

ASSEMBLING THE AUSTRASIAN LETTERS AT TRIER AND LORSCH

GRAHAM BARRETT AND GEORGE WOUDHUYSEN

This article is a reconsideration of the Epistulae Austrasicae. We critique the widespread notion that the constituent letters were compiled by a courtier in the late sixth century at Metz as a book of models for use in the Austrasian chancellery. We argue instead that a monk from the monastery of Lorsch assembled the letters in the early ninth century from individual exemplars and groupings which he found in archives at Trier. We conclude by outlining some implications of this rereading for the edition and interpretation of the letters as sources for the Merovingian period, and point out some avenues for future research on their reception in the Carolingian period.

As usual, it struck me that letters were the only really satisfactory form of literature. They give one the facts so amazingly, don't they? I felt when I got to the end that I'd lived for years in that set. But oh dearie me I am glad that I'm *not* in it!

Lytton Strachey¹

Introduction

The collection known as the *Epistulae Austrasicae* – a nineteenth-century name and hardly one to conjure with – is a set of 48 letters (including two epistolary poems), overwhelmingly sixth century in date, and mostly sent by or to royalty, ecclesiastics, and aristocrats in the eastern part of the Frankish world.² The letters should be of great interest to historians: libraries scarcely bubble over with contemporary texts, and so anything from the period must be taken into account, but the collection deserves better than grudging acknowledgement of its existence. Ranging broadly over time and space, the letters show us the whole sixth century and feature the Rhineland, northern Italy, and Constantinople, offering welcome variety from the concentration of other such collections in the half-century around the year 500 and in southern Gaul (think of Sidonius Apollinaris, Ruricius of Limoges, and Avitus of Vienne; Desiderius of Cahors is something of an outlier, at least in date). They provide us with the bulk of our contemporary evidence for the reign of Clovis, and for the episcopate of Remigius, the bishop who baptized him.³ They reveal to us the tense

negotiations of the Austrasian dynasty of Theudebert I and Theudebald with the emperor Justinian.⁴ An extensive diplomatic file allows us to see in detail the mechanics of sixth-century high politics, revealing quite how many people rulers and their ambassadors were expected to importune with the same florid sentiments.⁵ They open to us an Austrasian world of powerful bishops and erudite laymen, showing off their literary culture and rhetorical skill (and asking for favours) in complex and involved epistles.⁶ And they do all this independently of our other evidence for the period.

The *Epistulae Austrasicae* (henceforth *EA*) have been preserved in a single manuscript of thirty folios, lacking any original heading but much later labelled *Liber epistolarum*, and later still *Epistolae Remigii et aliorum*.⁷ They were copied, according to Bernhard Bischoff, in the first third of the ninth century at the monastery of Lorsch, by a scribe writing in a ‘strange and somewhat cumbersome’ hand, with occasional contributions from two secondary scribes.⁸ The letters remained there until at least the fourteenth or fifteenth century, when an annotation was made beneath the final one recording their presence in the monastic library; with the dissolution of the monastery in the mid-sixteenth century, the manuscript was transferred to the Bibliotheca Palatina at Heidelberg, only to be plundered during the Thirty Years’ War and removed to the Vatican City in 1622/3, where it can now be consulted.⁹ The humanist librarian Leo Allatius compiled a list of these ‘liberated’ manuscripts while supervising their transport to Rome: it is unfortunately not possible to identify the *EA* for certain amongst them, but the collection may well be one of those codices catalogued as *Epistolae diuersorum* (the name given to it in early medieval library catalogues from Lorsch), and thus have existed in independent form at this date.¹⁰ The *EA* are now to be found together, in a binding of about 1780, with some other letters of Seneca copied in the twelfth century in Normandy and a portion of the *Pharsalia* of Lucan copied in the late eleventh or early twelfth in Aragón; both fragmentary fascicles have

themselves become detached from other manuscripts.¹¹ According to the inventory made by Allatius, one of the sets of ‘Letters of various people’ occupied *capsa* or case 102 along with this very copy of Seneca, so the relocation could be the moment when they became associated, but the copy of Lucan had already made its journey to the throne of St Peter in the company of the future Pope Marcellus II in the mid-sixteenth century, and therefore the later binding was probably the first point at which these three originally separate manuscripts were joined by happenstance.¹²

Apart from one letter and one epistolary poem, the collection appears to have been quite obscure before it was published by Marquard Freher, antiquary and scholar-at-large, in 1613.¹³ Freher must have seen the manuscript in a form different to the one it has today, so his edition merits closer inspection than it has hitherto received. He announces, under the heading of *Epistolae Francicae*, the publication for the first time of letters found in a most ancient manuscript from Lorsch held in the Palatine Library. In the table of contents which follows this notice, however, he lists the *EA* and the correspondence of Desiderius of Cahors consecutively and with continuous numeration, while he has also inserted one of the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, unindexed, amongst them.¹⁴ Absent further editorial commentary, it is difficult to know what to make of this: based on their transmission histories, the three sets of letters are unlikely ever to have circulated as one, even if the possibility cannot be totally excluded.¹⁵ In fact, careful examination reveals that Freher has discreetly taken up into his own corpus the *editio princeps* of Desiderius – published by Henricus Canisius in 1601 from a unique manuscript discovered at St Gall – and given the misleading impression that he himself had unearthed it together with the Austrasian letters.¹⁶ Why Freher did this to Canisius is now unrecoverable, but we may note their confessional antagonism (the one a leading Protestant scholar, the other nephew to Counter-Reformation firebrand Petrus Canisius) and their professional rivalry (the one having previously published a pair of tracts

subject to printed refutation by the other).¹⁷ Freher did not, interestingly, copy over the correspondence of Ruricius of Limoges, printed by Canisius immediately before that of Desiderius from the same codex of St Gall, even though it would have complemented his compilation of ‘Frankish Letters’ nicely.¹⁸

Whatever the story behind Freher and his edition, for almost three centuries afterwards scholars read the *EA* in it, and others reprinted or derived from it, even as the manuscript itself came to be thought lost.¹⁹ The first modern reader of the *EA* appears to have been cardinal-philologist Angelo Mai, who rediscovered the manuscript sometime after his appointment to the Vatican Library in 1819 and annotated it briefly with a reference to one of these reprints before passing to other projects.²⁰ The classicist Karl Rudolf Fickert then made use of the composite codex for his edition of Seneca in 1842, taking no note of its other contents.²¹ But it is to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* that we owe the first modern edition of the letters: catalogued and collated by Ludwig Bethmann and Paul Ewald in 1854 and 1876/7, they were subsequently studied and then edited by Wilhelm Gundlach in 1888 and 1892; his text, although vulnerable to criticism on methodological grounds, remains the most frequently cited.²² The *Corpus Christianorum* series subsequently printed an improved version of his edition, curated by Floribert Rommel, introducing sundry emendations proposed by Bruno Krusch and Dag Norberg.²³ Most recently, Elena Malaspina published a substantial study of the collection in 2001, incorporating corrections advanced by Juan Gil and offering a new text, Italian translation, and extensive linguistic and historical commentary.²⁴

Yet in truth the *EA* have been neglected. For any text edited three times over this statement requires some hedging, but despite attention (most notably and subtly from Ian Wood and lately from Bruno Dumézil and Thomas Lienhard) they remain less read than the value of their testimony commands.²⁵ Several of the letters are regularly invoked, and heavily

picked over (*EA 2* immediately springs to mind), but most languish in scholarly obscurity, and indeed textual incoherence, since their editorial history has been characterized by an excess of contradictory emendation.²⁶ Place of honour amongst possible reasons for this must go to the complexity and confusion of the collection itself, both at the basic level of simply construing each sentence, and on the more elevated plane of working out the import of each text. There is no getting away from the fact that many of the letters are difficult, sometimes fiendishly so, and we are better off admitting this than gliding over it in learned silence or, worse yet, papering over it with emended editions. If the translation and commentary offered by Malaspina have gone some way towards addressing these difficulties for Italophones, the confusing text and exiguous notes presented by Gundlach continue to confront the majority of scholars. Still more importantly, what may be thought the fundamental questions to ask of the collection – when, where, and why it was assembled, and from what sources – have received no good answers. Whatever progress is made, much about the letters will remain unknowable; no solution will be a panacea, but a firm idea of the genesis of the collection would be a major advance. We might then better understand how to approach its frequent difficulties of text – to grasp why simple errors of syntax have been left uncorrected by the scribes who copied out the letters – and appreciate why a letter which to us is almost opaque was lovingly transcribed by someone who saw something in it. We might also be able to get a clearer sense of what could be called the texture of the collection: to fathom its inclusions and strange omissions (the curious absences of Theuderic I and Chlothar I, or its unexpected halt amidst the reign of Childebert II). Simply put, even if a better grip on the origins of the collection leaves much unclear, its challenges can be tackled from a surer footing.

Contexts

Scholars have not ignored these questions, and there is something like an answer to them, which proceeds along the lines laid down by Gundlach in the nineteenth century. He suggested that the *EA* were put together in about 585, based on what he thought was the date of the latest letter, and interpreted them as a book of models, perhaps for pedagogical use in the Austrasian chancellery. Gundlach accordingly conjectured that their compiler was someone at the court, then established at Metz, probably a student or successor of Gogo, *nutricius* or tutor of Childebert and sender or recipient of several letters in the collection (on his own behalf as well as that of his king).²⁷ This proposal commands wide if not consistent agreement: Malaspina deems it ‘commonly accepted’, while Dumézil asserts that the collection was ‘undoubtedly composed in Austrasia at the end of the sixth century’ as ‘an *ars dictaminis* responding to different needs of exchange’, assembled by someone ‘living in Austrasia and engaged in diplomatic activity’.²⁸ Such refinements as there have been of this working hypothesis are no more than minor modifications. Synthesizing the efforts of a series of medievalists before him, Paul Goubert demonstrated that Gundlach was not altogether right as to the chronology of the embassies mentioned in *EA* 25-46, implying that the *terminus post quem* for the collection should be moved a few years later.²⁹ An entry in a Carolingian library catalogue from Lorsch has indicated to some that Trier was involved in the transmission of the collection (but the potential of this evidence has yet to be fully exploited).³⁰ Dumézil, for one, has proposed that it was assembled by Magneric, bishop of Trier, in the late sixth or early seventh century, and both he and Malaspina that the Lorsch copy of the *EA* was made from a manuscript at Trier, but exactly how or why this was the case has not been properly explained.³¹

There have similarly been attempts to develop the rather curt statements of Gundlach on the origin and purpose of the collection. Ian Wood has argued at different points that the *EA* ‘could have been a handbook for any Austrasian courtier’, one amongst several

‘handbooks of style’ put together when it had become much harder to receive rhetorical instruction – perhaps to try to remedy precisely this problem.³² In contrast, Malaspina has argued that the letters were collected in 593-6, when Childebert inherited the kingdom of his uncle Guntram and his chancellery felt moved to new and grander modes of expression to reflect his now greater prestige. She presses this thesis by suggesting that Asclepiodotus, the *referendarius* or official responsible for documentation, transferred on the death of Guntram to the court of Childebert and brought with him ‘a new interest in expressive models’, thereby enhancing quality control at the Austrasian chancellery (yet we may well quibble with Malaspina that those who went before Asclepiodotus were ‘individuals of Germanic race and less brilliant culture’, not nearly so interested in the formal aspects of letters).³³

Such, so far, appears dignified and coherent, but subject to probing it begins to fall to the ground. Since Gundlach, two unargued premises about the *EA* have persisted in the historiography. First, that the date of the latest letter is a guide to when the collection was assembled: if relations between Austrasia and the Empire continued for some years beyond 585, the absence of material relating to them requires explanation unless we posit redaction then or very soon afterwards.³⁴ Secondly, that the diplomatic letters between the court of Childebert and the Empire must come from the Austrasian chancellery, which along with the royal court was at Metz.³⁵ Neither of these positions is secure. On the first, Gundlach has been proven wrong about the chronology of Austrasian relations with the Empire, and so his date of 585 is erroneous. The latest letters in the collection, *EA* 40-41, show the emperor and the exarch of Ravenna writing to Childebert in 590 about his Italian campaigns. This year saw Childebert ‘making ... an agreement’ with Lombard emissaries who were at his court when their king Authari died, allowing us to fix the date.³⁶ Peace established, the great Italian motor of diplomatic exchange between the Franks and the Empire came spluttering to a halt, explaining why the *EA*, the second half of which focusses on these intricate negotiations,

cease where they do.³⁷ Of course, another prime stimulus to contact with Italy – Frankish relations with the papacy – continued into the seventh century, and so it might be objected that the end date of the *EA* still looks a little odd, falling early in the pontificate of Gregory the Great, who sent numerous missives to Austrasian recipients.³⁸ Yet the collection includes not a single papal letter of any date, and so it seems sensible to conclude either that its compiler considered this a genre deserving of separate preservation or that he was simply not interested (and who, reviewing the countless communiqués of the *consul Dei*, will cast the first stone?). The latest entry in the collection therefore provides no more than a *terminus post quem* for its compilation, not a firm indication of date.

The role of Metz in the assembly of the *EA* is entirely hypothetical. The various Merovingian sub-kingdoms did have what contemporaries called *sedes* and we may call capitals, but it should hardly need stating that their kings were itinerant.³⁹ Outside the *EA* themselves, there is little surviving evidence of a permanent Austrasian chancellery in the sixth century; indeed, authentic contemporary royal documentation is confined to a single papyrus diploma of Chlothar II.⁴⁰ While later Roman documentary practice demonstrably provided the model for such texts, indicating some continuity through this period, the actual functioning of the institution which produced them, notwithstanding an extensive historiography, can scarcely be reconstructed except by projecting outwards dangerously from *deperdita* or backwards conjecturally from the seventh century and beyond, when much may have changed.⁴¹ The trial of Egidius of Reims at Metz, as described by Gregory of Tours, certainly involved the examination of much written evidence, but can this one vignette support a whole writing office (with attached archives) fixed in that city, given that some of the records at issue had explicitly been in the possession of Chilperic at Chelles until passing upon his death to Childebert?⁴² If it is even right to think of this chancellery in institutional terms at all, rather than simply as a convenient shorthand for a variable group of individuals

employed *ad hoc* to write royal diplomas and other documents, nothing ties it to Metz (itself far from certainly ‘the capital’ as distinct from one of many temporary royal residences).⁴³ The writing ‘office’ most likely followed the king around, along with materials such as the diplomatic correspondence in the *EA*; further copies could well have been in the hands of ambassadors, their secretaries, or other interested parties.

The group of six letters which Gundlach averred relate to Metz contains only three (*EA* 15, 17, and 22) with any firm connection to it, all sent to bishops there.⁴⁴ Of the remainder, two (*EA* 13 and 16) were written by Gogo, who composed letters on behalf of Austrasian kings and has been tied by assumption to the city because of this connection to the royal court, and one (*EA* 14) by Venantius Fortunatus to Magneric, bishop of Trier; this last has been rammed into the group because the poet was patronized by Sigibert I, whom Gundlach assumed was resident in Metz (in fact, Gregory of Tours records that Sigibert had his seat at Reims).⁴⁵ If the collection had been created in the putative royal chancellery at Metz, its nature would become still more mysterious, not less so: how, for instance, would we explain the absence of material from the reign of Theuderic? Malaspina contends that Theuderic was ‘more a warrior than a politician’, unable to get his organizational act together sufficiently to keep documents worth including in the collection, but this is cold comfort.⁴⁶ After all, at the beginning of the century, under Clovis, the mechanisms had clearly existed to preserve the letters of Remigius. Assigning the compilation of the *EA* to this city ultimately raises more questions than it answers. There is, in sum, no good reason to assume that the collection must have been put together in the 590s or at Metz.

Models

What of the idea that the *EA* represent a book of model letters? The proposition that an interest in epistolary templates incited the assembly of letter collections is one encountered

fairly frequently in discussions of the genre in Late Antiquity.⁴⁷ Rarer is it to find any flesh put on those bare bones as to what exactly the models were for or what indeed is meant by ‘models’. Sometimes, as with Gundlach, Malaspina, and Dumézil, a form text is clearly intended, one which could be copied and adapted to the needs of the moment, and this notion has dominated interpretation of the *EA*. At other times, ‘model’ is used in a much vaguer sense, to suggest something worth preserving as an item of literary interest, but what is gained by using the word is not obvious – perhaps it speaks to a discomfit with early medieval preservation of ephemera, as if the notion that people in the period kept things which they liked reading is a touch disreputable, and needs to be garbed in some respectable instrumentalist dress. Wood has sought to develop the idea of epistolary models in late antique Gaul with characteristic subtlety, yet the notion that such collections were put together to make up for the ‘slight or non-existent’ availability of rhetorical education does not stand up to scrutiny.⁴⁸ The habit of collecting letters in Latin long pre-dates the posited educational decline (Cicero, Pliny, Symmachus), continues through it (Sidonius Apollinaris, Ruricius of Limoges, Avitus of Vienne), and persists rather longer afterwards than we might expect (the *EA* themselves, the miscellaneous *Epistulae Visigothicae*, Desiderius of Cahors, Boniface). In the eastern Empire, moreover, where no similar degeneration can be posited until much later, the unwieldy Greek letter collections of Libanius of Antioch, Nilus of Ancyra, and Isidore of Pelusium caution that the urge to collect, copy, and circulate letters could exist, on a vast scale, without any impetus from an educational autumn or a cultural waning.

There are problems too with the idea that the *EA* were model letters in a stricter sense, for use by the clerk in his scribbling. We have sets of templates explicitly marketed as such, in the formularies of Marculf and others, and they are very different, stripped of the contextual information which so superabounds in the *EA*. In almost all cases, the names of

people, places, and institutions have been expurgated, replaced by bland demonstrative pronouns, repeated to plodding effect.⁴⁹ Comparison of the first formula prepared by Marculf with the opening of *EA* 42 illustrates this admirably:

*That bishop, to the holy lord and venerable brother in Christ that abbot, or to the whole congregation of that monastery, in honour of those blessed martyrs, built by that man, in that district.*⁵⁰

The emperor, Caesar Flavius Mauricius Tiberius, faithful in Christ, gentle, the greatest, beneficent, pacific, Alamannicus, Gothicus, Anticus, Alanicus, Vandalicus, Herulicus, Gepidicus, Africus, pious, fortunate, celebrated, victor and triumpher, always Augustus, to Childebert, glorious man, king of the Franks.⁵¹

The letters in our collection are bursting with information which can have been of little interest to anyone seeking out mere forms to fill in.

In *EA* 22, similarly, Gogo greets eight figures in Metz by name with lavish praise. Whereas the names of more important figures are on occasion retained even in formularies (in what is usually assumed to be error), the six more obscure officers cited below should surely have been excised from any model. Contrast the first formula in the Angers collection, which does retain the regnal year of a King Childebert but in which all the civic officials are anonymized to pronouns and titles:

In the city of Angers, the public curia sat in the forum, and there the magnificent man, *that prosecutor*, said, ‘I ask you, praiseworthy man, *that defender, that curator, that master of soldiers*, and the remaining public curia...’⁵²

I greet Flitomer, who under the past bishop laudably governed the affairs of the church. I greet Mactaricus the archdeacon, conspicuous in dignity, desirous to renew the church, vigilant for advantages. I greet Avolus, shining in the learning of the notary. I greet Sinderic, singing the songs of the Psalms, in order of position, at dawn. I greet Theodosius, soothing to the ears of all with serene songs. I greet Theodemund, agreeable to friends, governor of the citizens, fundament of faith.⁵³

The epithets used by Gogo could have been preserved as model prose, but why not delete the names, as has been done after the descriptors in the Angers text?

