

a 133/112

# VIATOR

MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES

Volume 2 (1971)

PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES OF  
THE CENTER FOR MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE STUDIES  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS  
BERKELEY, LOS ANGELES, LONDON 1971

té les habitudes ancestrales des païens, appauvri les curies orientales à la libération des chrétiens, prescrit la restitution des biens des églises, la succession des martyrs et confesseurs? Il eût peut-être confisqué les biens des temples, mais non englouti des sommes considérables dans les constructions d'édifices chrétiens.

Le regroupement dans la *Vita* de nombreuses mesures de Constantin favorables au christianisme prend ainsi une valeur beaucoup plus grande qu'une compilation dans des œuvres dispersées venant d'un même auteur et surtout de auteurs différents.

### III. LA COMPOSITION DU CODE THÉODOSIEN

La comparaison des indications fournies par Eusèbe et par le Code Théodosien atteste simultanément l'obéissance des compilateurs et leur initiative personnelle: l'obéissance, car ils ont éliminé les textes et décisions ne présentant pas le caractère de *leges*; l'initiative intelligente, car, devant réaliser une œuvre pratique, ils ont très largement écarté ce qui ne pouvait servir de modèles et aux plaideurs de leur temps.

La constatation de cette attitude autorise une remarque. Il serait intéressant de rechercher dans le Code Théodosien la mention des constitutions écrites et les raisons ayant amené leur disparition. On pourrait alors juger de l'importance de certaines dispositions peut être attribuée à la réflexion des législateurs. Un sujet d'étude se présente ainsi à ceux qui s'intéressent au Code Théodosien et à ses rédacteurs.

Chargée de recherche au C.N.R.S., Paris  
80 rue Jean sans Peur  
59 Lille (Nord), France

## THE SHAPING OF THE EARLY MEDIEVAL PRINCIPALITY AS A TYPE OF NON-ROYAL RULERSHIP

by Herwig Wolfram

We have to ask what a given ruler says of himself; we have to seek what one might label his "self-manifestation," if we want to obtain a methodologically reliable answer to the question, "what is a ruler?"<sup>1</sup> In addition to this, it is certainly very useful to learn what other people say of a given ruler, especially when this ruler is not a king, that is to say not the recognized head of a kingdom.<sup>2</sup>

Between Julian the Apostate's autobiography and that of Charles IV there exists little evidence that the rulers used the literary media to speak of, and about, themselves.<sup>3</sup> Many, if not the overwhelming majority of them, were illiterate: a literary education was just one form, and not the only form, of education. Literary sources, helpful and illustrative though they may be, however, do not provide us with the politically and philosophically relevant formulas we are looking for. It is primarily the diplomatic sources, such as the diplomas, charters, administrative acts, legal texts, and laws, that we have to investigate. These sources usually contain a specific formula, which the diplomatists call *intitulatio*, *subscription* or simply, though inaccurately, *titulus*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Wolfram, *Intitulatio I: Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung (MIÖG) suppl. 21 (1967) 9ff. I wish to thank Professor Howard Kaminsky, University of Washington, Seattle, for having offered me the opportunity for a thoroughgoing discussion of the present article in a faculty-student seminar that he conducted in Seattle on 24 April 1969.

<sup>2</sup> K. Brunner will investigate this problem in *Intitulatio II*, which is due to appear as a continuation of the aforementioned book (see n. 1 above). Cf. Wolfram 136ff., where I dealt with the nomenclature of the Late-Merovingian aristocracy.

<sup>3</sup> *Karoli IV. imperatoris Romanorum vita ab eo ipso conscripta*, ed. Walther Bulst in the series *Editiones Heidelbergenses* 16 (Heidelberg 1950). Julian's *Commentaries* on his Gallic campaigns are praised by, and partly known through, Libanius and Eunapius but are not now extant; see *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, ed. W. C. Wright, Loeb Classical Library, ed. 4, 1 (London 1962) viii. Cf. Georg Misch, *Geschichte der Autobiographie*, 4 vols., ed. 3 (Bern 1950ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* (n. 1 above) 22ff.

Here, the individual who issues a document states his name, title, and sometimes divine authorization. Certainly, this person, briefly called issuer, did not write that formula by himself. There was always a scribe or clerk around who was charged with this duty, which had to be fulfilled in keeping with the traditional rules of a chancery. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence that it was not the chancery nor a given individual scribe who devised the issuer's *intitulatio* without being controlled by the latter. It was the issuer himself who said the decisive last word about the phrasing and contents of the *intitulatio* formula. It was really a self-manifestation of the ruler-issuer, as can be clearly shown, for instance, by comparing the political events of the second half of the eighth century with the rapid change of the Frankish kingly *intitulatio* under Charles the Great.<sup>5</sup> I would go even further and apply to the ruler's *intitulatio* the question that the "priests and Levites of Jerusalem" put to John the Baptist (John 1.22f.), In this very "Quid dicis de teipso?" formula the abridgment of a whole political or even theological program had to be laid down, as, for instance, a title such as *Carolus gratia Dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum atque patricius Romanorum* would indicate.<sup>6</sup>

I am prepared to concede that in process of time, maybe by the end of the twelfth century, when the spread of writing increased the traditionally scarce diplomatic sources to a formerly inconceivable degree, the value of the *intitulatio* formula as the ruler's self-manifestation decreased at the time. I am not quite sure about this problem at the moment; yet I could imagine that the methodological approach to the late medieval *intitulatio* would have to be a different one. For the early medieval titles, however, it is in my opinion correct and even necessary to insist upon their political, theoretical and even theological relevance.

If we can accept this general assessment of the formula we are prepared to take the next step. The *intitulatio* is not the only place in a document where politically relevant terminology appears; other parts of a document have to be related to the wording of the *intitulatio*, as do other texts, even literary sources, which have a bearing on its shape.

The third step to be taken is to ask the questions: what is the terminology involved; what is the title of a nonroyal ruler over a *regnum*; what does a quasi-king say of himself when he does not dare to use the title *rex*?

