The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe

Edited by

Clemens Gantner
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna

Rosamond McKitterick
Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge

Sven Meeder
Radboud University, Nijmegen

Contents

Figures

Contributors

TIMOTHY BARNWELL University of Leeds

RICHARD BROOME University of Leeds

ROBERT FLIERMAN University of Utrecht, the Netherlands

CLEMENS GANTNER Mitarbeiter, Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Department Frühmittelalter, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria

ERIK GOOSMANN Post-Doctoral Researcher, Department of History and Art History and Research Institute for History and Culture (OGC), University of Utrecht, the Netherlands and University of Leiden, the Netherlands

MAYKE DE JONG Professor of Medieval History, University of Utrecht, the Netherlands

ROSAMOND MCKITTERICK Professor of Medieval History, University of Cambridge

SVEN MEEDER Lecturer in Medieval History, Faculty of Arts, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands

WALTER POHL Professor of Medieval History, University of Vienna and Director, Institut für Mittelalterforsching, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria

MARIANNE POLLHEIMER Mitarbeiter, Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Department Frühmittelalter, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria

HELMUT REIMITZ Professor of History, Princeton University, USA

DÉSIRÉE SCHOLTEN University of Cambridge

GIORGIA VOCINO Post-Doctoral Researcher, Department of History and Art History and Research Institute for History and Culture

(OGC), University of Utrecht and Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Department Frühmittelalter, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria

GRAEME WARD University of Cambridge and Leverhulme post-doctoral Fellow, Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Department Frühmittelalter, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, Austria

IAN WOOD Professor of Medieval History, University of Leeds

Abbreviations

ACO	*Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, 17 vols. (Berlin, 1914–1984), ed. E. Schwartz and J. Straub
AfD	*Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel- und Wappenkunde*
AHP	*Archivum historiae pontificae*
AL	*Annales Laureshamenses* (Annals of Lorsch), ed. E. Katz (St Paul, 1889)
AM	*Annales Mosellani*, ed. I. M. Lappenberg, *MGH SS* 16 (Hanover, 1859)
AMa	*Annals of Massay*, ed. P. Labbé, *Novae bibliothecae manuscriptorum librorum* (Paris, 1657), vol. II, pp. 733–6
AMP	*Annales Mettenses priores*, ed. B. von Simson, *MGH SRG* 10 (Hanover, 1905)
Annales ESC	*Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations*
AP	*Annales Petaviani*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS* 1 (Hanover 1826)
AQ	*Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt, 1955–)
ARF	*Annales regni Francorum*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH SRG* 6 (Hanover, 1895)
BAV	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
BHL	*Bibliographica hagiographica latina*
Blaise, *Dictionnaire*	A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout, 1954)
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France
BT	*Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana*, 1849–
CC	*Codex Carolinus*, ed. W. Gundlach, *MGH Epp.* III (Berlin, 1892), pp. 469–657
CCCM	*Corpus christianorum continuatio medievalis* (Turnhout, 1966)

CCSL	*Corpus christianorum series latina* (Turnhout, 1952)
CLA	Lowe, Elias A., *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century*, 11 vols. plus supplement (Oxford, 1935–71)
Continuations	Fredegar, *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV cum Continuationibus*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM* 2 (Hanover, 1888)
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*
EA	*Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed. E. Dümmler, 1900
EME	*Early Medieval Europe*
FrSt	*Frühmittelalterliche Studien*
HJb	*Historisches Jahrbuch*
HT	Cassiodorus, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, ed. W. Jacob and H. Hanslik, CSEL 71 (Vienna, 1972)
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LHF	*Liber historiae Francorum*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM* 2 (Hanover, 1888)
LM	Dhuoda, *Liber manualis*, ed. P. Riché (Paris, 1975)
LP	*Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, *Le 'Liber pontificalis': texte, introduction et commentaire*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886–92; 2nd edn. with vol. III ed. C. Vogel, Paris 1955–7)
MBK	*Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* (Munich, 1918–2009)
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica*
AA	*Auctores antiquissimi*
Capit.	*Leges: Capitularia regum Francorum*
Conc.	*Concilia. Legum Sectio* III, *Concilia* II, ed. A. Werminghoff, Hanover (1906–8); III, ed. W. Hartmann (Hanover, 1984).
DD Kar.	*Diplomatum Karolinorum*
Epp.	*Epistolae* III–VIII (= *Epistolae Merovingici et Karolini aevi*, Hanover, 1892–1939).
Epp. Sel.	*Epistolae selectae in usum scholarum*
Fontes iuris	*Fontes iuris Germanici Antiqui in usum scholarum separatim editi*
Poet.	*Poetae latini aevi carolini*

SRG	*Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi*
SRL	*Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum, saec.* VI–IX, ed. G. Waitz (Hanover, 1885–1920)
SRM	*Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*
SS	*Scriptores* in Folio
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*
PL	J.-P. Migne (pr.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, 221 vols. (Paris 1841–64)
RB	*Revue Bénédictine*
Reviser	*Annales qui dicuntur Einhardi* ('Revised' version of the *Annales regni Francorum*)
RHEF	*Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France*
Settimane	*Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo*, Spoleto (1954–)
SM	*Studi Medievali*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
VB	Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, ed. W. Levison, *MGH SRG* 57 (Hanover, 1905)
VK	Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH SRG* 25 (Hanover, 1911)
VL	Altfrid, *Vita Liudgeri*, ed. W. Diekamp, *Die Vitae Sancti Liudgeri* (Munster, 1881)
VV	*Vita Vulframni*, ed. W. Levison, *MGH SRG* 57 (Hanover, 1905)
VW	Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, ed. W. Levison, *MGH SRM* 7 (Hanover, 1920)
ZRG Kan. Abt.	*Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung*

found that the individual pieces of research could be grouped in different ways, crossing our original categorisations. Thus, this volume represents the results of inspiring discussions and cooperations made possible by the HERA project. It gave us the opportunity to look again at the ways in which individual societies, Merovingian, Carolingian, Papal, even Salian, used the past to define their position in the present.

Part I

Learning Empire

1   Creating cultural resources for Carolingian rule: historians of the Christian empire

Walter Pohl

The Carolingians inherited two of the most powerful 'visions of community'[1] that had hitherto been created, which helped to integrate particular communities in the matrix of a larger social whole: the Roman empire, and Christianity. Both became amalgamated in the Christian empire of Late Antiquity with remarkable success, but not without deep and sometimes fateful fissures and contradictions. The post-imperial West developed its own ways in which governance could follow Roman precedent and was tinged with Christian legitimacy. Around AD 700, the 'hegemonial kingdom' of the Merovingians lost its grip and the Visigothic monarchy was ousted; political culture seemed to become distinctively regional.[2] But soon, Carolingian expansion created a new need for a culture of wide-reaching political integration. At first, Frankish identity was trumpeted along the Carolingian way to success.[3] After all, what had to be held together most urgently in the sensible phase of shedding the Merovingian skin were the Frankish elites. But a generation later, more inclusive visions came on the agenda. It was certainly not a coincidence, as Einhard wanted to make his readers believe, that Charlemagne was eventually crowned emperor in Rome.[4] As Janet Nelson wrote, 'the hegemonial idea of empire, of the emperor ruling many peoples and realms, arose directly from the political experience of the eighth-century west'.[5] The memories of Christian empire explored in this article, including Byzantium, framed this process.

