

Francia – Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Bd. 29/1

2002

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2002.1.45509

Copyright

Das Digitalisat wird Ihnen von perspectivia.net, der Online-Publikationsplattform der Stiftung Deutsche Geisteswissenschaftliche Institute im Ausland (DGIA), zur Verfügung gestellt. Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

JOHN J. CONTRENI

»BY LIONS, BISHOPS ARE MEANT; BY WOLVES, PRIESTS«:
HISTORY, EXEGESIS, AND THE CAROLINGIAN CHURCH IN
HAIMO OF AUXERRE'S COMMENTARY ON EZECHIEL¹

The history of Carolingian biblical exegesis is long, rich, and complex. It begins during the second half of the eighth century when Charlemagne, emulating the example of King Josiah (2 Kings 22–23:30), sought to reform his kingdom according to biblical precepts. The impetus Charlemagne gave biblical studies in the eighth century continued through the ninth century by which time Carolingian scholars had composed some 200 biblical commentaries². These commentaries and the insights and methodologies embedded in them constitute one of the enduring legacies of Carolingian civilization and culture. The works of Carolingian exegetes were copied and recopied hundreds of times in the post-Carolingian centuries and provided the platform for the exegetical innovations of the twelfth century. Carolingian biblical commentaries continued to be collected and read even after the scholastic and Thomistic revolutions. Early on in the age of print, many of them made the transition from manuscript to printed page.

In the twentieth century scholars have come to appreciate the subtlety and complexity of the Carolingian exegetical tradition, thanks to the publication of new critical editions, but especially as a result of the detailed work of scholars whose articles and books have deconstructed biblical commentaries to plumb the intentions and methodologies of their authors and the needs of their audiences. Those intentions, methodologies, and needs varied over time. The first generation of Carolingian exegetes in the 780s and 790s favored encyclopedic commentaries based on earlier florilegia of patristic and early medieval authors. Wigbod's Genesis commentary and Peter of Pisa's comments on Daniel represent the contributions of this generation. A second generation writing roughly in the period of the 820s through the 840s con-

1 *Per leones designantur episcopi, per lupos autem presbiteri*: for this epigram, see fol. 78v in Paris, BNF, lat. 12302, the only known extant copy of Haimo's commentary on Ezechiel, and note 32 below. Subsequent references to the commentary will cite only the relevant folio number of the Paris manuscript. Where the commentary's biblical lemmata differ from the Vulgate (*Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem*, vol. 15: *Liber Hiezechielis*, Rome 1978) or are missing, Vulgate readings appear in following brackets. Transcriptions respect the orthography of the late tenth-century manuscript, including *t* for *c* as in *aties*; *a*-cedilla and *e*-cedilla have been silently expanded (*caeteris*; *aecclisia*; etc.).

2 See the *Carolingian Biblical Exegesis Homepage* developed by Burton Van Name EDWARDS available via email at Burton_Edwards@brown.edu; Robert E. McNALLY, *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages*, Woodstock Papers: Occasional Essays for Theology, 4, Westminster 1959, p. 89–117; and Pierre RICHÉ, *Instruments de travail et méthodes de l'exégète à l'époque carolingienne*, in: *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*, ed. Pierre RICHÉ and Guy LOBRICHON, *Bible de tous les temps* 4, Paris 1984, p. 154–157.

fronted the patristic and early medieval legacy directly when it composed anthology commentaries based on careful excerpting and juxtaposition of the authorities. The important work of Hrabanus Maurus exemplifies this generation's contribution. By the mid-ninth century a third generation had already begun to comment on the Bible in a new style. Angelomus of Luxeuil, John Scottus, Paschasius Radbertus, and Haimo of Auxerre, among others, blended patristic exegesis with their own grammatical, philosophical, or theological learning to create commentaries in which the imprint of the exegete and the biblical text itself became more apparent³.

Among this group of mid-ninth century Carolingian exegetes, Haimo occupies a special niche. His exegetical productivity was impressive – 17 commentaries have been attributed to him – and original. Not only did he tackle biblical books rarely commented on, books such as Isaiah and Ezechiel, his comments are also characterized by grammatical analysis and are anchored in monastic spirituality⁴. Despite the fundamental work of Eduard Riggenschach in 1907 and of Riccardo Quadri published more than thirty-five years ago in 1963 and 1966, Haimo remains in many respects an unknown figure on the landscape of Carolingian biblical culture. Only one critical edition, that of C. Gabriel on the commentary on Isaiah, appears to be on the horizon⁵.

Specialized studies of Haimo's work during the last thirty years have yielded impressive results and have made the case for modern editions of his other commentaries all the more imperative. Haimo's early intellectual formation, thanks to links Louis Holtz established between the Irish grammarian Murethach and Haimo, has emerged from obscurity to shed important light on the development of his brand of exegesis⁶. In a recent study, Johannes Heil described Haimo as the »Höhepunkt der karolingischen Exegese«⁷. Later in his life, Haimo took on a second career after that as *magister* at the monastery of Saint-Germain in Auxerre when he became abbot of the monastery at Sasceium (modern Cessy-les-Bois) *in territorio Autisioderensis*

3 See John J. CONTRENI, Carolingian Biblical Culture, in: Iohannes Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics, ed. Gerd van RIEL, Carlos STEEL, and James McEVOY, Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (De-Wulf-Mansion Centre, Series 1, XX), Leuven 1996, p. 1–23; and Michael GORMAN, Theodulf of Orléans and the Exegetical Miscellany in Paris Lat. 15679, in: *Revue Bénédictine* 109 (1999) p. 278–323; ID., The Commentary on Genesis of Angelomus of Luxeuil and Biblical Studies under Lothar, in: *Studi Medievali*, ser. 3, 40–2 (1999) p. 559–631.

4 See Dominique IOGNA-PRAT, L'œuvre d'Haymon: état de la question, in: *L'École carolingienne d'Auxerre de Murethach à Remi, 830–908*, ed. D. IOGNA-PRAT, Colette JEUDY, Guy LOBRICHON, Paris 1991, p. 229–242.

5 See Eduard RIGGENBACH, *Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief*, Leipzig 1907; Riccardo QUADRI, Aimone di Auxerre alla luce dei *Collectanea* di Heiric di Auxerre, in: *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 6 (1963) p. 1–48; ID., *I Collectanea* di Eirico di Auxerre, Freiburg 1966; C. GABRIEL, *Commentaires inédits d'Haymon d'Auxerre sur Isaïe 5,1–6,1*, in: *Sacris Erudiri* 35 (1995) p. 89–114.

6 See Murethach (Muridac), *In Donati artem maiorem*, ed. Louis HOLTZ (*Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 40), Turnhout 1977, p. xxviii–xxxv.

7 Johannes HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion? Die Juden in den Pauluskommentaren des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Forschungen zur Geschichte der Juden. Abt. A: Abhandlungen, 6), Hannover 1998, p. 275; for Haimo, see especially p. 275–334. Heil's study is the most important analysis of Haimo's exegesis since Riggenschach.

about 60 km southwest of Auxerre⁸. And from the perspective of intellectual history, his frequent reflections on the constitution of Christian society in his commentaries on Romans and on the Apocalypse have, in the words of Edmond Ortigues, earned Haimo the title of »theoretician of the three orders«⁹.

Haimo's concern for the functional orders of Christian society and for the orders of the Christian church implicitly linked exegesis of the biblical text to commentary on his world and suggests the possibility of reading his commentaries as reflections of Carolingian history and society. Biblical commentaries have not usually been mined for contemporary social or cultural comment. The technical conventions of exegesis and the exegetes' goals both to ground their comments in the authority of patristic authors and to achieve a kind of ahistorical timelessness in their work inhibited explicit contemporary comment. But no matter how much exegetes might have tried to ignore their present, they remained rooted in and shaped by their own times and experiences. Historians have begun to reveal subliminal and even explicit preoccupations with contemporary issues lurking beneath the seemingly dispassionate carapace of scholarly exegesis¹⁰.

Contemporary Reflections in the *Commentary on Ezechiel*

This essay explores Haimo's reflections on the Carolingian church as recorded in his biblical commentaries, especially the unpublished commentary on Ezechiel¹¹. If any biblical book invited reflection on contemporary events in Carolingian society, the New Israel, prophetic books such as Ezechiel did. Ezechiel portrayed Israel as a rebellious nation placed at the center of the world by God. In Ezechiel's time, God's

- 8 See John J. CONTRENI, Haimo of Auxerre, Abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois), and a New Sermon on 1 John v, 4–10, in: ID., *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts*, Aldershot 1992, ch. VII (orig. in: *Revue Bénédictine* 85 [1975] p. 303–320).
- 9 Haymon d'Auxerre, théoricien des trois ordres, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 181–227. For pre-Carolingian concepts of social order, see Martin HEINZELMANN, »Adel« und »Societas sanctorum«: Soziale Ordnungen und christliches Weltbild von Augustinus bis zu Gregor von Tours, in: *Nobilitas: Funktion und Repräsentation des Adels in Alteuropa*, ed. Otto Gerhard OEXLE and Werner PARAVICINI, Göttingen 1997, p. 216–256.
- 10 See Pierre RICHÉ, *La Bible et la vie politique dans le haut Moyen Age*, in: *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* (n. 2 above) p. 385–400; Mayke DE JONG, *Old Law and New-Found Power: Hrabanus Maurus and the Old Testament*, in: *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem DRIJVERS and Alasdair A. MACDONALD, Leiden and New York 1995, p. 161–176; EAD., *The Emperor Lothar and His Bibliotheca Historiarum*, in: *Media Latinitatis: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Occasion of the Retirement of L. J. Engels*, ed. Renée I. A. NIP et al. (*Instrumenta Patristica*, 28), Turnhout 1996, p. 229–235; EAD., *Exegesis for an Empress*, in: *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power and Gifts in Context*, ed. Esther COHEN and Mayke B. DE JONG, Leiden 2001, p. 69–100. In 1998, the entire issue of *Early Medieval Europe* 7–3 was dedicated to a series of essays on the theme »The Power of the Word: The Influence of the Bible on Early Medieval Politics«. For the twelfth to fourteenth centuries, see Philippe BUC, *L'ambiguïté du livre: prince, pouvoir, et peuple dans les commentaires de la Bible au Moyen Age* (*Théologie historique*, 95), Paris 1994.
- 11 Paris, BNF, lat. 12302. For this manuscript and its text, see John J. CONTRENI, Haimo of Auxerre's Commentary on Ezechiel, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 229–242, and Patricia STIRNEMANN, *L'illustration du commentaire d'Haymon sur Ezéchiël*: Paris, B. N. latin 12302, in: *ibid.*, p. 93–104.

bride had become a harlot. Conflicts between fathers and sons, bloody crimes and violence throughout the land, and the pollution of holy places (Ez 2,4–5; 4,4–5; 7,23) signaled Israel's infidelity. Ezechiel reserved some of his harshest words for Israel's princes and priests (Ez 22,25–26):

Her princes in the midst of her are like a roaring lion tearing the prey; they have devoured human lives; they have taken treasure and precious things; they have made many widows in the midst of her. Her priests have done violence to my law and have profaned my holy things; they have made no distinction between the holy and the common, neither have they taught the difference between the unclean and the clean, and they have disregarded my Sabbaths, so that I am profaned among them¹².

No Christian, no Carolingian reading Ezechiel's indictment of Israel's failure to keep the covenant with God could fail to notice contemporary parallels, especially since prophecy could envision a near as well as a distant future that reached even to the exegete's own day. Thus, when Ezechiel (33,30–33) reported the Lord's disdain for those who »come to you as people come, and they sit before you as my people, and they hear what you say but they will not do it«, Jerome observed that in his own day many come to church to witness the oratorical theatrics of the preacher and miss the message. When they should listen to the words of the Lord, they hear only the words of a man¹³. Gregory the Great in his homilies on Ezechiel saw in the fate of Israel, the fate of sixth-century Rome:

Everywhere we observe strife; everywhere we hear groans. Cities are destroyed, fortresses overturned, fields depopulated, the land returned to solitude. No one dwells among the fields, almost no one lives in the cities. ... See what has befallen Rome, once ruler of the world, She is worn down by great sorrows, by the disappearance of her citizens, by the attacks of her enemies, by numerous ruins. Thus we see fulfilled in her what the prophet long ago pronounced on the city of Samaria¹⁴.

In searching out Haimo's reflections on his ninth-century world, it pays to be cautious. What did Haimo mean by *hodie*? Generally, he meant anything that happened between the incarnation of Christ and his present day. He could report, for example, Jerome's observation on contemporary feminine jewelry in the Promised Land as contemporary to himself in the ninth century¹⁵. It seems unlikely that Haimo would have had knowledge either directly or indirectly of female ornamentation in the

12 All English versions of biblical passages are from: The Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version, New York 1952.

13 *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem libri xiv*, X,1416–1424, XI,259–263, ed. François GLORIE (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina [CCSL]*, 75), Turnhout 1964, p. 479, 488.

14 *Homiliae in Hiezechielem*, II, VI, 22, 525–539, ed. Marcus ADRIAEN (CCSL, 142), Turnhout 1971, p. 310–311. See also R. A. MARKUS, *Gregory the Great and His World*, Cambridge 1997, p. 51–67.