It was part of the common political heritage which the Latin-Germanic kings had taken over from the Roman emperors that each of them was the *princeps* or *dominus* of a *regnum*, which could also be called *terra* or *patria*. For instance, *gens vel patria Gotorum* meant nothing else but the Visigothic

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 206ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 225ff.

kingdom in Spain.<sup>7</sup> Similar expressions were used with the Franks and Lombards alike. For reasons upon which I slightly touched on an earlier occasion, the Anglo-Saxon institutional situation was so different from that on the Continent that here I must skip its investigation.<sup>8</sup> This seems to be necessary because the imported Latin vocabulary could give the false impression that a comparable situation existed in England and on the Continent.<sup>9</sup>

For the Continental Latin kingdoms, as one would label the successor states of the Empire, the formulas *rex qui et princeps gentis* or *rex qui et dominus*, that is to say, *terrae, patriae vel regni* were politically relevant.<sup>10</sup> Most kings of the Barbarian Invasions, and the very few who survived this holocaust, had not only replaced the emperor as *princeps et dominus*, if only in a given part of the Roman Empire, but also and above all an outdated type of tribal king who vanished with the destruction of the traditional tribal structure.<sup>11</sup> The settlement on Roman soil and the establishment of kingdoms allowed the formation of new peoples and completely new political entities. The political tradition of the prevailing ethnic element or ruling class might have been age-old, pre-Christian and wrapped up in the abolished tribal system, for this tradition was sacred and long-lived. But it cannot conceal the fact that the kingdoms on Roman soil formed new peoples, new ethnic systems, and new or at least strongly modified upper classes.<sup>12</sup> We know, moreover, that kings heavily stressed the latter process by virtually wiping out their relatives and all members of royal families within their zone of influence, in order to destroy any potential pretender to their positions.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Lex Visigothorum* 2.1.8, ed. K. Zeumer, MGH Leges nationum 1.1 (Hannover 1902) 54. See Wolfram (n. 1 above) 70. Cf. O. Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, ed. 4 (Vienna 1959) 188f., and annotations.

<sup>8</sup> Wolfram, "The Shaping of the Early Medieval Kingdom," *Viator* 1 (1971) 1-24. Cf. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* (n. 1 above) 18f.

<sup>9</sup> Take, for instance, the terminology used in a grant by Aethelbald, King of Mercia and of the *Sutangli*, 736; there, the titles *subregulus*, *dux* and *comes* come in, although nobody can really pretend that this political vocabulary had anything to do with its equivalent on the Continent. The Frankish *dux*, for instance, is the result of an institutional development that derives from both Roman and Germanic roots alike, whereas the Anglo-Saxon *dux* is a Latin word for an Anglo-Saxon type of leading position. See *Chartae latinae antiquiores*, ed. Albert Bruckner and Robert Marichal, 3 (Lausanne 1963) n°. 183. Cf. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 145f., n. 27.

<sup>10</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 69f., 104ff., 148f.

<sup>11</sup> Wolfram, "The Shaping" (n. 8 above) 15ff.

<sup>12</sup> My remark does by no means interfere with the conclusive results of Franz Irsigler, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des frühfränkischen Adels*, Rheinisches Archiv 70 (Bonn, 1969), 253ff. I would just like to stress my conviction that the Frankish nobility from, say, the end of the sixth century onward came to be a new body social and politic, consisting of both the Roman senatorial aristocracy and Teutonic noblemen alike. Cf. K. F. Werner, "Bedeutende Adelsfamilien im Reich Karls des Grossen," *Karl der Grosse* 1 (Düsseldorf 1965) 86ff.

The best evidence for this stems from Gregory of Tours's *History of the Franks*, where Clovis is quoted as saying: "Woe unto me who remain as a traveler among strangers, and have none of my kin to help me in the evil day"; whereupon Gregory adds the wise judgment: "But he did not thus allude to their death out of grief, but craftily, to see if he could bring to light some new relative to kill." This passage ends Gregory's account of the killing of four Frankish kings who were Clovis's kinsmen.<sup>13</sup> Despite this systematic extirpation, the next generations after Clovis could still continue in this friendly activity.<sup>14</sup>

Beside the threat from defeated but still existing royal families, and despite the formerly inconceivable success of the Migrations-kings, there was the possibility that any outstanding leader of a warrior retinue, a *dux* in the word of Tacitus,<sup>15</sup> could become king and directly replace the new tribal king. We have to realize that the centrifugal forces that dismembered the Roman Empire did not stop working with its fall. A king like Clovis, for instance, had to cope with the same trends and tendencies in Gaul and Germania as did the Roman emperors decades and centuries earlier.<sup>16</sup> His great advantage was, however, that he could concentrate on a smaller territorial unit than the empire had been and use a very successful army, the *exercitus Francorum* which stood for the Frankish people. So he and his successors not only had the power of monopolizing their kingship in their own Merovingian family but also restrained the right of organizing an effective warrior retinue strong enough to become the nucleus of a rival kingship.<sup>17</sup>

The Lombard kingdom in Italy, in contrast had been given up and then re-established by the *duces*, the nonroyal warlords who had finally come to realize that the Lombard people needed a kingdom to survive as a political entity that included their own positions. Consequently, however, the Lombard kingdom of the sixth and seventh centuries was weak and never really able to create a stable dynasty strong enough to expand its domination over

<sup>13</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 2.42, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH Script. rer. merov., ed. 2 (Hannover 1951) 1.92f.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* 3.14 (110). Erich Zöllner, *Geschichte der Franken*, *Geschichte der deutschen Stämme* (München 1970) 126.

<sup>15</sup> Tacitus, *Germania*, 7; cf. Wolfram, "The Shaping" (n. 8 above) 7.

<sup>16</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 89f.

<sup>17</sup> Zöllner (n. 14 above) 137f. By the phrase "restrained the right of organizing an effective warrior retinue" I do not mean that the Frankish aristocracy of the late fifth and sixth centuries had no bodies of retainers at all (cf. Irsigler, n. 12 above, 228ff., who rightly points out the contrary). I just wanted to say that those retinues could not compete with the royal *antrustiones* as far as these two centuries were concerned. Zöllner (n. 14 above) 112ff., and D. Claude, "Zu Fragen frühfränkischer Verfassungsgeschichte," *Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte, germanistische Abteilung* 83 (Weimar 1966) 273, and above all Irsigler (n. 12 above) dealt with the difficult topic "Frankish aristocracy" most recently.

the *duces*, above all over the Lombard duchies of Benevento and Spoleto. It was not before the beginning of the eighth century that the Lombard kingdom could overcome the built-in deficiency of its foundation; the Lombard kings stemmed more often than not from the *dux*-stratum that had created the kingdom.<sup>18</sup>

The Visigoths in Spain did not allow the establishment of a sacred royal family such as the Merovingians. The *duces* had still the chance to become kings, naturally one after the other, since the *morbus gothicus*, as Frankish historiographers described the disease of the Gothic kings, namely getting killed or at least deposed by their own people, was always endemic. Yet or maybe therefore, particularistic tendencies are not known before the last third of the seventh century, when the Gallic remains of the realm were close to becoming an independent kingdom.<sup>19</sup>