The complicated imperial title that Charles first carried – *Carolus serenissimus Augustus a Deo coronatus magnus pacificus imperator Romanum gubernans imperium, qui et per misericordiam Dei rex Francorum et*

---

[1] Pohl, Gantner and Payne (eds.), *Visions of Community*.

[2] Wood, *Merovingian Kingdoms*; Brown, *Rise*.

[3] Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity and the Rise of Western Ethnicity, 550–850*.

[4] *VK*, c. 28, p. 32; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 13, 116; Nelson, 'Why are there so many different accounts?'.

[5] Nelson, 'Kingship and empire', p. 52.

Langobardorum[6] – demonstrates that the process of imperialization of the *regnum Francorum* was in many respects experimental. There was certainly more than a 'Reichsidee', in the sense of traditional German medieval studies, which had to be appropriated and developed: imperial titles and rituals, political roles and forms of representation, juridical and canonical norms, biblical models and classical narratives, and much else. There was a variety of precedent that could be used, deliberately or without realising that a choice had been made: the Old Testament kingdom of Israel, the legendary exploits of Alexander the Great, pagan Rome, the Christian empire of Late Antiquity and its direct heir in Constantinople, and, of course, the Merovingian kingdom in its glory days.[7]

The potential of these models was harnessed to the needs of Carolingian rule in a variety of ways, which were part of the process usually described as renaissance, reform or *renovatio*. On a political level, there was a multifaceted process of transformation, with interlocking forms of institutional continuity, innovation and reappropriation, and an increased urgency to do things the right way. This was based on flows of knowledge, which have left traces in the copying and rewriting of ancient texts, in the adaptation of transmitted sets of norms, and which were accompanied by the emergence of new modes of identification and by the appropriation of well-established strategies of 'othering'. The contributions by Ian Wood, Richard Broome and Timothy Barnwell in this volume explore this last element. As Mayke de Jong has demonstrated, the Carolingian realm did not only operate on the political level, it was grounded in the *populus Christianus* and its *ecclesia*.[8] In this broader context of ambitious attempts to create a political community that would be pleasing to God and therefore successful on earth, is it at all possible to mark off an 'imperial mode' in the political culture of the 'Frankish kingdom turned Roman empire' in the Carolingian period?

This contribution raises the question of how empire could be understood, and on what knowledge this understanding rested. This is a wide field, including the impact of buildings, objects and texts, and much of it has been covered by recent studies.[9] As far as texts are concerned, it certainly was not only historiography that conveyed some knowledge of the Roman empire of the past. To give just a few examples: Roman law-books and specifically their prefaces; Jerome-Gennadius' *De viris illustribus*; the *Actus S. Silvestri*; letter collections such as the sixth-century *Epistolae*

Austrasicae which contained diplomatic correspondence to and about the Eastern empire; exegetical works such as the sixth-century work of Junillus (see the contribution by Marianne Pollheimer); or prophecies and eschatological literature, from the Book of Daniel (with the image of the successive world empires) to Pseudo-Methodius, a Syrian world chronicle with a strong apocalyptic focus written in *c.* 700 and soon translated into Latin.[10] In what follows, I will limit myself to the perceptions of the Christian-Roman empire of the past found in ancient and more recent works of historiography. Arguably, this was the most likely model for a renewed Christian empire of the West.

Historians of the Christian empire, fourth to sixth centuries

Late antique historiography followed a number of patterns, some of them highly innovative.[11] Rosamond McKitterick reminds us to look at 'these texts both as presenting a particular view of the Roman past to their readers, and as particular models for history writing'.[12] Christian world chronicles built on the *Chronicle* of Eusebius as preserved in its Latin adaptation by Jerome, who took it up to 378. Eusebius had recreated history in a number of ways.[13] First, unlike the classical perspective, his firm chronological grid incorporated ancient and biblical history and Greek myth in a vision of the world extending well beyond the classical world. Second, unlike earlier Christian views, it made the Roman empire part of God's providential plan. And third, his *fila regnorum* structure, parallel columns which gave essential information on several empires/kingdoms on one page within the chronological matrix, provided a very flexible instrument for a world history which could expand beyond or contract within the boundaries of empire. It was this decentralisation of world history which allowed the medieval West to place itself within a dynamic temporal–spatial structure in which the past (and potentially, the future) lay beyond its actual boundaries. Although the complicated layout was not continued, it allowed understanding the post-Roman West as a series of parallel histories, which could also converge again. The most important of many continuations, and a stepping-stone for several further ones, was Prosper's *Chronicle*, taken in several redactions until 451, which is both

[6] Classen, *Karl der Große*, p. 66; Garipzanov, *Symbolic Language*, pp. 136–7.
[7] McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 10, 28, 56, 206.
[8] De Jong, '*Ecclesia* and the early medieval polity'; de Jong, 'Charlemagne's church'.
[9] Mortensen, 'Diffusion'; Sot, *La Mémoire*; La Rocca, *Pacifico*; Bolgia, McKitterick and Osborne (eds.), *Rome across Time and Space*; Bauer, 'Die Stadt Rom'.

[10] Aerts and Kortekaas (eds.), *Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius*, vol. I, pp. 1–35; Gantner, 'Hoffnung in der Apokalypse?'.
[11] Whitby, 'Imperial Christian historiography'; Burgess and Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time*.
[12] McKitterick, 'Roman texts and Roman history', p. 32.
[13] See, most recently, Kelly, 'Shape of the past'.

transmitted as an appendix to Jerome's *Chronicle*, and together with Prosper's epitome of Jerome.[14] Later, Marcellinus Comes continued Jerome until 534.[15] Isidore's *Chronicle* relied heavily on Jerome, but also used other sources. Thus, for instance, he arrived at a differentiated image of Constantine as the first Christian emperor (based on Orosius and Rufinus), but deplored his Arian bias (based on Jerome).[16] The seventh-century Fredegar *Chronicle* relied on Jerome's *Chronicle* for what constitutes its second book, adding, among others, a web of rather legendary stories about Justinian, Belisarius and Theoderic, and thus fed it more closely into the web of Frankish history.[17] Of course, these chronicles were relatively succinct; they provided a general overview of the historical significance rather than detailed information on the workings of empire. Already Cassiodorus, in his *Institutions*, commented that they were 'only sketches of history or very brief summaries of the past', but recommended reading them.[18]

