to date it offers rather hypothetical speculations lacking unequivocal evidence. Even so, some scholars have accepted Percy Schramm’s interpretation of this imperial bull as demonstrating Roman imperial influence on the Carolingian court soon after the year 800. The main problem with such an interpretation the dating of the bull, which Schramm and Werner Ohnsorge suggested was produced between

---

55 Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge, vol. 2, 97, no. 18; Schramm, “Die beiden Metallbullen Karls des Großen,” 21–5; and idem, Die deutschen Kaiser, 149. As mentioned in chapter 4, one lead bull attributed to the royal period of Charlemagne survives. Unfortunately, it is in poor condition and its attribution to the reign of Charlemagne by Schramm, ibid., 35–6 and 149, is not conclusive.

56 The lance was not only in late Roman imperial insignia but also a symbol of Lombard kingship. See Stefano Gaspari, “Kingship Rituals and Ideology in Lombard Italy,” in Rituals of Power, ed. Theuws and Nelson, 95–114, at 98–9 and 112. Thus, the portrait on Charlemagne’s bull complied not only with late Roman, but also with Italo-Lombard tradition.

57 Ibid., 39 and 149.

58 For details on these legends, see chapter 3.

59 The exemplar is in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Département des Monnaies, Médailles et Antiques, no. 995.
803 and 807. The latter year is postulated from *The Chronicle of Farfa*, which states that the monastery had a gold bull of Charlemagne of that date. However, the only surviving imperial bull is made of lead, not of gold, and the chronicle does not specify the design of bull used. Considering that the Carolingian royal coinage introduced in 793/4 continued to be in use for more than a decade after the imperial coronation of 800, the exemplar mentioned in *The Chronicle of Farfa* might have also employed royal titles and symbols. Some scholars also rely upon Grierson’s initial dating of Charlemagne’s imperial coinage to 806–814, since it would have been quite logical if imperial bulls, similarly inspired by the Roman imperial tradition, were produced simultaneously. Yet, in 1985, Grierson abandoned this dating for a later one between 812 and 814, and, as I have argued earlier, this coinage was most likely struck in 813. The re-dating of Charlemagne’s imperial coinage thus suggests that if his imperial bull was produced at his court in Aachen—and the possibility remains that it could have been issued for special occasions in an Italian context—then it would have happened in the last years of his reign.

The obverse of Charlemagne’s imperial bull was repeated on that of Louis the Pious and on one of Charles the Bald, which continued to present the traditional, by then, image of Carolingian authority to their audiences. These included Roman imperial symbols like the diadem, *paludamentum*, lance, and shield. However, an important change pertained to the reverse: the invocation of the Roman empire and Rome was replaced by the legend *Renovatio regni Francorum* (renewal of the kingdom of the Franks). One must bear in mind that the impe-

---


61 See chapter 3.

62 *Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge*, vol. 2, 100 and 107, nos. 21 and 29; and Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 43, 157, and 166. The royal bulls of Charles the Bald also seem to have imitated those of his father and grandfather, although the attribution of some surviving royal bulls to Charles the Bald is not certain. For details, see ibid., 51 and 165–6; Tessier, *Diplomatique royale française*, 80–2; and Jean-Yves Mariotte, “Une bulle de plomb attribuée à Charles le Chauve,” *Ad* 23 (1977): 104–11. At any rate, by the mid-ninth century, their design showed the unbroken continuity of Frankish rulership to their receivers, the Carolingian aristocracy.

63 Jean Mabillon, *De re diplomatica*, 2d ed. (Paris: Robustel, 1709), 142 and Suppl., 47. For details on this bull, see Percy E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, 2:50–1; and
rial bull of Louis the Pious has not survived, so it is known to scholars only through the drawings in Jean Mabillon’s *De re diplomatica* (fig. 52). He reported that this bull was made of gold and attached to the diploma of Louis the Pious written on behalf of St. Martin of Tours on September 29, 816. The use of a gold bull was a direct imitation of Byzantine imperial tradition, with its possible appearance in 816 corresponding to the period when the coins with imperial portraits were issued in Gaul (814–818). As the above-mentioned passage from *The Chronicle of Farfa* suggests, this tradition was applied to Carolingian diplomas in Italy in 807 at the latest; one of Agobard of Lyons’ letters evinces that gold bulls continued to be used in the 820s on imperial diplomas given to recipients from southern Gaul. Furthermore, the use of a gold bull in the Byzantine world was a sign of respect to the recipient. This practice fits the abbeys of Farfa and St. Martin of Tours, the latter of which had especially close connections with the imperial chancery in these years.

While the use of imperial bulls by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious in the 810s and 820s imitated late Roman and early Byzantine traditions, Carolingian seals of the first half of the ninth century adhered to previous royal tradition. The seals of Louis the Pious and Lothar I, produced between the 810s and 830s, continued to include gems with the profiles of Roman emperors, a practice continued by most their...
successors.\textsuperscript{67} Only in the second third of the ninth century did some seal gems begin to be produced by contemporary Carolingian masters. Yet, Roman gems with imperial busts were also still used in royal seals. The best example for the coexistence of these practices is provided by the reign of Louis the German. His earliest seal, employed from 831 to 861, was carved as a single piece similar to those of early Germanic kings so that the royal image was not separated from the surrounding inscription. The profile bust, similar to images on contemporary imperial bulls, was copied from a Roman prototype and included the same attributes: a crown, \textit{paludamentum}, lance, and shield.\textsuperscript{68} When this seal became overused, another one imitating it was produced for the latter period of Louis' reign from 866 to 874. Parallel to those, another seal of Louis the German was employed between 833 and 875, and, in accordance with Carolingian sphragistic tradition, framed a Roman gem with the profile image of an emperor, in this case, Hadrian.\textsuperscript{69}

Regardless of whether a Roman or Carolingian gem was employed, the profile bust continued to be the typical image on Carolingian royal and clerical seals. This conservatism in imagery was due to the legal importance of the seal as a sign of the continuity of authority. Each successive ruler tried to maintain its design with as little change as possible so that his seal remained recognizable to its audiences, primarily the Carolingian aristocracy and monastic communities.\textsuperscript{70} The seals were

---

\textsuperscript{67} For the seals of Pippin I of Aquitaine, Louis II, and Charles the Bald, see ibid., 49–51 and 163–5; and \textit{Corpus des sceaux français du moyen âge}, vol. 2, 105–7 and 124–5, nos. 27–9 and 47–9.

\textsuperscript{68} “Das Vorbild hierfür hatte seinerseits ein antikes Medaillon gegeben, wohl ähnlich dem, das Konstantine der Große 312 nach dem Sieg über Maxentius hatte prägen lassen,” Keller, “Zu den Siegeln der Karolinger,” 412. This was the first use of arms on Carolingian seals.

\textsuperscript{69} This tradition of using Roman gems for seals was continued by the successors of the East Frankish king. For details, see Schramm, \textit{Die deutschen Kaiser}, 64 and 178; and Kornbluth, \textit{Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire}, 22–4.

\textsuperscript{70} This adherence to previous tradition in the ninth century cannot be explained by the low level of Carolingian art. Kornbluth, “The Seal of Lothar II,” 60–2, shows that a Carolingian artist could not only imitate the composition and general iconography of a model, but also could introduce “substantive iconographic changes.” When Louis the Pious began to use a new imperial seal in 833–837, its profile image very closely followed the model of the previous seal made early in his reign. Schramm, \textit{Die deutschen Kaiser}, 44, explained such conservatism by the need to make a Carolingian seal look authentic.
not intended to present the image of a particular holder, but rather to represent his social standing. From the mid-ninth century, the status of a holder began to be expressed primarily through a particular headdress: the royal status on a Carolingian seal was expressed, first and foremost, with a crown,71 while the status of bishops and abbots was demonstrated through the depiction of tonsure.72

Thus, early Carolingian seals with Roman gems were in full compliance with the “horizon of expectations” of its main audience of Carolingian bishops, abbots, and lay aristocrats, among whom this practice had already been established in the Merovingian period. Hence, the practice was not a part of any Carolingian renewal but rather the consequence of the inadequate skills of Carolingian engravers, who initially were unable to carve gems comparable in quality to Roman prototypes. From the last years of Charlemagne’s reign, Carolingian imperial bulls attest to important innovations in the sphragistic tradition of the imperial chancery. On these bulls, the Roman military image of an emperor was introduced as the symbolic image of Carolingian authority, remaining the main one until the 850s. At the same time, the bulls and, later, seals demonstrate the appearance of a new visual element of Carolingian authority, the crown. The significance of this symbol increased when a new visual tradition abandoned the image of the pacifying Christian emperor, which was employed in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority from the last years of Charlemagne’s reign. The visual tradition during the time of Charles the Bald developed new symbols of authority and could be already described as medieval royal iconography. This transformation of the ruler’s iconography was expressed most distinctly in contemporary Carolingian miniatures.

71 For instance, see the seals of Louis the German and Lothar II. Kornbluth, “The Seal of Lothar II,” 58–9, analyzes the images on the seals of Lothar I and Lothar II, showing that they represented a Roman imperial military bust wearing a cuirass and paludamentum. This type of bust appeared, for instance, on gems of Commodus and coins of Trajan, Caracalla, and Elagabalus. However, the Roman laurel wreath on the seal of Lothar I was transformed into something looking like a Carolingian royal crown, ibid., 62. See also Kornbluth, Engraved Gems of the Carolingian Empire, 58–63. For a similar imperial bust wearing a diadem and paludamentum, see a real seal from Zurich, attributed to Louis II, ibid., 109–13.

72 See the late ninth-century clerical seals in ibid., 68–70, 76 and fig. 8, 9, 12.
Frankish pictorial art lacks the direct depiction of Carolingian rulers in the time of Pippin the Short and Charlemagne. This phenomenon is hardly accidental, and Henry Mayr-Harting is likely correct in asserting that “there can be little doubt that this was deliberate policy rather than merely reflecting the chances of survival in our evidence.”

Such a conclusion comes without surprise considering that, unlike in Byzantium, royal images were not venerated in the Frankish world. Therefore, it is the appearance of such imagery in the ninth century, rather than its absence in the second half of the eighth century, that requires explanation. As the preceding analysis has demonstrated, the first proper images of a ruler, clad in Roman attire, appeared not in Carolingian miniatures, but on seals and bulls from the late eighth and early ninth centuries and in imperial coinage from 813. These media, functioning as ubiquitous material signs of Carolingian authority, needed a symbolic image to a greater extent than did miniatures. Early Carolingian iconography in manuscripts was limited to a small circle of religious images, mostly those of evangelists in gospel-books. This
choice derived from the late antique tradition of placing an author’s image at the beginning of the book. At the same time as evangelist portraits appeared in gospel-books, the image of King David was a logical prefatory image in the book of his psalms, the Psalter.

The image of King David emerged first in Byzantine iconography, in part because this king was perceived as the Old Testament predecessor to Roman and, consequently, to Byzantine emperors. As a result, the name “New David” became an honorific reference to Christian emperors of the late Roman and Byzantine empires. In regard to book miniatures, the image of David became one of the most frequently occurring prefatory images of the Psalter and had several different interpretations in Byzantium and the Carolingian empire. The first and most popular interpretation was the image of David as musician, and as a prefiguration of Christ, which penetrated into Carolingian art in the late eighth century. The second interpretation is the image


75 A well-known example is the imago clipeata of the author in the manuscript of Terence, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3868, fol. 2r. For details and other examples, see Giulio Battelli, “Motivi figurativi antichi nei manoscritti latini altomedievali,” in Testo e immagine nell’alto medioevo, 1:505–32.

76 Davidic imagery in early medieval art is a separate issue that will be briefly discussed insofar as it relates to rulers’ imagery. For the analysis of some pre-Carolingian imagery of the prophets of the Old Testament, including David, see Petra Sevrugian, “Prophetendarstellungen in der frühchristlichen Kunst,” FS 26 (1992): 65–81. For a detailed analysis of the imagery of David and its main attributes up to the twelfth century, see Hugo Steger, David rex et propheta: König David als vorbildliche Verkörperung des Herrschers und Dichters im Mittelalter, nach Bilddarstellungen des achten bis zwölften Jahrhunderts, Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kunstwissenschaft, no. 6 (Nürnberg: Carl, 1961).


79 For details, see Steger, David rex et propheta, 110–3.

80 The example of such an image is represented in the Khudov Psalter, fol. 1v: produced in Constantinople in the mid-nineth century, it probably reflects an early Christian model. The miniature depicts David seated, playing the psalter, and surrounded by four musicians. Above David, there is a portrait of the young Christ in a round frame. The connection between these two images reflected a very common Christian belief that psalms prefigured the life, passion, and resurrection of Christ. See Kathleen Corrigan, “Chapter 3. Early Medieval Psalter Illustrations in Byzantium and
of David as sinner, repenting for his conduct with Bathsheba after the rebuke of prophet Nathan; this visual interpretation was less frequent in the Carolingian West and found a parallel in the Utrecht Psalter (c. 816–822).\textsuperscript{81} The image of David seems to have become especially appealing to Charlemagne and his retinue in the late 780s and 790s: like the Old Testament king, Charlemagne claimed in his documents and actions of that time to be the head not only of the Frankish state, but also of the Frankish church. The image of David, the legendary king of Israel, provided Charlemagne and his advisors with an allegorical and visual analogue to his reign.\textsuperscript{82}

At approximately the same time, the first images of David were created in close relation to courtly art. One of them is depicted in the Montpellier Psalter, produced in c. 783–792 in Mondsee Abbey, which is well-known among liturgical scholars as the earliest text of the Frankish royal lauds.\textsuperscript{83} the prefatory imagery of this Psalter unifies the motifs of David as musician and the prefiguration of Christ.\textsuperscript{84} Better known among art historians is the image of David on the ivory book-covers of the West,” in The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David, ed. Koert van der Horst et al. (Vespremen: HES Publishers, 1996), 87.


\textsuperscript{83} Montpellier, Bibliothèque Universitaire, Ms. 409; CLLA no. 1611. For details on this manuscript, its dating and all relevant bibliography, see Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 140, n. 110.

\textsuperscript{84} David, depicted on folio 1v, stands under an arch, holds a harp with the left hand, and has his right hand in a blessing gesture. On folio 2v, Christ is depicted in the same posture under a similar arch but holding a book.
the so-called Dagulf Psalter (c. 783–795)—the ivories were most likely produced at the court of Charlemagne close to the final date when the Psalter had been completed, c. 795. They show all those involved in the creation of the Latin version of the Psalter, including the legendary author, David, playing a harp and surrounded by musicians, the poets chosen by David to record the psalms, and St. Jerome, who corrected and prepared the Latin edition of the Psalter. The Psalter, commissioned by Charlemagne, was intended for Pope Hadrian I, although the pope’s death in December 795 aborted this plan. Regardless, the manuscript and its ivory covers had been produced to carry a message from the Carolingian commissioners, Charlemagne and his advisors, to papal Rome. Its dedicatory poem in honor of Charlemagne indicates that the psalms were the golden words of King David, and Charlemagne his successor.

Charlemagne was often likened to David in the entourage of the Carolingian monarch in the 790s. Because David spoke directly to God, the use of this simile reflected an allegorical claim to a close relationship between Charlemagne and his Lord, whose protection of the Carolingian king was invoked symbolically on the contemporary royal seal used to make wax impressions on royal diplomas. Although the image of David as musician, a visual simile of Carolingian rulers, underwent further development in ninth-century productions including

---


87 John Beckwith, Early Medieval Art (London: Thames & Hudson, 1969), 34–5 and n. 39; and Bullough, “Imagines regum,” 59. That among the different interpretations of David, his image as a musician was chosen might also have indicated the epicurean environment of Charlemagne’s court, where musicians were a permanent feature of the everyday dinner. “Inter caenandum aut aliquod acroama aut lectorem audiebat,” Einhard, Vita Karoli Magni, c. 24, ed. Pertz, Waitz, and Holder-Egger, 29.

88 A dedicatory poem is found at the beginning of the manuscript on fol. 4r; and starts “Hadriano summo papae patriae beato / Rex Carolus salve mando valeque, pater.” On the next page, fol. 4v, there is a dedicatory poem from Dagulf to Charlemagne. For their texts, see Versus libris saeculi octavi adiecti, in MGH, PLAC, vol. 1, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin: Weidmann, 1881), 91–2. For details on these poems, see Der goldene Psalter, 47–54.

89 Bullough, “Imagines regum,” 59.
the Psalter of Charles the Bald, the First Bible of Charles the Bald, the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura, and the Psalterium Aureum of St. Gall, its role was less influential due to the emergence of a new brand of Carolingian royal iconography in contemporary manuscripts.⁹⁰

(d) The image of the ruler in Carolingian imperial art

The direct depiction of Carolingian monarchs appeared first in the reign of Louis the Pious.⁹¹ In 826, Ermold the Black described the appearance of the frescoes in the imperial palace of Ingelheim.⁹² In one part of the aula regia, he recounted that ancient pagan kings were depicted, while frescoes in another part presented the Christian predecessors of Louis the Pious: Constantine, Theodosius, Charles Martel, Pippin the Short, and Charlemagne.⁹³ A Roman imperial pattern most likely guided the

⁹⁰ For details on this iconography of David in Carolingian psalters, see Christopher Eggenberger, Psalterium Aureum Sancti Galli: Mittelalterliche Psalterillustration im Kloster St. Gallen (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1987), 45–53.

⁹¹ There might have been depictions of early Carolingian kings dating to the reign of Charlemagne, but none have survived; references to them are too vague to determine how they looked and when they were created. For examples, see Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, 150. Walter Lammers, “Ein karolingisches Bildprogramm in der aula regia von Ingelheim,” in Festschrift für Hermann Heimpel zum 70. Geburtstag am 19. September 1971 (Göttingen: Vandenhöck & Rupracht, 1971), 242, n. 44.

⁹² The construction of the palace began in the reign of Charlemagne but was most likely finished under Louis the Pious. Einhard, Vita Karoli Magni, c. 17, ed. Pertz, Waitz, and Holder-Egger, 20, mentions that Charlemagne inchoavit it. Cf. Lammers, “Ein karolingisches Bildprogramm,” 234–5, n. 33, who translates this term as “undertook” and argues that the palace must have been finished by 807. In any case, the frescoes might have been painted after the palace’s completion. For archaeological evidence of this palace, see ibid., 230–42. The palace had the form of a basilica and was similar to the palace in Aachen. Its shape ultimately derived from Roman imperial architecture, in particular the palace of Constantine in Trier.

composition since the Carolingian rulers were not only depicted together with the Roman emperors but also represented in functions normally associated with the latter, namely, as victorious generals and law-givers. This conclusion is corroborated by the description of Charlemagne’s representation, which took the form of a traditional triumphal image of a Roman Christian emperor pacifying belligerent pagans. It is reminiscent of the image on Charlemagne’s imperial bull:

...and the wise Charles shows his gracious face,  
and bears rightfully on his crowned head a diadem;  
here stands a Saxon warband, daring him to battle;  
he fights them, masters them, and draws them under his law.\(^94\)

This imagery must be understood in relation to other monarchical imagery produced in the reign of Louis the Pious. Einhard notes that a golden arch with Charlemagne’s image and title was constructed over the emperor’s grave in Aachen.\(^95\) Although this arch does not survive, a seventeenth-century drawing depicts the cross-base in the shape of a triumphal arch—made some time in the 820s, probably at the court school—that Einhard donated to the church of St. Servatius in Maastricht.\(^96\) The upper register of this \textit{arcus argenteus} presents Christ and his apostles, while the middle level is filled with evangelists. The lower register, in contrast, has imagery reminiscent of Roman imperial prototypes: there are four haloed figures on the front and back sides of the arch clad in the traditional military attire of Roman emperors and holding spears and shields. It is impossible to determine the identity of these personages; like the wall painting in Ingelheim, the images might depict late Roman and Carolingian rulers.\(^97\)

---

\(^94\) The translation is by Davis-Weyer, \textit{Early Medieval Art}, 88.


\(^96\) On the date of this cross-base and its detailed analysis, see contributions in Karl Hauck, ed., \textit{Das Einhardkreuz: Vorträge und Studien der Münsteraner Diskussion zum arcus Einhardi}, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, no. 87 (Göttingen: Vandenhöck & Ruprecht, 1974).

\(^97\) Schramm, \textit{Die deutschen Kaiser}, 152–4, thought that these figures represented holy warriors, while rulers’ imagery was presented by two equestrian figures on the inner walls of the arch. This assumption was followed by the participants of the colloquium in Münster; see, for instance, Kurt Weitzmann, “Der Aufbau und die unteren Felder des Einhard-Reliquiars,” in Hauck, ed., \textit{Das Einhardkreuz}, 35–41, who drew the parallel
The visual link between late Roman emperors and Carolingian rulers in the reign of Louis the Pious may be confirmed by the best known contemporary image of a Carolingian ruler, Louis the Pious, which served as an illustration to Hrabanus Maurus’ poem entitled *In honorem sanctae crucis*. This miniature (fig. 53) was created in the mid-830s to celebrate the restoration of Louis’ imperial position; hence, it matched the visual “vocabulary” employed at the Carolingian imperial court in the 810s and 820s. Depicted as a holy emperor in triumph, Louis the Pious held a cross-staff in his right arm and a shield in his left hand. Crowned with a nimbus, he stood wearing red leather boots, a helmet, and a blue military cloak—either the Roman *paludamentum* or the Frankish *sagum venetum* (a blue short military or hunting cloak)—over these equestrian figures and the imperial image on the Barberini plaque. However, this interpretation has one significant problem: these figures are on the inner walls of the arch which were not well seen by observers. Meanwhile, imperial imagery on Roman triumphal arches normally was carved on their front and back sides—the arch of Constantine is one example—where the figures of the so-called holy warriors were found.

---


100 The final lines of the poem, Hrabanus Maurus, *In honorem sanctae crucis*, 12, state this beyond doubt:

\[
\text{Conscripsi dudum nam Christi laude libellum / Versibus et prosa, tibi quem nunc, induperator,}
\]
\[
\text{Off ero, sancta, libens, cuius praecedit imago / Stans armata fide, victorem monstrat ubique} (47–50).
\]

a breastplate and tunic. Although all of these elements were characteristic of the military costume of a Roman emperor, the painter blended these classical patterns with familiar Frankish elements. While various interpretations of this image and its classical model have been given, it is more important to observe that this image adopted previous symbols of imperial authority, namely, the halo, paludamentum, and cross-staff. The latter was “an attribute of victorious Christian emperors, late antique as well as Byzantine.” Finally, the posture of the image, which recalls classical imperial sculptural prototypes, does not leave space for any gesture characteristic of later royal images. This imitation of the classical model was not exclusive to the book illuminations produced at the court school of Louis the Pious or in close relation to his court. Rather, this depiction developed the earlier tradition of representing imperial authority on coins, bulls, seals, and frescoes—all media closely connected to the imperial court—and ultimately derived from the late Roman visual “vocabulary.”

The accompanying text of the *carmen figuratum* strengthens the comparison of Louis the Pious with late Roman emperors. The connection between Christ and the Carolingian king is the leitmotif of both

---

102 For details, see Sears, “Louis the Pious as *miles Christi*,” 612. For instance, the boots, helmet, and shield are of an early medieval and Frankish type rather than Roman.

103 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser*, 46–7 and 158–9, proposed that this image in all its features, such as the costume, posture, and physiognomy, followed an antique prototype. Nordenfalk thought that this model belonged to the time of Constantine the Great, and it could possibly be a statue of the emperor in Rome. See André Grabar and Carl Nordenfalk, *Early Medieval Painting from the Fourth to the Eleventh Century* (Lausanne: Skira, 1957), 92. This interpretation has been repeated by the majority of modern art historians, see Ulrich Ernst, *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1991), 293, and Perrin, “La représentation figurée,” 47. By contrast, Sears, “Louis the Pious as *miles Christi*,” 611–2, argues that, although its relation to the Roman imperial portrait is beyond doubt, the image of Louis the Pious deviated from classical models formally and conceptually.

104 Ibid., 616.

105 For instance, see the imperial diptych dated to the fifth century that depicts Emperor Honorius from Aosta, ibid., fig. 36.

106 See Florentine Mütherich, “Book Illumination at the Court of Louis the Pious,” in ChH, 593–601, who states: “It is only the antiquarian world of classical texts and classical imagery which provides us with a picture of the activities of book illuminators at Louis’s court” (603).

107 It is also necessary to keep in mind that Hrabanus’ poem was inspired by Porfyrius’ *carmina figurata* presented to Constantine the Great; Sears, “Louis the Pious as *miles Christi*,” 624.
the dedicatory poem and the verses hidden in the imperial image. Based on this link and the military insignia of the image, Sears argues that Louis the Pious is presented here as a *miles Christi*. Nonetheless, late Roman and early Byzantine emperors were also seen as possessing the same intimate connection with Christ, who was to protect them and their empire. The most evident example is the panegyrical poem *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*, written by Flavius Cresconius Corippus in Constantinople in 566–567; a copy of this work circulated in the Frankish court by c. 800. The comparison of the two poems demonstrates that both the visual image of Louis the Pious and his textual portrayal in the poem by Hrabanus Maurus follow the late Roman and early Byzantine representations of a triumphant emperor, the earthly governor of Christ. This correlates with the strong connection between depictions of Christ and the emperor during the reign

---

108 Louis the Pious’ halo frames the words “*tu Hludovicum Criste corona*.” His head and body bear another verse:

Iesu Christe, tuum, vertice, signum / Augusti galeam conferet almam
Invictam et faciat optima dextram / Virtus, Iesu, tua detque triumfum . . .


109 Ibid., 614–24.

110 In the early Middle Ages, this poem was copied in Visigothic Spain; Flavius Cresconius Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris, libri IV*, ed. Averil Cameron (Athlone: University of London, 1976), 20. For the presence of this manuscript at the Carolingian court, see Dieter Schaller, “Frühkarolingische Corripus-Rezeption,” in *Studien zur lateinischen Dichtung des Frühmittelalters*, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, no. 11 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1995), 346–60 and 419–20.

111 Similar to the poem of Hrabanus Maurus, Christ crowns Emperor Justin II: “signa dedit manifesta deus, seque ipse probavit Iustino claram regni imposuisse coronam (I. 366–7),” Corippus, *In laudem Iustini*, 47. Later on in the poem, Corippus points to Christ as the main protector of the emperor, ibid., 82:

…quem Christus amat rex magnus, amatur: / ipse regit reges, ipse et non subditur ulli.

Iustinus princeps hoc protectore quietus / imperat, hunc ipsum solum spe certus adorat. (IV. 322)

Finally, the speech of Justin II in the poem contains striking parallels in the verses of Hrabanus, ibid., 72:

res Romana dei est, terrenis non eget armis, / iure pio vivit: . . . (III. 333–4)

imperii deus est virtus et gloria nostri, / a quo certa salus, sceptrum datur atque potestatis. (III. 360–1)

Both poems state that the Christian empire is protected not by terrestrial but celestial arms like pious justice and the virtue of Christ.
of Louis the Pious. Thus, there is sufficient evidence to believe that the production of rulers’ imagery at or for the imperial court of Louis the Pious resulted from the partial adaptation of late Roman and early Byzantine modes of imperial representation developed in the third through sixth centuries.

At the same time, depictions of Carolingians in contemporary legal manuscripts produced outside the imperial court did not exactly match the classicizing agenda of the imperial court. A more detailed analysis of contemporary legal imagery is hindered by two obstacles. First, this material is mostly preserved in later copies so it is not certain how closely the copies followed their prototypes. Second, the assumption that personages depicted in Carolingian legal manuscripts represent rulers as law-givers cannot often be proved and remains hypothetical. Yet even the sketchy evidence of Carolingian legal manuscripts allows us to make two important assertions. On the one hand, the Roman traditional representation of an emperor as law-giver continued in Carolingian legal manuscripts in the time of Louis the Pious. This introduction of royal/imperial imagery into legal manuscripts followed the tradition of placing the image of the author at the beginning of a text. In accordance with this tradition, images of Carolingian rulers might have been placed before the texts of Carolingian capitularies. On the other hand, this imagery did not always follow Roman patterns of imperial representation.

---


113 For the description of this imagery, see Florentine Mütherich, “Frühmittelalterliche Rechtshandschriften,” Aachener Kunstblätter 60 (1994): 79–86.

114 See such attributions in Hubert Mordek, “Frühmittelalterliche Gesetzgebung und Justitia in Miniaturen weltlicher Rechtshandschriften,” in La giustizia nell’alto medievale (secoli V–VIII), 7–13 aprile 1994, 2 vols, SSCISAM, no. 42 (Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medievale, 1995), 2:1005–49. For instance, he argues that a sketchy image of a man with a shield standing in front of a church presents Charlemagne as the defender of the Church, ibid., 2:1018–9. Another example is the prefatory image of a law-giver on the frontispiece of the Liber legum produced in northern Italy, probably in Aquileia, soon after 816 (St. Paul in Lavanttal, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 4/1, fol. 1v). For discussion of this image and all references, see ibid., 2:1005–18, table VI. This personage was earlier identified as Charlemagne, an attribution accepted by Percy Schramm and other scholars. Recently, Mordek has identified the personage as Bernhard of Italy, accompanied by the female figure of Justitia. Yet this attribution is doubtful because the personage lacks royal insignia. Moreover, the staff in his left hand, as other illustrations presented by Mordek show, was a general sign of a law-giver regardless of his status.
This dual conclusion derives from the depiction of Charlemagne and his son Pippin in the Liber legum, the collection of Germanic laws composed by Lupus of Ferrières, probably in Fulda, between 829 and 840. Unfortunately, it survives only in a later copy made around 991 (Modena, Archivio Capitolare, Ord. I, 2, fol. 110v), but its stylistic features demonstrate that the copy followed its original quite closely. The prefatory miniature introducing the collection of Carolingian capitularies presents both Carolingians with military insignia of the Frankish kings, different from those of the Roman emperors. Charlemagne and Pippin are depicted sitting with swords and staffs; in addition, the father wears a short blue cloak resembling the sagum venetum. It is worth mentioning that the legendary authors of the Lex Salica, who are depicted in the same manuscript, have similar insignia; the only attribute differentiating Charlemagne from the earlier Frankish law-givers and indicating his royal status is a crown on his head. (This feature reminds us of the concurrent sphragistic tradition familiar to the aristocracy, in which the crown became the main visual symbol of royal authority.)

The poem accompanying the image also stresses the “Frankishness” of Charlemagne and Pippin and describes them simply as Franks. The Liber legum was produced not for Louis the Pious and his imperial court but for a Frankish count, Bernhard of Friuli; therefore, the producers of the codex kept the latter and his entourage in mind as its intended audience. From this perspective, the absence of any visual reference to Roman imperial attributes and virtues evinces that they could have been less popular among the Carolingian lay aristocracy outside the imperial court of Louis the Pious.

115 Unfortunately, the following folio with the images of Louis the Pious and Lothar I has not survived. For details on this work and the discussion of relevant bibliography, see Oliver Münsch, Der Liber legum des Lupus von Ferrières, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, no. 14 (Frankfurt: Lang, 2001).

