

# MEDIEVAL PROSOPOGRAPHY

---

Volume 5

AUTUMN 1984

No. 2



Published twice yearly by

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS

Kalamazoo, Michigan

OBSERVATIONS ON THE OUTGROWTH OF PIPPINID INFLUENCE IN  
THE "REGNUM FRANCORUM" AFTER THE BATTLE OF TERTRY  
(687-715)<sup>1</sup>

PAUL J. FOURACRE

The history of the early Middle Ages has of late been recharged by a concentration on prosopographical studies,<sup>2</sup> for these have seemed to offer the prospect of extracting reliable information from sources traditionally regarded as biased, inconsistent, and confused. Though the prosopographical approach does not, by itself, rectify the bias of our sources and, no more than any other approach, is independent of effective bias in the selective survival of material, it nevertheless aids the construction of a solid corpus of useful material which can be checked and is free from the opinions of both the author and the historian. The history of later Merovingian Francia derives an especial benefit from the collection of such information, for in this field the sources are particularly fragmentary and strongly biased, often reinterpreting Merovingian events from a Carolingian point of view. Thus Horst Ebling's *Prosopographie der Amtsträger des Merowingerreiches* (1974)<sup>3</sup> has already become an essential guide to the later Merovingian world.

Ebling's work, however, reveals a central problem in any prosopographical approach to the history of later Merovingian Francia--the looseness and inconsistency of the Merovingian use of titles. The Merovingian use seems to have lain halfway between the simple description of a person's status or rank and a formal rank or title, and it could shift in either

direction.<sup>4</sup> The term *dux*, for example, could describe active leadership on specific occasions--armies have *duces*, commanders--or it could identify the long-term, officially recognized position of one man ruling over a specified area, as in the case of Eticho, *dux* of Alsace. The situation is further complicated by regional differences in the use of titles. The *dux* figure (as ruler) was called *patricius* in the south, and we see *comites* here as well; in the north their equivalent were *graphiones*. In the ecclesiastical sphere the picture is, not surprisingly, much clearer, revealing a contemporary awareness of a structured hierarchy.<sup>5</sup> In practice, however, where important church appointments lay in the gift of the kings, the exercise of royal patronage appears, often, to have resulted in the reward of secular services with ecclesiastical preferment, and preferred ecclesiastics continued their political careers in service to the king.<sup>6</sup> As the seventh century draws to a close, the figure of the warrior bishop emerges with increasing clarity.<sup>7</sup> The apparently casual use of titles here is, in context, the reflection of a political structure aligned less towards power emanating from the holding of office than towards power which was basically personal and, though deriving in part from royal patronage, was exercised through the exploitation of local economic resources. Royal power existed where the *potentes*, the magnates, were *fideles*, the followers of the kings; and magnates were maintained in a state of *fidelitas* by what the kings could offer in terms of both reward and punishment. Integral to the arrangement of rewards was a royal reinforcement of existing magnate strength by the delegation of further executive powers, and here we come closer to the idea of "offices" and "careers,"<sup>8</sup> though, naturally, appointments were not open to the powerless.<sup>9</sup> Contemporaries were struck by the power men had, not by the capacity in which it was exercised. Thus, in the narrative sources, political actors are described as often by the various words for "magnate" (*seniores*, *potentes*, *optimates*) as they are by any "official" designation. Even in the documents of the royal court, which conserve traces of the legacy of late

Roman formal government, the general terms for magnates (*obtimates*, *proceres*, and, most common, *viri inlustri* [sic]) are frequently seen.<sup>10</sup>

Despite these necessary *caveats*, prosopographical analysis is crucial to the process of determining who held political power and wielded political influence in later Merovingian Francia. If we cannot reconstruct by rank and office the careers of the most powerful, it is still possible to estimate political power by identifying the followers of the various leaders. Here the informal aspect of political life can be turned to the historian's advantage, for one way in which the Merovingians ruled was to hold assemblies of magnates drawn from the areas under their influence and thus to transmit to them directly and to involve them in royal commands, judgements, and decisions. Gifts were also exchanged at such times. A few of the documents relating to these full sessions of the royal court have survived,<sup>11</sup> and, from a scrutiny of the people mentioned in the documents, we can gain some, albeit tentative, impression of the political formations of the times. To this we can add information from other sources to make the impression firmer. My aim here is to use this approach to qualify a set of well-entrenched notions concerning the outgrowth of Pippinid power. The orthodox view is that, after his victory at the battle of Tertry in 687, Pippin of Heristal swiftly gained political control of Neustria, pushed already *fainéant* Merovingian kings deeper into the shadows, and consolidated an Austrasian domination in Francia which was to mature into Carolingian hegemony.<sup>12</sup> In 687 a decade-long struggle between the two Frankish kingdoms of Neustria and Austrasia was ended when a faction of Neustrians joined with the Austrasians and defeated the Neustrian *major domus* Berchar and his followers at the battle of Tertry. This was the moment at which the leader of the Austrasians, Pippin of Heristal, began to rule all Francia. In the words of the early ninth century *Annales Mettenses Priores*: "Thus in the year of our Lord 687 Pippin obtained undivided rule over all the Franks."<sup>13</sup>