15 Fol. 53r: [Ez 16,12] *ET DEDI INAUREM SUPER OS TUUM. Inauris hornamentum est mulieris dicit beatus Hieronimus quo usque hodie utuntur feminae nobiles terrae repromissionis et dependet adligatura capitis supra nares. Et quia similitudinem habet anorum qui ponuntur in auribus, idcirco inauris appellatur. Cf. Jerome, Commentariorum in Hiezechielem libri xiv, IV,xvi,12 (ed. GLORIE, n. 13 above, p. 175).*

Holy Land, so this reference and others like it can be set gently aside. But we should not go as far as to conclude that Haimo *never* alluded to events of his own times¹⁶. When Ezechiel reported God's words to the infidels (Ez 20,39: »Go serve every one of you his idols, now and hereafter, if you will not listen to me; but my holy name you shall no more profane with your gifts and your idols«), Haimo naturally thought of the infidels his world confronted, the Northmen, Saracens, and Slavs¹⁷. His most explicit reference to his times centers on one of the principal concerns of his exegesis – warnings against the dangers of heresy and false doctrine. When Ezechiel wrote that God would cause »a great shaking in the land of Israel« (Ez 38,19) against Gog, Haimo recalled a similar *commotio* when Constantine brought together all the bishops of the world against Arius as well as a more recent one in the 790s when Charlemagne gathered together all the learned men of his empire against Felix of Urgel¹⁸. That echoes of this event should reverberate in a commentary composed at least a generation or two after the controversy provoked by Felix's Christology suggests the deep impression Felix's teachings made on Carolingian society and memory. But perhaps Haimo's interest in Felix of Urgel was more personal. Johannes Heil has suggested that Haimo or his family may have come from Spain¹⁹. In his comments on the *Corpus Paulinum* Haimo referred often and easily to Jews, as might be expected of someone with roots in the Iberian peninsula. His quite explicit references to Saracens in the Ezechiel commentary are of the same tenor and reinforce the argument that Haimo along with other major Carolingian scholars (Claudius of Turin and Theodulf of Orleans, for example) was a Spanish transplant. Apropos of Ez 16,4, Haimo explained how water might not truly cleanse by reporting that Saracens baptized their children to ward off demons, obviously a false baptism, the exegete noted, since it was not performed *ex fide*²⁰. When John Scottus, the contemporary Irish scholar, explained Ezechiel's reference to the turbans worn by Chaldeans (Ez 23,15), he described the headgear as »a kind of cap, a *barr* [O.Ir.], worn by Persians and Chaldeans«. The turban reminded Haimo not of Persians or Chaldeans, but again of Saracens²¹. But was Haimo referring to contemporary Sara-

16 ORTIGUES, Haymon (n. 9 above) p. 184 (apropos of Haimo's commentary on Romans).

17 Fol. 71v: [Ez 20,44] *Quicumque enim extra aecclesiam hanc sunt, munus quod Domino sit acceptum non offerunt neque Normannus scilicet, neque Sarracenus, neque Sclauus aut quilibet infidelis.*

18 Fol. 119v: [Ez 38,19] *IN IGNE IRAE MEAE, id est in uindicta ultionis meae, LOCUTUS SUM QUIA IN DIE ILLO, id est in die aduentus tui, ERIT COMMOTIO MAGNA in aecclesia in persecutione sanctorum sicut fuit tempore Constantini contra Arrium quando omnes episcopi totius orbis in unum sunt congregati. Similiterque et temporibus Karoli contra Felicem omnes docti uiri ex omni eius imperio sunt collecti.* In a less specific, but nevertheless Carolingian reference, Haimo credited Charlemagne (along with Emperors Philip and Constantine) with enlarging the Christian world. Fol. 120r: [Ez 38,20] *BESTIAE AGRI, feroces et fortis contra hostes et daemonum inpugnationes uel contra ipsos uisibiles aecclesiae hostes sicut fuit Philippus, Constantinus, et Karolus qui multum populum Christianum adquisierunt.*

19 See HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 206, 279–280.

20 Fol. 51r–v: [Ez 16,4] *ET IN AQUA NON ES [cod. EST] LOTA IN SALUTEM. Videamus quae sit aqua qua abluuntur corpora infantum et non in salutem. Baptismus est utique quo baptizant Sarraceni filios suos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ne a demonibus inuadantur. Haec enim aqua non est illis in salutem quia non mundantur in ea, quoniam non ex fide baptizantur.*

21 John Scottus, *Glossae diuinae historiae: The Biblical Glosses of John Scottus Eriugena*, ed. John J. CONTRENI and Pádraig P. Ó NÉILL, Florence 1997, p. 157 (gloss 354): *Tiara, genus pilleoli, id est*

cen practices that he might have known? One of his observations on the story of the harlots Oholah and Oholibah (Ez 23,35–45) explained the Chaldean custom of reclining on couches by reference to practices »even now (*etiam nunc*) among Saracens«²².

These references to Charlemagne, Felix of Urgel, Northmen, Slavs, and especially Saracens that Haimo comfortably wove into the fabric of his commentary served as lessons and examples from the Carolingian present that his audience could draw on to understand Ezechiel and also to understand how prophecy affected their own times. Haimo's explicit contemporary references also encourage the search for other, more subtle, strands of contemporary reflection.

The words of Ezechiel rarely prompted references in Haimo's commentary as specific as those to Charlemagne and to Felix's Adoptionism. Most often he thought in broad societal terms. Haimo's concept of Carolingian society as adumbrated in his remarks on Romans 13 (»Let everyone be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God ...«) and on the church of Laodicea in the Apocalypse is also developed in the Ezechiel commentary. When Ezechiel described the sound of the wings of the living creatures that appeared to him as the sound of army camps (Ez 1,2), Haimo depicted three kinds of camps in the present age. The first consisted of the apostles, evangelists (*praedicatores*), and holy martyrs. The second camp contained celibates, »good« canons, and those who renounce the world. The third camp is inhabited by those good husbands and wives who marry not for lust, but to have children²³. This division is not based on the functions of the orders in society, but on the division of believers in the church with the saints occupying the highest rank and married people the lowest. Canons and monks who renounce the world mediate between the others.

Haimo elaborated on this theme in his comment on Ez 14,14 in which the prophet reported that even if the three righteous men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were alive, they could save only themselves, not their kin, from the Lord's wrath. Noah, who governed the ark, represented the preachers who guide the church amid the waves of

barr quo Persarum et Caldeorum gens utitur. Haimo of Auxerre, fol. 81r: [Ez 23,15] tiarasque, id est pilleos in suis ferebant capitibus sicut faciunt Sarraceni.

22 Fol. 83v: [Ez 23,40–41] *ET HORNATA ES MUNDO MULIEBRI, id est omni cultu et hornamento pretiosarum uestium te ornasti. SEDISTI IN LECTO et cetera. Mos enim fuit apud ueteres, et etiam nunc est apud Sarracenos qui de genere sunt Chaldeorum, ut mulieres nobiles in suis se uestiant lectis ibique se hornent suis uestibus et ibi etiam comedunt [comedunt cod.]. See RIGGENBACH, Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare (n. 5 above) p. 77–78, for additional references to the Saracens in Haimo's Pauline commentaries. Note also the circulation of products of Spanish Muslim origin (coins, rugs, leather goods) in Carolingian territory as reported in Theodulf of Orléans's *Contra iudices*, MGH Poet. lat. 1, ed. Ernst DÜMMLER, Berlin 1881, p. 498–500, and by Michael McCORMICK, *Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, A. D. 300–900*, Cambridge 2001, p. 345–351, 674–678.*

23 Fol. 14r–v: [Ez 1,24] *CUM AMBULARENT [QUASI om. cod.] SONUS ERAT MULTITUDINIS UT SONITUS [SONUS] CASTRORUM... / Tria et enim genera castrorum sunt in presenti uita a Domini incarnatione usque ad finem saeculi. Prima castrorum aties est in apostolis et caeteris praedicatoribus siue sanctis martiribus. Secundum genus castrorum continentes et boni canonici et illi qui saeculo perfecte renuntiauerunt. Tertium bonorum coniugatorum qui licito utuntur coniugio et hoc causa filiorum magis quam libidinis bonis praecipue deseruientes operibus.*

this world. Daniel, who preserved his virginity, represented the order of celibates and virgins. Job, who had a wife and children, represented the order of good married people²⁴. Haimo emphasized how important the clergy were in this schema in his comment on God's command to eat the scroll on which were written front and back words of lamentation and warning (Ez 2,9–3,3). Both Gregory the Great and Jerome interpreted the scroll whose taste was »as sweet as honey« as the scriptures²⁵. Haimo adopted this interpretation, but significantly and unlike his distinguished predecessors prefaced his remarks on the passage by drawing attention to the one who consumed the scroll: »Ezechiel here designates all the evangelists, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, and fittingly with the others the remaining prefects of the ecclesiastical order«²⁶. Each group occupies its place on the topography of Christian society according to merit and function. The bishops, the more eminent, are like mountains, the martyrs and lesser figures are the hills, scholars and biblical commentators such as Augustine, Jerome, and others are streams whose teachings water the entire land²⁷.

Haimo also saw the clergy as walls protecting the people of God. In the passage Haimo explained, Ezechiel (13,5) meant literal walls that would protect Israel in battle. Haimo's exegesis, however, was inspired by the actions of Moses as recounted in Exodus 32–33. God's wrath burned hot against the Israelites and he was about to consume them after they made and worshipped a molten calf. But Moses saved his people a second time when he interceded for them and convinced God to repent »of the evil he thought to do to his people« (Ex 32,14). The source of the violence in his society Haimo attributed not to outsiders, the Saracens, Northmen, or Slavs – they were important to him only as pagans and infidels²⁸. Rather, as in the case of Israel,

- 24 Fol. 48r–v: [Ez 14,14] *ET SI FUERINT TRES VIRI ISTI IN MEDIO EIUS, NOE, DANIEL, ET IOB; IPSI IUSTITIA SUA LIBERABUNT ANIMAS SUAS AIT DOMINUS DEUS...* / *Possumus etiam per istos tres viros intellegere tres ordines sanctae aecclesiae, praedicatorum uidelicet, continentium siue uirginum qui in unum comprehenduntur, atque coniugatorum. Per filios uero eorum uel propinquos eorum uel etiam generaliter omnes subiectos eorum. Per Noe qui rexit archam in diluuiio [diluuiio cod.], intellegitur ordo praedicatorum qui regit aecclesiam inter fluctus huius saeculi. Per Danihel qui uirginitatem seruauit, continentium ordo et uirginum. Per Iob qui uxore et filiis bene usus est, intellegitur ordo bonorum coniugatorum qui amore filiorum non luxuriae copulantur uxoribus et sic seruiunt illis ut non displiceant Creatori.* For the significance of Ez 14,14 in earlier formulations, see HEINZELMANN, »Adel« und »Societas sanctorum« (n. 9 above) p. 219–224.
- 25 Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem libri xiv*, I, 803–837 (ed. GLORIE, n. 13 above, p. 30–31); Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechielem*, I, IX, 29, 562–570 (ed. ADRIAEN, n. 14 above, p. 138).
- 26 Fol. 20r: [Ez 2,9] *ET VIDI ET ECCE MANUS MISSA AD ME IN QUA ERAT LIBER INVOLUTUS, id est clausus, ET EXPANDIT ILLUM CORAM ME, id est aperuit illum, QUI ERAT SCRIPTUS INTUS AC FORIS.* *Hiezechiel in hoc loco omnes designat praedicatores, apostolos, martires, confessores, episcopos, presbiteros, et caeteros aecclesastici ordinis iure aliis praefectos.* Is the last phrase a veiled reference to monks?
- 27 Fol. 113v: [Ez 36,4] *HAEC DICIT DOMINUS [DEUS om. cod.] MONTIBUS ET COLLIBUS TORRENTIBUS ET VALLIBUS ET DESERTIS PARIETINIS.* *His uariis ordinibus aecclesia est permixta. Nam per montes intelleguntur episcopi qui aeminentiores sunt in aecclesiam. Per colles autem minores potestates et martires. Per torrentes doctores et expositores diuinorum uoluminum qui sua doctrina omnem terram irrigant, Augustinus uidelicet, Hieronimus, et caeteri.*
- 28 Fol. 71v: [Ez 20,43] *ET TUNC DISPLICEBITIS VOBIS IN CONSPECTU VESTRO, ante conspectum uestrum ponentes et constituentes peccata quae gessistis, [Ez 20,44] ET SCIETIS QUIA*

which was overcome largely on account of its priests and kings, the danger came from within²⁹. Like Moses the clergy should intercede for God's sinful people so that his wrath might be stilled. And they should do more than pray. When they see the homes of widows and orphans plundered and violence done to the poor and weak, they must resist the powers of this world and put themselves in danger as if they were walls³⁰. Instead, Haimo lamented, just as in the times of Ezechiel, now in the church, »our own Jerusalem«, the people are led to sin by the crimes of their priests and princes³¹. Ezechiel described the princes of Israel as »wolves tearing the prey, destroying lives to get dishonest gain« (Ez 22,27). Israel's princes had also been

EGO DOMINUS CUM BENEFECERO VOBIS, id est »Cum dederō vobis potestatem aedificandi ciuitates et templa, et habundantia omnium rerum temporalium vobis tribuero, non propter meritum uestrum qui potius digni estis morte, sed propter nomen meum ut glorificetur in omnibus terrarum populis cum audierint quod solummodo in mea misericordia uos liberaui et in terram uestram adduxi. Allegoricae mons Sion quae speculatio interpretatur sanctam significat aeclesiam quae in monte, id est in Christo, est constructa per mentis contemplationem semper caelestia conscendit dicens cum apostolo, Nostra autem conuersatio in celis est [Phil 3,20]. In hoc itaque monte, id est in aeclesia, uult sibi Deus omnipotens sacrificare in oratione et uictimis muneribusque quae fideles offerunt illi in fide recta et operatione sanctam. Quicumque enim extra aeclesiam hanc sunt, munus quod Domino sit acceptum non offerunt neque Normannus scilicet, neque Sarracenus, neque Sclauus aut quilibet infidelis. Si autem illi munus offerre ambiunt, declinantes societatem infidelium tendant ad uiam sanctae aeclesiae et tunc utique illi munera sibi placita poterunt offerre.