Moreover, in *EA* 9, we meet the letter carrier Gundulf, while in *EA* 1 we encounter the priest Maccolus acting probably in the same capacity. Again the formularies purge such detail:

Know that we have received the letters of your loftiness through *those magnificent and illustrious men* with the greatest eagerness.⁵⁴

Greeting your glory, I also commend my intimate Maccolus the priest, whom I have sent.⁵⁵

The collection throughout is generously larded with names of ambassadors, officials, and places – precisely the information deleted from model letters. At the end of *EA* 42, we are even given a dating clause with place of issue, albeit one with certain textual problems:

Enacted *in that place, on that day, in that year*.⁵⁶

Given on 1 September in Constantinople under the emperor the divine Mauricius Tiberius perpetual Augustus [...] years after the consulship of the same.⁵⁷

Nor are the retained features limited to details of prosopography and nuances of titulature. In *EA* 8, we find a long string of Biblical citations designed to confute Arianism and, in *EA* 7, powerful rhetoric against the support which, it is alleged, Justinian has given to the doctrines of Eutyches and Nestorius. We likewise read in *EA* 6 a roll call of saints, some more household names than others: Ennodius of Pavia, Caesarius of Arles, Theodatus (an abbot), and Ambrose and Datus of Milan.

Comparison with a specifically *epistolary* formulary is instructive. Unlike the *EA*, the Greek manuals of Pseudo-Demetrius and Pseudo-Libanius on types and styles of letter-writing, both probably late antique in origin, are discursive, talking around pertinent examples in the form of partial extracts with an anonymous ‘so-and-so’ standing in for any party.⁵⁸ Closer in date, the criminally neglected *Formulae Augienses C*, almost certainly a product of the Carolingian monastery of Reichenau, consist of 26 model letters, in prose as

well as verse, stripped of nearly all particularities, at times labelled by typology, and ready for immediate use.⁵⁹ Contemplate a final contrast between this formulary and the collection, namely the headers given to texts, such as *EA* 23:

Sample to an abbot.⁶⁰

Letter of Auspicius, bishop of Toul,
to Arbogast, count of the Treveri.⁶¹

Content, not just form, matters. If the letters in the *EA* are meant to serve as models in any but the loosest sense (of material which might indirectly inspire), they are recondite models indeed.⁶²

The copyists of the collection seem instead to have taken special care to conserve original features, rather than prepare the letters for general use through selective deployment of the pumice stone. The preservation of authentically bombastic late antique incipits is of moment here (*EA* 10: ‘Germanus, a sinner, to the most clement and most surpassing lady, the lady always most pious to us, and a daughter in Christ of the holy Church, Queen Brunhild’; this is one of the begging letters).⁶³ Similar care has been shown for orthography, since *EA* 1-4 refer to ‘Remigius’ even as the *capitulatio* or table of contents which heads the collection indicates that the preferred spelling at the time and place of copying was ‘Remedius’.⁶⁴ A preference is also shown in the table for ‘Hildibert’ to either the ‘Childebert’ or ‘Childeberth’ used in the main text, an orthographic feature characteristic, perhaps tellingly, of other manuscripts of Merovingian historical texts corrected at the monastery of Lorsch (and a connection which we shall have occasion to develop).⁶⁵ Copying over the statements that *EA* 43 and 48 were composed in the name of the king respectively by Venantius Fortunatus and Gogo likewise suggests that it was really the authentic details of the letters which interested their compiler. We should mark too the preservation of notes to *EA* 35, ‘similar in prologue, to John the *quaestor* (that is, the advisor)’, and *EA* 36, ‘similar in prologue, to Megas the *curator*’.⁶⁶ Seeing how none of the other letters with very similar openings receives such a note, and none of the other sometimes more arcane titles such a gloss, we can only assume

that this has been faithfully copied from these originals, and these originals alone.⁶⁷ This is one last contrast to formularies: whereas the ‘similar in prologue’ of the *EA* is explanatory, describing the content transcribed in full thereafter, formularies often provide only one model *in extenso*, and excise repeated elements of that kind from additional exemplars.⁶⁸

The letters therefore do not resemble models; they are characterized by an interest in the fixed and the specific. Nor do the *EA* work as a *collection* of models: that presupposes an answer to the question ‘models for whom?’, and it is jolly hard to think of anyone. This fundamental problem has never been acknowledged. The latter part of the corpus seems to provide a ready solution: for all their difficulties, obscurities, and repetitions, the diplomatic letters from the court of Childebert could be seen as comprising a sort of (exhaustive) guide to drafting such material. But the ‘chancellery’ section is tacked onto a string of letters from great and powerful Austrasian bishops, which are relevant to quite specific historical moments, and perhaps of theological (*EA* 7 to Justinian) or even canon-law interest (*EA* 3 on a priest behaving badly), but hardly useful models for a clerk, who will not often have had cause to mail insults to emperors.⁶⁹ There are also letters exchanged between cultivated Austrasian courtiers, where the point was less to write *something* than to write *anything* in a particular manner.⁷⁰ Nor is it readily explicable how two poems ended up in the collection if it was meant for use in the chancellery – especially given that one pre-dates the establishment of Merovingian rule by several decades.⁷¹ It is true that in the Visigothic formulary we find a marriage contract in verse, which should caution us against construing too narrowly what kinds of texts a scribe might see fit to use, but the two poetical letters in the *EA* are straightforward works of praise to a bishop and a count such as might be found in any anthology of verse, with all the expected topical detail.⁷² That these could have been models in a very broad sense for someone of literary interests is not implausible, but forms for a scribe?⁷³ One can see how the two parts of the collection could function as models, and

indeed Gogo wrote both sorts of letter, but they are models in rather different senses: diplomatic correspondence for use in the chancellery, and other missives as a sort of common-place book providing stylistic, theological, and historical inspiration. They speak to users with distinct literary horizons. Moreover, while the latter part of the collection consists of a run of diplomatic letters, the inclusion of three more amidst the first half shows that the thematic disjuncture is not the result of a merging after the fact of two originally discrete sets of models.

This basic obstacle cannot be evaded by imagining that the *EA* were a species of *Book of the Courtier*. How would our Austrasian Castiglione react, leafing through his handbook and finding his king belaboured thus:

Your eminence has seemed until now to show no work appropriate to friendship, while promises in letters and ones affirmed through priests and strengthened by terrible oaths, after so much time has passed, have secured no effect. And if this is so, why do you tire out your intimate legates across such great spaces of earth and sea without response, who have brought nothing of use, hurling juvenile speeches?⁷⁴

Abused here by the emperor no less – it is hard to reconstruct a scenario in which this model could have been deployed at court. And it cannot escape the notice of anyone who has read the collection in its entirety that nine of the letters (*EA* 31-39) are effectively identical, clearly part of a file of some kind. Each has been slightly reworked to fit its specific addressee, and there is some variation of precisely how the flattery is thickly lathered, but it is no exaggeration, reader, to say that only one is needed to get the message. This surely is exactly what a book of model letters would avoid, providing one template in place of numerous exemplars.

The text of the *EA*, finally, is often deeply obscure. This is true at a fairly basic level: what is the reader to make of the incipit of *EA* 1, ‘angit me & satagit uestrae causae tristitia’, with its mystifying *satagit*, or *EA* 2, ‘orfanos nutre . si potius est quam erudies’, with its missing subjunctive and opaque meaning? Or *EA* 18, ‘Accedentibus ad nos legati uestri .

iohannis & missurius . non me|diocriter laetificati suscepimus’, with its absent ablatives, or EA 40, ‘INCIPIT LITTERAS DE ROMANORUM IMPERATORE DIREC|tas ad domnum regem’, with its flagrant accusatives?⁷⁵ What about baffling errors, such as in EA 32, where the addressee of the letter is named ‘Honor’, when his full name, ‘Honoratus’, has been given on the very line above?⁷⁶ Just how comfortable could readers make themselves in EA 47, with the unusual adverb ‘FELITER’, seemingly for *feliciter*?⁷⁷ In both cases one can imagine source texts from which abbreviation marks had gone astray, but in neither was the obvious expansion made. Examples like this thread their way through every letter in the collection, and may be multiplied beyond endurance. One cannot suppose that ‘qui ut quod iam semel bis & tertio ad omnes rectores | ecclesiae condemnatum fuerat . uel odoraris commonuit’ could have been much of a model for any reader: not only have agents and objects been confused (‘ad omnes rectores’ for *ab omnibus rectoribus*), but the addressee (Justinian) has apparently been encouraged to perfume rather than to praise that which has been condemned by the Church Fathers.⁷⁸

One can in every instance see how these lapses could be corrected into something more faithful to the commonly accepted rules of grammar and orthography, but throughout the copyists (although not reader-correctors of later centuries) have left them unaltered. Nor can one hold that this was simple incompetence on the part of a single tremulous scribe letting down the Lorsch scriptorium. On folio 9 *verso*, a second hand takes over, and continues for all of folio 10 *recto*, copying the end of EA 8 and the beginning of EA 9: we find here ‘&’ for what must be *ex* (in a sentence where it is used correctly a few words on; the same error occurs a few lines below), ‘sed’ for what should be *et*, and a missing *uobis*.⁷⁹ Still a little before (in EA 8), we meet the ‘hereticos alaricū uel gun|dobadū regum’ (for *reges*).⁸⁰ One scribe at Lorsch might just be believed capable of writing these in as simple mistakes, but that two do it consistently begins to suggest that something altogether more interesting is

going on: the errors, like the names and titles, have been carefully preserved. No editor has yet taken this seriously into account; any emendation of a prose text surviving in only one manuscript is hazardous enough, but here it also runs contrary to the apparent aims of the scribes, mistaking what was done intentionally for myriad absent-minded slips of the stylus.⁸¹ The archetype or archetypes which the scribes had in front of them were evidently difficult, and the problems confronted by Carolingian copyists dealing with Merovingian exemplars are well documented.⁸² The composition of the manuscript itself shows traces of this: while some of the interventions by the secondary scribes are for whole folios, as if the work of writing were straightforwardly being shared, one of the secondary hands, on at least one occasion, intervened for only two lines in the middle of a folio, as if taking over when the primary scribe faltered over some particularly impenetrable passage.⁸³ There are, in any case, real questions about whether the *EA* would have been usable as models – the concept does imply that the user can follow the meaning of the text, and it is not always manifest that our scribes could. There is therefore nothing to fix the collection to Metz, nor to the end of the sixth century, and these letters were not intended to serve as models.

Alternatives

What then are the *EA* and where and when were they assembled? On this point we have clear evidence of which Gundlach was ignorant but which immediately overturns his proposed date for the collection. In a library catalogue from Lorsch of *circa* 830 there is the following entry (formatted thus):

Liber epistularum diuersorum patrum
et regum quas [...] Treueris inueni
in uno codice XLIII⁸⁴

By the austere standards of the catalogue this is informative and precise: ‘A book of letters of diverse [Church] fathers and kings, which [letters] I found in Trier; in one codex, 43 [in

number]’. That it refers to the *EA* has been taken for granted by Bischoff, its most recent editor Angelika Häse, and Malaspina.⁸⁵ Not only is the description a pithy one for the collection which we have, but the number of letters said to be in it matches the erroneous total given in the *capitulatio* at its head. The number has been added to the catalogue by a later hand, which suggests that someone has glanced at the volume mentioned in the entry, seen the total listed in it, and jotted this down to aid later searchers. Interpretation of the entry, however, has been variable. Malaspina holds that it has simply been copied over from an earlier catalogue, but this is far from credible.⁸⁶ As a personal note by the compiler, it is all but unique, and was not copied over into later catalogues: there was no mechanical retention of information about texts and their origins from one catalogue to the next.⁸⁷ Dumézil takes the entry to show that the letters were collected at Trier in the sixth century, while Häse, following Bischoff, thinks that it demonstrates the existence there of the ‘direct – today lost – exemplar of the Lorsch copy’.⁸⁸ Malaspina is inconsistent: at some points she refers to a Treviran exemplar from which the Lorsch manuscript was copied, at others she appears open to the idea that it was the original letters which were found at Trier, while supposing that the collection was put together at Metz in the late sixth century.⁸⁹ These are all attempts to reconcile the catalogue entry with the date asserted for the *EA* by Gundlach, but entry and assertion contradict each other, and nineteenth-century speculation, however venerable, must retreat in the face of unambiguous contemporary testimony.

The import of the evidence is clear: it was not an exemplar of the *collection* that was found at Trier, but copies of the individual letters or groups of letters. Where in Trier is not specified, but this in itself may be significant: the source is not localized to a particular urban, institutional, or individual archive, conceivably indicating that more than one was involved, and certainly ruling out another claim made by Malaspina, that the letters were gathered from archives at Reims and Metz as well as Trier.⁹⁰ Readers should not be led astray by ‘in uno

codice' to a translation of 'letters which I found in Trier *in one codex*'.⁹¹ These words are not part of the relative clause 'quas Treueris inueni', and they are ubiquitous in catalogues, appearing in four entries in the selfsame column.⁹² As often occurs, they are here situated on a new line immediately below the entry and indented to clarify that they offer a separate category of information from what precedes them: like the total number of letters added thereafter by a later hand, they are a finding aid, not a guide to origins, describing what *now* exists in the monastic library. This is why entries for lengthy works and works of diverse contents commonly conclude with an indication of how many volumes they comprise (again making strategic use of line breaks): 'Collations of the Fathers | in four volumes' or 'the books of Plinius Secundus, *On the Nature of Things*, | 37 in two volumes'.⁹³ Nor would it be safe to presume blithely that 'quas' must refer back to 'liber', signalling that a book (rather than letters) was found, and that it only agrees with 'epistularum' by error of attraction. The elementary construction could hardly have challenged the perfectly adequate grammar of the cataloguer, and the two latter words sit next to each other, separated from the relative pronoun by three masculine genitive plurals rather more likely to be guilty of grammatical attraction. Unless we insist on interpreting the text in diametrical opposition to its plain meaning, the catalogue entry states that the cataloguer from Lorsch himself assembled the *EA* at Trier from multiple distinct exemplars, rather than copying an extant collection put together around 600 or at some other early date.⁹⁴

In this connection, there is a suggestive but hitherto largely neglected parallel in a manuscript of the latter half of the eighth century, originally from Soissons and likely the abbey of St Medard, once owned by finance minister and serial bibliophile Jean-Baptiste Colbert.⁹⁵ The codex is a copy of the *Collectio Sanblasiana*, a set of conciliar canons and decretals arranged in chronological order probably first compiled at Rome in the early sixth century.⁹⁶ Following the *explicit* of the Council of Chalcedon can be found the second section

of the Athanasian Creed, which deals with the Incarnation, headed by an intriguing scribal note: ‘HAEC INVINI TREVERIS IN UNO LIBRO SCRIPTŪ’ (‘I found this [*or* these] at Trier written in one [*or* the same] book’).⁹⁷ Grammatically inconsistent though they may be, ‘HAEC’ and ‘SCRIPTŪ’ frame ‘IN UNO LIBRO’, making it clear that the text of the Creed which follows has been taken from one or the same book. This stands in marked contrast to the construction of the entry in the Lorsch catalogue, to which, *independently* of the grammar of ‘quas Treueris inueni’, the cataloguer has appended ‘in uno libro’, leaving no doubt as to the difference in meaning.

But the fact that the compiler or copyist of this Soissons manuscript had travelled to Trier in order to gather materials is equally of importance. The ‘Trier fragment’ of the Athanasian Creed has had a glamorous and controversial role in its historiography, giving rise to the ‘two-portion’ hypothesis that it originated as two distinct compositions, one on the Trinity and the present Trier text on the Incarnation; indeed, this very manuscript was thought to be the oldest witness to the text, but earlier copies of the whole Creed have since been discovered, debunking the notion. The most recent monographic study has concluded that the text probably originated in the circle of the monastic community at Lérins in the late fifth or early sixth century, and was most likely written by either Vincent of Lérins or Caesarius of Arles (the earliest known text of the Creed is in fact in a form adapted by Caesarius for use as a sermon).⁹⁸ What matters here is that this manuscript transmits two sources, one of them Roman (the *Collectio*), the other Gallic (the Creed), from no later than the early sixth century: not only our cataloguer from Lorsch, therefore, but also another compiler from Soissons understood Trier to be a place where interesting and varied literary antiquities could be excavated. The ‘Trier fragment’, moreover, is a ‘preacher’s paraphrase’ of the Creed, and Nicetius, bishop of Trier and prominent actor in the *EA*, has been proposed as its author on linguistic grounds, potentially tying all the strands of our enquiry together.⁹⁹ Whatever the

authorship of this fragment, Trier begins to emerge as a destination for early Carolingians questing after literature of the Merovingian era, either because of the antiquity of its archives (and their possible holdings) or for the reputation of its most famous bishop.

The tantalizing evidence of the Lorsch catalogue for the role of Trier in the compilation of the *EA* receives further confirmation from the circulation of one of the letters outside the collection itself. *EA* 14, a poem by Venantius Fortunatus in praise of Magneric, bishop of Trier, can also be found in a hagiographical life of him written in the late tenth or early eleventh century by Eberwin, head of the abbey of St Martin in the same city.¹⁰⁰ The poem is not transmitted in manuscripts containing the other efforts of Venantius; it appears only in the *Vita Magnerici* and the *EA*.¹⁰¹ Eberwin believed that his abbey had been founded by Magneric and housed his corpse, and there is no good reason to doubt him.¹⁰² The monks had evidently kept literary materials relevant to their founder (including another isolated couplet by Venantius unknown anywhere else, perhaps preserved on site as an inscribed epitaph).¹⁰³ They had even adapted the poem in praise of Magneric into a series of antiphons and responsories for use on his feast day.¹⁰⁴ Yet Eberwin seems not to have read the poem as one of the *EA*: the *Vita Magnerici* includes quite a lot of detail about his predecessor Nicetius, and the abbot has not been idle here, drawing information from Gregory of Tours in his *Vita Patrum* or *Life of the Fathers*, but he has made no use of the extensive and dramatic testimony which the *EA* offer on the inexorable bishop of Trier.¹⁰⁵ Naturally it is a possibility that Eberwin had read the letters of Nicetius, preserved only in the *EA*, and decided to make no use of them; given that he cites Venantius on Magneric, however, and had gone to the trouble of reading the life of Nicetius by Gregory, this would take some explaining. The simplest deduction is that he makes no mention of the other letters because he does not know them, and therefore had not read this epistolary poem as one of our collection. Consequently, a full text of *EA* 14 must have survived at Trier, and seemingly only there, independently of

the *EA*, into the eleventh century, despite the terrors inflicted upon the monastery by Vikings and lay abbots, whom Eberwin considered equally distressing.¹⁰⁶ This is weighty evidence that our ninth-century cataloguer from Lorsch found in Trier not an exemplar of a compiled collection but, exactly as he says, raw materials from which to assemble one.

Materials

What if we try to read the Lorsch manuscript of the *EA* as though it had been put together from multiple exemplars, be they the original texts or copies in whatever form? There are clues scattered through the letters. Heading *EA* 32 we find the formula ‘INCIPIT AD HONORATUM APOCHRISARIUM’ (‘Here it begins, to Honoratus the *apocrisarius*’). The first line of the body is then offset from this header, rather than continuing on the same line, and contains the actual address: ‘Childebertus rex Francorum . uiro glorioso . Honor [sic]’ (‘Childebert, king of the Franks, to the glorious man Honor[atus]’).¹⁰⁷ Clearly the portion in capitals is not the beginning of the letter as such, but something else entirely: the start of a subsection within the collection? As we work our way through the letters which follow this one we find that, in most of them, the end is signalled by ‘FINIT’ (*EA* 36, 38, and 42 are the exceptions) until *EA* 47, where in large capitals we read ‘FINIT FELITER’, presumably for *finit feliciter* (‘happily it finishes’, a sentiment which anyone who has read the diplomatic letters can wholeheartedly endorse). What we have in *EA* 32-47, therefore, looks distinctly like an earlier gathering of letters, marked off between a distinctive ‘INCIPIT’ and a distinctive ‘FINIT’, which has subsequently been integrated *en bloc* into the collection (see below, Table 1: Group VII). When this subsidiary diplomatic collection was itself compiled is unknown, but its presence in the *EA* is intriguing, and worth pursuing.

