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'Baiuli' in the Carolingian 'regnum Langobardorum' and the career of Abbot Waldo (+813)

The capitularies and other 'official' sources for Charles the Great's reign provide us with a comprehensive account of the way in which that monarch tried to govern his extensive dominions and of the institutions through which this royal administration functioned; private charters, necrologies, and other texts of various kinds give us the names of many of the men who were expected to translate Charles's aspirations into reality and tell us something of their family connections and places of origin.1 The picture that this material tends to convey, however, is just a little too neat and systematic an all-sweeping research controlling a hierarchy of local officials whose responsibilities were too frequently overlapping but were not the less clearly defined and who at least at the highest levels were recruited from a limited number of established families. The recorded activity of some agents of the Carolingian monarchy and the terminology used to describe them suggests that in practice the administration of the Carolingian empire was far more flexible and empirical than this, varying widely between different regions and at different dates. They also suggest that the responsibility exercised by any particular individual was often determined more by his personality and ability than by his title or family connections (however important the latter might be in certain circumstances).2 Evidence that throws light on the way in which the regnum Langobardorum was governed after its annexation by Charles in 7743 is particularly revealing in this respect; and there is a special interest in a small group of texts recording the activity of baiuli—a title (or office) which is not mentioned in any capitulary or diploma.

1 The most notable present-day exponents of the prosopographical approach to Carolingian history are Professor Tellenbach and his pupils: see G. Tellenbach (ed.), Studien u. Forschungen zur Geschichte der geschichtlichen Forschung, 1 (Freiburg im Br., 1957) and subsequent publications in the Forsch. zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 1. 2 C. F. D. A. Bollonghi, 'Levo, qui quippe flabiae sunt baiuli, et le gouvernement du Roi des Franques dans le regnum Langobardorum', in Revue des Sciences, 5e série, liv. 6 (1964), 241-45. 3 The standard account is still that of J. M. Hartmann, Caroli regis in Ma. ilia (Gotha, 1904), 274 ff., iii (1908-10), passim. A great quantity of neuer material and new ideas is to be found in F. H. Hurst, in Frank. in seinem umkreis, 1 (Franken, 1934). 4 Abbot, 390 f. (Freiburg im Br., 1960).
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The first of these tests is a letter from King Charles to Pope Hadrian I (found in a palimpsest manuscript at Munich) which must be later than the baptism of Charles’s son Pippin and his coronation as rex Langobardorum on 15 April 741, since in the inititulatio Charles refers to himself and the pope as compatri. The letter has a lengthy exordium (arca) of a type familiar, although in shorter form, from other letters of Charles and from his diplomas, as well as from papal letters of this period. A much freer styling characterizes the expositio. The purpose of the letter is a request to the pope that, by the imposition of his hand he should make Waldo, shepherd of the holy church of Pavia, 4 for (as the letter explains) Charles, “sitting with bishops, priests and other ranks of the clergy,” has decided to put Waldo forward for that see and present him to the pope because he has been coming and going in those regions as minister suavis besides atque praecipue obrutus 5.

That the Frankish king should turn to the pope rather than the archbishop of Milan for the consecration of his nominee as bishop of Pavia was ecumenical correct. The Liber Pontificalis tells us that during the pontificate of Constantine I (708–15) Archbishop Benedict of Milan came to Rome to assert his metropolitan rights.


2 The latter account of ms. 6545 is by A. Moll in: Annales, 19 (1928), 194–95. See also, in: Annales, 22 (1930), 195–97.


5 The verbal parallel is found by Mundling, p. 114, in all three types of text.


7 The correspondence of books 25 and 26 is for donaut cum quae redduxi. The possibility that in the Carolingian period (especially) that reditus was, or came to be used particularly of someone far from the court is supported by words used by Abba Abba, in: J. Windisch in: Rev. Benedettini, 9 (1930), 250 ff., in connection with the idea of a donation of lands.

