

**Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte**

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 30/1 (2003)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2003.1.63197

---

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.

rien für Ordnung und Einordnung einzelner Stücke liegen nicht immer auf der Hand. Um so wichtiger sind das Titel- und Incipit-Verzeichnis im Index-Band, an dessen Ende sich Addenda und Corrigenda zum ersten Teil finden. Neu hinzugekommen sind Abkürzungen von öfter herangezogenen Aufsätzen und Monographien.

Von unschätzbarem Wert sind wiederum die Angaben zur handschriftlichen Einzelüberlieferung, Grundlage für die Erforschung gerade der weniger bekannten Schriften von Alkuins umfangreichem Werk, so die Herausgeberinnen im Vorwort. – Bei aller Sprödigkeit, die in der Natur der Sache liegt, schließt dieser Band der *Clavis* einen Saal des Mittelalters auf, dessen Pracht schon der *Schlüssel* ahnen läßt.

Mechthild PÖRNBACHER, München

Mathias M. TISCHLER, Einharts ›Vita Karoli‹. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption, 2 Bde., Hannover (Hahnsche Buchhandlung) 2001, LXX–1828 p. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Schriften, 48).

By publishing this volume in all of its fullness, the Monumenta Germaniae Historica have ensured that Dr. Tischler's work will be read by few, and consulted chiefly via its indexes. A reviewer must convey what has been achieved, assess how far Dr. Tischler's exhaustive account of the 123 surviving manuscripts, the editions, and the transmission of the *Vita Karoli* is reliable, and suggest how readers interested in Einhard's purpose can use his compendium of evidence.

Tischler spells Einhard's name with a ›T‹, like the scribes of the St Gall confraternity book, though the Ghent 830 charter is signed *EGO EINHARD ABB. RECOGNOVI ET SUBSCRIPSI* and in all of his Latin works, including the brief inscription on the lost triumphal arch, the T is latinised to a D. (His loyalty to his mother tongue mean that Professor McKittrick is called Rosamund, though she signs Rosamond.) In this review I keep the traditional English spelling, following arguments best presented by Schminke in the preface to his 1711 edition.

Few of those who use the *Vita Karoli* have worried about the accuracy of the MGH edition, the nature of its chapter divisions, or the popularity of the text. Tischler has traced all the manuscripts, reports their significant variants in his discussion of each subgroup, and supplies stemmata of their affiliations at pages 588, 893, 1312 and 1658. An alphabetical list of all manuscripts (p. 17–44), manuscripts with only the Germanic names of winds and/or months from chapter 29 (p. 49–56), and lost or misidentified manuscripts (p. 65–77) is followed by a discussion of the text, the date of composition, and then detailed accounts of the full contents and history of each manuscript and its role in the transmission and reception of the text. The bulk of his book is furnished by his full descriptions of each manuscript, and anyone wishing to learn about Johannes Cuspinian, who owned two copies at the start of the sixteenth century (p. 42, 304, 527f., 562–568, 571–575, 577, 585, 689, 881, 1665), the St Denis chronicle tradition (p. 1230–1252, 1621–1644) or about the watermarks in use in Venice and Aquilea in the 1480's (p. 497) will be richly rewarded. His ›Studien‹ will be cited by everyone who has to deal with any *Vita Karoli* manuscript: what does it reveal about the reception of the work?

In 1867 Phillip Jaffé had challenged Pertz's 1829 Monumenta edition of the *Vita Karoli* by publishing an edition of which printed Walahfrid's preface about Einhard and his set of chapter titles, and used Hincmar's manuscript (with its vast collection of Carolingian legislation) for its text. Wattenbach, Waitz and Holder-Egger all revised Pertz's edition, but though Holder-Egger's 1911 text remains in print, it retains incorrect manuscript datings and readings. Most subsequent work on the text has been the product of attempts to establish facts about Roland, who is not included in the B Recensio. Tischler distinguishes between various

versions of the text: the ›Widmungsfassung‹ with Gerward's dedication to Louis the Pious (Recensio B) which was known to Walahfrid Strabo, the ›offizielle Ausgabe‹ traced back to St. Wandrille and Jumièges (Recensio A), and the ›überarbeitete offizielle Ausgabe‹ (Recensio A 5. 5 a, C) used by Hincmar. The ›Widmungsfassung‹ was the base of Walahfrid's edition, the ›offizielle Ausgabe‹ was used at Fleury and by Ademar of Chabannes. The later history of all of these versions is fully chronicled, drawing on recent studies of the textual transmission of Thegan, the Astronomer, Regino and William of Jumièges, all of which circulated with the *Vita Karoli*.

The chapter divisions used in all Latin and English editions of the *Vita Karoli* derive from editions by Bessel (1667), Schminke and Bouquet. They were used by Löwe and Staubach in their discussions of the structure of Einhard's work and the nature of his use of Suetonius. Tischler compares the divisions used by Einhard, Walahfrid and modern editors on p. 372–375 (asserting that the divisions are first found in the nineteenth century) but he does not report on the ways the manuscripts divide the text. I suggest that this is as important as the textual variants he details so fully. (What is the source of the *Acta Sanctorum* division into 10 chapters?) While Einhard refers to different topics in his text, and all early manuscripts separate Einhard's preface (if it is present), the main text and Charlemagne's will, by the eleventh century enlarged and coloured capitals are used to separate sections within the main text, and Walahfrid's decision to divide the will into several chapters was followed by others. Perhaps the most important unnoticed division is the break at c. 18 line 5 of the MGH edition at *Post mortem patris* found in A and B class manuscripts from the tenth century.