Revisiting our corpus from the top with this in mind, the first four letters form a self-contained set from the pen of Remigius of Reims (*EA* 1-4). It is noticeable that the first two

bear no footer, the third has an ‘explic’ (with a bar over the -c), and the fourth an ‘EXPLICIT’.¹⁰⁸ By this the scribe could be indicating that he has here reached the end of a first gathering of letters, a set of four (or three plus one) which were already in circulation together before he had found them. While it might be countered that he merely seeks to mark the end of a subsection, with the capitalized *explicit* flagging a break in author rather than source material, we can test and reject this proposition in the letters which come next (*EA* 5-8). They all concern Nicetius of Trier, two to him and two from him, making up a quartet to balance the letters of Remigius, and all conclude with ‘EXPLICIT’, including the last – this copied by a secondary scribe, which also proves that the variation in endings is not simply an eccentricity of our primary copyist.¹⁰⁹ The subtle variations of *explicit* are not trying to tell us about changes in author: they show us how the compiler assembled the *EA*. He found a hefty file of diplomatic correspondence, the plurality of the collection, as well as a set of letters from Remigius, and he signalled as much with his use of headers and footers, but in addition he found a number of individual exemplars to and from Nicetius, which is reflected in the way that each one ends with ‘EXPLICIT’. If we look ahead, *EA* 9-11 similarly appear to have been copied from individual exemplars, since they all finish with the same footer.¹¹⁰ The first two of these letters, indeed, are from bishops to Austrasian royalty in the vein of *EA* 8, while the third is again addressed to Nicetius, bracketing off this bloc and suggesting that it is to be read as an extension of the previous grouping. The seven letters (*EA* 5-11) betray a neat organization: two letters from Abbot Florianus to the bishop of Trier, two letters from him to important political figures, a further two letters from other bishops to Austrasian monarchs, and a final letter to Nicetius from a fellow bishop (see Table 1: Group II).¹¹¹ There can be no question, moreover, that these were copied from individual exemplars instead of a file on the bishop of Trier: later on in the collection we have more letters to Nicetius (*EA* 21 and 24), supplementary to but separate from the earlier sequence, as if our compiler were adding

letters to the manuscript as they came to hand, while marking them off to indicate where each new run began.

What other groupings can be seen? Another shift is flagged at *EA* 12, introduced as ‘EPISTULA DINAMII AD AMICUM’ (‘Letter of Dynamius to a Friend’), with the text, unlike in most other cases, again offset from its header.¹¹² The letter has no footer, and we move to *EA* 13, from Gogo to Chaming, which finishes with an ‘EXPLICIT’.¹¹³ The two letters may therefore have reached the copyist together: perhaps the unnamed amigo to whom Dynamius sent the first was Chaming as well? Then *EA* 14-17 all conclude with ‘EXPLICIT’, the last letter in particular bearing an unusually large specimen of the word, as if signalling a shift from one set of related exemplars to another.¹¹⁴ Interestingly, *EA* 16 is also headed ‘EPISTULA’, conceivably (as with *EA* 12) indicating the beginning of a new grouping, yet at the same time it marks the reappearance of Gogo as sender.¹¹⁵ *EA* 17 is once more from Dynamius, thereby presenting the opposite order of senders to *EA* 12-13, chiastically framing the thematically related *EA* 12-17, a series of letters between cultivated Austrasian aristocrats and bishops (see Table 1: Group III). We then find the address heading *EA* 18 strikingly set off from the text of the letter, clearly marking some manner of break.¹¹⁶ *EA* 18-20 are in fact diplomatic letters from Theudebert and Theudebald to Justinian, which each have an ‘EXPLICIT’ and form a discrete set of their own (see Table 1: Group IV).¹¹⁷

This diplomatic correspondence has its complement in the run of *EA* 25-48 which makes up the balance of the collection, but the four intervening letters, *EA* 21-24, frankly offer resistance to interpretation as a grouping, and could simply be miscellaneous exemplars of interest to the compiler. All four end with ‘EXPLICIT’, and the latter two are oddities: *EA* 23 is early, from the mid-fifth century, and *EA* 24 is unique in its anonymous sender, while both are headed ‘EPISTULA’. On the page, moreover, *EA* 23 looks initially like it has been set off from the preceding letters, but this may simply be because it is in verse and, *metri*

causa, has to be; less clearly, *EA* 24 finishes with a small ‘expl’ rather than a capitalized one, somewhat unexpectedly so since the letter patently does not belong with those which follow it.¹¹⁸ Yet there is a possibility. This sequence is bookended by letters to Nicetius, and the locations of all four senders and recipients, where known, fall within the archdiocese of Trier: the episcopal see itself, Metz, and Toul.¹¹⁹ Only *EA* 22 is not addressed to a recipient in Trier, but the unnamed personage saluted at the end of it – who incessantly visits the thresholds of the saints, has recently constructed a church over the Moselle, and ornaments the palaces of kings with his doctrine – may well be Nicetius himself.¹²⁰ If this grouping does have a theme, it could be Trier and its history, a potentiality which we recommend that you keep in mind (see Table 1: Group V).

Thereafter we are on firmer ground as we move to a run of diplomatic letters (*EA* 25-31) all ending with ‘FINIT’. This marks a noticeable shift from the preference seen previously for ‘EXPLICIT’, but as it can be found in most of the subsequent diplomatic correspondence it seems to reflect a ‘house style’ amongst Austrasian court clerks of the later sixth century. The exception is *EA* 31, which finishes with ‘EXPLICIT’, plausibly the work of the copyist to signal the end of another grouping (see Table 1: Group VI).¹²¹ There follows the single largest series of letters, the diplomatic file with which we began our discussion (*EA* 32-47). This group itself splits into two neat subsections: eight near identical letters, the first alone of which is headed ‘INCIPIT’ (*EA* 32), then eight more of various content; the initial one also bears an ‘INCIPIT’ (*EA* 40), but so do three others (*EA* 44 and 46-47), perhaps indicating what were once separate exemplars within this file, and thus several stages to its own compilation.¹²² The consistency of the ‘FINIT’ footers, however, implies that the compiler himself encountered the file already formed into a unit, whatever its prehistory (see Table 1: Group VII). These last two groupings work best as monuments to Austrasian diplomatic-literary skill, and could originally have been gathered for that reason. The

collection concludes with *EA* 48 from Gogo to Grasulf, an appendix as it stands, which (unsurprisingly for a diplomatic letter) has its own ‘FINIT’.¹²³ Overall, what the evidence of the headers and footers confirms, if we have correctly understood it, is that our compiler from Lorsch found in Trier some ready-made groupings of letters and many other individual exemplars.¹²⁴ From these he wove together his collection.

Sources

We have solid evidence within the *EA* that they were assembled from a mixture of letters and sets of letters, and strong support from the Lorsch catalogue for the source of all this material being Trier. That the city played some role in the compilation of the corpus should have been obvious long ago from even a perfunctory inspection of its contents: discounting the diplomatic material, Nicetius, bishop of the city, is the single most common sender or recipient of letters, accounting for seven in all.¹²⁵ The most likely place for these letters to have been preserved is Trier – the question is whether they were available outside the city. The biography of Nicetius which Gregory of Tours included in his *Vita Patrum* is our other main source of information about his life.¹²⁶ He tells us that he got his information from Aridius, an abbot in the city of Limoges, who was raised and ordained by Nicetius. This comes in a section where Gregory is stoutly defending his use of sources against (imagined) critics: ‘But there are those, which is worse, who, with perverse sense, do not trust what is written, as much as they reprehend what has been witnessed, and indeed scorn that which has been seen as though it were fabricated’.¹²⁷ Strikingly, despite his concern to defend the accuracy of his account, he makes no mention of the letters of Nicetius – incontrovertible proof to buttress his case, one would have thought. Gregory was far from averse to citing material when he found it: to him we owe the only known fragments of the historians Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus and Sulpicius Alexander, in addition to the full text of the treaty of

Andelot (amongst other documents).¹²⁸ If anybody in Merovingian Gaul should have been interested in these letters and inclined to quote them, it would have been Gregory, and his silence here is revealing. Nor, so far as can be seen, does anyone else seem to have known about them until they were copied into the *EA*; they were not cited, quoted, or referenced explicitly or allusively. The logical inference is that the letters of Nicetius were confined to the archives in Trier, and were found there individually by our man from Lorsch.

The city is also likely the source of the second poem in the collection, *EA* 23, from Auspicius of Toul to Arbogast, count of the Treveri, the earliest item in it by some distance.¹²⁹ The most obvious outlier amongst the letters, it was presumably preserved as a notable article of *Treviriana* and perhaps incorporated by the compiler because of his evident interest in that city, or even because he recognized its *dramatis personae* from the letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, a copy of which was available at Lorsch in the early ninth century.¹³⁰ So far as can be determined, this poem too was utterly unknown until emerging from whatever archive it had dustily inhabited and taking its place amongst the *EA*. Whatever date of compilation between 590 and 830 one posits for the collection, it is improbable that after at least a century of oblivion this letter survived anywhere other than at Trier. Conceivably Toul, within the archdiocese, but given the preponderance of the Treviran in the corpus over material concerning that see this can be repudiated with confidence. Of the nine items in the collection which have a direct relation to Trier, one (*EA* 14) can be shown to have circulated only there and eight (*EA* 5-8, 11, 21, 23, 24) are unlikely to have been preserved anywhere else – indeed, all but two of these are addressed to recipients in the city itself.

The other letters in the collection cannot be tracked to Trier with comparable certainty, yet the obstacles to finding a way for the letters from here to have survived at any other location (such as Metz) are much more formidable. Trier was a major Austrasian centre, seat of one of its most important bishoprics and frequented by kings, even if never explicitly

a royal *sedes* in this period; it is not difficult to imagine how materials could have ended up there.¹³¹ Of its bishops, we find Nicetius *in situ* castigating Theudebert in church for his sins, and Magneric baptizing the son of Childebert, also named Theudebert.¹³² Magneric continued to play a prominent role in the politics of the kingdom, and attended the negotiations which led to the treaty of Andelot (narrowly avoiding incineration).¹³³ As such, the diplomatic letters could easily have wound up in Trier. The random assortment of royal materials in the *EA* may also be explained by the slightly more distant connection of the city to the Austrasian kings when compared with somewhere like Metz – at least as that city has been represented in the historiography, although this too is overdue for reassessment.¹³⁴ If we were to push a reconsideration of the status of Trier here, the *EA* themselves could be testimony to, and a simple reflection of, a more consistent royal presence there than has hitherto been supposed; for kings such as Theudebert, who set out to challenge imperial authority (just read his letters), the city and its legacy of Roman grandeur would have offered a powerfully symbolic seat for his court. In any case, we need to remember that many of the agents of our letters had multiple affiliations: churchmen as well as courtiers, bishops as well as legates, politicians as well as poets. Accordingly, they had connections to multiple archives, and so some diplomatic file could have arrived at Trier on a royal visit and never left, or been in the keeping of one of the shadowy ambassadors who flit briefly before our eyes in the letters, one with links to the city; this is equally true of the material from the reign of Childebert as of that from the time of Theudebert.¹³⁵ Likewise the cluster of letters which circle around Venantius Fortunatus and his connexions (*EA* 12-17, 22): these could have arrived in Trier with other works of the jobbing Italian sent to bishops there, or in the royal train with Gogo, whose set after all – gaily sketched by the poet – moved in the Rhine-Moselle region.¹³⁶

The only portion of the collection which presents any difficulty for this thesis is the four letters of Remigius of Reims. *EA* 1-2 are to Clovis, who, although his movements are not

well known, does not seem to have visited Trier, and in any case had his last seat at Paris; *EA* 3-4 are to bishops, none of whom held the see of Trier.¹³⁷ How then are we to suppose that the letters materialized there? Gregory of Tours, discussing the deeds of Remigius in his *Decem Libri Historiarum* or *Ten Books of Histories*, quotes a version of what is clearly *EA* 1, and just beforehand mentions that ‘there is today a book of his life’, seemingly his principal source (he mentions no others).¹³⁸ Possibly he drew his knowledge of the letter from this *Vita Remigii* – a useful parallel is the *Vita* of Desiderius of Cahors, which contains within it five letters (two royal and three from his mother) illustrating aspects of his life.¹³⁹ It is not unreasonable to conjecture that, if the *Life of Remigius* included *EA* 1, it might also have incorporated other of his letters. Gregory cites several such texts, which come into view and vanish like phantasms, but in this case we can trace things a little farther, for Hincmar, a successor to Remigius as bishop of Reims, wrote a life of the saint in the ninth century.¹⁴⁰ He describes in a fascinating prologue how he went about searching for the ‘book of the greatest size, written by an ancient hand, on the origin and life and virtue and death of the blessed Remigius, our most holy patron’, which elderly clerics had seen in the time of the bishop Tilipinus (748-94).¹⁴¹ This sounds a lot like the *Vita* known to Gregory, and it is hard to credit that there were two quite full but distinct lives of Remigius, of an early date, circulating widely in Gaul.

Hincmar says that the book had been neglected because an excerpt had been made of it by Venantius Fortunatus – as he believed, it would appear wrongly – on the orders of Bishop Egidius of Reims.¹⁴² In what Hincmar regarded as the time of troubles for the Church under Charles Martel, during the tenure of a bishop Milo whom he vehemently disapproved, the monks, reduced to penury, cut out leaves from the book in the course of commerce; the tome, partly plundered by scissors, partly rotted by damp, and partly gnawed by mice, was destroyed.¹⁴³ Hincmar claims that he went to great efforts to try to track down

this book, contending with the deception of false reports, but eventually gave up and had recourse to other sources.¹⁴⁴ This is not solely the customary exaggeration of a preface seeking to establish the *bona fides* of a text, for he left a parchment trail behind him. Flodoard of Reims, writing several generations later, knew that Hincmar had contacted Ado, bishop of Vienne (860-75), in search of a letter to Remigius from Avitus, the most famous occupant of that see, which he had heard was still extant there.¹⁴⁵ Flodoard also mentions a further letter sent *circa* 866-77 to one Lantard, a priest who had fled Reims during the episcopate of Ebo (the immediate predecessor of Hincmar), offering him extremely generous terms if he should send written materials about Remigius which he had purportedly taken with him in his flight.¹⁴⁶ Wrenching though it may be that Hincmar was unable to find the book and therewith enrich his *Vita Remigii*, the point is that Merovingian material about Remigius was available into the eighth century, and was held by those in the know still to be attainable well into the ninth. Portions of the book, with its hypothetical letters, may equally have survived at Trier: it had been closely linked with Reims for much of the eighth century, when Milo (to the considerable displeasure of Hincmar) simultaneously held both bishoprics.¹⁴⁷

Almost all the letters which are in our corpus can thus be tentatively supposed to have existed at Trier in the late eighth and early ninth centuries. In the light of the Lorsch catalogue entry, and the circulation of *EA* 14, there are very strong grounds to conclude that the collection was put together by someone from Lorsch, out of single letters and small groups of them found at Trier. This city, important in Austrasian politics but never a key seat of kings, also fits the somewhat haphazard sequence of royal letters in the collection. That no such letters of a later period were included can be explained by a mixture of factors. After the death of Childebert, his sons Theudebert and Theuderic divided his kingdom; Theudebert received Austrasia and made his capital at Metz.¹⁴⁸ Trier does not figure in our main source, Fredegar, for the next few years, and when Theudebert was defeated by Theuderic in the

(usual) civil war in 612, he fled via Metz to Cologne.¹⁴⁹ Soon after, Theuderic died of disease, and Chlothar, king in Neustria, was invited into Austrasia by some of its resident grandees.¹⁵⁰ Austrasia thereby lost its own ruling dynasty and its king resided in Neustria, leaving Metz and Trier without a royal court. Chlothar gave his son Dagobert to the Austrasians as king in 622, but he, at some point after becoming sole king of Francia on the death of his father, appears to have returned his seat to Neustria.¹⁵¹ Dagobert used Metz as a base while attempting to quash the uppity Wends on the eastern frontier in the early 630s, and when he made his son Sigibert king in Austrasia he established him there.¹⁵² Trier features in almost none of these events, cropping up only when Dagobert was present in 624 and had a certain Agilolfing lord named Chrodoald rubbed out.¹⁵³ This combination – of Austrasia having a king on the ground less frequently than before, and of that king being at Trier still less often – goes some way towards explaining why our collection stops in the reign of Childebert, as it becomes much more challenging to construct a scenario whereby any subsequent court correspondence could have made its way into archives in the city. Were we to retain Metz as the place of collection (in direct contradiction of the Lorsch catalogue entry), the evidence of Fredegar would present a real problem, for unlike Trier it clearly continued to be a royal centre well into the seventh century.

What of the bishops of Trier, the other prolific correspondents in the *EA*? After Magneric they become exceedingly shadowy figures. His successor Gunderic is but a name to us, and his successor in turn, Sabaudus, is known solely through his attendance at the Council of Paris in 614.¹⁵⁴ It is only with Modoald, bishop by 627 and mentioned by Desiderius of Cahors and the *vita* of Germanus of Grandval, that we return briefly to the light.¹⁵⁵ Numerianus, who succeeded him, is known from just two charters; the bishop after him, Basinus, is again as chaff upon the wind. His successor (and nephew?) Liutwin is documented slightly more extensively in charters, but seems to have been father to Milo, the

noted *roué* who succeeded him. Milo would have been in bad historical odour anyway, and he takes us well into the eighth century, perhaps too recent in time to excite the interest of the compiler from Lorsch.¹⁵⁶ We may have no letters from the seventh-century bishops who succeeded Magneric because no literary output survived from them, nor is there any hint that they had such inclinations. The collection may stop where it does because Trier had fewer letters which were of interest to the Carolingians from after 600 than from before.

How and where, then, were the letters preserved? Our ability to investigate the literary history of the city is impeded by two other factors. First, in 882, the Vikings, peacefully seeking after economic exchange, sacked Trier, by all accounts quite severely. One local monk described how ‘the Northmen, laying waste Trier, together with the monastery of St Maximin, cremated Gaul’.¹⁵⁷ Regino of Prüm is comparably bleak: he relates how the Northmen, having heard of the demise of Louis the Younger, ‘exulted enormously with a dance routine’ and proceeded to occupy Trier, demolishing the whole territory of the city to the ground on every side before setting it on fire for good measure.¹⁵⁸ We are lucky that the collection was assembled before the Viking sack, for remarkably little otherwise survives from Trier, about Trier, prior to it – the year 882 represents a dramatic, if not total, caesura in the transmission history of sources for the city.¹⁵⁹ In particular, we have almost nothing from its two great monasteries of St Martin and St Maximin from before that date.¹⁶⁰ Revealingly, the *Vita Maximini*, of which the redoubtable Krusch said that ‘amongst the records of Trier this clearly ought to be considered the oldest’, dates to the mid-eighth century, leaving a yawning abyss of nearly two hundred years between the last of the *EA* and our next survival of literary activity in the city.¹⁶¹ When Trier did experience an efflorescence of hagiographical production in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, the focus was on the earliest Christian (and imperial) centuries. We thus have much inventive material about its Apostolic origins and Roman Antiquity, partly in competition for primacy with the other

great Ottonian bishoprics of Mainz and Cologne, but no bulky tomes on illustrious Merovingian bishops yielding a few more documents to read alongside our letters.¹⁶² This focus is strikingly embodied in an eleventh-century forgery from St Maximin: a diploma of Dagobert I has been created by *erasing* a Merovingian (or very early Carolingian) text and writing over it a confirmation dated to 634 which alleges that the monastery had been founded by the emperor Constantine.¹⁶³ By the time the author of the twelfth-century *Gesta Treverorum* turned to the age of Nicetius and Magneric, after a protracted and idiosyncratic account of the genesis and history of the city, the only sources which he could unearth were the profile of Nicetius by Gregory of Tours in his *Vita Patrum* and of Magneric by Eberwin in his *Vita Magnerici*.¹⁶⁴

Both of these factors – the Viking sack and a subsequent lack of interest in Merovingian Trier – make it hard to establish in which archive or archives at Trier the letters were preserved. There is no archival continuity with which to provide a context of preservation; we simply cannot perceive the seventh to ninth centuries with sufficient detail to permit anything but speculation. That EA 14 alone seems to have been known at the monastery of St Martin (albeit at a later date, post-Vikings) is a further indicator, taken together with the Lorsch catalogue entry, that more than one archive at Trier was originally involved in safeguarding the contents of the collection. Nicetius was buried in the basilica of St Maximin, and logically that church could have kept his letters.¹⁶⁵ As for the remaining correspondence, we are in the dark. Given the weight of material to and from bishops of Trier, and the involvement of bishops at court and in diplomacy, the episcopal archives must have played some role. Beyond that our only evidence to go on is the variety of senders and recipients of the letters themselves: royalty, ecclesiastics, and aristocrats – this should point us again towards a similar multiplicity of archives.