8 The possibility that in the Carolingian period (especially) that reditus was, or came to be used particularly of someone far from the court is supported by words used by Abba Abba, in: J. Windisch in: Rev. Benedettini, 9 (1930), 250 ff., in connection with the idea of a donation of lands.


the Ostrogothic and Imperial periods) doubtless contained the Lombard royal treasure, which in the time of Pippin and his successors was apparently subject to the supervision of notaries. In this period it was certainly the repository of several important judicial proceedings; and a body of (say) royal notaries, distinct from the writers of diplomas, who undertook some of the most important judicial missions on the king’s behalf as well as being skilled writers of documents, was closely associated with it. This pre-eminence of Pavia and the notarial organization associated with its palace were substantiated by the Frankish annexation of the region. In 775 Pope Hadrian speaks in a letter to King Charles of the ‘notary usque constitutis vini exitis’ at Pavia. The activity of the royal notaries can be discerned in the years immediately after 774 and in the early years of Pippin; and at the end of the century they are beginning to play a unique and important part in the administration (more particularly the judicial administration) of the region. ‘Two capitulations in Pippin’s name (the second of them drawn up secondum scala donum Caroli) were promulgated in 778 in assemblies at Pavia.’ Pavia was therefore the obvious base for anyone who held the reins of government in the subordinate kingdom of the Lombards, when the sovereign was non-resident or during a royal minority.

That this was the responsibility that had already been accepted by the man named in Charles’s letter (who was now intended to combine it with the bishopric of Pavia) can confidently be deduced from the language used to describe his position. There was evidently no accepted technical term for this—the equivalent of ‘vicar’ or ‘regent’—and the dictator of the letter was compelled to draw on his knowledge of literary texts. An entry in the Vestiarium of the Carolingians, for example, transmitted by Paul the Deacon’s Epitome, has some bearing on the conjunction of the words baiulina and operarius: this reads (in Paul the Deacon’s Epitome) ‘Baiulina discipulum regis multo minus discipuli operarius.’ Unlike a prioriarius, which always meant the sense of ‘tutor’. The Vestiarium in the Lombard period has been denied by H. Richter. ‘Hymnen u. die Pfalz zu Aachen’, Arch. Inscr. Poet., Graec., hist. (1914), 14, n. 69. It occurs, however, in a royal diploma of 761 (C. Tropp, Cod. Dipl. Diplomata Lombardiae, Nürnberg, 1884, no. 388, p. 163; M. Ficinelli, Cod. Dipl. Vescovate (Venice, 1902), no. 41, in a note adduced by J. Giorgi and U. Balzani, ‘Il Regesto di Faro’, Roma, 1879, p. 89). For Lombard writers see E. Schiaparelli, Cod. Dipl. Lomb., I (Rome, 1904), no. 39 of 751, II (Rome, 1903), no. 417 of 771; Lib. Pont., i, 487. For his responsibility for the royal treasure see Hartmann, 472, 477.

2 As appears from the fourth document cited in n. 1.


4 As I hope to show later in a paper on the Italian monasticism of the Carolingian period.

5 Hart. Carol. Hist. d. Empire, iv, 89 (Mommsen), no. 457 (probably, no. 457a, possibly also Charlemaign’s capitulary, ibid. no. 350).
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of manual labourer, baiulina had acquired several new and more dignified senses in the post-Classical period. In the fourth to sixth centuries it was used particularly of ‘a letter carrier’, which is presumably the origin of the medieval Venetian baiola ‘envoy, esp. envoy of Constantinople.’ From the tenth century it was widely used in the sense of ‘agent, official, bailiff’, usually of a fairly subordinate kind. In Merovingian Gaul, however, it had come to have the very different sense of ‘tutor, preceptor’, and especially the tutor or mentor of a young sovereign or child of a sovereign, in which sense it was still used in the ninth century. If the words servellitae ministri are thought to be grammatically dependent on baiulina, neither ‘message’ nor ‘tutor’ is a strictly literal meaning in the context and we should have to translate ‘bearer of our burden’ (in those parts). However, we take servellitae ministri to mean simply ‘in (at) our service’; it is reasonable to suppose that the writer of the letter had both these senses in mind when he used the word baiulina of Waldo. As regards the other part of the phrase: praecessor was normal eight-century usage where distinction or superiority of some kind is being indicated. The other hand, is rare: like the related cooperarius, which is considerably more common, it was of parochial origin and used particularly (although not exclusively) of one who worked for God in the service of the Christian faith. Taken as a whole and in conjunction with the
evidence that the king was trying to secure the bishopric of Pavia for Waldo, the phrase *trenitas nostri* batilis atque principatus operator must be taken to mean that Charles regarded him as his principal agent in Italy both secular and religious matters, with some responsibility for the person of the young king as well as for the kingdom at large.\(^1\)