- 29 Fol. 78r-v: [Ez 22,26] *SACERDOTES EIUS CONTEMPSERUNT LEGEM MEAM. Ministerium quippe erat sacerdotum de lege et prophetis caeterisque scripturis respondere. Hinc et Moyses legem scriptam tradidit filiis Laeui [Dt 21,5]. Sed quorum ministerium erat docere legem aliisque ostendere doctrinam ueram primi contempserunt legem diuinam mala opera / perpetrando contra praeceptum Dei, nam subuersio Iudeorum maxime ex parte regum et sacerdotum uenit.*
- 30 Fol. 44v-45r: [Ez 13,5] *NON ASCENDISTIS EX ADVERSO NEQUE POSUISTIS [OPPOSU-ISTIS] MURUM PRO DOMO ISRAHEL UT STARETIS IN PROELIO IN DIE DOMINI, id est in die uindictae Domini ut uestris orationibus et intercessionibus iram Domini placaretis. Ex aduerso siue ex contrario ascendere et murum / opponere est contra iram omnipotentis Dei humili prece stare et intercedere pro salute populi peccantis ut ira illius quiescat et ne inducat uindictam super eum sicut legimus fecisse Moysi quando dixit, Si inueni gratiam in conspectu tuo, dimitte eis hoc peccatum maximum. Et si non uis dimittere hanc noxam, dele me de libro tuo [Ex 34,9; 32,31-32]. Statimque placatus Dominus precibus eius dixit, Feci iuxta uerbum tuum [Ex 33,17]. Similiter quando ortus est ignis in castris propter murmurationem a quo consumebatur populus et praecipiente Moyse accepit Aaron turibulum stetitque inter uiuos et mortuos, tunc ascendit Aaron ex aduerso et opposuit murum orationis quia iram Domini auertit a populo. Sic praedicatores aeclesiae debent agere et debent ex aduerso ascendere orantes pro populi salute uel quando uident depraedari domos uiduarum et pupillorum et uiolentiam inferri pauperibus et infirmis, debent resistere potestatibus huius saeculi et debent se opponere periculo ut sint ipsi murus, hoc est firmamentum subiectorum.*
- 31 Fol. 32v-33r: [Ez 5,11] *EGO QUOQUE CONFRINGAM, subauditur omnia idola tua, ET NON PARCET OCLUS MEUS NEQUE [ET NON] MISEREBOR. Ac si diceret, »Quia me abiecisti colendo idola et non es miserta pauperis, ego quoque cum te uidero gladio et seruituti subici, non miserebor tui.« Quod dicit IDCIRCO VIVO EGO, DICIT DOMINUS, si dici fas est iuramentum omnipotentis Dei est in ueteri testamento sicuti in nouo, amen, amen. Quare ergo dicit »uiuo ego«? Non quidne uiuunt angeli, homines et cetera animalia? Viuunt quidem sed ab illo uiuificantur et ab illo uitam sumunt. Ipse autem a se ipso uiuit. Ideoque ad distinctionem illarum rerum quae a se non habent uiuere uel etiam ad distinctionem falsorum deorum, dicit ipse »uiuo ego«. NISI PRO EO, hoc est »Quia sanctum meum templum polluistis ubi erant sancta sanctorum et altare incensi, ego quoque non miserebor uestri.« Hic ostenditur maxime propter culpam sacerdotum et principum. Haec omnia contigisse Iudeis. Similiter in nostram Hierusalem, hoc est in aeclesia, maxime aliquando ex culpa sacerdotum et / principum pendet peccatum populi qui errorem illorum sequitur.*

described as lions (Ez 22,25). Haimo saw the lions as the kings and war leaders (*duces*) of Israel. The wolves were lesser men, men like the *uicarii* of Haimo's world, local officials below the level of counts and thus more immediate to the people, and other minions set up by powerful men in Haimo's time. But instead of dwelling on the princes and their secular accomplices, Haimo interpreted the passage in ecclesiastical terms and related it to the Carolingian church. The lions were bishops and the wolves priests who rob the poor of their possessions and divert to their own use gifts given to the church for support of the poor. They also starve the poor to death and by the example of their depraved lives condemn even the souls of the poor to damnation. Ezechiel thundered that men in Israel took bribes to shed blood. Haimo explained that one man would bribe another to kill his enemy and observed that »many in the church do the same today«³².

Haimo did not limit his critique of contemporary clergy to his commentary on Ezechiel. In his comments on Paul's epistle to the Romans (12,3: »I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think«), Haimo drew attention to priests who usurped the office of bishops and deacons who took over the duties of priests. Just as the eyes do not function for the ears, clergy ought not to invade another's ministry³³. For Haimo, this was a relatively benign warning. When Paul at the end of his letter to the Romans (15,30) asked them to pray for him, Haimo described the dangers Paul was anticipating. Then, Haimo went out of his exegetical way to compare modern clergy to Paul. Paul's request, he wrote, struck at the pride of »bishops and prelates and princes and the powerful of this world« who think it unworthy of them to ask for the prayers of those beneath them (*subjectos suos*). »If he who was an apostle and the pontiff of all the people and filled with every grace of the Holy Spirit is not unworthy to seek the help of inferiors in prayer, how much more ought they to be not unworthy who are filled with greed, pride, and

32 Fol. 78v: [Ez 22,27] *PRINCIPES EIUS [IN MEDIO ILLIUS om. cod.] QUASI LUPI et caetera. Per leones, qui superius sunt commemorati [Ez 22,25], reges intelleguntur prophetae et duces qui generaliter populum insequabantur bona illorum sibi uindicando ipsosque interficiendo fame uel malo exemplo. Per lupos autem minoris potestatis homines designantur sicut sunt nunc uicarii et caeteri in minoribus principatibus constituti. Spiritualiter autem quantum ad nostrum pertinet tempus: per leones designantur episcopi, per lupos autem presbyteri. Isti enim miseros expoliant et de bonis illorum ac de elemosina quae aecclesiae Dei data est ad subsidium pauperum sibi praedia emunt et ex aliorum substantia ditantur. Et dum hoc fatiunt miseros fame interficiunt uel etiam exemplo prae conuersionis necant. Et animam illorum in perditionem mittunt sectando lucra et diuitias sibi congregando ob nimiam auaritiam.*

Fol. 77v: [Ez 22,12] *MUNERA ACCEPERUNT APUD TE AD EFFUNDENDUM SANGUINEM. Opprimebant enim pauperes per potentiam et bona illorum in suos conuertebant usus ipsosque interficiebant famae et penuria. Accipitur etiam aliter munus ad effundendum sanguinem quando uidelicet unus alteri munera tribuit ut inimicum suum interficiat. Sic enim fatiebant illi, sic fatiunt hodie etiam multi in aecclesia.*

33 Haymonis Halberstatensis episcopi [sic] In diui Pauli epistolas expositio. In epistolam ad Romanos, Migne PL 117, cols. 471D–472A: *Verbi gratia: Presbyter es, non usurpes episcopi ministerium; diaconus es, noli tibi vindicare aliquid ex officio presbyteri. Sic de caeteris ministeriis et gradibus intelligendum est. ... Et sicut unum membrum [i.e. corporis] alterius membri non usurpat officium, sic unusquisque nostrum non debet invadere alterius ministerium.* See also HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 298, n. 119, for other contemporary criticism embedded in Haimo's commentaries.

every evil deed?»³⁴. In a pointed remark he reminded puffed-up bishops that they were mere men. When the Lord said that he would »judge between sheep and sheep«, he did not mean »between the bishop and the lowly people (*populum subiectum*)«; nor will the bishop or the power of the episcopacy by which a bishop thinks himself so great today be judged, for the Lord said, »*Man*, I judge«. The Lord is not interested in titles nor even sheep, but in the »holy and the unholy, the religious and the profane«³⁵.

Haimo's Critique of the Carolingian Church

How did the Carolingian church come to be afflicted with proud and ravenous clergy? Although Haimo never posed the question in such stark terms, his comments suggest two answers to it. First, as in the time of Jerome, secular powers, followers of the devil on account of their sins, persecute the just men of the church³⁶. Secondly, and more fundamentally, the boundary line in the church between the clean and the unclean, the profane and the holy, the holy man and the sinner had been breached by bishops and priests who pollute the sanctuary of God when they exchange gifts and money for the laying on of hands. They make no distinction between the holy man and the sinner or between who should or should not enter holy orders. With such clergy, no wonder the rich sinner is honored while the poor sinner is condemned and cast out. Instead of observing the Sabbath by meditating on scripture, these clergy engage in worldly pursuits, attend banquets, drink, and turn

34 MIGNE PL 117, col. 503B–C: *Hinc decutitur pontificum superbia et praelatorum atque principum et potentium hujus saeculi, qui dedignantur exorare subjectos suos, quatenus pro eis preces orationesque fundant. Si enim ille qui et apostolus et pontifex erat omnium gentium, omnique gratia Spiritu sancti repletus, non est dedignatus auxilium subjectorum expetere in orationibus, quanto magis isti qui pleni sunt rapacitate, superbia, omnique nefario actu non debent dedignari?* See also on this theme similar comments in *ibid.*, In epistolam ad Hebraeos, col. 935C–D; and, *Scolia quaestionum*, ed. QUADRI, I Collectanea (n. 5 above) p. 130,8–10.

35 Fol. 109v: [Ez 34,17] *ECCE EGO IUDICO INTER PECUS ET PECUS, ubi notandum quia non dicit inter episcopum et populum subiectum, quia uidelicet apud Deum nullus dignitatis nomen est; neque enim ille episcopus, id est illa potestas episcopii qua se magnum aestimat in praesenti, iudicabitur, sed Homo, dicit ergo, ecce ego iudico inter pecus et pecus, id est inter sanctum et impium, inter religiosum et prophanum.*

36 Fol. 87v: [Ez 25,7] *IDCIRCO ECCE EGO EXTENDAM MANUM MEAM SUPER TE ›ad affligendum scilicet atque interficiendum et non mittam ad hoc fatiendum angelum aut alium ministrum, sed ego ipse ueniam‹ ET TRADAM TE IN DIREPTIONEM GENTIUM ›ut Chaldei diripiant omnem tuam substantiam‹. ET AUFERAM [INTERFICIAM] TE DE POPULIS ›per Nabuchodonosor seruum meum‹ ET PERDAM DE TERRA [TERRIS] ET CONTERAM. Ita enim factum est quoniam postquam multi sunt interfecti fame [famae cod.] et pestilentia, qui remanserunt ducti sunt in captiuitatem. Et tunc utique cognouerunt Dominum per flagella quem antea nolebant cognoscere cum clemens illis et misericors existeret. Possumus ista etiam ut beatus Hieronimus dicit referre ad praesens tempus. Plerumque homines seculares inuidentes iustis hominibus quos in ecclesia conspiciunt uirtutibus habundare si quomodo contigerit illos ruere peccatis impredientibus et traditi fuerant Nabuchodonosor, id est diabolo propter peccata sua, irrisione mouerentur aduersus eos et obprobriis atque deliramentis affitiunt eo quod qui diu in sua uixerant sanctitate repente caeciderint. Quod fatientes, oculos diuinae magestatis offendunt. See Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem libri xiv, VIII, 144–150* (ed. GLORIE, n. 13 above, p. 337–338). Haimo followed Jerome in making a contemporary parallel, but the parallel is his own.*

their eyes from the scriptures. He who ought to exemplify the true faith, instead encourages sin³⁷. Who ought to please God in all that he does, strives instead to please men, earn the praise of patrons, and become rich³⁸.

Haimo was convinced that the wrong people were in charge. In a remarkable series of passages he reiterated this theme several times in the Pauline commentaries³⁹. Haimo's inspiration was innocuous enough: in the opening verses of Romans (1,1), Galatians (1,1), and Ephesians (1,1), Paul introduced himself as an »apostle«. Haimo began by defining the four types of apostles according to the typology established by Jerome in his commentary on Paul's epistle to the Galatians. The first kind of apostle is made neither by men or through men, but by God and Christ (Isaiah, the prophets, Paul, etc.); the second type is made by God through man, as when God had Moses commission Joshua; the third type is made (*favore et studio*) by man, not by God; and the fourth type is self-made, as in the cases of pseudo-apostles and pseudo-prophets⁴⁰. Haimo, as was his style, paraphrased and embellished his source. He was especially interested in Jerome's description of the third, man-made category of apostle to which Haimo added a graphic citation from Pseudo-Ambrose's *Libellus de dignitate sacerdotali* and telling scriptural passages⁴¹.

