
Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 24/1 (1997)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.1997.1.60707

Rechtshinweis

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.

struktes demontiert hat und Waltraud Joch Chalpaida als zweite, vollgültige Gemahlin Pippins des Mittleren wahrscheinlich machen konnte. Daher ist noch für das endende 7. Jh. von polygamen Heiratsgewohnheiten auszugehen, wobei eben nicht zwischen verschiedenen Eheformen unterschieden wurde. In diesem Zusammenhang ist darauf zu verweisen, daß die Agilolfingerin Swanahild seit längerem in der Forschung als vollgültige Gemahlin Karl Martells und nicht etwa als dessen Friedelfrau angesehen wird. Bei der namenkundlichen Argumentation ist eigens auf die methodischen Schwierigkeiten hinzuweisen, die auch der Verfasserin bewußt sind. Dennoch ist ihr etwa entgangen, daß ›Grifo‹ möglicherweise die Kurzform von ›Garibald‹ war, wie dies Joachim Jahn kürzlich zur Diskussion stellte, und nicht von ›Grimoald‹. Doch dies sind nur Randbemerkungen zu einem Werk, das eine beeindruckende Gesamtschau der fränkischen Gesellschaft und ihrer Wandlungen in der Karolingerzeit bietet.

Matthias BECHER, Paderborn

Hubert MORDEK, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta. Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrschererlasse*, München (Monumenta Germaniae Historica) 1995, XLV–1158 p. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Hilfsmittel, 15).

The MGH edition of the *Capitularia Regum Francorum* begun by Alfred Boretius and completed after his death by Victor Krause and Albert Werminghoff never stated the criteria for selecting the 200 documents it classed as capitularies. Though the editors used far more manuscripts than the nineteen which had been the basis for Baluze's 1677 edition, they gave an inadequate picture of how the texts of Carolingian capitularies had been preserved and collected. In preparation for a new critical edition Professor Mordek has now given descriptions of all manuscripts of Frankish royal capitularies (excluding narrative sources), detailing which texts they contain, giving the foliation of each capitulary, printing the rubrics, incipits and explicits, how the *capitula* are numbered in the manuscript, a brief account of the other texts in the manuscript and a bibliography for each manuscript. A separate index lists the manuscripts of each capitulary text, making it possible to see how widely it was copied. (There is no documentation for the conciliar texts.) Mordek has worked closely with Gerhard Schmitz, who is about to publish a new edition of Ansegis's collection of capitularies, and they use the same sigla for manuscripts. They are to be congratulated on the detailed listing of additional capitulary materials which are included in copies of Ansegis and Benedictus Levita.

The most frequently copied capitularies are Herstal 779, the *Admonitio Generalis* and other legislation of 789, the legal reforms of 803, the legislation of 818/9, the Worms capitularies of 829. The 853 capitularies of Charles the Bald have survived in 12 copies, as has the edict of Pîtres, but most of Charles' capitularies are not found in more than 6 copies. Mordek describes 49 manuscripts of the *Capitulare Monasticum III* of 817, in contrast to the 8 manuscripts used by Boretius, and in his third appendix he gives a full list of the manuscripts of Louis the Pious' monastic reform legislation of 816, including excerpts.

The volume ends with the texts of 27 capitularies or fragments not edited by Boretius, (though some were printed by Baluze). They include an ecclesiastical capitulary of Charlemagne with 43 sections and a general capitulary which may date to 813, 2 capitularies for Italy perhaps of 813 linked to the 813 Mantua capitulary, the recently discovered leaf of 18 *capitula* headed *De his capitulis interrogandum est* which seems to be an agenda for discussion at an assembly, an important *capitula* of Louis the Pious against conspiracies and collective oaths, a decree of Charles the Bald on those who enter churches and violate their immunity, and 15 texts preserved in the collection of Benedictus Levita, including a decree on

those who hold ecclesiastical property *per verbum domni regis* and a decree instructing *missi* to work with bishops to restore church property.