But this is a Carolingian perspective. In reality, things were not quite as simple. The battle of Tertry marked, in fact, only the penultimate stage in a long-running feud between Pippin and elements of the Neustrian aristocracy based in the Rouen area. This feud appears to have been concerned with attempts by the Pippinid family to marry into the Neustrian family which had, since 680, held the all-important post of *major domus*, or Mayor of the Palace. A magnate called Waratto had succeeded the infamous Ebroin as mayor in 680 and had ended the hostilities with Austrasia which had dominated Ebroin's last years. Waratto's son Chiselmar had then displaced his father and had attacked Pippin. On Chiselmar's death, Waratto re-established peace, but on his own death his son-in-law, Berchar, became Mayor, and hostilities began afresh, leading to the encounter at Tertry. A year after Tertry, Berchar was murdered, according to the early eighth century Neustrian source, the *Liber Historiae Francorum*,<sup>14</sup> at the instigation of his mother-in-law, Ansflendis, Waratto's widow. Thereafter, her daughter, Anstrudis, now Berchar's widow, was married to Pippin's elder son, Drogo.<sup>15</sup> It is reasonable to think that it was the proposal of this final match which was behind the relations between the families of Pippin and Waratto in the period 680-87. Without knowing the date of Berchar's marriage to Anstrudis we cannot be sure, but the important point is that the Pippinids not only fought but also married their way to influence in Neustria. The Pippinid aim must have been that of Berchar earlier, that is, to marry into Waratto's family in order to acquire the key post of Mayor of the Palace. Tenure in the post would allow them open access to the king and to the fruit of such access--a strong say in the direction of royal patronage and in the exercise of power. By not overturning but joining the Neustrian regime, the Pippinid family had opened up a new area for its further expansion, but without that employment of force which was needed to make radical political changes in Merovingian society, any expansion would necessarily be slow and dependent on the approbation of those already in positions of power in Neustria.

There is no evidence for the use of force after the one encounter in 687, and a slow expansion is, indeed, what we seem to see. Even the benefits of the Anstrudis match appear limited in the short-term: Ansflendis, Waratto's widow, retained her grandson, Hugo, the first born of her daughter's marriage to Drogo,<sup>16</sup> while Drogo himself is mentioned only once in a Neustrian context--when, in fact, he failed in a judicial contest with St. Denis over land he claimed by virtue of his marriage to Anstrudis. In the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, Drogo is associated not with Neustria but with a *ducatus* in the Champagne, and in the *Annales Mettenses Priores* this becomes the *ducatus* of Burgundy.<sup>17</sup> Nor is there evidence to show that Pippin himself appeared as Mayor of the Palace in Neustria before 695,<sup>18</sup> although five charters have survived from the years 688-95, the seven years following the death of the last Neustrian Mayor, Berchar. Nevertheless, one benefit of the acquired share of the Warattonid patrimony around Rouen appears to have been the facilitation of moves to take control of the church in the district. In 690 or 691, Ansbert, bishop of Rouen and an old stalwart of the Neustrian regime, was exiled on Pippin's orders.<sup>19</sup> We must also presume that Pippin early acquired land in this area, for the *Gesta* of the abbey of St. Wandrille show him donating to the abbey *villae* distributed throughout the area in the years 703-06.<sup>20</sup> Elsewhere, progress was less rapid. Of confiscation of land we hear of only two possible cases. In 692, land was taken from one Amalbert, after *plura placeta*, ending with a judgement in the royal court<sup>21</sup> Amalbert had been prominent in Neustria under Ebroin, Pippin's enemy. The other case took place sometime in the reign of King Childebert III (695-711). A document issued in 726 by Charles Martel<sup>22</sup> refers to the confiscation of land from a man named Everhard, land which was then given to Pippin. Everhard, a magnate in the Laon area, had, probably in 679, attacked the convent of Notre Dame which lay under Pippinid protection at Laon.<sup>23</sup> If Childebert's confiscation showed Pippin taking revenge of Everhard, the former had waited a long time for an opportunity to do this.

Both cases show how Pippin operated through use of the royal court, a potent weapon not only in the underwriting of private concern with royal judgement and command, but also in the mobilization of collective magnate power against an individual. The judgement against Amalbert,<sup>24</sup> for example, was collectively made by no fewer than twelve bishops and forty secular magnates. As mentioned earlier, it is the surviving records of such court sessions which give us the clearest view of those involved around the center of politics in this period. The nineteen surviving original documents issued under the aegis of the Merovingian kings from 691 to 717<sup>25</sup> have eighty names associated with them, either as co-judges, referendaries, or as "counts of the palace" responsible for the management of court sessions. Of these eighty, only nineteen can be in any way associated with Austrasia or with the Pippinid family. More striking is the comparison with documents issued by the family itself in Austrasia.<sup>26</sup> The eight Austrasian documents issued by the family from 702 to 726 have fifty-eight names associated with them. Of these names, only six can be matched with the names seen in the Neustrian documents, and, of the six, only one (Constantinus) has a common identity beyond doubt in both sets of documents. In other words, only one person--Constantinus, bishop of Beauvais--can be shown to appear in both sets of documents.