An alternative strand, also based on the work of Eusebius, was constituted by Church histories. In 401, Rufinus of Aquileia translated and reworked Eusebius' *Church History* in Latin and took it up to the death of Theodosius I in 395.[19] This work was transmitted in more than a hundred manuscripts, some of them very early, and gives some coverage to the 'Constantinian turn' and its consequences for the Church.[20] As Rosamond McKitterick has shown, it basically presents 'the history of Christianity as the history of written authority', linking the identity of the Church to the works of the fathers.[21] Rufinus' additions fleshed out a few key events in the history of the fourth-century empire that became basic for the medieval imagination, such as the finding of the True Cross by Constantine's mother Helena and the penance of Theodosius.[22] Another passage that was used in Carolingian debates about the relationship between lay and ecclesiastical authority was Constantine's reputed renunciation of his right to judge bishops at Nicaea: 'For you have been given us by God as gods, and it is not fitting that a man should judge

gods.' The example appears, for instance, in a letter by Gregory the Great to the Emperor Maurice in 595 and in Jonas of Orléans' *Admonitio*.[23]

A further important translation was the Latin selection from three Greek Church histories, the *Historia tripartita*, commissioned by Cassiodorus, see Désirée Scholten's and Giorgia Vocino's contributions in this volume. It prominently featured Constantine, so that Sedulius Scottus in his *De rectoribus Christianis* amply quoted from it: for instance that the *imperator eminentissimus* prided himself more to be God's servant than of his earthly empire, and was rewarded for his modesty by triumphal victories.[24] It also highlighted the struggle against Arianism, for instance the burning of Arian books by Constantine.[25] These imperial church histories were not continued in the early medieval West. But some of the most important historical works of the early Middle Ages similarly conceived of the past of a realm as a history of its Church. Gregory of Tours' first book passes directly from an account of biblical history to the martyrs and missionaries of Roman Gaul, and to the establishment of its sacred topography.[26] The Roman empire is just a side-show to this Christian history of Gaul. Constantine is passed over coldly; his main act is poisoning his son Crispus and killing his wife Fausta in a boiling bath.[27] Bede treats the empire only as a backdrop to British affairs, for instance the persecution of Diocletian as a context for the martyrdom of St Alban; Constantine is only mentioned in passing as son of Constantius by Helena the concubine, under whom the Arian heresy arose.[28]

Perhaps the most popular Roman history of the Middle Ages was Orosius' *Historiae adversus paganos*, written *c.* 417. Of the 249 surviving manuscripts of Orosius, no fewer than thirty-one were written before AD 900.[29] This work made it possible to regard the glories of the pagan empire with reserve. Most of the work is dedicated to the *histoire noire* of the pagan period; only about half of the last book

[14] Muhlberger, *The Fifth-Century Chroniclers*, pp. 48–135.
[15] Croke, *Count Marcellinus*, pp. 17–18; Wood, 'Chains of chronicles', p. 72.
[16] Isidore of Seville, *Chronica*, 2, 329–34, ed. Martín, pp. 154–7.
[17] Reimitz, 'Cultural brokers of a common past'.
[18] Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, 1, 17, 2, trans. Halporn and Vessey, p. 150.
[19] McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 226–33.
[20] There are, for instance, three manuscripts from Bavarian monasteries, written before 840, in Munich, digitized at www.digital-collections.de/index.html?c=autoren_index&l=en&ab=Rufinus<Aquileiensis>. For the Lorsch manuscript, see Reimitz, in this volume.
[21] McKitterick, *History and Memory*, p. 232.
[22] Eusebius-Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 10, 7–8; 11,18, trans. Amidon, pp. 16 f., 77; McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 59–61.

[23] Rufinus, *Historia*, 10, 2, trans. Amidon, p. 10; Gregory the Great, *Registrum epistolarum* 5, 36, 55, ed. Ewald and Hartmann, pp. 317–20; Jonas of Orléans, *Admonitio*, 2, ed. Anton, p. 60.
[24] Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, 1, 9, 2, ed. Jacob and Hanslik, p. 24 (or 3, 7, 10, ed. Jacob and Hanslik, p. 145); Sedulius Scottus, *De rectoribus Christianis*, 1, ed. Anton, p. 106.
[25] Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*, 2, 10, ed. Jacob and Hanslik, pp. 98–9; McKitterick, *History and Memory*, p. 234.
[26] Reimitz, 'The providential past'.
[27] Gregory of Tours, *Decem libri historiarum*, 1, 36, ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 26–7.
[28] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 1, 6–8.
[29] Mortensen, 'Diffusion', 101 and 104; Guenée, *Histoire*, pp. 248–55. For reasons of space, I am not dealing with Florus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Aurelius Victor, the *Epitome de Caesaribus* or the *Historia augusta* here, all of which are attested in Carolingian manuscripts.

(7, 28–43) deals with the time between Constantine and 416. Even there, it highlights the punishment of pagans (such as Constantine's adversaries or Julian) and heretics (such as Valens) more than the positive role models.[30] Theodosius, however, receives a very favourable treatment, with the clear message: it was God's power, not human allegiance that always gave victory to the emperor.[31] The narrative culminates in the victorious battle against the usurper Eugenius, almost an apotheosis of the emperor, shortly before his death.[32] It seems that Orosius only became apologetic of the Christian empire against his (Augustinian) intentions, which creates a subtle tension in the text. As Peter van Nuffelen has argued, 'one way in which Orosius destabilizes the traditional view of Roman history is by reducing, not to say effacing, the distinction between Romans and barbarians . . . The destructive barbarians of today could be the great kings of a new empire tomorrow.'[33] A lesson that could be drawn from Orosius was that the glory of empire was worthless unless pursued in the right creed and humility; punishment would follow secular success, and lasting victory could only be achieved through God's grace.

We should not forget the Christian perspective on the empire offered by the *Liber pontificalis*.[34] The view is often negative. Many of the brief lives of the early popes underlined that they were 'crowned by martyrdom'. But even Constantine gets little credit for a turn to the better in the extensive biography of pope Silvester. The text briefly states that the pope had to flee from Constantine's persecution to Mount Soracte, but then returned to Rome 'in glory' to baptise him. This story then provided a context for the eighth-century forgery of the 'Donation of Constantine' and is contained in the 'Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals'.[35] The bulk of Silvester's Life comprises almost endless lists of churches (many of them built by Constantine), of their endowments and of the precious objects in them.[36] In the following lives, the trouble with the Arian sympathies of the sons of

Constantine is highlighted.[37] Dogmatic conflicts with emperors remain a central topic. Justinian receives a rather uneven treatment and is twice dubbed as Diocletian.[38] Only a few emperors appear unambiguously positive, among them, Justin I 'in the burning depths of his love for the Christian faith' and Constantine IV.[39] The *Life of Pope Agatho* contains an extensive account of the council of Constantinople and the honourable reception of the papal delegates. Pope Constantine's reception sounds even more grandiose: first by Justinian II's son Tiberius, who came out from Constantinople to the seventh milestone with the entire senate, the patriarch and the clergy to salute the pontiff, and then by the emperor himself. 'The Christian Augustus, diadem on his head [*cum regno in capite*], prostrated himself and kissed the feet of the pontiff.'[40] Much more lukewarm is the description of the visit of the emperor Constans II in Rome.[41] The pope and his clergy welcomed the emperor at the sixth milestone; in Rome, Constans repeatedly attended mass, left presents on the altar and dined with the pope. The memory of the event was impaired by the fact that he 'dismantled all the city's bronze decorations'. Some passages of the *Liber pontificalis* thus offered instances of the kind of relationship that could exist between popes and emperors.