Objectives

Trier, certainly; Lorsch? Given their proximity, there can be no objection in principle to someone having travelled to Trier from Lorsch in quest of *matériel*; the two places are under two hours apart, allowing for traffic. Richbod, third abbot of Lorsch (784-804), was also bishop of Trier (*circa* 791/2-804), and palpably a man of literary bent.¹⁶⁶ His correspondent Alcuin teasingly accused him of loving his Virgil too much, and sometimes pestered him for books (the teasing and pestering tend not to overlap).¹⁶⁷ The Lorsch house chronicle warmly, if conventionally, esteems Richbod as ‘a man clearly loved by God and by men, simple and wise, and learned to the highest degree, as much in divine as in secular teachings’, and he played a crucial role in the growth of the monastery as a centre of Carolingian learning and book production.¹⁶⁸ Heinrich Fichtenau controversially identified Richbod as the author of the *Annales Laureshamenses* or *Annals of Lorsch*, and in this context read the ‘I’ of the Lorsch catalogue entry on the compilation of the *EA* as describing the abbot himself pursuing his historical interests at Trier.¹⁶⁹ While his dates are too early to allow him a direct role in the library catalogue (of about 830), with his broad scholarly inclinations Richbod can surely supply the silhouette of our compiler: he would have been just the sort of man to bring an acquisitive librarian in his train to Trier, keen to rootle about for interesting holdings in its archives.¹⁷⁰

We can see *what* that librarian was interested in, but *why* he was interested in what he was interested in is another matter. Helpfully, we move here from the dimly beheld literary remains of Trier before the Viking sack to the bright lights of Lorsch and its cultural flowering in the ninth century – ‘an antiquarian age’.¹⁷¹ The monastery had serious holdings of historical texts, both Classical and late antique, some of which are exceedingly lengthy; considerable sums of money were invested in their production.¹⁷² Histories account for a goodly part of its library, as amply inventoried in a slightly later catalogue of the mid-ninth

century, at the head of which they are listed *en masse* directly after the books of the Bible and related literature.¹⁷³ This was no passive interest in Antiquity for its own sake: Lorsch was engaged in writing and re-writing the history of the Merovingian period, drawing on and revising the works of Gregory of Tours and Fredegar to produce its own *historia ecclesiastica* pointedly relevant to the contemporary world.¹⁷⁴ The monastic library also held a great number of letter collections, and it is in the earliest of its series of catalogues that we find the *EA* nestled snugly amongst these: listed in a single column are the letters of Ennodius of Pavia, Seneca, Sidonius Apollinaris, Pliny, ‘Senator the deacon, afterwards a priest, to various, seventeen in number’, and ‘assorted letters to emperors, sent against heretics and their arguments, together with the Holy Fathers’.¹⁷⁵ We even encounter, at the end of the column, the *Vita Caroli Imperatoris* of Einhard, and this juxtaposition perhaps implies a readership which did not distinguish so sharply between history and epistolography. Considerations of genre in a Carolingian collecting context can also help to explain the notable absence of the pope from the *EA*, since this was the period when the *Registrum* of Gregory the Great was first distilled in Italy.¹⁷⁶ Contemporaries may have been coming to the view (as we hypothesized above) that papal correspondence constituted a distinct category meriting its own collection.

In this setting, of a monastery with a great enthusiasm for history books and a prodigious appetite for sets of letters (well known or obscure), the *EA* kept good company. Their assembly begins to make sense, as a work of broadly antiquarian concern, full of good things for monks whose appetites had been whetted by other histories and epistles. Many features of the *EA* now come into focus. The letters contain sensitively conserved original details – names, titles, places – because that was precisely what was of interest. Copyists have reproduced tortuous errors and forms which they found or misunderstood in exemplars not out of rank incompetence, but because, confronted by strange orthographies and unfamiliar

constructions, they were curious. This is not precluded by the fact that later readers, stumbling across words which they failed to recognize and syntax which they found unintelligible, endeavoured to correct both. Corrections and comments begin to be added to these challenging texts, so far as can be divined through palaeography, only in a subsequent era, perhaps the eleventh century, when the antiquarian spirit animating and guiding the collection had faded. Nonetheless, that the letters continued to be read by people whose outlook was broadly 'historical' is clear from a fourteenth-century annotation to *EA* 2, made at a point where Remigius is ladling out sound advice to Clovis from his richly Biblical and rhetorical soup kitchen: 'would that the *mentalité* of kings and priests were so today'.¹⁷⁷

We get eight letters which are effectively the same because, to an antiquarian compiler, although merely subtle variations on a theme, they were all of interest as historical curios. The letters are too long and full of extraneous details that would shame a model letter because they are not models at all, but nourishing mulch from the compost heap of history. We have a mixture of ecclesiastical and royal texts ('*patrum et regum*') because, at the remove of several hundred years, both were relics of great antiquity, letters of note to the inhabitants of a powerful monastery with close imperial ties. Perhaps the bulk of material on Italian affairs in the *EA* also reflects the addition of that realm, still quite recent in the early ninth century, to the Carolingian world? And in an empire squaring up to its eastern counterpart, would it not have been instructive to read of relations, genial as well as belligerent, between Byzantium and the Franks at their dawn? Looking back, ensconced in the Rhineland heart of a domain crisscrossed by educated laymen and bishops adorning the palaces of emperors, would it not have been fascinating to find forerunners staring out from the relicts of the later sixth century? The scribes and scholars of Lorsch, closely linked too with the bishopric of Metz, were defining their place in a new empire in which the relations of the Frankish Church to the authority of Rome had become a pressing question: hence the

focus of our collection on the archdiocese as a whole and matters both ecclesiastical and diplomatic.¹⁷⁸

The great days of nearby Trier, meanwhile, linked equally closely to the monastery, lay long in the past, but something of its life as a late Roman imperial capital and then a prominent Austrasian bishopric could be resurrected through the focus of our collection on the fifth and sixth centuries.¹⁷⁹ Speculation, but profitable. The Lorsch annalist, after all, whoever he might be, was actively pursuing the question of *sedes* in his work, and the only ‘German’ imperial seat was to be found at Trier: the architecture and epigraphy of this city continued (and continues) to bear silent but impressive witness to its imperial past, a past safe for use under the awesome name of Constantine, the first Christian emperor.¹⁸⁰ What we have, therefore, is a collection compiled by someone interested in the full gamut of antique features, from peculiar spellings to the (un)pleasantries of diplomacy and fiery polemic against Arians and heretics – someone with antiquarian inclinations. Yet these antiquities also spoke to contemporary concerns. Consider by way of comparison Hincmar (or Hilduin) at St Denis: he evidently spent some time gathering Merovingian materials to create the purposeful Carolingians fictions of the *Gesta Dagoberti*, arguing for imperial involvement in the reform of the abbey under the name of the greatest member of that dynasty after Clovis himself.¹⁸¹ In this vein, we should entertain the proposition that the *EA* were assembled by someone who thought the letters useful for (or even as) a history; certainly the corpus is a fine supplement to Gregory of Tours or Fredegar, and a comfortable fit in the historical project then being prosecuted at Lorsch.

The ideal testing ground for this proposal is the *capitulatio* heading the collection (see below, Table 2, for what follows). Untapped in respect of the motives underlying the compilation, it is our only guide to what was going through the mind of the compiler as he put the manuscript together.¹⁸² In the main text, the headers of the letters are original. Those

of later letters in particular contain information, such as names and titles, impossible to infer from the content and implausible to imagine anyone researching after the fact: a Carolingian scribe is unlikely to have devised, let alone discovered, the victory titles of Maurice with accuracy.¹⁸³ Consider the only partial success achieved in the mid- to late eighth century by the otherwise accomplished forgers of the *Donation of Constantine* when confecting a set of these titles, yielding the triumphant anachronism of ‘Imperator ... Hunnicus’.¹⁸⁴ Nor is a standard formula used in the headers of the *EA*. The pattern in the letters of Remigius is for the names of the recipients to be in the dative, but the adjectives applied to each one vary, and there is no clear rationale for a copyist to have invented them; subsequent letters exhibit an almost chaotic degree of variation, at times naming who dictated or carried them, at times not.¹⁸⁵ The contents list, in contrast, must have been conceived by the compiler or copyist, since the descriptions which it offers, most notably in matters of orthography and other details, do not match the headers in the main text of each letter. The *capitulatio* has only 43 entries, but not because only 43 letters had been copied out at the time when it was written: it omits *EA* 18, 30, 42, 46, and 48.¹⁸⁶ The most plausible reconstruction is that it was made, imperfectly, after the transcription of the first 47 letters, and then *EA* 48 was added as an appendix to the collection but never entered into the index.

The headers given for the letters in the *capitulatio* are drastically simplified from those in the text, and essentially follow the pattern ‘letter of X to Y’, often but not always providing an office or honorific to aid identification. This is wholly distinct from the manner in which formularies are indexed – by identifying the typology of each document rather than senders and recipients – and confirms that the specific content, not the generic form, was the principal interest of the compiler of this collection.¹⁸⁷ Running an eye down the page, a broad chronological arc emerges, from Clovis to Childebert II. This has the interesting effect of assimilating Clovis into the Austrasian sub-dynasty of the Merovingians, perhaps the reason

for the inclusion of the Remigius file in the first place – Merovingian history as viewed from the Rhineland. While the groupings are approximately, if inconsistently, consecutive in date, within each grouping such an organization can rarely be detected and cannot have been the governing principle of the compiler. Despite the creation of this index, therefore, the corpus appears to have been open ended, best described as an archival work in progress. In the occasional oddities of grouping, or not grouping, we discern something of the texture of the archives in Trier around 800: somewhat chronological, somewhat thematic, above all variable. That our compiler was working steadily through the files seems to find confirmation in the page and a half left blank after the last entry of the *capitulatio*, as if for further letters; that *EA* 48 alone was appended suggests that he had run through the archival resources of the city, or at least those which were relevant to him. The evidence of the table of contents thus returns us to an antiquarian endeavour, a treatment of the past as much as a partial reflection of the archives.

Implications

This rethinking of the *EA* affects how we should approach not only the corpus as a whole, but also the text of each constituent letter. We are not dealing with a collection which has passed through several intermediaries and so become corrupted; in multiple cases we may be only one remove from a Merovingian original. Not a collection into which errors have crept through carelessness, but one in which they have been deliberately conserved. A certain caution is called for in editing the letters, and can, if applied, reward.¹⁸⁸ This furthermore reinforces the value of the collection for historians of the sixth century: we are tantalizingly close to that period, and its inhabitants, to the realities of their letter-writing habits, and their archival predilections. In the past, the collection has whispered to scholars of a world in cultural decline, where lack of access to formal educational institutions compelled men to

make their own handbooks, in order to retain the dignity of a learned language and an abiding style amidst the ancient ruins. We can now see the *EA* as a small sample of the flood of artfully composed ephemera which must then have existed and seldom now survives. What we have is but literary flotsam washed ashore from one major late antique city.¹⁸⁹

In the light of recent research, an underappreciated facet of the Merovingian world can be seen more plainly: the writing of all manner of texts and the keeping of all manner of records. In part this is the result of looking closer – at an unusual epistolary exchange preserved with a formulary from Sens, or the often unexpectedly miscellaneous contents of ‘canonical’ manuscripts.¹⁹⁰ In some measure it is also the consequence of discovering new evidence – the 28 accounting documents from St Martin of Tours testify, with their columns of names and quantities, to the central role of the written word in the administration of landed property.¹⁹¹ But it is the product too of revisiting old problems anew, tracing the survival of the *gesta municipalia*, whether still in the form of tax registries and urban archives as in the Roman period, or in a different yet recognizable guise as public forums for the confirmation of documents held privately.¹⁹² We can now perceive that archiving was a ubiquitous feature of Merovingian society, that a kaleidoscope of people and institutions made records and kept and used them, that this is true even if one single original non-royal charter is the lone survivor from the age of our Austrasian letters.¹⁹³ A multiplicity of archives – of kings and bishops, of lords and monks, of townsmen and tenant farmers – explains and is explained by the diversity of materials making up the *EA*, and raises still another possibility. Some of the groupings which our interested monk found and formed with other scattered exemplars into the collection could themselves have been Merovingian compilations, just as well as they could be compilations of some later date: the ‘dockets’ detectable in the correspondence of Avitus of Vienne, assembled in the sixth century, provide a ready analogy.¹⁹⁴

A world of archives, and of people who collected their writings, prompts a further thought: a multitude of places to deposit documents, bundled on occasion into files of sometimes surprising variety, means that any substantial archive must have had an initially baffling array of contents. At a given stage it might have been clear why a given range of texts had been gathered together, as the personal records (say) of a secretary who had served several masters, and indeed why they had been gathered together in a given place, for in later life (say) he had entered the service of a bishop and after his death his papers had passed into the episcopal archives. But the happenstances of this slow enamelling of sources would over time have led to the most exciting, if confusing, archival pluralism. The process too could gain momentum with the years: if men knew that a given place had numerous records, and kept them, they would conceivably be more inclined to store their own files there for safe-keeping. One wonders if Trier was not only a place to go to find old things, but also place to go to leave old things. If the *EA* speak to a diversity *of* archives, they also suggest a diversity *in* archives; and if we are now more firmly convinced that the Merovingians kept records, the next step is to think more subtly about *how* they kept them.

And if they did so, where has all this material gone? Generation and preservation through the Merovingian period: a constant stream of documents coursed through a world which created quantities of them, and where many actors took pains to preserve them. But then we must suppose that selection has intruded at some stage – the Merovingian period, edited. The work of the cataloguer from Lorsch falls squarely in the Carolingian era and this must be our horizon for squinting back into a past unfocussed by intervening lenses; this was the moment when decisions about what to keep were made which have set the shape for us of all that went before.¹⁹⁵ When John the Deacon wrote his life of Gregory the Great in the late ninth century, he recorded how the ‘papyrus books of letters of the same Father’, fourteen in number, one for each year of his pontificate, still survived from almost three centuries

previously, but also that, under Hadrian I (772-95), ‘certain decretal letters, for each indiction, were selected and collected in two volumes, as can now be seen’, and it is this lesser corpus (with others like it) which has been preserved.¹⁹⁶ From fourteen books down to two: it is critical to understand how much there was and how little there is in order to appreciate the importance of that Carolingian winnowing, which likewise distilled a mass of Merovingian correspondence into 48 letters occupying a bare thirty folios.

But why select? Taio of Zaragoza describes in a letter to Eugenius of Toledo making a visit to Rome in the mid-seventh century in search of works by Gregory unavailable in Spain; happening upon the last two books of the *Morals on Job*, he transcribed them by hand and edited the text in its entirety.¹⁹⁷ The *Chronicle of 754*, however, tells an altogether different story. In Rome on assignment, Taio ran up against papal stonewalling, day after day: only with difficulty could these same two books be found in the archives, on account of the vast number of other volumes stored there, and ultimately it took a miraculous midnight manifestation of Peter, Paul, and Gregory himself (unaided by a diffidently superior Augustine) to locate the chest in which the work was held.¹⁹⁸ There is anxiety here: archives were places to lose things as well as to find them, under the pope just as under the Roman emperor before him; paradoxically, what was preserved might thereby be lost.¹⁹⁹ When Charlemagne ordered that letters from the same Apostolic See, and also *de imperio*, as far back as the reign of his grandfather Charles Martel, be transcribed on ‘parchments of remembering’ in 791, he did so because they were being lost to age and neglect, yet the *Codex Epistolaris Carolinus* of the late ninth century which transmits this collection contains only papal correspondence; the processes of preservation and selection were inextricably linked, or so it seems.²⁰⁰ Could an alarmed archivist at Trier have made an appeal to Lorsch, resulting in a complementary assemblage? Or might his motives have been more complicated? What stands in the way of imagining an enterprising fellow at one of the main

churches of Trier, possessed of a keen eye for the main chance and a sharp nose for what might interest representatives of wealthy monasteries set on building up their libraries? The Carolingians conserved as they condensed, made more manageable as they cut down to size, and in what remains there is a dialogue between them and the Merovingians which we must do our best to hear. Even as the past has been actively shaped in the course of its transmission to us, the texture of the archives has shaped the texture of that past.

In the late eighth and early ninth centuries, it was still possible to find much Merovingian material in Trier, just as the correspondence of Desiderius could still be dug up by his hagiographer in Cahors. Nor was this the end of the line: *EA* 14 was available in some form at Trier until the late tenth or early eleventh century, just as the original register of Gregory made it into the lifetime of John the Deacon, to die of extreme old age at some date thereafter. This impressive archival tenacity is worth pondering: consider coming to different and more positive conclusions about other late antique sources whose authenticity has been impugned, including letters and testaments bequeathed from this period by way of Carolingian hagiography.²⁰¹ Yet sober second thought. Archives were tenacious, but they had their vagaries too: when we read the *EA*, we have to be live to the crucial intermediate seventh and eighth centuries in Trier, and we need a fuller comprehension of the curiosity felt by ninth-century monks at Lorsch about the history of the Frankish world, its kings, bishops, and aristocrats. What has been gathered into the *EA* is not a handful of Merovingian things considered important and potentially useful by a contemporary courtier of Childebert (even if some of the *subsidiary* gatherings might respond to this description), but letters which endured the years howsoever, to strike a Carolingian monk as interesting, noteworthy, and so to live on collected.

The *Epistulae Austrasicae*: not models, not assembled at Metz, and not compiled in the 590s. Searched out from materials at Trier in the late eighth or early ninth century by a

librarian from Lorsch and copied into a codex for that monastery; he had found in the great imperial foundation on the Moselle much of historical, theological, and literary significance to him. Picture this anonymous ninth-century monk, puzzling over the strange twists of Latin as styled by Remigius of Reims and trying to work out exactly what momentous things he was writing about, just because it was ancient and therefore of interest. There is something pleasing in the continuity between him and the historian of today, staring with furrowed brow at ‘rumor ad nos magnum peruenit administrationem uos secundum bellice suscepisse’ and wondering where it might lead.