The most momentous shift in the political spectrum, however, occurred in seventh-century Frankland when a divided and probably decaying royal family could no longer effectively prevent the upper class from becoming an actually ruling class.<sup>20</sup> It was exactly this political atmosphere that created the beginnings of the Frankish, and to some extent the European, nonroyal rulerships. At that time the credibility of the formula *rex qui et princeps Francorum* was destroyed. Yet since the long-haired Merovingian kings embodied an ecclesiasticized tribal charisma, which even obvious ineffectiveness could not abolish, the dynasty was not to be replaced until 751.<sup>21</sup> But the formula *dux qui et princeps Francorum* could be established, with a shadowy figurehead of a Merovingian king still around.<sup>22</sup> Our textbooks describe this historical phenomenon as the "Rise of the Carolingian Mayors of the Palace," or *duces* of Austrasia, which ended up in the royal unction of Pippin III, Charles the Great's father, as new King of the Franks. We know that this process took more than three generations; but it is easily overlooked that this long period could have been decisively shortened if Grimoald's attempt to replace the ineffective and powerless long-haired kings in 661 or 662 had met with permanent success.<sup>23</sup> Shocked by the stout resistance of their peers and the obviously poor support by the "people," who were in awe of their

<sup>18</sup> As to the history of the Lombards, one still must rely on L. M. Hartmann, *Geschichte Italiens im Mittelalter* 2.1.2 (Gotha 1900-1903). C. Brühl's new edition of the diplomas of the Lombard kings promises to provide us with a profound revision of the Lombard history.

<sup>19</sup> As to *morbus gothicus* or rather *Gothorum* see H. Messmer, *Hispania-Idee und Gotenmythos*, in the series *Geist und Werk der Zeiten* 5 (Zürich 1960) 66ff. On the particularistic tendencies in the Visigothic kingdom in 673, see Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 70f.

<sup>20</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 92ff. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 112ff.

<sup>21</sup> J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings* (London 1962) 231ff., esp. 243ff.

<sup>22</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 149ff.

<sup>23</sup> Wallace-Hadrill (n. 21 above) 234ff.

sacred kings, the Carolingians switched over to a policy of a gradual and very cautiously prepared take-over. So it was not before the year 742 that a Carolingian major-domo used the formula *dux et princeps Francorum* in front of the *servi Dei et optimales mei. . . qui in regno meo sunt*.<sup>24</sup> Yet, the previous history of *dux et princeps Francorum* can be essentially and formally traced to the end of the seventh century, probably to the decades after Pippin II's victory at Tertry in 687 when he defeated his last serious Frankish rival.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, we can conclude that despite Grimoald's catastrophe in 661 or 662, the next generation of his family provided if not the *rex et princeps Francorum* at least the *dux et princeps Francorum* who ruled over the *regnum Francorum*.

What should we understand by this term *regnum Francorum* on the verge of the seventh century? It means nothing else than the *tria regna*, the three kingdoms of Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy, which actually constituted the *regnum Francorum* more as a "Frankish commonwealth" than as single kingdom. This plurality of Frankish kingdoms had been institutionalized and stressed by numerous divisions of the greater *regnum Francorum* among the male members of the Merovingian family. More often than not, those three parts of the *regnum Francorum* built the base upon which a Frankish *pars regni* came to be constituted.<sup>26</sup>

By 700, the *tria regna* actually stood under the Carolingian sway. While Carloman, Charles the Great's uncle, had the aforementioned *intitulatio* formulated, the *tria regna* had successfully expanded. Within another forty years of Carolingian princely policy, the practically independent Alsatian *dux* and his Thuringian counterpart, both successors of former Frankish officials invested by Merovingian Kings around 650, had vanished. The Frisians had no longer a king, in the sense in which Anglo-Saxon sources had interpreted the kingly qualities of the Frisian *dux*. The Swabians were crush-

<sup>24</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 137ff.

<sup>25</sup> J. F. Böhmer and Engelbert Mühlbacher, *Regesta Imperii*, ed. 2, I (Innsbruck 1908) n. 4f. There is strong evidence that soon after the events of 687 the title *princeps* was first used for the Carolingian mayor of the palace, certainly in opposition to the Merovingian king; see Wolfram, *MIÖG* 76 (1968) 214.

<sup>26</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 92ff. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 114, 157. E. Ewig, "Die fränkischen Teilungen und Teilreiche, 511-613," *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* (Mainz 1952) 651ff., and "Die fränkischen Teilreiche im 7. Jahrhundert, 613-714," *Trierer Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 22 (Trier 1953) 85ff. The later two treatises are still by far the best descriptions of the topic. They are supposed to appear as a book in a revised edition soon.

<sup>27</sup> Ewig, "Die fränkischen Teilreiche," 85ff. W. Schlesinger, "Lord and Follower in Germanic Institutional History," *Lordship and Community in Medieval Europe*, ed. F. L. Cheyette (New York 1968) 00. B. Gebhardt and H. Grundmann, *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte*, ed. 8, I (Stuttgart 1954-60) 121ff. Wallace-Hadrill (n. 21 above) 239ff.

ingly defeated and were soon to lose their ducal family the members of which had appeared as independent rulers a generation earlier, although they owed their position to their investiture as Frankish officials. Even in the most outlying districts of the "multi-regnal" *regnum Francorum*, in Aquitaine and Bavaria, the Carolingian influence was growing considerably. The last Merovingian king had died five years before, and was not yet succeeded by another member of the sacred, long-haired family.<sup>27</sup>

But at this very moment, the old opposition forced the Carolingians to reverse their policy and to suffer a setback at the hands of their enemies. A Merovingian had to become king, and when Carloman's younger brother Pippin III repeated the formula *dux et princeps Francorum* in 744, he no longer spoke of his *regnum*.<sup>28</sup>

Who was this opposition, evidently strong enough to impose upon the Carolingians a policy that they did not like? This opposition consisted of those people who considered the Carolingians to be no more than their peers; if not social upstarts, who tried "to prevent them from obeying their Merovingian kings as they were wont to do since time immemorial."<sup>29</sup> The leaders of this aristocratic opposition were no doubt the Agilolfings in Swabia and Bavaria and the ducal family of Aquitaine.<sup>30</sup>

Although there remains no diplomatic evidence which would show the self-manifestation of the latter, contemporary papal and Carolingian sources alike prove the assumption that the ducal family of Aquitaine possessed the principate over Aquitaine, that is to say they were the *principes Aquitanorum*.<sup>31</sup> This principate can be traced back to the second half of the seventh century when the Frankish "dux Lupus" established a quasi-royal government over the "Romani" of the former Roman provinces Aquitania I and II.<sup>32</sup> There is evidence that Lupus's accession fell in the same year that the Gothic *dux* Paulus tried to establish Languedoc as an independent kingdom. Paulus failed, because he proclaimed himself king.<sup>33</sup> Certainly, Frankish sources denounced Lupus's accession also as an usurpation of royal rights. But diplomatic sources show that Lupus kept theoretically recognizing

<sup>28</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 139f.