This interpretation is borne out by other evidence for the existence of *baitum* and their activity in the subordinate kingdoms established by the king of the Franks in 784. According to the biographer of Louis the Pious known as *The Historian*, Charles sent his son Louis to Aquitaine in that year praefatum sic batilum Arnaldum adsque ministros ordinabantur assumpto regi regni puellarum.\(^2\) And that he was in fact paid for his services is suggested by the fact that he alone of the *ministri* named is the only one referred to elsewhere. A later passage in the same biographer refers to the wise advice given to Louis at the end of the century by, it is implied, the Magnanius who is described as magnum sibi a patre, vento sapientem et strenuum, gnoosisse utilebat et benelectus regis; and although the title of *baitum* is not actually applied to him it seems reasonable to regard him as a successor of Arnald.\(^2\)

Two later texts from Italy show a *baitum* in a less favourable light. In a *Carta pauperum* of Cenomana in 841 it was asserted that certain properties and dues that were apparently administered as part of the imperial fisc had in fact been granted by King Charles to Bishop Stephen of Cenomana in Lombardy and that Stephen possessed of *Annonem in qua domum Rotchadini baitum Pipini regis contra legum et mala ordine Annonem diversitatem, which seems to have happened round about the year 800.\(^3\)

The insubordination of Rotchadini are also the subject of a complaint made in a court of justice many years before this, in which he is not given any title: in March 812 the abbot of

---

\(^1\) A. Hesse, *Dictionnaire latin-françois des auteurs clérens* (Strasbourg, 1841), p. 579 f.\(^1\) 2\footnote{This is a somewhat broader interpretation than Meusele's *Königlich-Sächische* Schriften, i.e. *Cronica eorum Rerum* held in the chronicles of the *Abtei* de Nortmund.}\(^2\) 3\footnote{This is a somewhat broader interpretation than Meusele's *Königlich-Sächische* Schriften, i.e. *Cronica eorum Rerum* held in the chronicles of the *Abtei* de Nortmund.}\(^2\) 2\footnote{This is a somewhat broader interpretation than Meusele's *Königlich-Sächische* Schriften, i.e. *Cronica eorum Rerum* held in the chronicles of the *Abtei* de Nortmund.}\(^2\) 3\footnote{This is a somewhat broader interpretation than Meusele's *Königlich-Sächische* Schriften, i.e. *Cronica eorum Rerum* held in the chronicles of the *Abtei* de Nortmund.}
manuscript. Unfortunately it cannot be relied upon for points of detail; and the author was seriously wrong in his account of Waldo's connection with Pavia.

Waldo or Waldo (the latter appears to be the more usual form) apparently received his early education in some unidentified centre of Anglo-Saxon culture. He first occurs by name in August 779; at that time he was a deacon in the monastery of St. Gall and from then until January 780 he regularly appears as a writer of charters for the monastery: he also made his name as a book copyist. Although he never seems to have made a monastic profession, shortly before November 782, by election of the monks, he received a monastic habit. In 786, the emperor translated him to the abacy of the monastery that was most closely bound up with the fortunes of the Carolingians, Saint-Denis, where he (temporarily) reformed the life of the community; here, a trusted counsellor of the monarch and his court circle, he died in the year 814. A medieval catalogue of the bishops of Pavia is preserved in later copies and seems to be substantially reliable at least as regards the names and order of the bishops; Waldo does not figure in it. His exercising of authority in the bishopric of Pavia is the less established by two texts both of Reichenau origin but independent of one another. A passage in the so-called Translatio Sanguinis Domini, written in that monastery not earlier than the second quarter of the tenth century, reads:


It is clear that Waldo was for a time in charge of the bishopric of Pavia when he was already abbot of Reichenau (that is to say after 786) but that he was never consecrated bishop — that is he never acceded to the king's request: the fact that Waldo was already the head of a monastery may have been the excuse for this, although the appointment of an abbot of Reichenau as bishop (of Sens) in 783 or 786 clearly raised no objections from the pope since he subsequently recognized the man in question, Boniface, as metropolitan, and other reasons should probably be sought. (Whether Waldo was ever connected with the bishopric of Pisa, as the Translatio assures, must also be left an open question.)