The *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta* needs careful reading, and Mordek's five page forward gives little hint of what he has discovered. Important discussions of how collections were assembled and transmitted are found in the manuscript descriptions on pages 401 (a collection assembled in the reign of Charlemagne); 422–3 (on the *Leges Scriptorium* active under Louis the Pious); 589–90 and 600–1 (on Reims collections and Hincmar's part in their compilation); 677 (on the earliest Italian collections); 709 (on the copies of Ansegis with the 829 Worms *capitula*, here called the Ansegis-Worms Corpus); and 865–7 (on the lost ninth century Beauvais manuscript copied in the *Leges Scriptorium* of which Mordek has identified a portion surviving in Vat. Reg. Lat. 980 and a sixteenth century copy unknown to Boretius in B. N. Lat. 1567). Mordek changes our view of two important manuscripts by revealing that they were originally much larger collections. Leiden, BPL 114 has lost at least 56 leaves which are now Paris, B. N. Lat. 4629, and The Hague, Meermanno-Westreenianum, 10 D 2 is the continuation of Berlin, Phill. 1745. The Leiden-Paris manuscript is a lawbook with the *Epitome Aegidii* of the *Lex Romana Visigothorum*, Marculf's *Formulae* and *Formulae* from Bourges, followed by the *Lex Salica*, the *Decretio Childeberti* and six capitularies of 803–5, and the *Lex Ribuaria*. The *Lex Salica* is followed by two short dialogues about the Trinity and about Christian virtue, and the manuscript ends with a brief treatise on orthography, the epitaph of Alcuin, and Fortunatus' poem in praise of Palatina, wife of Bodegisil. Zeumer dated the latest of the Bourges *Formulae* in this collection to 805, which is the date of the latest capitulary. Since the Leiden volume has a Carolingian binding it may have been separated from the Paris portion soon after completion: only the Paris portion was copied in the tenth century into Berlin, Phill. 1736. Mordek suggests that this collection of Frankish law may be connected with Charlemagne's court. But the poems which introduce the Bourges *Formulae*, printed by Zeumer in *MGH Formulae* p. 167–8, are addressed to an unknown abbot Andreas of Bourges, who is clearly regarded as the author's patron. Is this a volume assembled in response to Carolingian control of Aquitaine and the heightened status of the archbishop of Bourges? It clearly deserves a detailed study.

The Berlin-Hague collection was made at Reims and served as an exemplar, (it was copied in B. N. Lat. 4638). It begins with a copy of Ansegis with additional inserted extracts from capitularies of Louis the Pious, followed by the 829 Worms legislation of Louis the Pious and the collection of Benedictus Levita, and then an important chronological collection of capitularies issued by Charles the Bald between 843 and 856. Mordek suggests that both the layout and the quality of the text makes this manuscript the archetype for Reims manuscripts of the Ansegis-Worms Corpus, in contrast to Classen's assertion that the text has errors not shared by other manuscripts. The *Bibliotheca* also redates B. N. Lat. 4637, a ninth century revised text of Ansegis, and B. N. Lat. 10753, a ninth century Burgundian collection of Roman and Frankish laws with two capitularies of Charlemagne. (Boretius had regarded both as tenth or eleventh century copies.)

The survival of Carolingian capitularies, especially those without obvious ecclesiastical content, was a hazardous process. Very few official copies have survived, but careful reading of Mordek's manuscript descriptions makes it possible to trace stages of their transmission. The earliest stage, the single document which might be copied on a roll, has survived in fragments now in Munich Clm. 29555/2 with the 813 capitula otherwise known only from Ansegis, and a roll in Colmar with Louis the Pious' *capitula* for the Aachen Reform synod of 816. Both of these documents were drawn up by one of the participants at the council. A sheet in the archives in Vienna with Louis' letter to archbishop Adalramm of Salzburg of 19th June 823 about the formal freeing of slaves before their ordination, copied at Salzburg, represents the local transcription of a court document. This may be the equivalent of the

paginam que coram domino imperatore et nobis omnibus lecta est mentioned in an early ninth century St Denis document, MGH Formulae p. 509.

