

PHILIPPE BUC

NOCH EINMAL 918–919

Of the ritualized demise of kings and of political rituals in general¹

*This article is dedicated to Tim Reuter,
a scholar-prince much to be mourned.*

As 918 drew to a wintry close, King Conrad lay dying. His reign had been short. Perhaps, as Adalbert of Magdeburg later suggested, the Franconian ruler had been exhausted by bitter feuds against his former peers, the German »dukes«. Some of these vendettas were deeply rooted, having grown in a fertile soil – the violent readjustments of the pecking order within the aristocracy brought about by two successive crises in kingship, Charles the Fat's 887/888 deposition and Arnulf of Carinthia's 900 problematic succession.² Thus, the greater men of Germany had far from always been the king's best friends, or those of his ancestors or relatives. Yet – so says another source, Liudprand of Cremona – Conrad now called them to his deathbed.

Adalbert and Liudprand's quills – on the surface of things – broadly agree with yet another tenth-century source, Widukind of Corvey, as to Conrad's succession.

¹ My thanks for many enlightening discussions go to Igor Gorevich, Mayke de Jong, Kathryn Miller, and Timothy Reuter. A first version of this text was presented in December 2001 in the seminar led by Robert Jacob and Claude Gauvard, Paris I-Sorbonne, and I benefited from questions raised there. Especial thanks go to Gerd Althoff for having invited me, his permanent adversary, to speak in Münster, and treated me at least as well as Berengar I treated Lambert. Main sources used here: Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis*, ed. by PAOLO CHIESA, *Liudprandi Cremonensis Opera Omnia*, CCCM 156, Turnhout 1998 (the edition by JOSEPH BECKER, *Die Werke Liudprands von Cremona* (MGH SS rer. Germ. in u.s. 41) Hannover 1915, is still useful owing to its historical apparatus); Widukind of Corvey, *Res Gestae Saxonicae*, ed. by PAUL HIRSCH and HANS-EBERHARD LOHMANN (MGH SS rer. Germ. in u.s. 60) Hannover 1935; Adalbert of Magdeburg, *Continuatio Reginonis*, ed. by FRIEDRICH KURZE, *Reginonis abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi* (MGH SS rer. Germ. in u.s. 50) Hannover 1890; *Panegyricus Berengarii*, ed. by PAUL VON WINTERFELD (MGH Poetae 4:1) Berlin 1899, p. 354–401. Throughout, I use the term »ritual« only as a shorthand, here synonymous with political ceremony, and without wanting to suggest that it had a privileged efficiency in early medieval political culture. See PHILIPPE BUC, *Dangers of Ritual. Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory*, Princeton 2001.

² Regino, *Chronicon ad an. 906* (as n. 1) p. 151–152. MICHAEL FRASE, *Friede und Königsherrschaft. Quellenkritik und Interpretation der Continuatio Reginonis*, Frankfurt a.M. 1990, p. 12–14, sums up how scholarship identified with a high degree of probability the continuator with Adalbert. On the feuds before and after Conrad's accession, see ECKHARD MÜLLER-MERTENS, *The Ottonians as kings and emperors*, in: *New Cambridge Medieval History 3*, ed. by TIMOTHY REUTER, Cambridge 1999, p. 233–266, here p. 237–239. MATTHEW INNES, *State and Society in the early middle ages. The Middle Rhine valley, 400–1000*, Cambridge 2000, has brought to light, for the preceding century and for one of the regions the Conradines took over, the mechanisms linking aristocratic violence and lack of access to the king. MARTIN LINTZEL, *Miszellen zur Geschichte des zehnten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1953, p. 20–30, reprint in: EDUARD HLAWITSCHKA (ed.), *Königswahl und Thronfolge in ottonisch-frühdeutscher Zeit*, Darmstadt 1971, p. 322–329, detects symptoms of a hostility between Liudolfings and Conradines already in 900–901.

The dying Franconian ordered that Henry, »duke« of the Saxons,³ be chosen as his successor. He had recognized (to cite Widukind's expression) that his kindred no longer held »fortuna atque mores« – »fortune« and »virtue« had passed on to the Saxon. The royal insignia were to be taken to him. These three famously convergent narratives are etched into German consciousness. Until the 1980s, German historiography could see in the deathbed scene the symbol of »die Anfänge der deutschen Geschichte«. In this moment, a united will had triumphed; the great men of the eastern realm wanted to remain together, under a single king, in a single political community. This despite the civil wars of the preceding era, and King Conrad's attempts to force the dukes into subjection.⁴ If we trust an oppositional Swabian annalist, to bridle his peers, Conrad had not even hesitated to have recourse to treason.⁵ Yet in 918–919, the common good and some foreshadowing of the abstract notion of the state had triumphed; the Frankish Conradine *Sippe* allowed royal power to pass into the hands of the Saxon Liudolfings. While the nationalist spirits that animated this line of inquiry have become unfashionable, some historians are still willing to see in 918–919 a turning point. This is due in no small part to the inertia of grand narratives. But another factor lies in the emotional force of the deathbed scene – a force tripled if one allows oneself to synthesize the three versions given by Adalbert, Liudprand of Cremona, and Widukind of Corvey.⁶

This synthesis is well known from textbooks. Conrad had been unable to tame the dukes of East Francia. Being childless, he resigned himself that the royal dignity would leave his kindred instead of passing on to his closest relative, his brother Eberhard. Conrad designated instead his former enemy Henry to be his successor, and demon-

³ Matthias BECHER, *Rex, Dux und Gens. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung des sächsischen Herzogtums im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Husum 1996, p. 67–91, underlines how this ducal title represents an anachronism for the early tenth-century Liudolfings; it was projected back on the emperor's ancestors by Otto I's chancery and by Ottonian historiography.

⁴ Cf. JOACHIM EHLERS, *Schriftkultur, Ethnogenese und Nationsbildung in ottonischer Zeit*, in: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 23, 1989, p. 302–317; repr. in: *Id.*, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. by MARTIN KINTZINGER and BERND SCHNEIDMÜLLER, Berlin 1996, p. 325–343; STEFAN WEINFURTER, *Ottonische »Neuanfänge« und ihre Perspektiven*, in: BERND SCHNEIDMÜLLER and STEFAN WEINFURTER (eds.), *Ottonische Neuanfänge. Symposium zur Ausstellung »Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa«*, Mainz 2001, p. 1–16, here 2–4, for a brief panorama and the relevant bibliography. One should mention the syntheses by HELMUT BEUMANN, *Die Ottonen*, Stuttgart 1994, p. 30–32; EDUARD HLAWITSCHKA, *Vom Frankenreich zur Formierung der europäischen Staaten- und Völkergemeinschaft 840–1046*, Darmstadt 1986, esp. p. 98–101; CARLRICHARD BRÜHL, *Deutschland-Frankreich. Die Geburt zweier Völker*, Cologne 1995, p. 410–427, who discusses nationalist historiography and raises the question of the sources. WALTER SCHLESINGER, *Die Königserhebung Heinrichs I. zu Fritzlar im Jahre 919*, in: *Magistrat der Stadt Fritzlar* (ed.), *Fritzlar im Mittelalter. Festschrift zur 1250-Jahrfeier*, Fritzlar 1974, p. 121–143, here 122–123, 142–143, repr. in: *Id.*, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. by HANS PATZE and FRED SCHWIND, Sigmaringen 1987, p. 198–220, sees in the rival elevations of Henry and Arnulf (see below at note 7) the symptom of the presence among the great of both a desire for unity and an emergent consciousness that they constituted a »German« people.

⁵ The *Annales Alamannici* (MGH SS 1) Hannover 1826, p. 56, or ed. WALTER LENDI, *Untersuchungen zur frühalemannischen Annalistik*, Freiburg 1971, p. 190, mention bitterly the »political trials« under Louis the Child and Conrad.

⁶ BRÜHL (as n. 4) p. 422. B. Rosenwein announces a book on medieval emotions – see already her article and discussions in: *Early medieval Europe* 10:2, 2001, p. 225–256, and BARBARA ROSENWEIN, *Worrying about Emotions*, in: *American Historical Review* 107,2, 2002, p. 821–845.

strated this designation by having the royal insignia sent to him. In 919, the Saxon was elected king, but refused the royal anointing. Conrad's brother Eberhard became Henry's faithful, and, after some campaigning, so did the two southern dukes Burchard of Swabia and Arnulf of Bavaria. The submission of the latter may have been more difficult to obtain, for there are testimonies that he tried to establish his own *regnum* against Henry's.⁷

In a 1995 article that has provoked much debate, Johannes Fried has called into question the truth-value of the three narratives, and of the reconstructions based on them.⁸ A first problem lies in the vast time-gap between, on the one hand, the putative events of 918–919 and, on the other hand, the three sources' date of composition – respectively between 958 and 962 for Liudprand, and circa 967/8 for both Widukind and Adalbert.⁹ More radically, Fried believes that is now impossible to disentangle fact from fiction. The scene of Conrad's agony is pure invention; the political conditions that obtained during the last two decades of Otto I's reign, not those present at Henry's beginnings, explain the narrators' choice of the episode's components and human actors. This is what Fried calls »ritualgeleitete Vergangenheitskonstruktion«: the constructed past uses as keystones imagined political rituals.¹⁰ What makes this process of invention

⁷ Status questionis on the nature of the »governance« (*regnum*) of the Liutpolding Arnulf in Bavaria by HERWIG WOLFRAM, Bavaria in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, in: *New Cambridge Medieval History* 3 (as n. 2) p. 293–309, esp. 293–303. For the famous »Bavarii sponte se rediderunt Arnolfo duci et regnare eum [Arnolfum] fecerunt in regno Teutonicorum« of the *Annales ex annalibus Iuvasensibus antiquis excerpti*, ad an. 920 (*vere* 919), ed. by HARRY BRESSLAU (MGH SS 30:2) Leipzig 1934, p. 727–744, here 742, see WOLFRAM, p. 301–302. Cp. BRÜHL (as n. 4) p. 419–421, 426–427. But see now ROMAN DEUTINGER, »Königswahl- und Herzogserhebung Arnulfs von Bayern«, in: *Deutsches Archiv zur Erforschung des Mittelalters* 58, 2002, p. 17–68.

⁸ JOHANNES FRIED, Die Königserhebung Heinrichs I. Erinnerung, Mündlichkeit und Traditionsbildung im 10. Jahrhundert, in: MICHAEL BORGOLTE (ed.), *Mittelalterforschung nach der Wende* 1989, Munich 1995, p. 267–318. The first modern study on a tenth-century author as author is owed to HELMUT BEUMANN, *Widukind von Corvei. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Weimar 1950. See as well ID., *Historiographische Konzeption und politische Ziele Widukinds von Corvey*, in: *Deutsches Archiv* 20, 1964, p. 325–388, repr. in ID., *Wissenschaft vom Mittelalter. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Cologne 1972, p. 71–108. For Anglo-American historiography, one must cite the seminal study by WALTER GOFFART, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800)*. Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon, Princeton 1988. In the mid-1990s, this style of approach, inspired by or re-enforced by postmodernism reaches Germany; one shall cite next to Fried's 1995 article BEATE SCHUSTER, *Das Treffen von St. Jean de Losne im Widerstreit der Meinungen. Zur Freiheit der Geschichtsschreibung im 12. Jahrhundert*, in: *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 43:3, 1995, p. 211–245. Fried returns here to the scepticism of LINTZEL, whose insights he mentions in a note; see, e.g., LINTZEL (as n. 2) and IDEM, *Zur Designation und Wahl König Heinrichs I.*, in: *Deutsches Archiv* 6, 1943, p. 379–400, repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA (as n. 2) p. 46–70.

⁹ On the written reports concerning 918/919, it is instructive to compare two studies separated in time by a century, CARL DÄNDLIKER and JOHANNES MÜLLER, *Liudprand von Cremona und seine Quellen*, Leipzig 1871, p. 140–141, and ERNST KARPF, *Herrscherlegitimation und Reichsbegriff in der ottonischen Geschichtsschreibung des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1985, passim and p. 191–196.

¹⁰ FRIED (as n. 8) p. 302–303.

possible is early medieval culture's fundamentally oral nature.¹¹ To cite and paraphrase Fried:

»Before being fixed down in writing, knowledge of the past and historical memory [...] were subjected to those basic conditions that one would expect in a fundamentally oral society, without writing or where writing is rare, without specialists that have authority over the transmission [of the past]«

(»[Historisches Wissen bzw. historische Erinnerung] unterlag, bevor es schriftlich fixiert wurde, jenen Grundbedingungen, die innerhalb der schriftlosen oder schriftarmen, weithin oralen Gesellschaft ohne spezialisierte und autorisierte Tradenten zu erwarten waren.«).