These documents have not survived at random. In all cases they survived because they were conserved in the archives of three particular institutions--the monasteries of St. Denis, Echternach, and Stablo-Malmédy--and they were conserved because they contained items of interest to those institutions. We should not imagine that they reveal a cross-section of the politically powerful representative of the *regnum Francorum* as a whole, and, indeed, many of the people mentioned in the documents cannot be identified at all.<sup>27</sup> They give us, nevertheless, the strong impression that Pippin did not pack the magnate assemblies around the king with his Austrasian followers. This impression is all the more striking if we remember that after the death of the Austrasian

king, Dagobert II, in 679, one Merovingian king ruled in both Austrasia and Neustria. We might, thus, have expected to see Austrasians at the royal court and to see them prominent in it once an Austrasian had become the Mayor of the Palace,<sup>28</sup> yet, what little prosopographical knowledge we have of some of the persons mentioned in the Neustrian documents largely confirms the above impression.

The one man we can certainly identify as a follower of Pippin was Nordbert.<sup>29</sup> The *Liber Historiae Francorum* tells us that, after the murder of Berchar (688), Pippin left his man Nordbert with the king while he himself returned to Austrasia.<sup>30</sup> Nordbert seems to have exercised some of the functions as Mayor of the Palace,<sup>31</sup> but his name is never associated with the title and, in the two documents in which he appears as witness, comes second in the list of magnates, on both occasions following persons about whom nothing is known. Nordbert's name never appears in any of the documents issued by the Pippinid family in Austrasia, and, since his own son, Ermentheus, appears in a Neustrian document of 697<sup>32</sup> as a count and in one of 726<sup>33</sup> as possessor of family lands on the river Oise, it is tempting to suppose that elements of Nordbert's kindred moved to Neustria in 688 and settled there.

Less obviously a Pippinid man was the Austrasian magnate, Gundoin.<sup>34</sup> He was a member of the generation of Austrasian magnates which had been prominent in the years when the Pippinid family had been in disgrace--660s to early 670s--following the failed coup of the family against the Austrasian Merovingian king, Sigibert. He had been close to the Austrasian Mayor of the Palace, Wulfoald, who had displaced Pippin's ancestor, Grimoald, as Mayor. Gundoin had, in fact, married Wulfoald's daughter, and a *dux Gundoinus* appears in the *Annales Mettenses Priores* as a sworn enemy of the house of Pippin.<sup>35</sup> It is, thus, perhaps significant that we see him in a position of prominence at this later date.<sup>36</sup> As Gundoin had been close to the Merovingian ruler of Austrasia, Childeric II (662-75), his attendance at the Neustrian court in 693 may signify support for the king rather than for his



old Austrasian enemy, Pippin. The latter point--possible attraction to Merovingian king rather than to Pippinid mayor--may also apply to three others mentioned in the Neustrian documents--Savaric, Chagneric, and Antenor.<sup>37</sup> All three, of unknown origins, ruled in either Burgundy or Provence.

Savaric was what we may, with Prinz, term a warrior bishop. In the near contemporary *Vita* of Eucherius, bishop of Orleans,<sup>38</sup> Savaric is said to have been bishop of Orleans and Eucherius' uncle. In the *Gesta* of the bishops of Auxerre,<sup>39</sup> a mid-ninth-century compilation, he is said to have been bishop of Auxerre and to have extended his rule *militari manu* over Orleans, Nevers, Tonnerre, Avalles, and Troyes. He is also said to have been engaged in an attempt to conquer Lyons when a stroke ended his colorful career. Later, from the *Vita Eucherii*<sup>40</sup> and the Auxerre *Gesta*,<sup>41</sup> we hear that Pippin's son, Charles Martel, attacked his family, driving Savaric's nephew, Eucherius, and his relations out of Orleans and his probable kinsman, Hainmar, out of Auxerre. The *Annales Mettenses*' statement that after 687 Pippin "ruled all the people of the regnum" could hardly have applied to Savaric.