A few manuscripts indicate that capitulary texts were directed to specified missi responsible for a particular region. New manuscripts of the *capitularia missorum specialia* of 802 sent to Sens, Aquitaine and Arras are discussed on p. 552–3. On p. 953 Mordek lists two new manuscripts of Louis the Pious's 816 letter to archbishops about the Aachen reform council, one for Agobard of Lyons and one for Magnus of Sens. And in Paris B. N. Lat. 4626 he has found capitula 9 and 15 from the 805 *capitula missorum* headed *Excarpsum capituli Domno imperatore Karoli quem Jesse episcopus ex ordinatione ipsius Augusti secum detulit omnibus hominibus notum faciendum*. Each of these new finds will clarify how capitularies were sent out to recipients.

In order to understand the status of capitulary texts, and their function as normative and symbolic legislation as well as practical measures for implementation, it is essential to explore how they have been transmitted. The very earliest manuscripts to contain capitularies include only a very few texts in anthologies of patristic and canonical materials often copied for bishops or abbots. Mordek lists three important early manuscripts, Gotha Membr. I 85 of c. 800, from Wissembourg, and Vat. Pal. Lat. 574 of c. 800, copied near Lorsch, each of which contain the same collection of canon law; and Paris B. N. lat. 2796 with canon law and patristic texts dating from c. 815. All three contain just one capitulary, (MGH Cap. nr. 13) issued by Pippin in 751–5, but they were unknown to Boretius who used later witnesses. Such episcopal collections often included the *Admonitio Generalis*, for which Mordek lists 41 manuscripts. Munich Clm 14508 and St Gall 679 are ninth century manuscripts which make the *Admonitio* the basis for a canon law collection, and Trier 1202/501 is an important early ninth century copy unknown to previous editors.

The Bibliotheca reveals how collections of capitularies developed. Bern 89 + A 26 is an early ninth century manuscript of the Dionysio-Hadriana preceded by four leaves with the 755 Ver capitulary and canonical and penitential texts. Mordek suggests that this unsystematic and unofficial assemblage may be the first witness to a Sens collection found in the twin late tenth century legal collections B. N. Lat. 9654 and Vat. Pal. Lat. 582. The early ninth century St Bertin manuscript Brussels 8654–72 contains a commentary on the Gospels and an important collection of creeds and canon law with the *Admonitio Generalis* and two other 789 capitularies and additional exegetical and computistical materials. It may suggest that a small collection of Charlemagne's capitularies had been assembled before 800. Leiden Voss Lat. Q. 119 is a late ninth century manuscript of Roman and barbarian law codes with capitularies of Pippin and Charlemagne, including two unique capitularies of 768 and 789 relating to Aquitaine, and an 802 capitulary for an Aquitanian *missaticum*. Mordek suggests that this manuscript preserves the collection of an Aquitanian *missus*, perhaps the Adalardus who records expenses for wheat for his men in a note at the bottom of folio 139v. But very few other manuscripts provide evidence for lay ownership. A further collection assembled in the reign of Charlemagne is in a manuscript unknown to Boretius: Cologne, Bodmer 107, containing the *Leges Ribuarum*, *Alamannorum*, *Baiuvariorum*, *Salica* and the 779 capitularies of Herstal, the *capitulare missorum* of 803, and capitularies of 806 and 805. Nürnberg Cent. V, App. 96 is a manuscript of the *Lex Salica Karolina emendata* with capitularies from 779 to 811 in chronological order, copied in the first half of the ninth century, apparently by a West Frankish scribe working in Germany. Mordek links this collection to that in Montpellier H 136 and dates it to the reign of Charlemagne. The Montpellier manuscript adds Roman law and four capitularies of 818/9 and Mordek suggests that it may be linked to the *Leges Scriptorium*. (His account of the *Leges Scriptorium*, the major source of copies of Roman and Germanic lawcodes with and without a few capitularies of Louis the Pious or Charlemagne, is an important modification of Rosamond McKitterick's article in *MIÖG* 101, 1993, 3–16.) Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. Samml. 1943 40 was not used by Boretius. It

is a late ninth century southern French collection of laws, with *formulae* for letters to emperors and popes, four capitularies of 818/9 and a set of homilies. The *formulae* (edited by Zeumer, MGH *Formulae* p. 265–82) suggest to Mordek that this is a copy deriving from a court manuscript.