1 A. B. Walsh, Begründer des goldenen Zeitalters der Reichenau — Tendenz, Arbeit, etc., 2 (Kronach-Leipzig, 1923). The account in K. Beyerle, Die Kultur des Abtes Reichenau (Munich, 1918), i, 65-66, is based on Manuring but it is possible that his account is uncertain; the reference to Waldo in J. M. Clark, The Abbey of St. Gall (Cambridge, 1956), is confused and mostly inaccurate.

2 Clark, pp. 61 f., arguing from Waldo's identity: A. Brokmeier, Scriptoria Medii Aevi Hiberniae, ii (Geneva, 1916), 24, on the evidence of his hand-script. It is even possible (but not very likely) that Waldo's name is Anglo-Saxon, although transmitted only in its Abranonic form: Clark, p. 64.

3 The account of the convent, A. Brokmeier, Charter Latin Anthopography, ii (Philadelphia, 1949), nos. 71, 73, 74, 92, 94, 95, 99, that of manuscripts in the abbey, ibid., nos. 71, 73, 74, 92, 94, 95, 99.

4 Clark's account is missing from the Liber Professorum of both St. Gall and Reichenau: Beyerle, p. 209, nos. 13, 15.

5 Beyerle, p. 61 f., ibid., pp. 13 f. and Clark, pp. 61 f., ibid., pp. 13 f.

6 A. B. Walsh, The Abbey of St. Gall (Cambridge, 1956), no. 15; and the list of manuscripts in the hand of Brokmeier, Scriptoria, ii, 24, 51.

7 For the details see P. Savige, Guillaume de Longueville, Reims, 11 (Paris, 1935), p. 578 ff.; W. Hoff, Pons: n. June Ponschi in der Kirche (Paris, 1951), p. 101. The view of both Savige and Hoff that a number of eighth-century bishops are named in the catalogue in the wrong order does not seem to be justified; see Hoffmann, p. 101 ff., "I wenden di Pavia."
Waldo’s nomination to the bishopric of Pavia and the letter to Hadrian fall sometime in the period 785 or 787-85. Bishop Poppo (II) of Pavia was apparently consecrated in 781, and a royal emissary to the papal court in 784 (where he was but less probably c. 787). Hadrian died in 795. The reference to Pippin’s wife in the passage quoted from Gallus Oheim makes it likely that Waldo was still connected with Pavia some time after 790. He must have left Italy, however, by about the middle of the decade. The activity of the only other Italian hintes known to us, Rothchild, seems to belong to the years immediately before and after 800.

Charles’s letter implies that when it was written Waldo had already gone and coming in Italy for quite a time. It is tempting to date the beginning of his association with the region Langobardorum and its court to the otherwise blank period of about two years between his abbatcy at St. Gall and his election as abbot of Reichenau. What we know of his early life certainly forbids our putting it back much further: for up to the beginning of 782 he was fully engaged at St. Gall, and it is unlikely that he would have attracted the king’s attention before his election as abbot before the end of that year. I do not accept the view that he came from an Austrian (Rhine-Frankish) family that already had connections with the Carolingian court.

Accordingly, another in Waldo’s connection with that area, but as we know, there is ample room for his supposed period of authority between Hadrianus and Heno, the second of whom was himself a monk of Reichenau before he became bishop. Only in 790, Pippin was married and a prince before the end of 785. A prince c. 784/793 (Pippin the Younger) was clearly a reference to a new prince of whose Pippin is being told not so much, but rather, a contemporary of Nennius or not just by name, but actually, a Prince of Hecker, Alam., 1915, p. 155. Nothing else is known about this wife.