37 Fol. 78v: [Ez 22,26] *ET POLLUERUNT SANCTUARIA MEA, id est templi et altaria immunda reddiderunt quia posuerunt ibi imaginem Baal, et INTER SANCTUM [HOMINEM add. cod.] ET PROFANUM, id est a uera religione separatum, NON HABUERUNT DISTANTIAM, id est non fecerunt discretionem, ET INTER POLLUTUM ET INMUNDUM [MUNDUM] NON INTELLEXERUNT. Precipiebatur quippe in lege ut leprosus aut quilibet immundus super animam mortui ostenderet se sacerdoti et iudicio illius mundus et immundus discerneret. Sed illi nullam fecerunt discretionem inter sanctum et peccatorem. Verum per hos sacerdotes nostri temporis sacerdotes designantur qui utique legem contempnunt et sanctuaria polluunt quando episcopi aut etiam presbyteri propter impositionem manus munera dant uel accipiunt, nullamque faciunt discretionem inter peccatorem et sanctum qui uidelicet debent accedere ad sacrum ordinem qui nonnullam inter profanum et mundum nisi pecuniae habent distantiam. A quibus utique peccator diues honoratur. Peccator autem pauper eicitur et anatematizatur. ET A SABATIS [SABBATIS] MEIS AVERTERUNT OCULOS SUOS. Sabbatum enim requies interpretatur quoniam qui ab opere rurali cessant, meditationibus diuinarum scripturarum insistere debent. Sed sacerdotes qui tunc temporis erant et qui nostri etiam sunt dum terrenis rebus insistunt et conuiuuiis ac potibus se resoluunt a sabbato, id est a scriptura diuina, suos oculos auertunt. ET COINQUINABOR [COINQUINBAR] IN MEDIO ILLARUM [EORUM]. Quando enim ille qui fidem rectam habere debet, peccatum aliquid perpetrat, coinquinatur Deus in opere illius quia quicquid peccatur in religione ab homine in Dei conuertitur iniuriam. In the margin opposite the last sentence of this passage: *Terribilis sententia.**

38 Haymonis ... In diui Pauli epistolas expositio In epistolam II ad Corinthios, MIGNE PL 117, col. 634A (*et in his omnibus non quaerat laudem humanam, sed Dei gratiam; non hominibus placere, sed Dei praeceptis obedire*); In epistolam ad Ephesios, col. 729A–B (*Sed ista omnia in timore Christi sunt agenda, id est pro amore Dei, non causa adulationis, nec patrocinationis, quod quidam faciunt ut possint inuenire gratiam praelati, et ut liberius quae eos delectant operentur*); In epistolam ad Hebraeos, col. 854B (*Confundit autem ac percutit beatus Apostolus sacerdotes cupidos honoris, et sacerdotii avidos, qui sponte immittunt se et ingerunt ad ministerium sacerdotale, non uocatione Dei vel uoluntate, sed potius interuentu munerum: quia non pro salute populi, sed pro ambitione saeculi hoc agunt*).

39 I owe these references, but not the analysis, to HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 300–301.

40 S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri *Commentariorum in epistolam ad Galatas libri tres*, MIGNE PL 26, col. 312B–C.

41 MIGNE PL 17, cols. 567–580. At col. 576B, Pseudo-Ambrose included a vivid quotation attributed to a man-made bishop that caught Haimo's eye: *Ab archiepiscopo sum nuper episcopus ordinatus, centumque ei solidos dedi ut episcopalem gratiam consequi meruissem, quos si minime dedissem,*

Ad Romanos
(MIGNE PL 117: 364A–B)

Tertium, quod ab homine est tantummodo, et non a Deo cum favore hominum aliquis eligitur, non pro bona conversatione, neque causa religionis, sed nobilitatis parentelae: seu cum quis pretio subrogatur in sacerdotii dignitatem: de quorum numero dicit uni beatus Ambrosius episcopus: Nisi centum solidos dedisses, hodie episcopus non esses. De istorum etiam numero erant illi de quibus dicitur in libro Regum [3 Rg 13,33], qui temporibus Jeroboam implebant manus suas et fiebant sacerdotes idolorum. De istis ergo talibus dicit Dominus per prophetam [Os 8,4]: »Ipsi regnaverunt, sed non ex me: principes exstiterunt, et non cognovi.«

Ad Galatas
(MIGNE PL 117: 669D–670A)

Tertium, quando ab homine tantummodo et non a Deo cum favore hominum aliquis eligitur non pro bona conversatione, vel quando pretio subrogatur in sacerdotium, de quibus dicebat beatus Ambrosius: O episcope, certe nisi centum solidos dedisses, hodie episcopus non fuisses. De quibus etiam in libro Regum dicitur [3 Rg 13,33]: Temporibus Jeroboam »quicumque implebat manum suam muneribus, fiebat sacerdos« idolorum. Ideoque isti tales inter eos sunt reputandi, de quibus Dominus per prophetam dicit [Jer 23,21+32]: »Ipsi veniebant et ego non mittebam eos.« Omnes quotquot venerunt fures sunt et latrones.

Ad Ephesios
(MIGNE PL 117: 700C)

Tertium genus est quod ab homine tantummodo et non a Deo, cum favore hominum aliquis eligitur, non pro bona conversatione, neque causa religionis, sed pretio subrogatur in sacerdotii dignitatem: de quorum numero dicit uni beatus Ambrosius: O episcope, vere nisi centum solidos dedisses, hodie episcopus non esses. De istorum etiam numero erant illi de quibus dicitur in libro Regum [3 Rg 13,33], quia temporibus Jeroboam implebant manus suas, et fiebant sacerdotes idolorum.

The slight variations among these passages and the liberties that Haimo took with his sources merit reflection. In the first part of each excerpt, Haimo described apostles of the third type as made not by God, but by the favor of men – and not for the quality of their lives or on account of religion, but for a price. Commenting in *Ad Romanos* he added another ingredient to the pecuniary: *causa ... nobilitatis parentelae*, on account of noble relations. At Auxerre in Haimo's day such connections counted for a great deal – as did their absence. Haimo also added an original touch to the passage he found in Pseudo-Ambrose. Pseudo-Ambrose had a putative bishop crowing about how he had acquired his episcopacy: »I was recently ordained bishop by the archbishop. I gave him a hundred solidi so that as a result I might be worthy of the episcopal privilege; if I had given less, I might not be a bishop today. It was better for me to bring gold in a little chest than to lose such a priesthood. I gave gold and got a bishopric«⁴².

hodie episcopus non essem; unde melius est mihi aurum de locello invehere, quam tantum sacerdotium perdere. Aurum dedi, et episcopatum comparavi. Although its title suggests a general treatment, the *Libellus* actually focuses almost exclusively on bishops. Haimo's use of the *Libellus* may be the earliest reference to the text. See *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, ed. Eligius DEKKERS and Aemilius GAAR (CCSL), 3rd ed., Turnhout 1995, p. 54 (no. 171a).

42 See above, n. 41.

In his rendition of the passage, Haimo turned his source around to make Ambrose rebuke the venal bishop: »If you had not given a hundred solidi, you would not be bishop today« (*Ad Romanos*). The passage became even more pointed in his *Ad Galatas* and *Ad Ephesios* versions where Haimo had Ambrose use the vocative case: »O bishop«. Haimo wanted to warn and to correct and for that purpose it was necessary to put the words of admonishment in the mouths of the true apostles, Ambrose to be sure, but also the biblical prophets and Haimo himself.

Haimo added the story of evil King Jeroboam from Kings to each of the commentaries because Jeroboam provided a fine example of a man who made apostles out of anyone and, as Haimo added in *Ad Galatas*, for the sake of gifts (*muneribus*). The *Ad Romanos* and *Ad Galatas* passages include an additional biblical lesson. In *Ad Romanos*, Haimo cited Osee 8,4, »They made kings but not through me. They set up princes, but without my knowledge«, to establish the point that divine approval was withheld from improperly constituted authorities. Although the reference to kings and princes seems incongruous in a comment on apostles, it may not have seemed out of place in Haimo's historical environment at Auxerre. The *Ad Galatas* reference apparently draws on two phrases in Jeremiah 23 of the same tenor as the verse from Osee. Haimo's *Ipsi veniebant et ego non mittebam eos* conflates Ier 23,21, *non mittebam prophetas et ipsi currebant* with v. 32, *cum ego non misissem eos*, again to establish the point that not all prophets are sent by the Lord.

In the Carolingian church, the bishops, priests, and abbots were supposed to fill the role of modern Ezechiels – watchmen »for the house of Israel; whenever you hear a word from my mouth, you shall give them warning from me« (Ez 33,7). Their task was to announce the judgment of God and call the people to repentance. But watchmen chosen for their wealth and family connections and mired in their own sin, neglectful and disobedient, could not warn the people who thus would remain impenitent. In God's eyes, Haimo noted, such unworthy watchmen were murderers since their people lost not only their present lives, even as the just must do, but also their eternal lives as well⁴³.

43 Fol. 105r-v: [Ez 33,2] *ET DICES inquit AD EOS, TERRA, id est cognatio hominum multorum, CUM INDUXERO SUPER EA [EAM] GLADIUM, id est fame, pestilentiam, et caetera propter iram / meam quia peccauerunt mihi [subaud del. corr.] ET TULERIT POPULUS [TERRAE VIRUM om. cod.] UNUM, subauditur hominem, DE NOVISSIMIS SUIS, id est de humilibus iuxta quod Dominus dicit, Qui uoluerit esse inter uos maior, sit omnium nouissimus [Mc 9,34], ET CONSTITUERIT EUM SPECULATOREM SUPER SE, id est episcopum, abbatem, aut in caeteris aecclisiae ordinibus illum sublimauerit, [Ez 33,3] ET ILLE, qui praelatus est, VIDERIT GLADIUM, id est Dei sententiam, VENIENTEM [SUPER TERRAM om. cod.] ET CECINERIT BUCINA, id est diuina praedicatione insonuerit iuxta illud, Super monte excelsum ascende et annuntia populo meo peccata eorum ex altans uocem tuam quasi tuba et caetera [Is 40,9; 58,1]. ET ANNUNTIAVERIT POPULO ut paenitentiam agat [Ez 33,4] AUDIENS AUTEM QUIQUIS ILLE EST SONITUM [SONUM] BUCINAE, id est praedicationem ex ore illius, aut rex uidelicet, aut mendicus, aut diues, aut pauper, aut quaecumque persona, NON SE OBSERUAVERIT, id est paenitentiam non egerit, ET TULERIT EUM GLADIUS, id est diuina sententia et mortuus fuerit, SANGUIS IPSIUS SUPER CAPUT ILLIUS [EIUS] ERIT, hoc est peccatum illius super eum permanebit. Sanguinis enim nomine peccata designantur iuxta quod Psalmista dicit, Libera me de sanguinibus Deus [Ps 50,14], id est de peccato homicidii et adulterii. Diuinam praedicationem audiuit et paenitentiam non egerit, peccatum illius super eum erit, id est cum eo manebit. In populo Iudeorum tunc temporis quando ista propheta dicebat, speculatores erant reges et sacerdotes qui populo legem*

Haimo saw other threats to the true faith, especially heresy spread by those who take biblical passages out of context and join them incongruously, effectively tearing the Lord's seamless tunic⁴⁴. And, ranging himself alongside the intellectual conservatives of the Carolingian *renouatio*, he criticized those who put their trust in the liberal arts of rhetoric and dialectic rather than in the truth of the church⁴⁵. But it was the princes and priests who overturned Israel and in Haimo's own day it was the princes and priests, not the scholars, who were chiefly responsible for corrupting the church. The Auxerre monk was not alone in his concern for the spiritual and moral health of Carolingian Europe, the New Israel. His critique of the venality and corruption of Carolingian society can be joined to those of Theodulf of Orléans in his

Dei annuntiare debebant. In aeclesia autem sunt speculatores episcopi, presbyteri, abbates, caeterisque qui praesunt aliis. Isti enim sicut hic dicitur si uiderint Dei imminere sententiam et annuntiauerint subditis ut paenitentiam agant, ipsi uero inpaenitentes extiterint populus quidem merito suae iniquitatis peribit, hii autem gaudebunt et laetabuntur, accipientes pro suo labore mercedem. Si autem quilibet audiens eorum praedicatione paenitentiam egerit animam suam, id est uita sua, seruauit. [Ez 33,6] QUOD SI SPECULATOR VIDERIT Dei uenire sententiam ET NON INSONUERIT BUCINA ut paenitentiam subditi agant et populos NON SE OBSERVAVERIT [CUSTODIERIT] quia non fuit qui annuntiaret VENERITQUE GLADIUS ET TULERIT ANIMAM DE EIS ILLE QUIDEM IN INIQUITATE SUA CAPTUS EST, SANGUINEM AUTEM EIUS, ait Dominus, DE MANU TUA REQUIRAM. Si enim ille qui perditus est in sua iniquitate audisset diuinam praedicationem poterat agere paenitentiam. Sed quia speculator negligens et inoboediens fuit, et non annuntiauit illi ut paenitentiam ageret et ipse quidem morietur non tantum morte presenti, quam etiam iusti moriuntur, sed et aeterna. Porro speculator in conspectu Dei homicida deputabitur quia nec liberabit illum sua iustitia. At the head of this passage, in the margin, De his qui praesunt in aeclesia.