<sup>29</sup> *Erchanberti breviarium regum Francorum*, MGH Script. 2 (1829) 328.

<sup>30</sup> See n. 29. E. Zöllner, "Die Herkunft der Agilolfinger," *Zur Geschichte der Bayerischen Wege der Forschung* 60 (Darmstadt 1965) 131f.; H. Löwe, "Bonifatius und die bayerische fränkische Spannung," *Wege der Forschung* 285f., 294ff.; Wolfram, "Das Fürstentum Tassilos III, Herzogs der Bayern," *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde* 108 (Salzburg 1968) 178f.

<sup>31</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 156f.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* 114f., 156f.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* 70f.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 142 n. 11.

Merovingian as his superior, as his *princeps*.<sup>35</sup> Lupus remained a *fidelis*, a faithful in theory so that he could easily overcome the verbal attacks on part of the Franks who had virtually to give up the whole southwestern part of Gaul.<sup>36</sup> The Merovingian king and his major-domo had no legal pretext to interfere. We shall see that this very theoretical construction is a typical product of Frankish politics and was to become even more important in the ninth and tenth than it had been in the seventh and eighth centuries.

After about three generations of "homerule," the new body politic, called *principatus*, *ducalus*, or *regnum Aquitanorum*, created a new tribal entity with a native political consciousness. The *Romani* of the territories and former Roman provinces south of the Loire River, who had up to then been just a legal unity which lived according to its provincial Gothic-Roman law, started thinking of themselves as a political unity which adopted a new "national" name. By about 750, the former *Romani* had finally become *Aquitani*. It was the very unifying "force of statehood" that had inaugurated and completed this process.<sup>37</sup>

In this particular case, the concept "statehood" means a *regnum* created by a non-Merovingian Frankish official, called *dux*, who used the Frankish political structure to organize a body politic. This was no longer dependent on the Merovingian kings and their government, although theoretically the new *regnum* did not separate from the greater *regnum Francorum*. I consider this compromise to be a genuine Frankish speciality which, for one, did justice to the principle that a successful warleader, a *dux*, was allowed and supposed to replace an ineffective "national" king as *princeps regni*. On the other hand, by refraining from becoming "kings" themselves in the technical and legal sense, these *principes-duces* avoided the built-in centrifugal forces of that principle that made them *the first* (*furisto*, *Fürst*) of a *regnum*. At the same time, they avoided being outlawed as unfaithful, *infideles*, which would have been the signal for their peers to fall upon them under the pretext of supporting the king.<sup>38</sup>

The process of establishing nonroyal rulership was by no means limited to Aquitaine nor to the seventh century. By 700, Frisia, Swabia, Alsace, Thuringia, and Bavaria were political entities built more or less on the lines of the aforementioned principate of Aquitaine.<sup>39</sup> The Carolingians tried to

reverse this development; but they did not destroy the new *regna*. It was only the independent dynasties that they could deprive of their power.<sup>40</sup> After 850 and above all from 887 onward, when the last Carolingian, who theoretically held the whole empire under his sway, was deposed for his ineffectiveness,<sup>41</sup> the seventh century process was revitalized. Certainly, there were new families and mostly new entities to become organized as *regna* ruled by nonroyal *principes*. We encounter again Aquitaine, Bavaria, and Swabia. But there are also Gothia-Septimania (Languedoc), Burgundy, (German) Franconia, Saxony, Flanders, Normandy, Brittany, (French) Francia (Ile-de-France), Lorraine and Gascony.<sup>42</sup> The latter might have had genuine indigenous origins. In Brittany, native traditions certainly provided the main impulse in the making of the duchy, although the final impact was initiated by the Breton Nominoë who was at the same time a Frankish count of the ninth-century type.<sup>43</sup>

Certainly, this description contains much interpretation of a very controversial topic. I am attempting to refute the whole hallowed doctrine of the difference between the beginnings of the West-Frankish, "French", *principautés territoriales*, and the East-Frankish, "German," stem-duchies. I have refuted the doctrine of the difference between the French *nationalités régionales* and the allegedly "age-old" political consciousness of the coeval German tribes. Certainly, their names had already appeared during the Migrations. Yet, their political, institutional, and biological structures had more often than not thoroughly changed. I have, moreover, refuted the basic difference between the so-called *älteres Stammesfürstentum* and *jüngeres Stammesfürstentum*, since I consider the duchies before and after Charlemagne to have been basically the same Frankish institution, although, of course, I do not overlook the differences in detail. I am also implying that both the French *nationalités régionales* and the German tribes of the ninth and tenth centuries were not the cause but the result of the dismemberment of the Carolingian Empire which, despite all its efforts, finally could not stop that dismemberment that had originated with the late Merovingian *regnum Francorum* two centuries before.

In sum: The *nationalités régionales* of the French Middle Ages and the tribes of the German side of the Rhine River were created by princes who

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 125f.

<sup>36</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 123ff.

<sup>37</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 114f.

<sup>38</sup> J. Dhondt, *Études sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France, IX<sup>e</sup>-X<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Brugge 1948) 213; Werner 123ff.

<sup>39</sup> For the understanding of this most important phenomenon I am deeply obliged to the helpful cooperation with K. F. Werner whose forthcoming book, *Die Entstehung des Fürstentums, 7.-10. Jahrhundert; Studien zur fränkischen Reichsstruktur und zur Geschichte*

*des nichtköniglichen Herrschertums* (Munich, Wilhelm Fink), will throw much light upon this issue. K. Brunner will deal with the same topic in *Intitulatio II*, laying, however, stress upon the princely and ducal titles involved: cf. n. 2 above; Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 113ff., 142ff.

<sup>40</sup> Wolfram, "Tassilo III" (n. 30 above) 179, and *Intitulatio* (n. 1 above) 221f.

<sup>41</sup> Böhmer-Mühlbacher (n. 25 above) no. 1765ab.

<sup>42</sup> See n. 39 above.