Of Chagneric we know little, but enough to identify him as the *patricius* of Vienne from the will of a later *patricius*, Abbo.<sup>42</sup> This identification explains why Chagneric's name appears next to that of Antenor in a Neustrian document of 697.<sup>43</sup> Antenor was *patricius* of Provence, and a document dated to the reign of Charlemagne from the monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles mentions him as having rebelled against "Charlemagne's great-grandfather," thus against Pippin of Heristal.<sup>44</sup> Another St. Victor document complains of Antenor's tyranny at a time at which he would have appeared to have been exercising independent rule in Provence.<sup>45</sup> It may be possible through numismatic evidence to hazard a date for Antenor's break with the northern court. In the later seventh century we see the series of coins minted in the name of the Merovingian kings in the south of the *regnum Francorum* coming to an end. Marseilles is something of an exception in this. Though only two Merovingian royal

coins minted at Marseilles have been found for the period c. 658-79, there exists, according to J. Lafaurie, a series of royal coins, *connus en assez abondante quantité*, which were minted at Marseilles during the reign of Childebert III. Then, with the death of Childebert, the issue ceased altogether.<sup>46</sup> This sequence implies that the ruler of Marseilles, Antenor, recognized Childebert's authority and that his rebellion may have been in some way related to the latter's death in 711. It would thus appear that Antenor's attendance at the Neustrian court in 697 may have been motivated by loyalty to Childebert rather than by loyalty to Pippin. The same might well be true of Chagneric, but here information fails us. To Childebert III we shall return later.

The political loyalties of the Neustrians in our documents are harder to trace, and a Neustrian identity would, of course, not necessarily have been synonymous with an anti-Pippinid alignment.<sup>47</sup> The problem is magnified by the uneven distribution of the documents containing the bulk of information on personnel. Since these do not begin until the 690s, it is difficult to trace individuals back to the pre-Waratto era. We can, however, note that the premier abbey of St. Denis remained in the hands of Neustrians associated with Ebroin's regime which had so strongly opposed Pippin.<sup>48</sup> Charderic, abbot in Ebroin's day,<sup>49</sup> was followed as abbot of St. Denis by one Chaino who can be seen receiving a royal gift of land at Ebroin's request in 677.<sup>50</sup> Chaino, who was the beneficiary of Berchar's last recorded act in October 688, remained abbot until 706, although a document of 697 mentions one Magnoald as abbot. Magnoald, who was Charderic's nephew,<sup>51</sup> can be seen in the document of 697 benefitting from a royal judgement made against Drogo, Pippin's son. These men apart, only one Vulfolaeus, a *referendarius*, figures in documents issued in the time of Berchar's mayoralty as well as in those issued after Berchar's death.<sup>52</sup>

Although the uneven distribution of documents may prevent us from tracing the post-Tertry fortunes of persons associated with a pre-Tertry regime hostile to Pippin, we are fortunate in having five documents from

one year (February 716–February 717) of a three-year Neustrian regime (715–18) which saw renewed conflict between Neustria and Austrasia.<sup>53</sup> In December 714 Pippin of Heristal died, having been predeceased by his sons Drogo (708) and Grimoald (April 714). The family was further weakened by the rivalry between Pippin's first wife, Plectrude, and the son of Pippin's second marriage, Charles, later to be remembered as Charles Martel. The Neustrians took this opportunity to drive the Pippinids out of their king's entourage and allied with the Frisians to make raids deep into Austrasian territory.<sup>54</sup> By 717 the Austrasians were retaliating under the leadership of Charles Martel, and the career of the latter unfolds in the conquest, first, of Neustria, and then, of the rest of the *regnum*. Against this background, it is striking that the five persons associated with documents issued by this regime hostile to the Austrasians all appear in documents issued in Pippin's life-time: Actulius appears as *referendarius* in 710, 716, and 717;<sup>55</sup> Chrodbert, another *referendarius* appears in 693 and 716;<sup>56</sup> Ermedramnus appears in 697 as *seniscalcus* and in 716 as *referendarius*;<sup>57</sup> and Vuarno appears as count of the palace in 692 and 716.<sup>58</sup> Most striking of all, however, is the appearance of one Ragamfred as *domesticus* in 693 and as Mayor of the Palace in 716 and 717.<sup>59</sup> According to the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, Ragamfred was chosen as mayor in 715 after the Neustrians had turned on Pippin's *parvulus* grandson, Theudoald, and driven him and his followers out of Neustria.<sup>60</sup> Thereafter Ragamfred led the Neustrian forces in person, survived their ultimate defeat, and continued to resist Charles Martel from his base at Angers until his death in 731.<sup>61</sup> The continuity in personnel here, the presence of magnates unsympathetic to Pippin and the Austrasians at the royal court, and the speed and effectiveness with which the Neustrians regrouped under their own leaders after Pippin's death, all suggest that, in the thirty-seven years which separated the latter from his victory at Tertry, Pippin of

Heristal may have managed to do no more than loosen the grip the Neustrian elite held over the king, his court, and his resources.