- 44 Fol. 54v: [Ez 16,16] *ET SUMENS DE VESTIMENTIS MEIS ... FECISTI TIBI EXCELSA HINC ET INDE CONSUTA ... ET FORNICATA ES SUPER EIS [cod. HIS]. ... Si autem allegoricae haec uaria uestimenta intellexerimus, est sensus: Quod omnia praecepta legis et diuitias ac rerum omnium abundantiam et sapientiam gratiam a Deo percepit, non ipsi sed idolis deputauit. Nostrae autem Hierusalem, hoc est aeclesiae quae uisio pacis dicitur, si ab hereticis scinditur qui uaria testimonia scripturarum de propriis locis carpentes, nituntur ea coniungere his quibus non queunt coaptari ista conueniunt [cod. cum ueniunt], quoniam per hanc incongrua commixtionem diuiditur, cum debuerit esse sicut Domini tunicam desuper texta per totum et nullam recipere scissionem.*
- 45 Fol. 118v: [Ez 38,11] *ASCENDAM AD TERRAM ABSQUE MURO ... VECTES ET PORTAE NON SUNT EIS, id est nullum habent munimen, non rethoricam, non dialecticam, caeterasque artes liberalium disciplinarum. His enim uectibus et portis muniti sunt haeretici et in hoc maximam habebant fidutiam.* Fol. 120r: [Ez 38,20] *ET SUBVERTENTUR MONTES ... ET CADENT SEPES, sepes munimentum prestant segetibus et defendunt illas, ideoque per sepes dialectica et rethorica designantur et caeterae artes in quibus illi confidebant. Verumtamen omnis haec confidentia quam in his artibus habebant caecidit, quia non potuerunt illos defendere sui ex omni parte constricti sillogismi, repugnante [cod. repugnant te] ecclesiastica ueritate. See also Haimo's Scolia quaestionum, ed. QUADRI, I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre (n. 5 above) p. 129,1–3: *Dominus Iesus et apostoli non artem dialecticam nobis tradiderunt et vanam uerborum fallaciam, sed puram scientiam fidei bonis operibus observandam*; and, Haymonis Halberstatensis episcopi Historiae sacrae epitome, sive De christianarum rerum memoria libri decem, MIGNE PL 118, col. 851A–B. One wonders here what Haimo thought when Heiric of Auxerre, his most illustrious student, went to study with Lupus of Ferrières, the self-styled »Demosthenes« (Servati Lupi Epistulae, ed. Peter K. MARSHALL, Leipzig 1984, Ep. 46 [p. 59,12] = Loup de Ferrières, Correspondance, ed. and trans. Léon LEVILLAIN, 2 vols., 2nd ed., Paris 1964, Ep. 54 [vol. 1, p. 218]) and with John Scottus (Eriugena). (Note: the order of Lupus of Ferrières's letters adopted in Marshall's edition follows the order in Lupi abbatis Ferrariensis epistolae, MGH, Epp.Karol.Aevi 4, ed. Ernst DÜMMLER, Berlin 1902).*

Contra iudices, of Hincmar of Reims in his *De cauendis uitiiis et uirtutibus exercendis*, and of the many authors of the political dream literature analyzed by Paul Edward Dutton. Hincmar's treatise, written at the request of King Charles the Bald, is especially pertinent. The archbishop borrowed extensively from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob*, but departed significantly from his source when, in place of Gregory's emphasis on pride (*superbia*), he followed Paul in warning Charles that greed (*auaritia*) was the root of all evil⁴⁶.

Sancti patres in monasterio beati Germani

That Haimo aimed his harshest words at corrupt bishops and priests suggests, *pace* Edmond Ortigues⁴⁷, a monastic critique of abuses in the episcopal and presbyteral church. Haimo never held monks up for criticism or correction in the Ezechiel commentary or in any other commentary for that matter⁴⁸. One wonders, in fact, where the monks were in Haimo's world. The monastic church appears in the commentary only rarely and then only as one of the enumerated ecclesiastical orders. Perhaps because Ezechiel's world contained only princes and priests, but not monks, Haimo had no opportunity to weave monks more integrally into his commentary. But perhaps monks were everywhere in his commentary as its audience. They were the just men, not elected to their positions, but chosen by God⁴⁹.

To understand the concerns of the commentator and his audience, it helps to understand the political and historical context of Auxerre during the Carolingian period. From the middle of the eighth century on, Auxerre served as a key center in the network of episcopal and monastic cities Carolingian rulers liberally used to build and maintain their power base. The bishopric of the wealthy city was especially useful as a reward to loyal Bavarian families who, in effect, constituted a »Bavarian occupation« of the city for much of the Carolingian period⁵⁰. During

46 Theodulf: MGH, Poet.lat. 1, p. 493–517; see especially Lawrence NEES, *A Tainted Mantle: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court*, Philadelphia 1991, p. 21–143. Hincmar: Hincmar von Reims: *De cauendis uitiiis et uirtutibus exercendis*, MGH, Quellen zur Geistesgesch. des Mittelalters 16, ed. Doris NACHTMANN, Munich 1998; for *auaritia*, see p. 132. Paul Edward DUTTON, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire*, Lincoln and London 1994.

47 ORTIGUES, Haymon (n. 9 above) p. 196: »[O]n ne perçoit dans l'oeuvre d'Haymon aucune tension entre les évêques et les moines« (again, apropos of the commentaries on Romans and the Apocalypse).

48 RIGGENBACH, *Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare* (n. 5 above) p. 72: »Nur selten ist von den Mönchen die Rede«.

49 Fol. 105v: [Ez 33,7] *ET TU FILI HOMINIS SPECULATOREM DEDI TE. Quasi diceret, »Non populus te aelegit sic superius dictum est, sed ego constitui principem et speculatorem«. Et quod Iezechiel dicitur omnibus aecclisiae praepositis aptatur. HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 282–286, has plausibly suggested that the Pauline commentaries had their genesis as liturgical homilies prepared for Haimo's monastic community. The same may be true of the Ezechiel commentary which lists Germanus, the community's patron, among the *boni doctores*, fol. 109v: [Ez 34,17] *Arietes quippe sunt boni doctores, Hieronimus uidelicet, Augustinus, Germanus, et caeteri qui exemplo et doctrina sua ducatum prestant unicuique perueniendi ad uitam aeternam.**

50 The term occurs on the last page of Josef SEMMLER, *Zu den bayerisch-westfränkischen Beziehungen in karolingischer Zeit*, in: *Zs. für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 29 (1966) p. 344–424; Yves SASSIER, *Les Carolingiens et Auxerre*, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 28, depicted Bishop Christian

Charles the Bald's reign (840–877) when Haimo was active, his monastery of Saint-Germain was deeply involved in the political life of the kingdom. As part of the kingdom bestowed on him by his father in 837, Auxerre figured prominently in Charles's political strategies as one of the *honores* he used to gain and hold the loyalty of the warrior aristocracy in his struggles with his half-brothers. The dominant figures in Auxerre during Charles's reign were Count Conrad of Argengau and his sons Hugh and Conrad junior, brother and nephews respectively of Charles's mother, Empress Judith. More than nepotism was at work here. Like Judith and Auxerre's bishops, Conrad and his sons were from Alemannia to the east. When they tilted toward Charles, they tilted away from his brother, Louis («the German»). In the 850s Charles appointed his cousins Hugh abbot of Saint-Germain and Conrad junior count of Auxerre. Their support and that of Bishop Abbo (857–860), another royal appointee, proved crucial to Charles's political survival in the difficult years 858–859 when Auxerre was Charles's Valley Forge⁵¹.

Where did Haimo, monk and scholar, fit in this supercharged environment of lay abbots and political bishops? Auxerre's history is relatively well documented for the ninth century. With Saint-Denis in Paris and Saint-Martin in Tours, Saint-Germain was in very distinguished company among Carolingian monasteries. Charles the Bald visited several times and issued some 18 charters for Auxerre's bishops and counts, for Saint-Germain's abbots, and for the monastery's monks⁵². These documents record donations and ratify previous gifts and exchanges of property. Two ninth-century cathedral canons, Rainagola and Alagus, set down the history of the bishops of Auxerre⁵³. Heiric, a monk of Auxerre and one of Haimo's pupils, wrote

(860–873), *natione Alemannus*, »parachuting« into Auxerre. See also Joachim WOLLASCH, *Das Patrimonium beati Germani in Auxerre: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der bayerisch-westfränkischen Beziehungen in der Karolingerzeit*, in: *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des großfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels*, ed. Gerd TELLENBACH (Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte, 4), Freiburg i. Br. 1957, p. 185–224; and Josef SEMMLER, *Episcopi potestas und karolingische Klosterpolitik*, in: *Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau*, ed. Arno BORST (Vorträge und Forschungen, 20), Sigmaringen 1974, p. 350–352.

51 See SASSIER, *Les Carolingiens et Auxerre* (n. 50 above) p. 28–32; Janet L. NELSON, *Charles the Bald and the Church in Town and Countryside*, in: EAD., *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe*, London and Ronceverte 1986, p. 87–88; and, EAD., *Charles the Bald*, London and New York 1992, p. 177–179, 189–190, 312. After Emperor Lothar, Charles's half-brother, died in September 855, the monks of Saint-Germain might have proved helpful in drawing Lothar's son and successor, Lothar II, to Charles's side; see T. DELFORGE, *Une »Vita sancti Germani« pour Lothaire II*, in: *Scriptorium* 22 (1968) p. 39–42.

52 *Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve, roi de France*, ed. Arthur GIRY, Maurice PROU, Ferdinand LOT, Georges TESSIER, 3 vols., Paris 1943–1955, no. 124 (850; Bishop Heriboldus); no. 156 (853; monks of Saint-Germain and Abbot Hugh); no. 195 (840–857; Bishop Heriboldus); no. 200 (859; monks of Saint-Germain); nos. 214–215 (859; Abbot Hugh and monks of Saint-Germain); no. 233 (861; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 234 (859–861; Abbot Hugh); no. 235 (861; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 260 (859?–863; Count Conrad); no. 261 (863; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 262 (864; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 267 (853–864; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 268 (860–864; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 269 (864; monks of Saint-Germain); no. 288 (866; Abbot Boso and monks of Saint-Germain); no. 396 (850–861 or 866–875; Abbot Hugh and community of Saint-Julian of Auxerre); no. 437 (877; Saint-Julian of Auxerre).

53 *Ex gestis episcoporum Autisidorensium*, ed. Georg WAITZ, MGH Script. 13, Hannover 1881, p. 393–400 (cap. 1–41 = MIGNE PL 138, cols. 219–259). See Pierre JANIN, *Heiric d'Auxerre et les*

accounts in prose and poetry of the *Miracles of Saint Germanus*, with special emphasis on the translation of the saint's relics in 859⁵⁴. Heiric even recorded autobiographical notices alongside a calendar, including references to the translation of Saint Germanus in 859 and the appointments in 864 and 865 of King Charles's sons, Lothar and Carloman, as abbots of Saint-Germain⁵⁵. Finally, Lupus of Ferrières, whose uncle Angelelmus (807–824) and brothers Heriboldus (824–857) and Abbo (857–859/860) served as bishops of Auxerre, wrote five letters to Auxerre, three to Heriboldus and two to the monks of Saint-Germain. The letters document at least one visit to the monastery, the exchange of students between Auxerre and Ferrières, and the deposit of the *ornamenta* of Ferrières in Saint-Germain for safekeeping⁵⁶.

Haimo's name appears nowhere in this relatively abundant contemporary documentary record. Were it not for Haimo's own reference in the Ezechiel commentary to Saint Germanus as one of the *boni doctores*, the only other source that places him in the monastery of Saint-Germain would be the twelfth-century Anonymous of Melk⁵⁷. It is as if the prolific and astute critic who composed at least 17 commentaries and a *précis* of early church history never existed.

There are, in fact, four brief ninth-century references to Haimo, three of them concern his role a teacher and monk⁵⁸.

Gesta pontificum autissiodorensium, in: *Francia* 4 (1976) p. 89–105; with reservations by Riccardo QUADRI, *Sulla data di morte di Eirico di Auxerre*, in: *Studi Medievali* 24 (1983) p. 355–366.