A Roman history that enjoyed some circulation in the Carolingian world was Jordanes' *Romana*, written in the reign of Justinian and linked with the same author's *Getica*.[42] Carolingian manuscripts of the *Romana* are attested, among others, at St Amand, Lorsch, Verona, and Reichenau (lost).[43] It starts with a brief review of biblical history, heavily leaning on Jerome, and concentrating on the succession of empires: Assyria, Media/Persia, Alexander and his Ptolemean successors up to Cleopatra, from whom the empire passes on to Augustus, under whom Christ is born. Then the narrative switches back to Romulus, covering the whole history up to Justinian in a rather succinct fashion.[44] Curiously, the section about Constantine is missing in the extant manuscripts – the lacuna stretches from the persecution under Diocletian to the death of Constantius II.[45] Julian returns to the cult of the idols, nevertheless is called

[30] Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 30, 6, ed. Zangemeister, p. 276 and 7, 33, 19, ed. Zangemeister, p. 281. See Goetz, *Orosius*, p. 125.

[31] Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 35, 12, ed. Zangemeister, p. 284: *potentia Dei non fiducia hominum victorem semper extitisse Theodosium*.

[32] Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 35, 11–23, ed. Zangemeister, pp. 284–6; Eusebius-Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 11, 33, ed. Mommsen, 1039; see McKitterick, 'Roman texts and Roman history'.

[33] Van Nuffelen, *Orosius*, p. 178.

[34] See also McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 32–3, placing the redactions to the 530s, the 550s, the early seventh century and then at smaller intervals.

[35] Fuhrmann, 'Einleitung', pp. 7–11. For a different date (830 in Francia): Fried, *Donation of Constantine*, p. 112. *Constitutum Constantini*, ed. Fuhrmann, p. 70; Zechiel-Eckes, *Fälschung*.

[36] *Liber pontificalis*, Life no. 34, trans. Davis, *Book of Pontiffs*, pp. 14–26; see McKitterick, in this volume.

[37] Julius, Liberius and Felix: *Liber pontificalis*, Lives nos. 36–8, trans. Davis, pp. 27–9.

[38] *Liber pontificalis*, Life no. 59, trans. Davis, p. 53; Life no. 61, trans. Davis, p. 58.

[39] *Liber pontificalis*, Life no. 55, trans. Davis, p. 49; Lives nos. 81–3, trans. Davis, pp. 74–80.

[40] *Liber pontificalis*, Life no. 90, trans. Davis, p. 391.

[41] *Liber pontificalis*, Life no. 76, trans. Davis, p. 71.

[42] For a synthesis see Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, pp. 47–58.

[43] See Mommsen, 'Prooemium', pp. xlvi–lxix; McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 201 and 212: Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, 95; BAV, Pal. lat. 920, and the *Epitome Phillippsiana*, see note 97 below.

[44] Jordanes, *Romana*, 85–7, ed. Mommsen, pp. 9–10.

[45] Jordanes, *Romana*, 303, ed. Mommsen, p. 39. As the whole section is derived from Eusebius/Jerome, the missing contents can be guessed at.

vir egregius et rei publicae necessarius.[46] Theodosius I receives a positive, though not enthusiastic treatment: *religiosus ecclesiae enituit propagator rei publiceque defensor eximius;*[47] the rest is about military exploits. The following sections, mostly taken from Marcellinus Comes, offer a rather bleak panorama of disputes and defeat; only Marcian recovers *divina provisione . . . quod delicati decessores predecessoresque eius per annos fere sexaginta vicissim imperantes minuerant.* For the West, Jordanes provides a famous formula for the fall of the empire in 476: *Sic quoque Hesperium regnum Romanique populi principatum, quod septingentesimo nono urbis conditae anno primus Augustorum Octavianus Augustus tenere coepit, cum hoc Augustulo periit.*[48] Interestingly, Jordanes accentuates the end of the Western empire by claiming that Odoacer had invaded Italy with his troops.[49] The *Romana* closes with an extensive account of military affairs under Justinian up to the battle between the Lombards and the Gepids in 552, just before Narses' final victory in the Gothic war which quite remarkably is no longer included.[50] Jordanes sums up on a rather subdued note: one could find in the annals how the *res publica* had conquered all the lands, and how these were lost again by incompetent leaders.[51] The *Getica*, written some years later, casts Justinian in a more favourable light.[52] In short, Jordanes takes a very different stance from Orosius: he indulges in the glory of empire even where it is pagan, and regards most of the Christian emperors of the recent past as the ones who have squandered the ancient glory.[53]

Rewriting Roman history: Eutropius and Paul the Deacon

In the seventh and early eighth centuries, some concise world chronicles followed, based mostly on the material presented above; most prominently, the *Chronicles* of Isidore (with quite a negative view of the empire

---

[46] Jordanes, *Romana*, 304, ed. Mommsen, p. 39.
[47] Jordanes, *Romana*, 315, ed. Mommsen, p. 40. In *Getica* 146, ed. Mommsen, p. 96, he is praised as *amator pacis gentisque Gothorum*.
[48] Jordanes, *Romana*, 345, ed. Mommsen, p. 44; the same phrase in Jordanes, *Getica*, 243, ed. Mommsen, 120.
[49] A similar view of the end of empire: Marcellinus Comes; see Croke, *Count Marcellinus*, and Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, p. 58.
[50] For the chronology, Pohl, 'Langobarden in Pannonien'. Although the Lombard–Gepid war lasted for a few years, the only real battle occured in 552.
[51] Jordanes, *Romana*, 388, ed. Mommsen, p. 52: *Scietque unde orta [scil. res publica], quomodo aucta, qualiterve sibi cunctas terras subdidit et quomodo iterum eas ab ignaros rectores amiserit.*
[52] Jordanes, *Getica*, 316, ed. Mommsen, p. 138.
[53] See also Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, pp. 51–2.

of his day) and Bede.[54] The writers of the Carolingian period diligently collected and copied ancient works of history and compiled them in 'history books', miscellany manuscripts.[55] In this process, many works were variously abbreviated, epitomised or combined, or subtly rewritten to fit the needs of the present. The study of the transmission of these texts, and of their use by other authors, is therefore a way to assess some of the impact that these texts had. Rosamond McKitterick has greatly enhanced our knowledge about the transfer of knowledge to and within the Carolingian world, and about the different uses to which these texts were put.[56] One of the results is that most of the above-mentioned texts were available in several monasteries with close affiliations to the court. Thus, Eusebius/Jerome, Eusebius/Rufinus, Orosius, Jordanes' *Romana*, the *Liber pontificalis* and Isidore's *Chronicle* are attested at Lorsch, extant copies of Eusebius/Rufinus, Orosius, Jordanes, the *Liber pontificalis* and Bede's *Chronica maiora* can be attributed to St Amand, while Fulda owned some rarer texts such as Ammianus Marcellinus, the *Historia augusta* and also Tacitus' *Germania*.[57]