A slow growth of influence was, as I said earlier, only to be expected in light of the circumstances of Pippin's move into Neustria. Even the family's acquisition of the post of Mayor of the Palace may not have guaranteed unchallengeable power and influence. The domination of the mayors of the palace in the *regnum Francorum* of this period was by no means as absolute as it has--since the ninth century--often been portrayed.<sup>62</sup> The mayor's power was, like the king's, conditional upon the support he received from other magnates.<sup>63</sup> When mayors did appear in unquestioned dominance, this was largely when the kings were either very young or (more rarely) discredited,<sup>64</sup> and then the mayors were able to distribute the king's rewards and punishments in the name of kings who were without personal influence or political relationships. A mature king with his own contacts amongst the magnates was always in a position of political influence. We can see such a king in Childebert III (695-711). One opportunity to marshal royal influence was provided by the annual spring-time assemblies around the kings, assemblies which were attended by such men as Savaric and Antenor. The Carolingian sources<sup>65</sup> claim strongly that Pippin reduced these assemblies to mere outward shows of respect for the ancient dynasty and that, in reality, they expressed concrete support for Pippin. The very emphasis on and early genesis of this claim makes it appear suspect. In reality, such assemblies may have provided an opportunity for the magnates collectively to censure offending elements of the political community, Pippinid or otherwise.<sup>66</sup> It is perhaps in this context that we should view a document issued under Childebert III in March 697 in which Savaric, Chagneric, and Antenor, amongst others, took part in a judgement made against Pippin's son, Drogo.<sup>67</sup>

Childebert III's reign saw the issue of two other documents effecting judgements against the Pippinid family--this time from the year 710<sup>68</sup> and made against Pippin's son, Grimoald, Mayor of the Palace in

Neustria. These judgements, coupled with the attendance at his court of southern magnates opposed to Pippin's family after Childebert's death, suggest that Childebert III retained a power of attraction, reward, and punishment which was an effective block to the expansion of Pippinid influence. It is a suggestion much reinforced by the way in which the Neustrian source, the *Liber Historiae Francorum*, treats Childebert with positive respect.<sup>69</sup> This treatment is neutralized in the mid-eighth century continuation of the *Chronicle of Fredegar*, written under the patronage of Childebrand, half brother to Charles Martel. The latter source copies the *Liber* but omits its words of praise for Childebert.<sup>70</sup> This neutral treatment then turns into a clear statement of Childebert's powerlessness and non-entity in the fiercely pro-Carolingian *Annales Mettenses Priores*.<sup>71</sup>

These observations thus strengthen the impression gained from prosopographical indications that the outgrowth of Pippinid influence after 687 was slow. In a political society in which the links between center and periphery could be broken by the simple refusal of a magnate to visit his overlord at the center,<sup>72</sup> we could not expect otherwise. One could go further and identify Pippin with the loss of political influence of the center over the periphery in this period. As we have seen, Savaric and Antenor seem to have been attracted to the Merovingian court of Childebert III but stayed away when Pippin's son, Grimoald, was mayor to Childebert's infant son, Dagobert, after 711. Their non-attendance amounted to the nominal independence (as opposed to the nominal dependence) of the areas under their influence. Such withdrawal of interest from the Neustrian court when the king no longer appeared able to guarantee favorable treatment to provincial magnates is best expressed in a ninth-century source which speaks of Gottfried, *dux* of the Alemans:<sup>73</sup>

At that time [the early eighth century] Gotefrid *dux* of the Alemans and the other *duces* round about him refused to obey the *duces* of the Franks because no longer were

they able to serve the Merovingian kings as formerly they had been accustomed to do. So each of them kept to himself.

This, then, was the central paradox of Pippin's position after the battle of Tertry: to expand his influence, Pippin had to utilize the apparatus of government and collective power vested in the royal court. In doing this he could not act with clear independence but had to work within a consensus of magnate and royal interests which served to limit his family's acquisition of power in Neustria. Only by the use of force could the established regime be overturned and one directed towards the service of Pippinid interests be put in its place. After the limited conflict at Tertry, Pippin is never again seen to use force in the West. The military quiet of the period of his prominence in politics in the West is in stark contrast to the turbulent rule of his son, Charles Martel. It was under the latter that the advances ascribed to Pippin in the *Annales Mettenses* really came about, and the price was clear--almost continual military conflict over a generation. The result was no less clear: there was established, through sweeping personnel change,<sup>74</sup> the Carolingian regime proper--in which the Merovingians no longer had any place, with "new" people in new positions owing loyalty to, and seeking rewards from and fearing punishment from, the descendants of Charles Martel. In a search for the origins of the latter regime, the attention of historians has hitherto been drawn to the earlier period of Pippin of Heristal's prominence.

The observations outlined above will, I hope, serve to suggest that what we see in 687-715 may be continuation of an old regime, not the establishment of a new one. Just as the observation of minimal personnel change was the key to the qualification of Pippin's power, so the observation of maximum change in personnel must be the main feature in any attempt to chart Charles Martel's increasing power in the period 715-41. In this context the establishment of a

sound corpus of prosopographical information for the latter period must be a primary aim of future research.