- 54 *Miracula sancti Germani*, Migne PL 124, cols. 1207–1270 (Ex Heirici *Miraculorum S. Germani* libro II, MGH *Script.* 13, p. 401–404); *Vita sancti Germani episcopi Autissiodorensis*, MGH, *Poet. lat.* 3, ed. Ludwig TRAUBE, Berlin 1896, p. 428–517. See also Jean-Charles PICARD, *Les Miracula sancti Germani d'Heric d'Auxerre et l'architecture des cryptes de Saint-Germain: Le Témoignage des textes*, in: *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre: Intellectuels et artistes dans l'Europe carolingienne, IX^e–XI^e siècles*, Auxerre 1990, p. 97–101; Dominique IOGNA-PRAT, *Le Texte des Miracula sancti Germani et son intérêt pour l'histoire des idées politiques*, in: *ibid.* p. 101–104; Peter Christian JACOBSEN, *Die Vita s. Germani Heirics von Auxerre: Untersuchungen zu Prosodie und Metrik*, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 329–351.
- 55 *Heirici monachi S. Germani Autissiodorensis Annales breves*, MGH *Script.* 13, p. 80. See Joachim WOLLASCH, *Zu den persönlichen Notizen des Heiricus von S. Germain d'Auxerre*, in: *DA* 15 (1959) p. 211–226, and, especially, QUADRI, *I Collectanea* (n. 5 above) p. 5–21.
- 56 *Servati Lupi Epistulae* (n. 45 above), ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 19 (p. 25); Ep. 37 (p. 50–51); Ep. 95 (p. 93–94); Ep. 115bis (p. 111); Ep. 116 (p. 111–112) = ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 97 (vol. 2, p. 114–116); Ep. 95 (*ibid.* p. 108–122); Ep. 96 (*ibid.* 112–114); Ep. 113 (*ibid.* p. 158); Ep. 115 (*ibid.* 2, p. 160–166). In Paris, BNF, lat. 2858, the unique manuscript of Lupus's letters, a folio is missing between Ep. 115 and Ep. 115bis (ed. MARSHALL). If the letters to Saint-Germain were grouped together, as they appear to have been (Epp. 115bis + 116, ed. MARSHALL), additional letters to the monks at Auxerre, including one that might have mentioned Lupus's most famous student, Heiric of Auxerre, may have been lost. For Lupus's intimate ties to Auxerre, see Louis HOLTZ, *L'école d'Auxerre*, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 131–146.
- 57 See above, n. 49. Anonymous of Melk, in: QUADRI, *Aimone di Auxerre* (n. 5 above) p. 12–13: *Haimo vir sapiens, apud Autysiodorum ad sanctum Germanum sub professione monastica degens, multa et varia conscripsit opuscula.*
- 58 Brief ninth- and tenth-century references to his work are not included in this count. See CONTRENI, *Haimo of Auxerre's Commentary on Ezechiel*, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 230, 236–237; also, ID., *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930: Its Manuscripts and Masters*, Munich 1978 (*Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung*, 29), p. 60, n. 76, for a note from Haimo's commentary on the Apocalypse inscribed on the last leaf of Vatican, Pal. Lat. 1649, fol. 36v (Priscian, *Partitiones duodecim uersuum Aeneidos principalium*).

- Muretach, the Irish grammarian who taught at Metz and knew Bishop Drogo of Metz (823–855) and Emperor Lothar I (844–855), seems first to have taught at Auxerre. The town's name appears as an example of an adverb of place. To illustrate the use of conjunction, the grammarian paired his name with that of Haimo, *Murethach et Aimo*. The peripatetic Irish master is assumed to have been one of Haimo's teachers and his predecessor as master at Auxerre since, in Murethach's teaching, the conjunction joins what precedes to what follows⁵⁹.
- Heiric of Auxerre collected and transcribed the lessons of his two teachers, Lupus of Ferrières and Haimo, and credited Haimo with the *Scolia quaestionum* and religious instruction⁶⁰.
- Toward the end of the ninth century, a note added to a sermon assigned the sermon to Haimo and described him as »a modern abbot of monks ... in the time of Emperor Louis and his son Charles«, thus in the period from 814–877⁶¹.

A fourth reference places Haimo close to the epicenter of political power in Auxerre. A ninth-century manuscript of Quintus Curtius Rufus's history of Alexander the Great (Paris, BNF, lat. 5716, fol. 1r) bears the inscription in capitals:

HAIMUS MONACHUS HOC VOLUMEN HISTORIARUM ALEXANDRI MAGNI IN LIBRIS VIII DOMNO CHUINRADO ILLUSTRISSIMO COMITI DEDIT UT IPSE ACCOMODARE EI DIGNETUR EXPOSITIONEM HRABANI IN LIBRUM ECCLESIASTICUM AD TRANSCRIBENDUM CUIUS EXORDIUM EST, OMNIS SAPIENTIA A DOMINO DEO EST.

The strands of information embedded in this *ex-dono* lead in several interesting directions – to Haimo's extensive knowledge of Roman historians, to an exegete's interest in the work of a contemporary colleague, Hrabanus Maurus, a noted biblical commentator in his own right, to patronage networks between clerics and aristocrats, to lay literacy and libraries. But it is the Auxerre nexus that matters most immediately⁶². Of the two Conrads, father († after 862) and son († 876), it seems

59 Murethach (Muridac) In Donati artem maiorem (n. 6 above) p. 161,19, 171,7. Also Louis HOLTZ, Murethach et l'influence de la culture irlandaise à Auxerre, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 147–156; Bernhard BISCHOFF, Muridac doctissimus plebis, ein irischer Grammatiker des IX. Jahrhunderts, in: ID., *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols., Stuttgart 1966–1981, vol. 3, p. 51–56.

60 I Collectanea di Eirico di Auxerre, ed. QUADRI (n. 5 above) p. 78 (praefatio): *His Lupus, his Haimo, ludebant ordine grato, / Cum quid ludendum tempus et hora daret. / Humanis alter, divinis calluit alter: / Excellet titulis clarus uterque suis*; p. 113 (Scolia quaestionum): *His quoque discipulos mulcebat plausibus Haimo / Iocundos lepidos doctus amare iocos*.

61 CONTRENI, Haimo of Auxerre, Abbot of Sasceium (n. 8 above) p. 306: *De expositione cuiusdam moderni abbatis monachorum in territorio Autisioderensis nomine Haimonis temporibus Hludowici imperatoris et filii eius Karoli sententia in epistolam Iohannis evangelistae ad locum Quoniam tres sunt qui testimonium dant*.

62 And that the monk Haimus/Haimo paired in the inscription with Count Conrad and the biblical exegesis of Hrabanus Maurus can only be Haimo of Auxerre seems to me to be beyond doubt. See Janet L. NELSON, Charles le Chauve et les utilisations du savoir, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 45, n. 66, and QUADRI, Aimone di Auxerre (n. 5 above) p. 15–17. Hrabanus Maurus's commentary on Ecclesiasticus (MIGNE PL 109, cols. 763–1126) was apparently written in the late

more likely that the Conrad of the inscription was the father whose connection both to Hrabanus and Auxerre is documented in another source. Around 853 Bishop Heriboldus of Auxerre (827–857) included in the pouch of a »messenger of Count Conrad« bound for Hrabanus, then bishop of Mainz (847–856), a long list of questions bearing on homicide, fornication, greed, sorcery (*maleficia*), magic, sexual practices, penance, and the deposition and restoration of the recently deceased Bishop Ebo of Reims (816–835; 840–841) and Hildesheim (845–851)⁶³. Conrad senior's ties to Auxerre, specifically to Saint-Germain, were deep and intimate. Around 840, Conrad, *princeps famosissimus* to Heiric of Auxerre who related these events, began to go blind in one eye. »A crowd of *medici* from the palace and every part of the kingdom« tried their best to cure the eminent man. Their cures failed and Conrad was scheduled to have the eye cauterized with iron. After an anxious and sleepless night and in deep pain, Conrad, in search of better medicine, prostrated himself before the tomb of Saint Germanus. The place was strewn with plants (*herbis*) which Conrad gathered and held over his eye for a while to cool it. When he took his hand away from his face, his sight began to return. Thus, Conrad escaped the »menacing terrors of the *medici*« (*minaces medicorum terrores*) and Germanus gained a most devoted prince. Conrad proved his devotion by undertaking with his wife Adelheid, who actually supervised the project, the rebuilding of the sixth-century church of Saint-Germain and refurbishing of its crypts⁶⁴. If the translation of Saint Germanus to his new resting place in the crypt on January 6, 859, in the presence of King Charles himself marked the end of the project, Conrad and Adelheid must have been familiar and very special figures to the monks of Saint-Germain for the better part of two decades. And since Haimo *monachus* had a book that he knew *illustrissimus comes* Conrad might like to have and, in turn, wanted a book copied that he knew Conrad owned, it seems reasonable to assume that the monk and devout count were more than passing acquaintances in Auxerre. They shared common intellectual interests in history and biblical exegesis.

Haimo's relationship with Count Conrad reveals that Haimo's world extended beyond the schoolroom, library, and scriptorium. A marginal note inscribed in the Quintus Curtius manuscript might even suggest Haimo's tangential involvement in contemporary political strife. On fol. 64r, the marginal note *Nota tibi prouerbi[um]* directs the reader's attention to VI.x.5–6 of Curtius's history, a passage in which Philotas, accused of conspiring against Alexander, protests his innocence of the plot: »For my part, I do not see with what crime I am charged; no one among the conspir-

830s and dedicated to Bishop Otgarius of Mainz (826–847) sometime between c. 835 and c. 840: see Hrabani (Mauri) Epistolae, Ep. 21, MGH Epp. 5, ed. Ernst DÜMMLER, Berlin 1898–1899, p. 426–427. If it can be assumed that Haimo was seeking a relatively recent commentary, that would put his request to Conrad sometime in the late 830s or the early 840s, a period when Conrad's ties to Auxerre became intimate (see below).

63 See the dedicatory letter to Heriboldus in Hrabanus Maurus's Poenitentiale (MIGNE PL 110, cols. 467–494) and in Hrabani (Mauri) Epistolae, Ep. 56, MGH Epp. 5, ed. Ernst DÜMMLER, Berlin 1898–1899, p. 509–514: *Capitula quaedam in pittatio conscripta per nuntium Cuonrati comitis mihi allata sunt, quae de diversis quaestionibus me vobis respondere coegerunt* (p. 510,3–4).

64 Heiric of Auxerre, *Miracula sancti Germani* (n. 54 above), II, 2–7, p. 401–403 (= MIGNE PL 124, cols. 1247B–1255B).

ators names me, Nicomachus said nothing about me, Cebalinus could not know more than he had heard. And yet the king believes me to have been the head of the conspiracy«⁶⁵.

Haimo knew the Roman historians well and incorporated ancient history into his biblical exegesis. It is both possible and plausible that he wrote the note directing a reader's attention to Philotas's denial of complicity in a plot against the king. But, then, who was the reader, who was the *tibi* for whom the proverb would have some resonance? The conflicts that erupted among Louis the Pious's sons in the 840s provided fertile breeding grounds for conspiracies. Conrad and his family, who might have been playing Charles off against Louis the German, could readily have been accused of conspiracy whether true or not. Conrad's sons, according to the Annals of Fulda, had come west to spy on Charles at the behest of Louis, but ended up betraying Louis for Charles⁶⁶. One of the sons, Abbot Hugh, actually went over to Charles's rival, Lothar II, and was dismissed from Auxerre in the early 860s. Conrad's brother, Rudolf, count of Troyes and lay-abbot of Saint-Riquier, also came under a cloud of royal suspicion⁶⁷. In such an atmosphere conspiracy theories, real or imagined, no doubt abounded. According to Quintus Curtius's account, Philotas's alleged crime was not that he was a conspirator, but that he did not report his knowledge of the conspiracy soon enough.

If Haimo's ties to Count Conrad senior and his family were as intimate as the book exchange and perhaps the fascinating note on fol. 64r of the Quintus Curtius volume would suggest, then as a distinguished scholar, teacher, and monk, perhaps Haimo harbored aspirations one day with Conrad's support of leading the community at Saint-Germain⁶⁸. Hrabanus Maurus, whose exegesis Haimo so admired, became abbot of his monastery at Fulda before his appointment to the bishopric of Mainz. But such a career path was not in the cards for Haimo. The political realities of the 850s and 860s were crueler and monastic leadership at Saint-Germain was problematical. Sometime during the bishopric of Heriboldus (840–857), Lupus of Ferrières wrote to the bishop concerning John, »one of your monks«. John had come to Ferrières, presumably from Saint-Germain, and now with other monks had

65 Quintus Curtius, ed. and trans. John C. ROLFE, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass. and London 1956, 2: 88–89: *Equidem, cuius criminis reus sim non video; inter coniuratos nemo me nominat, de me Nicomachus nihil dixit, Cebalinus plus quam audierat scire non potuit. Atqui coniurationis caput me fuisse credit rex!*

66 See The Annals of Fulda, trans. Timothy REUTER, Ninth-Century Histories 2, Manchester 1992, p. 43 (s.a. 858). SASSIER, *Les Carolingiens et Auxerre* (n. 50 above) p. 31 and NELSON, *Charles the Bald* (n. 51 above) p. 179, both argue that Conrad's sons joined Charles the Bald in 852/853, five or so years earlier than the report of the defection in the Annals of Fulda.