116 For details on this miniature and the manuscript, see Mütherich, “Frühmittelalterliche Rechtshandschriften,” 79–81; Mordek, “Frühmittelalterliche Gesetzgebung,” 2:1035–49; idem, “Kapitularien und Schriftlichkeit,” in Schriftkultur und Reichsverwaltung unter den Karolingern, ed. Schieffer, 47–9 and 55; and Münsch, Der Liber legum, 71–6. The only indication of Charlemagne’s imperial status is the inscription over his image designating him as Karolus christianissimus imperator augustus.

117 Quam pulchram poteris, si velis, forte videre / Effigies, lector, Francorum scema per aevum!

En Carolus cum Pippino quam fulget in vultu…

The image in the *Liber legum* reminds us that the first known images of Carolingian rulers appeared at a time when the imperial authority of Louis the Pious was first challenged and opposed. In those decades, the legitimacy and limits of imperial authority in its relation to the prerogatives of sub-kings and the rights of nobility became a matter of theological, political, and literary discourse. In this situation, courtly art presented visual concepts originating at the imperial seat that carried a certain propagandistic message to Carolingian aristocrats visiting or staying for some time at Aachen. Yet the image in the *Liber legum* suggests that other visual interpretations of Carolingian authority looking back to the previous tradition of *rex Francorum* existed outside the imperial court at that time.

The final feature of Carolingian rulers’ imagery in the imperial period is that it did not affect illuminations in contemporary religious manuscripts. The ruler’s iconography employed in a courtly context or legal manuscripts—irrespective of which visual tradition, Roman imperial or Frankish, it followed—was separated from imagery in religious manuscripts. In the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, their images were “barred” from being depicted in liturgical manuscripts together with sacred personages such as evangelists or David, not to mention Christ. Only in the 840s did the rift between these two spheres of the Carolingian art, which can be called, albeit loosely, clerical and lay, disappeared. At this point, Carolingian rulers began to be depicted in religious manuscripts like gospel-books, psalters, and bibles.

*(e)* **Rulers’ portraits in religious manuscripts in the time of Charles the Bald**

The imagery of Carolingian rulers produced in religious manuscripts in the mid-ninth century raises questions about its function and meaning in particular instances due to the varying authors and audiences of individual codices. The traditional approach formulated by Percy Schramm and thereafter taken for granted by many historians is that such imagery presents the self-image of a monarch. It therefore allows scholars to discern the monarch’s own political concept of kingship. This approach is, however, doubtful for two reasons. First, some mid-ninth-century images were created outside the court; thus, they present iconographic as well as political concepts of particular monastic communities or the monks involved in their creation. Second, even when there are reasons to believe that a particular royal image was depicted
at a court school, the question remains as to how much this image was defined and influenced by a ruler’s political thoughts.\textsuperscript{118} It is very doubtful that the ruler himself instructed the artists regarding how he had to be depicted in a given miniature. Instruction might have come from a member of his court supervising the activity of the court school, but it is unclear how detailed such instructions would have been.\textsuperscript{119} It is true, however, that the artists of the court school and their supervisor had to consider their intended courtly audience; therefore, they tended to produce a royal image that could be understood by and illicit a positive response from this group and the king in particular. Finally, since mid-ninth-century rulers’ images were produced in religious manuscripts, God may have been envisioned as another intended audience.\textsuperscript{120}

The final point, the provenance of royal imagery in religious manuscripts, has been developed further by Joachim Wollasch. Arguing against Schramm’s approach, he points out that the majority of the ninth- through eleventh-century manuscripts in which royal imagery appeared were liturgical books.\textsuperscript{121} To use a liturgical book, which was

\textsuperscript{118} Cf. Lowden, “The Royal/Imperial Book and the Image,” 240.

\textsuperscript{119} The Gospels of Lothar, albeit written outside the imperial court, provide a hint of the role this intermediary played in the production of a manuscript. A dedicatory poem in this gospel-book, commissioned by Lothar I from the monastery of St. Martin of Tours, mentions that he ordered this book to be decorated with gold and miniatures, while the minute supervision over the production of the manuscript was conducted by another person, Sigilaus.


employed in the sacred mystery of worshiping God, as a simple carrier for royal self-representation was an obvious trespass on the divine sphere. Wollasch proposes another explanation:

Thus, a ruler’s portrait in a liturgical manuscript could not be misunderstood, by any means, as arrogance in regard to the divine Lord, but it received a clearly defined communicative function in the reciprocal relationship between the ruler and a monastic community.¹²²

In addition to visualizing the fraternal relationship between the rulers and monastic communities, the royal images in liturgical manuscripts donated to monasteries were a means of establishing the assurance of royal well-being through monastic commemorative prayers.

Wollasch’s thesis of the communicative function of a ruler’s imagery is convincing, but the problem remains that he includes in the genre of liturgical manuscripts prayerbooks, psalters, evangelaries with gospel pericopes, and gospel-books with the gospels in extenso. Only the prayer-books and evangelaries can be described as practical liturgical books similar to sacramentaries or ordines; only one such book, the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, has a royal image (fig. 59)—but it was made for the personal use of the king himself! Psalters and gospel-books, as well as bibles, which also acquired royal imagery in the Carolingian period, were less adapted to liturgical purposes,¹²³ consequently making them

---

¹²² “So konnte das Herrscherbild in der liturgischen Handschrift jedenfalls nicht als Anmaßung gegenüber dem göttlichen Herrscher mißverstanden werden, sondern empfing eine klar umschriebene Funktion der Mitteilung in der gegenseitigen Beziehung von Herrscher und Klostergemeinschaft,” ibid., 20. Keller, “Herrscherbild und Herrschaftslegitimation,” 290–311, argues that, later on, this function of rulers’ imagery was even more explicitly expressed in Ottonian miniatures.

¹²³ As for the Gospels, additional Capitularia evangeliorum, listing what passages of the Gospels had to be used for every mass, were necessary in order to use this book in the liturgy. For instance, the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram had capitula after the text of the Gospels (see chapter 2) and was probably actively used for liturgical purposes. Psalters could be used in the liturgy but only together with other liturgical books like lectionaries or antiphonaries that contained references to the psalms to be performed on particular occasions. The Capitula ecclesiastica, written by Bishop Haito to clergy in his diocese between 807 and 823, gives the full list of liturgical books that every priest needed: “Sexto, quae ipsis sacerdotibus necessaria sunt ad discendum, id est sacramentarium, lectionarius, antifonarius, baptisterium, compotus, canon penitentialis, psalterium, homeliae per circumulu anni dominicis diebus et singulis festivitatisb aptae. Ex quibus omnibus si unum defuerit, sacerdotis nomen vix in eo constabit: quia valde periculoze sunt evangelicae minae quibus dicitur: ‘si cecus caeco ducatum praestet,
less useful for liturgical practice. This does not mean, however, that
they could not or were not used in the liturgy. The point is that they
were seen much more as compendia of divine law and texts for religious
study, as indeed numerous commentaries and glosses on them, written
at that time, demonstrate. The Bible, Psalter, or Gospels were the books
divine law—iura sacerdotii as coined in one gospel-book produced in
St. Martin of Tours in 840–843—that gave clergy their identity. To
depict a ruler there meant to define his authority in relation not only
to God but also to the clergy as a social group. The appearance of the
ruler’s imagery in religious manuscripts, therefore, meant more active
involvement of the clergy in the visual dialogue on royal authority.
These developments also reflected the changing perception of rulers’
authority and the power relations among God, the king, clergy, and
people. These changes visually erased the separation between lay and
religious authority. To depict a ruler in a religious manuscript made him
an intrinsic part of the divine order. This provided his authority with
divine sanctification, and, at the same time, divine authority—and the
religious manuscripts were its quintessence—imposed certain restrictions
and limitations on his rule.

The function of the ruler’s imagery in religious manuscripts closely
relates to the question of the messages they were supposed to transmit.
Although these royal images might have addressed several different audi-
ences, their origin at the court or monasteries closely affiliated with the
Carolingians showed their connections to contemporary courtly political
discourse on kingship. The question is whether this visual discourse was
coherent and can be summarized as a political concept. Dominique
Alibert, following the traditional approach to rulers’ imagery, asserts

ambo in foveam cadunt.’” Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 363. It is noteworthy that
practical liturgical books like lectionaries or antiphonaries never included royal imagery
in the Carolingian period.

Lawrence Nees, “Problems of Form and Function in Early Medieval Illustrated
Bibles from Northwest Europe,” in Imaging the Early Medieval Bible, ed. John Williams
(University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 122–177, demonstrates
that Carolingian bibles lacked clear devotional or liturgical function: “…if a monastery
or cathedral wanted a complete Bible at all, it was likely only if significant learned
activity took place there, and there was a desire for a scriptural corpus” (174).

The initial page of the Gospel of Luke in this gospel-book has the titulus “Iura
sacerdotii Lucas tenet ore iuvenci” over the symbol of Luke, a lion holding a book: Wolfen-
büttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 16. Aug. 2o, fol. 48r. Thus, the Gospels
are unequivocally called here the book of clerical laws. For the description of the
manuscript, see Wolfenbütteler Cimelien: Das Evangeliar Heinrichs des Löwen in der Herzog August
that this was precisely the case and that most examples (fig. 55–7, 59, and 63–4) represent the royal image in majesty. He argues that this image is close to the contemporary imagery of David and Christ in majesty and portrays “intermediary majesty” (majesté intermédiaire). The position of the Carolingian king is different from that of the prophets of the Old Testament because chronologically they are divided by the redemptive passions of Christ. Consequently, the Carolingian king is neither priest nor prophet; rather, he is an intermediary between God and his people, as well as a sacred personage and the mediator of transcendence (médiateur de la transcendance).

Alibert’s hypothesis may explain why royal imagery was brought into mid-ninth-century religious manuscripts: the Carolingian king as a sacred personage took a place alongside other sacred personages such as evangelists or Jerome. Yet not all surviving images of Carolingian rulers depicted in between 840 and 877 support his proposal. The image of Lothar I in the Psalter produced at his Court School soon after 842 (fig. 54, London, British Library, Add. MS 37768, fol. 4r) clearly contradicts this theory and has not been considered by Alibert. The fact that the Psalter was owned by the daughter of Lothar I after his death indicates that, from the very beginning, it was commissioned by and produced for Lothar’s family. The dedicatory image of the emperor might therefore reflect the vision of rulers’ authority at his court.

In this manuscript, the miniature certainly does not represent a sacred personage. The comparison with the image of David on the next folio (fol. 5r) clearly demonstrates the sharp distinction between the Old Testament king and Lothar; the former bears the feature of spiritual leader, while the latter embodies secular military power. David is portrayed as a musician playing a lute. Lothar, by contrast, holds a scepter and a sword. The sword, which does not appear in other

127 Ibid., 30–3. Alibert connects this image to the contemporary political thought, especially to ideas expressed by Hincmar of Rheims.
128 See Koehler and Mütherich, Die karolingischen Miniaturen, vol. 4, 28–30 and 35–46; and Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, 162.
129 Kohler and Mütherich, Die karolingische Miniaturen, vol. 4, no. 2a.
Carolingian royal images after 840, is undoubtedly a sign of military royal power. During the period from the 810s to 830s, it was used in the imagery of the Old Testament kings, in which it was one of the main signs of rulership together with the scepter and crown. The “spiritual-versus-lay” dichotomy is also noticeable in other differences between the two images. David is crowned with a halo, while Lothar wears a crown, which was an important visual symbol of Carolingian authority on bulls and in legal manuscripts. David sits on a throne usually employed in the imagery of sacred personages and Lothar on a secular sella curulis (folding stool). Finally, Lothar’s short cloak is adorned with gems and precious stones, resembling a garment worn by Constantius II in the now lost Roman calendar of 354. Thus, Lothar’s image still uses the elements of Roman imperial imagery like a scepter, imperial cloak, and sella curulis, mingled with an undoubtedly Frankish attribute of a sword.

The dedicatory poems accompanying both images express the same dichotomy between a lay military leader and a religious spiritual one. The poem, which faces Lothar’s image to the left (fol. 3v), resembles

---

130 The only parallel to this image is the above-mentioned depiction of Charlemagne and his son Pippin in the Liber legum. Thus, the image of Lothar I likely repeated the pattern of royal imagery established during the reign of Louis the Pious. On the importance of a sword among Carolingian insignia and its role as defining social status of Frankish lay nobility, see Régine Le Jan, “Frankish Giving of Arms and Rituals of Power: Continuity and Change in the Carolingian Period,” in Rituals of Power, ed. Theuws and Nelson, 281–309.

131 On the use of the sella curulis in imperial Rome, which was also called sella regia, see Ole Wanscher, Sella curulis: The Folding Stool, an Ancient Symbol of Dignity (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1980); and Thomas Schäfer, Imperii insignia: Sella curulis und Fasces: Zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrat (Mainz: von Zaben, 1989). Although Percy E. Schramm, “Die Throne und Bischofsstühle des frühen Mittelalters,” Herrschaftszeichen und Staatsymbolik, 1: 316–35, argued that there was no difference between throne (solium) and sella in the early Middle Ages, the so-called throne of Dagobert made in the Merovingian period has the shape of a faldistorium similar to the sella curulis. Thomas F. Mathews, The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 104–7, points to the important iconographic difference between the secular sella curulis and divine throne in late antiquity.

132 Charles Reginald Dodwell, The Pictorial Arts of the West 800–1200 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 61, Joachim E. Gaehde and Florentine Mütherich, Carolingian Painting (London: Chatto & Windus, 1977), plate 25, 85, mention: “The portrait of Lothar is certainly based on a representation of a late antique ruler, as is evidenced by the frontally seated posture, knees spread and one foot slightly drawn back, the right hand resting on the long scepter. ... These borrowed elements, however, are subsumed into an unmistakably Carolingian image.”

133 Inclita caesareum diffundit fama triumphum / Hlotharii, celebrat quem maximus ambitus orbis.
a Roman panegyric glorifying his imperial triumph that is known and celebrated by peoples of the surrounding world: from the East, the Greeks (Achivi, i.e. Acheaens) come kneeling to beg for mercy and peace. The peoples of the West tremble and are delighted to submit to him. The poem neither mentions God nor makes any religious remark, whereas, in contrast, the poem dedicated to David has a completely different tone and describes the divinely chosen king whose celestial psalms professed the birth of King Christ. Thus, the dedicatory miniature of Lothar is very different from the “intermediary majesty” proposed by Alibert. It presents the Carolingian in imperial majesty in line with the Roman imperial pattern and perfectly corresponding to the specific historical context in which it was created. As shown by Elina Screen, imperial legitimacy became one of the most important political issues at Lothar’s court precisely in the years when this triumphal image was drawn, and his charters likewise propagated his imperial status to their recipients in 842–843.

Alibert considers another image of a Carolingian monarch that might represent Lothar I and/or Louis the German in the Martyrologium of Wandalbert of Prüm (c. 850, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 438, fol.1v) as an additional example of


Verse in Miniaturenhandschriften, 164. Lowden, “The Royal/Imperial Book and the Image,” 223–4, thinks that two images present the traditional association “between a contemporary ruler and his biblical prototype.” The emphasis on David being chosen among other brothers echoes Lothar’s political claims at that time.


Although the original Martyrologium, written by Wandalbert of Prüm at Reichenau in 848, was dedicated to Lothar I, its copy, which is now in Rome, was presented to Louis the German. For details and historiography, see Schramm, Die deutschen
“intermediary majesty” (fig. 60). This image of a Carolingian was produced in a monastic atelier, Reichenau or St. Gall, and differs in structure and function from the previous one. The ruler wearing a long blue cloak sits on a *sella curulis* with the gesture of meditation and hesitation familiar to a monastic painter; only a crown and scepter indicate his royal status. The unidentified monarch is not the focus of the visual composition; at the center is a book, the Martyrologium of Wandalbert, which a monk suppliantly hands to the ruler. The *titulus* over the miniature confirms this visual impression: “Oh, mundane king, clement ruler, and kind lord, accept the small gifts a worthy servant brings.”

This image is very different from the one drawn at Lothar’s Court School; their dissimilarity reflects not only the varying places of their production—the imperial court versus a monastery—but also their alternative functions. While the first image propagated Lothar’s imperial legitimacy to the courtly audience, the monastic miniature depicted the presentation of a gift to a Carolingian and constantly reminded the ruler of expected remuneration. The book was the object connecting the ruler and the monastic community with the dedicatory miniature at the beginning of the manuscript making this bond visual.

At first glance, the next depiction of a Carolingian monarch (fig. 55), Lothar I, in the gospel-book produced at St. Martin of Tours (849–851, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 266, fol. 1v) fits the pattern of royal majesty delineated by Alibert. However, what was the function of the dedicatory miniature in the manuscript which the emperor commissioned in the monastery located on the territory of his younger brother, Charles the Bald, and which was used at the place of

*Kaiser*, 162; Wolfgang Haubrichs, “Neue Zeugnisse zur Reichenauer Kultgeschichte des neunten Jahrhunderts,” *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberreins* 126, new ser. 87 (1978): 1–2; and Bernhard Bischoff, “Bücher am Hofe Ludwigs des Deutschen und die Privatbibliothek des Kanzlers Grimalt,” *Mittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1981): 187–212, at 189. The miniature might have been in the original and the image of a Carolingian could have been equally applied to Lothar I and Louis the German.

137 “Rex rerum rector clemens seniorque benigne, / Suscipe dignatus que fert munuscula servus.” *Verse in Miniaturenhandschriften*, 164.

138 Wollasch, “Kaiser und Könige als Brüder der Mönche,” 8–9, argues that the image of the ruler was brought into the martyrology because of his fraternal relationship with the monastic community presenting a particular codex: “Es besteht kein Zweifel, daß sich die Herrscher im Bestreben ihrer Zeitgenossen, in das Buch des Lebens aufgenommen zu werden, garantiert durch Verbrüderung mit einer klösterlichen Gemeinschaft, besonders hervorgetan haben.”

production? As depicted, Lothar points his left hand at the dedicatory poem on folio 2r facing the image; the final lines of this poem answer the question.\footnote{Lowden, “The Royal/Imperial Book and the Image,” 222.}

The king is depicted on this page so that whoever might some time see here the face of Augustus suppliant will say, “praise to all-powerful God. Lothar deserves to have perennial rest through our Lord Jesus Christ, who reigns everywhere.”\footnote{Prescripti atque gregis voluit frater fore Cesar, / Scilicet ut humilis donum capiatque supernum Nemo ipsi grex toto nisu cunctipotentem / Pro virtute Augusti et prosperitate perenni Pro veneranda et coniuge necnon prole precatur. / Pictus habetur ob hoc necnon rex pagina in ista, Ut quisquis vultum Augusti hic conspexerit umquam / Supplex ipse “deo” dicat “laus cunctipotentii: Lotharius requiem mereatur habere perennem / Per dominum nostrum Christum qui regnat ubique.”

Carmina varia, 671. The English translation is by Diebold, Word and Image, 135–6.}

The poem also describes the specific relationship established between the emperor and the monastic community: by commissioning the book and presenting it to the monastery, Lothar became its lay brother. In return, the community was to pray for him and his family.\footnote{Thus, the message of this image and accompanying poem complies with Wollasch’s explanation of the royal imagery in liturgical manuscripts. Indeed, he used this image as the main evidence supporting his theory, Wollasch, “Kaiser und Könige als Brüder der Mönche,” 19. Yet, as I demonstrate in this sub-chapter, not all Carolingian royal images found in religious manuscripts support his argument.}

Since the gospel-book was commissioned for the internal use of St. Martin of Tours, the last lines of the poem were addressed to its monks able to read them. Thus, the miniature did not simply portray royal majesty or send a particular message, but it had a practical mnemonic function reminding monastic viewers of their obligation to pray to God on behalf of Lothar, his wife, and his children.\footnote{Diebold, Word and Image, 136 underlines this function of the miniature: “The picture is meant to function as a mnemonic device, summing up and recalling for us the monks’ desire that we, the viewers of this miniature, pray for Lothar. The image is a spur to devotion, and it reminds the viewer why the manuscript was made, functions far removed indeed from Gregory’s conception of pictures as the books of the illiterate.” On the miniature, the ruler’s left hand is raised, while the forefinger is pointing to the left. This gesture later became one of authority, and it had, no doubt, the same meaning here. For gestures of authority depicted on miniatures from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see François Garnier, Le langage de l’image au Moyen Age, vol. 1,
The First Bible of Charles the Bald presents another ruler’s image (fig. 55), produced at the same monastic atelier in 845 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 1, fol. 423r). Earlier this manuscript was called the Vivian Bible through its assumed connection to the lay abbot of St. Martin of Tours of that name. In their superb analysis of the book’s iconographic and poetic programs, Paul Dutton and Herbert Kessler have proved this assumption to be wrong. This Bible was a gift of the monastic community of St. Martin to the West Frankish king; not Vivian, but Audradus Modicus—a canon of this monastery known for his poetry and prose book of revelations—was likely the person supervising the book’s composition and production.

This image uses the symbols of authority found in the Gospels of Lothar, that is, a typical Carolingian crown, long mantle, high throne, scepter, and two guards. Yet the whole composition is quite different from the previous miniature. Charles the Bald sits in front of the monks of St. Martin; three of them are presenting him with the Bible, while the other eight monks do not look at the king but are engaged in liturgical actions. The second difference involves the hand of God at the top of the composition; from it, rays radiate down in the direction of the king.

As pointed out by Schramm, the latter visual element symbolizes the grace of God. He did not, however, analyze its use in contemporary religious imagery in which the motif of the hand of God was frequently connected to the Gospel of John. For instance, the Commentary of Augustine on the Gospel of John, produced in Abbey Weissenburg in the early ninth century (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 10. Weiss., fol. 3r), depicts the hand of God radiating rays onto an eagle, the symbol of John, sitting on the top of the first initial of his Gospel (fig. 62). A later example of the link between the hand of

---

Signification et la symbolique (Paris: Le Léopard d’Or, 1982), 188–9. Lothar as depicted orders a viewer to pray on his behalf.

144 For the most detailed description of the codex, the historical context of its production, and the analysis of the image itself, see Koehler, Die karolingischen Miniaturen, vol. 1, 27–65; Schramm, Die deutschen Kaiser, 51–3 and 166–7; Dodwell, The Pictorial Arts, 71–4; and most importantly, Dutton and Kessler, The Poetry and Paintings.


146 Die deutschen Kaiser, 52: “Über dem Haupt des Königs senkt sich aus blauem, sternenbesätem Felde die Hand Gottes herab, aus der die goldenen Strahlen der Gnade auf Karl herabfluten.”
God and John is the illumination preceding the Gospel of John in the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram.\textsuperscript{147} This connection between the hand of God and John probably comes from the Book of Revelations (Rev. 1), in which John by the grace of God witnesses the Lord’s words. The hand of God, which holds seven shining stars, plays a significant symbolic role in this revelation. This visual element was also a frequent motif in the imagery of David, which indicated divine protection of, or assistance to, the heroes of the Psalter and often corresponded with a reference in the text to the \textit{manus} (hand) or \textit{dextera} (rightful hand) of God. A good example is the Stuttgart Psalter executed in St. Germain-des-Près between 820 and 830, in which the hand of God is depicted in the illustrations to Ps. 19 (fol. 24r), Ps. 20 (fol. 24v), Ps. 88 (fol. 103r), and Ps. 108 (fol. 127r).\textsuperscript{148} Similarly, the hand of God over the head of Charles the Bald indicates divine protection or assistance, and the radiating rays in this composition probably visualize the grace of God to a viewer.

The king and the hand of God in the First Bible of Charles the Bald are separated by a curtain and other objects. What do these symbols mean? In conjunction with Alibert’s concept, Paul Dutton and Herbert Kessler argue that “the radiating \textit{manus dei} above the king’s head, surmounted by stars and separated by a curtain symbolizing heaven, signified Charles’s status as God’s intermediary on earth.”\textsuperscript{149} However, another interpretation is more likely: the presence of two liturgical chalices and two hangers on which two female figures are placing votive crowns (both attributes characteristic of a church interior)\textsuperscript{150} together with the hand of God in the space limited by the curtain, all indicate instead a liturgical space. The curtain, therefore, might represent that of a \textit{ciborium} (canopy over an altar). The entire message of the upper and lower registers of the miniature, then, underscores the liturgical role of the monks in maintaining royal authority; the grace of God is mediated through the mystery of the liturgy, as shown at the top of the miniature, and the monks perform this liturgy at the bottom.

\textsuperscript{147} See the facsimile edition in \textit{Der Codex Aureus}, ed. Leidinger.


\textsuperscript{149} Dutton and Kessler, \textit{The Poetry and Paintings}, 71.

\textsuperscript{150} The \textit{Liber pontificalis} mentions votive crowns in church already from the fourth century. For details, see Percy E. Schramm, “Die Kronen des frühen Mittelalters,” in \textit{Herrschaftszeichen und Staatsymbolik}, 2:378.
Thus, the miniature presents two different spaces simultaneously: the secular space dominated by the king and the liturgical space controlled by the monks. This liturgical motif is reinforced in the final lines of the dedicatory poem facing the image (fol. 422v):

What praises, what thanks, what songs, O David,\(^\text{151}\)
Will [this] sweet tune, sweet voice, lyre, and strings sing for you?
Since we pray specially in psalms and in masses,
We shall devoutly sing psalms for you, [your] wife, [and your] child.
In this way those of us who will come afterwards
Will bring forth constant and bountiful prayers [for you].
May there be hope, virtue, light, victory, Christ,
Peace, and praise for you without end, good King David. Be well!\(^\text{152}\)

\(^{151}\) The Davidic motif, which was so ubiquitous in Carolingian political thought, was used in this Bible but will not be considered here because of its comprehensive treatment in the literature. For details on the Davidic motif in the contemporary mirrors for princes, see Hans Hubert Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit*, Bonner Historische Forschungen, no. 32 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1968). The miniature on fol. 215v shows David playing the harp before four musicians, imperial guards, and the personifications of cardinal virtues, *Prudentia, Iustitia, Fortitudo*, and *Temperantia*. David wears a Carolingian crown, indicating the connection of this image to Charles the Bald. Steger, *David rex et propheta*, 8–23, demonstrated that the crown replaced the nimbus as an attribute of the Davidic image only at this time. Furthermore, it is generally recognized that David in this scene has been given the features of Charles the Bald himself. See Corrigan, “Early Medieval Psalter,” 90. For an iconographic analysis, see Koehler, *Die karolingischen Miniaturen*, vol. 1, 57–60. This connection is made more explicit by comparing this miniature with the already-analyzed depiction of Charles the Bald and the monks of St Martin of Tours. The portrait of Charles the Bald, with a similar crown and motion of the head, has an idealized character and creates a parallel to the previous miniature. In the poem accompanying the presentation image, Charles the Bald is named “sanctissime David.” This similarity is made explicit by two medallion portraits accompanying the poem, which compares Charles the Bald to David. The upper medallion has the inscription “David rex imperator,” the lower one “Karolus rex Francorum.” For details, see Dutton and Kessler, *The Poetry and Paintings*, 64, 81–2, and 98. For the comparative analysis of David’s image in the First Bible of Charles the Bald and in the Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura, see Herbert L. Kessler, *The Illustrated Bibles from Tours*, Studies in Manuscript Illumination, no. 7 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 105–10.

\(^{152}\) Quas laudes tibi, quas grates, quas carmina, David, / Qvod pro dulce melos vox, lira, corda canet?
Nos, siquidem psalmos, missas, speciale precamur,/ Psallemus pro te, coniuge, prole pie.
Sic nostri vere post nos quicunque future / Assiduas fundent multiplicesque preces.
Sint tibi spes, virtus, lumen, victoria, Christus, / Pax, laus continue, rex bone David. Ave.

These lines underline the monks’ paramount liturgical role on behalf of the well-being of the king and his family.

Besides the fact that the two royal miniatures produced at Tours in the 840s communicate messages different from those of previous royal imagery, they also used different visual semantics. There is no military symbol of authority. Both rulers sit on a throne wearing a full-length red mantle; this robe has no connection to the Roman paludamentum but looks rather like a chlamys, the core element of imperial state costume in contemporary Byzantium that symbolized anointed and elected power.\(^{153}\)

The image of royal authority is created by new symbols, that is, a crown and throne. These innovations indicate that the royal image accentuating military might and employing Roman or Frankish traditions was no longer relevant to the monastic community of St. Martin. Instead, it was replaced by a new image that both pointed to the spiritual power of the Carolingians and unified visual attributes developed in Christian and contemporary Byzantine iconographic traditions. This spiritual character of royal power is emphasized in the previously-mentioned miniature by depicting the hand of God above the head of Charles the Bald. It is, indeed, no more than a visual translation of the formula gratia Dei rex emerging in the intitulature of Charles the Bald in the same decade. At the same time, it is not a mere translation but rather an active interpretation of the formula, one connecting the grace of God to the liturgical performance of the clergy.

This interpretation reflected and reinforced the increased status of the clergy and their shepherds: archbishops, bishops, and abbots. Two miniatures in liturgical manuscripts produced at Tours in the same period mirror this change. One of them occurs in the gospel-book executed in St. Martin between 840 and 843: two clerics are depicted on a small medallion painted with shiny golden inks on the otherwise traditional initial page introducing the Gospel of Matthew (fig. 61).\(^{154}\)

A half-bent priest (with the inscription sacerdos over his head) presents a book to an archbishop (marked with the word archiepiscopus), who holds a crosier and sits on a chair resembling the sella curulis. The most important feature of the medallion is that both figures have a halo that identifies the two abstract representatives of clergy as saintly.

\(^{153}\) The chlamys was given “to the emperor at the time of his coronation. This robe symbolised the divine power, the authority to rule the world and the right to be worshipped,” Galavaris, “The Symbolism,” 102–3 and 109–10.

\(^{154}\) Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod. Guelf. 16. Aug. 2o, fol. 5r.
personages. The other example is a miniature in the Sacramentary of Marmoutier, produced at Tours in 844–845 for Rainaud, abbot of Marmoutier. The abbot, who is identified with the inscription *Raganaldus abba*, is portrayed reading benedictions to an audience. His status is expressed through a staff, halo, and stature double the size of the people submissively bending in front of him; monks, whose status is expressed by halos, are in the upper two rows, while lay people without halos are in the bottom row. Around this miniature, there are four medallions with the figures of four virtues, Prudence, Fortitude, Justice, and Temperance, who were often associated with lay rulers at that time. Thus, these two miniatures symbolically demonstrate the clerical perception of their spiritual superiority over the laity and the increased status of their leaders, whose authority was expressed by means of visual attributes used in royal iconography.