<sup>43</sup> See n. 39 above, and Dhondt (n. 38 above) 84ff.

could connect the Frankish political and military organization forms with varying tribal traditions of mostly legal and socioeconomic nature.<sup>44</sup>

But let us once more return to the eighth century, prepared to have a glance at the other outlying duchies of the fading Merovingian period. In the first half of the eighth century, the ducal families of Swabia and Bavaria had the same ancestors and took pride in being Agilolfingians. It is not quite clear as yet whether or not this powerful clan derived from the old Burgundian royal family. We know, however, that their political tradition came from those venerable origins.<sup>45</sup> The Agilolfingians had been a noble family whose core-land must have been Burgundy, who then spread all over the eastern part of the Merovingian *regna*, and even crossed the border of Frankland. Agilolfingians were kings of the Lombards for almost 80 years from the mid-seventh century onward. Members of this family had been invested by the Merovingian kings in Bavaria probably by the sixth century, and at an unknown but certainly much later date in Swabia. I believe 624 to be the first secure date for the inveterate conflict between Agilolfingians and Carolingians. From then onward the former were always prepared to fight the latter as upstarts without tradition.<sup>46</sup> Compare, for instance, the personal names of both families with each other. On the one hand, *Garibald*, *Tassilo*, *Odilo*, and *Theodo* were names worthy of royal persons. On the other hand, one has *Pippin*—nobody can tell what this emotional gemination is supposed to mean—then *Karl*, a name that is akin to Old Saxon *ceorl* which means *freeman*, and *Karlmann*, which is just a duplication, a rather unimaginative variation of *Karl*. Little wonder that Charlemagne himself tried to measure up to the status of a royal family by giving his son Louis-Clovis the name of the famous founder of the Merovingian dynasty.<sup>47</sup>

Despite their “better” origins, the Agilolfingians along with other noble families were more and more losing ground while the Carolingians progressed. Finally, Bavaria came to be the last stronghold of the formerly most powerful family.

Yet, only a few months before Carloman claimed to be the *dux et princeps Francorum*, he and his brother Pippin were deeply scandalized by the fact that their sister did not share their innate animosity and left Frankland for Bavaria to marry Odilo the Agilolfingian princelike *dux Bavariorum*.<sup>48</sup>

<sup>44</sup> See n. 39.

<sup>45</sup> Wolfram, “Tassilo III” (n. 30 above) 178. Werner, (n. 12 above) 108, differs from Zöllner (n. 30 above) 108ff., upon the question whether this family derived from the old Burgundian royal family actually or ideologically.

<sup>46</sup> Wolfram, “Tassilo III” 79; Werner (n. 12 above) 107ff.; E. Hlawitschka, “Die Vorfahren Karls des Grossen,” *Karl der Grosse* (Düsseldorf 1965) 51ff., 56ff.

<sup>47</sup> Werner 107ff.; Zöllner (n. 30 above) 110ff.; E. Förstemann, *Altdeutsches Namenbuch* (Bonn 1900) 299f., 359f., 855ff.

<sup>48</sup> Wolfram, “Tassilo III” 158f.

The offspring of that detested marriage was Tassilo III. He reigned over the Bavarians for forty years until Charlemagne, who was then the lord of the whole of Latin Continental Europe, could finally destroy him and take vengeance upon him for more than 160 years of Agilolfingian resistance.<sup>49</sup> Tassilo's diplomatic documents show that he took pains to keep up with the political development in Frankland. Except for the title *rex* itself, which he never used, the wording of Tassilo's *intitulatio* literally followed the pattern of the new Carolingian royal title. Tassilo was a *princeps regni*; he was the lord of “his” territorial church lately established by Boniface himself, and he invested counts by his own hand. He was hailed *novus Constantinus* as only Charlemagne was at this time, and he had his son christened and anointed by the pope in a ceremony that had just been introduced for the Carolingians to guarantee the dangerous transition from their principate to their kingship. Moreover, Tassilo married King Desiderius's daughter when the Lombard kingdom had arrived at the peak of its power and reputation in Europe. And he was the brother-in-law of another nonroyal ruler, the *princeps-dux gentis Langobardorum* in Benevento. Tassilo's fall in 788 included that of his family, which came to be imprisoned in several monasteries throughout Francia. But Tassilo's *regnum* survived. Thus Charlemagne repeated simply the policy already applied to Aquitaine.<sup>50</sup>

The first war Charlemagne had to wage as a young king was the inherited *bellum Aquitanicum*.<sup>51</sup> He succeeded in abolishing the ducal family, but not the *regnum Aquitanorum*, which he recognized as such hardly more than a decade later when he invested his little son Louis as *rex Aquitanorum*.<sup>52</sup> The same held true for the Bavarian kingdom. It was not divided into a plurality of counties as a superficial reading of Einhard would perhaps make one believe. Instead, it remained as an entity under the control of men who were both faithful to Charlemagne and relatives of the deposed duke. Louis the Pious, the former *rex Aquitanorum*, finally gave the *regnum Bavariorum* its king in the person of first his son Lothair and then of Louis whom the textbooks call the German.<sup>53</sup>

It is almost a commonplace that the Carolingian empire was a centralized state, relatively well organized in more than 300 counties,<sup>54</sup> which was only

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.* 177-79.

<sup>50</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 111ff. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 157, 170ff., esp. 181ff.

<sup>51</sup> Einhard, *Vita Karoli magni* 5, ed. G. Waitz, MGH Script. rer. germ. in usum scholarum (Hannover 1911) 7.

<sup>52</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 222f.; Cf. Einhard, *Vita* 5.

<sup>53</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 223. Böhmer-Mühlbacher (n. 25 above) nos. 528a, 1338c.

<sup>54</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 122, rightly criticizes this obsolete opinion, which is still held by N. Zacour, *An Introduction to Medieval Institutions* (New York 1969) 102ff., whereas E. Klebel, “Herzogtümer und Marken bis 900,” *Die Entstehung des Deutschen Reiches, Wege der Forschung* (Darmstadt 1956) 91, or *Deutsches Archiv* 2 (Weimar 1938) 52, has

to be thrown into chaos and aristocratic anarchy by the inefficiency of a pious hypocrite. But how do the two just mentioned *regna* fit into this picture? Furthermore, there were not just two *regna* as such recognized by, and incorporated in, the *regnum Francorum*. From 774 on, there existed the Frankish *regnum Langobardorum* which Charlemagne himself had recognized in his new title *rex Francorum et Langobardorum*, and which he had organized as a subrealm in 781 when he invested his son Pippin as another *rex Langobardorum*.<sup>55</sup> And there was the *regnum Neustriae*, obtained around 790 by Charlemagne's oldest son and heir apparent, Charles, who unfortunately died in 811. When this King Charles built up his kingdom, the concept *Neustria* started changing or had already considerably changed. It finally shrank to connote that part of Francia which lay between the Loire and the Seine.<sup>56</sup> This kingdom, which by the way was no *ad hoc* creation, advanced the process that finally led to the dismemberment of Francia proper into four and even more parts. These parts were Neustria, whose tradition was continued by the Normans; Francia in the narrow sense of the word, the Frankish country between the Seine and the Ardennes, which during the tenth century lost Flanders and became virtually limited to the Ile de France, the political base of the Capetian dukes and kings alike; then Lorraine, the *regnum quondam Lotharii*, called after the second Lothair, King of Lorraine (855-869), and again an example of the importance of political decisions in establishing statehood; finally Franconia along the Main river, the German duchy, which was to enable the East-Frankish German kingdom to remain theoretically a *regnum Francorum*.<sup>57</sup>