67 SASSIER, *ibid.*; NELSON, *ibid.* p. 178 (citing Hincmar of Reims in 857).

68 Heiric of Auxerre's fulsome description of Abbot Hugh as heir to the honor and glory of his father (*Ex Heirici Miraculorum S. Germani*, n. 54 above, II,5, p. 402,31–49) suggested to SASSIER, *ibid.* p. 29–30, that Conrad senior might have served at some point as abbot of Saint-Germain. Heiric's commemoration of Conrad and Adelheid presented the couple as out-doing each other in monastic virtue (*ut difficile iudicare sufficeret, uter eorum in religionem pronior, in sanctos ferventior, in pauperum diligentiam copiosior appareret*; *ibid.*, 401,10–11) and as benefactors, not oppressors *servorum Dei* (*ibid.*, line 16). WOLLASCH, *Das Patrimonium beati Germani* (n. 50 above) p. 193, thought that Conrad's governance of the monastery was »wohl möglich«.

been called back to Auxerre by the bishop. Lupus asked Heriboldus if he might keep John at Ferrières because of his usefulness and the poverty (*indigentia*) of John's monastery. One wonders where John's abbot was in all this? In another letter, this one dated to early 862, Lupus again wrote to Auxerre, but to the »holy fathers« of Saint-Germain, not its abbot. Apparently the abbot's office was vacant for several years after Abbot Hugh's dismissal until King Charles appointed his own son, Lothar, abbot in 863⁶⁹. After Lothar's death in December, 865, an otherwise unknown Abbot Boso seems to have been briefly in charge (January 866), before Charles turned to his other son, Carloman, already abbot of Saint-Medard in Soissons, and made him abbot of Saint-Germain and, shortly after, of Saint-Amand as well⁷⁰. By the time Charles had his rebellious son blinded in 873, Carloman had apparently ceased serving as abbot of Saint-Germain: Heiric of Auxerre in his calendar entry had no idea how long Carloman had been abbot and an Abbot Asper appeared sometime between 866–870⁷¹. By the 870s, Abbot Hugh was again a power in Auxerre⁷².

In the 850s, 860s and 870s the abbacy of Saint-Germain became available many times, but unlike Hrabanus Maurus, Haimo was never called to take the post. Powerful princes controlled church affairs and placed monasteries and cathedrals in the hands of other powerful men esteemed more for their political and military assets and family connections than for their scholarship and spirituality⁷³. As Haimo knew, money mattered and the priests of his time, preferring earthly things, turned their eyes from the divine scriptures. At Auxerre it must have seemed to Haimo that the just men chosen by God as Israel's true watchmen (Ez 33,7) had been shunted aside for apostles made by men who valued patronage, flattery, and worldly ambition more than virtue. Today, Haimo noted, many secular men, jealous of the just men in the church, mock them and, conspiring against them, persecute them. Haimo may even have had King Charles in mind when he offered his audience the example of King Jeroboam as a ruler who improperly constituted priests⁷⁴.

69 Servati Lupi Epistulae (n. 45 above), ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 19 (p. 25); Ep. 116 (p. 111–112) = ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 97 (vol. 2, p. 114–116); Ep. 115 (vol. 2, p. 160–166).

70 See above n. 52 (no. 288).

71 Heirici monachi S. Germani Autisiodorensis Annales breves (n. 55 above), s.a. 865 (p. 80,19–20): *Karlemannus abbatiam Sancti Germani accepit, incertum quanto tempore habiturus*. For Asper, see WOLLASCH, *Das Patrimonium beati Germani* (n. 50 above) p. 217, and p. 208–218 for an attempt to reconstruct the chronology of Saint-Germain's abbots; with pertinent reservations by QUADRI, *I Collectanea* (n. 5 above) p. 3–28. See Eckhard FREISE, *Kalendarische und annalistische Grundformen der Memoria*, in: *Memoria: Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. Karl SCHMID and Joachim WOLLASCH, Munich 1984, p. 527–534, where p. 530, Waitz's reading of Heiric's entry for 861, *Exultatio mundaliorum sancti medardi*, is corrected to *Exultatio monachorum sancti medardi*. For comment on this important revision, see Riccardo QUADRI, *Del nuovo su Eirico di Auxerre*, in: *Studi Medievali* 33 (1992) p. 217–228.

72 See above, n. 52 (nos. 396 and 437).

73 See NELSON, *Charles the Bald* (n. 51 above) p. 233–234, for Charles's dependence on his bishops and abbots, especially on men such as Abbot Hugh of Auxerre and elsewhere: »His case highlights the special utility to the king of that ecclesiastical anomaly the cleric-abbot, who made no monastic profession, but lived off *honores* and fought like a layman, yet (as a cleric) could leave no legitimate heir«.

74 See above, n. 36 and p. 40–41.

Managing Holiness in the Carolingian Age

The counter examples of Hrabanus Maurus and Lupus of Ferrières may be instructive for understanding Haimo's situation at Auxerre. Both men, like Haimo, were monks and considerable scholars, but unlike their Auxerre counterpart, they rose to positions of political and religious leadership in the Carolingian world. What made the difference? In the Carolingian age, as Richard E. Sullivan has perceptively observed, monastic life underwent a fundamental change in its relationship to the »outside« world. Monks pursued holiness in ever closer proximity to worldly people: »to be a monk involves coping with worldly people and activity: being holy is defined by how this involvement was managed«⁷⁵. Hrabanus Maurus and Lupus of Ferrières knew how to manage this involvement.

Hrabanus traveled in the highest political circles and although he was deposed as abbot of Fulda by King Louis in 842, his career rebounded when five years later he made his peace with Louis who appointed him archbishop of Mainz (847–856). Hrabanus certainly addressed his exegesis to his contemporary, especially royal, audience⁷⁶. But his exegetical style was less personal, less pointed than that of Haimo and consisted for the most part in the skillful arrangement of large excerpts from the *patres* to make his points. His Ezechiel commentary, for example, consists of long passages from Ezechiel followed by passages from Gregory the Great and Jerome with occasional, usually prefatory or concluding, statements by Hrabanus. Haimo's technique was to cite only a verse or two from Ezechiel to which he joined his own long interpretation. Where the reader or *auditor* of Hrabanus's commentary would experience an almost continuous text of Ezechiel interspersed with relevant passages from Hrabanus's principal sources, Haimo's monastic audience would experience his extended meditations on individual verses (often partial verses followed by *et caetera*). In Hrabanus's commentary, the critical passage that so inspired Haimo, *principes eius in medio illius quasi lupi* (Ez 22,27), was buried in a chapter-long block of text (Ez 22,1–31)⁷⁷. Hrabanus's reader, after first going through the entire chapter of Ezechiel, then read an excerpt from Jerome, followed by an excerpt from Gregory, before arriving at Jerome's treatment of Ez 22,27, an interpretation which, in comparison to that of Haimo (*Per leones designantur episcopi, per lupos autem pres-*

75 Richard E. SULLIVAN, What was Carolingian Monasticism? The Plan of St Gall and the History of Monasticism, in: *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart*, ed. Alexander Callander MURRAY, Toronto 1998, p. 251–287 (p. 278 for the quotation). See also Otto Gerhard OEXLE, Les Moines d'Occident et la vie politique et sociale dans le haut Moyen Age, in: *Revue Bénédictine* 109 (1993) p. 255–272.

76 See above, n. 10, and the next note for the important studies of Mayke De Jong.

77 Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentariorum in Ezechielem libri viginti*, in: MIGNE PL 110, cols. 739A–B, at line 12 of 26 lines comprising Ez 22. See above, n. 32, for the placement of this verse in Haimo's commentary and his immediate comment. Mayke de Jong noted that Hrabanus initially hesitated to compose the Ezechiel commentary Emperor Lothar requested because of the implications of Ezechiel's message for their troubled times, see EAD., The Empire as Ecclesia: Hrabanus Maurus and Biblical *historia* for Rulers, in: *Using the Past in Early Medieval Europe: Politics, Memory and Identity*, ed. Yitzhak HEN and Matthew INNES, Cambridge 2000, p. 207–208 (p. 191–226).

biteri, etc.) can only be described as pallid⁷⁸. If Emperor Lothar, for whom Hrabanus composed his commentary, and other readers were to draw any contemporary lessons from Ezechiel's terrible indictment, they were left on their own to do so. There was no mistaking Haimo's point on the matter.

Lupus of Ferrières's ability to cope with worldly people is well documented in his correspondence. Here one can observe Lupus exploiting personal connections at court and elsewhere to protect his own position and that of his monastery⁷⁹. As in Hrabanus's experience, high political involvement was not without its perils for monks. In 844 Lupus led troops into battle in Aquitaine, narrowly escaping death only to be captured and imprisoned. Lupus recounted his harrowing service to King Charles in a letter to Abbot Marcward of Prüm (829–853)⁸⁰. In the same letter, after requesting a copy of Suetonius, arranging for tutelage in the German language for several of his young monks, and reporting on the poor wine harvest that year, Lupus almost casually mentioned at the end of the letter the problems he was having with laymen who wanted to »invade« his monastery⁸¹. Lupus knew what to do in such threatening situations. He swung into action and wrote to Abbot Louis of Saint-Denis, a former monk of Ferrières and, more significantly in the circumstances, King Charles's archchancellor from 840 to 867. Lupus had earlier written to Louis in the name of his predecessor, Abbot Odo of Ferrières. In 840, Odo was concerned that palatine clergy had their eyes on monasteries such as his and he wanted Louis's protection⁸². Four years later when Lupus found himself in the same situation, he named a name. Rumor had it that Ferrières had been given to a certain Egilbertus, perhaps when it was thought that Lupus had been killed in battle during the campaign in Aquitaine. Lupus wanted Louis to remind King Charles of his services and his loyalty: *meam fidem et seruitium*⁸³. He also wrote to Charles directly, composing a mini-*Furstenspiegel* for the twenty-one year old king in which he counseled Charles not to act hastily and to »Seek counsel always of a wise

78 Ibid., col. 739B–C (Jerome), col. 739C–740A (Gregory), 740A–741A (Jerome): *Prophetae igitur sive duces leonibus comparantur, principes autem quos inferioris gradus homines intelligimus, luporum imitantur rapinam, ut effundant sanguinem non corporum, sed animarum, et avare sectantur lucra, nequaquam illo contenti* (col. 740C–D).

79 See Thomas F. X. NOBLE, Lupus of Ferrières in His Carolingian Context, in: *After Rome's Fall* (n. 75 above) p. 232–250.

80 *Servati Lupi Epistulae* (n. 45 above), ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 91 (p. 88–90) = ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 35 (vol. 1, p. 154–158).

81 *Sterilitatem vini superiore anno passi sumus. Aliis rebus pro tempore habundamus et largiente dei gratia aliquantula pace fruimur, nisi quod saeculares quidam, qui uellent nostrum inuadere monasterium, nobis moliuntur insidias*, *ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, p. 89,37–90,2 (ed. LEVILLAIN, *ibid.*, p. 158).

82 *Ceterum fama uersatur inter nos clericos palatii diuersorum coenobiorum sibi dominium optare atque poscere, quibus nulla sit alia cura nisi ut suae auaritiae oppressione seruorum dei satisfaciant*, *ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 25, p. 32,31–33 (ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 16, vol. 1, p. 96). Abbot Wala of Corbie, a Jeremiah of the 830s according to Paschasius Radbertus in his *Epitaphium Arsenii*, was also concerned about lay intervention in monastic life and especially the dangers posed by the palace chapel; see David GANZ, *The Epitaphium Arsenii and Opposition to Louis the Pious*, in: *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. Peter GODMAN and Roger COLLINS, Oxford 1990, p. 536–550, esp. p. 545–546.

83 *Ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 92, p. 90 (ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 36, vol. 1, p. 158–160).

man« (Tobias 4,19), a man, in fact, very much like Lupus, experienced, well read, and holy⁸⁴.

The strategy worked and Lupus remained at the helm of his monastery, but managing a relationship with worldly people took constant attention. The letter Lupus wrote to the holy fathers at Auxerre almost twenty years later in 862 is eloquent on this point. Lupus felt compelled to write to the monks of Saint-Germain because he had chosen to lodge with them in the autumn of 861 when King Charles and his entourage came to Auxerre and »occupied« nearly all the neighboring monasteries. But attendance on the king, which he could not avoid, kept Lupus from companionship with his monastic brethren and even prohibited him from thanking the monks for their hospitality when he had to depart hurriedly with the king⁸⁵. Several months later he sent his letter via personal emissaries to explain his dilemma: service to the king required compromise.

This was a compromise that Haimo might not have been willing to make. Because he could not or would not effectively manage relationships with worldly men, the king, counts, *vicarii*, political bishops, lay abbots, and the palatine clerics Lupus feared, in short, the »entourage social laïque«⁸⁶ of the 850s and 860s, Haimo may have left (or been encouraged to leave?) Auxerre for Sasceium 60 km away as early as the 850s⁸⁷. Sasceium in the eighth century served as a refuge for monks from Nîmes fleeing Saracen incursions. Sasceium's connections with the south were reinforced in 878 when Abbot Trudgaudus completed the restoration of the monastery's basilica, undoubtedly with the assistance of Bishop Wala of Auxerre (873–879) who, contrary to custom, chose Sasceium, not Saint-Germain, for his burial place. The translation of Saint Baudelius's relics from Nîmes to Sasceium, the crowning event in the monastery's restoration, was aided by Bernard, *Gothorum princeps*, and several Septimanian bishops and abbots⁸⁸. Sasceium during Haimo's abbacy is completely undocumented. If we accept the suggestion that Haimo's proximate roots reached to Spain and imagine that Sasceium was one of the houses touched by the reforms of

84 »*Consilium semper a sapiente perquire.*« *Sapientem hic intellegimus, quem aut experientia docuit aut lectio erudiuit aut inspiratio diuina caeteris praetulit*, *ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 93, p. 91,13–15 (ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 37, p. 162). Lupus was implying that Charles should prefer him to Egilbertus, a rival with whom Lupus could hardly bear comparison: ... *magnam indignitatem facile comprehendatis me cum praedicto Egilberto conferri*, *ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 92, p. 90,18–19 (ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 36, vol. 1, p. 160).