The evidence that these texts were sought for, collected, copied, exchanged and used is substantial. Some Carolingian authors also attempted a more ambitious synthesis, for instance Frechulf; as the contribution by Graeme Ward in this volume shows, he had a wide variety of sources at his disposal. Here we will look at another author who dealt with the Roman past in the period: Paul the Deacon, a historian and scholar from Lombard Italy who later enjoyed good contacts with the Carolingian court.[58] He wrote both a Roman and a Lombard history, which will be discussed here in turn as they contain interesting perspectives on contemporary attitudes towards the Christian Roman empire. Quite paradoxically, the Roman history was written for a Lombard princess, and it is not reliably attested north of the Alps in the Carolingian period,[59]

---

[54] Isidore of Seville, *Chronica*, ed. Martín; Bede, *Chronica Maiora*, ed. Mommsen; Wood, *The Politics of Identity*.
[55] McKitterick, *History and Memory*, 1, 28–59; Reimitz, 'The art of truth'.
[56] McKitterick, *Carolingians and the Written Word*; McKitterick, *Books, Scribes and Learning*; McKitterick, *History and Memory*.
[57] McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 197–201, 212, 190. For Lorsch, see Reimitz, in this volume.
[58] Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, pp. 329–431; Pohl, 'Paulus Diaconus'; McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks' and *History and Memory*, pp. 66–83; Chiesa (ed.), *Paolo Diacono*, especially Pohl, 'Paolo Diacono e la costruzione'; and the articles in *Paolo Diacono e il Friuli altomedievale (saec. VI–X). Atti del XIV Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto medioevo* (Spoleto, 2001).
[59] The earliest manuscripts Mortensen, 'Diffusion', nos. 8 (Bamberg), 96 (Lucca), 107 (Munich), 127 (Paris) and 217 (private, from Nonantola) all seem to be from Italy; only

while the Lombard history appealed to a much wider audience, and was soon distributed throughout the Carolingian world.[60]

To create a Christian history of the late antique empire, Paul the Deacon revised and supplemented the *Breviarium* by Eutropius at the request of Adelperga, duchess of Benevento, in the 760s or early 770s.[61] Eutropius, a pagan who wrote at the commission of Valens, had taken his history up to Jovian's death in 364.[62] Paul continued the history up to the victory of Narses against Totila in 552, mainly based on Orosius,[63] Prosper and Bede's *Chronicle*. Mortensen lists 153 surviving manuscripts of Paul's work, and 218 in total of the chain of texts based on Eutropius; however, only 6 of them are pre-900.[64] Paul's text was successively reworked; one of the most interesting revisions, perhaps copied from a tenth-century exemplar from Southern Italy, appears in a historical miscellany written at Halberstadt around AD 1000.[65] Obviously, the revival of empire under the Ottonians led to a renewed interest in Roman histories. Around that time Landolf Sagax also used Paul's *Roman History* for his own compilation, in which he included extensive material from Anastasius' translation of the ninth-century Byzantine *Chronicle* of Theophanes.

Paul did three things to Eutropius' text: First, he added six books at the end, taking the narrative to Justinian. Second, he attached a new beginning, based on Orosius and Jerome, which covered the period before the foundation of Rome. In Eutropius the Roman empire began with Romulus. In Paul, Janus is the first king in Italy, followed by gods and heroes, Aeneas and a line of kings until he reaches the foundation of the city.[66] Eutropius explains that 'when the city was founded, it received its name Rome from his name [Romulus]'. Quite characteristically, Paul adds: 'and from that the name for the Romans is derived'.[67] Eutropius

described the civic foundations of empire, Paul the mythical origins of Italian kingship and of the Roman people.

Paul's third change to Eutropius is his reworking of the transmitted text of Eutropius' history; the aim, as he states in his dedication to Adelperga, was *eam sacratissimae historiae consonam reddere*.[68] But it is surprising how hesitant Paul was about the Christianisation of the text. One example is his treatment of Constantine. Eutropius had presented Constantine as an able military leader, both against the barbarians and against inner competitors.[69] His Constantine was gifted and ambitious, 'dedicated to civil arts and liberal studies', and introduced some good but also many superfluous and severe laws. 'At the beginning of his reign [he] was comparable to the best of rulers', but was 'made somewhat arrogant by his success', so that in later years he lost his mild temperament, and began to persecute his family and friends. Eutropius does not mention his change of policy towards the Christians. Paul faithfully follows this portrayal, without adding anything about the Christianisation of the empire. The sentence from the *Epitome de Caesaribus* that he does insert right after Eutropius' account of the battle at the Milvian Bridge deals with rumours about Constantine's defeated opponent.[70] Only later the copy of Paul's *History* written around 1000 at Halberstadt fills in the obvious lacunae. That was easy: Orosius (on whom Paul leaned heavily elsewhere) provided the necessary material.[71] The compiler also omitted the reference to Constantine's deification, untouched by Paul.[72]

Paul, following Orosius, makes Theodosius I a more conspicuous model of a Christian emperor: 'Theodosius, believing that a state afflicted by God's wrath must be set aright by God's mercy, placed all his trust in Christ's aid', and attacked the Goths.[73] His account of the civil wars relates how Theodosius used the cross as a sign for battle against Eugenius, but leaves out much of Orosius' providential embellishments –

one Eutropius MS was written in Fulda in the early ninth century (no. 51, Gotha). See also Cornford, 'Paul the Deacon's understanding'.

60 McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 77–93; Chiesa, 'Caratteristiche'.
61 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, ed. Droysen, p. 1.
62 Bird, *Eutropius*, pp. xi, lvi.
63 See van Doren, 'Paulus Orosius and Paulus Diaconus' http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/student-theses/2012–0816–200633/ (29/12/2012).
64 Mortensen, 'Diffusion' 104–5.   65 Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History*, p. 54.
66 Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 1, 1, ed. Santini, p. 3: *Romanum imperium . . . a Romulo exordium habet*. Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 1, 1, ed. Droysen, p. 3–5: *Primus in Italia, ut quibusdam placet, regnavit Ianus*; Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?'.
67 Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 1, 2. 1, ed. Santini, p. 3; trans. Bird, p. 3: *Condita civitate, quam ex nomine suo Romam vocavit*. Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 1, 2, ed. Droysen, p. 11: *. . . a qua et Romanis nomen inditum est*. Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?'.