Through the First Bible of Charles the Bald sent to his court, the new interpretation of royal imagery that emerged at Tours in the 840s and early 850s, before it was sacked by Normans in 853, became known in his court school active between about 855 and 877. Even so, it did not immediately affect the visual representation of royal authority there: the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald (Munich, Residenz, Schatzkammer, fol. 38v) was produced at his court school between 855 and 869 after the First Bible of Charles the Bald had reached the court, but the ruler’s image in the prayerbook did not follow the Touronian model. Charles the Bald is kneeling in proskynesis in front of crucified Christ,

---


156 The use of a halo to distinguish the clerics is consistent in this sacramentary. The introductory miniature on fol. 1v presents clerics of different ranks, and all the clerics from a bishop to a doorkeeper have golden or scarlet halos. For details on this miniature, see Roger R. Reynolds, “The Portrait of the Ecclesiastical Officers in the Raganaldus Sacramentary and Its Liturgico-Canonical Significance,” *Speculum* 46 (1971): 432–42.

157 On the court school of Charles the Bald and the problem of its localization, see Koehler and Mütherich, *Die karolingischen Miniaturen*, vol. 5, *Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlen*, 9–16 and 67–71. The final conclusion is that this school functioned between 855 and 877 somewhere in the “Residenzlandschaft” of Charles the Bald. The most probable location of the court school was Compiègne; see McKitterick, “The Palace School of Charles the Bald,” 326–39.

with the only sign indicating the royal status of the praying king being a diadem (fig. 61).

The prayerbook was composed by a cleric or a group of clerics at the court as a personal liturgical manual for Charles the Bald.159 Suppliant recommendations of the composer addressed to the king are discernable in some titles of the collection, such as Oratio quando offertis ad missam pro propriis peccatis, et pro animabus amicorum (The prayer when you offer a sacrifice at the mass for your own sins and for the souls of friends) or Hora prima sic orabitis (At Prime you will pray this).160 The prayerbook contains a personal prayer that Charles the Bald had to say before a litany; in the prayer, the text switches from the second person plural, used by the composer to address the king, to the first person singular, used by the king to address God.161 The depiction of the king and crucified Christ precedes the Oratio ad orandum sanctam crucem, a prayer that was performed on Good Friday and explains the posture of the king.162

Contemporary events explain both the royal image and its place in the manuscript. The writings of Gottschalk of Orbais on predestination were condemned by Carolingian bishops precisely during the years when the prayerbook was produced; Hincmar of Rheims, the influential archbishop at Charles the Bald’s court, led this cause against Gottschalk. This explains the visual emphasis on the Good Friday ceremony that underlined the redemptive role of crucified Christ.163 The titulus accompanying the image likewise stated the contemporary orthodoxy on the universal redemptive role of Christ’s crucifixion:

---
159 On fol. 6v, Charles the Bald is announced as commissioner as well as receiver of the manuscript: “Incipit liber orationum quem Karolus pissimus rex Hludovici caesaris filius omonimus colligere atque sibi manualem scribere iussit,” Liber precationum quas Carolus Calvus imperator Hludovici Pii Caesaris filius et Caroli Magni nepos, sibi adolescenti pro quotidiano usu, ante annos viginti quinque supra septingentos in unum collegi, et literis scribi aureis mandavit, ed. Guilhelm, 2d ed. (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1585), 3. See also Koehler and Mütherich, Die karolingischen Miniaturen, vol. 5, 75.
160 Liber precationum quas Carolus Calvus, 158 and 173.
161 Ibid., 134–5.
162 Ibid., 171–2. “In the Carolingian period one of the most important features of this Good Friday ceremony of the adoration of the cross was the prostration of the clergy and the faithful before the cross on the altar, and the image in the prayerbook refers to this ritual proskynesis on Good Friday,” Deshman, “The Exalted Servant,” 389.
163 For details, see Chazelle, The Crucified God, 165–208.
O Christ, you who on the cross have absolved the sins of the world, absolve, I pray, all [my] wounds for me.164

Thus, taken in its historical context, the royal image calls Charles’s attention to the orthodox message and endorses it for the people who might have seen it by chance. Hence, the prayerbook presents neither the royal image in majesty nor the self-representation of the king. Instead, it is addressed to the king both as a visual manual for the adoration of the cross in the liturgy of Good Friday and as an orthodox statement on Crucifixion against Gottschalk’s heresy.

As a personal manual of Charles the Bald, the book was hardly intended to be displayed to other people. That is probably why the image does not bear traditional royal insignia, which can be found in another manuscript produced for the king at the same school and in the same period before 869: the Psalter of Charles the Bald (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 1152, fol. 3v).165 Charles the Bald is depicted at the beginning of the Psalter between the images of David and Jerome (fig. 57). This royal depiction can no doubt be called the image in majesty which is created by means of imperial attributes derived from late imperial Rome and contemporary Byzantium; it includes a short scepter instead of a more traditional Frankish staff, a chlamys instead of a paludamentum or sagum venetum, an imperial throne instead of a sella curulis or faldistorium, a fastigium,166 and a purple orb with a golden cross.167 The use of imperial attributes matches the titulus that proclaims Charles the Bald as similar to the Old Testament’s Josiah and equal to Emperor Theodosius.168 All these features indicate that the miniature represents not a real but an ideal royal image reflecting the perception of royal authority at the court of Charles the Bald and

---

166 For details on the importance of the fastigium among imperial attributes and its introduction into Carolingian iconography and discourse, see Garipzanov, “Fastigium as an Element,” 5–26.
167 This item is treated not as a real spherical object but rather as a visual sign copied from an imperial prototype. On the role of the orb among monarchic insignia, see Schramm, Sphaira–Globus–Reichsapfel.
168 “Cum sedeat Karolus magno coronato honore, / Est Iosiae similis parque Theodosio.” Fol. 3v,
probably also the king’s own understanding of his mission. Unlike the previous prayerbook, which arranges psalms, prayers, and the readings from the Gospels by feasts or certain occasions, the Psalter of Charles the Bald presents a traditional Carolingian text of the Psalter together with accompanying *Cantica*. The only feature connecting the manuscript to Charles the Bald is a litany similar to one in his prayerbook that refers to him and to his wife, Írmintrude (fols. 170r–172v). It is not convenient as an everyday devotional book. Most likely, it was produced for the library or treasury of the king; it could, for instance, have been placed in the royal chapel open to the front pages with the images of Charles the Bald and Jerome facing one another. Furthermore, splendid manuscripts such as the Psalter of Charles the Bald were common currency in gift-exchange relations. Thus, the real possibilities of being used as gift and being viewed by the members of Carolingian elite may have affected the iconographical program of the codex from the very beginning. This may explain why the royal image in the discussed manuscript is so close to the public image of Charles the Bald after his imperial coronation, which openly turned from Frankish royal attributes to Byzantine imperial ones.\(^{169}\)

Although the use of the hand of God in the Psalter of Charles the Bald recalls the Touronian tradition, there is a significant difference: there is no separating line between the hand of God and the king. The grace of God directly descends onto the head of Charles the Bald; the hand of God appears from the highest point of the *fastigium* which symbolizes royal authority. Hence, the whole composition makes the hand of God another royal insignia,\(^ {170}\) connecting the grace of God directly to the royal office without an intermediary role for the clergy.


Thus, the iconographical element first developed at Tours was adapted at the court school of Charles the Bald as a visual attribute of royal authority to convey a very different message. The grace of God, its relation to royal office, and the crucial question of who was in control of this grace were the main contemporary issues that produced varying interpretations. The imagery of the court school presenting an official royal self-portrait was part of this political discourse in West Francia and, as such, might be called to a certain degree royal propaganda.

This point has been especially accentuated by Nicholaus Staubach. He considers the next three images of Charles the Bald drawn in the years 869 and 870 the most obvious examples of royal propaganda related to contemporary events like the coronation in Metz and the imperial aspirations of the Carolingian king. Staubach argues that these three images developed the royal representative image as rex Christianus: a new Solomon and the embodiment of an ideal ruler. The first image occurs in the Sacramentary of Metz (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 1141, fol. 2v), produced by the court school of Charles the Bald around 869 and probably related to his coronation

---


172 Staubach, *Rex christianus*, pt. 2, 223. He also argues against the common approach in studying the activity of the court school of Charles the Bald as a simple act of royal patronage: ”Das Mäzenatentum des Herrschers…gehört vielmehr in den Bereich der monarchischen Repräsentation, die auf verschieden Weise als Element der Herrschaftspraxis wirksam wird,” ibid., 14–5. Therefore, in his opinion, ruler’s iconography cannot be studied only in terms of traditions and prototypes, but rather as means of communicating the messages of the royal court and reflecting contemporary political discourse.

173 Ibid., 342. At the same time, Boshof, ”Karl der Kahle—novus Carolus magnus?” 147–51, strongly criticizes Staubach’s approach to Charles the Bald’s imagery and concludes: ”Wenn man diese Herrscherdarstellungen darüber hinaus als ein Mittel der Propaganda ansieht, die letztlich in der Kaiserkrönungen des westfränkischen Königs zum Erfolg führte, dann ist prinzipiell zu fragen, welche Öffentlichkeit mit diesen in der Regel liturgischen Handschriften erreicht wurde, wie gross also letztendlich die Breitenwirkung sein konnte. Da überdies in der Bildern häufig Vorlagen aus unterschiedlichen Epochen und Zeiten nachgeahmt oder übernommen wurden, dürfte es nicht immer so einfach sein, zwischen eher traditionellen Ausdrucksmustern und situationsbestimmter gegenwartsbezogener Darstellungen zu unterscheiden,” ibid., 147–8.
as king of Lotharingia (fig. 58). The prince, generally thought to be Charles the Bald, stands between two prelates and wears a red *paludamentum*. His right hand is lifted up to the level of his chest, with his forefinger pointing upward in the direction of the hand of God placing a royal crown on his head. All three personages have golden halos that make the king an equal spiritual partner to the nearby clerics. Although the clerics are certainly involved in the ceremony, God crowns Charles directly. This composition repeats the royal message already visible in the Psalter of Charles the Bald that the grace of God is connected directly to the royal office and the king is a sacred personage spiritually equal to the clergy.

---


175 The reason for the *paludamentum* being depicted here might lie in the Byzantine tradition that a prince did not have the right to wear a chlamys before royal anointment.

176 Three figures are thought to present allegorically Merovingian and Carolingian personages: Arnulf and Adventius, Remigius and Hincmar, Clovis and Charles the Bald. This miniature is faced by the depiction of Gregory the Great, and Staubach thinks that, similar to the images of Charles the Bald and Jerome in the Psalter of Charles the Bald, the two miniatures facing each other in the Gregorian sacramentary of Metz represent the commissioner and the author of the work. The scene with the king refers, in Staubach’s opinion, to the occasion when the manuscript was donated to the Metz cathedral in 869: “Daher scheint es gerechtfertigt, das Bildprogramm der Handschrift vom Ereignis der Metzer Krönung her zu interpretieren und es zugleich als ein Mittel zur Propagierung der mit dem Weihegeschehen erlangten neuen charismatischen Legitimierung Karls d. K. zu begreifen,” ibid., 233–4. Krah, “‘Rex christianus’,” 956–8, questions this assertion and argues that this composition represents, instead, clerical authority and Charles the Bald’s dependence on it.

177 The coronation of a ruler by the hand of God is a motif known from late antiquity. It is presented, for instance, on a gold medallion of Constantine I issued in 330. It was also known in the earlier Carolingian period as demonstrated by a miniature from the Stuttgart Psalter showing the hand of God crowning David. For details, see Marielle Hageman, “Between the Imperial and the Sacred: The Gesture of Coronation in Carolingian and Ottonian Images,” in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Mostert, 127–64; and Mutherich, “Introduction,” in *Sakramentar von Metz, Fragment*, 14.

178 This visual message complies with the fact, already emphasized in chapter 2, that this sacramentary fragment includes only the text of the canon of the mass, in which the eucharist is offered for the Holy Church not only *una cum* the pope and a local bishop as was customary earlier, but also *una cum* the king. This feature may indicate that the manuscript was composed for a special liturgical event in which the king, Charles the Bald, was participating; the coronation in Metz is the best choice here. Hence, the miniature might represent not only a commissioner and the occasion for a gift-presentation but also three persons mentioned in the text of the mass. Finally, considering that the visual program of the sacramentary fragment is more coherent
The *Codex Aureus* of St. Emmeram, executed at the same Court School in 870, expressed this message even more succinctly (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 14000, fol. 5v). This gospel-book, possibly produced as a foundation gift, presents Charles the Bald in majesty, wearing a chlamys and crown and sitting on a throne under a religious *fastigium*, from the upper part of which the hand of God bestows divine grace onto the king (fig. 63). The dedicatory poem also points to the ruler’s connection to the grace of God: he was born by the bestowal of God (*tribuente deo*), and he is strengthened *divino munere* (by the divine gift). God is his protector and sovereign. The depicted king is no longer merely the *rex Francorum* whose authority is tied to his *gens* or *gentes*; he is a ruler of the lands *Francia* and *Gotia*, whose female personifications stand submissively beside the royal throne.

In the image, Charles turns to the left and looks at the Lamb of God which is depicted on the facing page and symbolizes Christ and his passion; in addition, the accompanying verse explains that Charles

---


180 See for details chapter 2.

181 Hic residet Karolus divino munere fultus, / Ornat quem pietas et bonitatis amor.
   Hludowic iustus erat (quo rex non iustior alter), / Qui genuit prolem hanc tribuente deo.
   Alma viro peperit Iudith de sanguine claro, / Cum genitor regnis iura dabat propriis.
   Hic nomen magni Karoli de nomine sumpsit, / Nomen et indicium sceptr a tenendo sua.
   Hic David vario fulgescit stemmate regis / Atque Salomonica iura docentis habet.
   Istius imperio hic codex resplendit et auro, / Qui bona construxit multa favente deo.

182 They are identified in the accompanying *titulus*: “Francia grata tibi, rex inclite, munera defert / Gotia te pariter cum regnis inchoat altis.”

---
prays to the Lord to obtain a long life. The use of the pronoun *te* implies a direct address to God who is therefore the ideal audience of the whole composition. Thus, one of the functions of this miniature is to communicate the king’s devotion to God, as well as his hope for constant divine support and protection. At the same time, assuming that from the very beginning the magnificent gospel-book was produced as a gift to a church, Frankish clergymen must have been envisioned as another audience. For them, the miniature demonstrated the image of an ideal monarch in majesty by whose power and gold (*imperio et auro*) the codex shined, and who followed the laws of Solomon (*Salomonica iura*) and accomplished many good things with the help of God (*favente deo*). The king’s representation communicating these messages could have functioned, as Staubach argues, as a means of royal propaganda.

The Bible of San Paolo fuori le mura contains the third image of Charles the Bald that Staubach considers an example of royal propagandistic self-representation (fig. 64). This manuscript was executed at the School of Rheims around the years 870–871 (Rome, Abbazia di San Paolo f.l.m., fol. 1r, originally 337v), and it shares with the *Codex Aureus* most signs of rulership like a chlamys, crown, throne, and orb. Even so, it reveals three significant differences: it lacks the hand of God; it employs the imperial *fastigium* instead of the religious *fastigium* seen in the *Codex Aureus*; and, finally, it presents the four cardinal virtues that an ideal ruler was advised to follow. The dedicatory poem stresses

---

183 “Et princeps Karolus vultu speculator aperto / Orans, ut tecum vivat longeveus in aevum.” Fol. 6r.
184 Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaisers*, 55, saw as the main tendency of this image “den Fürsten nicht nur als Menschen, sondern als Inhaber eines Amtes von besonderem politisch-religiösen Gehalt abzubilden.”
186 Ibid., 253.
the importance of these virtues, which the ruler has to exhibit in order to be adequate for his office.

The Lord, King of Heaven, overflowing with his wonted love,  
Has cherished this Charles, his master’s king on earth;  
Therefore, that he might be equal to this great office,  
He has filled him with the fourfold sustenance of the four virtues;  
Here they bend over his head, pouring all things down from on high,  
So that with prudence, justice, moderation, and strength,  
He rightly governs first himself, and then all else.  
He is sheltered on right and left by sacred protection of the angels  
So that he may rejoice in peace, all his enemies are conquered.  
To his right, arm-bearing servants present the weapons  
By which the valiant unvanquished defender often adorns  
With great triumphs the eternal church of Christ;  
To his left his noble wife, in her accustomed beauty,  
By whom princely issue may rightly be given the realm.188

The ruler depicted on this miniature is deprived of all spiritual signs of rulership. Whereas the dedicatory poem in the Codex Aureus describes the arms of Christ protecting the king,189 the poem in the Bible of San

---

188 Rex caeli dominus solita pietate redundans / Hunc Karolum regem terrae dilexit herilem.  
Tanti ergo officiis ut compos valuisset haberí, / Tetrasti implevit virtutum quattuor almo:  
Imminet hic capiti de vertice cuncta refundens / Denique se primum, tunc omnia rite gubernat  
Prudenter, iuste, moderate, fortiter atque, / Hinc inde angelico septus tutamine sacro,  
Hostibus ut cunctis exultet pace repulsis. / Ad dextram armigeri praetendunt arma ministri,  
Ecclesiam Christi invictus defensor in aevum / Armipotens magnis quis ornet saepe triumphis;  
Nobilis ad levam coniunx de more venustat, / Qua insignis proles in regnum rite paretur.


189 “Arma tibi faveant Christi stabilita per aevum / Muniat et clypeus semper ab hoste suus.” *Bibliothecarum et psalterium versus*, 253. Further in the codex, this poetic motif is developed near the depiction of the hand of God on fol. 97v at the beginning of the Gospel of John; *ibid.*, 254; and *Der Codex Aureus*, ed. Leidinger, 4: tab. 194: “Dextera haec patris mundum dicione gubernans / Protegat et Karolum semper ab hoste suum.” Thus, the hand of God usually associated with divine grace defends Charles the Bald from any enemy. This depiction follows the image of John and precedes the illuminated first lines of his Gospel, “In principio erat Verbum.”
Paolo fuori le mura mentions only angels protecting him. Although the introductory poem on fols. 2v–3r\textsuperscript{190} mentions Charles the Bald as commissioner of the book which was created as a votive offering to Christ—therefore indicating God as its projected audience—the image of the king together with accompanying poem expresses, in contrast, the ideas of the powerful archbishop of Rheims. Hincmar may have had a direct hand in the work for the purpose of sending a symbolic message to his king.\textsuperscript{191} In 869, Charles the Bald donated his first Bible to the Metz cathedral with a monitory message of the monastic community of St. Martin of Tours. The next Bible, the book of divine law which a Christian ruler was expected to have, likewise contained a clerical message reminding him of both his duty to govern himself with the cardinal virtues and his obligation to defend the Christian church.

This overview of Carolingian royal images created in the mid-ninth century shows that, in spite of their common communicative function, the audiences they addressed and the messages they carried varied significantly. Hence, it is impossible to categorize them only as means of royal self-representation and propaganda or the visualization of the so-called “contemporary concept of rulership.” This imagery provided visual dialogue on royal authority between specific authors; their messages represented a multiplicity of opinions expressed in different historical contexts. In practice, places of production like a court or monastery visibly affected the content of royal images. Although they often shared similar attributes like the hand of God, a fastigium,

\textsuperscript{190} Koehler and Mütherich, \textit{Die karolingischen Miniaturen}, vol. 6, pt. 2, 114.

\textsuperscript{191} The introductory poem is the main reason that Staubach, \textit{Rex christianus}, pt. 2, 234–61, considers the royal image of this bible Charles the Bald’s self-representation. At the same time, Staubach, ibid., 151–7, thinks that Hincmar’s concept of rulership can be reduced to three key duties, that is, those of self-governing, the correctio of his people, and responsibility for his family and followers. The motif of self-governing is obvious in the miniature and the poem. Responsibility for his family is expressed both by depicting the queen near the royal fastigium and mentioning her in the poem. The duty to correct his people is less evident but might be echoed in the last lines of the poem calling him \textit{ecclesiam Christi invictus defensor}, who adorns it with many triumphs. Finally, the connection of the manuscript to the school of Rheims on an iconographic basis also allows Hincmar of Rheims to be seen as the author of the message expressed by the royal image and the accompanying poem. Nees, “Problems of Form and Function,” 143, thinks that the Bible was commissioned by Hincmar as a gift to Charles the Bald: “Hincmar had been a close associate and adviser and sometime friend of Charles the Bald for thirty years by the early 870s, but in fact at just that moment was strongly in disfavor. A complex combination of flattery and admonition courses through the iconographic program of the S. Paolo Bible.”
crown, or throne, these visual elements were nonetheless used to convey different interpretations and messages. To condense this iconographic multiplicity to the notion of mere royal propaganda—an approach strongly influenced by late medieval and early modern historiography on the imagery of absolute monarchs—is therefore too reductive. The exchange of precious religious manuscripts carrying different images of royal authority provided constant visual dialogue among the royal court, key monasteries like St. Martin of Tours, and some influential Frankish bishops like Hincmar of Rheims. Surviving manuscripts demonstrate that this dialogue was particularly active in the kingdom of Charles the Bald, where there was a growing need to define royal authority vis-à-vis God and the clergy not only via liturgical and diplomatic means but also via symbolic royal images. As this tendency developed in the West Frankish kingdom, the earlier dichotomy of lay/military versus religious/spiritual authority disappeared. In the time of Charles the Bald, all sides involved in the visual dialogue viewed the king as an intrinsic part of the divinely organized universe, in which the grace of God became a *conditio sine qua non* for successful rulership.

In summary, rulers’ imagery on coins, seals, bulls, wall painting, and in book miniatures was an important part of the symbolic language of authority. The use of these images in visual communication in the Carolingian world was characterized by four main features. First, unlike Byzantine custom, rulers’ imagery was not thought to possess numinous power and intimately connected to its royal prototype. Consequently, these images were never an object of adoration, which explains why rulers’ portraits had never become a prominent type in Carolingian coinage addressed to a broader audience. Their appearance on imperial coins of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious in the 810s imitated late Roman coinage from the end of the third and fourth centuries; during this short period, Roman imperial tradition, the code *imperator Augustus*, was especially prominent in the symbolical language of Carolingian authority, especially at the imperial court. Yet this practice hardly encountered a comprehending response among a broader audience, and the imperial profile portrait was quickly replaced in coinage by more traditional coin types.

Second, the use of Roman gems with portraits in early Carolingian seals seems to have complied with the “horizon of expectations” of the Frankish higher aristocracy. Carolingian seals were important means
of authentication. In addition, their imagery tended to be conservative and did not change much up to the mid-ninth century. The first significant innovation to Carolingian sphragistics was the introduction of bulls with imperial busts imitating late Roman prototypes in the last years of Charlemagne’s reign, a novelty that owed to the visual tradition of imperial Rome prominent in Aachen in the 810s and 820s. The significance of this visual tradition can also be traced in other media connected to the Carolingian imperial court like commemorative coin-medallions and wall paintings. It was under the influence of imperial imagery on the bulls that new visual symbols were introduced to the otherwise conservative portraiture of Carolingian seals, namely, the crown and arms.

Third, royal imagery, regardless of the medium in which it was presented, clearly had a communicative function in the Carolingian world. As a result, gradual changes in Carolingian authority took place concurrently with similar developments in its visual representation. From the end of the eighth century, royal imagery occasionally employed visual parallels to depictions of David, as this king of the chosen people provided an excellent image of royal authority both for the Carolingian clergy and for Charlemagne, the king of the Franks. This allegoric imagery became less important in the imperial period, when the official imago auctoritatis turned toward Roman imperial vocabulary. This led to the creation at the imperial court of the image of a victorious imperator, an earthly vicar of Christ. In contrast, some images in legal manuscripts suggest that the Carolingian lay aristocracy outside the imperial court might have continued to adhere to more traditional Frankish representations of royal authority.

Fourth, royal imagery appeared on front pages of psalters, bibles, and gospel-books in the 840s only after rulers’ authority began to be considered tightly linked to the grace of God and clerical authority became an important issue of political discourse. The grace of God became a major symbol in royal representation parallel to developments in other media of the symbolical language of authority. However, the Carolingian court, on the one hand, and the monastic and episcopal scriptoria, on the other, viewed the sources of and an access to this grace differently. Hence, royal imagery in religious manuscripts facilitated the visual dialogue on royal authority between the court and Carolingian clerics, which became most visible in the kingdom of Charles the Bald from the 840s to 860s. In the course of this visual communication,
clerical perceptions of Carolingian authority as being highly dependent on a regular royal liturgy greatly influenced his court. Consequently, the imagery of the West Frankish king produced there at the end of his reign responded to this symbolical clerical message by representing him as an ideal—and in a way, self-sufficient—gratia Dei rex.
CONCLUSION: THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE SYMBOLIC LANGUAGE OF CAROLINGIAN AUTHORITY

Quæcumus omnipotens deus ut famulus tuus ille, qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula, virtutum etiam omnium percipiat incrementa, quibus decenter ornatus, et vitiorum monstra devitare, et ad te qui via, veritas, et vita es, gratiosus valeat pervenire. (Missa cotidiana pro rege, App. 5)

A broad range of sources including liturgical manuscripts, diplomas, letters, miniatures, seals, and coins have demonstrated that the indirect communication of Carolingian authority between 751 and 877 was visibly affected by the “horizons of expectations” of diverse social and regional audiences. In the latter case, the expectations of people living in places as different as the Frankish hinterland or former Roman Italy were shaped by regional sociopolitical *habitus*—that is, by various predisposed assumptions, expectations, and beliefs about interactions between the ruler and subjects, their corresponding rights, duties, and obligations, and basic principles of royal legitimation. Those *habitus*, together with more rationalized discourses available via written sources, formed the traditions that shaped patterns of political behavior, thus defining the playing field within which the Carolingians effectively communicated their authority. Some of those political traditions had lasted for centuries; others originated from concurrent social and political changes. This semiotic diversity has been analyzed in the preceding chapters by looking at the use of different titles, graphic signs, visual images, and liturgical formulas to describe royal and imperial authority in the Carolingian realm. This concluding chapter not only summarizes the evidence provided by these non-narrative sources—with focus on those political traditions and corresponding semiotic codes that are most important for understanding both a Carolingian polity and the gradual transformation of the symbolic language of authority—but also contrasts it with relevant Carolingian written discourse and modern debates on Carolingian politics.
(a) Rex Francorum: *Frankish tradition continued*

The Frankish tradition may be seen in the symbolic language of authority throughout the analyzed period, but its influence was especially strong in the second half of the eighth century. The code “*rex Francorum*” that communicated this tradition of royal authority as connected to the Frankish *gens* can be traced back to the Merovingian period. As Helmut Reimitz suggests, its intensive use in Frankish narrative discourse started as early as the late seventh century. The development of this tradition correlated with the decreasing authority of Merovingian kings and the concurrent increasing power of Frankish nobles; the symbolic language of late Merovingian coins and diplomas attests to this change. This correlation highlights the fact that the category “*Franci*,” in the narrative and diplomatic discourses of the eighth century most frequently referred to the Frankish aristocracy. Thus, in practice, the stress on the *gens Francorum*—the imagined political community of the Franks—as the main source of legitimation for rulership in Gaul pointed to a political consensus between Frankish aristocrats and the rising Carolingians.

Hence, the symbolic language of authority first underlined the dependence of Carolingian rule upon the Franks; thus, in 751, Pippin the Short became not just king but king of the Franks. The traditional Merovingian title “*rex Francorum*” appeared in Pippin’s royal diplomas addressing the Frankish aristocracy. The monogram of this title, RF, appeared also on his coins accessible to ordinary Franks (fig. 4), which deviated from the Merovingian numismatic tradition. The stress on *Francorum* in these media propagated the message that the Carolingians acquired royal authority with both the consent of the Franks imagined as a political entity and with the Frankish aristocracy in practice. The same emphasis on a consensus with the Frankish elite is indicated by

---

1 On this tradition, Nelson, “Chapter 15. Kingship and Royal Government,” 423, mentions: “The third and fundamental aspect of [Carolingian] kingship, demonstrating both continuities with the Frankish past and similarities with other early medieval realms, Christians and pagan alike, was its basis in a *gens*, a people, and hence in the bonding of ruler and ruled.”
3 For details and all references, see Airlie, “Towards a Carolingian Aristocracy,” 110–1.
the fact that the early Carolingian chancery continued to employ the title *vir inluster* and seals with Roman gems, both traditionally used by Frankish magnates. As Mary Garrison puts it, “the dynasty which succeeded the Merovingians reverted to being *Franks.*”

In political culture, the royal authority of the king of the Franks was legitimated through his relationship to his *gens*. As the supreme representative of this imagined political community, the king was perceived as its military leader as well as the guarantor of its law and social stability. As the most powerful member of the *gens*, the king was expected to protect its other members and dispense favors among them, especially the Frankish aristocrats. To cope with those duties, he needed extensive material resources and a social network at the center and in localities to support demands on, and withstand challenges to, royal status. Although the last Merovingians relied on the sacred power of their long hair, in the long run, sacred symbols were no substitute for material resources and social allegiances. The Carolingians, more powerful and resourceful by the mid-eighth century, took over the royal title of the Franks because they addressed the expected duties and obligations of this position much better than their predecessors had.

Consequently, political activities and rituals promoting the consensus between the Franks (first and foremost, the Frankish aristocracy) and their king—such as spring military camps, royal election by the Franks, royal promulgation of ethnic laws, or royal assemblies—became especially important for the Carolingian center. As a result, these activities, together with corresponding categories like “the army of the Franks,” “the judgment of Franks,” and “the custom of the Franks,” dominated political discourse presented in contemporary annals.

---

4 On the use of this title by Frankish nobility, see Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoir*, 122–6.
6 For this aspect of Carolingian rulership, see Nelson, “Chapter 15. Kingship and Royal Government,” 385–98. For the interaction between the Carolingian center and localities, see especially Innes, *State and Society*.
7 For details and references, see Maximillian Diesenberger, “Hair, Sacrality and Symbolic Capital in the Frankish Kingdom,” in *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Corradini, Diesenberger, and Reimitz, 173–212.
8 Airlie, “Towards a Carolingian Aristocracy,” 116, points out that in these decades, even aristocratic discontent was channeled for the most part through the members of the Carolingian dynasty.
9 Considering the fact that in this period the authors of the annals were not able to boast of good Latin and were limited in their political vocabulary, the repeated use of the same expressions presents the general patterns of contemporary discourse rather than the literary style of a particular author. On this, see Hartmut Hoffmann,
The constitutive role of the Franks in the new royal dynasty was a crucial component of this discourse. For instance, *The Continuation of Fredegar*, probably written at the time of the coup d’état of Pippin the Short in 751 or soon thereafter, mentions that at that time, messengers were sent to Rome with the consent of all the Franks (*una cum consilio et consensu omnium Francorum*) to bolster the dynastic change and that Pippin was elevated to the Frankish kingship through election by all the Franks (*electione totius Francorum*). Furthermore, this narrative, which is even sometimes called “the family chronicle of the Carolingian house,” was commissioned by close relatives of Pippin the Short. Therefore, this passage indicates that, at least for the entourage of Pippin, it was important to stress the Frankish *gens* as a vital constitutive element of Carolingian authority.