85 *Postquam per carissimum propinquum Remigium et gratissimum auditorem meum Fridilonem sanctitati uestrae satisfacimus, ostendentes uotum nostrum, quibus reniti non ualebamus, mandata regis alio quam uellemus auertere. Discessuri ne gratias quidem in conuentu referendi copiam habuimus, quoniam moras omnes differendae legationis impossibilitas auferebat*, *ibid.*, ed. MARSHALL, Ep. 116, p. 111,26–31 (ed. LEVILLAIN, Ep. 115, vol. 2, p. 162–164).

86 OEXLE, *Les Moines* (n. 75 above) p. 269–270. The pious Count Conrad senior and Adelheid, his wife, who outdid each in monastic virtue and never oppressed the servants of God (see above, n. 68) would be exceptions.

87 See CONTRENI, *Haimo of Auxerre* (n. 8 above) p. 317, where Haimo's approximate tenure at Sasceium was given as 865–875. See the appendix below for an attempt to establish a new chronology of Haimo's life.

88 *Ibid.* p. 314–316; Dom C. DE VIC and Dom J. VAISSÈTE, *Histoire générale de Languedoc*, 10 vols., Toulouse 1875, vol. 5, cols. 1–4; *Gallia christiana*, 16 vols., Paris 1739–1874, vol. 6, cols. 168b–170a.

Benedict of Aniane earlier in the ninth century, Haimo may have found Sasceium more congenial to his vision of monastic life than Saint-Germain had become⁸⁹.

It would be tempting to suggest that Haimo's critique of the Carolingian church embedded in his Ezechiel commentary reflected personal disappointment. But that would diminish the value of his observations and stand the story on its head. Although the precise inspiration and sources of his exegesis cannot yet be fully determined, Haimo's critique of the church and especially of the disruptive role laymen played in it courses through all his exegesis as a pervasive and clearly articulated theme, one that was most fully developed in the Ezechiel commentary. Haimo never finished his comments on Ezechiel, which break off suddenly at Ez 39,29 (fol. 122v, line 7). The truncated commentary presumably was a work of his last days⁹⁰. Its circulation was limited and confined to monastic circles: the sole surviving copy is from Saint-Germain in Auxerre and two other copies were listed in inventories from Cluny and Corbie, a restricted manuscript tradition in marked contrast to the many copies of Haimo's other commentaries⁹¹. The fate of the Ezechiel commentary mirrors the obscurity of the man whose final audience was the struggling community at Sasceium. A Carolingian Ezechiel, Haimo and his commentary were incendiary and raised too many uncomfortable questions about the new order of the ninth century. As he told his monks, he saw all about him the decline of human governance, *ut discedant omnia regna a regno*, that presaged the end times⁹². Such a man and such a message did not charm the powerful in Haimo's world.

Appendix

This attempt to place Haimo's Ezechiel commentary within the context of Carolingian political and religious culture has also involved rethinking the chronology of Haimo's life and monastic career. Contemporary sources are few and contradictory. The most recent investigation of these matters put it aptly: »doch viele Fragen bleiben noch offen«⁹³.

One question worth pursuing concerns Haimo's relationship with the Irish grammarian, Murethach (note 59). Louis Holtz's suggestion that Murethach taught at

89 See HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 206, 279–280, 329–330, 333. Heil underscored Haimo's intellectual affinities with the work of Theodulf of Orléans and Claudius of Turin, two *Hispani*.

90 The comments that follow in the Paris manuscript down to fol. 160v are the work of others. See CONTRENI, *Haimo of Auxerre's Commentary on Ezechiel* (n. 58 above) p. 238–239.

91 Ibid. p. 242, n. 36, and STIRNEMANN, *L'illustration* (n. 11 above) p. 93; an anonymous ninth-century Ezechiel commentary, *sans commencement ni fin*, once at Auxerre may have been Haimo's, see *ibid.* p. 104, n. 25. For manuscripts of Haimo's other works, see BURTON VAN NAME EDWARDS, *The Carolingian Biblical Exegesis Homepage* (n. 2 above) and IOGNA-PRAT, *L'œuvre d'Haymon* (n. 4 above) p. 157–179.

92 In *epistolam II ad Thessal.*, MIGNE PL 117, col. 780B: *His verbis* [2 Thess 2,1–4, that the day of judgment »will not come, unless the rebellion comes first«, *ut discedant omnia regna a regno*, *ibid.*, col. 779D] *demonstravit Apostolus Thessalonicensibus, non prius venturum Dominum ad iudicium, qui regni humani defectio fieret, quod jam nos impletum videmus, et Antichristum apparere in mundo qui interficiet Christi martyres.*

93 HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 277.

Auxerre *before* moving to Metz in the 840s certainly is reasonable and would mean that Murethach was associated with Haimo in the 830s. In what capacity? Placing his own name before that of Haimo in his example of the use and force of the conjunction *et* certainly establishes Murethach's own sense of precedence. Holtz has suggested that the *Murethach et Aimo* example dates from 844–855 when Murethach »published« his commentary after leaving Auxerre⁹⁴. The example, in this interpretation, was Murethach's acknowledgement that Haimo succeeded him as master in Auxerre after his departure. But why would Murethach continue to use »Auxerre« as an example of an adverb of place once in Lotharingia? The references to Haimo and Auxerre in Murethach's commentary make more sense as artifacts of Murethach's teaching in Auxerre in the 830s. And in this period, the relationship between the two men may well have been one of master (grammarian and cathedral school) and master (exegesis and monastic school), rather than master (Murethach) and pupil (Haimo). In other words, it may be worth thinking of Murethach and Haimo as colleagues, even friendly rivals, in the 830s. That Haimo owned a Quintus Curtius manuscript, probably in the early 840s (see above, note 62), that he could use to bargain with Count Conrad suggests that he was already by that time a master of some experience, stature, and unusual literary resources, not a beginner.

At the other end of Haimo's life, there is the information provided by the inscription prefixed to the Leiden sermon (note 61 above) specifying that the *expositio* was by »a modern abbot of monks in the territory of Auxerre by the name of Haimo in the time of Emperor Louis and his son Charles«. A note added above »Auxerre« identifies Haimo's monastery as Sasceium. But what of the chronological reference? Did the author of the note mean to imply that Haimo was abbot of Sasceium as far back as the reign of Louis the Pious (814–840) or simply (and less perplexingly) that his monastic career spanned the reigns of the two rulers? That Haimo was an abbot before 840 hardly seems credible, but that he was known to have been active before 840 is credible.

All efforts to fix dates to Haimo's career depend ultimately, albeit indirectly, on the precise details Heiric, his only known student, provided on his own life and that Riccardo Quadri masterfully reconstructed (note 55 above). Heiric recorded that he was born in 841, tonsured at age 9 in 850, ordained subdeacon at age 18 in 859, moved to Soissons in the early 860s, was ordained a priest there in 865, and in the same year was ordered to return to Auxerre. Quadri's reconstruction of Heiric's career placed the peripatetic young monk in nearby Ferrières where he studied with Lupus sometime after September, 859 (after Heiric's ordination as subdeacon) to 862 when, presumably, Lupus died⁹⁵. Within this framework Heiric would have studied with Haimo, according to Quadri, from 855/856 to 859. But the beginning date seems arbitrary and Haimo could just as well have been teaching Heiric earlier in the 850s.

94 HOLTZ, *Murethach et l'influence de la culture irlandaise à Auxerre*, in: *L'école carolingienne* (n. 4 above) p. 151.

95 QUADRI, *I Collectanea* (n. 5 above) p. 14–15; see also ID., *Del nuovo su Eirico di Auxerre* (n. 71 above).

Assuming, as I did, that Haimo left Auxerre for Sasceium in 865 on the evidence of Heiric's return home that year to take up teaching duties is also arbitrary (see note 87). Other masters might have intervened between the magistracies of Haimo and Heiric. That Lupus recruited young Auxerre monks in 861 to come to Ferrières to study with him suggests a hiatus in instruction at Saint-Germain⁹⁶. Apparently, Haimo was no longer on the scene by the early 860s and could already have been at Sasceium. This hypothesis would explain his absence from the Auxerre sources clustered around the translation of Saint Germanus to the new crypt in January 859. If Haimo's abbacy at Sasceium began earlier than previously suggested, earlier, that is, than 865, it may well have ended earlier than 875 as well. The completion of Abbot Trudgaudus's renovation of the old basilica, *jam vero vetustam*, at Sasceium in 878 was undoubtedly an undertaking of many years. The account of the completion of the project and the translation of the relics of Saint Baudelius mentions Sasceium's founding abbots, Romulus, Odo, and Wala, and current benefactors, but not Haimo. Once again, the impression one forms is that Haimo was long gone by 878 and that if anyone then remembered him at all, it would have been as abbot of a run-down monastery.

But Haimo was probably working on the Ezechiel commentary, his last work, at Sasceium when he died and left the work unfinished. Haimo's intellectual activity usually is dated to 840–860 on the internal evidence of Heiric's *Collectanea* which he compiled from notes he had taken when a student with Haimo and Lupus. The *Scolia quaestionum* based on Haimo's instruction contains three references to Ezechiel⁹⁷. The substance of the solia accurately reflects the substance of the commentary, but the solia are not *verbatim* excerpts from a written commentary. Haimo no doubt posed certain problems from Ezechiel to his students based on his reading and reflection, the substance of which would later be recorded in slightly different words in the commentary. It seems reasonable to assume that Haimo taught Ezechiel in the 850s, but it does not necessarily follow from the evidence of the *Scolia quaestionum* that he had a written commentary to hand by the time Heiric left Auxerre in 859. The uncompleted written commentary could well have taken shape sometime after 859.

One other implication of this readjustment of the chronology of Haimo's teaching career that places its beginning in the 830s, *in temporibus Hludowici imperatoris*, and its end at Sasceium in the 860s should be considered. Johannes Heil's discovery of Haimo's Spanish roots opens entirely new approaches toward understanding Haimo and the inspiration for his exegesis. Haimo's Spanish heritage is suggested

96 *Servati Lupi Epistulae* (n. 45 above), Ep. 115bis, ed. MARSHALL, p. 111 = Ep. 113, ed. LEVILLAIN, p. 159. See QUADRI, I *Collectanea* (n. 5 above) p. 14–15. The date of this letter is not certain, but it would seem to predate a letter of 862, Ep. 116, ed. MARSHALL, p. 111–112 = Ep. 115, ed. LEVILLAIN, p. 160–166, in which Lupus mentioned a Fridilo, *auditorem meum*, who is most probably the Fridilo whose name can still be read on a fresco in the crypt of Saint-Germain (HOLTZ, *L'école d'Auxerre*, n. 56 above, p. 133).

97 QUADRI, I *Collectanea* (n. 5 above) identified two Ezechiel solia from Haimo's lessons at p. 113,21–23 – 114,1–14 and p. 115,23–26. But a third scolium, headed IN EZECHIELE, *ibid.*, p. 117,9–12, also approximates Haimo's comments on Ez 28,12 at fol. 96r.

not only by his continuous and comfortable reference to Jews and to a lesser extent to Saracens (traits difficult to comprehend in an Auxerrois), but also can be detected in implied personal references to Spain⁹⁸. Heil also detected intellectual affinities between Haimo and Bishop Theodulf of Orléans (c. 780–821), not in terms of direct borrowing, but more fundamentally in terms of intellectual and analytical traits⁹⁹. Orléans and Theodulf's monasteries along with nearby Auxerre were all located in the province of Sens. Further research would no doubt amplify this important discovery. For the moment it suffices to note that locating Haimo's birth early in the ninth century permits us to imagine Haimo spending his formative teenage years studying directly with the Visigoth Theodulf, a monastic reformer and formidable biblical scholar¹⁰⁰.

98 HEIL, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion?* (n. 7 above) p. 199, 206, 333–334. See *In epistolam ad Romanos*, Migne PL 117, col. 363B, where Haimo borrowed from Origen to explain how some Roman names descended from conquered peoples as Parthicus from the Parthians and Gothicus from the Goths. But Haimo dropped the example of the Goths and substituted Germanicus from the Germans. At *ibid.*, col. 419A–B, Haimo paired a Gaul with a Spaniard when he described the principle of the »personality of the law«: *Verbi gratia: Romanus quanto tempore vivit, sub dominio Romanae legis consistit, Gallus et Hispanus similiter, Judaeus et Christianus, monachus et canonicus, quanto tempore vivunt, sub dominio legis suae vivunt.*

99 *Ibid.*, p. 206, 328–330.

100 A preliminary version of this essay was presented in June 1998 at the conference »L'étude de la Bible d'Isidore à Remi d'Auxerre/The Study of the Bible from Isidore to Remigius of Auxerre« (Université de Paris IV Sorbonne and Institut de France, Paris).