St John's College

All Souls College

Oxford

Table 1
Groups of Letters in the *Epistulae Austrasicae*

Group	EA	Sender	Recipient	Header	Footer
I Remigius of Reims	1	Bishop Remigius of Reims	King Clovis	{Address}	-
	2	Bishop Remigius of Reims	King Clovis	{Offset Address}	-
	3	Bishop Remigius of Reims	Bishops Heraclius, Leo, and Theodosius	{Address}	explicit
	4	Bishop Remigius of Reims	Bishop Falco of Tongres	{Address}	EXPLICIT
II Nicetius of Trier	5	Abbot Florianus	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	6	Abbot Florianus	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	7	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	Emperor Justinian	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	8	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	Queen Chlodosuinth	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	9	Bishop Germanus of Paris	Queen Brunhild	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	10	Bishop Aurelian of Arles	King Theudebert	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	11	Bishop Mapinius of Reims	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	{Address}	EXPLICIT
III	12	Dynamius	[Duke Chaming?]	EPISTULA	-
Aristocratic Culture	13	Gogo	Duke Chaming	{Address}	EXPLICIT

	14	Venantius Fortunatus	Bishop Magneric of Trier	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	15	Bishop Mapinius of Reims	Bishop Vilicus of Metz	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	16	Gogo	Bishop Traseric of Toul	EPISTULA	EXPLICIT
	17	Dynamius	Bishop Vilicus of Metz	{Address}	EXPLICIT
IV Diplomacy I	18	King Theudebald	Emperor Justinian	{Offset Address}	EXPLICIT
	19	King Theudebert	Emperor Justinian	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	20	King Theudebert	Emperor Justinian	{Address}	EXPLICIT
V History of Trier	21	Bishop Rufus of Martigny	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	22	Gogo	Bishop Peter of Metz	{Address}	EXPLICIT
	23	Bishop Auspicius of Toul	Count Arbogast of Trier	EPISTULA	EXPLICIT
	24	-	Bishop Nicetius of Trier	EPISTULA	EXPLICIT
VI Diplomacy II	25	King Childebert	Emperor Maurice	{Address}	FINIT
	26	Queen Brunhild	Emperor Maurice	{Address}	-
	27	Queen Brunhild	King Athanagild	{Address}	FINIT
	28	King Childebert	King Athanagild	{Offset Address}	FINIT
	29	Queen Brunhild	Empress Anastasia	{Address}	FINIT
	30	[Queen Brunhild]	[Empress Anastasia]	-	-
	31	King Childebert	Bishop John of Constantinople	{Address}	EXPLICIT

	32	King Childebert	Honoratus the Apocrisarius	INCIPIT	FINIT
	33	King Childebert	Bishop Domitian of Melitene	{Address}	FINIT
	34	King Childebert	Theodore the Magister	{Address}	FINIT
	35	[King Childebert]	John the Quaestor	SIMILI PROLOGO	-
	36	[King Childebert]	Megas the Curator	SIMILI PROLOGO	-
	37	King Childebert	Paul	{Offset Address}	FINIT
	38	King Childebert	Italica the Patrician	{Address}	-
VII	39	King Childebert	Venantius the Patrician	{Offset Address}	FINIT
Diplomacy III	40	[Exarch Romanus?]	[King Childebert]	INCIPIT	FINIT
	41	Exarch Romanus	King Childebert	{Address}	FINIT
	42	Emperor Maurice	King Childebert	IN NOMINE DOMINI	-
	43	Fortunatus [for King Childebert]	[Theodosius]	ITEM	FINIT
	44	[Queen Brunhild]	[Empress Anastasia]	INCIPIT	FINIT
	45	[King Childebert]	Patriarch [John] of Constantinople	{Address}	FINIT
	46	[King Childebert]	Patriarch Laurence of Milan	INCIPIT	FINIT
	47	[King Childebert]	[Emperor Maurice]	INCIPIT	FINIT FELITER
Appendix	48	Gogo [for King Childebert]	Duke Grasulf of Istria	INCIPIT	FINIT

- * The absence of a horizontal line between letters within a group indicates that the compiler seems to have found them already grouped together.
- ** The presence of a dotted horizontal line between letters within a group indicates that the compiler seems to have found them as individual exemplars.

Table 2
Headers of Letters in the *Epistulae Austrasicae*

<i>EA</i>	Date (CCSL)	Date (Malaspina)	<i>Capitulatio</i> Number	<i>Capitulatio</i> Header	Main Text Number	Main Text Header
1	<i>ante</i> 486?	<i>c.</i> 509?	I	Epistula domni remedii <i>episcopi</i> . ad domnum chlodoueam regem	I	DOMINO INLUSTRO MERITIS CHLODOUEO REGI REMEGIUS episcopus
2	486?	482/483	II	ITEM Epistula domni remedii <i>episcopi</i> . ad domnum chlodoueam regem	II	DOMINO INSIGNI ET MERITIS MAGNIFICO hlodoueo REGI REMEGIUS EPISCOPUS
3	512	512	III	Epistula domni remedii <i>episcopi</i> . ad heraclium . leonem . <i>et</i> theodosium . <i>episcopos</i>	III	DOMINIS UERE SANCTIS ET MERITIS BEATISSIMIS IN XPISTO fratribus heraclio . leoni <i>et</i> theodosio remegius episcopus .

4	c. 500?- 533	c. 511?-533	III	Epistula domni remedii episcopi ad falconem episcopum	III	DOMINO UERE SANCTO ET IN XP ISTO BEATISSIMO FRATRI FAL coni episcopo remegius episcopus .
5	551/552	543/552	V	Epistula floriani ex monasterio romeno . a ^d domnum nicecium episcopum	V	DOMINO SUO NICETIO PAPAE FLORIANUS EX MO nasterio romeno .
6	c. 550	c. 550	VI	Epistula floriani serui xpisti ad nicecium archiepiscopum	VI	DOMINO MERITIS BEATISSIMO ET APOSTOLICO PATRI nicetio . archiepiscopo florianus seruus xpisti .
7	ante 565	c. 550-553	VII	Epistula domni nicetii episcopi ad iustinianum imperatorem	VII	DOMINO SEMPER SUO IUSTINIANO IMPERATORE Nicetius cum suis humilis sed misericordia domini episcopus .
8	ante 568?	561/567	VIII	Epistula domni nicetii episcopi ad hodosuindam reginam	VIII	DOMINE CLEMENTISSIMAE . IN XP ISTO FILIAE . HLODOSINDAE reginae nicetius peccator .
9	575	575	VIII	Epistula germani episcopi ad domnam brunehildam reginam	VIII	DOMINE CLEMENTISSIMAE ATQUE PRAECELLENTISSIMAE et nobis semper piissimae domne et in xpisto sancte ecclesiae filiae brunehildae regine germanus peccator .

10	546-548	<i>c. 534 uel 546/547</i>	X	Epistula domni aureliani <i>episcopi ad domnum theodobertum regem</i>	X	DOMINO INCLITO ET UBIQUE GLORIOSISSI mo adque in <i>xpisto</i> piissimo domno <i>et</i> filio teudeberto regi aurelianus episcopus .
11	<i>c. 550</i>	<i>c. 550</i>	XI	Epistula domni mapini <i>episcopi ad domnum nicetium episcopum</i>	XI	DOMINO SANCTO ET IN <i>xpisto</i> BEATISSIMO FRATRI NICETIO papae mapinius <i>episcopus</i> .
12	<i>c. 580?</i>	<i>ante 580?</i>	XII	Epistula dinamii ad amicum	XII	EPISTULA DINAMII AD AMICUM
13	<i>ante 575?</i>	<i>c. 561?</i>	XIII	Epistula gogoni ad chamingum . ducem	XIII	DOMINO SUO CHAMINGO DUCI GOGO . ITA IN ARCANO PEC toris ...
14	<i>c. 568</i>	<i>c. 566/585</i>	XIIII	Epistula furtunati . ad domnum magnericum episcopum	XIII [<i>sic</i>]	DOMINO SANCTO MERITIS APOSTOLICIS PRAEDICANDO IN <i>xpisto</i> patri magnerico papae furtunatus humilis
15	<i>c. 540- 550</i>	<i>c. 542/549</i>	XV	Epistula domni mapini <i>episcopi . ad domnum uilicum episcopum</i>	XV	DOMINO SUO UILICO PAPAE MAPINIUS EPISCOPUS .
16	<i>c. 565- 581</i>	<i>ante 581</i>	XVI	Epistula gogonis ad trasericum [...]	XVI	EPISTULA GOGONIS AD TRASERICUM

17	542-568	561-568	XVII	Epistula dinamii ad domnum uilicum papam [...]	XVII	DOMINO SEMPER PECULIARE SUO UILICO PAPAE dinamius .
18	547	548-549	-	-	XVIII	DOMINO INLUSTRO . INCLITO TRIUMPHATO tori . ac semper augusto . iustiniano imperatore . theodobaldus rex .
19	534-547	536-538	XVIII	Epistula domni theodoberti regis ad iustinianum imperatorem	XVIII	DOMINO INLUSTRO ET PRAECELLENTISSIMO DOMNO <i>et</i> patri iustiniano imperatore . theodebertus rex .
20	534-547	540-545	XVIII	ITEM Epistula domni theodoberti regis ad iustinianum imperatorem	XX	DOMINO INLUSTRO ET PRAECELLENTISSIMO DOM . no <i>et</i> patri iustiniano imperatore theodebertus rex
21	c. 550	c. 550	XX	Epistula domni rufi <i>episcopi</i> ad domnum nicetium episcopum [...]	XXI	DOMINO SEMPER SUO ET APOSTOLICO DOMNO <i>et</i> papae nicetio rufus <i>episcopus</i> .
22	568?	post 568	XXI	Epistula gogonis ad petrum papam	XXII	DOMINO UERE SANCTO AC BEATISSIMO DOMNO ET PATRI PE tro papae . gogus .
23	c. 460	c. 472-474	XXII	Epistula auspici <i>episcopi</i> ecclesiae tullensis . ad	XXIII	EPISTULA AUSPICI EPISCOPI ECCLESIAE TULLENSIS AD ARBO GASTEM COMITEM TREUERORUM

				arbogastem comitem trefe- rorum		
24	561	561	XXIII	Epistula directa ad domnum nicetium episcopum [...]	XXIII	EPISTULA DIRECTA AD DOMNUM NICETIUM EPISCOPUM
25	584	587 ex.	XXIII	Epistula hildiberti regis ad mauricium imperatorem [...]	XXV	DOMINO GLORIOSO PIO PERPETUO INCLITO TRIUM phatore ac semper augusto patri mauricio imperatore childebertus rex .
26	-	587 ex.	XXV	Epistula brunihildis reginae ad mauricium imperatorem	XXVI	DOMINO GLORIOSO PIO . PERPETUO INCLITO . TRIUM phatore ac semper augusto mauricio . imperatore . brunichildis . regina .
27	584	587 ex.	XXVI	Epistula brunihildae reginae . ad athanagildo regi . nepoti	XXVII	DOMINO GLORIOSO ATQUE INEFFABILI DESEDERIO nominando dulcissimo nepoti athanagyldo regi . brunehildis regina .
28	584	587 ex.	XXVII	Epistula hildiberti regis athanagildo regi [...]	XXVIII	DOMINO GLORIOSISSIMO ET UBIQUE . PRAECELSO DUL cissimo nepoti athanagyldo regi hildebertus rex .
29	584	587 ex.	XXVIII	Epistula brunihildae ad anastasiam augustam [...]	XXVIII	DOMINAE GLORIOSAE ATQUE INCLITAE AUGUSTE ANA STAsie brunehildis regina .
30	584	587 ex.	-	-	XXX	-

31	584	587 ex.	XXVIII ^l	Epistula hildiberti regis ad iohannem <i>episcopum</i>	XXXI	DOMINO SANCTO ET APOSTOLICA SEDE COLENDO IN XP ^I STO PATRI iohanne <i>episcopo</i> hildebertus rex .
32	584	587 ex.	XXX	Epistula hildiberti regis ad honoratum appocrisarium	XXXII	INCIPI ^T AD HONORATUM APOCHRISARIUM
33	584	587 ex.	XXXI	Epistula hildiberti regis domitiano <i>episcopo</i>	XXXIII	DOMINO SANCTO SANCTISQUE UIRTUTIBUS PRAEFERENDO IN xp ^I sto patri domitiano <i>episcopo</i> hildebertus rex .
34	584	587 ex.	XXXII	Epistula hildiberti regis . theodoro magistro	XXXIII	CHILDEBERTUS REX FRANCORUM UIRO GLORIOSO THEO doro . magistro
35	584	587 ex.	XXXIII	Item ad iohannem questorem	XXXV	SIMILI PROLOGO AD IOHANNEM QUESTOREM HOC EST coNsiliarium .
36	584	587 ex.	XXXIII	Item ad megatam curatorem	XXXVI	SIMILI PROLOGO AD MEGANTEM CURATOREM .
37	584	587 ex.	XXXV	Item epistula hildiberti regis paulo patrem imperatoris	XXXVII	CHILDEBERTUS REX FRANCORUM UIRO GLORIOSO ATQ ^{UE} praecelso paulo hoc est patrem imperatorem
38	584	587 ex.	XXXVI	Epistula hildiberti regis . italicae patriciae	XXXVIII	CHILDEBERTUS REX FRANCORUM INLUSTRO ATQ ^{UE} magnificentissimae italicae patriciae .
39	584	587 ex.	XXXVII	Item epistula hildiberti regis uenantio patricio	XXXVIII	CHILDEBERTUS REX FRANCORUM UIRO GLORIOSO UBIQ ^{UE} celsis laudibus praeferendo . uenantio patricio .

40	585 uel 590	590	XXXVI ^{II}	Item epistula imperatoris ad hildibertum regem	XL	INCIPIT LITTERAS DE ROMANORUM IMPERATORE DIREC tas ad domnum regem .
41	585 uel 590	590 ex.	XXXVII ^I	Epistula romani . ad hildibertum regem	XLI	DOMINO EXCELLENTISSIMO ATQUE PRAECELLEN tissimo . Childebertu regi francorum . romanus
42	585 uel 590	585?	-	-	XLII	IN NOMINE DOMINI DEI NOSTRI IHESU XPISTI . IMPERATORE . CAESAR . flaius . mauricius . tiberius . fidelis in xpisto . mansuetus . maxi mus . beneficus . pacificus . alamannicus . gothicus . anticus . alanicus . uuandalicus . erullicus . gypedicus . africus . pius . felix . incleti . uictor . ac triumphator . semper augustus . childebertho uiro glorioso . regi francorum
43	585	585 ex.	XL	Item dicta furtuna ad folium imperatoris	XLIII	ITEM DICTA FURTUNA AD FILIO IMPERATORIS DE DOM ne nomine per babone <i>et</i> gripone
44	585	585 ex.	XLI	Item epistula ad augustam de nomine hildiberti	XLIII	INCIPIT DE NOMINE DOMNAE AD IMPERATRICEM
45	585	585 ex.	XLII	Ad patriarcham constantinopolitanum	XLV	AD PATRIARCAM CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM DE DOMNI NOMEN
46	585	587 ex. uel 589	-	-	XLVI	INCIPIT AD PATRIARCAM LAURENTIO DE DOMNI NOMEN

47	584 <i>uel</i> 585	585 <i>ex.</i>	XLIII	Item ad imperatorem epistula	XLVII	INCIPIT AD IMPERATORE DE DOMNO NOMINE
48	<i>ante</i> 581?	<i>ante</i> 581	-	-	XLVIII	INCIPIT DICTA GOGONE AD GRASULFO DE NOMEN REGIS

Endnotes

* We should like to express our gratitude here to Thomas Charles-Edwards, David Ganz, Ian Maclean, John Nightingale, Helmut Reimitz, Bryan Ward-Perkins, Chris Wickham, Ian Wood, one of the anonymous reviewers at *Early Medieval Europe*; and, once seen, to Hope Williard.

** We use the following abbreviations:

AASS *Acta Sanctorum*

BAV Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

BnF Bibliothèque nationale de France

ChLA *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*

CLA *Codices Latini Antiquiores*

DLH *Decem Libri Historiarum*

EA *Epistulae Austrasicae*

GSNF *Germania Sacra. Neue Folge*

NA *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*

PCBE *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire*

PLRE *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*

*** All quotations of the *EA* are from our own diplomatic transcription of the manuscript.

¹ *The Letters of Lytton Strachey*, ed. P. Levy (London, 2005), p. 329.

² E. Dekkers and E. Gaar, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (3rd ed., Turnhout, 1995), nos. 1055-67, 1070. For the name, see W. Gundlach, 'Die Sammlung der Epistolae Austrasicae', *NA*, 13 (1888), pp. 357-8; scholars since have disagreed on how to convert the noun 'Austrasia' into an adjective, and a faction has arisen which prefers to refer to the collection as *Epistulae Austrasiacae*. *EA* 23 is certainly fifth century, and *EA* 1-2 may be (but on *EA* 2, see G. Barrett and G. Woudhuysen, 'Remigius and the "Important News" of Clovis Rewritten' (forthcoming)); the rest are all sixth century.

-
- ³ EA 1-4.
- ⁴ EA 18-20.
- ⁵ EA 25-48; these have recently been the object of a series of studies by A. Gillett, ‘Diplomatic Documents from the Barbarian Kingdoms’ and ‘Diplomacy between the Barbarian Kingdoms and Constantinople’, in J.-J. Aillagon (ed.), *Rome and the Barbarians: the Birth of a New World* (Milan, 2008), pp. 400-405, ‘Love and Grief in Post-Imperial Diplomacy: the Letters of Brunhild’, in B. Sidwell and D. Dzino (eds.), *Studies in Emotions and Power in the Late Roman World: Papers in Honour of Ron Newbold* (Pascataway, NJ, 2010), pp. 127-65, ‘Ethnography and Imperium in the Sixth Century: Frankish and Byzantine Rhetoric in the *Epistolae Austrasicae*’, in G. Nathan and L. Garland (eds.), *Basileia: Essays on Imperium and Culture in Honour of E.M. and M.J. Jeffreys* (Brisbane, 2011), pp. 67-81, and ‘Advise the Emperor Beneficially: Lateral Communication in Diplomatic Embassies between the Post-Imperial West and Byzantium’, in A. Becker and N. Drocourt (eds.), *Ambassadeurs et ambassades au cœur des relations diplomatiques. Rome – Occident médiéval – Byzance (VIII^e s. avant J.-C. – XII^e s. après J.-C.)* (Metz, 2012), pp. 257-85, at pp. 271-5, 284.
- ⁶ *i.a.* EA 15-17.
- ⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 1-30; for the labels, see fol. 1r (the second label reproduces a title added in the twelfth or thirteen century above EA 1 on fol. 3r). There is now a digital facsimile available online at http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_869.
- ⁸ B. Bischoff, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften* (2nd ed., Lorsch, 1989), p. 51, ‘fremd und etwas schwerfällig’, with pp. 75, 77, 80 (n. 16), 126-7; and now B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)* (3 vols., Wiesbaden, 1998-2014), iii, no. 6566; cf. S. Krämer, *Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters*,