Another narrative source, *The Clause on Pippin’s Anointing*, probably written in 767 in the circles of the chaplain of King Pippin, Abbot Fulrad of St. Denis, accentuates the constitutive role of Pope Zachary and the anointment performed by Frankish bishops. It is not surprising that at St. Denis, these acts were considered especially significant, but this text still confirms that Pippin was elected by all Franks (*electionem omnium Francorum*), as does *The Royal Frankish Annals*, composed around the year 790. Thus, the major narrative sources written in
proximity to the royal court in the second half of the eighth century emphasize that King Pippin was elected by the Franks according to an old Frankish tradition (*mos Francorum*). Regardless of how this electoral procedure was actually performed—if it was performed at all—these references suggest that election by the *gens Francorum* was considered a sufficiently significant part of royal installation to be mentioned in official narrative discourse.\(^\text{14}\)

During the royal reign, the March and later May camps\(^\text{15}\) were the main links that connected the Frankish king with his *gens*; these practices underline the importance of military leadership for kingship bound to the *gens*. The early Frankish kings used those camps as an important tool of military mobilization. But, as pointed out by Stuart Airlie, “the army was much more than a military institution, it was a political community as well.”\(^\text{16}\) On such occasions, early Frankish kings discussed many significant political matters with Frankish magnates. However, the most important aspect of those camps from the perspective of this study is that they provided an important mode of regular communication between Frankish kings and those Franks capable of fulfilling their military duty. For an armed Frank, a Frankish aristocrat, or a prosperous freeman, regular participation in those camps and the military campaigns that followed brought access to public rituals that fostered identity. In other words, taking part in these activities increased a free Frank’s social status and his social worth.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{14}\) The description of the elevation of Charlemagne and Carloman to royal status repeated the narrative pattern of the year 751: *Continuatio Friedegarii*, c. 53–4, 192–3.

\(^{15}\) Traditionally, these camps were summoned in March but during the reign of Pippin the Short they began to gather in May. This transition related to the increasing dominance of cavalry in the Carolingian army; in May, there was an abundance of fodder for horses. Another reason for this transition was the desire to avoid bloodshed during Lent. For details and references, see Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 135–6.

\(^{16}\) “Towards a Carolingian Aristocracy,” 115.

\(^{17}\) The wergeld for killing a free Frank serving in the army, 600 solidi, was three times above the norm, 200 solidi. *Pactus legis Salicae*, 41.1 and 63.1, ed. Karl August Eckhardt, MGH, Leges nationum Germanicarum, no. 4,1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1962), 154 and 229.
camps confirmed and “materialized” his feeling of belonging to the political community, *gens Francorum*, and his relation to its military leader, *rex Francorum*; regular involvement in such public activities made self-identification and positioning vis-à-vis the ruler habitual.

As a result, military camps became an important political category in official narrative discourse. The above-mentioned *Continuation of Fredegar* frequently mentions these camps, which the Frankish king summoned according to the tradition of the Franks (*mos Francorum*). There, he consulted with the Frankish nobility on various matters, and only thereafter did he wage war “with the entire army of the Franks” (*cum omni exercitu Francorum*). This repeatedly-used expression unequivocally points to the constitutive role of the *gens Francorum* in military life. The *Continuation of Fredegar* never calls the Frankish troops the army of the king; rather, they remain a separate entity in the narrative as the *exercitus Francorum* (the army of the Franks), *agmina Francorum* (troops of the Franks), or *universa multitudo gentis Francorum* (the entire multitude of the Frankish people). In addition, the chronicler asserts repeatedly that the activity of the king and his nobility was undertaken for the sake of the fatherland and the well-being of the Franks. These examples indicate that during the reign of Pippin the Short, “*gens Francorum*” remained the notion *sine qua non* in official political discourse.

*The Royal Frankish Annals* evince the importance of this notion around the year 790. The first part of these annals for the years 741–793 was written probably at Charlemagne’s court between 788 and 793. Nonetheless, their description of the royal elevation of Pippin the
conclusion

Short exemplifies a tendency already noticeable in *The Clause on Pippin’s Anointing*: the early stress on the Franks in the royal elevation of Pippin the Short, as well as on Frankish bishops in his royal anointment, was gradually replaced by an emphasis on the decisive role in this event of Pope Zacharius, Archbishop Boniface, and Abbot Fulrad.22 This reconstruction of historical memory in the first decades of Carolingian kingship points to the fact that in the second half of the eighth century, the code “*rex Francorum*” was increasingly used at the court to communicate Christian messages from the Carolingian clergy.

That Pippin was anointed in 751 and 754, as subsequently were his sons, symbolically emphasized the Christian nature of Carolingian kingship and the *gens Francorum* linked to it. It is therefore no accident that in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, produced in Neustria around that time, the text of the Good Friday Mass—a liturgical event in which the participation of lay nobility and high clergy was expected—implored God to look propitiously at the *imperium Francorum*.

Christianization of Frankish kingship began in the Merovingian period, sometimes by drawing parallels between Frankish kings and Old Testament rulers, and this long process continued in the early Carolingian period.23 Papal letters to early Carolingians communicated this message starting in the 750s, but it took a few decades before it was fully appreciated at the Carolingian court.24 The revised prologue of the *Lex Salica*, written at Pippin’s court in 763/4 (most likely by a chancery cleric, Baddilo), has been traditionally considered to be one of the earliest texts pointing to the Christian nature of the *gens Francorum*. Some scholars have even seen it as presenting the Franks as

---


23 For details and references, see Hen, “The Christianization of Kingship,” 163–77.

24 On epistolary communication between popes and the early Carolingians, see both chapter 3 and Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 123–9. For arguments against the Old Testament prototypes influencing Pippin the Short and his entourage in the 750s, and his anointments in particular, see Enright, *Iona, Tara and Soissons*, 119–37.
“a new chosen people” of God. Recently, however, Mary Garrison has argued quite persuasively that, notwithstanding a Christian tone in this document addressed to a lay audience, it is “more redolent of the world of secular heroism… than the Bible” and expresses “warrior machismo slightly coloured by Christianity.” In the same decade, an emphasis on the Christian nature of Carolingian kingship is especially noticeable in documents produced at the Carolingian chancery by clerics or in the most prominent royal monastery, St. Denis. A well-known example is the *arenga* (opening preamble) of a royal charter issued for the royal monastery of Prüm in 762:

> And since it is clear to us that Divine Providence has anointed [us] to the throne of the kingdom, it is right to exercise these things in God’s name, in so far as we may be able to follow the grace and will of the Highest….And since kings reign from God and He in his mercy has entrusted to us nations and realms to be governed and looked after, so that we may be exalted rulers for the poor and needy, let us not fail to govern and educate [them] for the love of Christ.27

The most likely author of this *arenga* is the above-mentioned Baddilo, working at the royal chancery during the second half of Pippin the Short’s reign, starting in the late 750s. All these years he worked side by side with Hitherius, who, starting in 760, signed royal charters *invice Baddilone* and, in 766, replaced Baddilo as chancellor. It was within this narrow circle of chancery clerics, personified by Hitherius (who worked in the chanceries of Pippin the Short and Charlemagne in c. 753–776), that the claim to the divine nature of Carolingian kingship, formulated in the diploma given to the Abbey of Prüm, was expressed by the introduction of new semantic elements to the symbolic language of authority. The element *gratia Dei* was first added to the title of the king of the Franks in 768. The cruciform monogram of Charlemagne, symbolizing the Christian nature of kingship and influenced by Byzantine

---


26 For details and all references, see Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 129–33.

27 *Pippini, Carolomanni, Caroli Magni Diplomata*, no 16. The English translations is by Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 131. For the detailed discussion of this *arenga* and all references, see ibid., 131–4.

and papal prototypes, was introduced as his new royal *signum* in 769. In 774–775, the official intitulature of Charlemagne was changed to “Charles, by the grace of God King of the Franks and the Lombards, as well as patrician of the Romans” (*Carolus gratia Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricius Romanorum*), which echoed the statement of the above-mentioned arenga: “Et quia reges ex deo regnant nobisque gentes et regna per sua misericordia ad gubernandum commisit.”

The activity of Baddilo and Hitherius shows that the ways in which Carolingian kingship was communicated and the use of various semantic elements in the symbolic language of authority depended more on the people involved in their creation and development than on the development of abstract ideas and political theology. In other words, the symbolic image of Carolingian kingship was created by people surrounding Carolingian rulers, their retinues and households, the personnel at their courts, and intellectual elite in royal monasteries, which is why the change in personnel within the entourage of a Carolingian ruler was as important for this symbolic language as the accession of a new king. For instance, the introduction of the titles “King of the Lombards” and “patrician of the Romans” in 774–775 coincided with the influx of Italian intellectuals after the conquest of the Lombard kingdom in 774 and their influence on Charlemagne’s court in the 770s and early 780s.  

The new practice of staffing the Carolingian chancery with clerics left a recognizable imprint on this language, making it different from the one used in the Merovingian period. These courtly clerics influenced the symbolic communication of authority at the court, and, later in their lives, they were rewarded with abbbacies in prominent royal monasteries. The lives of Hitherius (a chancery cleric c. 753–776 and abbot of St. Martin of Tours in 775–796) and Fulrad (abbot of St. Denis from 750 and chaplain at the court of Pippin the Short) best exemplify this

---

practice, which created much tighter links between the Carolingian court and influential abbeys of the Carolingian realm.\footnote{For details, see Ganz and Goffart, “Charters Earlier than 800,” 924–5.}

This practice also points to another characteristic of Carolingian politics that has been mentioned earlier in this study. Royal monasteries were the focal points of the political landscape in which political power was accumulated and redistributed; they were the connecting nodes between the Carolingian center and regional elites. As a result, the symbolic language of authority, which signaled the accumulation of power in the political landscape, developed and functioned, first and foremost, in court and royal abbeys. This explains the amount of wealth donated and distributed via monasteries like St. Denis, St. Martin of Tours, St. Peter (Corbie), St. Riquier, St. Gall, and St. Amand. Modern research has shown the importance of these monasteries for the Carolingians in terms of economic and military support. The analysis of the symbolic language of authority in the previous chapters, especially its liturgical and iconographic modes, has demonstrated that such monasteries were equally important in creating, maintaining, and negotiating Carolingian authority—in short, legitimizing Carolingian power—in localities. In this sense, Carolingian monasteries can be seen as epicenters of political life, where political dissent and the acceptance of royal authority were expressed via the liturgy and book production and where the negotiation and political consensus between the Carolingian center and local elites were formulated in a coherent discourse.

The convergence between the royal court and the largest monastic basilicas was especially strong during the first decades of the Carolingian dynasty. Fulrad of St. Denis personified this early trend. In the absence of an established royal court, St. Denis functioned to a certain degree as a “monastic royal court,” in which Pippin the Short and his two sons were anointed by Pope Stephen II in 754, and in which an everyday royal liturgy was performed. Recent excavations suggest the existence of a royal palace northwest of the abbey church in the eighth century.\footnote{For details and references, see Uwe Lobbedey, “Carolingian Royal Palaces: The State of Research from an Architectural Historian’s Viewpoint,” in Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages, ed. Cubitt, 129–53, at 148.} It is from this perspective that the 753 grant of tolls from the St. Denis fair to this abbey must be seen. After all, this money was partly spent on the activity of Pippin the Short’s court. It seems that St. Denis continued to be important for the Carolingian court during
Charlemagne’s early reign. For instance, in 775, a new basilica was
dedicated at St. Denis and Charlemagne gave generous grants of land
to the abbey on this occasion.32

Monastic coinage presents the same picture of economic and political
power of the largest monastic basilicas connected to the Carolingian
court. St. Denis, St. Martin of Tours, and Corbie had their own mints
already in the Merovingian period, and their activities continued in the
reign of Pippin the Short. Thanks to the grant of 753, the mint of St.
Denis became one of the most prolific among the early Carolingian
mints.33 The hoard of Imphy—concealed near Nevers, central France,
probably in the 770s, and consisting of about one hundred coins—
demonstrates the importance of the monastic mints from the 750s to 770s.
The coins of St. Denis comprise one fifth of the deposit; with the
addition of coins of St. Martin and Corbie, the monastic coins com-
prise 25 percent of the hoard.34 The output of these monastic mints
decreased in the reign of Charlemagne,35 and the monetary reform of
793/4 put a halt on monastic minting which was restored only in the
mid-ninth century.36 This disappearance of monastic minting correlates
to the establishment of more-or-less permanent royal headquarters in
Aachen starting in the 790s, which probably became a more important
repository of symbolic capital for Charlemagne than St. Denis or St.
Martin. It was precisely in these years that, as argued by Matthew Innes,
“political conflict was effectively centralized” at the royal court.37

33 Depeyrot, Le numéraire carolingien, nos. 365, 892, and 1047–8. The most detailed
description of the coinage of Corbie in the Merovingian and Carolingian periods has
been made by Paul Doublies, “Le monnayage de l’abbaye Saint-Pierre de Corbie,” in
34 Jean Duplessy, Les trésors monétaires médiévaux et modernes découverts en France, vol. 1,
35 Numismatic catalogues list only one coin of St. Denis, ten coins of St. Martin,
and four coins of Corbie struck between 771 and 793/4. See Depeyrot, Le numéraire
carolingien, nos. 366–7, 894, and 1051.
36 Ibid., no. 895. Depeyrot attributes three coins of St. Denis to the period 793/4–812
because one of them was found in the hoard concealed in the early ninth century.
However, one or two of them might also have been struck between 840 and 864
because the early coins of Charles the Bald are often very similar to the post-reform
ones of Charlemagne.
37 State and Society, 197.
A chain of events and documents in the late 780s and early 790s attests to significant changes in the symbolic language of authority at the Carolingian court. The *Admonitio generalis* (789), a programmatic capitulary for the second half of Charlemagne’s reign, illustrates this point by placing an increasing emphasis on the Christian nature of the Frankish kingdom and its kingship. This capitulary aimed at both correcting many deviations from Christian norms, traditions, and morality and affirming the basic norms of Christian ritual. Its measures sought to instruct priests so that they understood the main routine of Christian liturgy, especially the Sunday orations, and could explain them to lay people, who had to visit a church and were prohibited from working on this day (chapters 59 and 81). Latin, which was used in liturgy, must have been a difficult language for a person whose mother’s tongue was a Germanic dialect; as a result, in 794, the Frankfurt Council (chapter 52) allowed prayers in other languages to facilitate the dissemination of Christianity in Carolingian society, in which pagan traditions and practices persisted under the gloss of Christian discourse.

The *Admonitio generalis* starts with an unusual royal intitulature: “Charlemagne, by the grace of God and by the gift of his mercy King and Ruler of the kingdom of the Franks, and devoted defender and humble assistant of the Holy Church of God.” This intitulature stresses the divine nature of Charlemagne’s kingship and his duty to protect the Church. This emphasis corresponds to the language of the rest of the text, which, as Rosamond McKitterick, Wilfried Hartmann, and Mary Garrison argue, is quite different from the earlier Carolingian capitularies due to the heavy influence of the Bible and Old Testament royal

---

38 *Admonitio generalis*, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 57–9. The observance of Sunday was stressed in Carolingian capitularies that demonstrate how difficult it was to introduce even basic Christian norms to a slightly Christianized society, in which laymen were capable of stealing stones and roof-tiles from a church and priests had to be ordered to learn and understand basic Christian prayers. See, for instance, chapters 21, 26, and 33 from the decisions of the Frankfurt Council in ibid., vol. 1, 76–7. For the general overview of Carolingian capitularies and related bibliography, see the collection of essays by Mordek, *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung*.

39 *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 78.

40 “Karolus gratia Dei eiusque misericordia donante rex et rector regni Francorum et devotus sanctae ecclesiae defensor humilisque adiutor,” ibid., 53.
These Old Testament parallels continued to be employed in the 790s, when Charlemagne was likened to King David in different media related to his court. Similarly, at Charlemagne’s court in the late 780s and 790s, the gens Francorum was represented repeatedly as the chosen people of God, the beatus gens, and all spheres of its existence, namely, political, social, judicial, and religious, were firmly tied to its new David. Seen from this perspective, it is hardly accidental that the earliest extant Frankish Gelasian sacramentaries with *The Mass for Kings* were copied precisely in this period.

It is probable that this Old Testament perspective on the gens Francorum and their king was to a large degree due to the change in personnel at Charlemagne’s court in the late 780s: Italian intellectuals frequenting Charlemagne’s court in the 770s returned to their homeland, while clerical intellectuals from the British Isles became more prominent at the court. As emphasized by Mary Garrison, the parallels between contemporary rulers and the kings of the Old Testament were commonplace in insular political culture; furthermore, Bede’s literary presentation of the Anglo-Saxons as God’s elect was well-known to Alcuin and other intellectual émigrés from the British Isles. As a result, the works drawing the strongest Old Testament parallels were written by the quill pens of those “northerners.” The Northumbrian Alcuin, the likely author of the *Admonitio generalis*, was the most important disseminator of insular political ideas at Charlemagne’s court. He was present in person in 787–789 and in 794–796, before he replaced Hitherius as abbot of St. Martin of Tours in 796. Even then, through


42 “By the 790s, Old Testament comparisons had gained a new prominence and a new public at the Carolingian court. Typology was reified, and the Bible’s role as an authoritative text was such that biblical law could be applied to the Franks in the *Admonitio generalis* and Charlemagne himself could be addressed as David rather than merely compared to him.” Ibid., 159. Garrison provides the best overview of this process (153–6). See also Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, 65–7.

43 Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms*, 32–3, calls this phenomenon the “royal monism” of Charlemagne.


45 For details, see Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” 150–61.

correspondence, he continued to exercise influence on the court until his death in 804; in fact, the strongest statement of the Franks as God’s chosen people in the written discourse of the time is found in his letter to Charlemagne in 801.

The modification of Frankish political tradition in the late 780s and early 790s is confirmed by other significant events of this period. It is noticeable, for instance, in the first oath of allegiance, or the subject’s oath, sworn to Charlemagne in 789. It was undertaken as a reaction to the conspiracy in 785–786 of Count Hardrad, whose supporters were described by different annals as eastern Franks, Alemannians, or Thuringians. This oath corresponds in its main elements with the earlier Frankish tradition: for instance, the fact that only militarily active members of the gens were tied to their king by the oath of 789—clerics were exempted from it—reminds us of the crucial role of the May camps and the exercitum Francorum in the “king-gens” relations. Yet, it is set apart by the fact that unlike earlier examples, it was not a reciprocal oath binding Charlemagne.

This change resulted from the profound socio-political transformation of the Carolingian realm under the influence of successful wars. New conquests and rich booty strengthened the political positions of Charlemagne and his retinue, destabilizing the traditional balance of power in the “king-gens” relationship, which must have caused a negative reaction on the part of the lay elites. Three events exemplified this political imbalance and the growing tension between the newly-elevated status of Charlemagne and the Frankish tradition of royal authority: the above-mentioned conspiracy of Hardrad; the case of Tassilo, duke of the Bavarians, deprived of his political status and put...

---

47 For details and references, see Donald Bullough, “Unsettled in Aachen: Alcuin between Francfurt and Tours,” in Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages, ed. Cubitt, 17–38.
49 Duplex legationis edictum, c. 18, in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 63. In 802, it was followed by the second imperial oath. For a general overview of the oaths of allegiance in the Middle Ages, see Ruth Schmidt-Wiegang, “Eid und Gelöbnis, Formel und Formular im mittelalterlichen Recht,” in Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter, ed. Peter Classen (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1977), 55–90; and Paolo Prodi, Il sacramento del potere: Il giuramento politico nella storia costituzionale dell’Occidente (Bologna: Mulino, 1992). For a recent analysis of these oaths and modern historiography on them, see Becher, Eid und Herrschaft, 79–138 and 191–2.
under monastic confinements in 788; and, finally, the conspiracy of some Frankish magnates with Charlemagne’s oldest son, Pippin the Hunchback, in 792.\textsuperscript{51} This chain of events, concurrent with the promotion of the Davidic image of Charlemagne’s authority at his court, suggests a serious crisis in the negotiation and maintenance of royal authority within the Carolingian aristocracy. This crisis was caused by the discrepancy between Charlemagne’s growing power that exceeded the limits of traditional kingship and earlier Frankish perceptions of royal authority as dependent on and limited to its gens.

The immediate reaction of the Carolingian court to this political crisis that is visible in the years 786–792 was compensatory: namely, it propagated more actively the ties of Charlemagne to his political community, gens Francorum. Hence, the first edition of \textit{The Royal Frankish Annals}, composed at his court in those years as a work of royal propaganda and thereafter disseminated to other intellectual centers in the Carolingian realm, described him, first and foremost, as king of the Franks; it also stressed his connection to the Frankish aristocracy and gens through the repeated use of expressions like \textit{una cum Francis} (along with the Franks) in the description of his activities.\textsuperscript{52} Consequently, as proposed by Rosamond McKitterick, “the annalist created a far more encompassing idea of Frankish identity than ever before and a notion of the \textit{gens francorum} specifically associated with the Carolingian mayors and kings and the legitimacy of Carolingian rule.”\textsuperscript{53} At the same time, \textit{The Royal Frankish Annals} accommodated the idea of divine support given to the Franks in their wars against the pagan Saxons and Avars.

These courtly annals are devoid of any reference to the conspiracies of Hardrad and Pippin the Hunchback. In addition, the story of Tassilo’s relations with Charlemagne was profoundly modified in order to present the duke of the Bavarians as a violator of traditional political principles in his dealing with the king of the Franks. Chapter 3 in the


\textsuperscript{53} McKitterick, “Political Ideology in Carolingian Historiography,” 167.
Frankfurt Capitulary of 794 presented this interpretation of Tassilo’s story to a wider audience, while chapter 5 described new Carolingian coinage that had been introduced in the realm, stressing the link between the Franks and Charlemagne through its legend, Carolus rex Francorum, and emphasizing their Christian nature through the use of Charlemagne’s cruciform monogram and the sign of cross (fig. 7).

Yet at the turn of the ninth century, this insistence on Carolingian authority legitimated via the Frankish gens increasingly contradicted a changing political landscape which was characterized by the introduction of new territories and gentes into Carolingian politics. This change could still be accommodated within the traditional perception of gentes as the constituent basis of kingdoms creating the cluster of Carolingian polity. This is why Charlemagne and his retinue first tried to resolve the problem by the simple multiplication of connections to gentes in his intitulature or in the titles of his sons and by the creation of the hierarchy of gentes: the Franks, a gens with a special divine support, were at its apex. Even so, the extensive application of this political tradition to new conquests obviously had its limits. New peoples brought to the Carolingian realm their own political experiences that were shaped by diverse sociopolitical habitus, and, consequently, their “horizons of expectations” began influencing the symbolic language of authority at Charlemagne’s court. Italian influence was most visible in this process of semiotic adjustment; the appearance of Charlemagne’s cruciform monogram that derived from the Mediterranean numismatic and sphragistic traditions and even its introduction into Carolingian coinage in 793/4 bears witness to this. Yet a more important adjustment to the “horizons of expectations” of his Italian subjects was made on Christmas Day 800, when Charlemagne was elevated to imperial status in Rome. The new status not only facilitated the communication of Carolingian authority with the Italian elites but also better suited the enhanced power and position of Charlemagne within Frankish society.

Earlier discussions of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation, of its moving forces and meanings, have been often framed by the developments of ideal political concepts and the individual choices of the Carolingian rulers; by the mid-twentieth century, two main approaches ruled the historiographic debate on this historical event. According to the first “Romanistic” approach, Charlemagne deliberately undertook the restoration of the Roman empire under the influence of courtly clerics and popes, and the imperial coronation corresponded to the conscious reception of Roman legacy in politics and culture at that
time. According to the second “Germanistic” approach, Charlemagne always remained king of the Franks, with his imperial coronation having been mostly masterminded and performed by the Roman pope Leo III for his own political ends. Consequently, the Carolingian monarch took the imperial title without much enthusiasm, or even against his own will, without giving the title much weight.54

The tale of the Frankish king becoming “Kaiser wider Willen” (emperor against his will), which was still strong in German historiography in the third quarter of the twentieth century,55 first came under harsh criticism in the early 1960s and gradually lost support.56 In addition to this development, from the 1950s onwards, an increasing number of scholars tried to reconcile the previous dichotomy of Charlemagne’s intentional restoration of the Roman empire with his reluctant receipt of the imperial title from the hands of the pope.57

54 For details and all references, see François-Louis Ganshof, “The Imperial Coronation of Charlemagne: Theories and Facts,” in The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy (London: Longman, 1971), 41–4. This interpretation often cites Einhard’s controversial assertion of Charlemagne’s claim that, if he had known the intents of the pope in advance, he would not have entered St. Peter’s on that Christmas day. Einhard, Vita Karoli Magni, c. 28, 32–3. However, it is necessary to keep in mind that the biography of the Carolingian ruler was written after the death of Charlemagne and presented his ideal image constructed at the court of Louis the Pious and endowed with various virtues. In this construction, the tale of the unwillingly crowned emperor served to illustrate a Roman imperial as well as Christian virtue, humilitas. See Peter Classen, Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz, 75–6; and Josef Semmler, “Der vorbildliche Herrscher in seinem Jahrhundert: Karl der Große,” in Der Herrscher: Leitbild und Abbild in Mittelalter und Renaissance, ed. Hans Hecker, Studia Humaniora, no. 13 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1990), 53–4.


Modern scholars argue that Charlemagne’s imperial coronation was linked to his relations with the papacy and Byzantium in the preceding two years. It caused different reactions and was given different interpretations by those involved, namely, Leo III and the Romans, Charlemagne and the Franks, and the Byzantines. Historians now generally agree that the planning of the imperial coronation started, at the latest, at the meeting of the Carolingian king and Leo III in Paderborn in 799 and that it was affected by many factors. This multifaceted approach concentrates on some details of the years preceding the imperial coronation: specifically, the relations between Charlemagne’s court, Constantinople, and Leo’s Rome, as well as the role of different historical personages in these events. Although they disagree in most cases on the relative significance of each factor, most commentators admit that the imperial coronation was brought about by a number of different issues. Most importantly, modern studies leave aside ideological and idealistic explanations of this act, turning to more practical and functional interpretations by pointing to the influence of various audiences and people on the events leading to that act and the later memories of it. Three recent studies ought to be mentioned in this regard.

First, Johannes Fried points to the discrepancy between Charlemagne’s coronation as a real historical event and re-constructed memories of it in later annals. Fried also raises the issue that the proclaimed empire meant different things to different audiences. For the Franks, the imperial coronation had no constitutive power whatsoever, meaning that it


merely confirmed the real status of Charlemagne and the new world order. For Romans, it was the coronation in Rome that constituted a new empire and the new emperor. These two different memories survived in medieval historiography.61 Second, Janet Nelson emphasizes the role of family politics and quarrels in the royal household in Charlemagne’s decision to become emperor.62 Aging Carolingian kings always had troubles controlling adult sons. The imperial coronation allowed Charlemagne to satisfy the aspirations of his son Charles by crowning him king of the Franks while securing his own position as ruler over his royal sons.63 Third, Henry Mayr-Harting argues that Charlemagne’s elevation to imperial status primarily targeted a Saxon audience. The Saxons did not have kingship, so they fiercely resisted being subdued by any king: emperorship, known to the Saxons since the Roman empire, was a convenient way out of long-lasting Frankish-Saxon antagonism. Hence, the decision about the imperial coronation was made in Paderborn, the Frankish outpost amidst the Saxons.64

The recent research on Charlemagne’s elevation to emperorship therefore suggests that this act was not motivated ideologically but instead served a number of practical purposes. The new name for Carolingian authority may indeed have addressed a Saxon audience—if we accept Mayr-Harting’s hypothesis. Yet, most importantly, it matched the expectations of Italians and “Romans” first and foremost. Leo III voiced these expectations, which eventually influenced the communication of Carolingian authority in Italy, at Paderborn in 799. In Rome and Italy, perceptions of the imperial coronation in 800 and its political consequences were greatly affected by the Roman imperial tradition of authority deriving from the late Roman empire. However,
it is very unlikely that such assessments were shared in Aachen in the years 799–800. For Charlemagne and his retinue, the imperial title was useful in communicating his authority to the Italian subjects. In addition, the aging emperor no longer needed to exert himself with participation in the yearly military activity that was so important in the “king-gens” relationship. This was left to his young and vigilant sons, allowing Charlemagne to spend the rest of his life primarily in the new imperial capital, Aachen. Thus, although the imperial coronation further indicated the increasing inadequacy of the Frankish code in coping with a changing political reality, in addition to the urgent need for a new “vocabulary,” it did not mark the establishment of a new imperial tradition as a dominating code in the symbolic language of authority. Rather, the coronation was just another compromising step in dealing with various subjects and their different “horizons of expectations.”

This act can also be viewed as another reaction to the political crisis of 786–792, which demanded corrections in the indirect communication of Carolingian authority from Charlemagne’s court.

Non-narrative sources that were created immediately after the year 800 support this interpretation of the imperial coronation: there was no predilection for the Roman imperial legacy nor any consistent attempts to imitate the artifacts and practices of the late Roman or early Byzantine empire. Some scholars refer to Richer’s remark made in the late ninth century that an eagle, the old Roman military symbol, was placed on Charlemagne’s palace in Aachen, but Jürgen Römer has recently demonstrated that there is no evidence for the imitation of such an imperial symbol in Charlemagne’s time.65 His royal coinage, pointing to the Franks as the primary basis of Carolingian authority, continued to be struck until the last years of his life. His official intitulature combined royal titles, which addressed Frankish and Lombard audiences, with an imperial title, which better complied with the political and cultural experience of Italian audiences. This imperial title followed neither Roman nor Byzantine imperial titles, but rather the names for emperor used in Italian charters and inscriptions in the early Middle Ages familiar to Italian audiences. Nor did Charlemagne follow the tradition of imperial imagery. In fact, the only sculpture known to

---

have been placed in his palace in Aachen was that of a Germanic
king, Theodoric the Great.66

A limited interest in the Roman imperial legacy to the north of the
Alps around the date of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation is also
illustrated by the traditional Frankish royal lists, which were copied
in the turn of the ninth century.67 These royal catalogues point to the
continuity of the Frankish kings in the seventh and eighth centuries,
thereby indicating that the use of the Frankish political tradition in the
indirect communication of Carolingian authority had not been inter-
rupted by the imperial coronation. These royal lists usually followed
the traditional law of the Franks, the *Lex Salica*, in manuscripts. The
close ties between kings and the law of a *gens* was an important compo-
nent of the Frankish political tradition, one that Pippin the Short and
Charlemagne continued to emphasize. It is known, for instance, that
the court of Charlemagne composed two editions of the *Lex Salica* in
798 and 803.68 At the same time, there was no attempt whatsoever to
codify newer legislation, namely the Carolingian capitularies that paid
more attention to Christian reforms; their first collection, composed by
Ansegis, did not appear until 827. Furthermore, the capitularies that
were issued immediately after the year 800 demonstrate continuity
with previous documents like the *Admonitio generalis* and the Frankfurt
Capitulary and so do not provide support for the theory of on-going
Roman *renovatio*.69 Similar to the earlier legislative acts, their main task

ßen,” in *Am Vorabend der Kaiser Krönung*, ed. Godman, Jarnut, and Johanek, 217–29,
who states after Heinz Löwe, “Bemühungen um die germanische Tradition,” *DAEM*
9 (1952): 333–401, that the example of Theodoric the Great played a direct role in
Charlemagne’s imperial coronation.