The development that I have just described took place mostly between 850 and 950, but it was Charlemagne himself who, if he did not start it, at least did not fight it. How can we explain this seemingly contradictory policy of the architect of the Carolingian Empire? Again, diplomatic sources provide the clue to its understanding. It was neither Pippin's nor his greater son's policy to destroy what has been called the "regna-structure" of the fading Merovingian Kingdom. They simply fought the incumbents of the *regna* who possessed them in virtue of their own "age-old" rights as heirlooms of their ancestors, confirmed by the tribal law, as is evident with the

clearly shown and proven the contrary. As to the figure "more than 300 counties" see J. Flach, *Les origines de l'ancienne France* (Paris 1886) 165.

<sup>55</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 220ff., 224.

<sup>56</sup> *Annales sancti Amandi*, ad annum 789, MGH Script. 1 (Hannover 1826) 12. Cf. Dhondt, (n. 38 above) 100. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 206.

<sup>57</sup> E. Ewig, "Descriptio Franciae," *Karl der Grosse* 143. E. Hlawitschka, *Lotharingen und das Reich an der Schwelle der deutschen Geschichte*, MGH Schriftenreihe 21 (Stuttgart 1968) 15ff. Dhondt (n. 38 above) 81ff. W. Schlesinger, "Die Auflösung des Karlsreiches," *Karl der Grosse* 1.852ff., and above all, K. F. Werner in his forthcoming book (see n. 39).

Bavarian Agilolfingians.<sup>58</sup> I am of the opinion that it was this very recognition of the *regna*-structure based upon already shaped or still growing tribal or national entities, which actually allowed the Carolingians to build their Empire.<sup>59</sup> Of course, the Frankish army was irresistible at the moment; but without the support of the *gentes adquisitae*, of the "acquired peoples" as the sources had it,<sup>60</sup> the most glorious victory was almost in vain. For instance, the Frankish army defeated the Bavarians in 725, 728, 743, 749, and 787. But the Bavarian dukes survived all these bloodless defeats, until feudal policy mainly based upon feudal law and the factional strife among the Bavarians themselves allowed the Frankish King to build up a strong Frankish party in Bavaria by means of which he could oust Tassilo, the ducal family, and its followers in 788.<sup>61</sup> The same held true for the Saxons whom Charlemagne had to fight for more than 30 years. All his numerous victories over this people did not meet with decisive success until the Saxon aristocracy sided with the Franks in fear of the growing strength of the so-called freemen (*Gemeinfreien*).<sup>62</sup> The best way, certainly, to attain the support of a *gens adquisita* was to recognize its tribal or "national" entity in the form of a *regnum*. Like the Late Roman Empire, so the Carolingian Empire contained a plurality of *regna*.<sup>63</sup>

We must clarify or rather define this word *regnum*. The Merovingian kings divided the Frankish greater *regnum* into as many separate Frankish *regna* as they had sons living. Moreover, during the seventh century it became more and more common and necessary to establish subrealms for the heirs apparent while the fathers were still living.<sup>64</sup> These different types of *regna* could attach to local political traditions or more often create the political commonalty of a given area. The Carolingians had to follow their predecessors in this policy, imposed upon them by the sacred law of heritage. Therefore we have to reckon with a threefold meaning of *regnum*: (1) *regnum* in the sense of *Regnum Francorum*; (2) *regnum* in the sense of *pars regni Francorum* as evidenced in 741 or 768, when Carloman and Peppin, and Charlemagne and Carloman II respectively shared in the *regnum Francorum*; and (3) *regnum* in the sense of subrealm, *provincia*, *regio*, *patria*, as for instance, evidenced

<sup>58</sup> Wolfram, "Tassilo III" 173. About the anti-Carolingian aspects of this very law see Löwe (n. 30 above) 294ff.

<sup>59</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 222-224.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.* 157, n. 7.

<sup>61</sup> Wolfram, "Tassilo III" 163, 161f., 171-173.

<sup>62</sup> M. Lintzel, "Der sächsische Stammesstaat und seine Eroberung," *Entstehung und Verfassung des Sachsenstammes*, Wege der Forschung 50 (Darmstadt 1967) 198ff.

<sup>63</sup> Werner (n. 12 above) 122. Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 35.

<sup>64</sup> G. Eiten, *Das Unterkönigtum im Reiche der Merowinger und Karolinger*, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte 18 (Heidelberg 1907) 16f.



by the *regnum Aquilanorum* of Louis the Pious and the *regnum Bavariorum* of Louis the German.<sup>65</sup>

Thus far, I have mainly dealt with seventh- and eighth-century principalities, although enough allusions to the later development may already have made clear that I consider the ninth- and tenth-century principalities merely to have been the continuation of the former. Certainly, the *principes regni* had little or nothing to do genealogically with the defeated and destroyed ducal families of former times. Moreover, the people who lived in the older type of principalities had more often than not changed, too. New tribal entities emerged, more locally and territorially oriented, in fact, but still considered to be tribal units in theory. In other words, the Capetian duke of Francia called himself "*dux Francorum*"; his counterparts in Aquitaine, *dux Aquilanorum*; in Bavaria, *dux Bavariorum*, and so on. Yet, despite the particular changes, which I would never deny, the rise of the new *principes regni* occurred along the same lines as it did centuries earlier.<sup>66</sup>