-
2. Köln-Zyfflich. *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, Ergänzungsband I* (Munich, 1989), pp. 498-501. The manuscript was first described in detail by H. Stevenson and G.B. de Rossi, *Codices Palatini Latini Bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1886), no. 869, pp. 308-10.
- ⁹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 30v; with M. Kautz, ‘Vatikan, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 869, Bll. 1-30 (Fasz. I)’, at http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/digi-pdf-katalogisate/sammlung51/werk/pdf/bav_pal_lat_869.pdf. See in general W. Berschin, *Die Palatina in der Vaticana. Eine deutsche Bibliothek in Rom* (Stuttgart, 1992).
- ¹⁰ BAV, Pal. lat. 1949, fol. 19r, nos. 245 (C. 102) and 558 (C. 81); there is now a digital facsimile available online at http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/bav_pal_lat_1949.
- ¹¹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 31r-61v (Seneca), and fols. 62r-69v (Lucan); I. Schunke, *Die Einbände der Palatina in der Vatikanischen Bibliothek* (3 vols., Vatican City, 1962), i, pp. 333-6, iii, p. 853; E. Pellegrin *et al.*, *Les manuscrits classiques latins de la Bibliothèque Vaticane*, i, *Fonds Archivio San Pietro à Ottoboni* (Paris, 1975), pp. 480-81, ii, 2, *Fonds Palatin, Rossi, Ste-Marie Majeure et Urbinate* (Paris, 1982), pp. 51-2; B. Munk Olsen, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, ii, *Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copiés du IX^e au XII^e siècle. Livius – Vitruvius. Florilèges – Essais de plume* (Paris, 1985), pp. 67-8, 457. For Seneca (MS C), see BnF, lat. 3358, fols. 121-36 (there is now a digital facsimile available online at <http://gallicalabs.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52501345q>); with L.D. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters* (Oxford, 1965), pp. 110, 120, 150; J. Fohlen *et al.*, ‘Notes sur quelques manuscrits de textes classiques latins conservés à la Bibliothèque Vaticane’, *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, 1 (1971), pp. 208-9; J. Fohlen, ‘Manuscrits démembrés des *Epistulae ad Lucilium* de Sénèque’, *Revue d'Histoire des Textes*, 3 (1973), pp. 245-8; L.E. Boyle, ‘“Epistulae Venerunt Parum Dulces”: the Place of Codicology in the Editing of Medieval Latin Texts’, in R. Landon (ed.), *Editing and Editors: a Retrospect* (New York, 1988), pp. 41-6; M. Spallone, ‘Storia del libro, storia del testo: una interazione possibile’, in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Les problèmes posés par l'édition critique des textes*

anciens et médiévaux (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1992), pp. 85-93; J. Fohlen, ‘Variations sur Sénèque, “ad Lucilium, Ep.” 96 §3’, in J. Elfassi, C. Lanéry, and A.-M. Turcan-Verkerk (eds.), *Amicorum societas. Mélanges offerts à François Dolbeau pour son 65^e anniversaire* (Florence, 2013), pp. 209-18. For Lucan (MS H or J), see BAV, Ottob. lat. 1210, fols. 1-8, 9-124; with D. de Bruyne, ‘Manuscrits wisigothiques’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 36 (1924), no. 18, p. 7; B. Katterbach, ‘Ein westgotischer Kodex der Vatikanischen Bibliothek’, in *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der mittleren und neueren Geschichte und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften. Eine Festgabe zum siebzigsten Geburtstag Geh. Rat Prof. Dr. Heinrich Finke. Vorreformationsgeschichtliche Forschungen. Supplementband* (Münster, 1925), pp. 62-6; E.M. Thompson *et al.* (eds.), *The New Palaeographical Society. Facsimiles of Ancient Manuscripts, etc. Second Series*, ii (London, 1913-30), pl. 144a-b; W.J. Anderson *et al.*, ‘Nouvelle liste de *membra disiecta*’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 43 (1931), pp. 104-5; H. Foerster, *Mittelalterliche Buch- und Urkundenschriften auf 50 Tafeln mit Erläuterungen und vollständiger Transkription* (Bern, 1946), pp. 44-6, pl. 22a-b; A.M. Mundó, ‘El *Commicus palimpsest* París lat. 2260 amb notes sobre litúrgis i manuscrits visigòtics a Septimània i Catalunya’, in *Liturgica*, 1. *Cardinali I.A. Schuster in memoriam. Scripta et Documenta*, 7 (Montserrat, 1956), p. 177; E. Strubbe, *Grondbegrippen van de paleografie der Middeleeuwen* (3rd ed., 2 vols., Gent, 1961), ii, no. 15, p. 3, pl. vii; J.R. Weaver, *Vaticanus Ottobianus Latinus 1210 and Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 869 ff. 62-69 of the Bellum Civile of Marcus Annaeus Lucanus* (Ph.D. Thesis, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 1970), pp. 3-48, 195-208; H.C. Gotoff, *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), pp. 23-4; R. Badali, ‘I codici romani di Lucano (II)’, *Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione della edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini*, 22 (1974), nos. 21 (pp. 5-7) and 30 (p. 22); M. Sánchez Mariana, ‘Notas sobre la biblioteca monástica de San Salvador de Oña’, *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 82/3 (1979), no. 67, p. 492; A. Millares Carlo, *Corpus de códices visigóticos*, ed. M.C. Díaz y Díaz *et al.* (2 vols., Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 1999), no. 277, i, p. 174; L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: a Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (4th ed., Oxford, 2013), p. 265.

¹² For the *capsa* of Seneca, see BAV, Pal. lat. 1949, fol. 48r, no. 238 (C. 102), with BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 31r; and on Lucan, see Weaver, pp. 38-43; F. Fossier, ‘Premières recherches sur les manuscrits

latins du cardinal Marcello Cervini (1501-1555)', *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Moyen-Age, Temps Modernes*, 91/1 (1979), pp. 383-6 (with n. 20), no. 298, p. 432; F. Russo, 'La biblioteca del Card. Sirleto', in L. Calabretta and G. Sinatora (eds.), *Il Card. Guglielmo Sirleto (1514-1585). Atti del Convegno di Studio nel IV Centenario della morte* (Catanzaro-Squillace, 1989), p. 283. No *capsa* number survives on BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 1r to identify the *EA* amongst the possibilities, suggesting that this may not originally have been the first folio of the manuscript, or even that it may have been appended rather than prefixed to Seneca at the time of their joint 'relocation' from Heidelberg.

- ¹³ Gregory of Tours quotes the incipit of *EA* 1 (or a version of it – the text is not identical) in *DLH* (ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Libri Historiarum X. MGH SRM I.1* (2nd ed., Hannover, 1951)), II.31, pp. 77-8; Eberwin, abbot of St Martin of Trier (active in the early eleventh century), quotes *EA* 14 in his *Vita Sancti Magnerici* (ed. AASS, July VI (Antwerp, 1729)), §§8 (partially) and 50-51 (fully), cols. 184D and 191A-B. On research at the library of Lorsch in the first half of the sixteenth century, however, see P. Lehmann, *Iohannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften. Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 4/1* (Munich, 1911), pp. 133-58 (listing the *EA* manuscript at p. 139). For the *editio princeps*, see M. Freher, *Corpus Francicae Historiae Veteris et Sincerae* (Hannover, 1613), pp. 182-212; and on his life and work, W. Kühlmann, V. Hartmann, and S. El Kholi (eds.), *Die deutschen Humanisten. Dokumente zur Überlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur in der frühen Neuzeit, Abteilung I: Die Kurpfalz, Band I/1: Marquard Freher* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 1-7, with no. 27, pp. 486-7.
- ¹⁴ Freher, pp. 182-3, for the table of contents, and pp. 184-5, for the letter of Cassiodorus, which has an ambiguous marginal annotation; the only hint of a section break is the capitalization of 'Desiderii' in its first appearance, on p. 183, but the *Epistolae Francicae* have only one 'Finis', on p. 224, at the end of both sets of letters.

-
- ¹⁵ The correspondence of Desiderius of Cahors survives in a single manuscript, St Gall 190; there is now a digital facsimile available online at <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0190>. For the manuscript transmission of the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, see T. Mommsen (ed.), *Cassiodori Senatoris Variae*. MGH AA XII (Berlin, 1894), pp. lxxviii-cx; and Å.J. Fridh, 'Variarum Libri XII', in Å.J. Fridh and J.W. Halporn (eds.), *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris Opera, Pars I. Variarum Libri XII. De Anima*. CCSL 96 (Turnhout, 1973), pp. xxxvii-xliii.
- ¹⁶ H. Canisius, *Antiquae Lectionis* (6 vols., Ingolstadt, 1601-4), v, pp. 526-50; repr. in M. de La Bigne, *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, et Antiquorum Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum* (27 vols., Lyon, 1677), viii, pp. 579-87; and rev. J. Basnage, *Thesaurus Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum et Historicorum* (7 vols., Antwerp, 1725), i, pp. 631-42; cf. W. Arndt, 'Desiderii Episcopi Cadurcensis Epistulae', rev. F. Rommel, in H.M. Rochais (ed.), *Defensoris Locogiacensis Monachi Liber Scintillarum*. CCSL 117 (Turnhout, 1957), p. 310; and D.L. Norberg (ed.), *Epistulae S. Desiderii Cadurcensis* (Stockholm, 1961), p. 6. By 1636, however, the jig seems to have been up: A. du Chesne, *Historiae Francorum Scriptores Coetanei* (5 vols., Paris, 1636-49), reprints the edition of Freher at i, pp. 847-88, but he has inserted an emphatic section break after the last of the *EA* and a marginal reference to the edition of Canisius alongside the first letter of Desiderius (see p. 875).
- ¹⁷ See I. Maclean, *Scholarship, Commerce, Religion: the Learned Book in the Age of Confessions* (Cambridge, MA, 2012), ch. 2, esp. pp. 25-30; and J. Sullivan, 'Marsiglio of Padua and William of Ockam II', *American Historical Review*, 2/4 (1897), p. 609.
- ¹⁸ Canisius, v, pp. 459-523; de La Bigne, viii, pp. 559-79; Basnage, i, pp. 369-407. This is all the more noteworthy given that the letters of Ruricius, just as the *EA* and those of Desiderius, depict an early Church with minimal papal presence, precisely what Protestant scholars such as Freher sought.
- ¹⁹ On the textual history (and much more), see Barrett and Woudhuysen, 'Remigius'.

-
- ²⁰ See BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 2r and (less certainly) 19r; *cf.* annotations by distinct hands on fols. 3v, 4v, 6v, 8r, 10r, 11v, 13r, and 17r, and fols. 23r-v. The reprint which Mai cites is du Chesne, i, pp. 847-75.
- ²¹ C.R. Fickert, *L. Annaei Senecae Opera, I. L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistularum Moralium Libri XX* (Leipzig, 1842), p. xxiv; *cf.* O. Roszbach, *De Senecae Philosophi Librorum Recensione et Emendatione. Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, 2/3 (Breslau, 1888), pp. 80-81; C. Hosius, *M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili Libri Decem* (1st ed., Leipzig, 1892), pp. xvi, xxiv.
- ²² Catalogued and collated: G.H. Pertz, ‘Dr. Ludwig Bethmann’s Nachrichten über die von ihm für die *Monumenta Germaniae historica* benutzten Sammlungen von Handschriften und Urkunden Italiens, aus dem Jahre 1854’, *Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichten des Mittelalters*, 12 (1874), p. 344; P. Ewald, ‘Reise nach Italien im Winter von 1876 auf 1877’, *NA*, 3 (1878), p. 154; *cf.* W. Wattenbach, ‘Die Abtheilung “Briefe” der Monumenta Germaniae’, *NA*, 12 (1886), p. 251. Studied and edited: Gundlach, ‘Sammlung’, pp. 367-87; W. Gundlach, ‘Epistolae Austrasicae’, in E. Dümmler (ed.), *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi I. MGH Epistolae III* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 110-53.
- ²³ W. Gundlach, ‘Epistolae Austrasicae’, rev. F. Rommel, in Rochais (ed.), pp. 404-70; *cf.* ‘Addenda et Emendanda’, in Dümmler (ed.), *Epistolae Merowingici*, pp. 719-20; D. Norberg, ‘Ad epistulas uarias Merouingici aevi adnotationes’, *Eranos*, 35 (1937), pp. 105-15.
- ²⁴ E. Malaspina, *Il Liber epistolarum della cancelleria austrasica (sec. V-VI)* (Rome, 2001); *cf.* the tireless J. Gil, ‘Notas de lectura’, *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, 8 (1975), §4, pp. 136-42, and ‘Notas e interpretaciones’, *Habis*, 9 (1978), §I, pp. 117-23.
- ²⁵ See esp. I.N. Wood, ‘Administration, Law and Culture in Merovingian Gaul’, in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The Uses of Literacy in Early Mediaeval Europe* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 67-71; and B.

Dumézil, ‘Culture et politique II. Gogo et ses amis: écriture, échanges et ambitions dans un réseau aristocratique de la fin du VI^e siècle’, *Revue Historique*, 309/3 (2007), pp. 553-93; B. Dumézil and T. Lienhard, ‘Les *Lettres austrasiennes*: dire, cacher, transmettre les informations diplomatiques au haut Moyen Âge’, in *Les relations diplomatiques au Moyen Âge. Formes et enjeux* (Paris, 2011), pp. 69-80.

- ²⁶ See Barrett and Woudhuysen, ‘Remigius’.
- ²⁷ Gundlach, ‘Sammlung’, pp. 371, 378; on Gogo, see A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, J. Morris, *PLRE* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1971-92), III.A, ‘Gogo’, pp. 541-2; *PCBE IV. La Gaule Chrétienne (314-614)*, ed. L. Pietri and M. Heijmans (2 vols., Paris, 2013), ‘Gogo’, i, pp. 899-901.
- ²⁸ Malaspina, p. 7, ‘comunemente accettata’; Dumézil, ‘Gogo’, p. 554, n. 6, ‘sans doute constituée en Austrasie à la fin due VI^e siècle’, and p. 591, ‘un *ars dictamini*[s] répondant aux différents besoins de l’échange’, ‘vivant en Austrasie et ayant une activité diplomatique’; cf. Dumézil and Lienhard, pp. 77-80; see also H.H. Anton, *Trier im frühen Mittelalter* (Paderborn, 1987), p. 89, n. 1.
- ²⁹ P. Goubert, *Byzance avant l’Islam* (2 vols., Paris, 1951-65), ii/1, *Byzance et les Francs*, pp. 170-71, for a convenient summary of his conclusions, dating the embassy reflected in *EA* 25-39 to late 587 or early 588, the embassy in *EA* 43-45 and 47 to 585-6, and the embassy in *EA* 46 to 589; in the table on p. 171, the date of the first embassy should be 585 (not 385), and the letters associated with the third embassy should read *EA* 25-39 (not 24-39); this work incorporates P. Goubert, ‘Chronologie des lettres austrasiennes’, in *Mélanges d’histoire du Moyen Âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), pp. 291-5. See also esp. G. Reverdy, ‘Les relations de Childebart II et de Byzance’, *Revue Historique*, 114/1 (1913), pp. 61-85 (with corrections and emendations to the text at pp. 85-6); T. Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders* (2nd ed., 8 vols., Oxford, 1892-1916), v, *The Lombard Invasion*, pp. 263, 277-8, with n. e; and L.M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter* (4 vols., Gotha, 1897-1915), ii, *Langobarden und Franken*, pp. 69-71, 83-4.

-
- ³⁰ For the entry, see now A. Häse, *Mittelalterliche Bücherverzeichnisse aus Kloster Lorsch: Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar* (Wiesbaden, 2002), p. 98, ll. 21-2; this supersedes the edition of G. Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1885), p. 115.
- ³¹ Dumézil, 'Gogo', p. 591; Malaspina, pp. 31 and 34, envisages (here, at least) an archetype from Trier; cf. B. Dumézil, *La reine Brunehaut* (Paris, 2008), app. 1, p. 481; Dumézil and Lienhard, pp. 77-8; on Magneric of Trier, see *PCBE* IV, 'Magnericus', ii, pp. 1223-4.
- ³² I.N. Wood, 'Letters and Letter Collections from Antiquity to the Middle Ages: the Prose Works of Avitus of Vienne', in M.A. Meyer (ed.), *The Culture of Christendom: Essays in Medieval History in Commemoration of Denis T. Bethell* (London, 1993), p. 42.
- ³³ Malaspina, pp. 7-8; 'un nuovo interesse per i modelli espressivi', 'personaggi di stirpe germanica e di cultura meno brillante'; on Asclepiodotus, see *PLRE*, III.A, 'Asclepiodotus 3', p. 134.
- ³⁴ Gundlach, 'Sammlung', p. 378.
- ³⁵ Gundlach, 'Sammlung', p. 371.
- ³⁶ See Goubert, ii/1, pp. 187-202, for discussion of these letters (esp. pp. 201-2 for the date); Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, X.3, p. 486, 'placitum ... ponens'; Authari died on 5 September 590 (according to Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* (ed. L. Bethmann and G. Waitz, *Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum Saec. VI-IX. MGH Scriptores Rerum Langobardicarum I* (Hannover, 1878)), III.35, p. 113).
- ³⁷ See in general E. Ewig, *Die Merowinger und das Imperium* (Opladen, 1983), esp. pp. 12-48.
- ³⁸ See R.A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 209, for a tabulation of papal correspondents by region.

-
- ³⁹ For *sedes*, see Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, IV.22, p. 155; Fredegar (ed. B. Krusch, ‘Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii Scholastici libri IV’, in *MGH SRM II* (Hannover, 1888)), III.29, p. 103; A. Dierkens and P. Périn, ‘Les *sedes regiae* mérovingiennes entre Seine et Rhin’, in G. Ripoll and J.M. Gurt (eds.), *Sedes regiae (ann. 400-800). Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, 25 (Barcelona, 2000), pp. 267-304.
- ⁴⁰ A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (eds.), *ChLA XIII* (Olten-Dietikon, 1981), no. 550, pp. 6-7 (T. Kölzer (ed.), *Diplomata Regum Francorum e Stirpe Merovingica. MGH Diplomata Merovingica* (2 vols., Hannover, 2001), no. 22, i, pp. 62-4).
- ⁴¹ By far the best overview remains D. Ganz and W. Goffart, ‘Charters Earlier than 800 from French Collections’, *Speculum*, 65/4 (1990), pp. 907-23; with the salutary note of caution sounded by A.C. Murray, ‘Review Article: the New MGH Edition of the Charters of the Merovingian Kings’, *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 15 (2005), pp. 250-61; on the seventh century and the limits of our knowledge, typically acute is D. Ganz, ‘Bureaucratic Shorthand and Merovingian Learning’, in P. Wormald, D. Bullough, and R. Collins (eds.), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J.M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), esp. pp. 61-7. For *deperdita* from the sixth century, see Kölzer (ed.), *dep.* 1-101, ii, pp. 497-542.
- ⁴² Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, X.19, pp. 510-13, which includes amongst the evidence shorthand copies of the correspondence of Egidius retained by his secretary; cf. S. Esders, ‘“Avenger of All Perjury” in Constantinople, Ravenna and Metz: St Polyeuctus, Sigibert I and the Division of Charibert’s Kingdom in 568’, in A. Fischer and I.N. Wood (eds.), *Western Perspectives on the Mediterranean: Cultural Transfer in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, 400-800 AD* (London, 2014), p. 31, making careful mention of ‘royal archives at the Austrasian court at Metz’ whence the *EA* ‘may well have been compiled’; and G. Halsall, *Settlement and Social Organization: the Merovingian Region of Metz* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 12. Seldom acknowledged in this context is the fact that the only extant

Merovingian diploma issued at Metz dates to 724 and has been emphatically deemed *unecht*: Kölzer (ed.), no. 186, i, pp. 462-5.

- ⁴³ See now B. Dumézil, ‘La chancellerie mérovingienne au VI^e siècle’, in *Le corti nell’Alto Medioevo. Settimane LXII* (2 vols., Spoleto, 2015), i, pp. 473-99, 501-2, which reviews and revises the literature to date.
- ⁴⁴ Gundlach, ‘Sammlung’, pp. 369-70.
- ⁴⁵ Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, IV.22, p. 155; cf. EA 48, a diplomatic letter the incipit of which says that it was dictated by Gogo.
- ⁴⁶ Malaspina, p. 15, ‘più guerriero che politico’.
- ⁴⁷ *i.a.* Wood, ‘Letters and Letter Collections’, p. 42, on Avitus of Vienne; R.W. Mathisen, ‘The *Codex Sangallensis* 190 and the Transmission of the Classical Tradition during Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages’, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 5/2 (1998), p. 188, on the manuscript containing the letters of Ruricius of Limoges and Desiderius of Cahors (although Mathisen, at p. 188, n. 100, misleadingly calls BAV, Pal. lat. 869 ‘the famous “Codex Nazarianus”’, which is the label conventionally applied to BAV, Pal. lat. 1547, archetype (MS N) of the medieval tradition of Seneca, *De Beneficiis* and *De Clementia*: see B. Bischoff, *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, transl. M.M. Gorman (Cambridge, 1994), p. 129; there is now a digital facsimile available online at http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_1547); M.R. Salzman and M. Roberts (transl.), *The Letters of Symmachus: Book I* (Atlanta, GA, 2011), p. lviii, on Symmachus, and other fourth-century Greek and Latin collections; but cf. R. Gibson, ‘On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections’, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 102 (2012), pp. 56-78. See in general G. Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections. Typologie des sources du Moyen Âge, fasc. 17* (Turnhout, 1976), pp. 56-62; G. Halsall, ‘The Sources and their Interpretation’, in P. Fouracre (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History, I. c. 500-c. 700* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 73-4 (citing the EA as an

example); B. Neil and P. Allen (eds.), *Collecting Early Christian Letters from the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2015), esp. chs. 1-2; and A. Gillett, ‘Communication in Late Antiquity: Use and Reuse’, in S.F. Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012), p. 835, ‘The most common interpretations of the function of the publication and copying of personal letter-collections are social and literary, that they served as monuments to the social status of their authors and as literary models for later imitation’.