## APPENDIX A

List of those mentioned as co-judges, referendaries, and counts of the palace in charters issued in Neustria from 691 to 717. The letter N denotes an association with Neustria, the letter A with Austrasia, P a definite association with Pippin. Such associations, it must be stressed, are often tentative, and in many cases no identification of association is possible. Such cases are here signalled with a ?

NAME	DESIGNATION IN THE DOCUMENTS	CLA DOCUMENT NUMBERS
N. Vulfo-laecus	referendarius	570, 576, 577, 581
? Ansoaldus	comes palatii	572
N. Abthadus	referendarius	572
N. Sygofridus	episcopus (Paris)	573, 575
P. Constantinus	episcopus (Beauvais)	575, 576
P. Gripho	episcopus (Rouen)	575, 576, 581
? Ursinianus	episcopus (Amiens)	575
? Ragnold	vir inluster	575, 576
P. Nordbert	vir inluster	575, 576, 579
P. Ermenfrid	vir inluster	575
N. Madelulf	graphio, domesticus	575, 576, 581
N. Erconaldus	graphio	575
A. Benedictus	seniscalcus	575, 581
A. Chardoino	seniscalcus	575
? Marso	comes palatii	575
? Chlodoinus	referendarius	575
N. Vuarno	comes palatii	573, 590
N. Aghilus	referendarius	573, 574
N. Ansoaldus	episcopus (Poitiers)	576, 581
N. Godinus	episcopus (Lyons)	576
? Ansoberctus	episcopus (Autun)	576
? Protadius	episcopus (?)	576
N. Savaricus	episcopus (Orleans)	576, 581
N. Vulfochramnus	episcopus (Sens)	576
A. Chaduinus	episcopus (Langres)	576
N. Turnoaldus	episcopus (Paris)	576, 581
P. Abbo	episcopus (Metz)	576
A. Stefanus	episcopus (Cologne ?)	576
? Godinus	vir inluster	576
? Sarroardus	vir inluster	576
A. Gunduinus	vir inluster	576
A. Blidegarius	vir inluster	576
A. Magnecharius	vir inluster	576, 581
N. Vualdrannus	vir inluster	576
N. Ermecharius	vir inluster	576
N. Chagnerich	patricius	576, 581
N. Antener	patricius	576, 581
A. Buccelenus	vir inluster	576
? Sigolenus	vir inluster	576
? Ogmirus	comes	576
? Ettherius	comes	576
? Chillon	comes	576
N. Adrebercth	comes	576
N. Ghislemarus	comes palatii	576, 584
N. Adalric	comes	576, 581
N. Ionathan	comes	576, 581
? Modghiselus	comes	576



?.	Chrodmund	graphio	576
?.	Godinus	graphio	576
P.	Sigofred	graphio, comes palatii	576, 586, 587
?.	Ghiboinus	graphio	576
P.	Ermentheus	graphio, comes	576, 581
?.	Arigio	graphio	576
?.	Aurilianus	graphio	576
N.	Ragamfred	domesticus, major domus	576, 588, 589, 593
N.	Maurilius	domesticus	576
N.	Ermenricus	domesticus, vir inluster	576
?.	Leudeberctus	domesticus	576
N.	Aiglus	referendarius	576
N.	Chrodoberctus	referendarius	576, 589
N.	Vauldramnus	referendarius	576
P.	Chugoberctus	seniscalcus, comes palatii	576, 581
N.	Landricus	seniscalcus	576
P.	Audoramnus	comes palatii	579
P.	Pippin	major domus	577, 581
N.	Aigobertus	ministerialis, referendarius	577, 581
N.	Rhyghinus	referendarius	577, 581
P.	Grimoald	vir inluster, major domus	581, 584, 586
?.	Ebarcius	episcopus (Tours)	581
N.	Arghilus	domesticus	581
N.	Chaldeberct	referendarius	581
N.	Beffa	referendarius	584
N.	Blatcharius	referendarius	584
N.	Actulius	referendarius	586, 588, 591
N.	Bero	comes palatii	587
N.	Grimberct	comes palatii	587
N.	Dagobertus	referendarius	587
N.	Angilbad	referendarius	587
N.	Sygobaldus	referendarius	583
N.	Ermedramnus	seniscalcus, referendarius	581, 590

## APPENDIX B

List of those mentioned as witnesses in documents issued by the Pippinid family in Austrasia from 702 to 726. The document numbers refer to the Pertz edition: G. Pertz, ed., MGH Diplomata I: Diplomata Maiorum Domus. Those names which are also found in the Neustrian documents are signalled by a dashed underlining and by a full underlining where it can be shown that it is, in fact, the same person appearing in both sets of documents. Where persons are given no designation in the documents, this is signalled with a -