But before I enter the final chapter of my topic, I would like to mention the only nonroyal princely dynasty in Europe which actually survived the Carolingian Empire. From 715 to 774, the diplomatic records of the powerful Lombard Dukes of Benevento bear the proud and certainly much older title *Nos domnus vir gloriosissimus (nomen) summus dux gentis Langobardorum*. The kings of the barbarian invasions inherited the titles both of *princeps* and *dominus* from their political model, the Roman emperors. Thus far, we have investigated how *princeps* could be adopted by nonroyal rulers. Certainly, *princeps* was the more important title. In Italy, however, it was *dom[i]nus* that became part of a princely duke's title. The Lombard duke of Spoleto tried to imitate his more successful colleague in Benevento. And it is true that both duchies virtually remained outside of the proper Lombard kingdom. After 774, when this realm collapsed and was incorporated into the growing Carolingian Empire, Spoleto fell victim to the impact of both papal and Frankish pressure. The duke of Benevento, no longer hindered by a *rex et princeps gentis Langobardorum*, assumed the title *princeps*. It proves my theory of the value of *dominus* that *princeps* replaced not only *dux* but *dominus* alike. Despite heavy attacks from all sides, from Franks, Arabs, and Byzantines, this genuine Lombard principality survived as a

bufferstate between East and West, even when it came to be divided, to build the nucleus of the Italian Norman state.<sup>67</sup>

When the Carolingians were still major-domos, they used the Frankish aristocracy, that is to say their peers some generations earlier, for missions all over Europe unless these nobles resisted them as the Swabian and Bavarian Agilolfingians did. The transfer of nobles, as holders of offices and benefices, from one part of the *regnum Francorum* to another effected a deep change in the structure of a great many of the aristocratic clans. It goes without saying that Charlemagne's reign increased the need for Franks all over Europe. Eventually, a purely provincial aristocracy, tied to its inherited estates and traditional patterns, turned into a European aristocracy, the so-called Carolingian imperial aristocracy. A stream of noblemen poured out from Austrasia, the heartland of Carolingian power, into the other parts of the Kingdom.<sup>68</sup> These newcomers fused with the local families into a new aristocracy, in Bavaria as well as in Italy, in Saxonia as well as in Aquitaine. For instance, the ancestors of the Capetians, the kings of France after 987, were newcomers from the central Rhine valley, settling then in Neustria and Francia around Paris.<sup>69</sup>

Certainly, among these newcomers there were not only men of lowly origins; usually, the contrary was true. We find mainly those members of the Merovingian-Frankish elite who made up their minds in time to support the apparently irresistible rise of the Carolingians, whom they followed as their feudal lords and kings of the Franks. This aristocracy first had a vested interest in maintaining the universality of the empire. The struggles among Charlemagne's grandsons and great-grandsons, however, occurred against the background of Viking and Saracen invasions; the affliction was soon to be increased by the Hungarian horsemen, so that virtually no place within the large Frankish commonwealth was safe any more. The inability of most of the Carolingian kings and emperors to protect their kingdoms against the external enemy led to a situation somewhat similar to that in which the Carolingians had risen themselves, two hundred years earlier. The members of the imperial aristocracy, moreover, had to decide whom of the Carolingians to follow. Their services came to be highly honored by each of the potential lords. So, the new upper class took rather quick advantage of the dismemberment and internal strife in concentrating their power in a given *regnum*

<sup>65</sup> For this scheme, I draw upon K. F. Werner, as n. 39 above indicates.

<sup>66</sup> Dhondt (n. 38 above) 217ff., 285ff.; K. Reindel, "Bayern unter den Luitpoldingern," *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte* (Munich 1967) 206ff.; F. Prinz, "Das Herzogtum der Luitpoldinger," *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte* 295ff. It goes without saying that Werner will deal with this topic as well as K. Brunner (see n. 39 above).

<sup>67</sup> Wolfram, *Intitulatio* 185ff. E. Cornides will cover the later development (from 774 onward) in *Intitulatio II*.

<sup>68</sup> H. Fichtenau, *The Carolingian Empire* (Oxford 1957) 110. Cf. E. Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien, 774-962* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1960).

<sup>69</sup> Werner, "Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums," *Welt als Geschichte* 19 (Stuttgart 1959) 168f. n. 90. Flach (n. 54 above) 3 (1904) 199, speaks of the Saxon origins of the Capetians.

of the empire. Some of them could even rise to become the nonroyal heads of those *regna*, again called *principes*, that is to say of a people or simply of a *regnum*.<sup>70</sup>

Such a new *princeps regni* was not only the most ruthless collector of counties in a given *regnum*,<sup>71</sup> but he had to prove himself prepared and able to protect and organize this *regnum* as an efficient body politic. Odo, count of Paris, defended the city against the Normans. His success backed his principate over Neustria and expanded it over Francia (Ile-de-France) to some extent. Odo finally received a sort of personal kingship which can be understood as a direct principate over Neustria and Francia plus indirect overlordship over Burgundy and Aquitaine, if we are allowed to neglect Brittany and Gascony.<sup>72</sup> Arnulf of Bavaria alone was able to defeat and come to terms with the Hungarians after the catastrophes of Pressburg-Bratislava in 907 where his father fell, and of Augsburg in 910 when the Carolingian king himself was defeated.<sup>73</sup>

The rise of this new stratum of Carolingian officials to an eventual ruling class was accompanied by an interesting terminological "confusion." The famous foundation charter for Cluny was issued by William the Pious of Aquitaine who called himself *comes et dux* in 910, after having used several variations of this title form, among which we even find *comes*, *marchio atque dux* (898).<sup>74</sup> Beside this threefold *intitulatio*, *princeps* and *dux gentis* could have been used also.<sup>75</sup> How can we explain this?

Charlemagne defeated the ducal families and of necessity suppressed the titles *dux* or even *princeps* for their king-likeness. The princely *regna*, however, were recognized by him as such and even upgraded by the investiture of real kings in the persons of Carolingian offspring. But this policy neither occurred automatically nor materialized everywhere. In contrast, while the "county organization" of the empire might have been relatively efficient in the core-land, it was certainly too weak to provide sufficient protection on the borders. "Super-counts" in charge of a plurality of counties had to be invested. To avoid all kinds of inconvenient allusions to former princely titles and to measure up to the classical renewal, such an official, such a "super-count" came to be called *praefectus limitis*. In Bavaria, a *praefectus limitis* was in charge of the whole *regnum*. Little wonder that less official sources soon started calling him *praefectus provinciae* or *dux*, again. Officially the artificial "literary" term *praefectus limitis* was replaced by the Latinized German-Frankish

<sup>70</sup> See n. 39 above. Werner (n. 69 above) 163ff.; Dhondt (n. 38 above) 234ff.  
<sup>71</sup> Dhondt 34f.

<sup>72</sup> Dhondt 100ff., cf. 45ff.

<sup>73</sup> Reindel (n. 66 above) 210.