Historical memory never stood still; it mutated constantly, without society being aware of it, even during the lifetime of the agents that were being remembered. The present needs of the groups that remembered the past and the conditions in which they found themselves determined the specific contents of historical memory and historical knowledge.¹²

As far as 918–919 is concerned, the determining horizon was constituted by the 950s and 960s. Fried detects there the presence of bad Conradines, still opposed to the interests of the ruling Ottonian circles.¹³ In this line of reasoning, the commemoration of the pact struck at Conrad's death could justify a categorical condemnation of any relative of the former king who might rebel, or had already rebelled, against his Saxon successors. Perhaps the story of the pact was mustered precisely against Eberhard and his heirs. Along with Gislebert of Lotharingia, Conrad's piously obedient brother of 918–919 had ended up heading the great 938–939 rebellion against Otto I. And found there a dramatic end, painted in vivid colors by the historiographers of the 960s.¹⁴ But this horizon encompassed as well good Conradines – a branch of the *Sippe* faithful to Otto, and (so Fried surmises) in conflict with Eberhard.¹⁵ (The data concerning this friendship is quite preeminent in our three sources, which suggests strongly that the very same groups that sought to commemorate 918–919 also wanted to remember precisely these specific »good« Conradines). This familial sprig encompassed Count Udo and especially his brother Hermann, who had been made Duke of Swabia after Burchard's

¹¹ Compare SCHLESINGER (as n. 4) p. 127 and n. 34, for whom the hypothesis of the oral transmission of a core of historical facts is more likely than the hypothesis of a fictional »court legend«. Says Schlesinger: »the fact that legend [...] adopted the topic is rather a sign that the impression that the event had on contemporaries and posterity was profound«; and, conversely, LINTZEL (as n. 2) p. 39–40, repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA (as n. 2) p. 342–343, who sees in the adoption of the death-bed story by later legends a hint that the three sources, Adalbert, Widukind, and Liudprand, already strongly participate of the legendary.

¹² FRIED (as n. 8) p. 273–275; cf. ID., *Der Weg in die Geschichte. Die Ursprünge Deutschlands bis 1024*, Berlin 1994, p. 461.

¹³ FRIED (as n. 8) p. 279–280, 294–297; cf. FRIED (as n. 12) p. 506–508 (on the crisis and realignments that Otto's second marriage with Adelheid triggered).

¹⁴ FRIED (as n. 8) p. 291–296. But cp. KARPf (as n. 9) p. 159–162, who surmises that Widukind is describing a *pactum* between Eberhard and Henry, a *pactum* that does not entail the one's submission to the other, and which will be broken when Otto will back a Saxon vassal of Eberhard against Eberhard.

¹⁵ FRIED (as n. 8) p. 294–296. See also THOMAS ZOTZ, *Der Breisgau und das alemannische Herzogtum. Zur Verfassungs- und Besitzgeschichte im 10. und beginnenden 11. Jahrhundert*, Sigmaringen 1974, p. 103–110.

death in 926. Udo (d. 949) had defeated the 939 rebels at the key battle of Andernach, where Eberhard and Gislebert of Lotharingia had found their death. Two years later, conspirators plotted to kill the king during Easter and replace him with his brother Henry. Udo, Hermann, and Conrad ›the Red‹ formed the intimate circle of advisors that helped Otto to seize these men and condemn them to capital punishment.¹⁶ Conrad the Red, son-in-law to Otto, was probably a Conradine on his mother's side.¹⁷ Hermann, duke of Swabia, ›the most prudent and most wise among his group‹ had died in 949, but his memory remained potent in the years 958–968. Hermann, indeed, had betrothed in 947 his daughter to Otto's eldest legitimate son, young prince Liudolf (who, according to Widukind, had been designated his father's heir in 946).¹⁸ Liudolf had died too before the three sources' composition (in 957). Nevertheless, through him, the late Hermann was still the grandfather, alongside Otto I, of the first male of royal blood in this Liudolfing generation – Otto (954–982), later Duke of Swabia (973) and Bavaria (976).¹⁹ These Conradines, then, enjoyed a massive *Königsnähe*. Contemporary historiography projected back onto the Saxon dynasty's originary moment both the alliance with the *Sippe* and the implicit condemnation of any betrayal from within its ranks.

Fried's 1995 model is extreme and has provoked sharp rejoinders. Since then – but without explicitly saying so – Fried has moved away from radical doubts and shown how to extract political history from the complex web of historical memory.²⁰ Yet the problem of what can be salvaged concerning what occurred in 918–919 remains. So do,

¹⁶ Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 2.31 (as n. 1) p. 92:4–23. On the Conradines, see DONALD C. JACKMAN, *The Konradiner. A Study in Genealogical Methodology*, Frankfurt 1990, with the objections of JOHANNES FRIED, *Prolepsis oder Tod? Methodische und andere Bemerkungen zur Konradiner-Genealogie im 10. und frühen 11. Jahrhundert*, in: JOACHIM DAHLHAUS and ARMIN KOHNLE (eds.), *Papstgeschichte und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift für Hermann Jakobs zum 65. Geburtstag*, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna 1995, p. 69–119. Genealogical polemics on the Conradines seem endless; see most recently JOSEF HEINZELMANN, *Spanheimer-Späne, Schachwappen und Konradinererbe*, in: *Jahrbuch für westdeutsche Landesgeschichte* 25, 1999, p. 7–67.

¹⁷ JACKMAN (as n. 16) p. 225–231.

¹⁸ Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 3.1 (as n. 1) p. 104; The *Annals of Lobbes* ad an. 951 & 956 also call him *rex* (MGH SS 13) Hannover 1881, p. 234 (well informed, they also know ›Bruno, frater eius parvulus‹, ad an. 956, his half-brother); Liudprand and Adalbert make Liudolf a mere *dux*; see FRASE (as n. 2) p. 234f. The *Annales necrologici Fuldenses* ad an. 957 (MGH SS 13) Berlin 1881, p. 198b, make ›Liudolf filius regis‹ die on 6 Sept., ›Brun parvulus filius regis‹ on 8 Sept.). See WINFRIED GLOCKER, *Die Verwandten der Ottonen und ihre Bedeutung in der Politik*, Cologne 1989, p. 101–102, 278–279.

¹⁹ Cf. Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 2.11, 2.26, 2.31, 3.75 (as n. 1) p. 75:2–5, 88:7–15, 92:20–23, 152:12–16; Adalbert, *Continuatio Reginonis* ad an. 910 (as n. 1) p. 154: ›... Udo(ne) et Herimann(o), qui postea clari et nobiles in Francia extiterunt‹; ad an. 949, p. 164: ›Herimannus dux, inter suos sapientissimus et prudentissimus‹. For Otto, see Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 3.57, p. 136:1–2: ›[Liudolf] reliquit post se filium patris vocabulo insignitum‹. The future Otto II had been born the following year, according to Adalbert, ad. an. 954, p. 168. BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 1, had already underlined the importance of Liudolf for the historiography produced in the reign of Otto I.

²⁰ See, respectively on 813–817 and on 799–801, JOHANNES FRIED, *Elite und Ideologie, oder die Nachfolgeordnung Karls des Großen vom Jahre 813*, in: RÉGINE LE JAN (ed.), *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne*, Lille 1998, p. 71–109, and ID., *Papst Leo III. besucht Karl den Großen in Paderborn oder Einhard's Schweigen*, in: *Historische Zeitschrift* 272, 2001, p. 281–326.

even more, the methodological questions. In this sense continuing reference to the 1995 article is still highly productive, for an extreme model highlights methodological stakes much more clearly than later, more nuanced but more muddled avatars. Consequently, at the risk of *déjà vu*, I rehearse some of the controversy. Was indeed, as queried politely but firmly Hagen Keller, tenth-century Germany *fast schriftlos*? Can one apply to it models provided by ethnologists studying oral societies?²¹ The seeming importance of political rituals might tempt one to nod positively, owing to the correlation often posited between ritual and orality – a correlation that has increasingly come under attack.²² Second, Gerd Althoff has recently countered that the medievalist cannot process in the same way epics, *origines gentium*, and traditions on the origins of a dynasty when these traditions happened to be presented back to members of that very dynasty.²³ The relationship between authors and the ruling circles was such that historical memory could not flow in just any direction. I cite Althoff: »Diese radikale Überlieferungskritik lässt [...] bestimmte Rahmenbedingungen von Erinnerung im 10. Jahrhundert ausser Acht, die zugleich Rahmenbedingungen von Herrschaft waren« (this radical critique of the transmission of sources does not take into account precise conditions and frameworks of memory in the tenth century, which were all at once conditions and frameworks for rulership). By this, Althoff means specifically that when the audience of a text recounting the past comprised an agent of that past, or one of his or her relatives, »one may have been bound by the preexisting ways to envisage [the past]«. The author could diverge from the facts only to amplify the more glorious moments and paper over problems or failures.²⁴

In a book published simultaneously, the same Althoff has argued that the past is still accessible, and proposed – not without commendable caution – a reconstruction

²¹ HAGEN KELLER, Widukinds Bericht über die Aachener Wahl und Krönung Ottos I., in: Frühmittelalterliche Studien 29, 1995, p. 390–453, esp. 406–410 and notes. The examples that Fried gives of orality necessarily come from written traditions. See the enlightening remarks of STEFFEN PATZOLD, Konflikte im Kloster. Studien zu Auseinandersetzungen in monastischen Gemeinschaften des ottonisch-salischen Reichs, Husum 2000, p. 50, concerning the a-prioris that have led historians down that road.

²² Althoff had, until recently, posited that rituals played, in the absence of writing, the role of univocal means of communication. This position is close to that of KARL J. LEYSER, Ritual, Ceremony and Gesture: Ottonian Germany, in: ID., Communications and Power in Medieval Europe, ed. by TIMOTHY REUTER, 2 vols., London 1994, p. 1.189–213, here 192–196 and 211 (in German: Ritual, Zeremonie und Gestik. Das ottonische Reich, Frühmittelalterliche Studien 27, 1993, p. 1–26, here 5–9 and 24–25). See the critiques in PHILIPPE BUC, Rituel politique et imaginaire politique, in: Revue historique 305:4, 2001, p. 843–883, here 859–860. This tendency in European historiography to join ritual to orality also owes something to the accent placed since the early Modern era on the sensual nature of rites, on their socially stabilizing function, and on the alleged correlation between weak power of the political center and the compensatory strength of rituals – see ID. (as n. 1) p. 161ff.

²³ GERD ALTHOFF, Geschichtsschreibung in einer oralen Gesellschaft, in: SCHNEIDMÜLLER and WEINFURTER (as n. 4) p. 151–169, here 153–154.

²⁴ ALTHOFF (as n. 23) p. 153, 154, 168 (see as well KELLER [as n. 21], p. 403 and n. 66, 410 n. 95). Cp. FRIED (as n. 8) p. 276–277. I am grateful to Timothy Reuter for having reminded me that for many historians Widukind's Deeds of the Saxons participate of the literary genre of the epic. See BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 51–65 and passim.

of the transfer of power in 918–919.²⁵ It seems to him allowable on two grounds.²⁶ First, the stark convergences between the three versions of Conrad's death suggest that tradition did not shape itself arbitrarily, and can lead back to a hard core of facts. Second, the sources contain two other convergent streams: the manner in which the dukes recognized Henry, and Henry's refusal of the anointing.²⁷ They fit so well within the historical context and political culture of tenth-century Germany as to have a high degree of likelihood. In turn, the high probability that these two narrative clusters correspond to some historical truth renders more probable Conrad's deathbed bequest of the royal *potestas*. The sources propose that immediately after Conrad's death, two or three of the dukes, one by one, negotiated their relationship with Henry according to a composite ritual. In a first phase, Eberhard, Burchard and Arnulf performed a *deditio*, a public and solemn submission. It manifested itself with the surrender of their treasures or of their main city, into which they led the king. In a second phase, Henry granted them, equally publicly and demonstratively, the highest boon a king could give: his *amicitia*.²⁸ The meaning of this pairing is clear given the tenth-century political culture that Althoff himself, in the wake of the regretted Heinrich Fichtenau, has done so much to map out and theorize.²⁹ Effectively, the king and the magnates have entered in a pact

²⁵ GERD ALTHOFF, *Die Ottonen. Königsherrschaft ohne Staat*, Darmstadt 2000, p. 29–46.

²⁶ Actually, on three grounds. Even though it is also methodologically important, for expository purposes, I relegate the third to this footnote. On the basis of other documents that bear on 911–920 and are independent of the three narrative sources, Althoff deems it likely that Conrad and Henry were reconciled prior to the king's death. The Saxon bishops loyal to Henry did not participate in the 916 synod of Hohenaltheim (on which see recently GENEVIÈVE BÜHRER-THIERRY, *Evêques et pouvoir dans le royaume de Germanie*, Paris 1997, p. 92–104) but this assembly's legislation did not condemn the Liudolfing prince – unlike the powerful Swabian counts Berthold and Erchanger, called upon to enter monasteries for perpetual penance, or the dukes Arnulf and Burchard, threatened with excommunication if they did not perform due penance (ALTHOFF [as n. 25], p. 34–35; Hohenaltheim c. 34, ed. by ERNST-DIETER HEHL, *Concilia Aevi Saxonici, 919–960* (MGH Concilia 6:1) Hannover 1987, p. 36). With greater evidentiary power – since it comes from a totally different source-genre – is the information that Conrad and his wife Kunigunde were taken in the Ottonian liturgical commemoration of the dead. Cf. GERD ALTHOFF, *Amicitiae und pacta. Bündnis, Einung, Politik und Gebetsgedenken im beginnenden 10. Jahrhundert*, Hannover 1992, p. 240–264, 363–375, table XXIX, 2.

²⁷ ALTHOFF (as n. 25) p. 40–42.