NAME	DESIGNATION IN THE DOCUMENTS	PERTZ DOCUMENT NUMBERS
Ansigisilus	comes	3
Ansigisubo	comes	3
Ansebertus	comes	3
Hardericus	comes	3
Bono	comes	3
Erminhard	comes	3
Ratgisus	comes	3
<u>Gonduinus</u>	comes	3
<u>Ramfridus</u>	comes	3
Drogo (son of Pippin)	-	4, 5
<u>Chugoberct</u>	episcopus (Lüttich)	4, 5
<u>Constantinus</u>	episcopus (Beauvais)	4, 5
Benarius	episcopus (?)	4, 5
Josephus	episcopus (?)	4, 5
Wintharius	epscopus (?)	4, 5
Charigantus	-	4, 5
Agio	-	4, 5
Crodebaldus	-	4
Cardimus	-	4
Remedius	-	4, 5
Hardoinus	-	5
Blendumen	abbatissa	6
Adalbert	abba	6
Chammingo	graphio	6
Helmoinus	-	6
Remigius	-	6
Geraldus	-	6
Crodegertus	-	6
Chrodoaldus	-	6
Garibertus	fidelis	10
Ingisus	fidelis	10
Racanarius	fidelis	10
Martinus	fidelis	10
<u>Amalbertus</u>	fidelis	10
Alvezo	fidelis	10
Bobolenus	fidelis	10
Gariaonis	-	11
Odo	-	11, 12
Baldricus	-	11
<u>Abbo</u>	-	11
<u>Engilbaldus</u>	-	11
Adalhardus	-	11
Thieldoldus	filius Adalhardi	11
Ruotbertus	-	11
Harirardus	-	11

Audoinus	presbiter	11
Chelmoinus	-	11
Boso	-	11
Wido	-	11
Grimfridus	-	11
Saleco	comes	12
Folkarius	comes	12
Bergethosienus	comes	12
Maginharius	comes	12
Herigerus	comes	12
Liudolfus	-	12
<u>Agilo</u>	-	12
Erkanfred	advocatus, comes	12

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This essay draws on research first presented in my Ph.D. thesis, "The Career of Ebroin, Mayor of the Palace, c. 675-680," Diss. King's College, Univ. of London 1981. (Cited hereafter as Ebroin.) I am indebted to Janet Nelson both for her guidance in the original research and for her helpful reading of this essay.

<sup>2</sup> See, for examples, the advances made in this direction by K. F. Werner, "Bedeutende Adelsfamilien im Reich Karls der Grossen," in *Karl der Grosse*, 4 vols., vol. 1., ed. K. Braunfels (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 83-142; C. Hart, "Athelstan 'Half King' and his Family," *Anglo-Saxon England*, 2 (1973), 115-45; and A. Williams, "Princeps Merciorum gentis: the Family, Career and Connections of Aelfhere, Ealdorman of Mercia, 956-983," *Anglo-Saxon England*, 10 (1983), 143-71.

<sup>3</sup> H. Ebling, *Prosopographie der Amtsträger des Merowingerreiches*, Beiheft der *Francia*, 2 (Munich, 1974). Cited hereafter as Ebling.

<sup>4</sup> Certain titles associated with unique power or specialized function must remain as exceptions to this rule: thus, "rex," "major domus," "referendarius," "seniscalcus." On "duces" see A. R. Lewis, "The Dukes in the *Regnum Francorum* A.D. 550-751," *Speculum*, 51 (1976), 381-410.

<sup>5</sup> Witness, for example, the structure of attendance lists for church councils: *Concilia Galliae 511-695*, ed. C. de Clercq, *Corpus Christianorum*, Series Latina vol. 148 A (1963).

<sup>6</sup> The fact that Ebling did not pursue his subjects if they crossed over to the ecclesiastical sphere in their careers has limited the usefulness of his work.

7 On the role of bishops see F. Prinz, "Die bishöfliche Stadtherrschaft im Frankreich vom 5. bis 7. Jahrhundert," *Historisches Zeitschrift* (1974), 1-35.

8 Recent work by K. F. Werner suggests a contrast with Carolingian political society here. He argues that royal vassals were dropped (*parachuté*) into positions of power at royal command ("Missus-Marchio-Comes' Entre l'administration centrale et l'administration locale de l'Empire carolingien," in *Histoire comparée de l'administration (IV<sup>e</sup> -XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, ed. W. Paravicini and K. F. Werner, Beiheft der *Francia*, 9 [Munich, 1980]). The political society of Ottonian Germany seems more akin to that seen under the Merovingians, an observation which raises further questions about the structure of Carolingian political society. On Ottonian Germany see K. Leyser, "Ottonian Government," *English Historical Review*, 96 (1981), 721-53.

9 Church appointments may, very occasionally, have been open to the less powerful because the appointee would receive land associated with the post. For the (only) two seventh-century examples, see Ebroin, pp. 81-83. For a famous ninth-century example and contemporary attitudes towards it, see J. Martindale, "The French Aristocracy in the Early Middle Ages," *Past and Present*, 75 (1977), 5-45, esp. 5-6.