68 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, ed. Droysen, p. 2. See also Cornford, 'The idea of the Roman past'.
69 Eutropius, *Breviarium*, 10, 2–8, ed. Santini, pp. 65–7; trans. Bird, pp. 64–6.
70 *Maxentium suppositum ferunt arte muliebri, tenere mariti animum laborantis auspicio gratissimi partus coepti a puero*: Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 10, 4, ed. Droysen, p. 84; (Pseudo-Aurelius Victor,) *Epitome de Caesaribus*, 40, 13, ed. Pichlmayr, p. 165.
71 Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Hist. 3 (olim E.3.14); ed. Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History*, pp. 68–166 at p. 135; after Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 28, 1–2, ed. Zangemeister, p. 271.
72 Kretschmer, *Rewriting Roman History*, p. 249, relating to Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 10, 8, ed. Droysen, pp. 85–6.
73 *Itaque Theodosius afflictam rem publicam ira Dei reparandam credidit misericordia Dei; omnem fiduciam sui ad opem Christi conferens*: Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 11, 15, ed. Droysen, p. 94, after Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 34, 5, ed. Zangemeister, pp. 281–2. In general, see McLynn, *Theodosius*; Duval, 'L'Éloge de Théodose'; Leppin, *Theodosius*.

for instance how Theodosius, before the battle, alone on the mountain fasts and prays to God 'who alone can bring about all things'.[74] Paul's appraisal of Theodosius is derived from the *Epitome de Caesaribus* instead of Orosius, and includes a comparison with Trajan, which is also found in Orosius.[75] Paul adds a brief account of the penance of Theodosius, which was to become paradigmatic for the relationship of kings and bishops in the Middle Ages.[76]

Another remarkable feature of Paul's *Roman History* is its extremely varied terminology of empire, which exceeds the variation in his model, Eutropius, by far. The rule of the emperor can be called *rei publicae imperium* (13, 3), *regia potestas* (15, 3), *imperii regimen* (15, 7), *Augustalis dignitas* (15, 7), *imperialis maiestas* (15, 10), the title can be *totius Italiae imperator* (13, 9), *occidui rector imperii* (14, 1), *Romanorum princeps* (16, 11), *Romanorum rex* (15, 1), the act of accession is described as *Orientali aulae praeficitur imperator* (14, 1), *regiam adeptus est potestatem* (15, 3), *purpuram induit* (16, 2), *Augustali solio potitus est* (16, 6), *Augustalem adeptus est principatum* (16, 11), *imperialia iura suscepit* (16, 11). Even where Paul otherwise directly follows his source, the gifted grammarian plays with the designations of empire. The terms had ancient precedents, and fifth- or sixth-century writers had no problems in referring to the empire as *regnum*, but their terminological variation was usually more limited. Like Charlemagne's initially rather experimental use of his imperial title, Paul's endless stylistic variations suggest that the eighth century had no coherent political language of empire, but a wide range of high-sounding vocabulary was available.

The Eastern empire in Paul's *Lombard History*

One of the most important historiographical works from the early Carolingian period was Paul the Deacon's *History of the Lombards*, which Paul wrote towards the end of his life, between his return from Francia in *c.* 786 and 796 (the end date results from Paul's observation that the Gepids still suffer under the Avar yoke).[77] These were important years

---

[74] *Signo crucis signum proelio dedit*: Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 35, 14–15, ed. Zangemeister, p. 285; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana* 12, 4, ed. Droysen, p. 97, mentions the prayers but without the rhetoric.

[75] Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 34, 2, ed. Zangemeister, p. 281, although Orosius, *Historiae*, 7, 12, 3, ed. Zangemeister, pp. 252–3 presents Trajan in a less favourable light as the second persecutor after Nero.

[76] Mommsen: from the *HT*, 9, 30, ed. Jacob and Hanslik, pp. 540–6; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, ed. Crivellucci, p. 167: from Paulinus of Milan, *Vita Ambrosii*, 24, ed. Bastiaensen, p. 84, which shows little resemblance.

[77] Pohl, 'Paolo Diacono'; Pohl, 'Paul the Deacon – between Sacci and Marsuppia'.

---

for the reconceptualisation of Carolingian rule.[78] Paul had come a long way since his *Roman History*. He had seen the Lombard kingdom fall to Charlemagne, and Lombard resistance crumble – his brother had been involved in a failed anti-Frankish plot. It took a while until Paul realised the new opportunities that Carolingian ambitions created for an intellectual with many skills. But when he wrote his *Lombard History*, he had already been entrusted with procuring an authoritative copy of the rule of St Benedict; a model homiliary; a collection of letters by Pope Gregory the Great and a life of the great pope; revised editions of Latin grammars; a history of the see of Metz, where a saintly Carolingian progenitor had once been bishop; and had taken part in exchanges of poems and letters with the circle of scholars around Charlemagne.[79] In short, Paul was one of the key figures of a systematic transfer of knowledge from Italy to the Frankish realm and helped to establish standards in many social and intellectual spaces that mattered to the Carolingian regime. His *Lombard History* cannot have been irrelevant in this context, and indeed, many ninth-century manuscripts attest its growing popularity north of the Alps.[80]

What Paul wrote about empire is dispersed throughout the six books, and adds up to a relatively coherent thread of narrative on the fate of the Eastern empire, from Justinian to Leo III. He is very brief about Heraclius (unlike Fredegar, who is much more elaborate on Heraclius and styles him as *novus David*),[81] but that corresponds to the chronological unevenness of the work. Some emperors receive extra coverage for their involvement in Italian matters, for instance Maurice (who keeps encouraging the Franks to attack the Lombards) and Constans II for his move to Italy and his attack on Benevento. Extensive passages on Tiberius II are taken from the Histories of Gregory of Tours; information on seventh-century emperors comes from the *Liber pontificalis*; some is of unknown origin.

An almost panegyric passage is devoted to Justinian (I, 25), using material from Jordanes, Isidore, Bede and the preface of Justinian's *Digest*. It underlines Justinian's success both in military and in civil affairs.[82] After enumerating some of Belisarius' victories, the text passes to elaborate

---

[78] Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity and the Rise of Western Ethnicity, 550–850*.

[79] Cf. Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, pp. 329–431; Pohl, 'Paulus Diaconus'.

[80] McKitterick, 'Paul the Deacon and the Franks' and *History and Memory*, p. 49; Chiesa (ed.), *Paolo Diacono*.

[81] Fredegar, *Chronicle*, IV, 64, ed. Krusch, p. 152; Esders, 'Herakleios'.

[82] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 1, 25, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 62: *Hac tempestate Iustinianus Augustus Romanum imperium felici sorte regebat. Qui et bella prospere gessit et in causis civilibus mirificus extitit.*

praise of Justinian's inner accomplishments. First, Justinian 'corrected the laws of the Romans' and their 'useless dissonance'. Second, he built churches, for instance the Hagia Sophia in its unique splendour. This demonstrated the emperor's faith: *Erat enim hic princeps fide catholicus, in operibus rectus, in iudiciis iustus; ideoque ei omnia concurrebant in bonum.* Third, learning flourished in Justinian's day: Cassiodorus (credited especially with his *Commentaries on the Psalms*), Dionysius Exiguus and the reckoning of time, Priscian and the art of grammar, and finally, Arator for the poem on the Acts of the Apostles. Paul does not mention that these authors mostly wrote in Italy and had little to do with Justinian. It is a programme for a Christian ruler that corresponded well with Charlemagne's efforts to revise the law, build the palatine chapel in Aachen (which was started in the early 790s) and assemble a circle of intellectuals around his court.