The Manuscripts: In his accounts of the Carolingian manuscripts Tischler disagrees with Bischoff about the dates of Vienna 473 and Vat. Pal. Lat 243. Vienna 473 is the subject of a very detailed study by Helmut Reimitz (MIÖG-Ergänzungsband 35, 2000 p. 34–90), it has close links with the court of Charles the Bald and scholars have tried to date it very precisely. Tischler's suggestion that Reimitz's dating would require the manuscript to be in Franco-Saxon style seems to me mistaken: Franco-Saxon manuscripts are identified by decoration rather than script, and such decoration is a function of the status of the text. The excellent display capitals in Vienna 473 include a remarkable K-shaped form of display capital H which can best be matched in the alphabet of the *scriptor regis Bertcaudus*, they are quite remarkable in a historical compendium, and the way they are used in the *Annales Regni Francorum* deserves interpretation. If Vienna 473 were made for Louis the German, as is argued here, the removal of all references to the Austrasii in the *Liber Historiae Francorum* needs explanation. (I am grateful to Dr. Reimitz for very helpful discussion, and for checking the text of Vienna 473.)

Reimitz reports the following corrections to Tischler: p. 439 n. 628: Corpore fuit amplo atque robusta statura (as a B2-reading), Vienna 473 reads: amplo at robusta statura; ecclesiam sancti Petri per illum non solum tuta ac defensa, Vienna 473 reads ecclesia; una quidem ... adderentur, Vienna 473 reads: adderetur. – P. 502 T. reports ex aliqua parte sibi heredes faceret (but the first *e* in *heredes* is an *e*-caudata). – P. 503: in Syriam et Egyptum atque Africam (here T. has as B2: Aegyptum). – P. 504: Hildegardem ... in matrimonium, Vienna 473: Hildegardem ... in matrimoniam, later corrected by a dot below the line.

These are small details, but Vat. Pal. 243 is a late ninth century manuscript of Recensio C copied in the region of St Amand, which came to Lorsch. It contains a collection of texts, but the *Vita Karoli* was originally a separate volume, and is now incomplete. It was soon bound with a collection of historical texts which Bischoff dated around 900 (p. 1540–1547). Tischler rejects this dating and calls that collection ›frühottonisch‹, asserting that one of the scribes was trained at Reims. The full implications of this are made clear if the reader turns back to p. 1432, where he has shown that Flodoard of Reims knew the C version, and to p. 108, where he reveals that he thinks Vat. Pal. Lat 243 was actually copied at Reims. (I do

not accept his dating or localization, but tenth century northern France is a palaeographical *terra incognita*.) The suggestion that Hucbald or Remigius of Auxerre might have brought a St Amand copy of the Vita to Reims (p. 257, 1557) is unprovable and somewhat restrictive. Similarly the monk from Jumièges who brought sequences to Notker at St Gall is seen as the courier for a branch of the tradition which Tischler has located at St Wandrille or Jumièges (p. 958–962). Here speculation and probability have been fleshed out in a way which may mislead hasty readers.

**English Manuscripts:** The account of some of the English manuscripts can be corrected thanks to the kindness of Michael Gullick, who has been working for over thirty years on English scribes. On p. 978–985 elaborate arguments are presented for a Canterbury origin for Oxford Bodley. Laud misc. 247 but it was copied in the West Country in the 1120s and has no link with Canterbury. Bodley lat. Class d 39 (Einhard + Suetonius etc) is also assigned to Canterbury in third quarter of the twelfth century (p. 1394ff.). It was certainly not copied at Canterbury and dates from the last quarter of the twelfth century.

I have checked Tischler's report of readings in Cambridge Gonville and Caius 177/210. His transcription of the flyleaf Reading ownership inscription corrects the contemporary punctuation, his reports of ›Graphie‹ ignore some ligatures and corrections, his transcription of the contents list (p. 1012) omits the *deest* additions which have a bearing on his account of how the book was divided, and his transcription of Camden's entry on the verso of the flyleaf ignores standard conventions for the transcription of early modern English. The study of Reading manuscripts T. failed to locate on his visit to Oxford, *English medieval books: the Reading Abbey collections from foundation to dispersal* by Alan Coates, appeared in 1999, it identifies one scribe in this book as that of a glossed Reading Psalter dated 1158–1165, confirming Tischler's dating.