²⁸ See Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* I.26–27 (as n. 1) p. 39–40. The status of *amicus regis* or *philos basiléos* did not necessarily entail equality between the king and his »friend« (BURKHARD MEISSNER, *Hofmann und Herrscher. Was es für die Griechen hieß, Freund eines Königs zu sein*, in: *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82, 2000, p. 1–36) but equality seems to have been normative in the tenth century, see VERENA EPP, *Amicitia. Zur Geschichte personaler, sozialer, politischer und geistlicher Beziehungen im frühen Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1999.

²⁹ Cf. GERD ALTHOFF, *Königsherrschaft und Konfliktbewältigung im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert*; ID., *Das Privileg der deditio. Formen gütlicher Konfliktbeendigung in der mittelalterlichen Adelsgesellschaft*; ID., *Huld. Überlegungen zu einem Zentralbegriff der mittelalterlichen Herrschaftsordnung*, all repr. in: ALTHOFF, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*, Darmstadt 1997, p. 21–56, 99–125, and 199–228. See as well HEINRICH FICHTEAU, *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts. Studien über Denkart und Existenz im einstigen Karolingerreich*, 2 vols., Stuttgart 1984.

of alliance; it has been sealed (or even brought into being) by gestures and deeds that demonstrate its nature: an equilibrium between superiority and equality.³⁰

This composite ritual pact is for Althoff consonant with what one can otherwise reconstruct of the reign of Henry I.³¹ The Saxon renounced his predecessor Conrad's Neo-Carolingian policy, and left a high degree of autonomy to the dukes, his former peers. A second element dovetails with this all: Henry's refusal, recounted by Widukind, of the crown and anointing that archbishop Heriger of Mainz preferred to him. The Saxon turned it down so as not to exalt himself above those who had been his equals under Conrad.³² This set of convergences and internal consistencies, both between the three sources and within the political ideology that they present, allows Althoff to plead for the existence of a factual core to the narratives on 918–919, including the death-bed legacy.

To navigate between the sharp shoals of two German *Ordinarii* can make for a dangerous odyssey. Have Keller and Althoff countered once and for all Fried's 1995 position? Keller expressed legitimate skepticism regarding Fried's postulate of orality. One should even go further. First of all, it has scant explanatory power. The introduction of ethnological »orality« into this specific debate brings little new result (the comparison with the equally skeptical Martin Lintzel, who had already demolished in the 1940s the

³⁰ The structure Althoff brings to light here is analogous to Le Goff's proposal to see the ritual of vassalage as made up of two parts balancing elements of equality and superiority – see JACQUES LE GOFF, *Le rituel symbolique de la vassalité*, repr. in: *Id.*, *Pour un autre Moyen Age*, Paris 1977, p. 349–420 (American trans., *The Symbolic Ritual of Vassalage*, in: LE GOFF, *Time, Work and Culture*, Chicago 1980, p. 237–287).

³¹ Characteristics that Althoff did much, with others, to bring to light; see GERD ALTHOFF and HAGEN KELLER, *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große. Neubeginn und karolingisches Erbe*, 2 vols., Göttingen 1985. Earlier: HAGEN KELLER, *Reichsstruktur und Herrschaftsauffassung in ottonisch-frühsalischer Zeit*, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 16, 1982, p. 74–128, and ECKHARD MÜLLER-MERTENS, *Die Reichsstruktur im Spiegel der Herrschaftspraxis Ottos des Großen*, Berlin 1980.

³² Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae* 1.26 (as n. 1) p. 39:6–15, with ALTHOFF (as n. 25) p. 43–45. An excursus on the vexed question of Henry as »non-anointed king« may have its place here. JOACHIM OTT, *Kronen und Krönungen in frühottonischer Zeit*, in: SCHNEIDMÜLLER and WEINFURTER (as n. 4) p. 171–188, here 172–175, reminds us that according to Widukind Henry refused both the anointing and the crown, but that according to Liudprand, he initially refused the royal dignity to finally accept it. The texts thus do not make it impossible that Henry might at first have rejected, then accepted, simultaneously the anointing and the crown. Widukind would have simply omitted the second half of the sequence (the acceptance). The cryptic vision recounted much later – circa 982/993 – by the *Vita Oudalrici* 3, ed. by HARTO KALLFELZ, *Vitae quorundam episcoporum seculorum X, XI, XII*, Darmstadt 1973, p. 62:16–20, may not contrast as the »king who will hold the governance (*regnum*) without a pontifical blessing« and the »king who will hold the reins of governance by God's blessing« so much Henry I and Otto I, as Otto I and Berengar II. The vision places the kings in the future, and its ultimate recipient is Henry, already king. The topos of the elect reluctant to rule is explored by BJÖRN WEILER, *The rex renitens and the Medieval Ideal of Kingship*, c. 950–c. 1250, in: *Viator* 31, 2000, p. 1–42. I verified with Professor Weiler the lack of Carolingian precedents to Henry's refusal of the crown. The model of a refusal of the *imperial* ornaments is classical, see Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris* 1, vv. 130–189, ed. by JOSEPH PARTSCH, *Corippi Africani grammatici libri qui supersunt (MGH Auctores antiquissimi 3:2)* Berlin 1879, p. III–156, here 121–122. However, as Althoff pointed out in the public discussion of this paper at the Münster conference, this first textual occurrence of a royal refusal of the anointing and of the crown begs for an explanation.

trustworthiness of the *Sage* on 918–919, is telling).³³ Second of all, it was not some fluid oral memory that produced the substratum of the narratives on 918–919. Early medieval society did have authorized specialists of memory. What else were the authors of Carolingian annals?³⁴ And did monasteries' officials not comprise the *armarius*? The *armarius* or librarian was entrusted with the recording of history so as to better present his institution's rights and properties in a chronological framework punctuated with memorable events.³⁵ His task was also to predict the future in the light of the past.³⁶ Monks and clerks may have been professional forgers and active in the willful twisting of the past; they were still authoritative specialists.³⁷ It is to the written craft and techniques of such men that we owe the texts on 918–919.

In fact, contrary to what both Fried and Althoff assume, it seems very likely that, for 918–919, Adalbert summarized either Liudprand, or a source of Liudprand, or a derivative of Liudprand.³⁸ As Karl Hauck had already demonstrated in 1974, one can easily transpose Liudprand's text into that of Adalbert through simple processes: condensation and substitution of synonyms. But the basic architectural structure of the two narratives is identical, sentence segment after sentence segment.³⁹ We have here the palimpsest, perhaps, of an authorized version, lost to us, but most likely written. More

³³ Cf. LINTZEL (as n. 2) and ID. (as n. 8).

³⁴ Important articles by McKitterick; see ROSAMOND MCKITTERICK with MATTHEW INNES, The writing of history, in: ROSAMOND MCKITTERICK (ed.), *Carolingian culture: emulation and innovation*, Cambridge 1994, p. 193–220; EAD., *Constructing the past in the early Middle Ages: the case of the Royal Frankish Annals*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th s., 7, 1997, p. 101–129; EAD., *The Illusion of Royal Power in the Carolingian Annals*, *English Historical Review* 460, 2000, p. 1–20.

³⁵ See, e.g., PATRICK J. GEARY, *Phantoms of Remembrance. Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium*, Princeton 1994, and AMY G. REMENSNYDER, *Remembering Kings Past. Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France*, Ithaca 1995.

³⁶ KARL-FERDINAND WERNER, *Gott, Herrscher und Historiograph. Der Geschichtsschreiber als Interpret des Wirkens Gottes in der Welt und Ratgeber der Könige (4.–12. Jahrhundert)*, in: ERNST-DIETER HEHL et al. (eds.), *Deus qui mutat tempora. Festgabe für Alfons Becker*, Sigmaringen 1987, p. 1–31; ID., *L'histoire et les rois*, in: DOMINIQUE IOGNA-PRAT and JEAN-CHARLES PICARD (eds.), *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil*, Paris 1990, p. 135–143. The best guide to *Geschichtstheologie* and its relation to medieval historiography is probably Goetz, see most recently HANS-WERNER GOETZ, *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewußtsein im hohen Mittelalter*, Berlin 1999.

³⁷ Alongside the articles of McKitterick (above, n. 34) studies by both Althoff and Fried have eloquently demonstrated with what intensity ninth and tenth-century authors reworked the past: FRIED (as n. 20); GERD ALTHOFF, *Causa scribendi und Darstellungsabsicht. Die Lebensbeschreibungen der Königin Mathilde und andere Beispiele*, in: MICHAEL BORGOLTE and HERRAD SPILLING (eds.), *Litterae Medii Aevi. Festschrift Johannes Authenrieth*, Sigmaringen 1988, p. 117–133.

³⁸ ALTHOFF (as n. 25) p. 37, thinks that the three sources are independent from one another: »... die [drei Autoren] insofern unabhängig voneinander schrieben, als keiner das Werk des anderen benutzte oder kannte«.

³⁹ The demonstration is in the appendix. I do not go much further than KARL HAUCK, *Erzbischof Adalbert von Magdeburg als Geschichtsschreiber*, in: HELMUT BEUMANN (ed.), *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, 2 vols., Cologne 1974, vol. 2, p. 276–353, here 285–287 (comparison) and 287–289 (analysis). Hauck believes that Adalbert borrowed directly from Liudprand, the simplest stemma, which is not however the sole possible one.

important for the odyssean navigation between Althoff and Fried, one can identify the tradition that provided some of the key elements in this version.

In all likelihood in 915 or shortly after, an anonymous author composed a Panegyric to Emperor Berengar I, king of Italy.⁴⁰ It opens with the death of Charles the Fat and closes on a lengthy description of Berengar's imperial coronation and its ceremonies. The Panegyric includes two deathbed scenes. The first one is that of Charles the Fat; Ernst Dümmler had already noticed in 1871 its parallels with Conrad's agony.⁴¹ The emperor had recognized in the margrave

»a man who rejoiced in being under the banners of war, who was governed by reason, and who deserved the charge of the kingdom. [...] He chose him to be [...] his trusted *amicus* and a delegate able to bear the insignia of military command (*fusces imperii*) should war happen to flare up«.⁴²

As he lay dying, Charles summoned his main helpers; his last words were devoted to Berengar, ultimately destined to the imperial office, but first to reign over Italy.⁴³

Long struggles ensue, for an enemy arises immediately. Until his own demise, Wido of Spoleto will contend with Berengar for the Italian *regnum*. But in the end, in a second deathbed scene, Wido advises his son Lambert to submit to Berengar. Lambert will comply. This scenario does violence to the chronology of rule in Italy that the diplomata of Wido, Lambert, and Berengar allow one to reconstruct. Lambert reigned; Lambert became emperor; and before Lambert's death Berengar was not much of

⁴⁰ Panegyricus Berengarii (as n. 1). On Berengar's reign, see most recently BARBARA ROSENWEIN, The Family Politics of Berengar I, King of Italy (888–924), in: *Speculum* 71, 1996, p. 247–289, an important study that brings to light the networks and strategies of the king. EAD., *Negotiating Space. Power, Restraint and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe*, Ithaca 1999, p. 137–155, argues that Berengar was not a weak king, did not grant concessions of rights and domains out of political weakness, and acquired instead symbolic power by giving immunities and proclaiming himself bound by his own gifts. In my opinion, and with due appreciation for Professor Rosenwein's always stimulating hypotheses, the averred failure of the king argues for the opposite. In the early Middle Ages, on the continent, it was rare for kings to be assassinated – yet such was Berengar's fate. Rosenwein attributes the ultimate failure of Berengar to a change in policies: the king went from a consensual mode of governance (marked by gift-exchange) to a coercive mode; see EAD., *Family Politics*, p. 277–278. In the vein of older historiography, this might simply prove that Berengar lost aristocratic support when he stopped bribing it. Cp. HAGEN KELLER, *Zur Struktur der Königsherrschaft im karolingischen und nachkarolingischen Italien. Der »consiliarius regis«*, in: *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 47, 1967, p. 123–223.

⁴¹ ERNST DÜMMLER, *Gesta Berengarii imperatoris. Beiträge zur Geschichte Italiens im Anfange des zehnten Jahrhunderts*, Halle 1871, p. 14: »Völlig von der Wahrheit entfernt sich unser Dichter, indem er Karl III. selbst auf dem Sterbebette in voller Machtvollkommenheit Berengar sich zum Nachfolger wählen lässt, in ähnlicher Weise wie nachmals Konrad Heinrich I. erkor«. GERMANA GANDINO, *Il vocabolario politico e sociale di Liutprando di Cremona*, Rome 1995, p. 75 n. 73, also noticed the parallel.

⁴² Panegyricus Berengarii I (as n. 1) vv. 24–28, p. 358: »Ille virum cernens belli sub imagine laetum / Et ratione pium regnique beamine dignum, / Egregii fidum lateris delegit amicum / Fascibus imperique aptum, si bella, ministrum, / Forte ruunt«.