<sup>74</sup> W. Kienast, *Der Herzogstitel in Frankreich und Deutschland*, (Munich 1968) 169.  
<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.* 169ff.

term *marchio* (from *mark*, *march*, i. e. border). For the next generation, this word was obviously prevailing. Then the word *marchio* remained but with a new meaning. Now, each "super-count" no matter where in the Frankish commonwealth, was called *marchio*. In fact, *marchio* came to name the new non-Carolingian and nonroyal *princeps regni* for a while. After 900, almost in the same year, the *princeps regni* in Aquitaine, in Burgundy, and in Bavaria used the title type *Dei gratia dux (princeps) gentis*, which was evidently modeled after the royal title. Yet, the Carolingian chanceries east and west of the Rhine river continued calling those self-styled *duces-principes* simply *marchiones et comites*. The new royal dynasties, however, who were to replace the Carolingian kings, had to recognize the *dux-princeps* title as a matter of fact.<sup>76</sup>

The princes around 900 were *comites* as incumbents of counties, *marchiones* as holders of a plurality of counties, both in keeping with the official Carolingian policy. But they had also become *duces* by the way of fact. *Dux* by this time definitely meant *heritoho*, *herzog*, leader of the army, that is to say leader of the people under arms. The Carolingian kings were no longer able to fulfil this task. Possessing the most powerful position in a given *regnum*, the greatest number of counties, and having proven himself a successful leader of the army of the *regnum*, the *dux-marchio-comes* had become the *princeps regni*, or, since the army was the "people," the *dux gentis* or *princeps gentis*.

The last question which almost automatically rises is: Why did they not try to become real kings? I have already touched upon this issue, but it is important enough to discuss more completely.

In 887, Charles the Fat was deposed for inability and disease; these legal reasons were confirmed by ecclesiastical theory as well as by the Teutonic right of resistance.<sup>77</sup> In 888, some of the nonroyal non-Carolingian *principes regni* tried to proclaim their kingship.<sup>78</sup> Very few of them succeeded, however. Much more successful was the way shown by Bernard Plantevelue, William the Pious's father, some years earlier, who remained faithful to the Carolingian king and was able, therefore, to become the most powerful magnate in southern France;<sup>79</sup> this goal was never reached either by Bernard of Gothia or even by Boso of Burgundy, who either proclaimed themselves kings or at

<sup>76</sup> Kienast (n. 14 above) 43ff., who heavily relies on the fundamental article of J. Dhondt, "Le titre du marquis à l'époque carolingienne," *Archivum latinitatis medii Aevi* 19 (Brussels 1946) 407ff.

<sup>77</sup> F. Kern, *Gottesgnadentum und Widerstandsrecht*, ed. 2 (Darmstadt 1954) 318. An English translation of the first edition that appeared in 1914, *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages*, by S. B. Chrimes (Oxford 1948), is now obsolete.

<sup>78</sup> Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon*, ad annum 888, ed. F. Kurze, MGH Script. rer. Germ. in usum scholarum (Hannover 1890) 128-31.

<sup>79</sup> Dhondt (n. 38 above) 240ff.

least behaved as such.<sup>80</sup> It was actually the faithful, *fideles*, who dismembered the Frankish empire, not the unfaithful usurpers, *infideles*. For despite his lack of power to be an over-all efficient king, the Carolingian king was still powerful enough to curb the unfaithful who had broken their feudal oaths.<sup>81</sup> To fight them, he would always find enough support from men who, otherwise, could not care less about the king's glory and honor. The very powerful Arnulf of Bavaria, for instance, had to flee his duchy twice from the king to whom he did not want to swear feudal allegiance.<sup>82</sup>

In sum, it did not pay off to become king, except in the long run for the Capetians who possessed Francia proper with all its Carolingian resources and traditions, and for the Saxon kings who could make the world believe that they continued the Carolingian-Frankish tradition in Aachen as well as in Pavia and Rome.<sup>83</sup> It was the latter who came to be powerful enough to repeat Charlemagne's policy toward the principalities in a modified form, which was so effective, in the end that it definitely broke those principalities based upon a tribal body politic. In the West, however, the rising French principalities maintained the status of their incumbents much longer. They were still heads of the church in their *regna*, decided upon their basically hereditary succession, possessed the former royal domains, intermarried with royal families, were supreme judges in their *regna*, were lords of the former royal vassals, feudal lords of counts, bishops, abbots. It was at their courts that the cultural life, the political and socioeconomic organization were initiated and concentrated. The West-Frankish principalities were the almost forgotten cradle of France, of French culture, French literature, and above all of French and European religious renewal. The Truce-of-God movement was inaugurated by the church of the duke of Aquitaine, and the monastery of Cluny was founded neither by an emperor nor by a king, neither by a pope nor by a bishop, but by William the Pious, the first to call himself by God's grace duke of the Aquitanians.<sup>84</sup> On the other hand, the Neustrian-Norman *regnum-ducatus* provided the base from which the Normans conquered Eng-

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, cf 213.

<sup>81</sup> See n. 38 above.

<sup>82</sup> Reindel (n. 66 above) 211.

<sup>83</sup> H. Beumann, "Grab und Thron Karls des Grossen zu Aachen," *Karl der Grosse* (Düsseldorf 1967) 9ff., and K. Hauck, "Die Ottonen und Aachen, 876 bis 936," *Karl der Grosse* 4.39ff., are dealing with the Carolingian tradition east of the Rhine. As to the "French" counterpart see J. F. Lemarignier, *Le gouvernement royal aux premiers temps capétiens, 987-1108* (Paris 1964) 37ff. R. Fawtier, *Les Capétiens et la France*, (Paris 1942), has been recently translated into English as *The Capetian Kings of France*, by L. Butler and R. J. Adam (New York 1966), but this book does not meet the standards of modern research; Cf. Werner, "Die Legitimität der Kapetingen und die Entstehung des 'Reditus regni Francorum ad stirpem Karoli,'" *Welt als Geschichte* 17 (Stuttgart 1952) 203ff.

<sup>84</sup> See the list of titles given by J. Flach (n. 54 above) 4 (1917) 507 n. 20.

land and Southern Italy where they modified the feudal system along the lines of logic, and achieved feudal immediacy for the king. Flanders, finally, became the cradle of modern industry and commerce and another center of cultural life.<sup>85</sup>

The efforts and achievements of those bodies politic are unjustly overlooked by a "king-centered" historiography, which is interested too exclusively in the modern, centralized, and unifying Leviathan—the modern state.

<sup>85</sup> Werner, "Untersuchungen zur Frühzeit des französischen Fürstentums," *Welt als Geschichte* 18 (Stuttgart 1958) 256ff.

University of Vienna  
A-1010 Vienna 1  
Austria