67 *Chronologica regum Francorum stirpis Merovingicae*, ed. Bruno Krusch, in *Passiones
vitaque sanctorum aevi Merovingici*, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH, SRM,
vol. 7 (Hanover: Hahn, 1920), 479–82. For details on these royal catalogues and other
Carolingian genealogies, see Eugen Ewig, “Die fränkischen Königskataloge und der
zur Interpretation: Schrift und Genealogie in der Karolingerzeit,” in *Von Nutzen des
Schreibens: Soziales Gedächtnis, Herrschaft und Besitz im Mittelalter*, ed. Walter Pohl and Paul
Herold, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, no. 5 (Vienna: Österreichische

68 *Pactus legis Salicae*, ed. Eckhardt, xl. The oldest surviving texts of *The Book of the
History of the Franks*, copied around the year 800, had a title echoing the same tradition
of royal authority: *Gesta regum Francorum*. See Reimitz, “Social Networks and Identities
in Frankish Historiography,” 240.

69 Wilfried Hartmann, “Karl der Große und das Recht,” in *Charlemagne and His
Heritage: 1200 Years of Civilization and Science in Europe*, vol. 1, *Scholarship, Worldview and
was to further the Christianization of Carolingian society and the increased authority of its ruler, king of the Franks and Lombards and emperor governing the Roman empire.

The capitularies of 802, which demanded an imperial oath to Charlemagne, are a good illustration of this point. Every male subject in the Carolingian empire from the age of twelve—the age of adulthood at the time—had to swear this oath publicly and express his submission to the Carolingian ruler. The inclusion of all of the male population made the oath of fidelity a very important mode of indirect communication of Carolingian authority comparable to the May camps in its significance. Not only did men have to confirm fidelity to the emperor but they also had to promise to live according to the laws of the Carolingian state and the precepts of God. This oath contains no hint of the traditional relations between the king and his gens Francorum or its militarily active members visible in the oath of 789; rather, it connected the subjects of a Christian realm—supposedly following Christian norms of behavior—and their ruler, Charlemagne, to whom the subjects were entrusted. As the New David holding an imperial title (nomen imperatoris), he claimed a place of honor after the Lord and his saints as protector and defender of the poor and the Church.

This image of a Christian state and its Christian ruler affected concurrent official discourse, as indicated by the increased use of the category populus Christianus (the Christian people), together with the term imperium Christianum (Christian empire). These categories replaced former divisions as gentes in the Carolingian polity. Starting in 798, Alcuin began

---


71 See *Capitulare missorum in Theodonis Villa datum secedundum, generale*, in *Capitullaria regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 124, which was issued in 805.

72 “...populus nobis ad regendum commissos,” *Capitulare missorum generale* (a. 802 initio), c. 32, in *Capitullaria regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 97.

73 “Ut sanctis ecclesiis Dei neque viduis neque orphans neque peregrinis fraud e vel rapinam vel aliquit iniuriae quis facere presumat; quia ipse dominus imperator, post Domini et sanctis eius, eorum et protector et defensor esse constitutus est,” ibid., c. 5, 93.
to employ both terms in his letters. Although the category *populus Christianus* had appeared in Carolingian capitularies as early as the mid-eighth century, by the first decade of the ninth century, it had become much more frequent in legislative discourse. In the same decades, the notion of Christian people appeared in annalistic discourse. In the record of the year 791, *The Royal Frankish Annals* already used the term *populus Christianus*, with the *The Lorsch Annals* (a. 801) also employing it in the description of the imperial coronation of Charlemagne. Since the latter text ends with the record for the year 803, the wording used for the year 801 introduces us to the discourse immediately after the imperial coronation. *The Lorsch Annals* are thought to have had a connection to the imperial court; therefore, both narratives were written in the same discursive milieu as the capitularies. Yet the category *populus Christianus* was also used in those years in annals written outside the court: for instance, *The Moissac Chronicle*, composed in Aquitaine, introduced the notion of the Christian people in the description of the years 799–802.

The Christianization of Carolingian society meant a more strict social division between the clergy and the laity as had already been implemented in the *Admonitio generalis*. One of its chapters forbade presbyters and deacons to carry arms, a prohibition that points to the symbolic

---


75 For an example of an earlier usage, see *Karlmanni principis capitulare Liptinense*, c. 2, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 28. For examples from the early ninth century, see *Capitulare missorum item speciale* (c. 802), c. 30, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 103; *Capitula vel missorum vel synodalia* (c. 813), c. 3 and c. 7, in ibid., 182; *Capitulare generale Caroli Magni* (a. 813), c. 1, in ibid., 134; and *Capitulare ecclesiasticum Caroli Magni* (a. 805–813), c. 2, in Mordek and Schmitz, ed., “Neue Kapitularien und Kapitulariensammlungen,” 119.

76 *Annales regni Francorum*, 88.


79 “...Et omnimodis dicendum est presbyteris et diaconibus, ut arma non portent, sed magis se confidant in defensione Dei quam in armis,” *Admonitio generalis*, c. 70, in...
significance of arms, and a sword in particular, for a higher social status in Frankish society. This chapter is reminiscent of the importance of the May camps in the previous decades. Clergy had to give up this traditional status symbol of Frankish society and turned instead to canonical measures to guard their position in the social ladder through segregation from the rest of society.

Thus, parallel to the development of ritualized liturgical communication between clergy and lay people, informal ways of communication were considerably limited: for instance, another chapter of the *Admonitio generalis* prohibited clerics from eating and drinking in taverns. This norm was introduced with a reference to the Laodicean and African canons—in spite of the fact that the latter allowed clergy to eat and drink in taverns on their travels. Subsequently, the unconditional prohibition against clergy visiting taverns was repeated in other Carolingian capitularies. This norm was difficult to follow for traveling clerics, so Bishop Haito advised them to send their servants to buy food and

---

*Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 59. This request was later repeated in the *Capitula a sacerdotibus proposita* (a. 802), c. 18, in ibid., 107. On the detailed analysis of this prohibition in the capitularies of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, see Friedrich Prinz, *Klerus und Krieg im früheren Mittelalter: Untersuchungen zur Rolle der Kirche beim Aufbau der Königsherrschaft* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1971), 9–18.


81 “In concilio Laudicensi necnon in Africano praecipitur, ut monachi et clerici tabernas non ingrediantur edendi vel bibendi causa,” *Admonitio generalis*, c. 14, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 55. Canon 24 of Laodicea directly prohibits clerics to enter taverns, while African canon 7 (40) prohibited them from eating and drinking there nisi *pergrinationis necessitate compulsī*. For details, see Hubert Mordek, “Aachen, Frankfurt, Reims: Beobachtungen zu Genese und Tradition des ‘Capitulare Francofurtense’ (794),” in *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung*, 219.

82 *Capitulare Francofurtense*, c. 19, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 76; *Capitula a sacerdotibus proposita* (a. 802), c. 19, in ibid., 107; and *Capitulare ecclesiasticum Caroli Magni* (a. 805–813), c. 28, in Mordek and Schmitz, ed., “Neue Kapitularen und Kapitulariensammlungen,” 129.
drinks and then eat their meal in another place. The precept of Bishop Ghaerbald of Liège, written in the first decade of the ninth century and promulgating a Carolingian capitulary among the clergy of his bishopric, developed this topic further. He admonished his clerical fellows: “A priest should neither dare to enter taverns to have a drink nor should he mingle in such a gathering with secular people, where he could hear or speak harsh words, or hear or take part in some brawls, as happens there often.” This passage suggests that even if the authority of canonical rules played a role in the introduction of this norm, its main purpose was to draw a clear social line between clerics and common people, who were the main visitors in taverns. On the one hand, eating and especially drinking in taverns could easily tarnish the elevated spiritual image of clerics. On the other, eating and drinking together always tend to break social borders; indeed, a joint meal was a constant feature of medieval confraternities. Thus, the clause “tabernas non ingrediantur” (shall not enter taverns) vividly demonstrates the extent to which in Charlemagne’s time, clergymen, especially those of the highest ranks, strove to establish themselves as a separate and independent social order.

At the beginning of the ninth century, the clerical dream of a Christian state, in which a unified Christian people lived under the government of a Christian monarch, increasingly influenced political discourse, especially at the imperial court. The issue was how to communicate this dream and the new status of the Carolingian rulers to subjects in a language comprehensible not only to theological erudites but also to more ignorant lay populations of Gaul, Germany, and Italy. The only prototypes of the Christian imperial state were the late Roman and early Byzantine empires. Because contemporary Byzantium, the empire of the Greeks, was weakened by struggles over iconoclasm, it could not match this ideal; the only model of such a realm left to follow was therefore the late Roman empire. This prototype was preferable, too, because in its chronological space lived the church fathers so often quoted in Carolingian writings. Moreover, the Western Roman empire

83 *Haitonis episcopi Basileensis capitula ecclesiastica* (a. 807–823), c. 10, in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 364. What a cleric had to do when he had no servants remains an open question; most likely, he just went in and ate there.

84 *Ghaerbaldi Leodiensis episcopi capitula* (a. 802–810), c. 4, in ibid., 243: “Ut nullus presbyter tabernas ingrediat ad bibendum nec se misceat in tali conventu saecularibus hominibus, ubi turpia verba audiat aut loquatur aut contentiones ibi aliquas audiat aut intersit, sicut saepe contingere solet.”
remained a tangible memory through old Roman coins, the remains of Roman walls and roads, and the grave stones in ancient cemeteries. At the same time, however, the memory of this empire was also already blurred and therefore open for creative reconstruction. In this inventive process, the Carolingian clergy and their lay rulers followed not a realistic model of the Roman empire, but rather its mythological imprint preserved in patristic literature. Thus, the aspiration to create an ideal Christian state (an aspiration that was quite strong at the Carolingian court, as well as the clerical centers closely connected to it, in the first decades of the ninth century), led to the reception of Roman imperial tradition; hence, semantic elements described by the code “imperator Augustus” popped up in the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. Nevertheless, these Roman imperial elements were revived and re-used only as long as they communicated the new ideas and values of the Christian empire.

(c) Imperator Augustus and imperium Christianum: The appropriation of Roman imperial tradition

As shown in the previous chapters, formulas, signs, and images derived from imperial Rome came to play a prominent role in the symbolic language of imperial authority in the last years of Charlemagne’s rule and early in the reign of Louis the Pious, especially in the 810s. This practice corresponded to the prominence of Roman imperial political categories and narrative models in contemporary official written discourse. Among those categories, the term res publica, which was a common designation for the late Roman empire, became an integral part of political discourse at the time of Louis the Pious and his sons. Wolfgang Wehlen even argues that, when Carolingian writers described the Carolingian polity, some of them fully understood all the meanings of this and other polisemantic categories describing a state. Although

this might be an over-reaching statement, the fact is that Carolingian authors turned to late Roman political vocabulary both to characterize the changing Frankish polity and demonstrate continuity with the mythologized Christian empire of the Roman emperors as it was reconstructed from the texts of earlier Christian authors.

During those years, not only Roman political vocabulary but also imperial narrative models were imitated. Einhard’s *Life of Charlemagne*, written between 817 and c. 826,\(^{86}\) is an excellent example of how the narrative model of imperial biography was re-worked during the reign of Louis the Pious. This biographic work imitating *The Lives of Twelve Caesars* by the early imperial writer Suetonius stood apart from previous hagiographical tradition,\(^{87}\) yet it still corresponded to classicizing trends


in contemporary Carolingian poetry.\(^{88}\) Since *The Life of Charlemagne* was written at the imperial court at a time when the imperial code was employed in the symbolic communication of Carolingian authority, the narrative image of Charlemagne was updated to suit tastes and expectations in Aachen.\(^{89}\)

In a similar way, Carolingian genealogy was modified in those years to suit better the new image of Carolingian imperial authority. Whereas the traditional Frankish royal lists stressed the interrupted continuity of the Frankish rulers, a new abbreviation of Bede’s chronicle, which was created in Aachen in 807–809 and distributed among the episcopal and monastic centers closely linked to the imperial court, presented the Carolingian as legitimate heirs of Roman and early Byzantine emperors.\(^{90}\)

The changes in political atmosphere in Aachen also affected the official narratives written there, including, first and foremost, *The Royal Frankish Annals*.\(^{91}\) In the records of the years from 807 to 829, the annals underwent such a profound stylistic transformation that scholars speak of their second edition. Similar to other written works produced at the court, the new edition attests to the increasing use of Roman imperial communicative elements in official discourse. From the year 807, the anonymous author of *The Royal Frankish Annals* began to describe in detail eclipses of the sun and the moon, a subject that both testified to an increasing interest in zodiacal events and followed the pattern of Roman annals.\(^{92}\) The expression *una cum Francis* (together with Franks)—very common in the first part of the annals for the description of the military activity of Carolingian rulers—was replaced in the second part with the word *exercitum* (army), which was more appropriate for narrating

---

89 This apologetic image of a Christian emperor, which could have been very different from its prototype, provided Louis the Pious with an ancestral tradition more appropriate for the contemporary “face” of Christian imperial rulership. See Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, 55–9; McKitterick, “The Audience for Latin Historiography,” 97; and Krüger, “Neue Beobachtungen zur Datierung,” 145.
91 Although their author or authors are unknown, some prominent figures at Louis the Pious’ court must have been involved in their composition. For possible candidates, see Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, 8.
the deeds of a victorious emperor.93 This was not the only change in vocabulary that occurred; other terms deriving from the Roman past also appeared in the chronicle.94 Even so, the complete substitution of a vocabulary connected with the Frankish gens by a Roman imperial lexicon did not happen: the second part of the annals still employed terms pointing to the important constitutive role of the Franks and required consensus with Frankish magnates in the political structure of the Carolingian empire.95 Such references to the Franks as an important political force correlate to the legend that might have appeared on the golden bull of Louis the Pious dated to 816: *Renovatio regni Francorum* (fig. 52). Thus, in spite of the increasing importance of the code “imperator Augustus” in narratives produced at the imperial court, Frankish traditional elements did not disappear there entirely.

This feature owed to the fact that the Frankish political tradition of Carolingian authority was still strong outside the imperial court; its continuing influence was indicated by the addressing lines of some letters sent to the imperial court and by the royal imagery in legal manuscripts. Similarly, *The Chronicle of Moissac*, written in southern Gaul and containing records up to the year 818, shows a strong imprint of the Frankish political tradition on written discourse outside the court.96 Unlike *The Frankish Royal Annals*, the structure of *The Chronicle of Moissac* did not change much between the years 791 and 818.97 The chronicle’s discourse consistently used the traditional code of authority, which is noticeable only occasionally in the annals written at the imperial

---

93 See, for instance, *Annales regni Francorum*, a. 819, 150.
94 For instance, the word *provincia* (province) was used for the description of Carinthia, ibid., 151–3.
95 The chronicler mentions that Louis the Pious succeeded his father in 814 with the unanimous consent of all Franks (*summoque omnium Francorum consensu ac favore*); ibid., 140. When the narrator described the “plot” of King Bernhard, Louis’ nephew, and the merciless punishment of the former in the spring of 818, he felt it is necessary to notice that the harsh sentence was imposed by the judgment of the Franks (*iudicio Francorum*); ibid., 148. For other examples of the use of the term *Francorum* in the *Annales regni Francorum*, see ibid., 153, 156, and 160.
96 For the description of the manuscript copied in the abbey of Moissac in the eleventh century, see Jean Dufour, *La bibliothèque et le scriptorium de Moissac* (Geneve: Droz, 1972), 139. For links to other Carolingian annals and the probable origin of the chronicle in Septimania, see Wattenbach and Levison, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, vol. 2, 265–6; and Patrick Geary, “Un fragment récemment découvert du *Chronicon Moissiacense*,” *Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes* 136 (1978): 69–73.
97 *Chronicon Moissiacense*, 299–313.
The final records of the annals continued to use expressions common in the eighth century like *exercitus Francorum* (the army of the Franks), *maiores natu Francorum* (the magnates of the Franks), and *conventum Francorum* (the assembly of the Franks). In those years, although the annals both named Charlemagne or Louis the Pious emperor and often called the people of their empire *populus Christianus*, the Carolingian realm was still referred to as *regnum, universum regnum* to distinguish it from particular kingdoms of the Carolingian sons, or *omnis regnum vel imperium suum* (the entire kingdom or his own empire). This usage coincided with Frankish perception of Charlemagne’s imperial coronation: he received the name of emperor (*nomen imperatoris*), but this barely affected the essence of the Frankish polity.

The Carolingian genealogies composed in those years in the Frankish periphery also show that local elites in many places did not accept the “Romanizing” fashion of the imperial court. According to a genealogy of Charlemagne, the so-called *Genealogia domni Arnulfi*, most likely written in circles close to bishops of Metz between 801 and 814, their episcopal predecessors of the seventh century stood at the beginning of the Carolingian dynasty. Another royal genealogy, the so-called *Erchanberti breviarium regum Francorum*, composed in an episcopal or monastic center in Alemannia around 827, lists the Carolingians after the Merovingian kings, but its longest passage accentuates the role of the papacy in the transmission of kingship to the Carolingian rulers. These examples show that in the first decades of the ninth century, the official imperial genealogy co-existed at a local level with various alter-

---

98 When describing the imperial coronation of Charlemagne, for instance, the chronicle concludes with a traditional reference to previous Frankish rulers: “Magnificatus autem est imperator Karolus super omnes reges Francorum qui ante eum fuerant, divitiis, gloria, honore et nomine. Item primus ex genere Francorum Caesar est appellatus.” Ibid., 305–6. The last sentence is slightly modified in the second version of the chronicle: “Iste primus ex genere Francorum imperator extitit.”

99 In the years 804, 811, 813, 815, and 817, ibid., 307 and 309–312.

100 In the years 799–802, 810 and 813, ibid., 305–7 and 309–10.

101 For *regnum*, see ibid., a. 804, 307; a. 815, 312; and a. 817, 313. For *universum regnum*, see ibid., a. 802, 306; and a. 815, 311. For *omnis regnum vel imperium suum*, see ibid., 305–6, 310, and 312.


conclusion

native interpretations. These alternative genealogies also underlined the role of the clergy in the royal elevation of the Carolingians, reminding us of the importance of Christian components in the legitimation of Carolingian authority.

As mentioned above, most clerics were ready to accept Roman imperial elements in so far as they agreed with the quest for an ideal Christian state; a letter of Odilbert, bishop of Milan, which was sent to Charlemagne in c. 809–812, clearly illustrates how the Roman imperial legacy was employed in the first decades of the ninth century to communicate his vision of monarchical authority. Odilbert states in the preamble of his letter that Charlemagne received his authority, together with the entrusted Christian people, directly from God and that the new Christian emperor superseded previous Christian emperors like Constantine, Theodosius the Great, and Justinian I in his devotion and divine zeal. Similar to David and Christ, the new Christian emperor protected the *populum Christianum* by fighting against all possible deviations from the true faith, but, in this endeavor, he needed to follow the clergy—the priests of the Lord (*Domini sacerdotes*), as Odilbert defines them. Thus, this passage draws a new social order in the *imperium Christianum*: the emperor ruling as the vicar of God, the Christian people entrusted to him, and the priests of the Lord receiving a special status as interpreters of God’s will. This new social order was bolstered by references to the period of the late Roman empire, which had, in the eyes of Odilbert, an analogous hierarchy of authorities. The spirit of Odelbert’s letter was echoed in the content of the reform church councils of 813, which demanded a more intense royal liturgy on behalf of the Christian emperor. Although these councils were summoned by Charlemagne’s order, he did not attend them in person, so it was the members of the higher clergy who drafted these documents. As emphasized by Rosamond McKitterick, these councils signaled “the transition from primarily royally-initiated to clerically-initiated legislation.”

---

104 Odilberti ad Karolum M. responsum (a. 809–812), in *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, 247.


This clerical perception, however, did not entirely define the symbolic language of imperial authority used at Aachen during the last years of Charlemagne’s reign. As pointed out by Paul Dutton, the lifestyle at the imperial court after the death of Alcuin in 804 did not exactly follow the norms of Christian morality; its habits recall David the sinner rather than David the musician. In a similar vein, Charlemagne’s last public acts put more emphasis on lay military elements of the Roman imperial tradition than on Christian universalism. The first evidence to support this interpretation is the fact that public undertakings imitating Roman imperial rituals appeared only after the successful war against Byzantium that led to the acknowledgement of Charlemagne’s imperial status by Byzantines; in April 812, Byzantine ambassadors signed the peace treaty and proclaimed Charlemagne emperor and basileus in a liturgical setting. One year later, in September 813, Charlemagne crowned his only living son as co-emperor. The previous historiographic discussion of the imperial coronation of Louis the Pious in 813 has shown that Christian components, normally expressed through the intervention of a pope or bishops, were almost neglected in that ceremony. It was influenced mostly by late Roman, early Byzantine, and, to a certain extent, earlier Frankish traditions. These public acts of 812–813 were accompanied by Romanizing changes in Charlemagne’s intitulature


108 Annales regni Francorum, 136. Most scholars acknowledge the importance of this event, and Wolfgang Wendling, “Die Erhebung Ludwigs d. Fr. zum Mitkaiser im Jahre 813 und ihre Bedeutung für die Verfassungsgeschichte des Frankenreiches,” FSt 19 (1995): 233, argues that this event led directly to the imperial coronation of Louis the Pious in 813.

109 Percy E. Schramm and Gerd Tellenbach thought that this act was rooted in the Frankish royal elevation ceremonial, the core of which was electio Francorum. See Gerd Tellenbach, “Europa im Zeitalter der Karolinger,” in Historia Mundi, 10 vols, ed. Fritz Valjavec, vol. 5 (Bern: Francke, 1956), 434; Schramm, “Die Anerkennung Karls d. Gr. als Kaiser,” 508; and idem, “Karl der Große als Kaiser (800–814) im Licht der Staatsymbolik,” in Kaiser, Könige und Päpste, 1:296–300. Cf. Walter Schlesinger, “Karolingische Königswahlen,” in Königswahl und Thronfolge in fränkisch-karolingischer Zeit, ed. Eduard Hlawitschka (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1975), 201, who posited that the questioning of Franks by Charlemagne at the time of this elevation related to the ceremony and therefore should not be interpreted as election. This pro-Frankish interpretation has been challenged in recent decades by Peter Classen, Eugen Ewig, and Wolfgang Wendling, who have argued that the coronational act of 813, albeit having a Frankish flavor, was a legal innovation that followed early Byzantine tradition. See Peter Classen, “Karl der Große und die Thronfolge im Frankenreich,” 133; Eugen Ewig, “Überlegungen zu den merowingischen und karolingischen Teilungen,” in Nascita dell’Europa de Europa carolingia, un’equazione da verificare, 19–25 aprile 1979, 2 vols,
and coinage, as well as by the introduction of the Roman tradition of imperial bulls (fig. 8–9 and 50). Finally, Charlemagne was buried in a classical sarcophagus decorated with a scene from pagan mythology, the rape of Proserpina. The absence of any Christian symbol reveals much about Charlemagne’s esthetics. The Frankish emperor chose the masterpiece that was dominated by the expression of masculine physical, rather than spiritual biblical, power and undoubtedly linked to the Roman past, which became so prominent in the imperial court in the very last years of his life.110

After the death of Charlemagne in early 814, the imperial court of his successor, Louis the Pious, continued to employ symbolic references to the late Roman empire.111 His coinage continued the imperial model of his father (fig. 10) that imitated coins of Constantine the Great. In addition, the Roman imperial tradition of commemorative gold medallions was renewed in 816. Moreover, Louis' imperial chancery removed all the royal elements from his imperial intitulature, continuing the early Byzantine practice of imperial bulls. His imperial diplomas used an imperial signum imitating the box monogram of Theodosius II (fig. 34–6). Classical imagery appeared on the walls of imperial palaces and on the folios of manuscripts produced at the court school.

Within this symbolic context, it is not surprising to see that the Ordinatio imperii of 817, Louis' most prominent act in the first years of his reign, developed the principles of imperial government introduced by his father in 813. In July 817, Louis crowned his elder son Lothar I as co-emperor, while two younger sons, Pippin and Louis, became


110 For details on this sarcophagus, see Janet L. Nelson, “Carolingian Royal Funerals,” in Rituals of Power, ed. Theuws and Nelson, 152–3. Even though Nelson accepts that it was an obvious example of imitatio imperii, she thinks that “it could no doubt be given a Christian reading, as symbolizing the ascent of the soul to heaven.” This is true; however, if a Christian motif was important for Charlemagne indeed, the question remains of why he did not bring to Aachen a late Roman Christian sarcophagus, which he was definitely able to obtain in Italy.

111 I do not intend to trace all the pitfalls of Louis the Pious’ reign and relevant historiographical debates. For a general overview of modern historiography on his reign, see Philippe Depreux, “Louis le Pieux reconsidéré? À propos des travaux récents consacrés à l’héritier de Charlemagne et à son règne,” Francia 21,1 (1994): 181–212. For the importance of Constantine and Theodosius the Great as exemplary rulers in the reign of Louis the Pious, see Karl Ferdinand Werner, “Hludowicus Augustus: Gouverner l’empire chrétien—Idées et réalités,” in ChH, 56–60.
kings of Aquitaine and Bavaria respectively. Lothar I was designated as imperial heir and so was named *augustus* on his coins, which were issued occasionally before 833; his father kept the title of emperor on his coins struck from 818 to 840. Thus, the late imperial hierarchy of the ruling *imperator* and his co-emperor *augustus*, his future heir, was imitated in the Frankish empire. Nonetheless, this division was designed for the future, while Louis the Pious continued to exercise full control over his empire, which allowed him to spread Christian reforms—monastic reform, foremost—throughout the entire realm.

Roman universalistic elements at his imperial court—which had become more ascetic after being purged of his sisters and other relatives—were balanced by Christian components, which played an increasingly significant role: it was not by accident that Louis was called “Pious” after his death. The imperial coronation of Louis the


113 The governing opinion in modern literature is that the changes of 817 mirrored the trans-personal or de-personalized character of Carolingian authority: Boshof, “Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip,” 165. But Fried, “Der karolingsche Herrschaftsverband im 9. Jh.,” 27, warns that the late classical distinction between a person and the office did not exist in the ninth century.

114 For this “cleansing” of the Carolingian court, see Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, 93–4 and 103. See also Brigitte Kasten, *Adalhard von Corbie: Die Biographie eines karolingschen Politikers und Klostergründers*, Studia humaniora, no. 3 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1986), 85–6 and 100–5. The most detailed description of this change occurs in *Astronomus, Vita Hludowici imperatori*, cc. 21–2, 346–52.

115 This nickname began to be used, at the earliest, at the end of the ninth century. For the origins of this epithet, see Rudolf Schießler, “Ludwig ‘der Fromme’: Zur
Pious by the Roman pope Stephen IV in 816 was one of the signs of the importance of Christian components in symbolic communication. The balance between Roman imperial and Christian elements was also expressed through the development during the reign of Louis the Pious, especially in the years 814–821, of the imperial cult of Christ. Finally, between 810 and 815, his closest counselor, Benedict of Aniane, composed the new set of royal masses better suited to a Christian emperor and reminiscent of earlier imperial liturgy. The texts of these masses incorporated the notion of imperium Christianum emerging in Carolingian written discourse from the late 790s and referred to the same social order as presented in the above-mentioned letter of Odilbert of Milan: the Christian ruler governing the Christian empire and the Christian people, entrusted to him by the Lord. Benedict of Aniane was also a driving force for monastic reform, which had begun first in the kingdom of Aquitaine and eventually spread to the entire Carolingian empire after 816. Monastic reform was intended to make the relations between the ruler and imperial monasteries more uniform and oblige them to perform the liturgy of authority on a more regular basis.

Between 818 and 822, the balance between the Roman imperial and Christian components in the indirect communication of a Carolingian universalistic ideal gradually tilted in favor of the latter. Carolingian coins, designed at the imperial court, clearly display this change. In 818, the Roman imperial portrait was replaced on Carolingian coins by the sign of a cross (fig. 11). From 822 on, all Carolingian coins bore not only this sign, but also the image of a Christian basilica, accompanied with the propagandistic slogan “Christian religion” (fig. 37). Thus, the new imperial coinage presented Louis the Pious to their audiences as a Christian emperor whose signum was a cross and whose main agenda was the Christian faith.

The penance of Louis the Pious in Attigny in August 822 publicly presented the increasing use of Christian elements in the symbolic communication of Carolingian authority. This penance, in which Louis

---

116 Similar allusions to Christ were typical of late Roman emperors; for details, see Le Maître, “Image du Christ,” 201–12. For a similar view on the role of Christ in the rulership of Louis the Pious, see Deshman, “‘Benedictus monarcha et monachus’,” 204–40, who argues against Kantorowicz’ concept that Carolingian authority was framed exclusively after Davidic kingship, and that Christ-centered rulers appeared under the influence of Christological monastic piety only around the year 1000.
imitated the late Roman emperor Theodosius I, addressed Louis’ “wrong-doings” against some members of the extended Carolingian family in the first years of his reign. Although Louis was acting from a position of strength, the public penance communicated to witnesses the message of the emperor’s obedience to ecclesiastical norms and his acceptance of Christian humility as a virtue important for imperial rulership. Moreover, Louis’ penitence followed the rehabilitation of Charlemagne’s cousins, Adalhard (abbot of Corbie in 780–826) and Wala (Adalhard’s successor in Corbie in 826–836), in the autumn of 821; they had been in monastic exile since 814 but now began to play more prominent roles at the imperial court as they had in Charlemagne’s time. These changes in personnel, taken together with public penance and new coinage, presented the emperor not as a Christ-like vicar of the Lord but rather as his minister, who was to perform his minsterium along with the bishops and abbots and be held accountable for his wrong-doings. With increasing family quarrels and the growing authority of the Carolingian upper clergy, such a presentation of imperial office to the public made Louis especially vulnerable, as proven by the penance of 833, which was forced on him by his son Lothar I and his supporters.

Immediately after his earlier penance in 822, Louis the Pious sent his elder sons to their sub-kingdoms, Lothar to Italy and Pippin to Aquitaine; the third son, Louis the German, was elevated to the sub-kingdom of Bavaria in 825. In doing so, he returned to Charlemagne’s practice of governing the Frankish empire as a cluster of regna and gentes requiring their own sub-rulers, which better fit the reality of the Carolingian realm and addressed the interests and expectations of local

---

117 In 390, Theodosius I undertook public penance in front of Ambrose of Milan, which was often referred to by early medieval authors; see Rudolf Schießler, “Von Mailand nach Canossa: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der christlichen Herrscherbuße von Theodosius d. Gr. bis zu Heinrich IV.,” DAEM 28 (1972): 333–52.


119 Annales regni Francorum, 158. For details and references, see David Ganz, Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1990), 26; and Semmler, “Renovatio Regni Francorum,” 142.