⁴³ Panegyricus Berengarii I (as n. 1) vv. 34–40, p. 359. See the parallels in Liudprand, *Antapodosis* 1.44 & 2.20 (as n. 1) p. 30:847–849 & 44:434–437. HAGEN KELLER, *Zum Sturz Karls III.*, repr. in: EDUARD HLAWITSCHKA, *Königswahl und Thronfolge in fränkisch-karolingischer Zeit*, Darmstadt 1975, p. 432–494, here 489–490, believes that it is possible that Charles designated Berengar his successor for Italy.

a king.⁴⁴ But the scenario anticipates – even more than Charles the Fat’s demise – Conrad’s agony and its aftermath. The same drama is present: »Conrad, as much as he could find strength for it, exhaled these words«; Wido »in broken words, preferred this memorable advice«. Which advice? »Whichever method you may find, give your recognition to Berengar, the strong. For Italy will follow him with a better fate; and he shall even lord over our lands«. Such were Wido’s last words.⁴⁵ If Wido’s advice prefigures Conrad I’s, Lambert’s reaction is not unlike that of Eberhard. He sends to Berengar a close friend who, having prostrated himself before the Friulan, negotiates the following: Berengar shall forget the hostile deeds of Lambert’s father, and rather »choose him [Lambert] to be his friend in governance through a pact of association, and his lieutenant in warfare should Mars incite a conflict« (»Sed legat in regnum sociali foedere amicum, / Miliciæque etiam, Mavors si quando, ministrum / Bella ciet«). Berengar accepts these terms, and invites Lambert to come meet him: »Veniat noster dicendus amicus«; the envoy, joyful, prostrates himself and worships the king. Berengar and Lambert will enter together Pavia, speak together, and will swear mutual oaths.⁴⁶

The process illustrates in an exemplary fashion the model that Althoff has elaborated since the late 1980s of conflict-resolution among the upper aristocracy. All the more when one considers the contemporary glosses that the manuscript of the Panegyric bore:⁴⁷

»Notanda est distinctio precis: nam petebat se amicum (i. e. equalem) legi foedere (i. e. societate) regni, ministrum vero (miliciæ,) [feri]«.

»To choose him. Note the distinction within the request. For he asked to be made a friend, understand, an equal, through a pact, that is, an association, in governance, but to be his lieutenant in military matters«.

⁴⁴ See PAUL HIRSCH, *Die Erhebung Berengar I. von Friaul zum König in Italien*, Strassburg diss., Strassburg 1910. See as well Regino, *Chronicon* ad. an. 894 (as n. 1) p. 142. While chroniclers like Regino are not too trustworthy, the agreement depicted in the Panegyric to share power with Lambert is also rendered unlikely by the »paper trail« provided by the diplomata; see *I diplomi di Guido e di Lamberto* (Fonti per la Storia d’Italia 36), ed. by LUIGI SCHIAPARELLI, Rome 1906. These documents do not suggest any caesura in Widonide rule over Italy with the death of Wido. Furthermore, Lambert kept the notary and archchancellor attested in his father’s last surviving diploma.

⁴⁵ *Panegyricus Berengarii 3* (as n. 1) vv. 178–191, p. 390.

⁴⁶ *Panegyricus Berengarii 3* (as n. 1) vv. 203–240, p. 391–392. *Miliciæ*: cp. Liudprand, *Antapodosis* 2.23 (as n. 1) p. 44: »[Arnaldus/Arnulf] Heinrici regis miles efficitur«.

⁴⁷ *Ad. Panegyricus Berengarii 3* (as n. 1) v. 206, p. 391 note. The Regensburg Continuation to the Annals of Fulda, ad. an. 896, ed. by FRIEDRICH KURZE, *Annales Fuldenses, sive Annales regni Francorum Orientalis* (MGH SS rer. Germ. in u.s. 7) Hannover 1891, repr. 1993, p. 129, may indicate that Lambert and Berengar shared governance: »Post mortem etenim Walfredi Foroiulii marchensis, qui multum fideliter ad imperatorem Veronam contendendo retinuit, ilico Perngarius regnum Italicum invasit et usque ad flumen Adduam quasi hereditario iure contra Lambertum in participationem recepit«. Cf. KELLER (as n. 40) p. 165–166 n. 160. But if the sharing in power occurred, it took place (if we follow the chronology of the Continuation of the Annals of Fulda) only after Arnulf of Carinthia’s retreat from Italy (996), and it would have obeyed territorial criteria (so technically speaking, it would not have made the two men *consortes regni*, sharers in authority over a single realm).

Effectively, Lambert and Berengar stood in a relationship balancing equality and superiority analogous to the one that obtained, if we follow Althoff and Keller, between Henry and his dukes.⁴⁸

What is then the import of the Panegyric of Berengar for the ›beginnings of German history‹? Two opposite interpretive courses open themselves – and they are paradigmatic for the study of tradition in or within a political culture. One is that this source makes even more probable the Althoffian reconstruction of 918–919. The Panegyric confirms indeed that it was conceivable within the traditions of late Carolingian political culture for a ruler to pass on royal potestas not to his nearest relative but to a more fortunate rival. Like Widukind of Corvey later, the Panegyric justifies the transfer in term of *fortuna* and *mores*.⁴⁹ Berengar is the strongest and more fortunate man, a fact recognized by Charles the Fat, Wido, and Lambert (through the mouth of his envoy).⁵⁰ It adds historical plausibility to the terms of the entente between king Henry and the German dukes, and the rituals that effected it and publicized its terms – submission, entry into a town, colloquia. More strongly put even, the traditions shaped by the succession of Charles the Fat – the very moment that opens up the anonymous Panegyric – may have provided a model for action. As the Saxon Henry in the historiography under

⁴⁸ See also the *Modus de Heinrico*, ed. KARL STRECKER, *Die Cambridger Lieder* 18, Berlin 1955, here p. 57–60, where a prince is made second to the ruler for all the kingdom's business: Otdo ›our good emperor‹ greeted Henry; hand in hand they entered a church to pray; they took counsel together; and Otdo entrusted Henry with ›everything that he possessed here / with the exception of what pertained to royalty (*preter quod regale*), what Henry did not desire / Then all counsel found itself under Henry the strong / Whatever Otdo did, Henry was consulted, / and whatever he omitted from doing, Henry was also consulted‹. I thank wholeheartedly Sophia Koers for her help in translating the Old High German. On this poem, see JOHANNES FRIED, *Mündlichkeit, Erinnerung und Herrschaft. Zugleich zum Modus de Heinrico*, in: JOSEPH CANNING and OTTO GERHARD OEXLE (eds.), *Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages*, Göttingen 1998, p. 9–32. The pact could create a true diarchy: after Lambert's accidental hunting death, the military elites beg Berengar to no longer impose upon them to obey two rulers; see *Panegyricus Berengarii* 3 (as n. 1) vv. 288–289, p. 394 (there might be an inverted echo of this in Liudprand, who claims that the peninsular aristocracy always seeks to have two masters so as to play the one against the other). For the Italian situation, where kings would recruit into their counsel the faithful of a former rival for rule, see KELLER (as n. 40) p. 163–167, 173, 184. For rule by counsel, see now BERND SCHNEIDMÜLLER, *Konsensuale Herrschaft. Ein Essay über Formen und Konzepte politischer Ordnung im Mittelalter*, in: PAUL-JOACHIM HEINIG [et al.] (eds.), *Reich, Regionen und Europa im Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Festschrift für Peter Moraw*, Berlin 2000, p. 53–87.

⁴⁹ Cp. Widukind, *Res gestae Saxonicae* 1.25 (as n. 1) p. 38:2. BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 237–238, 252–254, still interpreted Widukind's ›*fortuna atque mores*‹, the ›luck‹ (*Heil*) of the Germanic king – while also underlining Roman origins. See the rebuke in LINTZEL (as n. 2) p. 42–51, or repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA (as n. 2) p. 346–355.

⁵⁰ Destiny is with Berengar, say Charles the Fat (›Attamen Hesperiae proceres pro viribus ardent / Rite subesse tibi, tanto quia digna labore / Cuncta geris. Penes imperii te gloria nostri, / Atque tuis stabit Romana potentia fati!‹), Wido (›Hunc etenim fato meliore sequetur / Hesperia, et nostris etiam dominabitur arvis‹), and Lambert's envoy (›[Edocet Brengarium], quae sit fortuna viro [Lamberto] pacisque voluntas‹) – *Panegyricus Berengarii* 1 (as n. 1) vv. 37–40, 3, vv. 188–189, & 3, v. 213, p. 359, 390, & 391. Conversely, the man who stirs the final conflict reported in the Panegyric, Louis III, despite his imperial Carolingian blood lacks in *fortuna* and *mores* – *Panegyricus Berengarii*, 4, vv. 4–8, p. 395: ›Sollicitat Rhodani gentem; cui moribus auctor / Temnendus Ludovicus erat, sed stirpe legendus, / Brengario genesi conjunctus quippe superba. / Hic dudum Ausonium cupidus regnasse per arvom; / Sed vetuit fortuna‹.

examination here, Arnulf of Carinthia (according to a continuation of the Annals of Fulda quite favorable to him) had obtained the submission of three aristocrats of royal rank, the Robertine Odo, the Welf Rudolph, and Berengar; as Henry, he allowed them at first almost total autonomy.⁵¹

But a second line of interpretation would strengthen – to a point – Fried’s radical skepticism. While this article’s purpose is not to show that a Frenchman can arbitrate between two Germans, it is worth sailing this course for the sake of exploration. For the Panegyric, equally, can help to re-categorize into the realm of fiction the building blocks in Althoff’s reconstruction of 918–919. The Panegyric, or a related text or clusters of texts, might be the more or less direct model of the 918–919 sequence of death-bed wishes / submission / *amicitia* that Althoff finds so internally consistent. Here the existence of a tradition in political culture makes possible the invention of the ritualized political event. And this is how Fried would interpret parallel events – not as models for action but as literary models. This is in particular how he explains a specific case involving both a death-bed scene and a sharing in governance: in 898, as he lay dying, King Odo asked »all men to preserve their fidelity to Charles [the Simple]«, against whom he had fought since 893, but whose rights to share in governance he had finally recognized. Odo’s brother Robert (soon imitated by other aristocrats of ducal rank) then journeyed to visit Charles. Charles having received and honored him, Robert became the Carolingian’s faithful.⁵²

Without further data, the historian can hardly choose between models for action and literary models, between patterned action within a tradition of political culture and authorial reproduction in a political tradition of story-writing or telling. Yet in the case of the sources concerning 918–919, he or she has at his or her disposal some such additional information. Berengar I’s grandson, King Berengar II, the rival of Henry’s son Otto I in Italy, had had in his service Liudprand, author of the earliest surviving narrative on 918–

⁵¹ *Annales Fuldenses, Continuatio Ratisbonensis ad. an. 888* (as n. 47) p. 116–117: »Quod vero Odo comperiens salubri utens consilio contestans se malle suum regnum gratia cum regis pacifice habere quam ulla iactantia contra eius fidelitatem superbire; veniensque humiliter ad regem et gratanter ibi recipitur. Rebus ab utraque parte, prout placuit, prospere dispositis unusquisque reversus est in sua. Rex contra Rodulfum Elisaciam progreditur; inde ad eum misso Alamannico exercitu ipse per Franciam Baiowariam reversus est. Rodolfus enim inito consilio cum primoribus Alamannorum sponte sua ad regem urbem Radasbonam usque pervenit multaque inter illos convenienter adunata ipse a rege cum pace permissus, sicuti venit, ad sua remeavit. Italiam equidem cum exercitu aggredi regi complacuit, sed Perangarius, qui parumper antea cum Witone dimicans cruenter tyranno, hoc praecavens, ne Italicum regnum cum tam valida manu ingressum perperam pateretur, missis ante se principibus suis, ipse vero oppido Tarentino regi se praesentavit. Ob id ergo et a rege est clementer susceptus, nilque ei antequisiti regni abstrahitur; excipiuntur curtes navum et sagum«.

⁵² FRIED (as n. 8) p. 284, a parallel already noticed by LINTZEL (as n. 2) p. 40–41, or repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA (as n. 2) p. 344. *Annales Vedastini ad an. 897–898*, ed. by BERNHARD DE SIMSON, *Annales Xantenses et Annales Vedastini* (MGH SS rer. Germ. in u.s. 12) Hannover 1909; repr. 1979, p. 79:15–80:2: »Odo vero rex [...] graviter infirmari coepit. Qui dum languor per dies singulos increceret, omnibus rogari coepit, ut Karolo servarent fidem. [...] Obiit ipse [...] Post haec Robertus comes, frater regis Odonis, venit ad regem; quem rex honorifice suscepit, eique fidelis effectus, rediit ad sua«. Other sources tell us that Robert kept the honors and possessions of his deceased brother (perhaps according to the provisions of some pact negotiated beforehand); see JEAN DUNBABIN, West Francia: the kingdom, in: *The New Cambridge Medieval History* 3 (as n. 2) p. 372–397, here 376–377.

919, the Antapodosis. The Panegyric and the Antapodosis have common stylistic traits and share many details, but often with opposite slants. Like the anonymous Panegyrist, Liudprand knows a smattering of Greek, cites in abundance classical authors, and can compose verses. Let us see the extent to which a parallel reading of the two texts can bear fruits.⁵³

Comparisons and contrasts will verify a thesis proposed elsewhere: Liudprand sought to dismantle the prestige of Berengar I, grandfather of the man for whom he professes the greatest hatred – his former master Berengar II.⁵⁴ In a nutshell, the Antapodosis can be seen as an anti-panegyric, which besmirches Berengar I's memory where the Panegyric had exalted it. Second, the parallels, direct or inverted, will allow us to gauge with greater precision the truth-value that Liudprand and his audience would have attributed to the anecdotes recounted in the Antapodosis – including the deathbed transfer of power of 918.