Justinian's two successors are portrayed in extended and almost verbatim quotes from Gregory of Tours, which revolve around the themes of avarice and generosity. Justin and, even more so, his wife Sophia represent avarice:[83] *vir in omni avaritia deditus, contemptor pauperum, senatorum spoliator.* When Tiberius becomes Caesar, he begins to use public money for the poor, dramatised by Gregory in an argument between Tiberius and the empress culminating in Matthew 6:20: 'but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven...'[84] Tiberius is directly rewarded by miraculous discoveries of treasures (among them, the immense riches stored up by the late general Narses), and can give even more alms to the poor. God, that is Gregory's moral, will more than make up for generous gifts to the Church by earthly treasures given to the monarch; his treatment of Guntram is another case in point – a sixth-century issue still relevant for the eighth.[85]

Given the almost verbatim reproduction of Gregory's text, it is remarkable where Paul introduces deliberate changes. Most strikingly, Paul turns the Caesar Tiberius into a mayor of the palace, and that in two instances. Where Gregory writes that Justin adjoined himself Tiberius as Caesar *ad defensandas provintias suas*, Paul rephrases *qui eius palatium vel*

---

singulas provincias gubernaret.[86] Later, when Tiberius becomes emperor, Paul repeats that under Justin he had administered the palace as Caesar.[87] More subtly, but still pertinent to the realities of the Carolingian kingdom, Paul also omits Gregory's information that Sophia had ruled alone after Justin's death, and that the people elected Tiberius emperor, *populi ... Tiberium caesarem elegerunt.*[88] Paul has *sumpsit imperium* here, without mentioning an election. It may also be telling that his use of *imperium* is less consistent than Gregory's; where the contemporary author relates that Tiberius *cum inmensis laudibus imperium confirmavit,* in Paul he is confirmed in *regni gloria* – from mayor of the palace to king.[89]

Both histories go into some detail of imperial accession ceremonies here: the procession to the sacred places, the arrival of the patriarch, whom Gregory calls *urbis papa* and Paul according to changed usage *pontifex urbis,* the entry into the palace together with the highest lay officials, the investiture in the imperial purple garments, the crowning with the diadem, and at last, the *laudes.*[90] A similar account, again from Gregory, is given for the accession of Maurice: *Quo defuncto, Mauricius indutus purpura, redimitus diademate, ad circum processit, adclamatisque sibi laudibus, largita populo munera.*[91] There is one difference: Paul calls the new emperor *primus ex Grecorum genere,* the first Greek on the imperial throne. Being the last properly Roman emperor lends extra significance to the extensive portrayal of Tiberius, who in fact ruled as *augustus* for just four years. Some of the elements listed in these passages, specifically the *laudes* and the coronation with a diadem, were to appear later in accounts of Carolingian imperial coronations, although these are usually

---

83 *Cui tanta fuit cupiditatis rabies, ut arcas iuberet ferreas fieri, in quibus ea quae rapiebat auri talenta congereret.* Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 11, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 97; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 4, 40, ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 171–3.

84 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 11, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 98; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 5,19, ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 226–7.

85 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 34, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, pp. 112–13; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 10, 3, ed. Krusch/Levison, pp. 483–6. About the idea of gifts to the poor/the Church: Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle*.

86 Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 4, 40, ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 172; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3,11.

87 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 11, ed. Bethmann/Waitz, p. 97; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 5, 19, ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 225.

88 Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 5, 19, ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 225: *et per solam Sophiam augustam eius imperium regiretur, populi, ut in superiori libro iam diximus, Tiberium caesarem elegerunt.*

89 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3,12, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 99: *cum immensis laudibus in regni est gloria confirmatus,* cf. Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 5, 30, ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 235–6.

90 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 12, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 99, after Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 5, 30, ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 235: *Hic* [i.e. Tiberius] *cum augustalem coronam accepturus esset, eumque iuxta consuetudinem ad spectaculum circi populus expectaret ... per loca sancta prius procedens, dehinc vocatum ad se pontificem urbis, cum consulibus ac praefectis palatium ingressus, indutus purpura, diademate coronatus, throno imperiali inpositus, cum immensis laudibus in regni est gloria confirmatus.*

91 Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 3, 15, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 100, abbreviated from Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 6, 30, ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 298–9; Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?'.

relatively brief about accession ceremonies and pay more attention to the process of establishing consensus.[92] Maurice, although consistently instigating the Franks against the Lombards, gets a basically positive, if lukewarm appraisal in the *Historia Langobardorum*: *Fuit autem utilis rei publicae; nam saepe contra hostes dimicans victoriam obtinuit.*

The later Byzantine emperors (apart from Constans II) receive a succinct treatment; Paul's only identifiable source was the *Liber pontificalis*. Two themes stand out: the permanent internal struggles and usurpations which create a rather bleak picture throughout, and heresy. It is remarkable that here as elsewhere, Paul is rather opaque and often badly informed about heretical positions and the reason why they are heretical; he is inconsistent about Arianism, and completely confuses the sides in the Three Chapters' controversy.[93] He mentions monotheletism as a reason for the council of Constantinople under Constantine IV,[94] but gives no reason for the dissent between the pope and Philippicus Bardanes which leads to rebellion in Rome: *Statuit populus Romanus, ne heretici imperatoris nomen aut chartas aut figuram solidi susciperent.*[95] It is remarkable that here, the 'Roman people' is the population of the city of Rome that refuses to accept the acts and symbols of the heretical emperor. The last passage dealing with the Eastern empire recounts the beginning of iconoclast repression under Leo III, burning icons and killing or maiming those who venerated them. Apart from occasional returns to orthodoxy, there is hardly anything positive that Paul relates about seventh- and eighth-century emperors.

Although the *Lombard History* was designed as an ethnic history, starting with the origin myth of the Lombards, its range was considerably broader. Extracts of it could therefore be put together to serve rather different purposes. One such reworking is preserved in a miscellany manuscript written in Verona in the ninth century, the so-called *Epitome Phillippsiana*, in which the narrative of Lombard events was mostly omitted.[96] Even more reduced to a history of the Byzantine empire was an epitome transmitted as a seventeenth book of Paul's *Historia Romana*, which contains an almost complete selection of matters regarding the eastern emperors with a few related Italian affairs (for instance, of the

patriarchate of Aquileia).[97] It begins with Paul's eulogy of Justinian, and ends with the iconoclast repression under Leo III.