120 De Jong, “Power and Humility in Carolingian Society,” 39, argues that Louis the Pious shared this concept of imperial office from the very beginning.
Thus, Louis’ penance in 822 symbolized a return to a more traditional Frankish royal household and court, in which the ruler’s relatives played a greater role than they had allowed during the first years of his reign.

Thus, the events of 821–822 indicate an important modification of Carolingian rulership which was reflected in the symbolic language of images, graphic symbols, and formulas communicated to broader audiences via imperial coinage. Yet, what caused such a transformation? The first factor, which has been already mentioned in relation to the courts of Pippin the Short and Charlemagne, is a change in the courtly entourage of Louis the Pious. The symbolic image of Carolingian authority was created by influential people at his court and was thus affected by their political experiences and “horizons of expectations.” The heavy reliance on Roman imperial elements in the symbolic communication of Carolingian emperorship in the first years of Louis’s reign coincided with the flood of “southerners,” the term coined by J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, to the imperial court. Most of them had faithfully served their ruler in Aquitaine and Catalonia, making them influential in Aachen when their lord inherited the vacant throne in 814. By contrast, former noble “courtiers,” some of them Carolingians by blood, were removed from Louis’ entourage; a telling example is the destiny of the brothers Adalhard and Wala, who were sent into monastic exile.

Among new prominent courtiers, the Visigoth Benedict of Aniane was the first advisor of the emperor. Another “southerner,” Helisachar, was Louis’ chancellor in Aquitaine and after 814 in Aachen. It was precisely during this period that Roman imperial tradition shaped the imperial intitulature, monogram, and coinage of Louis the Pious. The Visigoth Agobard, the courtly lecturer on the Scripture, was raised to one of the most prestigious Frankish archbishoprics, that of Lyons, in

---

121 The importance of a social factor for the decentralization of Carolingian authority was underlined by Timothy Reuter, “The End of Carolingian Military Expansion,” 391–405. He argued that after the end of Carolingian military expansion in the early ninth century, the aristocratic elite and their warrior followings no longer had the loot gained by successful warfare and so were less ready to comply with the universalistic authority of their ruler.

122 The Frankish Church, 229.

123 For an overview of this group at the imperial court, see Semmler, “Renovatio Regni Francorum,” 140–1; and Boshof, Ludwig der Fromme, 65–70.
During the same year, another Spaniard, Claudius, connected to the court of Louis the Pious from at least 811, was promoted by the emperor to become bishop of Turin, where he later became known for his activity against the adoration of icons and crosses. This policy of Claudius mirrored iconoclastic acts undertaken in the contemporary Byzantine empire and constituted a source of worry for other Frankish bishops. The Visigoth Theodulf of Orléans was a prominent figure in the imperial court after the death of Alcuin in 804, when the first signs of the increasing role of Roman imperial elements appeared, and he retained his position after 814. The “southerners” were joined by personal followers of Louis the Pious—such as the Frank Bego, count of Paris (Louis’ son-in-law from around 806 and the first among the emperor’s friends), or the emperor’s foster-brother, Ebbo, manumitted by Charlemagne and raised to the archbishopric of Rheims by Louis in 816.

In addition to the presence of courtiers from the former Visigothic territories, Louis the Pious himself spent many years in Aquitaine and south of the Pyrenees before he was elevated to the imperial throne. Both Louis’ advisors, as well as his previous political experiences, no doubt affected the young emperor. The political culture of the Visigoths and their perception of empire were quite different from those of contemporary Franks. This difference is clearly demonstrated by the strong anti-Jewish rhetoric of Visigoths like Agobard of Lyons, Claudius of Turin, and Theodulf of Orléans, which echoed anti-Jewish legislation.

124 He was from Septimania and possibly a Visigoth. For details on his career, see Egon Boshof, Erzbishof Agobard von Lyon: Leben und Werk (Cologne: Böhlau, 1969), 20–37.
125 For details, see Michael Idomir Allen, “The Chronicle of Claudius of Turin,” in After Rome’s Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History, ed. Alexander Callander Murray (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1998), 288–90; Boshof, Erzbishof Agobard von Lyon, 139–58; and Chazelle, The Crucified God, 120.
127 For details, see Kasten, Adalhard von Corbie, 86–90; and Boshof, Ludwig der Fromme, 65–6.
128 For his biography, see Peter R. McKeon, “Archbishop Ebbo of Reims (816–835): A Study in the Carolingian Empire and Church,” Church History 43 (1974): 437–47. In the 830s, Thegan, suffragan bishop of Trier, demonstrated the negative reaction of Frankish nobility in his disapproving remarks on bishops elevated from a servile status and on those coming from other nations (ex barbaris nacionibus). Theganus, Gesta Hludovici imperatori, c. 20 and c. 43, ed. Tremp, 204–6 and 230.
of Visigothic kings in the seventh century. Works written by Visigothic authors in the preceding period—like the Chronicle by John of Biclaro, the world chronicle of Isidore of Seville, or the anonymous Chronicle of 754—illustrate another aspect of Visigothic political culture: the authors’ presentation of events in these chronicles followed a specific perception of the landscape of authorities existing in the Mediterranean. The Roman/Byzantine empire was always at the top of this worldly hierarchy, and consequently, the late Roman and early Byzantine emperors, not Roman popes, were presented as the leaders of the Christian world. For a person raised in a Visigothic sociopolitical habitus, to be emperor meant to follow the line of the Christian emperors of Ravenna and Constantinople and to express an imperial dignity meant using Roman imperial symbols.

By 822, the “southerners” no longer influenced the imperial court. Bego died in 816, and his role at the court was taken over by Count Matfrid of Orléans. Only one out of the seventeen lay aristocrats who were in Louis’ entourage in Aquitaine in 794 can be traced in his imperial court after 820. The promotion of Agobard to the bishopric of Lyons loosened his connection to the court, and after 822, he was removed from the inner circle of Louis the Pious. In 817/8, Theodulf of Orléans was linked to the case of Bernhard of Italy and sent into exile. In 819, Helisachar lost his position of imperial chancellor.

---

131 Similarly, Johannes Fried (“Ludwig der Fromme, das Papsttum,” 239), while describing the influence of Benedict of Aniane and Helisachar on the imperial court, speaks of the “Visigothic” trend to distance from papal Rome.
132 Paxton, Christianizing Death, 138–48, provides a telling example of Visigothic influence on Benedict of Aniane in showing that the prayers for the dead in the latter’s Supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary were taken from the Visigothic death liturgy.
133 On these changes, see Semmler, “Renovatio Regni Francorum,” 125–8 and 141–2.
136 For details, see Kasten, Adalhard of Corbie, 144.
137 See Godman, Poets and Emperors, 95–106.
Finally, Benedict of Aniane, Louis the Pious’ closest advisor and the promoter of monastic reform, died in early 821. As many scholars have stressed, his death was probably most significant in changing Louis’ entourage. At the same time, Benedict’s main opponent of monastic reform and an old courtier of Charlemagne’s, Abbot Adalhard, together with his brother Wala, victoriously returned to the imperial court and played an important role in orchestrating the events of 822. Thus, Charlemagne’s old “guards” and relatives of Louis the Pious again dominated the imperial court. The effect of these changes in personnel was enhanced by the death of Queen Irmengard in 818 and the second marriage of Louis the Pious to Judith in 819 (a queen whose family roots lay east of the Rhine), who soon brought her own favorites into the imperial court. The birth of Charles the Bald in 823 was another blow to the court’s stability, threatening to jeopardize the constitution established by the Ordinatio imperii. Thus, between 819 and 821, the inner circle of Louis the Pious’ counselors almost completely changed. This transformation modified the symbolic language of Carolingian authority employed at his court.

The second factor in this modification was that a broader Frankish audience, whose perception of rulership was dominated by more traditional political mentalities, was reluctant to accept Roman imperial semantics and the associated new universalistic perception of

---

139 Adalhard advocated the diversity of monastic life adjusted to local differences, and Benedict of Aniane’s reforming policy of monastic unification was effectively abandoned after the death of its main proponent. Having played a prominent role in the crucial events of 822, seventy-year-old Adalhard left the imperial court for Corbie, to die there in 826. After his departure, Wala, who later replaced his brother as abbot of Corbie, took the leading position among the courtly clergy. For details, see Kasten, Adalhard von Corbie, 91–100, 143–54, and 168–9; and Cabaniss, Charlemagne’s Cousins, 6–12.
141 For details, see Boshof, Ludwig der Fromme, 150–60.
142 The political shift visible in the year 822 and the changes in symbolic messages sent via coins to Carolingian subjects can hardly be explained by the existence of the so-called “Reichseinheitpartei,” postulated by some historians, most recently by Egon Boshof (“Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip,” 161–89; and idem, Ludwig der Fromme). For the criticism of this concept, see Staubach, Das Herrscherbild Karls des Kahlen, 32.
Carolingian authority. The increasing role of Carolingian bishops and abbots in Carolingian politics became the last, but not the least, factor in the change in the symbolic language between 818–822. In 819, Fridugis—a friend of Alcuin and a prominent member of Charlemagne’s court, and from 808 on, abbot of St. Martin of Tours—became arch-chancellor of Louis the Pious; another abbot, Hilduin of St. Denis, was appointed chaplain during the years of change. Thus, the abbots of the three royal abbeys, so powerful in the first decades of Carolingian rule, held key positions at Aachen in the 820s. Yet there was a significant difference from the early Carolingian period: while earlier, the faithful advisors at the royal court were rewarded with these abbacies, now it was the powerful abbots who came to influence the imperial court. As shown in chapter 3, the addressing lines in the letters sent by Carolingian bishops and abbots to Louis the Pious in the late 820s and 830s hint at their changing perception of Carolingian authority: the clerical subjects saw themselves less in direct submission to the Carolingian emperor and claimed God as their main lord. There are other documents pointing to the same change.

In a motion presented to Louis the Pious around 820, Carolingian bishops asserted that “priests of the Lord” were the mediators between God and human beings, and that through their ministerium, they played an intermediary role between human beings and the Lord. This clerical vision came to influence the imperial court after 822. The Admonition to All Orders of the Kingdom, issued by Louis the Pious in the years 823–825, states that the responsibility for the protection of the church and state had to be jointly fulfilled by all orders of the Christian realm. Having already shared his authority with the royal household and his sons, Louis the Pious now also had to share authority with clerical and lay nobles. According to The Admonition, every member of the Christian community was obliged to carry a part of the imperial


\[144\] Felten, Äbte und Laienäbte, 244–6; and Worm, Karolingische Rekognitionsscheine, 45.

\[145\] Episcoporum ad Hludovicum imperatorem relatio, in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 1, 367: “4. Ut sacerdotes Domini, qui sunt meditores inter Deum et homines, per quos homines Deo reconciliantur, tanto despectui non habean tur, sed pro amore et reverentia Dei ministerium sacram, quod per eos Deo exibet ecclesia, in eis honoretur…”
Louis the Pious accepted the role of admonisher, while other leaders of community—bishops, abbots, priests, and counts—to whom different chapters of *The Admonition* were addressed, were conceived of as his assistants in this *ministerium*.

Yet bishops and abbots were not entirely satisfied with being the emperor’s subordinate assistants in his *ministerium*. In the second half of the 820s, when family quarrels began to weaken the regime of Louis the Pious, the growing power of the high clergy in Carolingian politics led to corresponding demands for a higher status. According to Paschasius Radbertus, Wala, by that time abbot of Corbie and an influential personage in courtly politics, presented Louis the Pious with a codex that stated that spiritual matters had to be removed from the control of temporal authority. At the same time, Louis the Pious and Lothar I expressed a need for correction and self-examination. As a response to these calls, four church councils were held in 829. They resulted in a new motion of the Carolingian bishops to Louis the Pious, in which they asserted that the body of the Church had two *personae*, namely, the sacerdotal and the royal; in addition, with a reference to the famous letter of Pope Gelasius I to Emperor Anastasius in 494, they claimed that the episcopal *auctoritas* was “weightier” than royal *potestas*. Further on, the petition quoted another emperor, Constantine

---


147 For details, see Suchan, “Kirchenpolitik des Königs,” 13–27.


149 For details, see ibid., 16–8.

the Great, who is said to have addressed bishops at the first Council of Nicea with the following words:

God has appointed you priests and given you power to judge even concerning us, and therefore we are rightly judged by you, while you cannot be judged by men. For this reason, wait for God alone to judge among you, and whatever your quarrels may be, let them be saved for that divine scrutiny. For you have been given to us by God as gods, and it is not fitting that a man should judge gods, but only he of whom it is written: God has stood in the assembly of the gods, in the midst he has judged between gods.\footnote{Episcoporum ad Hludowicum imperatorem relatio, 35–6. This passage is taken from Rufinus of Aquileia, Eusebii Caesariensis historia ecclesiastica, Rufini continuatio, X. 2, ed. Theodor Mommsen, in Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, vol. 9.2, Eusebius Werke, Die Kirchengeschichte, ed. Eduard Schwarz (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 961. The English translation is from The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia by Rufinus, Books 10 and 11, trans. Philip R. Amidon (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 9–10. For the detailed analysis of how Gelasian ideas were developed by the Carolingian high clergy in 829 in order to claim ecclesiastical authority independent from a secular ruler, see Hans Hubert Anton, “Zum politischen Konzept karolingischer Synoden und zur karolingischen Brüdergemeinschaft,” HJ 99 (1979): 55–80. Cf. De Jong, “Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity,” in Staat im frühen Mittelalter, ed. Airlie, Pohl, and Reimitz, 129–31.}

In both quotations, bishops used the examples of late Roman emperors and church fathers to bolster their claim to spiritual superiority over Louis the Pious, and, accordingly, to support their right to judge him in spiritual matters. In doing so, they constructed their own myth of a Roman Christian empire, in which humble Christian emperors bowed their heads before the spiritual authority of bishops. These statements were soon followed by real actions against unbound imperial authority: abbots Wala of Corbie and Hilduin of St. Denis headed the first such plot, the so-called “loyal palace revolution” of 830, which temporarily reduced the imperial authority of Louis the Pious.\footnote{For details, see Boshof, Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon, 195–215; idem, “Einheitsidee und Teilungsprinzip,” 183–4, and idem, Ludwig der Fromme, 182–91. Collins, “Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine,” 381–3, demonstrates that Louis’ son, Pippin I of Aquitaine, played a leading role in the coup.} Although the emperor soon recovered the full exercise of his authority and persecuted the participants of this event, it nevertheless demonstrated the power of the high clergy and opened the Pandora’s box that triggered the civil strife of 833–834.
The claim that the bishops had the full right to judge the emperor in spiritual matters took a practical form in the forced penance of Louis the Pious in 833 when, under the pretext of “moral sins” and the negligence in his ministerium, he was deprived of imperial authority and placed under monastic arrest. The emperor, demoted from the position of the vicar of the Lord to that of his earthly minister, was left unprotected against the priests of the Lord, which allowed ecclesiastic authority (ecclesiastica auctoritas) to jeopardize his earthly power (terrena potestas). This deposition of the emperor surely had practical political reasons, but the particular form that it took in practice can be explained only by the changing perception of Christian emperorship and the increased spiritual authority of bishops and abbots, which henceforth could override the Carolingian one in certain circumstances.

After Louis the Pious had restored his imperial authority in 834, Hrabanus Maurus, a staunch supporter of the Christian empire, sent him a poetic work accompanied with the prefatory triumphal image of the Carolingian ruler, which was constructed according to late Roman imperial standards (fig. 53). However, this was more a gesture of personal fidelity on the part of Hrabanus than a real sign of restored imperial authority. The sons of Louis the Pious effectively ruled their parts of the Carolingian realm. The death of the old emperor in 840 triggered the violent restructuring of separate kingdoms, which simply confirmed de iure the fact that the Christian empire, whose birth was “announced” via different symbolic means at the end of Charlemagne’s reign, no longer existed in the Frankish lands. The dream of one Christian people living in a unified Christian empire under the rule of a Christian emperor was smashed by the realities of Carolingian politics. By 840, when the Roman imperial tradition had all but lost its prime role in the symbolic communication of Carolingian authority, the intellectual “dreamers” of a universal empire became a rarity; most of them had either passed away or vanished into political oblivion.

154 On the last years of Louis the Pious’ reign, see Janet L. Nelson, “The Last Years of Louis the Pious,” in ChH, 147–59; and Boshof, Ludwig der Fromme, 219–51.
Louis the Pious was buried in a late Roman sarcophagus, which presented a scene from the Old Testament: Moses leading his people across the Red Sea as the army of the pharaoh perished in the returning water.\(^{156}\) Louis’ choice, strikingly different from that of his father, recalled his efforts to lead to the promised land the people entrusted to him by God. At the same time, Abbot Radbert, Wala’s successor in Corbie, pessimistically looked back at the reign of Louis the Pious, which matched neither his nor Wala’s expectations of Christian rulership. In their eyes, the ultimate goal of a Christian empire was to defend the Christian religion, the church, and the clergy, exactly the task that the Carolingian emperor failed to fulfill.\(^{157}\) If it was better executed by the Frankish king elevated to his mission by the grace of God, then the \textit{imperator Augustus} had to give way to the \textit{gratia Dei rex}.

(d) Gratia Dei rex: \textit{The dawn of \textquotedblright medieval\textquotedblright tradition}

The new political reality that was created after the death of Louis the Pious in 840 and the Treaty of Verdun (843)\(^{158}\) was accompanied by the transformation of the symbolic languages of Carolingian authority in the separate Frankish kingdoms during the 840s. These led to an eclectic mixture of various semantic elements which were partly derived from the Frankish royal and Roman imperial traditions and partly appearing anew.\(^ {159}\) The first “post-imperial” decade saw the increasing negotiation of royal authority because, during this period, “consent” politics and the mutuality of royal vis-à-vis aristocratic rights, duties, and obligations came to dominate political actions and discourse, especially in the


\(^{158}\) For the detailed analysis of the political developments in the early 840s, see Adelheid Krah, \textit{Die Entstehung der \textquotedblright potestas regia\textquotedblright im Westfrankenreich während der ersten Regierungsjahre Kaiser Karls II. (840–877)} (Berlin: Akademie, 2000).

\(^{159}\) The changing meaning of the category \textit{res publica} in contemporary political discourse provides an illustration to this process. The term, which from the time of the late Roman empire described an imperial polity, came to define separate Frankish kingdoms after 840. For details, see ibid., 100–10.
West Frankish kingdom.\textsuperscript{160} “Consent” politics, in which a Frankish king was expected to consult with his nobles on the most significant issues, had always been a part of the previous Frankish tradition.\textsuperscript{161} Yet this politics underwent an important modification in the mid-ninth century: the consent of the episcopate acquired a crucial role.

When the victorious Charles the Bald and Louis the German decided the future of Lothar’s middle kingdom in Aachen, they had to promise the bishops gathered there to rule in accordance with God’s will (\textit{secundum Dei voluntatem}).\textsuperscript{162} After the treaty of Verdun, Charles the Bald had to swear an oath in front of his subjects in Coulaines in November 843 and issue a capitulary that distinguished royal sublimity (\textit{regalis sublimitas}), episcopal authority (\textit{episcopalis auctoritas}), and the utility of the subjects (\textit{fidelium commoditas}). It stated that all three sides had their rights and obligations: the worship of God (\textit{cultus Dei}) belonged to the clergy, the king possessed royal power (\textit{regalis potestas}), and the law (\textit{lex}) was promised to the subjects, especially the lay nobility.\textsuperscript{163} Thus, the capitulary proclaimed that all three sides—the king, the clergy with bishops at their head, and the subjects as \textit{populus Christianus}—had their own rights in authority and constituted equal political bodies. These political agreements show that the rights of the subjects as \textit{populus Christianus} had become an important part of political discourse. For example, the “Christian people” was mentioned in vernacular languages at the beginning of the Strasburg oath, indicating that people swearing there in Romance and Germanic languages had a basic idea


\textsuperscript{161} For a general overview, see Hanning, \textit{Consensus fidelium}.


of both Christian poblo and Christianes folches, respectively.\textsuperscript{164} At the same time, care for the safety and prosperity of the populus Christianus became a frequent motif in written polemics that accompanied the political struggle among Frankish rulers and their supporters.\textsuperscript{165}

In the capitulary of Coulaines, episcopalis auctoritas was written side by side with regalis sublimitas and fidelium commoditas, which pointed to the crucial role of the bishops in the realm of Charles the Bald. Their increasing status led next to their exemption from swearing oaths (sacramenta) to the king. In 858, the Council of Quierzy sent a letter to Louis the German that was written most likely by Hincmar of Rheims; it protested against the king’s invasion of West Frankish territory. This letter states that the bishops, having been consecrated by the Lord, could not commend themselves in vassalage or swear oaths like lay people, because these actions were prohibited to them by evangelical, apostolic, and canonical authorities. Moreover, participation in liturgical mysteries raised the bishops above ordinary people, thereby exempting them from swearing an oath of fidelity to their king.\textsuperscript{166} In the 860s, this position became official. In 872, when the West Frankish nobility swore its fidelity to Charles the Bald again, two different oaths were used: a sacramentum for the laymen and a professio for the bishops.\textsuperscript{167} This same difference is seen again in 877, at the time of the royal elevation of Louis the Stammerer, the son of Charles the Bald. In addition, at the demand of the bishops, Louis the Stammerer swore to conserve and protect the canonical privilege and due justice the king owed to each bishop in his kingdom.\textsuperscript{168} This was an obvious sign of the bishops’ special status in the West Frankish kingdom.


\textsuperscript{165} See for instance, Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 2, 435.

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., 439–40. For details, see Prodi, Das Sakrament der Herrschaft, 84–8.

\textsuperscript{167} Sacramenta apud Gundulfvillam facta (9 Sep. 872), in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 2, 342. The professio probably was a simple oath, and, unlike a sacramentum, it did not use sacred objects or invoke the names of God and saints. On episcopal oaths at the time of Charles the Bald, see Reinhold Kaiser, Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königstum und Fürstenmacht (Bonn: Köhrscheid, 1981), 98–9.

Clerical authority, first and foremost that of bishops and abbots, was founded upon their liturgical functions: their communication with the divine on behalf of the kings and Christian people via the mass, liturgical office, and other sacred ceremonies. In the preamble to the decisions of the Council of Meaux and Paris (845–846), the archbishops and bishops assembled there called themselves vicars of Christ (Christi vicarii) and successors of his apostles.¹⁶⁹ This meant that, in their eyes, a Carolingian ruler was no longer the vicar of God according to the model set by late Roman emperors; rather, he was not directly designated and supported by God, as Louis the Pious had been symbolically presented in the first part of his reign, but through new intermediaries, the clergy. As shown in chapter 5, this newly acquired clerical authority found its pictorial expression in the imagery of Carolingian clerics appearing in the 840s. Contemporary changes in the canon of the mass—namely, the mentioning of a local bishop in the final sentence of the Te igitur—show the same trend (app. 10).

In the troubled period after 840 dominated by feuds among Carolingians and pagan incursions into Frankish territories, bishops and abbots stated that the grace of God was vital to the prosperity of the Christian people and Christian kings. This grace was obtained in a twofold way: the interrupted flow of divine grace to the king and his people was guaranteed by means of a “regular” royal liturgy that was performed in church, and the ruler was designated and elevated through the anointing at his coronation. It is necessary to stress here that these two channels were intertwined. The ritual of anointment could efficiently “work” in the mid-ninth century—in other words, it could be accepted as an important symbolic source of royal legitimation—only because all participants of this public ritual recognized (if we recall Pierre Bourdieu) royal authority by the grace of God; that is, it “worked” because they agreed that royal authority was based on divine grace and liturgical proximity to God. It was this recognition that turned the ritual of royal anointment into the “symbolic capital” of late Carolingian rulers.

¹⁶⁹ Consilium Meldense-Parisiense (17 June 845–2 Feb. 846), in Capitularia regum Francorum, vol. 2, 397. Charles the Bald was reluctant to accept such a statement, as the assembly at Épernay (846) shows: Annales Bertiniani, 33–4.
In 848, the year in which the anointment ritual in Orléans bestowed the grace of God upon Charles the Bald, Gottschalk of Orbais and his views on predestination were condemned by the Mainz Council headed by Hrabanus Maurus. Following certain ideas of Augustine and Isidore, Gottschalk stated that through God’s grace, only the elect were predestined for salvation while the reprobate were doomed. Thus, Gottschalk’s concept of “twin predestination” implies that the grace of God, which was the key to salvation, was a free gift and could not be controlled by the Church. If “the priests of the Lord” were not able to distribute the grace of God through their sacraments, then the church hierarchs could not claim the prime status for clergy in the Christian community as mediators to the divine. It was this social implication, in addition to theological reasons, that so infuriated the archbishops Hincmar of Rheims and Hrabanus of Mainz in 848–849. After the death of the latter, Hincmar led the cause against Gottschalk’s views and had them repeatedly condemned in the 850s and 860s. In Hincmar’s view, the Lord, through the crucified Christ, made an offer of universal salvation; it was a person’s free will to accept that gift and be saved. Communion in church and the sacraments were the channels through which the divine offer reached Christians to lead them to redemption. Therefore, the priests controlled the grace of God through the liturgy, so every layman, including a king, depended on them for salvation. A king as Christian ruler also needed the grace of God to fulfill his ministerium, and, thus, he was even more dependent on the work of clergy for both his personal and communal well-being. This message was communicated to the West Frankish king through various media, such as clerical letters or royal imagery (fig. 55).

Charles the Bald, with his questionable legitimacy and unstable position in the early years of his reign, took these expectations of his clergy seriously because they were so prominent in his entourage; as a result, he increasingly began to use the motif of the grace of God in the symbolic language of authority. From the very beginning of his independent rule, the charters of the West Frankish king disseminated

---


171 See ibid., 205. On Hincmar’s concept of kingship, see Anton, Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos, 281–355.
among aristocrats the new royal title “Charles, King by the grace of God”; after 864, this title was addressed to most of his subjects (fig. 46–7).

In the West Frankish kingdom, the anointment and coronation in Orléans in 848 and in Metz in 869 were performed not by a pope, who had traditionally played a main role in Carolingian royal coronations, but by Carolingian bishops. Therefore, as much as elevating the king over the other lay people, this anointment significantly raised the status of bishops themselves, who, as the vicars of Christ, were able henceforth to make a ruler king by the grace of God. With this change in the bishops’ standing, the social status of the entire Carolingian clergy was enhanced. After 848, an anointment performed by bishops became an expected part of the medieval ritual of royal elevation in general and of the coronation ceremonial of Charles the Bald and his family members in particular.

By means of the royal anointment conducted by bishops, two sides involved in the symbolic communication of royal authority reinforced their mutual links, bonds expressed by similarities between episcopal and royal consecrations and confirming pragmatic self-interest. For instance, when most of the West Frankish episcopate refused to obey to Louis the German in 858 after he had invaded the kingdom of his brother, the letter to Louis drafted by Hincmar of Rheims on their behalf referred to the anointment of Charles the Bald as the main reason for their fidelity. After all, “symbolic capital” proved to be effective in bolstering Charles’ royal authority. The West Frankish clergy


173 These West Frankish practices were in a sharp contrast to the situation in the East Frankish kingdom. Louis the German had not been anointed. The degree of indifference of the East Frankish political culture to this ritual is also demonstrated by the fact that Charles the Bald’s anointment in 848 and 869 passed unnoticed in The Annals of Fulda written there. Annales Fuldenses, 37–8 and 69–70. See also Erkens, “Der Herrscher als götes drüt,” 1–39. For the analysis of these annals, see Wilhelm Wattenbach, Wilhelm Levison, and Heinz Löwe, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger, vol. 6, Die Karolinger vom Vertrag von Verdun bis zum Herrschaftsantritt der Herrscher aus dem sächsischen Hause: Das ostfränkische Reich (Weimar: Böhlau, 1990), 687–714; and The Annals of Fulda, trans. Timothy Reuter, Ninth-Century Histories, vol. 2 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 2–9.

firmly stood on the side of their king, who was deserted by most of his lay nobles, and the military detachments provided by bishoprics and abbeys were able to repel the invaders. In return, one year later, Charles the Bald publicly acknowledged the importance of episcopal anointment in his royal elevation by stating at a church council that he was anointed as king by the prerogative of bishops.

The different patterns of behavior shown by the West Frankish lay and clerical nobility point to the close ties between Charles the Bald and high clergy, headed by his spiritual advisor, Hincmar of Rheims. From the 840s, statements appeared in West Frankish councils that royal power (potestas regia) came from God and that those who obstructed it had to be anathemized. Charles the Bald, for his part, respected episcopal authority most of the time, and thus one of his capitularies repeated the concept of the Church fathers: “there are two [things] by which the world is ruled: royal power and pontifical authority.”

Furthermore, throughout his entire reign, Charles the Bald always had close ties with his abbeys like St. Martin of Tours earlier in his reign and St. Amand. Yet, it was St. Denis under the rule of his cousin Louis, who was also his archchancellor from 840 to 867, that returned to the prominence it enjoyed almost a century earlier. As a result, both episcopal civitates and favorite royal abbeys were the main stopping points in royal itineraries. The clerics—bishops, abbots, and clerical advisers like Gozlin and Hincmar of Rheims—were the social power basis and political masterminds of Charles the Bald’s regime.

175 Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, 186–9; and Innes, *State and Society*, 216.
179 Monastic mints restored their activity with the division of the empire; in the last decade of the reign of Charles the Bald, the most prolific monastic mint in the Carolingian realm was in St. Denis. See Depeyrot, *Le numéraire carolingien*, nos. 896–7.
180 In this practice, Charles the Bald was different from Louis the German, who spent more time in his royal palaces in Regensburg and Frankfurt than visiting his abbeys and episcopal civitates. For details, see Kaiser, *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königsgn und Fürstenmacht*, 94; and Hartmann, *Ludwig der Deutsche*, 125–30 and 173–87.
181 On the importance of political and economic support of the West Frankish church for Charles the Bald, see Nelson, “Charles the Bald and the Church,” 103–18. For the military function of the church in this period, see Prinz, *Klerus und Krieg im
The function of the West Frankish clergy in the symbolic communication of the grace of God to Charles the Bald was as significant as more mundane duties; precisely because of this liturgical function, the clergy acquired the primary role in a new triangle of authority. The main task of the clergy was not only to bestow the grace of God upon the king through the ritual of anointment performed by bishops, but also to provide him with an unceasing flow of divine grace through the developed regular liturgy of authority. As shown in chapter 2, for this purpose, various texts necessary for royal masses were disseminated in West Francia under the patronage of the royal court, and the name of the Carolingian king was even brought into the canon of the mass.

Eric J. Goldberg has demonstrated that, unlike Charles the Bald with his close ties to high clergy, Louis the German relied more on the lay military elite. His frontier kingdom, consisting of various Germanic gentes, included the most warlike military elite in the entire Carolingian realm. The Slavic border provided him with abundant opportunities for plunder and military tribute to cement aristocratic support. To a certain extent, this situation was similar to Frankish military expansion at the time of Charlemagne. Another similarity is that, in both cases, the Frankish tradition dominated the symbolic communication of authority; Goldberg provides numerous examples of “a highly militarized style of Frankish warrior kingship,” typical of Louis the German’s rulership. This image accords with the liturgical developments in the East Frankish kingdom, reviewed in chapter 2.