Liudprand and the Panegyrist both blend into a single enterprise the two distinct expeditions that Arnulf of Carinthia conducted into Italy.⁵⁵ They also agree in not mentioning the feats of some of Berengar's opponents. This is the case when these figures happen to be also relatives or allies of Otto I's enemies or rivals (be they actual or potential) – in other words, figures whom Otto's servant Liudprand had every reason not to praise. The Panegyrist does not report that Wido and Lambert became emperors; Liudprand alludes only twice to Wido's imperial title, and only once to Berengar's («In those days [...] the *imperatores* Wido and Berengar were in conflict over the kingdom of Italy»).⁵⁶ The nearly complete silence about Berengar I's emperorship is likely not fortuitous on the part of his grandson's ambassador. Neither author mention that immediately after the storming of Rome in 896, Arnulf obtained this same imperial dignity – he was both an enemy of Berengar I and a relative of the Bavarian dukes, a *Sippe* that had long rivaled with the Ottonians.⁵⁷ Both sources also ignore Louis III's emperorship. The Antapodosis and the Panegyric know that Wido and Berengar fought two pitched battles, but according to Liudprand, the Friulan was defeated in both encounters.⁵⁸

Depicted by Liudprand's wily quill, then, and in contrast to the image projected in the Panegyric, Berengar I's *fortuna* seems far from evident. Neither are his *mores*

⁵³ One should not expect Liudprand to quote directly from the Panegyric. As an exile in Germany and then traveler to Byzantium, he is unlikely to have had in his package a manuscript of this work. For the echoes between the Antapodosis and the Panegyric, see DÄNDLIKER and MÜLLER (as n. 9) *passim*.

⁵⁴ See PHILIPPE BUC, Italian Hussies and German Matrons: Liudprand of Cremona on Dynastic Legitimacy, in: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29, 1995, p. 207–225; ID. (as n. 1) chapter 1: «Writing Ottonian Hegemony».

⁵⁵ Compare Regino, *Chronicon ad an. 894 & 896* (as n. 1) p. 142 & 144; see DÄNDLIKER and MÜLLER (as n. 9) p. 66–67, with references to earlier historiography.

⁵⁶ Liudprand, Antapodosis 1.15 & 1.5 (as n. 1) p. 18:481–482 & 8:177–178.

⁵⁷ Compare Regino, *Chronicon ad. an. 896* (as n. 1) p. 144. Admittedly, a contemporary Italian chronicler Benedict of Saint-Andrew on Mount-Soracte, knew that «a nation from Gaul, the Bavarians, and a king who was called Arnulf», conquered the Leonine City (*Chronicon* 30 (MGH SS 3) Hannover 1839, p. 714:49–715:2), yet did not mention any of these imperial coronations. But Benedict's lack of information on all sorts of North Italian topics is striking.

⁵⁸ Liudprand, Antapodosis 1.18–19 (as n. 1) p. 19:515–522.

beyond questioning, to say the least. Liudprand attributes to him the decision to blind his rival Louis III, grandson of the Carolingian emperor and king of Italy Louis II (d. 875). Berengar has suddenly gained control of the palace of Verona, forcing the usurper to conceal himself. A tenderhearted warrior has detected Louis' hiding place. With characteristic art, Liudprand now recounts how Berengar assures this man that he will spare Louis, as »Holy David« had spared »King Saul«. But the author immediately reveals that the promised mercy has narrow limits indeed. Berengar is a sophist:⁵⁹ Once Louis handed over to him, Berengar does not kill him; he blinds him. A medieval audience would have known that David had only cut the fringe of Saul's robe when he held him at his mercy, asleep and unprotected.⁶⁰ In the Panegyric, on the other hand, Berengar is mercy *par excellence*. Before attacking Verona where Louis has taken his seat, he makes his warriors promise not to mutilate the young Carolingian – they were clamoring for the contrary. The blinding of his relative, then, constitutes a tragedy that runs counters to his explicit orders.⁶¹ Liudprand does recount, in his last story on Berengar I, how the emperor was betrayed by his *compater* Flambert and assassinated, so died an »innocent« – a death by treason that puts him on a parallel with Christ.⁶² But this does little to erase the negative impression created by the accumulation throughout the book of incriminating details.

Berengar I's bad fortune and bad character are especially visible when Liudprand depicts his relationship to the Italian king and the strongman of the tenth century's last decade, Arnulf of Carinthia. The Panegyric insists that the two men are relatives; the Antapodosis avoids the issue (as it avoids all the family bonds that tie Otto's rivals with the Carolingians).⁶³ For the former source, kinship motivates the Italian expeditions of Zwentibold and his father; for the latter, Berengar has to beg for transalpine help.⁶⁴ The former makes Arnulf and Berengar equal partners in the conduct of the war against Wido (they even co-lead the 896 storming of Rome); the latter perfidiously depicts Berengar carrying Arnulf's shield »in token of fidelity«, and holding a torch before him (»ante Arnulfi regis praesentiam«).⁶⁵ Other contemporary sources do state that a form of »fidelity« or »patronage« bound the two men, but do not go as far as painting the relationship in humiliating colors.⁶⁶ To bear someone's arms is to recognize publicly

⁵⁹ Reporting the king's specious reasoning, Liudprand calls it a *sophistica responsio* – not a positive expression, see, e.g., Ecclesiasticus 37, »Qui sophisticè loquitur, odibilis est«.

⁶⁰ Liudprand, Antapodosis 2.41 (as n. 1) p. 51:667–52:697.

⁶¹ Panegyricus Berengarii 4 (as n. 1) vv. 45–65, p. 396–397. Compare Regino, Chronicon ad. an. 905 (as n. 2) p. 150, who like Liudprand thinks that Berengar captured by ruse Louis (but mentions the affair only briefly): »Improvidum virum dolo cepit et captum luminibus privavit«.

⁶² Liudprand, Antapodosis 2.68–73 (as n. 1) p. 62–64.

⁶³ Buc (as n. 54); DÄNDLIKER and MÜLLER (as n. 9) p. 137–140.

⁶⁴ Panegyricus Berengarii 3 (as n. 1) vv. 389, p. 384; Liudprand, Antapodosis 1.20–22 (as n. 1) p. 19.

⁶⁵ Liudprand, Antapodosis 1.22 & 1.34 (as n. 1) p. 20:567–568 & 25:706–708.

⁶⁶ Compare Regino, Chronicon ad. an. 888 (as n. 1) p. 129 (Berengar, expelled by Wido from the *regnum*, travels North to obtain Arnulf's *patrocinia*); and the Annals of Fulda, continuatio Ratisbonensis ad an. 896 (as n. 47) p. 127 (When Arnulf reached Italy in his quest for the imperial coronation, he found out that »Perngarium [...] nepotem eius a fidelitate sua defecisse et in Italiam [...] reversum fuisse«).

one's dependence on that person, as is implicit in Richer of Reims' probably imaginary anecdote, recounting how Otto II had tried to trick Hugh the Great into carrying his sword.⁶⁷

Finally, the frameworks of the two texts are similar. Thematically: the two authors justify identically their enterprise, proclaiming that since one recounts the exploits even of pagan princes, one should all the more sing those of Christian kings.⁶⁸ Chronologically: the part of the *Antapodosis* devoted to Latin Europe also begins with Charles the Fat's death. This event, as in the Panegyric, triggers the rivalry between Berengar and Wido, who in their cupidity for rule break the *amicitia* that had bound them together. Liudprand even mentions innocently that the two men, egged on by the desire to secure crowns for themselves, were absent at the emperor's funerals (so implicitly at his deathbed).⁶⁹ Had the *Antapodosis* been completed, it too would have ended on an imperial coronation – Otto's. This was Liudprand's ultimate horizon, which explains why he sometime calls the Saxon »then king now emperor« (»tunc rex nunc imperator«). Here and there the author announces that he shall give information to which the narrative never gets – for it breaks off right in the middle of the depiction of the embassy that Liudprand conducted for Berengar in Constantinople. Crisis explains lack of completion. Otto did manage to receive the imperial office in Rome in February 962, but troubles overshadowed immediately the Saxon's new dignity. Otto was forced to besiege Rome, depose two popes – including John XII, who had consecrated him, but had almost immediately gone over to Berengar. Struggles for the control of northern Italy lasted until 966–967.⁷⁰ Incidentally, it may not be fortuitous that several contem-

⁶⁷ »Hac enim causa super sellam relictus fuit, ut dum dux cunctis videntibus gladium ferret, in posterum etiam portaturum indicaret« – Richer of Reims, *Historiarum libri quatuor* 3.85, ed. by HARTMUT HOFFMANN (MGH SS 38) Hannover 2000, pp. 217:3–4 (see also *ibid.* 2.4–5, p. 100:18–19, where first Hugh, then the other West Frankish magnates, carry the arms of Louis IV d'Outremer). This episode is discussed by FICHTENAU (as n. 29) p. 1.50, by GEOFFREY G. KOZIOL, *Begging Pardon and Favor. Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*, Ithaca 1992, p. 124, and most recently with very different aims by BERND SCHNEIDMÜLLER, *Wahrnehmungsmuster und Verhaltensformen in den fränkischen Nachfolgeregieren*, in: JOACHIM EHLERS (ed.), *Deutschland und der Westen Europas im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 2002, p. 263–302 at 284–285. On Richer, see now JASON GLENN, *The Lost Works of Richer: the Gesta Adalberonis and the Vita Gerberti*, in: *Filologia Mediolatina* 4, 1997, p. 153–190; *id.*, *The Composition of Richer's Autograph Manuscript*, in: *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 27, 1997, p. 151–189; and HARTMUT HOFFMANN, *Die Historien Richers von Saint-Remi*, in: *Deutsches Archiv* 54.2, 1998, p. 445–531.

⁶⁸ Liudprand, *Antapodosis* 1.1 (as n. 1) p. 5:97–105; *Panegyricus Berengarii I* (as n. 1) v. 1–10, p. 357.

⁶⁹ Liudprand, *Antapodosis* 1.15 (as n. 1) p. 18:480–481. On royal funerals in the early Middle Ages, see most recently JANET L. NELSON, *Carolingian royal funerals*, in: FRANS THEUWS and JANET L. NELSON, *Rituals of Power. From Late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages*, Leiden 2000, p. 131–184. Participation in the last rites of a ruler constituted one of many arguments to be his successor.

⁷⁰ Benedict of Saint-Andrew, *Chronicon* 36–39 (MGH SS 3) (as n. 57) p. 717–719, compared with Adalbert of Magdeburg *ad an. 962–967* (as n. 1) 171–179, is suggestive of the level of disorder, and of peninsular hostility towards the northern king and his allies. The *Chronicon* ends with Rome »expoliata et menstruata« (ch. 39, p. 719:23). And if Liudprand's Berengar had brought into Italy Hungarian auxiliaries, Benedict's Otto had in his train in 961–962 barbarian Slavs (*Chronicon* 36, p. 717:47–50).

porary sources end, break, or break off in or around these very years – was it that Italy seemed to have been definitively won by the Saxons?⁷¹

As for Liudprand, he had chosen in 962 to turn his pen to these urgent matters. He had not finished the *Antapodosis*, and had rushed instead to compose a justification of Pope John's deposition, the *Historia Ottonis* or *De Ottone rege*. This text precedes the *Antapodosis* in most manuscripts, including the Freiburg semi-autograph, a position that suggests that Liudprand saw in it a sort of retroactive introduction. Such a hasty collage is attested elsewhere in tenth-century historiography.⁷² Still, before the outbreak of the 962–963 crisis, the former deacon of Pavia had come to shape his *Antapodosis* into a justification of the Saxon intervention in Northern Italy and of Otto's acquisition of the imperial title – an »apologia« for a new course in policy whose natural audience was constituted by the German kingdom's lay and clerical aristocracy.⁷³ This involved many a re-interpretation of the recent past, and especially a process of torsion by which Liudprand both perverted Berengar I's deeds and hijacked to the benefit of Otto's father Henry the drama and political message of the Panegyric's death-bed scenes.

But for this historian the fundamental issue is not whether Fried or Althoff »are in the right« (to paraphrase the anonymous Song of Roland). More important, the links, direct or indirect, between the Panegyric and the texts that document 918–919 raise the question of genre and the issue of the audience's relation to these texts. Panegyrics were meant to be heard by their princely heroes, yet – as the glosses to Berengar's Panegyric themselves explain, citing Isidore of Seville – »a panegyric is form of address used to praise kings that takes large freedoms and is prone to hyperbole« (»Panirigicum est licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum«).⁷⁴

⁷¹ So Widukind, Adalbert (happily), and (unhappily) Benedict (as n. 57 above). As Liudprand seems to have originally intended, Adalbert of Magdeburg ends his continuation of Regino on the full description of an imperial coronation, Otto II's.

⁷² PAOLO CHIESA, *Liutprando di Cremona e il codice di Frisinga* Clm 6388, Turnhout 1994, p. 17–23; ID. (as n. 1) p. lvii–lviii (but see now HARTMUT HOFFMANN, *Autographa des früheren Mittelalters*, in: *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 57, 2001, p. 1–62, here 49–57). For composite works of historiography, see J. GLENN (as n. 67) who shows how Richer of Reims, impelled by the sudden change of dynasty in 987, hurriedly pasted together several works he was working on to produce *Histories* that made sense of the Capetian acquisition of the West Frankish crown.