⁴⁸ Wood, ‘Letters and Letter Collections’, p. 42.

⁴⁹ See A. Rio, *Legal Practice and the Written Word in the Early Middle Ages: Frankish Formulae, c. 500-1000* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 20-40.

⁵⁰ Formulary of Marculf (ed. K. Zeumer, *Formulae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi. MGH Leges* (Hannover, 1886)), I.1, p. 39, ‘Domino sancto et in Christo venerabile fratri illo abate vel cunctae congregatione monasterii illi, in honore beatorum illorum ab ill. in pago illo constructo, ille episcopus’; cf. A. Rio (transl.), *The Formularies of Angers and Marculf. Two Merovingian Legal Handbooks* (Liverpool, 2008), p. 129.

⁵¹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 27r, ‘IMPERATORE. CAESAR . | flavius . mauricius . Tiberius . fidelis in xpē . mansuetus . maximus . beneficus . pacificus . alamannicus . gothicus . anticus . | analicus . uuandalicus . erullicus . gypedicus . africanus . pius . felix . | incle^{ts} . victor . ac triumphator . semper augustus . childebertho | uiro glorioso . regi francorum’.

⁵² Formulary of Angers (ed. Zeumer), 1a, p. 4, ‘Andicavis civetate curia puplica resedere in foro, ibiquae vir magnificus illi prosecutor dixit: “Rogo te, vir laudabilis illi defensor, illi curator, illi magister militum, vel reliquam curia puplica...”’; cf. Rio (transl.), *Formularies*, p. 48.

⁵³ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 18v-19r, ‘saluto flitomerem . qui sub praeteritū | sacerdotem actionem ecclesiae laudabiliter gubernavit . | saluto mactaricum archidiacon . dignitate conspicuum . | iniantem

in reparationem ecclesiae in utilitatib: uigilantē . | saluto auolum notarii eruditione fulgentem . saluto
 sin | dericum . psalmorum carmina in positionis ordine dilucu | lo concinnetem . saluto theodosium .
 uniuersorum au|ribus serenis cantibus linientem . saluto theodemundū . || amicis congruum .
 praesidium ciuium . fidei fundamentum . ?.

- ⁵⁴ Marculf, I.10, p. 48, ‘Apices vestrae celsitudinis per magnificus et inlustris viros illos summa cum
 auiditate nos accepisse conperite’; cf. Rio (transl.), *Formularies*, p. 142.
- ⁵⁵ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 3r, ‘salutans gloriam uestram | & commendo familiarem meum pr̄bm
 maccolum quem direxi’.
- ⁵⁶ Marculf, I.1, p. 41, ‘Actum ibi sub die illo, anno illo’; cf. Rio (transl.), *Formularies*, p. 131.
- ⁵⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 27v, ‘data kl septembris | constantinopoli . imperatore diui mauricii . tiberii .
 per|petus augustinus [*sic*] . & post consolatum eiusdem annis .’. *Caveat lector*: as should be patent,
 any translation of the foregoing must perforce be provisional.
- ⁵⁸ See A.J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (Atlanta, GA, 1988), pp. 30-41, 66-81.
- ⁵⁹ *Formulae Augienses. Collectio C. Formulae Epistolares Augienses* (ed. Zeumer), pp. 364-77; cf. Rio,
Legal Practice, pp. 148-50.
- ⁶⁰ *Formulae Augienses C*, 1, p. 364, ‘Indiculum ad abbatum’.
- ⁶¹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 19r, ‘EPISTULA AUSPICI EP̄I ECCLESIAE TULLENSIS AD
 ARBO|GASTEM COMITEM TREUERORUM’.
- ⁶² cf. Mathisen, ‘*Codex Sangallensis 190*’, pp. 189-94, on the letters of Ruricius of Limoges as
 inspiration.

-
- ⁶³ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 10r ‘DOMINE CLEMENTISSIMAE ATQUE PRAECELLENTISSIMAE | & nobis semper piissimae domne & in x̄rō scē ecclesiae filiae | brunehildae regine germanus peccator’.
- ⁶⁴ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 1v-2r.
- ⁶⁵ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 27r (*EA* 42), ‘Childeberth’, fol. 24v (*EA* 39), ‘Childebertus’; cf. H. Reimitz, ‘Transformations of Late Antiquity: the Writing and Re-Writing of Church History at the Monastery of Lorsch, c. 800’, in C. Gantner, R. McKitterick, and S. Meeder (eds.), *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 263-5.
- ⁶⁶ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 23v, ‘SIMILI PROLOGO AD IOHANNEM QUESTOREM HOC EST | consiliarium’; ‘SIMILI PROLOGO AD MEGANTEM CURATOREM’.
- ⁶⁷ cf. the gloss on *EA* 37 (BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 24r), ‘CHILDEBERTUS REX FRANCORUM VIRO GLORIOSO ATQ: | praelcelso paulo hoc est patrem imperatorem’.
- ⁶⁸ See e.g. *Formulae Visigothicae* (ed. J. Gil, *Miscellanea Wisigothica* (2nd ed., Seville, 1991)), 7, 11, 35, pp. 78-9, 86, 103-4.
- ⁶⁹ cf. H.A. Pohlsander, ‘A Call to Repentance: Bishop Nicetius of Trier to the Emperor Justinian’, *Byzantion*, 70/2 (2000), pp. 456-71.
- ⁷⁰ See esp. *EA* 12.
- ⁷¹ *EA* 14 and 23.
- ⁷² *Formulae Visigothicae*, 20, pp. 90-95.

⁷³ In this respect *EA* 16 is worth considering: if the purpose of the collection were to provide stylistic models, the omission of the promised versicles from this literary epistle would be puzzling; presumably they had been lost from the exemplar, and perhaps the poetic *EA* 17 was added next by way of supplement.

⁷⁴ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 27r (*EA* 42), ‘nihil operis usq: adhuc amicitiae congruum eminentia tua | ostendens visa est . dum in scriptis polli^{ci}ta . atque per sacerdo|tis firmata . & terribilibus iuramentis roborata . tanto tē|pore excesso . nullum effectum perceperunt ; & si hoc ita est . | quid per tantes^a spatia terrae . atq: maris . inaniter sine | responsa necessarioꝝ vestros ligatarios fatigatis iuuenal|lis sermonis . qui nihil utilitatis induxerunt iactante^s’.

⁷⁵ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 3r, 3v, 16v, 24v.

⁷⁶ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 22v.

⁷⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 30r.

⁷⁸ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 7r.

⁷⁹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 10r, ‘propter ea | & contribulato corde sed ex intima animi dilectione audemus | suggere’.

⁸⁰ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 9v; the abbreviations show that the writing of ‘regum’ is not simple dittography.

⁸¹ *cf.* Barrett and Woudhuysen, ‘Remigius’.

⁸² See D. Ganz, ‘The Preconditions for Caroline Minuscule’, *Viator*, 18 (1987), esp. pp. 28-9, 35-8.

-
- ⁸³ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 26v, ll. 11-12. According to Bischoff, *Lorsch*, p. 51, the two secondary scribes are responsible respectively for fols. 9v-11v and fols. 16r-v; according to Malaspina, pp. 28-9, the first of these wrote fols. 9v-10r and 11v-12r, the second fols. 16r-v. Our own inspection of the manuscript suggests that the following portions of it were written by secondary hands: fols. 9v (from l. 18), 10r (entirely), 11v-12r (entirely), 16r (from l. 13), 16v (entirely), 17r (to l. 7), and 26v (ll. 11-12 only). While we are loath to dissent from the Bischoff line, we confess to finding it exceedingly difficult to make his absolute distinction between two secondary hands; *cf.* the interesting comments of D. Ganz, 'The Study of Caroline Minuscule 1953-2004', *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 50 (2004), pp. 387-9.
- ⁸⁴ See Häse, A.105, p. 98, for the text of the catalogue, and p. 57, for its date; we have transcribed the entry in question directly from BAV, Pal. lat. 1877 (there is now a digital facsimile available online at http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_1877), fol. 78r, with '[...]' signalling an erasure (most likely of *in*, since there is space for no more than two letters). C.E. Finch, 'Catalogues and Other Manuscripts from Lorsch', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 99 (1968), pp. 165-79, remains useful for untangling confusions about the catalogue to that date.
- ⁸⁵ Bischoff, *Lorsch*, pp. 51, 75; Häse, p. 298; Malaspina, p. 31. Interestingly, Angelo Mai, who had both read the manuscript of the *EA* and edited the library catalogues from Lorsch, failed to make the connection (see A. Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum* (10 vols., Rome, 1839-44), v, pp. 190, 196); the same is true of A. Wilmanns, 'Der Katalog der Lorscher Klosterbibliothek aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 23 (1868), pp. 389 and 396. The first scholars to have done so seem to be F. Falk, *Beiträge zur Rekonstruktion der alten Bibliotheca fuldensis und Bibliotheca laureshamensis* (Leipzig, 1902), p. 71; and M. Manitius, 'Geschichtliches aus mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen. Nachtrag', *NA*, 36 (1911), p. 759 (*cf.* M. Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig, 1935), p. 242).

-
- ⁸⁶ Malaspina, pp. 31-2.
- ⁸⁷ In two later catalogues, the manuscript is simply described as ‘Epistulae diversorum numero XLIII’; see Häse, Ca.370, D.255, pp. 163, 174. The only other potentially personal note in this catalogue is A.56-57, p. 97, ‘Eiusdem Gregorii papae omeliae XX de evangelio in uno codice et in alio XX ad opus nostrum’.
- ⁸⁸ Dumézil, ‘Gogo’, p. 591; Häse, p. 298, ‘sie sich wohl auf die direkte, heute verlorene Vorlage der Lorscher Kopie bezieht’; cf. Dumézil and Lienhard, pp. 69, 77-8; Bischoff, *Lorsch*, p. 75.
- ⁸⁹ Malaspina, pp. 31, 34, for a Treviran exemplar, and pp. 31-2 for the possibility that the letters, rather than an exemplar, come from Trier.
- ⁹⁰ Malaspina, pp. 5-7.
- ⁹¹ e.g. Dumézil and Lienhard, p. 69.
- ⁹² See BAV, Pal. lat. 1877, fol. 78r.
- ⁹³ Häse, A.61-64, 123-124, pp. 97, 101 (BAV, Pal. lat. 1877, fols. 77rb, 79va).
- ⁹⁴ cf. I.N. Wood, ‘Why Collect Letters?’, in G.M. Müller (ed.), *Zwischen Alltagskommunikation und literarischer Identitätsbildung. Kulturgeschichtliche Aspekte lateinischer Epistolographie in der Spätantike* (Stuttgart, forthcoming).
- ⁹⁵ BnF, lat. 3836 (there is now a digital facsimile available online at <http://gallicalabs.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10510443v>); D. Ganz and M. Goulet, ‘Le Légendier de Turin et l’écriture *ab*’, in M. Goulet and S. Isetta (eds.), *Le Légendier de Turin: Ms. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire* (Florence, 2014), pp. 81-91; T.A.M. Bishop, ‘The Scribes of

the Corbie a-b', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds.), *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814-840)* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 531-6; cf. E.A. Lowe (ed.), *CLA* (12 vols., Oxford, 1934-71), v, no. 554, where the manuscript is assigned to Corbie or its environs; L.W. Jones, 'The Scriptorium at Corbie: II. The Script and the Problems', *Speculum*, 22/3 (1947), pp. 378, 382, 384. On Corbie in general, see D. Ganz, 'The Merovingian Library of Corbie', in H.B. Clarke and M. Brennan (eds.), *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 153-72; and D. Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmaringen, 1990).

⁹⁶ L. Kéry (ed.), *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400-1140): a Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts* (Washington, DC, 1999), pp. 29-31.

⁹⁷ BnF, lat. 3836, fol. 89r; see E.A. Bond and E.M. Thompson (eds.), *The Palaeographical Society. Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions*, i (London, 1873-83), pl. VIII, for an excellent reproduction of this folio, and pl. IX, for the *verso*; and M. Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen âge, I. Les manuscrits* (Louvain, 1931), pp. 271-2, on the text.

⁹⁸ See J.N.D. Kelly, *The Athanasian Creed* (London, 1964), esp. chs. 1-2, 7, with pp. 129-30; C.H. Turner, 'A Critical Text of the *Quicumque vult*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 11 (1910), p. 403.

⁹⁹ For the attribution to Nicetius of Trier, see A.E. Burn, *The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries* (Cambridge, 1896), pp. xxxv-xxxviii; and for this description of the 'Trier fragment', see Kelly, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ H.V. Sauerland, *Trierer Geschichtsquellen des IX. Jahrhunderts* (Trier, 1889), pp. 41-5, prints *Vita Magnerici*, §§52-60, the portion most relevant to the later history of the abbey; for the date, see K. Krönert, 'Saint Martin, l'abbatiola de Trèves', *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest*, 119/3 (2012), p. 77, useful on the history of the abbey in general; and on the other literary output of Eberwin, see M.C. Ferrari, 'From Pilgrim's Guide to Living Relic: Symeon of Trier and his

Biographer Eberwin’, in M.W. Herren, C.J. McDonough, and R.G. Arthur (eds.), *Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century* (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 324-44.

- ¹⁰¹ F. Leo, *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati Presbyteri Italici Opera Poetica. MGH AA IV.1* (Berlin, 1881), app. XXXIV, pp. 291-2, citing Eberwin as the source; it is absent from the otherwise fine survey of Venantian epistolary poems by G. Knight, ‘The Parameters of Epistolarity: Mapping the Verse-Epistle in Venantius Fortunatus’, *Res Publica Litterarum*, 9 (2006), pp. 21-45.
- ¹⁰² *Vita Magnerici*, §52, col. 191B; Krönert, ‘Saint Martin’, pp. 75-6, is unduly cautious on this point, although he reaches the same conclusion.
- ¹⁰³ *Vita Magnerici*, §52, col. 191B, ‘Templa antiqua Dei in priscum renovavit honorem / Ex quibus illam esse praecipuam constat, in qua’.
- ¹⁰⁴ See Sauerland, pp. 53-4.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Vita Magnerici*, §§4-5, cols. 184A-C, with nn. d-e; also Krönert, ‘Saint Martin’, p. 77, for Eberwin and his sources. On Nicetius of Trier, cf. Anton, esp. pp. 131-3; K. Uhalde, ‘Proof and Reproof: the Judicial Component of Episcopal Confrontation’, *EME*, 8/1 (1999), pp. 1-11; *PCBE* IV, ‘Nicetius 6’, ii, pp. 1373-7.
- ¹⁰⁶ *Vita Magnerici*, §§55-56, cols. 191C-D.
- ¹⁰⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 22v.
- ¹⁰⁸ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 4v, 5v.
- ¹⁰⁹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 6r, 6v, 8r, 10r.

-
- ¹¹⁰ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 11v, 13r, 14r.
- ¹¹¹ cf. P. Radiciotti, 'Note su Floriano abate di Romeno e la cultura intellettuale in Italia alla metà del VI secolo', *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 126/2 (1998), pp. 183-8; *PCBE II. L'Italie Chrétienne (313-604)*, ed. C. Pietri, L. Pietri, and J. Desmulliez (2 vols., Paris, 1999), 'Florianus 2', i, pp. 845-6.
- ¹¹² BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 14r; cf. B. Dumézil, 'Le patrice Dynamius et son réseau: culture aristocratique et transformation des pouvoirs autour de Lérins dans la seconde moitié du VI^e siècle', in Y. Codou and M. Lauwers (eds.), *Lérins, une île sainte de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge* (Turnhout, 2009), pp. 174-5; D. Norberg, 'Dynamie Patrice de Marseilles', *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 1 (1991), pp. 46-51.
- ¹¹³ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 14v.
- ¹¹⁴ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 15r, 15v, 16r, 16v.
- ¹¹⁵ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 15v.
- ¹¹⁶ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 16v.
- ¹¹⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 17r, 17v, 19r, 19v.
- ¹¹⁸ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 19r, 20v, 21r.
- ¹¹⁹ L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule* (2nd ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1907-15), iii, ch. 2.
- ¹²⁰ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 19r; H.D. Williard, 'Letter-Writing and Literary Culture in Merovingian Gaul', *European Review of History*, 21/5 (2014), p. 697; Esders, p. 31.

-
- ¹²¹ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 21r, 21v, 22r, 22v.
- ¹²² BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fols. 22v, 24v, 29r, 29v.
- ¹²³ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 30v.
- ¹²⁴ cf. W.M. Lindsay, 'Collectanea Varia', in W.M. Lindsay (ed.), *Palaeographia Latina*, ii (London, 1923), §1, 'Explicit and Finit', pp. 5-10; W.M. Lindsay, 'Collectanea Varia', in W.M. Lindsay (ed.), *Palaeographia Latina*, iv (London, 1925), §1, 'Explicit and Finit', pp. 83-4.
- ¹²⁵ EA 5-8, 11, 21, 24; on the city, see in general E. Ewig, *Trier im Merowingerreich. Civitas, Stadt, Bistum* (Trier, 1954), esp. pp. 88-111.
- ¹²⁶ Gregory of Tours, *Vita Patrum* (ed. B. Krusch, *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Miracula et Opera Minora. MGH SRM I.2* (Hannover, 1885)), XVII, pp. 277-83.
- ¹²⁷ Gregory of Tours, *Vita Patrum, Praefatio*, p. 277, 'Sed sunt, quod peius est, qui perverso sensu, ut scripta non credunt, ita testificata reprehendunt, visa vero tamquam conficta fastidiunt'; cf. E. James (transl.), *Gregory of Tours: Life of the Fathers* (2nd ed., Liverpool, 1991), p. 104.
- ¹²⁸ Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, II.8-9, pp. 50-58, for the historians, IX.20, pp. 434-9, for the treaty; there is a convenient list of documents cited in Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, transl. L. Thorpe (London, 1974), pp. 27-30; cf. G. Monod, *Études critiques sur les sources de l'histoire mérovingienne* (Paris, 1872), pp. 73-89.
- ¹²⁹ Malaspina, p. 154, n. 514, opts for a date of 472-4; *PLRE*, II, 'Arbogastes', pp. 128-9, suggests 477; it hardly matters for the present argument.

-
- ¹³⁰ Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae* (ed. A. Loyen, *Sidoine Apollinaire* (3 vols., Paris, 1960-70)), IV.17 (ii, pp. 149-50), for Arbogast, VII.10 (iii, pp. 63-4), for Auspicius; and see Häse, A.103, Ca.364, D.249, pp. 98, 163, 174.
- ¹³¹ Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, transl. Thorpe, has inferred at IX.10, pp. 491-3, that Guntram and Childebert held a conference in Trier, but the meeting clearly took place within the kingdom ruled by Guntram, centred in Burgundy.
- ¹³² For Theudebert, see Gregory of Tours, *Vita Patrum*, XVII.2, p. 279; for the baptism, see Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, VIII.37, p. 405.
- ¹³³ For the treaty of Andelot, see Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, IX.10, pp. 424-6.
- ¹³⁴ Here we should note that Gregory of Tours in fact mentions Metz no more often than he does Trier, while neither he nor Venantius Fortunatus explicitly places ‘the capital’ of Sigibert (if he had one) at Metz; the earliest source to identify Metz as a royal *sedes* is Fredegar, III.29, p. 103, but in this passage he is re-writing Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, III.1, pp. 97-8, interpolating (anachronistically?) the names of various royal *sedes*, including Metz for Theuderic I; cf. H. Reimitz, ‘Cultural Brokers of a Common Past: History, Identity, and Ethnicity in Merovingian Historiography’, in W. Pohl and G. Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout, 2013), p. 280, n. 105; Dierkens and Périn, pp. 289-92; J.E. Woodruff, *The Historia Epitomata (Third Book) of the Chronicle of Fredegar: an Annotated Translation and Historical Analysis of Interpolated Material* (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1988), p. 43.
- ¹³⁵ cf. B. Dumézil, ‘L’ambassadeur barbare au VI^e siècle d’après les échanges épistolaires’, in Becker and Drocourt (eds.), pp. 239-55.
- ¹³⁶ Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* (ed. M. Reydellet, *Venance Fortunat. Poèmes* (3 vols., Paris, 1994-2004)), III.11-12 (i, pp. 106-9), to Nicetius, VII.4 (ii, pp. 88-90), to Gogo; EA 14, to Magneric.