The Frankish tradition was, however, less important in the indirect communication of rulers’ authority in the Middle Frankish kingdom, as demonstrated by the texts of royal masses copied there and by the image of Lothar I produced in his court school (fig. 54). After 834, many imperial supporters of Lothar I fled to Italy, and, partly due to the continuity provided by these advisors, his coinage, seals, signum, and intitulature continued to employ the imperial elements previously used by those of Louis the Pious. Another important factor leading to the


\[\text{182 “More Devoted to the Equipment of Battle,” 41–78. See the discussion of the reign of Louis the German in Goldberg, Struggle for Empire.}\]

\[\text{183 Ibid., 44–5. For a more detailed discussion of the two different styles of the symbolic communication of royal authority presented by Louis the German and Charles the Bald, see Goldberg, “More Devoted to the Equipment of Battle,” 73–8.}\]
frequent use of imperial symbols, graphic signs, images, and formulas was the significance of imperial legitimacy for Lothar’s rulership. It was Lothar I who controlled the old imperial capital, Aachen. Finally, these communicative elements addressed the expectations of the subjects in northern Italy, which was his powerbase from the late 820s until the early 840s, when it was given to his son Louis II. Nevertheless, the realm of Lothar I was too diverse, and available evidence is so far too scarce and insufficiently studied in modern historiography to determine if imperial semantic elements continued to dominate the symbolic language of authority throughout his imperial kingdom.

The state of Lothar’s imperial successor, Louis II, was confined to Italy, so one may expect the dominance of the imperial code in his representation of authority. His imperial titles on charters and coins support this assumption. The clause that requests prayers on his behalf in the imperial charters given to monasteries and episcopal churches repeats that his empire was bestowed upon him directly by God (a deo nobis collati or a deo nobis concessi). The imperial code also dominates the letter of Louis II to Emperor Basil I written in 871. Although its text refers to the gens Francorum and papal anointment as the “symbolic capital” of his emperorship, these references do not contradict the main thesis that the Carolingian rulers were legitimate heirs of Roman Christian rulers and that they received their imperial authority according to God’s will. Finally, the letter directly states that the Carolingian emperors were, first and foremost, imperatores Romanorum and only then emperors of the Franks, with their legitimacy deriving from Rome, the “mother” of the Christian church, and the Romans.

---

186 Ludovici II. Diplomata, 92, 139, and 142.
188 “Praeterea mirari se dilecta fraternitas tua significent, quod non Francorum et Romanorum imperatores appellamus se scire te convenit, quia nisi Romanorum imperatore semus, utique nec Francorum. A Romanis enim hoc nomen et dignitatem assumpsimus, apud quos profecto primum tanta culmen sublimitas et appellantionis effusit, quorumque gentem et urbem divinitus guberandum et matrem omnium ecclesiarum Dei defendendam arque sublimandam suscepmus, a qua et regnandi prius et postmodum imperandi auctoritatem prosapiae nostrae seminarium sumpsit,” ibid., 389.
accentuated role of Roman imperial tradition no doubt owed to Louis’ adjustment to the “horizon of expectations” of his Italian subjects seen in his diplomas and coins.

The imperial tradition was also strong in the kingdom of another son of Lothar I, Lothar II. Hans Hubert Anton’s studies on the church councils in Lothar II’s kingdom have demonstrated the strong influence of the code *imperator Augustus* on their documents. Similar to his father, Lothar II was not anointed, and initially his nobles supported the East Frankish king, Louis the German. Yet the Lotharingian episcopate stood firmly on the side of Lothar II, helping him survive the turmoil of the first years in his reign. Under the leadership of Adventius of Metz, in the documents of the Lotharingian church councils of the 860s (like the Aachen Council of 862), they stated that the king as God’s vicar was installed in his office directly by the Lord. Thus, the high clergy of Lothar II seems to have returned to the political tradition of imperial rulership, which was prominent in the early years of Louis the Pious’ reign; accordingly, the documents of the church councils, especially those written by Adventius of Metz, are replete with Roman imperial vocabulary. This political tradition diverged from the approach promoted by some members of the West Frankish high clergy personified by Hincmar of Rheims, namely, that kingship was a royal ministerium heavily dependent on episcopal authority.

Yet, as stressed by Janet Nelson, “Hincmar was not always listened to by a king who had a mind of his own, and the option of seeking other counsellors.” In these decades, Roman imperial elements were

---

190 For details, see ibid., 79–84.
gradually revived in the language of authority employed at the West Frankish court. The edict of Pîtres (864), greatly influenced by late Roman legislation, is the most obvious example. The promotion of royal liturgy during the same years is also reminiscent of Roman imperial liturgy. The use of imperial elements increased considerably after the coronation in Metz in 869—conducted by both Hincmar of Rheims and Adventius of Metz—and the inclusion of a part of Lotharingia in the West Frankish kingdom, culminating after the imperial coronation at Christmas of 875. In the latter case, he was anointed emperor by the grace of God, a fact pointed out by Hincmar in *The Annals of St. Bertin* but left unnoticed in the sources written away from the inner circle of Charles the Bald. Henceforth, the title *Karolus gratia Dei imperator* and its variants appeared in his charters and coinage; in spite of imperial status, the grace of God still mattered. The royal images produced at his court in these years also leaned on imperial attributes that derived from late imperial Rome and contemporary Byzantium. In this imagery, the visual motif of the grace of God was reworked at the court school to be presented as directly descending upon the West Frankish king (fig. 57–8 and 63). These facts suggest that during the second half of the reign of Charles the Bald, Roman imperial elements were actively incorporated in the code “*gratia Dei rex*” at his court to claim the highest status in the contemporary political hierarchy right above his powerful bishops.

This view on royal authority was propagated in two letters of Charles the Bald sent to Pope Hadrian II in 871 and 872. These letters state that the king was not a “bishops’ bailiff” but “the lord of the earth,” who, by God’s grace, was raised up to kingship through legitimate succession

---

194 “Translating Images of Authority,” 89–98. She sees the first signs of such revival in 852 when Charles the Bald established the liturgical commemoration of his own birthday: Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, 168.

195 This might have been partly a response to the “horizon of expectations” of Lotharingian bishops, whose influence is noticeable at the coronation of 869. The political treatise by Sedulius Scottus, *On Christian Rulers*, written under the patronage of Adventius of Metz, nicely illustrates this convergence of Lotharingian and West Frankish political cultures. Sedulius Scottus, *Liber de rectoribus Christianis*, ed. S. Hellmann, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, vol. 1 (Munich: Beck, 1906). For details, see Anton, “Verfassungspolitik und Liturgie,” 88–94 and 97–101; and Staubach, *Rex christianus*, 105–221.

from his grandfather and father.197 This combination of legitimacy by succession and grace brings into view another important element of legislative discourse in the kingdom of Charles the Bald: the constant references to the deeds and laws of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious (secundum capitula avi et patris nostri).198 The increasing importance of direct succession for royal authority also enhanced the status of queens, who began to be solemnly elevated to their queenship at that time. The significance of royal lineage found another expression in the appearance in sacramentaries from the mid-ninth century of special masses on behalf of the king, the queen, and their children.

As the symbolic language of authority had been transformed steadily during the reign of Charles the Bald, Frankish traditional elements addressed to the lay nobility were also grafted onto the new “stock” (gratia Dei rex) of the symbolic language of Carolingian authority. “Consent” policy was at the core of these references, and the capitularies of Charles the Bald often expressed his thanks to fideles for their faithful service.199 Thus, the king by the grace of God always had to express thanks (agere gratias) to hisnobles, who were a mundane pillar of his royal authority. The acknowledgement of this fact was expressed through rituals and procedures connecting the ruler with his nobility.200

This new image of royal authority, an image addressing various audiences and adjusting to the “horizons of expectations” of different subjects, was propagated by the court of Charles the Bald after 864 in order to gain as much loyalty from subjects as possible. This image resulted from the constant communication of royal authority, in which the “voices” of bishops and lay nobles were as important as the agenda propagated by the royal court. The common base of this polyphony was the acknowledgement of Charles not simply as a Christian king201—but there were many Christian kings in the Carolingian post-imperial space—but
as the \textit{gratia Dei rex}. This basic consensus allowed the use of this motif in different media communicating royal authority, namely, coins, seals, charters, miniatures, liturgy, and literary works.

The short unification of the West Frankish kingdom with Lotharingia, Provence, and northern Italy compelled Charles the Bald and his entourage to employ different semantic elements more actively in the symbolic communication of his authority in order to accommodate such diverse, both historically and culturally, political entities. An example that illustrates such adaptative behavior is the communicative use of different vestments by the emperor at the Council of Ponthien (876), visited by Frankish and Italian bishops, as well as by papal legates. At the opening of the church council, Charles appeared in moderate Frankish clothes (\textit{in vestitu deaurato, habitu Francico}), thus both addressing his Frankish audience and stressing the Frankish roots of his legitimation. Six days later, he visited the council attired like an early Byzantine emperor (\textit{Grecisco more paratus et coronatus}), thus demonstrating to the Italian audience the imperial roots of his recently enhanced authority.202 To balance the different “horizons of expectations” with different modes of presenting authority, and thus, to maintain a “consensus,” was a very difficult business.

Even so, balancing the practical interests of different audiences was even more difficult, not to say impossible, as demonstrated by Charles’ final actions in 877. Pulled in two directions by the need to check the destructive incursions of Northmen in West Francia and by the papal call to defend Italian lands from Muslim raids, Charles the Bald tried to meet both demands, which brought great pressure to bear on the social and economic resources of his authority.203 Exhausted and unable to succeed in either task, he died halfway between his Frankish and Italian lands. Although in the symbolic communication of his own authority, Charles was capable of addressing various audiences inhabiting his realm, to balance the diverging social and political interests of the different political and regional groups gathered in his short-lived

\footnotesize{202} Annales Bertiniani, 128 and 130–1. See also Nelson, \textit{Charles the Bald}, 243–4. The use of two different costumes by Charles the Bald repeats the behavior of Louis the Pious; see Garipzanov, “The Image of Authority in Carolingian Coinage,” 216.

\footnotesize{203} For the detailed description of these actions, see Annales Bertiniani, 135–7. Hincmar of Rheims did not mention the negative reaction of Frankish nobility and clergy to Charles’ Italian expedition that threatened “consensus,” but The Annals of St. Vaast leave no doubt about their sentiments: Annales Vedastini, 41–2. Cf., Nelson, \textit{Charles the Bald}, 248–53.
empire was a task impossible even for such a shrewd politician and a gratia Dei rex, as Charles the Bald truly was.\textsuperscript{204} 

After death, his body was buried at St. Denis in a coffin that could have been made from an ancient Roman red marble bathtub brought from Italy in 876.\textsuperscript{205} (If true, the choice of red marble might be in imitation of the porphyry imperial sarcophagi at Constantinople.) This final image nicely summarizes the transformation of the symbolic language of Carolingian authority between 751 and 877: the king by the grace of God resting in the Roman imperial sarcophagus in the traditional burial place of the Frankish kings.


\textsuperscript{205} For details on this hypothesis, see Nelson, “Carolingian Royal Funerals,” 161–3.
EPILOGUE

This study started with the story that described the rejection of distant imperial authority in Rome in 711, as well as with the assumption that the four media mentioned there played major roles in the indirect communication of authority between rulers and their remote subjects in the early Middle Ages. Hence, this analysis of the symbolic language of authority in the Carolingian world has focused on regular royal liturgy, royal charters, coinage, and the imagery of rulers. Yet, the concluding scrutiny of wider political contexts within which they operated suggests that they were not the only media in that process and, furthermore, that the relative importance of such media greatly differed across early medieval Europe. In the Carolingian world, there were other channels involved in the indirect communication of authority, such as military camps or oaths of fidelity mentioned in the conclusion, and I hope future research may shed more light on the media that were left by the wayside in this book.

This study has also demonstrated that while the symbolic language of authority employed similar modes in the Byzantine and Carolingian worlds, it functioned within different social environments. In the early Byzantine world, which was descended from late antiquity, this “language” was focused on an urban context, pointing to major cities like Constantinople or Rome as key points in the landscape of power. This landscape of power in the Carolingian world was quite different from that of late antiquity. Political power was concentrated at royal courts and major monasteries, which connected the royal center with local elites. Monasteries, intended to be places of seclusion from earthly life and the world of politics, became the epicenters of political life. Hence, the symbolic language of authority—via royal liturgy, diplomas, and imagery—marked out these crucial nodes of Carolingian politics, so different from the classical world of public politics.

Finally, I would like to point to some wider implications that this book offers for the study of Carolingian society and medieval politics. First, it points to the continuity of political traditions from the seventh and first half of the eighth century to the early Carolingian period, on the one hand, and from the late Carolingian period to the high Middle Ages, on the other.
Second, by presenting some examples of regional differences in graphic signs, images, and liturgical and diplomatic formulas, this book confirms another important aspect of Carolingian society that has been repeatedly emphasized in recent studies: regional diversity. One may argue that the evidence presented in this book is in some parts very thin due to the nature of the sources used here. However, taken as a whole, the analyzed material clearly indicates that Carolingian authority often meant different things in different regions and that this diversity had a strong impact on the ways in which the Carolingian rulers symbolically presented themselves and their authority across their realm.

Third, this study offers another look at the issue of the medieval state, which has recently become a subject of intense polemic—exemplified by the debates between Rees Davies and Susan Reynolds in English, and between Johannes Fried and Hans-Werner Goetz in German. Davies and Fried have argued that the definition of the state is not applicable to medieval polities, especially in the early Middle Ages, because medieval politics were defined in most cases by personal relations between the ruler and elites. Therefore, in their opinion, “lordship” or “Herrschaftsverband” (bonds of lordship) are better terms for describing those power relations. This study confirms this view by demonstrating that the symbolic language of authority greatly depended on personalities at the royal/imperial court and on personal relations between the ruler and his elites. Even so, this study also shows that personal bonds of lordship between the rulers and nobility, no matter how important they might have been, were not the only means of defining Carolingian politics.

Although the political community within which the symbolic language of authority functioned in the Carolingian world was dominated by the clerical and lay aristocracy, it was by no means limited to this social group. The political importance of May camps and oaths of fidelity during the Carolingian period suggests that the freemen who participated in such public rituals were considered the subjects of collective political actions. Moreover, the fact that, in the period under

---

analysis, the Carolingian center strictly controlled coinage, using it to propagate symbolic political messages, indicates that for the Carolingians and their advisors, it did matter how their authority was presented to, and perceived by, various social groups in their realm. As to whether it was the “state” or “bonds of lordship” that, metaphorically speaking, materialized in the minds of the majority of Carolingian subjects when imagining the polity they lived in, I leave this question to future studies.
APPENDICES

Abbreviations for Sacramentaries


*The “Gregorian” and Mixed Tradition*


SArb—the Sacramentary of Albi (Fleury, s. IX med. or c. 850–875), CLLA no. 756: Albi, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 4.

SARl—the Sacramentary of Arles (Lyons, before 840), CLLA no. 744:1 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 2812; Deshusses, 1:424–6.

SArr—the Sacramentary of St. Vaast of Arras (the monastery of St Vaast of Arras, s. IX2), CLLA no. 761: Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 162 et 163; Deshusses, 1:177–8, and 424–6.

SB—the Sacramentary of Beauvais (Northern France, s. IX2), CLLA no. 750: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 9429.

SBer—the Sacramentary of Berenger (Northern France, s. IX med.), CLLA no. 728: Monza, Biblioteca Capitolare [Tesoro del Duomo], Deshusses, 3:53.

SC—the Sacramentary of Cambrai (Cambrai, 812), CLLA no. 720: Deshusses, 1:85–348.

SCh—the Sacramentary of Chelles (St. Amand, c. 855): New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Department of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, Ms. G. 57.

SCol—the Sacramentary of Cologne (Fulda for the Cathedral of Cologne, s. X1), CLLA no. 746b: Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 88.

---

1 Gamber gives a wrong shelfmark 2912.
SCon—the Sacramentary of Constance (Reichenau, c. 850–875), CLLA no. 738: Donaueschingen, Fürstliche Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek, Cod. 191.

SDen—the Sacramentary of St. Denis (St. Amand for St. Denis, c. 867), CLLA no. 760: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 2290.

SDro—the Sacramentary of Drogo (Metz for Bishop Drogo, 845–855), CLLA no. 912: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 9428.


SEss—the Sacramentary of Essen (the north-western part of Germany, Corvey?, c. 870), CLLA no. 915: Dusseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, cod. D1; Deshusses, 1:177, 3:48–9.

SFlo—the Sacramentary of Florence (Northern Italy, s. IX ex.), CLLA no. 755: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ms. Aedili 121; Deshusses, 3:52–3.


SGerm—the Sacramentary of St.-Germain-des-Prés (St. Amand, c. 875–876), CLLA no. 925: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 2291.


SMain—the Sacramentary of Mainz (Mainz or St. Gall for St. Alban of Mainz, s. IX ex.), CLLA no. 737: *St. Alban Sakramentar*: Mainz, Bischöfliche Priesterseminarbibliothek, Hs. 1.

SMar—the Sacramentary of Le Mans (St. Amand, c. 851), CLLA no. 743: Le Mans, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 77.

SMetz—the Sacramentary Fragment of Metz, CLLA no. 771: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 1141; facsimile edition—*Sakramentar*

SMod—the Sacramentary of Modena (for Modena, s. IX med.), CLLA no. 729: Modena, Biblioteca Capitolare, Cod. 0.II.7.

SNon—the Sacramentary of Nonantola (Court School of Charles the Bald, Compiègne? for John of Arezzo, c. 850–875), CLLA no. 770: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 2292.

SNoy—the Sacramentary of Noyon (St. Amand, c. 869), CLLA no. 1385: Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 213.


SPam—the Sacramentary of Pamelius (Northern France for the Cathedral of Cologne, c. 870–875), CLLA no. 746a: Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 137.


SRh2—the Sacramentary of Rheinau #2 (Northern France, s. IX ex.), CLLA no. 748: Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, Cod. Rheinau 43.

SRod—the Sacramentary of Rodrad (Amiens, for Corbie, 853), CLLA no. 742: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 12050.

SSenl—the Sacramentary of Senlis (St. Denis, c. 880): Paris, Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Ms. 111; Deshusses, 3:50–1.

SSens—the Sacramentary of Sens (St. Amand, c. 876–877), CLLA no. 763: Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Ms. A 136.

SSStav—the Sacramentary of Stavelot (Northern France, for the abbey of Stavelot, s. IX), CLLA no. 734: London, British Library, Ms. Add. 16605.
STour1—the Sacramentary of St. Martin of Tours (St. Martin of Tours, s. IX ex.), CLLA no. 1385b: Tours, Bibliothèque Municipale, Ms. 184.

STour2—the Sacramentary of St. Maurice of Tours (St. Martin of Tours, s. X in.): Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. acq. lat. 1589; Deshusses, 3:58–9.

STourn—the Sacramentary of Tournai (St. Amand, c. 863), CLLA no. 926: Saint-Petersburg, Publichnaja Biblioteka, Ms. Q v. I #41.


SVer1—the Sacramentary of Verona #1 (Verona, c. 800–825), CLLA no. 725: Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, Cod. 91.

SVer2—the Sacramentary of Verona #2 (Verona, s. IX med.), CLLA no. 726: Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, Cod. 86.

1. *Roman Roots of the Gelasian Missa pro regibus*  
*based on Chavasse, Le sacramentaire gélasien, 511*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman prototypes</th>
<th>Missa pro regibus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the second oration and secreta)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Prov., 21,1. ita cor regis in manu domini | SV, no. 1506, 218. Deus in cuius manu corda sunt regum, inclina ad preces humilitatis nostrae aures misericordiae tuae et principibus nostris famulis tuis illis regimen appone sapientiae, ut haustis de tuo fonte consilii et tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecequent. |
| SV, no. 1488, 215. Deus qui... inclina ad preces humilitatis nostrae aures misericordiae tuae | SV, no. 1507, 216. Suscipe, Domine, preces et hostias ecclesiae tuae, pro salute famuli tui illius supplicantis, et protectione fidelium populum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut superatis pacis inimicis, secura tibi serviat Romana libertas. Per |
| SV, n.o. 1480,214. ...et tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecequent. |  |

SL, no. 1132, 143.  
Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, in protectione fidelium populum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut hostibus nostris tua virtute compressis secura tibi serviat Romana devotio. Per
2. *The Gelasian Mass for Kings* (Missa pro regibus)  
*from the Vatican Sacramentary (with Mohlberg’s corrections)*  

*a*) *Latin text*²  

Deus, regnorum omnium et Romani maxime protector imperii,  
da servis tuis regibus nostris illis triumphum virtutis tuae scienter  
excolere, ut cuius constitutione sunt principes, eius semper munere  
sint potentes. Per.  

¹Deus, in⁸ cuius manu corda sunt regum, inclina ad preces⁵ humilitas⁴  
nostrae aures misericordiae tuae ut principibus nostris tuis illis  
regimen tuae adponere sapientiae, ut haustis de tuo fonte consiliis et tibi  
placeant et super omnia regna praecellant. Per.  

**Secreta**¹. Suscipe, domine, praeces⁷ et hostias aecclesiae tuae pro  
salute famuli tui illius supplicantes et protectione fidelium populorum  
antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut superatis pacis inimicis secura  
tibi serviat Romanar libertas. Per.  

**Infra accionem**¹. Hanc igitur oblacionem, domine, famuli tui illius,  
quam tibi ministerio officii sacerdotalis offerimus, pro eo quod in ipsum  
potestatem imperii conferre dignatus es, propicius et benignus  
adsume; et exoratus nostra obsecratione concede, ut maiestatis tuae  
protectione confidens, et evo augeatur et regno. Per.  

---  
² Mohlberg, ed. *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae*, 217–8. The following Gelasian sacramentaries have been consulted in addition to SV (III, 62): SPr (246), SRh1 (228), SA (II, 102), SPh (382), SG (405), LG.  
³ Romanorum—SG, Francorumque—add. in SA; ² nostros—SG; ⁴ N.—SPr; ⁵ sti-  
enter—SG; ⁶ super numere—SPr; ⁷ the second oration is omitted in SP, SRh1, LG; ⁸ omit. in SRh1, SPh, SG; ⁹ humana—SG, ⁷ precis—SG; ¹ humilitatis—SPh, SA, SG;  
¹ et—SA; ¹ Super obleta—SRh1, SPh, LG; ² precis—SG; ³ supplicantis—SRh1, SA, LG; ³ in—add. in LG; ⁸ brachii—SP, SRh1, SA, SPh, SG, LG; ⁹ operante—SRh1;  
¹ Christianorum Romanae—SPh, Christianorum Romana—SRh1, SA, LG, Christiano-  
rum—SG; ¹ actionem—SA, SPh, SG, actione—SRh1, omit. in SP, *Infra actionem* part is  
 omitted in LG; ¹ oblationem—SP, SRh1, SA, SPh, SG, LG; ³ famulum tum ill.—SG,  
famuli tui N.—SPr; ³ minsterio—SP, ministerii—SG; ⁸ omit.—SG; ⁹ propitius—SP,  
SA, SPh, SG, LG; ² adsumme—SRh, assumme—SG; ² omit. in SG; ³ exoratis—SG;  
⁸ maiestati—SPr; ⁸ tuo—SG;
**Post communionem**

Deus, qui praedicando aeterni regni evangelium Romanum imperium praeparasti, praetende famulis tuis illis principibus nostris arma caelestia, et pax aecclesiarum nullo turbetur tempestate bellorum. Per.

b) *English translation*

**[The First Collect:]** O God, protector of all the kingdoms and, above all, of the Roman empire, let your slaves, our kings, 

*N.*

expertly perfect the triumph of your virtue so that they may always be powerful by the favor of the one by whose disposition they are princes.

**[The Second Collect:]** O God, in whose hand are the kings’ hearts, incline the ears of your mercy to the prayers of our humility and bring the guidance of your wisdom to our princes, your servants, 

*N.*

so that, after counsels are imbibed from your fountain, they may please you and may rise above all the kingdoms.

**The Secret:** O Lord, accept the prayers and sacrifices of your church, beseeching for the safety of your servant 

*N.*, and perform the ancient miracles of your arm for the protection of faithful peoples so that, after the enemies of peace are overcome, secure Roman liberty may serve you.

**Infra actionem:** O Lord, propitiously and favorably accept this offering of your servant 

*N.*, which we make with the sacred vessels of the priestly service, because you have deigned to invest the power of empire in him; and implored by our prayer, grant that he, confident of the protection of your majesty, may be blessed with age and kingdom.

**The Postcommunion:** O God, you who have prepared the Roman Empire for preaching the Gospel of the eternal kingdom, place celestial arms in front of your servants, our princes, 

*N.*, and the peace of churches may never be disturbed by the tempest of wars.

---

*d* Ad c.—SPr; *et nostri*—SG; *regis*—SPh, SA; *evangelium*—SA, SG, LG; *omit.* in SPr; *omit.* in SPr; *ut*—SPr, SRh1, SA, SPh, SG, LG; *nulla*—SA, nullum—SG; *turbentur*—SPr
3a. *The Mass for Kings* (Missa pro regibus) *in Gregorian Sacramentaries in the Ninth Century: The corrected version of Benedict of Aniane*

**A. Latin Text**

Deus regnorum omnium et Christiani maxime protector imperii, da servis tuis regibus nostris\(^a\) illius\(^b\) triumphum virtutis tuae scienter excolere, ut qui tua constitutione\(^c\) sunt principes, tuo\(^d\) semper munere sint\(^e\) potentes\(^f\). Per.

**Super oblata**\(^g\). Suscipe domine praece et hostias aeclesiae tuae pro salute famuli tui illius\(^b\) supplicantis et in protectione fidelium populum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut superatis pacis inimicis secura tibi serviat\(^i\) Christiana libertas. Per.

**Infra actionem**\(^j\). Hanc igitur oblationem famuli tui illius\(^b\), quam tibi ministerio officii sacerdotalis offerimus, pro eo quod in ipso\(^l\) potestatem imperii conferre\(^m\) dignatus es, propitius et benignus adsumere\(^n\), et exoratus nostra\(^o\) obsecratione concede, ut maiestatis tuae protectione confidens\(^p\), et aevo augeatur\(^q\) et regno\(^r\). Per.

**Ad complendum**\(^s\). Deus, qui ad praedicandum aeterni regis evangelium Romanum\(^t\) imperium praeparasti, praetende famulis tuis\(^u\) principibus nostris\(^v\) arma caelestia, ut pax aeclesiarum nulla turbetur tempestate bellorum. Per.

\(^3\) The text is from Benedict’s Supplement to the Gregorian sacramentaries: FG (S63), SReg (S63), SM (S64), SRod (S64), SP (S63), SMan (S63), SCh (S71), STourn (S75), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71), S (S71).

\(^a\) servo tuo imperatori nostro—*corr.* in SCol; \(^b\) *omit.* in SNoY ill et ill.—SPam, N—SCol, \(^c\) *cuius constitutiones*—SCol\(^2\) (correction); \(^d\) *princeps eius*—SCol\(^2\); \(^e\) *sit*—SCol\(^2\); \(^f\) potestates, *corr.* potentes—SCol; \(^g\) *Secreta*—SCol; \(^h\) *famulorum tuorum illorum*—SRod, SCh, SGerm, SB, *famularum tuorum*—SNoy; \(^i\) *serviant*—SCol; \(^j\) *omit.* in FG; \(^k\) *famulorum tuorum illorum*—SRod, SCh, SGerm, SB, *famularum tuorum*—SNoy, ill et ill.—SPam, SCh, SGerm, SB, *famularum tuorum*—SCol; \(^l\) *ipsis*—SRod, SCh, SNoy, SGerm; \(^m\) *conservare*—SCol; \(^n\) *assume*—SPar, SRod, SCh, SNoy, SGerm, SPam, SCol, SB\(^2\) (correction); \(^o\) *omit.*—SCol; \(^p\) *confidentes*—SRod, SCh, SNoy, SGerm, SPam, SB; \(^q\) in regno diesque—SCol; \(^r\) *auegantur*—SRod, SCh, SNoy, SGerm, SB; \(^s\) *Ad completa*—SMan, SCh, STourn, Ad com.—SPar, SRod, SCol, Post com.—SPam; \(^t\) *Christianum*—SCol; \(^u\) *ill.—add.* in SPam, N—add. in SCol; \(^v\) *famulo tuo N imperatori nostro*—SCol\(^2\)
B. *English translation*⁴

**[Collect:]** O God, protector of all the kingdoms and, above all, of the Christian empire, let your slaves, our kings, N. expertly perfect the triumph of your virtue so that those who are princes by your disposition may always be powerful by your favor.

**The Secret:** O Lord, accept the prayers and sacrifices of your church for the safety of your beseeching servant N., and perform the ancient miracles of your arm for the protection of faithful peoples so that, after the enemies of peace are overcome, secure Christian liberty may serve you.

**Infra actionem:** O Lord, propitiously and favorably accept this offering of your servant N., which we make with the sacred vessels of the priestly service, because you have deigned to invest the power of empire in him; and implored by our prayer, grant that he, confident of the protection of your majesty, may be blessed with age and kingdom.

**The Postcommunion:** O God, you who have prepared the Roman Empire for preaching the Gospel of the eternal King, place celestial arms in front of your servants, our princes, N. so that the peace of churches may never be disturbed by the tempest of wars.

3b. *The Mass for Kings (Missa pro regibus) in Gregorian Sacramentaries in the Ninth Century: Modified Gelasian versions*⁵

*Deus regnorum omnium et Christiani maxime protector imperii, da servis tuis regibus nostris illis triumphum virtutis tuae scienter*

---

⁴ Cf. another translation of this mass in Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy*, 40.

⁵ The following Gregorian sacramentaries have been consulted: STre (194, *Oratio pro regibus*), SVer1, SVer2, SPad, SGal2, SMain.

* a The first oration is omitted in SPad, SGal2; b Romanorum—SVer1 (original), SVer2 (original); c es—*add.* in SVer1; d servo tuo imperatori—SVer2, servo tuo regi—STre, SVer2 (correction), SMain; e nostro—SVer2, SMain, *omit.* in STre; f Berengari et Adelberii r.—*add.* in SVer2
excolere, ut qui tua\(^{a}\) constitutione sunt principes\(^{b}\), tuo\(^{i}\) semper munere sint potentis\(^{l}\). Per.

Deus, in cuius manu corda sunt regum, inclina ad preces humilitatis nostrae aures misericordiae tuae, ut\(^{i}\) principibus nostris\(^{m}\) famulis nostris ill.\(^{n}\) regimen tuae adpone\(^{o}\) sapientiae\(^{p}\), ut haustis de tuo fonte consiliis et tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecellant\(^{q}\). Per.