⁷³ I owe to Hagen Keller (letter dated 27/07/94) the idea that Otto needed to justify his change of policy towards Berengar II to the lay and ecclesiastical magnates who had guaranteed and mediated the Augsburg pact of 952. See the discussion along these lines in BUC (as n. 54) p. 211–212, and ID. (as n. 1) p. 17–19. One should draw into the discussion also Hrotsvith of Gandersheim, *Gesta Ottonis* v. 696–734, ed. by HELENE HOMEYER, *Hrotsvithae Opera. Mit Einleitung und Kommentar*, Munich 1970, p. 383–438, here 432–433. The work, dedicated to Otto I, Otto II and the Liudolfing Gerberga, presents Berengar's visit to Germany and the Augsburg pact as engineered by the Italian's hypocrisy – so insinuates that Otto's later actions against the provisions of the pact were legitimate.

⁷⁴ *Ad Panegyricus Berengarii* I (as n. 1) v. 1, p. 357 n.; cp. Isidore, *Etymologiae* 6.8.7, PL 82, col. 238b, ed. by WALLACE MARTIN LINDSAY, *Isidori Sevilensis Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, Oxford 1911, n. p.: »Panegyricum est licentiosum et lasciviosum genus dicendi in laudibus regum, in cuius compositione homines multis mendaciis adulantur«. See most recently MICHAEL MAUSE, *Die Darstellung des Kaisers in der lateinischen Panegyrik*, Stuttgart 1994, p. 18–22 (to be used with caution); CLAUDIA RAPP, *Comparison, Paradigm and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography*, in: MARY WHITBY (ed.), *The Propaganda of*

Liudprand himself relates his work explicitly to tragedy, comedy, and even *historia*. According to medieval theories, the tragic mode deals with rulers' public misdeeds or the momentous mishaps that happen to them; the comic mode, with the sexual vices and other vices of private persons. (And indeed the acute interest that Liudprand evinces for the carnal appetites of peninsular princes and their females led an earlier generation of historians to imagine pre-Ottonian Italy under the yoke of a »pornocracy«).⁷⁵

Both tragedy and comedy stand in a complex relation to truth – the relation is sometimes heuristic, and often mendacious.⁷⁶ As for *historia*, it has been shown elsewhere how Liudprand the cleric reads it and writes it in the light of the spiritual senses. It is not the surface reality of events but a »letter« that has to be deciphered for the higher truths that it contains.⁷⁷ The Antapodosis participates of these three genres; structure and contents, as we have shown, also relate it to the encomiastic genre. For even if Liudprand did not know the Panegyric of Berengar or a related text, his work and panegyrics share common motifs that they share as well with the two other sources on 918–919. Corippus' Praise of emperor Justin, for example, also sang of a successful transfer of authority after an initial refusal to accept the royal ornaments (*regalia signa*).⁷⁸ Widukind, in the latter chapters of his work, veers sharply away from anything

Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity, Leiden 1998, p. 277–298; PER GODMAN, Poets and emperors. Frankish politics and Carolingian poetry, Oxford 1987, p. 28–34: the panegyric does not correspond to historical facts but needs a »reinforcement from actuality« (p. 34). Cp. Augustine, De doctrina christiana 4.25–55, CCSL 32, Turnhout 1962, p. 161: merely for delectation.

⁷⁵ See BUC (as n. 54). The positive feminist interpretation inverts the terms of this moralistic explanation: owing to the control that they had over the domestic sphere, a correlate of the weakness of the public sphere, aristocratic women enjoyed in the tenth century a degree of power that they later lost. See JO ANN McNAMARA and SUZANNE F. WEMPLE, The Power of Women through the Family, in: MARY ERLER and MARYANNE KOWALESKI (eds.), Women and Power in the Middle Ages, Athens (Georgia) 1988, p. 83–101; JANET T. SCHULENBURG, Public and Private Roles, in *ibid.* p. 102–126.

⁷⁶ Isidore of Seville, Etymologiae 8.7.5–6 & 10, PL 82, cols. 308cd & 309b, or ed. by LINDSAY (as n. 74) n. p.: »Tragici multum honorem adepti sunt, excellentes in argumentis fabularum ad veritatis imaginem fictis. [...] Sed comici priuatorum hominum praedicant acta; tragici uero res publicas et regum historias. [...] Officium autem poetae in eo est ut ea, quae vere gesta sunt, in alias species obliquis figurationibus cum decore aliquo conversa transducant. Unde et Lucanus ideo in numero poetarum non ponitur, quia uidetur historias composuisse, non poema«. *Ibid.* 18.45.1, PL 82, col. 658b: »Tragoedi sunt qui antiqua gesta atque facinora sceleratorum regum luctuosa carmine spectante populo concinebant«. A text transforms itself from history to tragedy through the mere accumulation of the horrible deeds committed or suffered by a king. See, taking King Herod as his example, Eusebius-Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.8.4, ed. by THEODOR MOMMSEN, 2 vols., Berlin 1903–1908, p. 1.65: »Longum est, si prosperitates imperii eius, quibus ad illud tempus usque pollebat, domesticis referam cladibus obscuratas, ignominiam matrimonii, funera liberorum, quorum tamen ipse extiterit parricida, sororis etiam propinquorum que omnium si exequar clades, tragoedia magis, quam historia texti videbitur«. See, inter alia, RUTH MORSE, Truth and convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, representation, and reality, Cambridge/New York 1991; JOAQUIN MATRINEZ PIZARRO, A rhetoric of the scene: Dramatic narrative in the early Middle Ages, Toronto 1989.

⁷⁷ BUC (as n. 1) p. 49–50. Cf. MCKITTERICK and INNES (as n. 34) p. 195, 212–213, on Cassiodorus and Freculph of Lisieux. For Widukind and *historia*, cp. BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 16–18, 35–36, 47–50.

⁷⁸ Corippus, In laudem Iustini 1 (as n. 32) vv. 179–180, p. 122: »[...] ipse tenere / scepra tuus moriens te iussit avunculus ore«. The initial refusal of the *regalia signa* is at v. 171.

approaching unreflective praise of Otto.⁷⁹ But echoes of the panegyrics are visible in his version of Conrad's death. The »fortune and virtue« (»fortuna atque mores«) that the Conradine lack but that the Saxon Henry possesses constitute two key attributes of new kings in the encomiastic tradition since at least Menander Rhetor.⁸⁰

The panegyristic strand in the Antapodosis thus suggests that we should not expect an identity between the scenes described and what the readers had experienced personally. This is not »history« as we moderns understand it. Just as Berengar I knew that his relationship with Charles the Fat and Wido had been far from similar to what the panegyrist depicted, so too the aristocratic audience of Liudprand's work – a public that included the king – could hear and appreciate fictions in which they were characters.

Thus Fried is probably wrong to see in orality the matrix for the formation of the textual tradition dealing with 918–919. Written models and learned culture stand behind these narratives. As for Althoff, his analysis of 918–919 underestimates the freedom enjoyed by early medieval authors; their audience's knowledge of facts did not constrain their ability to weave fictions beyond mere amplifications and elisions.⁸¹ Rulers and other aristocrats fully expected fictions to be woven by authors of books (and, we must assume, of texts to be declaimed orally). So granted that »die Rahmenbedingungen von Herrschaft« do condition the composition of medieval texts,⁸² cultural expectations and frameworks also condition as independent variables the interaction of power (*Herrschaft*) and memory (*Erinnerung*). But culture is anything if not patterned: there was for sure, as Fried would have it, a high degree of potential arbitrariness in the shaping of historical memory – but within chains of transmission in which writing, learned culture, and authoritative specialists of the written word played a major role. The *spezialisierte und autorisierte Tradenten* of the early Middle Ages came with their understanding of what could be communicated and how. Part of their »specialization« (in another sense of the term) included the mastery of genres for presentation – *historia*, tragedy, comedy, and panegyric. Behind their narratives stood the immensely weighty

⁷⁹ ALTHOFF (as n. 23) p. 162–168. Cp. BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 7–40, on the complicated question of the panegyristic component in the *Res gestae Saxonicae*.

⁸⁰ E.g., Quintus Aurelius Symmachus, *Oratio I*, ed. by OTTO SEECK (MGH AA 6:1) Berlin 1883, p. 318–339, here 320:15–17: »Galea diademate, sceptris pila mutantur: auri praemium ferri labore meruisti haec in te mutari sola potuerunt, nam quod spectat ad mores, unum hoc tibi fortuna addidit, ut plura curares«. See as well the blueprint offered by Menander Rhetor, *Peri Epideiktikon* 373–376, ed. by DONALD ANDREW RUSSELL and NIGEL GUY WILSON, Oxford 1981, p. 84–92: An encomium passes from praise of *aretai* to praise of *túche*.

⁸¹ Althoff, in the passages cited above, at n. 24, comes close to reinventing Menander's famous definition of the panegyric, but does not go quite far enough (cp. Menander Rhetor, *Peri Epideiktikon* 368, ed. by RUSSELL and WILSON [as n. 80], p. 77). Indeed the same scholar has given us in two recent articles devoted to fiction and reality in medieval literature every indication that he is not far from our position. See GERD ALTHOFF, *Spielen die Dichter mit den Spielregeln der Gesellschaft?*; in: NIGEL F. PALMER and HANS-JOCHEN SCHIEWER (eds.), *Mittelalterliche Literatur und Kunst im Spannungsfeld von Hof und Kloster*, Tübingen 1999, p. 53–71; *Id.*, *Fußfälle. Realität und Fiktionalität einer rituellen Kommunikationsform*, in: Christa BERTELSMEIER-KIERST and CHRISTOPHER YOUNG (eds.), *Eine Epoche im Umbruch. Volkssprachliche Literalität von 1200–1300*, Cambridge 2002, p. 1–12 – a truly remarkable piece.

⁸² ALTHOFF (as n. 23) p. 153, cited above, at n. 24.

system of values elaborated in, and through the scriptures – biblical models of behavior and biblical reflection on rulership. The varying truth-values that author and audience attached to a work, a factor of the literary genres to which this work belonged, complexifies the relationship between *Herrschaft* and *Erinnerung*. We owe to the Althoff-Fried debate a sharp awareness of the issue, and to each of these historians the beginnings of a methodological solution.

Three points that relate these issues to tenth-century authorship and the functioning of ambient political culture are now in order. First, the constellation of values (*Werte*) that medieval rituals referred to, and that they took as referent was fundamentally structured by biblical texts. Consequently, historians must be highly attentive to scriptural models. One might be tempted to dismiss them as »mere *topoi*«, but Mary Garrison has just reminded us that *topoi* are not empty but very much full. They may be the most efficacious vector for communication.⁸³ Second, the medieval reading of the Bible was directed by a hermeneutic, exegesis; writing about rituals and emotions elicited by rituals was thus conditioned by exegetical techniques and exegetical logic. Third, both biblical models and the hermeneutical culture of exegesis rendered problematic the transparency of emotions, provoked discussions as to whether the prince was supposed to express them, and raised the issue of the relationship between interior disposition and exterior demeanor.

The remainder of this essay shall develop these three aspects. It shall do so in relation to a few other sources that deal with royal deaths, and in general with mourning. Death, and especially the death of kings, provided a favorite keystone for narratives.⁸⁴ Agents and authors »ritualized« the royal death – understand, they stuffed the event with pomp, references to the Scriptures, regalia, and solemn discourses. Thus it became a vector for political or ethical messages, alongside the coronation, the royal entry, and a number of other so-called »political rituals«. It is for all these a general rule that both the ornamental component and the ethical or political messages tended to grow in length and enlarge in details and drama the more the narrative was written at a chronological distance from the putative event.⁸⁵ One will think of the deaths of William the Conqueror – pages

⁸³ MARY GARRISON, The study of emotions in early medieval history: some starting points, in: *Early medieval Europe* 10:2, 2001, p. 243–250, here 246–247. See already GEORG SCHEIBELREITER, *Der frühfränkische Episkopat: Bild und Wirklichkeit*, in: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 17, 1983, p. 131–147, here 136, speaking of »stylized behavior«.

⁸⁴ Around the turn of the millennium, Notker Labeo mentioned or complained that writings on monarchs (»libri regum novissimi«) were organized in an artificial order: They began with the kings' deaths and dealt only after that with their deeds. Was he complaining about contemporary authors or about the biblical books of kings? See Notker Labeo, *De arte rhetorica* 49 (»de dispositione«), ed. by PAUL PIPER, *Die Schriften Notkers und seiner Schule*, 3 vols., Freiburg/Tübingen 1882–1883, p. 1.670:14–18: »Bona dispositio est rem eo ordine quo gesta est narrare · non est hoc observatum in libris regum novissimis · ubi prepostero ordine · quorundam regum obitus · deinde quid in vita gesserint · narratur«. See MARIE SCHULZ, *Die Lehre von der historischen Methode bei den Geschichtsschreibern des Mittelalters (VI.–XIII. Jahrhundert)*, Berlin/Leipzig 1909, p. 132.