It is not clear whether any of these collections had an official status. But manuscripts assembled for Carolingian rulers have survived. St Paul in Carinthia MS 4/1, a collection of Lombard laws and all the laws needed to rule the various peoples now dwelling in Italy, was made for King Bernhard of Italy, and Mordek dates it between 1 November 816 and December 817. There is a frontispiece showing an unnamed ruler and a female figure, here identified as Bernhard and Ecclesia. A comparable collection, more lavishly illustrated, was copied by Lupus of Ferrières for count Eberhard of Friuli in 836. Mordek identified and published the oldest witness, a Freiburg fragment, in *Deutsches Archiv* (48, 1992, p. 609–613). Here he also gives full descriptions of the tenth century copies in Gotha Membr. I 84 and Modena O.I.2. Lupus' collection begins with a list of emperors from Augustus to Louis the Pious, and includes capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious (which were deleted) and Lothar, and the Worms capitularies of 829. Mordek notes that Lupus provided rubrics for many of these capitularies, but sadly does not transcribe them.

In the second half of the ninth century Reims was the major centre for the copying of capitularies. In addition to the important anthology B. N. Lat. 10758 assembled by Hincmar, several manuscripts of Ansegis' collection were copied at Reims: St Gall 727 (Ansegis and Benedictus Levita); Milan, Ambr. A 46 inf. which combines the Ansegis-Worms Corpus and the 853 and 857 capitularies of Charles the Bald with canon law collections into an integrated collection with its own list of chapters. New Haven, Beinecke 413 is a de luxe volume containing Ansegis with the two capitularies of Pîtres and the 873 Quierzy capitulary, Vat Pal. Lat. 973 from the Reims region combines Ansegis with brief canon law texts, Pseudo Cyprian and the 852 council of Mainz. Paris B. N. Lat 4280 A is a Reims collection of canon law which includes four capitularies of 818/9.

Though capitularies were not issued in east Francia they were copied there. Vat. Pal. Lat. 289 was copied at Mainz c. 825, and includes Charlemagne's Saxon capitularies. Vat. Pal. Lat. 582 includes a collection from early in the reign of Louis the Pious, the Ansegis-Worms Corpus, and capitularies and councils of Charles the Bald and is close to Regino of Prüm's source for the *de synodalibus causis*.

Munich Clm 19416 is an Italian collection copied in southern Bavaria at the end of the ninth century. Augsburg and Freising copied extensive collections of Carolingian capitularies in the tenth century, and there are tenth century Bamberg and Metz copies of the Ansegis-Worms Corpus. Of later manuscripts Dietrich von Nieheim's early fifteenth century transcription of a Corvey copy of the 806 *Divisio regnorum* is particularly interesting, since he claimed to be copying a text written by Adalhard of Corbie/Corvey.

In his second appendix Mordek sketches the reception of the capitularies in canon law, and includes descriptions of lost manuscripts preserved in library catalogues and problematic references to capitulary collections.

Much may be learned about attitudes to legislation from a careful reading of the headings which Mordek prints. The full page explicit in the *Leges* manuscript Paris B. N. Lat. 18238 reads *Explicunt Capit. Domini Clodouici Magn. Imp. Que sunt omnino custodiendi et observandi firmiter* in alternating lines of large red and brown capitals. Similarly an early Freising copy of the capitula de examinandis ecclesiasticis of 802, Clm 28135, entitles it *Iussa dominica presbiteris pertinentia est mandatum domni nostri imperatoris per universum regum suum*. A tenth century Italian copy of the 803 capitulare legibus additum, B. N. Lat. 4613, gives it the unique rubric *Haec sunt capitula que dominus Karolus magnus imperator iussit scribere in consilio suo et iussit eas ponere inter alias leges*. Such details convey the richness of the Bibliotheca's 1158 pages: not only has Mordek provided the sure footing for any

future account of Carolingian capitularies, his volume includes details which will clarify our understanding of the status of individual documents and collections, and suggestions about how and why capitulary collections were assembled. We must hope he can be persuaded to give a synthesis of the ways his magnificent catalogue has transformed our understanding of the nature of Carolingian legislation.