First published in Monast., 1916, p. 126. pp. 63-66. Waldo was later allowed his title by Gallo, pp. 63-66, Thesnière, p. 45, and Bocquet, p. 78 and Hecker, p. 80. The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7). The grounds for this view are two, neither of which convinces one. The first is the return of Waldo to his home with Bishop Pippin in Toledo in 767 (his Quœstiones or superior of Humbert of Turin to himself). The second is that in the ninth century two of Waldo’s abbeys were successively archbishoprics of Freising (Heli, p. 84-7).
The evidence for Waldó’s and Rotchild’s activity in Italy is pitifully fragmentary and conspicuously lacking in dates. It is none the less possible to find in it several points of general interest for the history of the Carolingian period. According to a later source the young king Louis was accompanied by a haunduc when he was sent to his subordinate kingdom of Aquitaine in 781. In the regnum Langobardorum similarly king Pippin had associated with him for most or all of his minority and for some time after he had reached majority men who were known, officially or unofficially, as haundi. The earlier of the two whose names we know, Waldó, who arrived in Italy not earlier than c. 785 and possibly a year or two later, was a cleric of monastic background, probably from Alemania; Rotchild who was active just before the end of the century was apparently a Bavarian and probably a Lombard. Their functions are unlikely ever to have been clearly laid down but were largely in the field of what is conveniently called ‘administration’; someone else must be supposed to have commanded the military expeditions that were nominally led by the boy Pippin. The fact that Charles chose as haundi men of undistinguished background with little or no previous experience of affairs of state may mean that he expected them to be mere transmitters of the royal will and command, of what contemporary sources call the reichsregal. However, the haundi came to play a very different part in the government of the regnum Langobardorum: and Waldó in particular was evidently a man in whom the Frankish kings placed great trust and from whom he received loyal service both during his stay in Italy and later. The early Carolingians made a deliberate attempt to widen the circle of those to whom positions of authority could be given in their kingdoms: this was one of the purposes that lay behind the recruiting of pari, amongst whom Rotchild and the Aquitanian Arnold are perhaps to be numbered; but a similar policy was pursued among clerics, as Waldó’s career reminds us. Such men naturally brought relatives into the royal service and, in the case of laymen, were often the progenitors of several generations of royal servants—members of what Professor Tellenbach (misleadingly, in my view) calls the Reichs- or gräfliche Aristokratie. It is not surprising that relatives of Waldó were in the imperial service in the ninth century. The evidence for the haundi also illustrates one of the inevitable weaknesses in Charles’s rule of his newly-annexed and more distant territories. Waldó came to Italy as a stranger to its problems and the relatively short time that he and others served there cannot have helped matters. Moreover, from time to time missi were sent to Italy direct from Charles’s court. What made this lack of continuity and of knowledge of local conditions less serious than might otherwise have been the case was the existence of a permanent capital at Pavia and the organization associated with its royal palace, which the Frankish kings inherited from their Lombard predecessors. By nominating Waldó for the bishops’ of Pavia, Charles evidently hoped to link him more closely with this unique source of strength for whoever exercised sovereign or vice-regal authority in Italy. Waldó’s (abortive) nomination is interesting for another reason. Professor Berendini, in a paper which he read at a recent Italian Church History Conference, compared the almost complete absence of mention of bishops in the Lombard laws with the frequent references to their involvement in secular affairs in the early Carolingian capitularies. I myself believe that the evidence of documents somewhat softens the ‘sharp contrast’ between the two periods which the laws and capitularies undoubtedly suggest. But there is certainly no known precedent in the regnum Langobardorum for the combination of an extensive authority in secular matters with a bishopric, or for that matter with an abbey; although both were to be common enough later. Many of the best-known features and usages of ninth-century Carolingian government and administration were only established gradually and by a process of trial and error: the evidence for Waldó and Rotchild throws light on one aspect of this process in the ill-documented last decades of the eighth century.

University of Edinburgh

D. A. Bulleid

1 In 785, Marazion, 1. 760 (suppl. no. 1) and Dipl. Carol., 1. iv. 159; in 798, Marazion, i. no. 18; in 798 or shortly afterwards, ibid. p. 792.

---

1 As in 785 against Bavaria, Anecd. regni Francorum (ed. Kurze), p. 974.
3 A point that tends to get forgotten when too much stress is laid on the military nature of the themes. It does much to explain the marked development in the use of vassalage as the century proceeded. For an Italian writer who was almost a professional administrator, in the first quarter of the ninth century see the article cited above, p. 115 n. 2.