⁸⁵ LINTZEL (as n. 2) p. 39, or repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA (as n. 2) p. 342 (»ungewöhnlich breit ausgestaltet und ausgemalt«), on the three sources concerning 918–919; ID., *Zur Designation und Wahl König Heinrichs I.*, repr. in: HLAWITSCHKA, p. 52–53.

and pages in Ordericus Vitalis – and those of his sons William Rufus and Henry I.⁸⁶ Tears shed, like those Eberhard shed in accepting his brother Conrad's mandate (in Widukind's version), and in general sadness and mourning, link the death of rulers to a vast field of penitential liturgies. A disposition to penance – and penitential calls for God's mercy or justice – expresses itself in an abundance of tears. The clothes that one wears in penitential processions and litanies come from the wardrobe of mourning.⁸⁷ Here the early Middle Ages borrowed from the Roman world. The Republican Romans of Livy dressed in »sordid clothing« to beseech the help of their gods or of their human patrons and allies.⁸⁸ A biblical anchor had allowed the Roman usage to be adopted without too much struggle in Christian liturgies – the tears of kings Ezechias, Joab, and David, or those shed by the Jewish people, in sackcloth and covered with ashes, under the leadership of their queen Esther.⁸⁹

Early medieval authors would not have rejected outright the diagnosis of Émile Durkheim, that through mourning a group ends up consolidating itself. To quote Liudprand's much after-the-fact dirge for Henry I, »The multitude, widowed of its dear king, now stops shedding tears, when another surges up to be worshipped by the world, a son image of the father who nominated him, Otto King [...]«. In Gregory of Tours, the funerals of a saint can result in the formation of consensus between neighboring communities, if only as a happy aftermath to a crisis that demonstrates the value of the holy man: they had just been fighting over the possession of the holy body.⁹⁰ The correspondence between the group that mourns and its ruler finds a clear expression in Widukind. Henry I is buried »cum planctu et lacrimis plurimarum gentium« (with the dirges and tears of several nations), a fitting plurality for the »master and ruler and greatest of kings in Europe« (»rerum dominus et maximus regum Europae«) who had tamed the neighboring pagans. Edith, his first wife, is taken to the grave »cum gemitu

⁸⁶ DIETRICH LOHRMANN, *Der Tod König Heinrichs I. von England in der mittellateinischen Literatur Englands und der Normandie*, in: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 8, 1973, p. 90–107; THOMAS CALLAHAN, *The Making of a Monster. The Historical Image of William Rufus*, in: *Journal of medieval History* 7, 1981, p. 175–185; bibliography and discussion of the sources on William the Conqueror's death in KLAUS VAN EICKELS, *Vom inszenierten Konsens zum systematisierten Konflikt. Die englisch-französischen Beziehungen und ihre Wahrnehmung an der Wende vom Hoch- zum Spätmittelalter*, Stuttgart 2002, p. 67–70.

⁸⁷ Contemporaries knew this, obviously. See Gregory of Tours, describing a protective liturgy performed in a city besieged by the Franks, *Libri Historiarum* 3.29, ed. (altera) by BRUNO KRUSCH and WILHELM LEVISON, in: *SS Merov.* 1,1, Hannover 1951, p. 125: »At ille in tanta humilitate ad Deum conversi sunt, ut induti ciliciis, abstinens a cibis et poculis, cum tonica beati Vinceni martiris muros civitatis psallendo circumirent; mulieres quoque amictae nigris palleis, dissoluta caesariae, superposito cinere, ut eas putares virorum funeribus deservire, plangendo sequebantur«.

⁸⁸ E.g., Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 3.47.1–4 & 3.58.1, ed. by JEAN BAYET, vol. 3, Paris 1943, p. 71–72 & 90. See as well how in times of crisis Roman women, in tears, would clean with their hair the pavement of sanctuaries, e.g., *Ab urbe condita* 3.7.7–8, p. 12–13.

⁸⁹ Esther 4.3: »In omnibus quoque provinciis oppidis ac locis ad quae crudele regis dogma pervenerat planctus ingens erat apud Iudaeos ieiunium ululatus et fletus sacco et cinere multis pro strato utentibus«; Esther 4.1; Job 16.16; Jeremiah 6.26; Luke 10.13 = Matt. 11.21, (without tears). For David, see 2 Kings 15.30 (without ashes).

⁹⁰ Liudprand, *Antapodosis* 4.16 (as n. 1) p. 106:368–372; cf. KARPf (as n. 9) p. 25–27. Cp. EMILE DURKHEIM, *Formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse* 3.5.2, Paris 1912, vol. 3 p. 89. For Gregory, cf. BUC (as n. 1) p. 119.

et lacrimis omnium Saxonum«, a narrower circle. Conrad I is buried »cum moerore ac lacrimis omnium Francorum«; Otto's brother-in-law Conrad the Red, who died at the Lech (955), »cum fletu et planctu omnium Francorum«. But Liudolf, the young king, Otto's first legitimate son and erstwhile heir, received his funerals in Mainz »cum luctu et planctu multorum populorum« – the people of the empire for whom his death had been a severe wound.⁹¹ Incidentally, the pattern in Widukind suggests that Queen Edith, born to the insular dynasty of Wessex, was fundamentally (at least for Widukind) a Queen *for* the (related continental) Saxons, and *of* the Saxons;⁹² similarly, King Conrad's real circle of authority comprised the Franks and only the Franks.

Thus, like many a political ritual or liturgies with a social import (such as relic translations), the agony and funerals of a king ideally manifested the consensus of a group. Yet for this very reason authors might ascribe dissent and disorder to such occasions (and it is logical to assume that their disruption belonged to the actual toolkits of social agents). Such tactics were age-old; witness Flavius Josephus's description of King Herod of Judea's funerals. Staged by Herod's successor Archelaus, these ceremonies were meant to heighten and solemnize the latter man's accession. But they also provided the new king's enemies with the terms of their own oppositional ritual, and with an occasion to perform it. After having kept as was customary seven days of mourning, and given the customary funeral banquet to the people, Archelaus changed into white clothes and proceeded to the Temple, received acclamations, sat himself on the throne, granted a number of boons, sacrificed, and gave another banquet. But towards night-time, the Jewish revolutionaries staged a counter-ritual, »on the same spot«, that is from within the precincts of the Temple:

»And now that the public mourning for the king was ended, the revolutionaries began a lamentation of their own, bewailing the fate of those Herod had punished for cutting down the golden eagle from the gate of the Temple. This mourning was in no subdued tones: there were piercing wails, a funeral dirge led with rhythm, with beatings of the breast that resounded through the whole city. Indeed all this meant to honor the men who, they asserted, had perished [on the pyre] in defense of their ancestral laws and the Temple.«⁹³

Mourning answers mourning, the martyrs' pyre answers the flaming disposal of King Herod's body. The ceremonial complex of funeral and accession has opened up a space for public dissent: the Temple's ritual specialists invert and recompose the royal rites into a counter-liturgy.

More subtly, a ruler's last moments and last rites might be erased or rendered insignificant. Gregory of Tours, who liked kings only when they followed the advice of

⁹¹ Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 1.41, 2.41, 1.25, 3.47, 3.57 (as n. 1) p. 61:1–2, 99:19–100:1, 38:17–18, 128:18–19, 135:29–136:1. On the *planctus*, see HANS CHRISTIAN JACOBSEN, *Das Totengericht Kaiser Heinrichs II. Eine neue Variante aus dem Echternacher Liber aureus*, in: *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 33, 1998, p. 53–58.

⁹² Cf. KARL J. LEYSER, *Die Ottonen und Wessex*, in: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 17, 1983, p. 73–97; in English in LEYSER, *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe*, 2 vols, ed. and trad. by TIMOTHY REUTER, London 1994, p. 73–104.

⁹³ Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, II, 1, 5–6, ed. by ANDRÉ PELLETIER, vol. 2, Paris 1980, p. 13; cf. the English transl. by G. A. WILLIAMSON, rev. ed. London 1981, p. 120.

bishops, does not develop the funerals of any ruling Frankish prince. Those persons of royal rank whose mourning the bishop details in some way happen to be the innocent victims of assassination by ruling relatives or the equally guiltless children of sinful rulers.⁹⁴ And all in all, in Gregory's works, tears are shed overwhelmingly for saints – and this means bishops.⁹⁵ The implicit argument behind this imbalance may be that only the episcopate truly rules the *populus*.

Finally, a king's successor could be accused of lack of *pietas* – and the fact that he had been the opponent of his predecessor was not an acceptable excuse. The counter-model here was Davidic. The future king of Judah and Israel had cried at the news of his rival Saul's death, and led the mourning. (It is worthy of note that this biblical transfer of power also involved a transfer of crown and arm-ring).⁹⁶ In Gregory's Histories, the ruler who manifests the greatest piety for royal blood is the author's exemplary king, Guntramn. Guntramn even cried »with the greatest bitterness« over his brother, evil king Chilperic, and organized his *planctus*. No wonder that Gregory provides this information or fiction. The bishop approved of Guntram's claim to inherit his dead relatives' portions of the kingdom of the Franks.⁹⁷

The Davidic model of behavior in the face of a predecessor's death takes us back full circle to a moment critical in the economy of both the Antapodosis and the Panegyric – the demise of Charles the Fat. Sources closer to the event remembered that shortly before his death the emperor had been deposed by Arnulf of Carinthia. Regino of Prüm – a man who had suffered himself from betrayal and fall from power – saw in this episode an exemplary illustration of the wheel of fortune.⁹⁸ Redacted much closer to the event (perhaps within the year), one branch of the so-called *Annals of Fulda* recounted it with an eye to power-politics. This version claims that Charles sent to Arnulf

⁹⁴ Gregory of Tours, *Libri Historiarum* 3.18 (as n. 87) p. 119:13–14; *ibid.* 8.10, p. 377:17f.: »Convocato igitur episcopo civitatis, cum clero et populo ac cereorum innumerabilium ornato ad basilicam sancti Vincenti denulit tumulandum, non minus plangens nepotes mortuos, quam cum vidit filios proprios iam sepultus«. *Ibid.* 5.34, p. 240–241, details the funerals of the two sons of Chilperic and Fredegunda who died owing to their parents' impious governance.

⁹⁵ The model agony is that of Gregory's relative Sidonius, who, amidst the tears of his people, predicts on his deathbed the identity of his successor, *Libri Historiarum* 2.23 (as n. 87) p. 68.

⁹⁶ 2 Kings 11.12: »[...] tuli diadema quod erat in capite eius et armillam de brachio illius et adtuli ad te dominum meum huc«. Adprehendens autem David vestimenta sua scidit omnesque viri qui erant cum eo, et planxerunt et fleverunt et ieiunaverunt usque ad vesperam super Saul et super Ionathan filium eius et super populum Domini et super domum Israhel quod corruissent gladio«.

⁹⁷ Cf. *Libri Historiarum* 8.10, p. 377:17f.: »Convocato igitur episcopo civitatis, cum clero et populo ac cereorum innumerabilium ornato ad basilicam sancti Vincenti denulit tumulandum, non minus plangens nepotes mortuos, quam cum vidit filios proprios iam sepultus«; *ibid.* 7.5, p. 328:17–18. For Gregory on funerals, see BUC (as n. 1) p. 83–87, 111–112; MARTIN HEINZELMANN, *Gregor von Tours (538–594). »Zehn Bücher Geschichte«*. Historiographie und Gesellschaftskonzept im 6. Jahrhundert, Darmstadt 1994 (now in English: *Id.*, *Gregory of Tours: History and society in the sixth century*, Cambridge [UK], 2001), and GOFFART (as n. 8) remain the best studies of this author.

⁹⁸ Regino, *Chronicon ad an. 887* (as n. 2) p. 128.

»[a piece of] the wood of the holy cross over which Arnulf had once sworn to remain faithful to Charles, so that Arnulf would not forget his oath and act in such a barbaric and ferocious way towards Charles. One reports that, seeing it [the relic], Arnulf shed tears. Nevertheless, he organized the kingdom as he wished, and returned to Bavaria.«⁹⁹

Matthias Becher has recently argued – on slim grounds if intelligently – that Arnulf’s tears served a political purpose: to open up a face-saving opportunity for the deposed emperor’s aristocratic friends to rally to the usurper. Arnulf’s humanity and mercy would allow them to submit honorably. The Mainz circles that produced this version of the *Annals* rewrote in black the usurper’s display of emotions.¹⁰⁰ Important for the topic at hand is to notice that the model here was King Herod and his false display of sadness when Herodiades had asked him for John the Baptist’s head.¹⁰¹ Gregory of Tours, again, provides a second example of false tears with a biblical reference: King Lothar, faced with his son Chramm’s rebellion, tearfully prayed God to judge between the two of them, setting himself on a par with David and Chramm with Absalom (2 Kings 15–18). With characteristic art, the episcopal author allows his reader to think at first that the Frankish family tragedy is a remake of the Old Testament type. And indeed this is the interpretation that Gregory’s Lothar gives of his travails:¹⁰²

⁹⁹ *Annales Fuldenses* ad an. 887 (as n. 47) p. 106: »At ille in Baioariam ad Arnolfum se contulit et cum eo machinari studuit, qualiter imperatorem regno privaret; quod et factum est. Nam cum idem imperator in villa Tribure consedisset, suorum undique opperens adventum, Arnolfus cum manu valida Noricorum et Sclavorum supervenit et ei molestus efficitur. Nam omnes optimates Francorum, qui contra imperatorem conspiraverant, ad se venientes in suum suscepit dominium; venire nolentes beneficiis privavit nichilque imperatori nisi vilissimas ad serviendum reliquit personas. Cui imperator lignum sanctae crucis, in quo prius ei fidem se servaturum iuraverat, per Liutbertum archiepiscopum destinavit, ut sacramentorum suorum non immemor tam ferociter et barbaramente contra eum non faceret. Quo viso lacrimas fudisse perhibetur; tamen disposito, prout voluit, regno in Baioariam se recepit; imperator vero cum paucis, qui secum erant, in Alamanniam repedavit«. We owe to KELLER (as n. 43) here p. 433–435, the first constructive attempt to take stock of authorial intentions and bias in the two versions of the *Annals* of Fulda.