Super oblata\(^{r}\). Suscipe domine praeces et hostias aeccliae tuae pro salute\(^{t}\) famuli tui illius\(^{s}\) supplicantis et in\(^{p}\) protectione fidelium populum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut superatis pacis\(^{v}\) inimicis\(^{w}\) secura tibi serviat\(^{x}\) Christiana\(^{y}\) libertas. Per.

Infra actionem\(^{z}\). Hanc igitur oblationem\(^{b}\) famuli tui illius quam\(^{h}\) tibi\(^{i}\) ministerio officii sacerdotalis offerimus, pro eo quod in ipso\(^{d}\) potestatem imperii conferre dignatus es, propitius et\(^{e}\) benignus admune\(^{f}\), et exoratus\(^{g}\) nostra obseccionem concede, ut maiestatis tuae protectione confidens\(^{h}\), et aevo augeatur\(^{i}\) et regno. Per.

Ad complendum\(^{j}\). Deus, qui ad\(^{k}\) praedicandum\(^{l}\) aeterni regim\(^{n}\) evangeliu\(^{o}\) Romanum\(^{p}\) imperium praeparasti\(^{q}\), praeitende famulis tuis\(^{s}\) principibus nostris\(^{e}\) arma caelestia, ut pax ecclesiarum nulla turbetur tempestate bellorum\(^{t}\). Per.

---

\(^{a}\) cuius—STre; \(^{b}\) es principes—SVer2, est princeps—STre, SMain; \(^{i}\) eius—STre; \(^{l}\) sit potens—SVer2, SMain, sit protectus—STre; \(^{k}\) The second oration is omitted in SMain, SVer2; \(^{t}\) et—in STre, SGal2; \(^{m}\) principibus nostris omit. in STre, et regi nostro—SPad; \(^{o}\) famulo tuo illi—STre, SPad; \(^{p}\) appone—SGal2; \(^{n}\) regiminis tuae appone saientiam—SPad; \(^{q}\) praecellat—STre; \(^{r}\) Secreta—STre, SGal2, SMain; \(^{s}\) omit. in SVer2; \(^{t}\) famulorum tuorum illorum—SVer1, SVer2; \(^{u}\) om. in SVer1, SVer2, paucis—SGal2; \(^{v}\) pacis—add. in SVer1, SVer2; \(^{w}\) deserviat—STre; \(^{x}\) Franchorum—SGal2, Christianorum—STre, SVer1, SVer2; \(^{y}\) Coniunctio—SMain; the Infra actionem part is missing in STre, SVer2; \(^{b}\) domine—add. in SGal2; \(^{e}\) famulorum tuorum illorum quas—SVer1; \(^{i}\) in—add. in SGal2; \(^{d}\) ipsum—SVer1, SVer2, SMain; \(^{j}\) assume—SGal2, SMain; \(^{g}\) exorati—SVer1; \(^{h}\) confidentes—SVer1; \(^{l}\) augeantur—SVer1; \(^{i}\) Post comp.—SVer1, omit. in SVer2, omit in STre, SVer1, SVer2; \(^{m}\) praedicando—STre; \(^{n}\) regni—STre, SVer1, SGal2; \(^{e}\) evangelio—STre; \(^{o}\) Romanorum—SVer1, Romanorum et Franchorum—SGal2, Christianum—SVer1, SVer2, SGal2; \(^{p}\) dilatasti—SGal2; \(^{q}\) famulo tuo—SVer2, SMain; famulo tuo illo—STre, ill.—add. in SVer1; \(^{r}\) om. in STre, principi nostro—SMain, imperatori nostro—SVer2, regi nostro—SVer2; \(^{t}\) ut pax ecclesiarum te donante semper renovetur et crescat—STre
4. The Key Changes in the Good Friday Mass and in the Missa Pro Regibus in the Second Half of the Eighth Through Ninth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacr.</th>
<th>Date (Place of production)</th>
<th>Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui regnis omnibus aeterna potestate dominaris, respice propitius ad ** benignus imperium (Gelasian version)⁶</th>
<th>Deus, regnorum omnium et ** maxime protector imperii</th>
<th>ut superatis pacis inimicis secura tibi serviat ** libertas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>s. VIII med. (Neustria)</td>
<td>Romanum sive Francorum</td>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>Romana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>before 794 (Bavaria)</td>
<td>Romanum</td>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>Romana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRh1</td>
<td>c. 795–800 (Alemannia or Rhaetia)</td>
<td>Romanorum atque Francorum</td>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>Romanorum Romane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>c. 800 (Aquitaine)</td>
<td>Romanum sive Francorum</td>
<td>Romani Francorumque</td>
<td>Christianorum Romana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>790s (Neustria)</td>
<td>Romanorum sive Francorum</td>
<td>Romanorum</td>
<td>Christianorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPh</td>
<td>c. 800 (Burgundy)</td>
<td>Romanorum</td>
<td>Romani</td>
<td>Christianorum Romane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGall</td>
<td>796–806 (Rhaetia) (corrected to Christianorum)</td>
<td>Romanorum</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STre</td>
<td>c. 825–830 (Tyrol)</td>
<td>Christianum</td>
<td>Christiani</td>
<td>Christianorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVer2</td>
<td>s. IX med. (Verona)</td>
<td>Romanum (corrected later to Christiani)</td>
<td>Christianorum Romana</td>
<td>Christianorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC, SReg, SM, SCh, SSens</td>
<td>812–c.876</td>
<td>Romanum</td>
<td>Christiani</td>
<td>Christiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPad, SPar</td>
<td>840–855</td>
<td>Christianum</td>
<td>Christiani</td>
<td>Christiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>s. IX² (Neustria)</td>
<td>Romanorum atque Francorum</td>
<td>Christiani</td>
<td>Christiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGall</td>
<td>s. IX² (Alemannia)</td>
<td>Christianum</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Franchorum (corrected later to Christiana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLux</td>
<td>s. IX ex. (Austrasia)</td>
<td>Christianum Francorum</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEch</td>
<td>895–898 (Austrasia)</td>
<td>Romanum seu Francorum</td>
<td>Christiani</td>
<td>Christiana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. *The Everyday Mass for a King* (Missa cotidiana pro rege)  
*from the supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary*

A. *Latin text*

Quaesumus omnipotens deus ut famulus tuus ille, qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula, virtutum etiam omnium percipiat incrementa, quibus decente ornatus, et vitiorum monstra devitare, et ad te qui via, veritas, et vita es, gratiosus valeat pervenire. Per.

**Secreta**. Munera domine quaesumus oblata sanctifica, ut et nobis unigeniti tui corpus et sanguis fiant, et illum regem ad obtinendum animae corporisque salutem, et peragendum in unctum officium, te largiente usqueaque proficiant. Per.

**Post communionem**. Haec domine oratio salutaris famulum tuum illi ab omnibus tueatur adversis, quatenus et ecclesiasticae pacis obtineat tranquillitatem, et post istius temporis decursum, ad aeternam perveniat hereditatem. Per.

B. *English translation*

**[Collect:]** We beseech you, Almighty God, that your servant N., who by your mercy took the government of the kingdom, may also experience the growth of all the virtues, by which he is adorned with propriety, and may graciously be able to avoid the abominations of sins and come to you, who are the way, truth, and life.

---

7 Deshusses, 1:425–6. The following sacramentaries have been consulted in addition: FG (S64), SReg (S64), SArl (S64), SM (S65), SPam (S64), SCol, SRh2, SRei, SPar (S65), SB (S65), SRod (S65) SCh (S72, *Missa pro rege cotidiana*), SDen, SNoy, SGerman, SSens (S38), SE, STour1.

"famulum tuum"—SM, rex noster—add. in SDen, STour1; "illum"—SM, N.—SCol, SRei, omit. in SNoy, STour1, Hluduwicus—SB (original); "a add." in SArl, SReg, FG, SRh2, SPar, SDen, a—erased in SE; "percipiet"—SPam; "decentur"—SPam; "qua [instead of qui vita]"—SM, SCh; "veritatis"—SPam; "Super oblata"—SPar, SB, S Rod, SCh, SDen, SNoy, SGerman, SSens, SE, STour1, omit. in FG; "quaesumus domine"—STour1; "illo"—SM, illius—SReg, SArl, illi—SPar, SSens, STour1, SPam, omit. in SNoy, SRei, N.—SCol; "omit."—SPam, SCol; N.—add. in SRei; "animam - SB", STour1; "ad—add." in SNoy, SGerman, SSens; "officium inunctum"—STour1; "profitat—SB"; "Ad complendum—SPar, SB, S Rod, SCh, SNoy, SE, STour1, SPam, S Col; Ad completa—S Rod, SCh, Post complendum—SRh2, omit. in FG; "salutaris sacramenti perceptio [instead of oratio salutaris]"—S Rod, SCh, SNoy, SGerman, SSens; "tum—SDen; "illum"—SAr, SReg, SSens, N.—STour1, SRei, SCol, omit. in SNoy, Hluduwicus—SB; "illium regem cum collecto clero et popolo sibi commisso—SPar; "quatenus—SB, SPam, SCol, SRh2
The Secret: O Lord, we beseech you, sanctify the offered gifts so that they may become for us the body and blood of your only son and, by your largess, may be of benefit in every thing to King N. for maintaining spiritual and bodily health and for fulfilling [his] assigned office.

The Postcommunion: O Lord, let this beneficial prayer protect your servant N. from all dangers, insofar that he may maintain the tranquility of ecclesiastical peace and arrive at the eternal inheritance after the descent of this time.

6. The Everyday Mass for a King (Missa cotidiana pro rege):
A corrected version from the Sacramentary of Le Mans

A. Latin text

Praesta quaesumus omnipotens deus ut famulus tuus ill., qui a tua miseratione suscipit regni gubernacula, a te percipiat virtutum omnium incrementa, ut in eo prudentia principaliter regnet, fortitudo quod prudentia invenerit fortiter agat, iustitia fortia acta exornet, temperantia iustitiam ne modum excedat temperet, quatenus hanc viam regiam tenens vitiorum monstris quae illam hinc inde circumstant devitare valeat, et ad te qui via, veritas, et vita es, gratiosus valeat pervenire. Per.

Super oblata. Haec domine salutaris sacramenti perceptio peccatorum nostrorum maculas diluat, et ill. regem ad regendum secundum tuam voluntatem populum idoneum reddat, ut hoc salutari ministerio contra visibles et invisibles hostes reddatur invictus, per quod mundus est divina dispensione redemptus. Per dominum.

B. English translation

The Collect: We beseech you, Almighty God, to act so that your servant N., who by your mercy took the government of the kingdom,
may also experience from you the growth of all the virtues so that
prudence may primarily govern him, fortitude, which is established by
prudence, may act bravely, justice may bravely embellish deeds, and
temperance may temper justice not to exceed a limit, insofar as, while
keeping this royal way, he may be able to avoid the abominations of
sins, which surround it henceforth, and may graciously be able to come
to you, who are the way, truth, and life.

The Secret: . . .

The Postcommunion: O Lord, shall this receiving of the beneficial
Eucharist cleanse the stains of our sins and render this king fit for rule
over the people according to your will so that through this beneficial
sacrament, by which the world was redeemed by divine dispensation,
he shall become invincible against visible and invisible enemies.

7. The Everyday Mass for a King (Missa pro rege cotidiana)
    from the Sacramentary of Sens

A. Latin text

Deus qui conteris bella, et impugnatores in te sperantium potestia
tuae defensionis expugnas, auxiliare quaeasumus famulo tuo regi nostro
illo, coniugi et proli, populoquo sibi subiecto, pro quibus suppliciethmisericordiam tuam imploramus, ut te parcente remissionem pec-
catorum percidiant, et cuncta sibi adversantia te adiuvante superare
vealaut. Per.

Super oblata. Sacrificium domine quod indigno immolamus pro-
pitius intende, ut ab omni nos bellorum nequittia exuat, et in tuae
protectionis securitate constituat, et famulum regem nostrum illum,
coniugem, prolemque, ac populum sibi commissum, et a peccatis
absolve, et ab hostium visibilium vel invisibilium insidiis, tutum atque
securum efficiat. Per dominum.

\[11\] Missa pro rege cotidiana—SSens; Missa pro rege, coniuge, populoque sibi subi-
recto—SRei; Missa pro rege, coniuge, et prole, populoque sibi subiecto—SMain.
\[a\] omit. in SRei, SMain; \[b\] omit. in SRei; \[c\] supplicier—theadd. in SRei; \[d\] Secreta—SMain;
\[e\] omit. in SRei, SMain; \[f\] bellorum exuat nequittia—SMain, exuat bellorum nequittia—
SRei; \[g\] tuum—theadd. in SRei, SMain; \[h\] omit. in SRei, SMain; \[i\] efficiat—SRei;
Ad complendum. Sacro corporis sancti et sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi refectione vegetati, supplices te rogamus omnipotens deus, ut hoc remedio singulari et salutaris, famulum tuum illum, coniugem prolemque, populumque sibi subiectum, et ab omnium purifices contagione peccatorum, et a cunctorum munias incursione periculorum. Per dominum.

B. English translation

[Collect:] O God, you who impede wars and subdue with the power of your protection the assailants of those hoping in you, we ask [you] to help your servant, our king, N., [his] wife and offspring, as well as the people subjected to him; for them, we suppliantly beseech your mercy so that, with your leniency, they may gain the remission of sins and, with your help, be able to overcome all their adversaries.

The Secret: O Lord, consider favorably the sacrifice that we, unworthy, offer so that it will clear us from every wickedness of wars and establish [us] in the security of your protection; and absolve from sins [your] servant, our king, N., [his] wife and offspring, as well as the people entrusted to him, and make [them] safe and secure from the plots of visible and invisible enemies.

The Postcommunion: Invigorated by the consumption of the consecrated body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, we suppliantly ask you, Almighty God, to clean, with this unique and saving remedy, your servant N., his wife and offspring, as well as the people subjected to him, from the contagion of all sins and protect [them] from the incursion of all dangers.

---

3 Post communionem—SRei; 4 Sacrosancti corporis—SRei, SMain; 1 regem nostrum—SRei, SMain; 1 et prolem—SRei, SMain
### 8. Royal Masses in Ninth-Century Sacramentaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place and time of production of sacramentaries</th>
<th>Royal masses in sacramentaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 STre Sabiona, Tyrol—c. 825–830</td>
<td>MR113 [the <em>Infra actionem</em> part is missing, and the Postcommunion is modified] (fols. 137v–138r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 SVer1 Verona—c. 800–825</td>
<td>MR1 (fols. 100v–102r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SVer2 Verona—s. IX med.</td>
<td>MR1 [the <em>Infra actionem</em> part is missing] (fols. 155v–156r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SPad Court School of Lothar I for Verona—825–855</td>
<td>MR1;14 addition (s. X)—MCR15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 SMod for Modena—s. IX med.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SFlo Northern Italy—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>MR2,16 MCR, MTSR17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 SDro Metz for Bishop Drogo—845–855</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 SAib Fleury—s. IX med. or c. 850–875</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SLux Eastern France—c. 850–875</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SNon Court School of Charles the Bald (Compiègne?) for John of Arezzo—c. 850–875.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 SBer Northern France—s. IX med.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 SSav Northern France,19 for the abbey of Stavelot—s. IX2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 FG Southern France—810s</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 SReg Lyons—c. 835</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 SArl Lyons—before 840</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 When an actual manuscript or its critical edition has not been available, the data is based on Deshusses, 3:19–59. The origin and dating of manuscripts is based on ibid., 1:36–47; idem, “Chronologie des sacramentaires de Saint-Amand,” 230–7; idem, “Encore le sacramentaires de Saint-Amand,” 310–2; CLLA, 325–428; and Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 85–104.

13 **MR1**—*Missa pro regibus* of type 1: the original Gelasian version with two collects and its modifications. For the text and its translation, see app. 3b.

14 A peculiar version with the second Gelasian collect, a different Postcommunion, and a special *praefatio* (Deshusses, nos. 2022–4).

15 **MCR**—*Missa cotidiana pro regre* of Benedict of Aniane; see Deshusses, nos. 1270–2. For the text and its translation, see app. 5.

16 **MR2**—*Missa pro regibus* of type 2: Benedict of Aniane’s version with the first collect; see Deshusses, nos. 1266–9. For the text and its translation, see app. 3a

17 **MTSR**—*Missa tempore synodi pro regre* of Benedict of Aniane: Deshusses, nos. 1273–9.


19 Gamber, CLLA, 344, attributed it to St. Gall or Mainz, but, according to Deshusses, 1:37, its text is close to the group of sacramentaries from Corbie and St. Amand. In addition, the illuminated **T** and **E** in the expression *Teigitur* at the beginning of the sacramentary (fol. 18v) repeat the pattern used at St. Amand. The illuminated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place and time of production of sacramentaries</th>
<th>Royal masses in sacramentaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 SM Marmoutier—c. 845</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 117r–118r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 SPar Paris region for the Cathedral of Paris—c. 855</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 137r–139v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 SRod Amiens, for Corbie—853</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 126v–128r); AIPP (fol. 243v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 SE Corbie—s. IX</td>
<td>MCR (fol. 272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 SMan St. Amand—c. 851</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 134v–136v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 SCh St. Amand—c. 855</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 STourn St. Amand—c. 863</td>
<td>MR2 (fols. 168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 SDen St. Amand for St. Denis—c. 867</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 SNoy St. Amand—c. 869</td>
<td>AIPP (fol. 5r); MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 138v–139v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 SGerm St. Amand—c. 875-876</td>
<td>AIPP (fol. 5r); MR2, MCR, MTSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 SSSens St. Amand—c. 876-77</td>
<td>MRCPP, MRIII (fols. 14v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 SSenl St. Denis—c. 880</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SArr St. Vaast of Arras—s. IX</td>
<td>MCR, MR2 [the Secret part is missing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 SB Northern France—s. IX</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 120v–123v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 SRh2 Northern France—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 234–237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 STour1 St. Martin of Tours—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>MCR (fols. 238v–239r)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V used in the expression Vere dignum (fol. 17v) also derives from the design employed in the sacramentaries of St. Amand in the third quarter of the ninth century. Therefore, this manuscript might have been produced in the scriptorium close to St. Amand or even in St. Amand itself.

20 AIPP—Memoria imperatoris et prolis eius et totius populi (Deshusses, no. 4393).
21 The mass includes the praefatio from MCR2 between the Secret and Infra actionem.
22 MRIII—Missa pro rege of type III: Deshusses, nos. 2047–9.
23 MRCPP—Missa pro rege, coniunge, et prole, populoque sibi subiecto: Deshusses, nos. 2044–6. It has different titles in surviving manuscripts: Missa pro rege cotidiana (SSens); Missa pro rege, coniunge, populoque sibi subiecto (SRei); Missa pro rege, coniunge, et prole, populoque sibi subiecto (SMain). For the text and its translation, see app. 7.
24 MCR2—Missa cotidiana pro rege of type 2 with a praefatio: Deshusses, no. 1719.
25 MTSR2—Missa tempore synodi pro rege of type 2 with a praefatio: Deshusses, no. 1720 (SSens), Deshusses, no. 1721 (SRei).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Place and time of production of sacramentaries</th>
<th>Royal masses in sacramentaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>STour2 St. Martin of Tours—s. X in.</td>
<td>MR2, MCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SRei  St. Gaul for Reichenau—s. IX med.</td>
<td>MRII (fols. 168v–169r); additions (ss. IX–X): MCR, MRCPP (fol. 221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SCon  Reichenau—c. 850–875</td>
<td>MRII (fols. 125v–126v)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SGal2 St. Gall—s. IX²</td>
<td>MR1 [with the second collect] (fols. 150v–151v), MRII (fol. 208r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>SMain Mainz or St. Gall for St. Alban of Mainz—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>MR2 (fol. 185v), MRCPP (fols. 198v–199r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SEss  The northwestern part of Germany (Corvey)—c. 870 twenty-seventh</td>
<td>MCR2, MTSR2; addition (s. X): MR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SPam  Northern France for the Cathedral of Cologne—c. 870–875</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 113r–114r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>SCol  Fulda (later additions—Trier) for the Cathedral of Cologne—s. X²</td>
<td>MR2, MCR, MTSR (fols. 120v–122r); later addition (fol. 13r)—AIPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Dissemination of Benedict of Aniane’s Collection of Royal Masses (based on appendix 8: MR2, MCR, MTSR)

Southern France (810s–830s, Lyons)

不下

Northern France (c. 845–900):

Marmoutier of Tour (c. 845), St. Amand (c. 851), Corbie (c. 853), Paris (c. 855), St. Denis (c. 867), Arras (c. 850–900), St. Martin of Tour (890s)

不下

modified version in Corvey (c. 870) St. Amand (c. 876–877) (890s) Cologne (870s)

---

26 MRII—*Missa pro regibus* of type II: the mixture of the Gelasian mass and prayers from the *Missale Francorum*, Deshusses, nos. 2025–30.

10. Changes in the Te igitur of the Ordinary of the Mass in the Ninth Century

+ Te igitur clementissime pater per Iesum Christum filium tuum Dominum nostrum supplices rogamus et petimus uti accepta habeas, et benedicas + haec dona + haec sancta sacrificia inlibata. Inprimis quae tibi offerimus pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica quam pacificare custodire adunare et regnere digneris toto orbe terrarum,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place—Date</th>
<th>Sacramentary</th>
<th>I. “una cum [A1]28 famulo tuo papa nostro [A2]”</th>
<th>II. “et antistite nostro”</th>
<th>III. “et rege nostro”</th>
<th>IV. +1,30 +2,31 +3,32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall—s. IX2</td>
<td>SGal (fol. 38v)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court School of Charles the Bald—c. 850–875</td>
<td>SNon (fol. 8v)</td>
<td>+ N.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichenau—c. 850–875</td>
<td>SCon (fol. 7r)</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz or St. Gall—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>SMain (fol. 4v)</td>
<td>+ C33–A2</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona—s. IX med.</td>
<td>SVer (fol. 4r)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Cathedral of Cologne—c. 895</td>
<td>SPan (fol. 26v)</td>
<td>+A1 N.</td>
<td>+ N</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the Cathedral of Cologne—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>SCol (fol. 2v)</td>
<td>+A1 ill.</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Modena—s. IX med.</td>
<td>SMod (fol. 2v)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C2 (between I and II)</td>
<td>+ C1 +2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marmoutier—c. 845</td>
<td>SM (fol. 9v)</td>
<td>+ N.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 A1—add. “beatissimo.”
29 A2—add. “sedis apostolicae.”
30 +1—“et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae fidei cultoribus.”
31 +2—“et omnibus orthodoxis catholicae atque apostolicae fidei cultoribus.”
32 +3—“et omnibus orthodoxis atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus.”
33 C—correction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place—Date</th>
<th>Sacramentary</th>
<th>I. “una cum famulo tuo papa nostro [A1]”</th>
<th>II. “et antistite nostro”</th>
<th>III. “et rege nostro”</th>
<th>IV. +1,+2,+3,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern France—s. IX&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SStav (fol. 19r)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz—845–855</td>
<td>SDro (fol. 17r)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>C +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichenau—s. IX med.</td>
<td>SRei (fol. 16r)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>C + N.</td>
<td>C +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Amand—c. 851</td>
<td>SMan (fol. 10v)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>C1 + ill.</td>
<td>C1 + ill.</td>
<td>C2 +3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleury—s. IX med.</td>
<td>SAib (fol. 1v)</td>
<td>+A1 ill.</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens, for Corbie—853; northern France—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>SRod. (fol. 23v); SRih2 (pag. 18)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris region for the Cathedral of</td>
<td>SPar (fol. 9v)</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris—c. 855</td>
<td>SCh</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Amand—c. 876–877</td>
<td>SSens (fol. 28v)</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Amand—c. 863–869</td>
<td>STourn (fol. 16v), SNo (fol. 14v)</td>
<td>+ ill. A2</td>
<td>necnon + ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Amand—c. 875–876</td>
<td>SGerm (fol. 20r)</td>
<td>+ ill. A2</td>
<td>necnon + ill.</td>
<td>C +</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Amand for St. Denis—c. 867</td>
<td>SDen (fol. 20v)</td>
<td>+ ill. C–A2</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbie—s. IX&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SE (fol. 8r)</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin of Tours—s. IX ex.</td>
<td>STour1 (fol. 3v)</td>
<td>+A2</td>
<td>+ ill.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court School of Charles the Bald—c. 869</td>
<td>SMEt (fol. 7r)</td>
<td>+ illo</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official title in diplomas</td>
<td>Title on bulls</td>
<td>Title on seals</td>
<td>Title on coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pippin the Short (751–768)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pippinus rex Francorum vir illuster</em> (752–768)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><em>rex Pippinus</em> or <em>rex Francorum</em> (754/5–768)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlemagne (768–814)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carolus gratia Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricius Romanorum</em> (774–800)</td>
<td>Carolus rex Francorum (769–813)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Carolus</em> (771–793/4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Karolus serenissimus Augustus a Deo coronatus magnus pacificus imperator Romanum gubernans imperium qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum</em> (801–813)</td>
<td>Dominus Noster Karolus imperator pius felix perpetuus Augustus (after 806–814)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karolus imperator Augustus</em> (813–814)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official title in diplomas</td>
<td>Title on bulls</td>
<td>Title on seals</td>
<td>Title on coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlodoicus gratia Dei rex Aquitanorum (794–813)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hludvih (781–793/4?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hludowicus divina ordinante providentia imperator Augustus (814–833)</td>
<td>Dominus Noster Hludowicus imperator</td>
<td>Hludowicus imperator</td>
<td>Hludowicus imperator Augustus (814–818)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hludowicus divina repropitante clementia imperator Augustus (834–840)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hludowicus imperator (818–840)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pippin I of Aquitaine (817–838)</td>
<td>Pippin rex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pippinus rex Aquitanorum (817?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pippin II of Aquitaine (838–852)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Pippinus rex Equitanorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlotharius augustus (822–833)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlotharius divina ordinante providentia imperator Augustus (833–855)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hlotharius imperator (840–855)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothar II (855–869)</td>
<td><strong>Hlotharius rex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hlotharius divina preveniente clementia rex</em> (855–869)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis II (855–875)</td>
<td><strong>Ludowicus imperator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus gratia Dei imperator Augustus</em> (851–855?)</td>
<td><em>Hludowicus divina ordinante providentia imperator Augustus</em> (866–875)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dominus noster Hludowicus rex</em></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus rex</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus Augustus</em></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus imperator Augustus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis the German (840–876)</td>
<td><strong>Hludowicus rex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus divina largiente gratia rex Baioariorum</em> (830–833)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hludowicus divina favente gratia rex</em> (833–876)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles the Bald (840–877)</td>
<td><strong>Carolus rex or Carolus rex Francorum</strong> (840–864)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karolus gratia Dei rex</em> (840–875)</td>
<td><em>Karolus gratia Dei rex</em> (840–864)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karolus Dei gratia rex</em></td>
<td><em>Karolus Dei gratia rex</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karolus misericordia Dei imperator Augustus</em> (864–876)</td>
<td><em>Karolus imperator Augustus</em> or Karolus gratia Dei imperator (876–877)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Karolus Dei gratia imperator Augustus</em> (876–877)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Solomon, Old Testament king, 252, 255
Spain, 135, 166–9, 174, 232, 299
sphragistics, 259
St. Amand, abbey, 62, 87, 89–92, 270, 311, 324–7, 338–40, 342
St. Deodat, abbey, 78
St. Gall, 75, 82, 85, 86, 163, 215, 228, 242, 270, 325, 338, 340, 341
St. Germain-des-Prê, abbey, 245
St. Hilaire (Poitiers), church, 169
St. Martial of Limoges, abbey, 169
St. Martin of Tours, abbey, 30, 79, 89, 92, 94, 98, 149, 177, 197, 221, 236, 238, 242–4, 257, 258, 269–71, 273, 301, 311, 327, 339, 340, 342
St. Mary (Compiegne), church, 92, 93
St. Medard (Soissons), church, 45
St. Michael of Marsoup, abbey, 78
St. Michael (on Monte Gargano), church, 82, 83, 192
St. Peter (Rome), papal church, 59, 109, 110, 175, 188, 190, 270, 277
St. Remi of Rheims, abbey, 53
St. Riquier, abbey, 70, 74, 78, 92, 97, 98, 270
St. Savior of Gellone, abbey, 69
St. Sebastian and St. Medard of Soissons, abbey, 119
St. Servatius (Maastricht), church, 229
St. Suzanna (Rome), church, 3
St. Vaast, abbey, 98, 317, 324, 339
Stephen II, pope, 109, 121, 175, 270
Stephen III, pope, 174–6
Stephen IV, pope, 131, 189, 295
Strasbourg, 82, 306
subsripitio, 161, 162, 170, 187, 188, 192
Supplement to the Gregorian Sacramentary, 62, 69–72, 79, 86, 87, 299, 330
suscritio, 129, 164, 192
symbolic capital, 89, 98, 271, 308, 310, 313
Syracuse, 27, 166, 167, 186, 211
Syrian, 173
Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, 17, 66, 274–6
Te igitur, 54, 57, 77, 94, 95, 97, 308, 338, 341
Theodebald I, Merovingian king, 166
Theodebert I, Merovingian king, 137
Theodoric, king of Ostrogoths, 124, 166, 217, 281
Theodosian Code, 95
Theodosius I, Roman emperor, 228, 250, 291, 293, 296
Theodosius II, Byzantine emperor, 139, 165, 183, 184, 200, 219, 293
Theodulf of Orléans, 206, 216, 298, 299
Theophanes, 130, 151, 192
Theuderic III, Merovingian king, 170
Thuringia/Thuringians, 136, 274
Tiber, 174
Tiberius III, pope, 174
Tironian notes, 57, 94, 170
Toulouse, 135, 195
Tours, 73, 78, 134, 163, 169, 213, 246–8, 252; see also St. Martin of Tours
tradition of authority, 39, 40, 141, 279
Trajan, Roman emperor, 223
tremisses, 129, 130, 208, 211
Treviso, 135, 179
Triclinium, 3
Trier, 78, 113, 114, 134, 142, 212, 228, 298, 340
una cum Francis, 275, 288
Utrecht, 214
Utrecht Psalter, 226, 248, 256
Uzès, 179
Valens, Roman emperor, 139
Valentine, pope, 189
Valentinian III, Roman emperor, 95
Vandals, 166
Vatican Sacramentary, 56, 58, 65, 86, 323, 328
Venerius, bishop of Grado, 114, 116
Venice, 179
Verdun, 294, 305, 306, 310
Vere dignum, 78, 339
Vicenza, 179
Victorinus, Roman emperor, 221
Vikings, 102, 177
Visigothic, 126, 145, 166–9, 174, 176, 177, 232, 298, 299
Visigoths, 169, 298
Vitalien, pope, 176, 177
Wala, abbot of Corbie, 303
Walafrid Strabo, 215, 216
Weissenburg abbey, 244
Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, 96
Witiza, Visigothic king, 169
Zachary, pope, 264