-
- ¹³⁷ Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, II.38, p. 89, where the word used is ‘cathedra’; see Malaspina, n. 38, on *EA* 3, n. 58, on *EA* 4.
- ¹³⁸ Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, II.31, pp. 77-8, ‘Est ... nunc liber vitae eius’; cf. M.-C. Isaïa, *Remi de Reims. Mémoire d’un saint, histoire d’une Église* (Paris, 2010), pp. 207-8.
- ¹³⁹ *Vita Desiderii* (ed. B. Krusch, *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici II. MGH SRM IV* (Hannover, 1902)), §9-11, 13-14, pp. 569-70, 571-3.
- ¹⁴⁰ e.g. the letter collection of Ferreolus of Uzès, mentioned by Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, VI.7, p. 276.
- ¹⁴¹ See Hincmar of Reims, *Vita Remigii* (ed. B. Krusch, *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici et Antiquiorum Aliquot I. MGH SRM III* (Hannover, 1896)), *Praefatio*, p. 250, ‘librum maxime quantitatis manu antiquaria scriptum de ortu ac vita et virtutibus atque obitu beati Remigii sanctissimi patroni nostri’; Duchesne, *Fastes*, iii, p. 86, for the episcopacy of Tilipinus.
- ¹⁴² J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, ‘History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar’, in R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern* (Oxford, 1981), p. 62; cf. B. Krusch (ed.), *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati Presbyteri Italici Opera Pedestria. MGH AA IV.2* (Berlin, 1885), pp. xxii-xxiii; G. Kurth, *Études franques* (2 vols., Paris, 1919), ii, pp. 232-5; G. Kurth, *Clovis*, (3rd ed., 2 vols., Brussels, 1923), ii, pp. 287-9; F. Baix, ‘Les sources liturgiques de la *Vita Remigii* de Hincmar’, in *Miscellanea historica in honorem Alberti de Meyer* (2 vols., Louvain-Brussels, 1946), i, pp. 219-22; Dekkers and Gaar, no. 1052⁰ (p. 341); Isaïa, pp. 208-10, 217-21.
- ¹⁴³ Hincmar of Reims, *Vita Remigii, Praefatio*, pp. 251-2.
- ¹⁴⁴ Hincmar of Reims, *Vita Remigii, Praefatio*, p. 253.

-
- ¹⁴⁵ Flodoard of Reims, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* (ed. M. Stratmann, *Flodoard von Reims: Die Geschichte der Reimser Kirche. MGH Scriptores in Folio XXXVI* (Hannover, 1998)), III.21, pp. 274-5; M. Sot, *Un historien et son Église au X^e siècle: Flodoard de Reims* (Paris, 1993), reg. IV, no. 40, p. 552; H. Schrörs, *Hincmar, Erzbischof von Reims. Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1884), no. 351, p. 544; D. Shanzer and I. Wood (transl.), *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose* (Liverpool, 2002), p. 373; but on the divergent historical aims of Hincmar and Flodoard, see now E. Roberts, 'Flodoard, the Will of St Remigius and the See of Reims in the Tenth Century', *EME*, 22/2 (2014), pp. 201-30.
- ¹⁴⁶ Flodoard of Reims, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, III.28, p. 357; Sot, reg. IX, no. 19, p. 617; Schrörs, no. 396, p. 547.
- ¹⁴⁷ Hincmar of Reims, *Vita Remigii, Praefatio*, p. 251.
- ¹⁴⁸ Fredegar (ed.-transl. J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar* (Oxford, 1960)), IV.16, p. 11.
- ¹⁴⁹ Fredegar, IV.38, pp. 30-2.
- ¹⁵⁰ Fredegar, IV.39-40, pp. 31-3.
- ¹⁵¹ Fredegar, IV.47, p. 39, IV.60, p. 50.
- ¹⁵² Fredegar, IV.74-75, pp. 62-3.
- ¹⁵³ Fredegar, IV.52, p. 43.
- ¹⁵⁴ See Duchesne, *Fastes*, iii, p. 38; on Sabaudus, see also *PCBE*, IV, 'Sabaudus 2', ii, p. 1670.

-
- ¹⁵⁵ Duchesne, *Fastes*, iii, pp. 38-9.
- ¹⁵⁶ Duchesne, *Fastes*, iii, p. 39; E. Ewig, 'Milo et eiusmodi similes', repr. in E. Ewig, *Spätantikes und Fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften (1952-1973)*, ed. H. Atsma (2 vols., Munich, 1976-79), ii, pp. 189-219.
- ¹⁵⁷ *Annales S. Maximini Trevirensis* (ed. G.H. Pertz, *Annales, Chronica et Historiae Aevi Carolini et Saxonici. MGH Scriptores IV* (Hannover, 1841)), s.a. 882, p. 6, 'Northmanni Treverim cum monasterio sancti Maximini vastantes, Galliam cremaverunt'.
- ¹⁵⁸ Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon* (ed. F. Kurze, *Reginonis Abbatis Prumiensis Chronicon cum Continuatione Treverensi. MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum Separatim Editi L* (Hannover, 1890)), s.a. 882, p. 119, 'nimio exultant tripudio'; cf. S. MacLean (transl.), *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg* (Manchester, 2009), p. 186.
- ¹⁵⁹ Note the difficulty encountered by E.A. Lowe in securely ascribing manuscripts of the seventh and eighth centuries to early medieval Trier: *CLA*, viii, no. 1071 (late eighth century), ix, nos. 1363 (seventh century, palimpsest), 1366 (eighth-ninth century), 1367 (719), 1368 (eighth century, second quarter), x, no. 1557 (eighth century), supplement, no. 1332 (early eighth century); and the predominantly, if by no means exclusively, later ninth-century date of the manuscripts at Trier in Bischoff, *Katalog*, iii, nos. 6152-239; cf. also the summary of sources in N. Gauthier, *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle, I. Province ecclésiastique de Trèves* (Belgica Prima) (Paris, 1986), pp. 17-8; F. Prévot, M. Gaillard, and N. Gauthier (eds.), *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle, XVI. Quarante ans d'enquête (1972-2012), 2. Christianisation et espace urbain. Atlas, tableaux, index* (Paris, 2014), pp. 676-7. The relevant volumes of *Germania Sacra* (i.e. those covering the city of Trier specifically rather than the archdiocese more broadly) are revealing in this regard: the age of Nicetius excepted,

they pick up from the tenth or eleventh century (F.-J. Heyen, *Das Erzbistum Trier 1: Das Stift St. Paulin vor Trier. GSNF 6* (Berlin, 1972); P. Becker, *Das Erzbistum Trier 8: Die Benediktinerabtei St. Eucherius – St. Matthias vor Trier. GSNF 34* (Berlin, 1996); F.-J. Heyen, *Das Erzbistum Trier 9: Das Stift St. Simeon in Trier. GSNF 41* (Berlin, 2002)).

¹⁶⁰ See Krönert, ‘Saint Martin’, p. 75, for the earliest documents (tenth century) from St Martin; and I. Knoblich, *Die Bibliothek des Klosters St Maximin bei Trier bis zum 12. Jahrhundert* (Trier, 1996), pp. 16, 80, 115, for the devastating effect of the ‘Normanneneinfall’ on St Maximin; with the sagacious animadversions of J. Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reform: Lotharingia, c. 850-1000* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 169-71, on the cultural achievements of St Martin before 882 and the richness of the documentation thereafter.

¹⁶¹ *Vita Maximini* (ed. AASS, May VII (Antwerp, 1688)), cols. 21B-24F; Krusch (ed.), *Passiones I*, p. 71.

¹⁶² See K. Krönert, ‘Le rôle de l’hagiographie dans la mise en place d’une identité locale aux X^e-XI^e siècles: l’exemple de Trèves’, in *Construction de l’espace au Moyen Âge: pratiques et representations* (Paris, 2007), pp. 379-89, esp. 381-3, and ‘Production hagiographique et enjeux politiques à Trèves (X^e-XI^e siècle)’, in E. Bozoky (ed.), *Hagiographie, idéologie et politique au Moyen Âge en Occident* (Turnhout, 2012), pp. 185-98; E. Ewig, ‘Kaiserliche und apostolische Tradition im mittelalterlichen Trier’, repr. in Atsma (ed.), ii, pp. 51-90.

¹⁶³ Kölzer (ed.), no. 47, i, pp. 121-4.

¹⁶⁴ *Gesta Treverorum* (ed. G. Waitz, *MGH Scriptores VIII* (Hannover, 1848)), XXIV, pp. 159-60, and, for the date, p. 118.

¹⁶⁵ Gregory of Tours, *Vita Patrum*, XVII.6, p. 283.

-
- ¹⁶⁶ See F. Knöpp, 'Richbod (Erz-)Bischof von Trier 791(?)–804', in F. Knöpp (ed.), *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift z. Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764* (2 vols., Darmstadt, 1973), i, pp. 247–51.
- ¹⁶⁷ Alcuin, *Epistulae* (ed. E. Dümmler, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi II. MGH Epistolae IV* (Berlin, 1895)), 13, 49, 78, 191, pp. 38–9, 93, 119–20, 318; he asks for books in the second and fourth of these letters.
- ¹⁶⁸ *Chronicon Laureshamense* (ed. K. Pertz, in G. Pertz (ed.), *Historici Germaniae Saec. XII. I. MGH Scriptores XXI* (Hannover, 1868)), s.a. 785, p. 352, 'vir plane dilectus Deo et hominibus, simplex et sapiens, atque tam in divinis quam in saecularibus disciplinis adprime eruditus'; J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 338–9; D. Ganz, 'Book Production in the Carolingian Empire and the Spread of Caroline Minuscule', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History, II. c. 700–c. 900* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 804; R. McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 197.
- ¹⁶⁹ H. Fichtenau, 'Abt Richbod und die Annales Laureshamenses', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 61 (1953), p. 297, with pp. 321, 323.
- ¹⁷⁰ cf. the critical comment on Fichtenau by Bischoff, *Lorsch*, p. 80, n. 16; and on the vexed question of the authorship of the *Annales Laureshamenses*, see now M. Innes, 'Charlemagne, Justice and Written Law', in A. Rio (ed.), *Law, Custom, and Justice in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (London, 2011), esp. pp. 158–60, 182–5.
- ¹⁷¹ J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Archbishop Hincmar and the Authorship of Lex Salica', *Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis*, 21 (1953), p. 25 (repr. in J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings* (London, 1962), pp. 95–120); cf. e.g. R. Melzak, 'Antiquarianism in the Time of Louis the Pious and its Influence on the Art of Metz', in Godman and Collins (eds.), pp. 629–40.
- ¹⁷² See McKitterick, *History and Memory*, p. 203.

-
- ¹⁷³ See Häse, Ca.93-110, p. 137 (*cf.* D.17-29, p. 169); on the dates of the catalogues, see pp. 71 (Ca, around 860) and 77, n. 150 (D, perhaps a little older than Ca); *cf.* Bischoff, *Lorsch*, pp. 61-71.
- ¹⁷⁴ Reimitz, ‘Transformations’, esp. pp. 268-74.
- ¹⁷⁵ Häse, A.100-112, pp. 98-9, ‘Senatoris diaconi postea presbyteri ad diversos, numero XVII’, ‘Epistolae diversae imperatoribus, missae contra hereticos et eorum definitiones cum sanctis patribus’ (BAV, Pal. lat. 1877, fol. 78r).
- ¹⁷⁶ Markus, pp. 14-5.
- ¹⁷⁷ BAV, Pal. lat. 869, fol. 3v, ‘utinam sic hodie esset mens regibus et sacerdotibus’.
- ¹⁷⁸ Reimitz, ‘Transformations’, pp. 278-82.
- ¹⁷⁹ E. Ewig, ‘Observations sur la grandeur et la décadence de Trèves la romaine’, repr. in Atsma (ed.), ii, pp. 21-32; E. Ewig, ‘Von der Kaiserstadt zur Bischofsstadt. Beobachtungen zur Geschichte von Trier im 5. Jahrhundert’, repr. in Atsma (ed.), ii, pp. 33-50.
- ¹⁸⁰ Fichtenau, p. 321, ‘Neben Ravenna und Mailand, Paris, Arles und Lyon gab es nur einen einzigen “deutschen” Sitz römischer Kaiser: Trier, die Stadt des großen Konstantin und seiner Mutter Helena’, with p. 323; *cf.* Gauthier, pp. 18-32; F. Prévot, M. Gaillard, and N. Gauthier (eds.), *Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIII^e siècle, XVI. Quarante ans d’enquête (1972-2012), 1. Images nouvelles des villes de la Gaule* (Paris, 2014), pp. 289-99. Indeed Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, I.43, p. 28, records Maximus ‘in urbe Treverica sedem instituens’; on Constantinian and Tetrarchic buildings at Trier (the distinction is unlikely to have been clear in the Carolingian age), see E.M. Wightman, *Roman Trier and the Treveri* (London, 1970), pp. 98-113.
- ¹⁸¹ See classically Wallace-Hadrill, ‘Archbishop Hincmar’, pp. 3-7.

-
- ¹⁸² On the comparatively rare term *capitulatio*, note that the chapter headings for Gregory of Tours, *DLH*, III, pp. 94-6, conclude with ‘explicit capitulatio’ rather than ‘expliciunt capitula’ in some of the manuscripts.
- ¹⁸³ *EA* 42; cf. *EA* 35, to Megas the Curator (see *PLRE*, IIIB, ‘Megas 2’, pp. 870-71), otherwise attested only by silver-stamps.
- ¹⁸⁴ For a text and translation, see L. Valla, *On the Donation of Constantine*, transl. G.W. Bowersock (Cambridge, MA, 2007), app. 1, esp. §1, pp. 162-3; this is not, however, one of the linguistic grounds upon which Lorenzo Valla himself criticizes the forgery.
- ¹⁸⁵ e.g. *EA* 43 and 48.
- ¹⁸⁶ The omissions are a challenge to explain and may simply be an oversight in the case of *EA* 18, which is clearly identified in the main text. *EA* 30 lacks a proper header, and both the ‘FINIT’ of *EA* 29 and the ‘XXX’ of *EA* 30 have been erased, so its absence from the *capitulatio* may reflect a change of mind on the part of the compiler or one of the scribes as to whether it constituted a distinct letter. The header of *EA* 42 is totally out of control; its exclusion may represent a species of scribal *Weltschmerz* more than anything else. *EA* 46 comes in a series of letters with very similar headings in the main text and may have been omitted by accident on this account. If the addition of *EA* 48 to the collection does indeed postdate the making of the *capitulatio* then its omission is easy to understand, especially if the compiler envisioned adding a whole series of such letters but ended up confining himself to just the one.
- ¹⁸⁷ cf. Marculf, I *Capitula*, pp. 37-8, II *Capitula*, pp. 69-70.
- ¹⁸⁸ See Barrett and Woudhuysen, ‘Remigius’.

-
- ¹⁸⁹ See in general M. Garrison, “‘Send More Socks’: On Mentality and the Preservation Context of Medieval Letters’, in M. Mostert (ed.), *New Approaches to Medieval Communication* (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 69-99.
- ¹⁹⁰ D. Shanzer, ‘The Tale of Frodebert’s Tail’, in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 376-405; R.W. Mathisen, ‘Between Arles, Rome, and Toledo: Gallic Collections of Canon Law in Late Antiquity’, *Cuadernos 'Ilu*, 2 (1999), pp. 33-46; R.W. Mathisen, ‘Church Councils and Local Authority: the Development of Gallic *Libri canonum* during Late Antiquity’, in C. Harrison, C. Humfress, and I. Sandwell (eds.), *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: a Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford, 2014), pp. 175-93.
- ¹⁹¹ A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (eds.), *ChLA XVIII* (Olten-Dietikon, 1985), no. 659 (with *ChLA XLVIII* (Olten-Dietikon, 1998), no. 659), and *ChLA XLVII* (Olten-Dietikon, 1997), nos. 1404-5; *cf.* most recently S. Sato, ‘The Merovingian Accounting Documents of Tours: Form and Function’, *EME*, 9/2 (2000), pp. 143-61.
- ¹⁹² J. Barbier, *Archives oubliées du haut Moyen Âge. Les gesta municipalia en Gaule franque (VI^e-IX^e siècle)* (Paris, 2014), esp. pp. 135-72; with W.C. Brown, ‘The *gesta municipalia* and the Public Validation of Documents in Frankish Europe’, in W.C. Brown, M. Costambeys, M. Innes, and A.J. Kosto (eds.), *Documentary Culture and the Laity in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2013), pp. 95-124; W.C. Brown, ‘On the *gesta municipalia* and the Public Validation of Documents in Frankish Europe’, *Speculum*, 87/2 (2012), pp. 345-75.
- ¹⁹³ A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (eds.), *ChLA XIV* (Olten-Dietikon, 1982), no. 592 (with *ChLA XLVIII*, no. 592); and see now Brown, Costambeys, Innes, and Kosto (eds.), *Documentary Culture*, ‘Introduction’, pp. 1-16, and ‘Conclusion’, pp. 363-76, with the literature reviewed therein.
- ¹⁹⁴ *cf.* Shanzer and Wood (transl.), pp. 31-45; Wood, ‘Why Collect Letters?’.

-
- ¹⁹⁵ See P. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994), esp. pp. 177-81.
- ¹⁹⁶ John the Deacon, *Sancti Gregorii Magni Vita* (ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 75 (Paris, 1849)), *Praefatio*, col. 62, ‘charticios libros epistolarum ejusdem Patris’, IV.71, col. 223, ‘quaedam epistolae decretales per singulas indictiones excerptae sunt, et in duobus voluminibus, sicut modo cernitur, congregatae’; cf. Markus, pp. 1-3 (with n. 4), 14-6.
- ¹⁹⁷ See the edition by M.C. Díaz y Díaz, *Libros y librerías en la Rioja altomedieval* (2nd ed., Logroño, 1991), app. XXI, a, pp. 342-6, at p. 344.
- ¹⁹⁸ J.E. López Pereira, *Continuatio isidoriana hispana: crónica mozárabe de 754. Estudio, edición crítica y traducción* (León, 2009), §23, pp. 190-97; cf. K.B. Wolf (transl.), *Conquerors and Chroniclers of Early Medieval Spain* (2nd ed., Liverpool, 1999), pp. 97-8.
- ¹⁹⁹ cf. C. Kelly, *Ruling the Later Roman Empire* (Cambridge, MA, 2004), pp. 117-20; C. Kelly, ‘Later Roman Bureaucracy: Going through the Files’, in A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 161-6; and in general E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), pp. 205-23.
- ²⁰⁰ W. Gundlach, ‘Codex Carolinus’, in Dümmler (ed.), *Epistolae Merowingici*, p. 476, ‘memoralibus membranibus’; but see now D.B. van Espelo, *A Testimony of Carolingian Rule. The Codex Epistolaris Carolinus as a Product of its Time* (Ph.D. Thesis, University of Utrecht, 2014), pp. 49-80; D. van Espelo, ‘A Testimony of Carolingian Rule? The *Codex Epistolaris Carolinus*, its Historical Context, and the Meaning of *Imperium*’, *EME*, 21/3 (2013), pp. 254-82.
- ²⁰¹ e.g. A.H.M. Jones, P. Grierson, and J.A. Crook, ‘The Authenticity of the “Testamentum S. Remigii”’, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire*, 35/2 (1957), pp. 356-73, on the shorter testament

of Remigius of Reims; cf. J. Devisse, *Hincmar, archevêque de Reims, 845-882* (3 vols., Geneva, 1975-76), ii, pp. 657-61; Roberts, 'Flodoard', pp. 201-8.