¹⁰⁰ MATTHIAS BECHER, »*Cum lacrimis et gemitu*«. Vom Weinen der Sieger und der Besiegten im frühen und hohen Mittelalter, in: GERD ALTHOFF (ed.), *Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 2001, p. 25–52 at 47–50.

¹⁰¹ Hincmar, *De divortio Lotharii regis et Theutbergae reginae, interrogatio-responsio 1*, ed. by LETHA BÖHRINGER (MGH *Concilia* 4, Suppl. 1) Hannover 1992, p. 123:15–18: »Unde scriptum est de Herode, quia contristatus est rex pro Herodiadis petitione. Talis quippe est tristitia Herodis qualis poenitentia faraonis et Iudae, quorum quisque facinora sua, postquam accusante conscientia inivitus prodidit, vecors augmentavit. Itaque Herodes caput Iohannis petitus tristitiam quidem praetendebat in vultu, quia se ipse damnaret, ostendendo cunctis liquido, quia insontem noverat et sanctum, quem erat neci daturus«. Cf. BUC (as n. 1) p. 65–66.

¹⁰² Gregory of Tours (as n. 87) p. 153: »Ibatque Chlotharius rex tamquam novus David contra Absolonem filium pugnans, plangens atque dicens: »Respice, Domine, de caelo et iudica causam meam, quia iniuste a filio iniurias patior. Respice, Domine, et iudica iuste, illudque inpone iudicium, quod quondam inter Absalonem et patrem eius David posuisti«. Confligentes etenim pariter, Brittanorum comes terga vertit ibique et caecidit. Denique Chramnus fugam inivit, naves in mare paratas habens; sed dum uxorem vel filias liberare voluit, ab exercitu patris oppraessus, captus atque legatus est. Quod cum Chlothario regi nuntiarum fuisset, iussit eum cum uxore et filiabus igni consumi«. In his groundbreaking study, Heinzelmann surprisingly does not detect Gregory’s perverse irony, and sees here only positive typology – see HEINZELMANN (as n. 97) p. 123, 133, 179.

»King Lothar, as if a new David marching to fight against his son Absalom, went in tears, saying: »Look down from Heaven, o Lord, and judge my case, for I am suffering unjustly injustices from my son. Look down, and judge justly, laying down the verdict that you laid down in the past between Absalom and his father David« ».

But this is a perversion of exemplarity, not genuine typology. The king does not follow the Davidic model all the way. Chramn, like Absalom, is defeated; Chramn, like Absalom, is killed. But whereas David had left no stone unturned to spare the young rebel, giving express orders to his soldiers not to kill him, Lothar orders that his son be burnt alive with his wife and daughters. The king does not shed a single tear. Effectively, in Gregory's book, Lothar assimilates himself to Constantine, who killed his son Crispus and wife Fausta, and through this negative model, to Herod, who devoured his own family.

Gregory's tactics, and those of the Mainz Annals of Fulda, point to an important characteristic of medieval political rituals: interpreters and actors of the political game considered that hypocrisy was always a possibility. This seriously warped the political potential of ritual as communication. But there existed a sense that every royal dissimulation of emotions was not bad. Widukind has Otto hide his pain with other bodily motions during the battle of Birten (939); another character in his *Deeds of the Saxons* masks an extreme anger under a tranquil facial expression.¹⁰³ Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, recounting the battle of Andernach, places Otto in a Davidic posture. When the Conradine Udo falls on the rebels Eberhard and Gislebert, the king »does not at all rejoice at his enemies' death, but wholeheartedly feels sadness for these great men's demise, as David who piously mourned King Saul's death«. Otto's leading men, finding him his face covered with tears, exhort him to change his composure and rejoice with his army. Hrosvitha has now passed to the model of 2 Kings 19.5–7, where David's generals rebuke him for his public wails over Absalom, a manifestation of grief that risks depressing his partisans. So Otto »shows on his face a controlled happiness (*laetitia[m] vultu moderatam*), while secretly preserving in his heart pain and dissimulated sadness (*clam subtristem servans in corde dolorem*)«. ¹⁰⁴ Then as now, it was wise policy to mask one's feelings. Crocodile tears and hidden mourning, bad dissimulation and good dissimulation thus coexisted in tenth-century political culture. For an outside observer, then, a great man's tears were always potentially equivocal. Historians no longer understand graphic expressions of feelings as a symptom of the dominance of the irrational in a medieval aristocratic society putatively located in the prehistory of the civilizing process. Such manifestations have been rightfully recognized to be vectors in social and political communication.¹⁰⁵ But the potentially equivocal nature of such displays

¹⁰³ Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae* 2.17 (as n. 1) p. 82:5: »Rex autem his auditis dolorem animi motu corporis non celabat«. *Ibid.* 1.9, p. 22: »Thiadricus autem nimiam iram vultu celans sereno«. See BEUMANN (as n. 8) p. 109.

¹⁰⁴ Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, *Gesta Ottonis* (as n. 73) vv. 256–315, p. 416–418.

¹⁰⁵ See GERD ALTHOFF, *Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung. Emotionen in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters*, in: *Id.*, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde*, Darmstadt 1997, p. 258–281, esp. 260; and STEPHEN D. WHITE, *The Politics of Anger*, in: BARBARA

complexifies the idea that they transmitted trustworthy and unambiguous messages. One could not always table on outward expressions of emotion to evaluate the real inner dispositions of an aristocrat. And while a public commitment conveyed through signs, formulas, and gestures had value as a form of promise, it could hardly be more binding than a solemn oath.¹⁰⁶

Being human, historians of medieval political culture understandably would like the object of their research – be it ritual-in-performance or ritual-in-text – to have been central to this culture, and effective. Ritual-in-performance or ritual-in-text were probably central indeed, given their presence in the sources and the strategies developed around them. Their efficaciousness is more dubious. Participants and observers knew that a performance might be re-interpreted; authors and readers (or listeners) knew that texts participated in various genres that involved fictionality. Still, like oaths, ever sworn and ever broken, major political rituals had to be staged, and texts praising rulers, composed. Elites had little else at their disposal to strike amity. So they employed these solemn forms of political action, and probably oscillated between the hope that these practices would be efficacious and the fear that they would fail or be manipulated. No matter what, the meaning and efficiency of individual rituals can be assessed only with full cognizance of medieval values, of exemplary points of reference such as the Bible, and of literary forms. One must also always try to replace an individual solemnity within a fuller field of political factors, including brute force. Finally, the complicated documentary precipitate of medieval strategies involving rituals helps us put the finger on major contradictions within medieval political culture.¹⁰⁷ They belong to the meta-domain of values. Lordship and kingship were founded on the imitation, as Platonic forms, of the exemplary power of the Highest Lord and King, God. Correlatively, there existed some confidence in the correspondence between the appearances and the realities of power, between action and intention. But legitimate authority was also a corrective to the disorders induced by the Fall. So, correlatively, one knew that there was seldom a perfect match between virtue and power, seeming and being, inward and outward. In rituals, performers were scrutinized, and scrutinized themselves, wondering, for instance, whether they should hold back their tears or let them flow.

ROSENWEIN (ed.), *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca 1998, p. 127–132, here 27–130.

¹⁰⁶ For early modern developments in matters of political dissimulation, see BARBARA STOLLBERG-RILINGER, in this volume.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. BUC (as n. 22) p. 881–883.

Appendix: Comparison of Liudprand and Adalbert

Liudprand of Cremona, *Antapodosis* 2.17–20, ed. by P. CHIESA, CCCM 156, p. 43–44:

- ¹⁷ Hac igitur eadem tempestate Hulodoicus rex moritur. Chunradus Francorum ex genere oriundus, vir strenuus bellorum que exercitio doctus, rex cunctis a populis ordinatur.
- ¹⁸ Sub quo potentissimi principes Arnaldus in Bagoaria, Bruchardus in Suevia, Everardus comes potentissimus in Francia, Giselbertus dux in Lotharingia erant. Quos inter Heinricus, Saxonum et Turingiorum praepotens dux, clarebat.
- ¹⁹ Secundo itaque regni huius susceptionis anno, memorati principes huic, praesertim Heinricus, **rebelle**s extiterant. Quos Chuonradus rex tam sapientiae vigore quam fortitudinis robore **superavit** suam que ad fidelitatem perduxit. Arnaldus autem, eius nimio terrore coactus, cum uxore et filiis ad Hungarios fugit deguit que eodem, quoad vitalis aura Chuonradi regis rexerat artus.
- ²⁰ Septimo denique regni sui anno, vocationis suae ad Deum tempus agnovit. Cum que memoratos principes se adire fecisset, Heinrico solummodo non praesente, ita convenit: »Ex corruptione ad incorruptionem, ex mortalitate ad immortalitatem vocationis meae tempus, ut cernitis, praesto est. Proin pacem vos concordiam que sectari etiam atque etiam rogo; me hominem exeunte nulla vos regnandi cupiditas, nulla praesidendi ambitio inflammet. **Heinricum, Saxonum** et Turingiorum **ducem** prudentissimum, regem **eligit**e, dominum constituite: is enim est et scientia pollens et iustae severitatis censurae habundans«. His ita prolatis, propriam coronam non auro, quo poene cuiuscumque ordinis principes pollent, verum gemmis preciosissimis, non solum inquam ornatam, sed gravatam, sceptrum etiam cuncta que regalia indumenta in medium venire precepit ac, prout valuit, huiusmodi verba effudit: »Heredem **regiae** que **dignitatis** vicarium regalibus his **ornamentis** Heinricum constituo; cui ut oboediatis, non solum consulo, sed exoro«. Quam iussionem interitus et interitum mox est oboedientia prosecuta. Ipso namque mortem obeunte, memorati principes **coronam** cuncta que regalia indumenta Heinrico duci contulerunt; atque ut rex Chuonradus dixerat cuncta per ordinem enarrarunt. Qui regiae dignitatis culmen et prius humiliter declinavit, ac paulo post non ambitiose suscepit.

Adalbert of Magdeburg, *Continuatio Reginonis*, ed. by F. KURZE, p. 156:

DCCCCXVIII. Cuonradus rex obiit, vir per omnia mansuetus et prudens et divinae religionis amator. Qui, cum obitus sui diem imminere sentiret, vocatis ad se fratribus et cognatis suis, majoribus scilicet Francorum, mortem sibi imminere praedixit et, ne in eligendo post se rege discidium regni fieret, paterna eos voce premonuit. Sed et **Heinricum Saxonum ducem**, filium Ottonis, virum strenuum et industrium praecipuumque pacis sectatorem ut **eligerent** iussit, aliumque ei ad hoc officium aequae condignum inveniri non posse testificans **sceptrum** ei et **coronam** caeteraque **regiae dignitatis ornamenta** pacto tuendi et conservandi regni per eosdem transmisit. Ipse vero huic vitae decedens

in Fulda monasterio honorificata est sepultura tumulatus. Multis tamen laboribus, paucis, quos regnavit annos, est a Bawariis et Alamannis et Saxonibus sibi **rebellantibus** fatigatus, quos ante obitum suum Deo propitio **superavit**.

- »vocationis suae ad Deum tempus agnovit« becomes »cum obitus sui diem imminere sentiret«.
- »Cumque memoratos principes **se adire** fecisset« becomes »vocatis **ad se** fratribus et cognatis suis, majoribus scilicet Francorum«.
- The sentence in the direct style, »vocationis meae tempus [...] praesto est« becomes in indirect style, »mortem sibi imminere praedixit«. One will note here that both Liudprand and Adalbert double up an information: they first present the fact that Conrad is feeling the time of his death approaching, then have Conrad tell this to his entourage in the same words (respectively *vocationis [...] tempus*, for Liudprand, and *diem/mortem [...] imminere*, for Adalbert).
- The sentence in direct style, »Proin pacem vos concordiam que sectari etiam atque etiam rogo; me hominem exeunte nulla vos regnandi cupiditas, nulla praesidendi ambitio inflammet« is summarized in the indirect style: »ne in eligendo post se rege dissidium regni fieret, paterna eos voce praemonuit«.
- »**Heinricum, Saxonum** et Turingiorum **ducem** [...] regem **eligite**, dominum constituite« becomes in indirect style, »**Heinricum, Saxonum ducem** [...] ut **eligerent** jussit«.
- Henry's qualities are now listed; they vary but the use of the superlative is a constant: »prudentissimu[s] [...] et scientia pollens et iustae severitatis censurae habundans« or »virum strenuum et industrium praecipuumque pacis sectatorem [...] aliumque ei ad hoc officium aequae condignum inveniri non posse«
- For both authors the handing over of the royal ornaments means a transmission of the *regia dignitas*
- In Liudprand, the information that the rebellious magnates were finally tamed precedes the deathbed story (Antapodosis 2.19); it follows it in Adalbert, paraphrased. On this topic, »huic [...] **rebelles** [...] **superavit**« becomes »sibi **rebellantibus** [...] **superavit**«. Note here the shared usage of the dative (*huic, sibi*).