David GANZ, London

Susan A. RABE, *Faith, Art, and Politics at Saint-Riquier: the Symbolic Vision of Angilbert*, Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania Press) 1995, XVII–220 p.

S. Rabe s'emploie à communiquer la fascination qu'elle éprouve pour le monastère de Centula et la liturgie qui s'y déroulait. Néanmoins, ce qu'elle présente est déjà pour l'essentiel connu, grâce notamment aux travaux de C. Heitz que viennent compléter les fouilles menées par H. Bernard: par exemple, l'importance des processions, l'agencement des autels à l'intérieur de la basilique, la valeur symbolique de certains chiffres. A cet égard, l'objet de ce livre est l'analyse de la référence à la Trinité, située dans le contexte théologique assez mouvementé de la dernière décennie du VIII^e siècle (Adoptianisme, procession du Saint-Esprit, culte des images). Certes, on suivra volontiers l'auteur dans cette démarche. Cependant, s'il est aisé de démontrer l'intérêt du roi des Francs et de certains membres de son entourage pour les questions relatives à la Trinité, il est plus délicat de prouver que le modèle forgé par Angilbert est une traduction concrète des vues de Charlemagne. Pour cela, il faudrait s'attacher, plus que ne le fait l'auteur, à peser l'importance, pour Charlemagne, du monastère de Saint-Riquier. Il faudrait par exemple apprécier la portée de la visite du roi lors des fêtes pascales de l'an 800, de même que la signification, politique, de la dédicace au Saint-Sauveur. Il faudrait par conséquent tenter de comparer Saint-Riquier aux autres monastères du *regnum Francorum*. Cette enquête souffre assurément du regard trop restrictif porté sur la question, alors que l'auteur se réclame d'une démarche interdisciplinaire: en tant qu'étude sur Saint-Riquier et Angilbert, ce livre déçoit car il n'est pas assez exhaustif; à propos de la théologie carolingienne, l'auteur s'en tient aux généralités, où les citations et leur paraphrase tiennent lieu d'analyse.

Bien évidemment, l'auteur propose parfois des interprétations intéressantes, tel le parallèle entre l'*Institutio* d'Angilbert et l'*Admonitio generalis* de Charlemagne (789) – bien que les prescriptions auxquelles il est fait référence (p. 20) soient plus générales que ne le suggère l'analyse – ou celui entre les prières récitées à Centula lors des Rogations et celles dont Charlemagne exigea de tous l'apprentissage par cœur (p. 131). Le développement sur l'église dédiée à la mère de Dieu (p. 126 sq.) est particulièrement bien mené. Toutefois, l'impression que laisse la lecture de ce livre n'est pas favorable, pour plusieurs raisons. La démonstration présente certaines lourdeurs, dues en particulier à la multiplication des répétitions, non seulement des idées, mais aussi des traductions, accompagnées du texte latin (que l'on compare par exemple les pages 41 et 99, ou 76 et 96 sq.). Certaines traductions sont contestables, voire erronées. Ainsi, p. 77, c'est Louis le Pieux *qui est pius atque humilis* (v. 24) et non Angilbert. De même, à la page suivante, les vers 16 sq. ne sont pas une prière pour que Dieu accorde le pouvoir à la descendance de Louis, mais pour que Dieu daigne, «avec (Louis), régir son épouse, sa descendance et tous les fidèles». On s'étonne aussi de lire que Raban Maur fut abbé de Corbie (p. 17). Notons également qu'il est désagréable de voir sans cesse le substantif masculin «Dienst» cité comme un nom féminin. De même, il serait plus judicieux de citer, dans le corps du texte, les termes latins au nominatif et non au cas originel – ce ne serait aucunement trahir les auteurs médiévaux. Le (sic) de la note 52 p. 180 n'a pas lieu d'être. Là n'est certes pas l'essentiel, ni dans les quelques coquilles que l'on peut relever. En revanche, on se doit de souligner que la bibliographie est assez surprenante. S. Rabe étudia à Paris (p. X), mais elle n'en profita apparemment pas pour s'initier aux travaux des mé-