As a direct model for a Christian *res publica*, the 'Greek' empire offered little attraction. On the contrary, Paul directs attention back to the 'Latin' emperors of the sixth century who embodied some of the key virtues of rulership. Some scholars believed that for Paul, the empire was a thing of the past.[98] As Jordanes before him, Paul found clear words for the deposition of the last Western emperor in 476: *Ita Romanorum apud Romam imperium toto terrarum orbe venerabile et Augustalis illa sublimitas, quae ab Augusto quondam Octaviano coepta est, cum hoc Augustulo periit*; Odoacer took over *totius . . . Italiae regnum*, and that remained at the centre of Paul's attention.[99] But the phrase only refers to the Roman empire in Rome. The alternative still existed; it is no coincidence that the *Historia Romana* ended with Narses' victory in 552 that 'returned the entire *res publica* to the rule of the *res publica*' (*universam rem publicam ad rei publicae iura reduxit*).[100] The paradox phrase is characteristic of the remaining tension between two concepts of empire that finally fell apart at the juncture of Paul's and Jordanes' Roman and ethnic histories, the Roman empire of the Greeks and the *res publica* that incorporated the 'kingdoms of the empire' in the West.[101] In Paul's eyes the empire clearly still existed, if only in the East.[102] The reconstitution of a Western empire was not his concern. But his work could provide material for those who would try to achieve that, not least by proposing moral standards of rulership. There had been good and bad rulers in all countries; it was not historical legitimacy that counted, but the quality of rulership.

Conclusion: Carolingian interests in histories of Christian empire

What could contemporaries of Charlemagne know about the Christian empire of the past? It was certainly possible to obtain a relatively reliable overview of the outlines of Roman history up to the eighth century. The legendary material about Theoderic, Justinian and Belisarius offered in

---

[92] *Laudes: ARF* s.a. 801, ed. Kurze, pp. 112–13; coronation with diadem: *VK*, p. 34.

[93] Pohl, 'Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon'.

[94] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 6, 4, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, p. 213.

[95] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, 6, 34, ed. Bethmann and Waitz, pp. 226–7.

[96] Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1885 and 1896, and St Petersburg, Rossiĭskaya natsional'naya biblioteka, lat. Q.v.IX and lat. Q.v.IV.5. McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 52–7.

[97] Published in *MGH AA* 2, pp. 396–405; Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, ed. Crivellucci, pp. 239–68. See also Maskarinec, 'Who were the Romans?'.

[98] Löwe, 'Von Theoderich dem Großen'; Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, p. 352.

[99] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 15, 10, ed. Droysen p. 122.

[100] Paul the Deacon, *Historia Romana*, 16, 23, ed. Droysen p. 135.

[101] Wolfram, *Reich und die Germanen*, p. 271; Pohl (ed.), *Kingdoms*; Pohl, 'Introduction: Christian and barbarian identities'.

[102] Mortensen, '*Impero Romano*', p. 362.

the second book of Fredegar did not become mainstream; it was out-weighed by a series of more factual histories. Most of them were widely copied throughout the Middle Ages, although not all of them are equally well attested in the Carolingian realm. They contain some passages which could be used as a model for Christian rulership, for instance Orosius' depiction of Theodosius I or Paul's portraits of Justinian and Tiberius II. Other obvious role models left surprisingly contradictory traces in the texts. This is the case of Constantine I, whose memory was initially tainted by his association with Arianism.[103] His achievements for the victory of Christianity were downplayed by the *Liber pontificalis*, ignored by Gregory, Bede and Paul the Deacon, while the passage is missing in Jordanes. Consequently, the only mention of Constantine in the *Annales regni Francorum* (the revised version) makes him a persecutor: Pippin's brother Carloman founds a monastery on Mount Soracte in honour of Pope Silvester, who hid there during Constantine's persecution.[104] But Eusebius/Rufinus, the *Historia tripartita* or Orosius all offered more favourable alternatives, elaborated in part by hagiography.[105] Otherwise Charlemagne could not have been praised as a 'new Constantine'.[106] In the East, where the memory of Constantine had also been rather slow to catch on, already Justinian was hailed as 'new Constantine'.[107] But this comparison could also develop an edge. In the adoptianist contro-versy, Elipand of Toledo warned Alcuin that he would become another Arius and Charlemagne another Constantine, and quoted from Isidore's *Chronicle*: *Heu pro dolor! Principio bono, fine malo*.[108]

Christian Roman histories related several instances in which problems of rulership were condensed, for instance, the relationship between sacred and lay authority. Who was to judge whom? Theodosius' penance became a test case for posterity. Many of the Christian Roman histories offer pieces of advice on how to treat churchmen; generosity, respect and conformity in dogmatic matters are frequent topics. Ultimately, it was God who would give victory, or punish a bad ruler. More pragmatically, some of the texts contain important material on ceremonial, for instance the *adventus* or the accession to imperial rule. Knowledge of Roman history could be a guideline for Frankish rulers, as becomes clear from Lupus of Ferrières' letter to Charles the Bald: 'I have had a very brief summary of the deeds of the emperors presented to your majesty so

---

[103] Cf. Wolfram, 'Constantin der Große', 231 f.
[104] *ARF* s.a. 746, ed. Kurze, p. 6.   [105] Ménager, 'Écrire l'histoire'.
[106] By Pope Hadrian I: *Codex Carolinus*, 60, ed. Gundlach, p. 587.
[107] Berger, 'Legitimation und Legenden', p. 10.
[108] Alcuin, *Epistolae*, 182, ed. Dümmler, pp. 303 and 307. Ewig, 'Das Bild Constantins', 35.

that you may readily observe from their actions what you should imitate or what you should avoid'.[109] Lupus particularly suggested Trajan and Theodosius for imitation.

More generally, the Christian histories put empire/s into a historical perspective, more or less imbued with the history of salvation. The world was ancient, and empires had been around for a long time, bringing about as much bad as good. Good and evil were not confined to cer-tain peoples or realms. In spite of Orosius' polemic, the overwhelming impression was that even pagan emperors could be good rulers, and cer-tainly Christian emperors could be very bad ones. In many respects, the Christian historians of Late Antiquity took surprisingly varied views of Christian Roman history (the contradictory representations of Constan-tine are just one example). The Carolingian world accepted the challenge and showed no reluctance to face these contradictions. Empire, and its relationship to spiritual authority, would remain a contentious issue up to the nineteenth century. The idea that empire was the natural form in which a Christian commonwealth should be organised had lost its appeal to Western churchmen already in the fifth or sixth centuries, and the histories could easily be read that way. What the *Liber pontificalis* or Paul the Deacon write about seventh- and eighth-century Byzantium is little more than a succession of heresies and usurpations. They do not go as far as claiming that Byzantium had squandered its legitimacy, but cer-tainly leave the impression that things had been going wrong for a while. Yet many of the texts discussed here make the lure of empire felt behind the many shortcomings of its representatives, and indicate the potential that a large-scale imperial polity offered. Christian empire, they suggest, was a form of government that had not yet been successfully put into practice for any considerable period of time, due to human weakness and the workings of the devil. Things could be done better. Empire was a resource of the past that could have a future.

---

[109] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistolae*, 37, ed. Levillain, 1, p. 164; McKitterick, *History and Memory*, p. 208.