Salisbury 80 is a copy of the important historical anthology with excerpts from Jordanes and Paul the Deacon followed by Einhard and Notker's lives of Charlemagne. The hands of the text scribes are English, but the hand of the corrector is not quite so typically English. Tischler tells us it was written in the second half of that century, at Salisbury (p. 331) quoting Dr. Webber's date ›to the last third of the twelfth century‹. Dr. Webber has been kind enough to say that ›no one has yet demonstrated that Salisbury was producing manuscripts at this date, and therefore one cannot argue for a Salisbury origin in the present state of our knowledge‹. Magdalen lat. 14 is also attributed to a Salisbury scriptorium by Tischler (p. 333–334), but again there is no palaeographical or other evidence to support this guess.

**Date of Composition:** The date of composition has been much discussed. Tischler's treatment (p. 151–239) follows his account of the Carolingian textual history, but precedes his account of the version with the dedication to Louis the Pious and what he calls the ›official‹ version. So to appreciate his argument the reader must move backwards and forwards through these two volumes. The author rejects the early dating recently suggested by English scholars, and helpfully tabulates echoes of the *Vita Karoli* in Einhard's *Translatio*, suggesting a date of composition before 829–830 (p. 174–178). He suggests that the entry in the lost Reichenau catalogue, which has been used to sustain various dates of composition, refers to a text with Walahfrid's prologue, composed after 840. But his own dating rests on traditional assumptions about Einhard's ›indirekte Analyse der Persönlichkeitsstruktur Ludwigs‹ and the ›Dechiffrierung der internationalen Ebene der Vita‹ (p. 197, 199). This approach risks a hermeneutic circle: Tischler's command of the literature about the date of the work and about Charlemagne's ninth century reputation (he has excellent comments about Walahfrid's criticism of Charlemagne) lead him to assert that ›Louis the Pious alone could be the first to receive the Vita‹.

The damaged inscription above Einhard's preface in the early eleventh century Egmond manuscript London, BL Cotton Tiberius C. XI is a dedication to ›G‹, and Tischler and I independently suggested that this must be Gerward, Louis' librarian. (The staff of the

British Library, using ultra-violet light, can see nothing of the ›Amico‹ or ›In Domino‹ that Tischler records on p. 159 and p. 1382. I am grateful to them.) Gerward would then have given the book to Louis. But Tischler acknowledges that the work was also known to an exclusive and highly educated readership, almost all of whom were linked to the court. If I understand him, he envisages a series of readers, and a series of Carolingian editions, some produced with Einhard's sanction. This would explain the popularity of versions without Einhard's preface.

Though Einhard was an older statesman, his audience believed that his classicising of biography needed some sort of commentary. He saw no reason to identify himself in his preface except as a reliable witness and a *homo barbarus*. Walahfrid and the author of the Carolingian preface found in the A3 manuscripts identify Einhard, praise his learning, and add a Christian context to the work. Tischler's suggestion that the Astronomer composed this preface (p. 1105–1111) deserves more study. Gerward, identifying Einhard, makes the work contribute to the eternal memory of Louis the Pious. A later Carolingian collection, if Tischler's dating is right, combined Alexander the Great's letter to Aristotle, the *Historia Langobardorum* and the *Vita Karoli*. That combination is less self-evident, but it may be a tribute to Einhard's own ability to create a hero beyond imitation (and Einhard would have known of Alexander's letters from Alcuin). We still need to explore what Einhard meant by *debita laus* in his preface, as we need to admire his brevity.

Much more work is needed on the links between the *Vita* and the *Annales Regni Francorum*. Tischler is silent about Einhard's use of them, though it might have been relevant to his discussion of the date of composition and the function of the work. On p. 594–597 Tischler treats the manuscripts with both works and suggests that this combination has a Carolingian origin and he returns to it when discussing his Fleury Textkorpus on p. 1201. (The dating of the text of ARF in Paris BNF lat. 10911, p. 1156–1158, depends on a misunderstanding of the note printed by Monod *et ut istum miliarium impleatur, restant ann. LXIII*, in other words, Tischler's ... *restant anni CXIII* is no more than a scribal error: C for L.)

Among the riches hidden in these two volumes are Tischler's discovery of an unknown Carolingian fragment of the 806 *Divisio Regnorum* in Paris BNF lat. 7561: his suggestion that the Astronomer can be identified with Jonas of Orléans rather than Hilduin – an argument which is unlikely to convince – and the excursus on the Papal Library and *Salutati* (p. 474–495). The excellent account of the publication history of the *Vita Karoli* (p. 1662–1732) is a major contribution to the study of Medievalism, which deserves independent publication. There is a full list of editions and translations, starting from the 1546 translation by Elie Vinet. Tischler does not know of Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. J. F. Collins Bryn Mawr Commentaries (1985), a helpful small edition, and might have mentioned the project of a Nelson Medieval Classics edition, to be edited by F. L. Ganshof.

In his index, which provides brief epithets for everyone mentioned save Jesus Christ, Tischler is ›Mittellateiner, Historiker und Editor‹. But he deserved a better ›Editor‹ himself. The vast amount of valuable textual information he presents might have been published electronically, the arguments about the form and date of the work would have made essential articles, an album of plates would have been an ideal teaching tool in all those classes where the *Vita Karoli* is read. The MGH has reduced his readership to the ›in das Thema eingeweihte Leser‹ (p. VII) who needs a good library or a full wallet, and may need to check what he reads.

David GANZ, London