10 On royal and mayoral titles see H. Wolfram, "Intitulatio I, Lateinisches Königs-und Fürstentitel bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Ergänzungsband, 21 (Graz, 1967), 108-227. Wolfram does not, however, deal with the general terms for magnates.

11 The thirty-eight surviving original documents are published in facsimile and transcription in H. Atsma, *France I*, and J. Vezin, *France II*, vols. 13 and 14 of *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*, ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (Zurich, 1981, 1982). Cited hereafter as *CLA*. Reference is by charter number. They are also

to be found in Ph. Lauer and Ch. Samaran, *Les diplômes Originiaux des Merovingiens* (Paris, 1908). Non-original documents are to be found in *MGH Diplomata*, vol. 1 (but note there is only one volume in this series), ed. G. Pertz (Hannover, 1872). The documents which yield the fullest prosopographical information are all royal judgements. On the latter, see W. Bergmann, "Untersuchungen zu den Gerichtsurkunden der Merowingerzeit," *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 22 (1976), 1-186. Cited hereafter as Bergmann, "Gerichtsurkunden."

12 The year 687 and the battle of Tertry have traditionally been taken to mark a watershed in Frankish history. Backdating effective Carolingian rule to this year gives the dynasty a round three hundred year era of domination, and it is not surprising that it is in the general surveys of early medieval history that the idea of a "clean break" after 687 is given its strongest emphasis. See, for instance: J. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Barbarian West*, 3rd. ed. (London, 1972), p. 82; H. Myers, *Medieval Kingship* (Chicago, 1982), p. 102; and E. James, *The Origins of France* (London, 1982), p. 149. Works concentrating on the Merovingian period itself tend to dilute with detail the idea of a break after 687, but it often remains as an underlying assumption in thought about the later Merovingian period. E. Ewig, for instance, looked for personnel change after 687, found little, but nevertheless assumed that there must have been a great deal more ("Die fränkische Teilreich im 7. Jahrhundert," *Trierer Zeitschrift*, 22 [1953], 85-144, esp. 136-42). I. Haselbach pointed out the influence of Carolingian propaganda on the historical picture but still assumed that there was a new regime after 687 ("Aufstieg und Herrschaft der Karolinger in Darstellung der sogenannten 'Annales Mettenses Priores,'" *Historische Studien*, 406 [1970], 1-208). K. F. Werner spread development in outlying areas across the period pre and post 687 but still saw 687 as a moment of structural change at the center, with the remnants of "pouvoir central" swept away by Pippin wielding power "comme chef de l'aristocratie aus-

trasienne" ("Les principautés périphériques dans le monde Franque du vii<sup>e</sup> siècle," *S. S. Spoleto*, 20 [1972], 483-514, esp. 493-94). It is only when emphasis is laid on the spectacular nature of political change after 714 that the importance of 687 recedes. Tertry is thus not even mentioned in J. Boussard, *The Civilization of Charlemagne*, trans. Frances Partridge (London, 1968), which begins Carolingian history with the career of Charles Martel. Likewise, J. Semmler emphasizes the period 714-23 as the critical moment in the rise of the Carolingians, thus reducing emphasis on the immediate post-Tertry period ("Zur Pippinidisch-Karolingisch Sukzessionskrise 714-723," *Deutsches Archiv*, 33 [1977], 1-36). For an earlier *caveat* on presuming great change post 687, see J. Laporte, "Les monastères francs et l'avenement des Pippinides," *Revue Mabillon*, 30 (1940), 1-30, esp. 4, 14-15.

13 *Annales Mettenses Priores*, ed. B. Von Simson, MGH, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum, seperatim editi* (1905). Cited hereafter as MGH SRG. A very good critical study of this source is provided by I. Haselbach, "Aufstieg und Herrschaft der Karolinger."

14 *Liber Historiae Francorum* (hereafter *LHF*), ed. B. Krusch, vol. 2 (1887) of MGH, *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* (cited hereafter as MGH SRM), 7 vols. (Hannover/Leipzig, 1887-1950). Here, see *LHF* ch. 48, p. 323.

15 *Annales Mettenses Priores*, p. 16.

16 *Annales Mettenses Priores*, p. 16.

17 The dispute between Drogo and St. Denis took place in 697 and is recorded in *CLA* no. 581. For his association with Champagne, see *LHF*, ch. 48, p. 323. For the association with Burgundy, see *Annales Mettenses Priores*, p. 16.

18 This evidence comes from J. Tardif's reading of the Tironian notes at the bottom of a charter of 695 (*CLA* no. 577). Pippin does not appear as Mayor in the body of a charter until 697 (*CLA* no. 581).

19 *Vita Ansberti*, ed. W. Levison, vol. 5 of MGH SRM (1910), pp. 619-41. "Ansbert . . . incusatus apud ipsum principem (Pippin) . . . iussu eiusdem in exilio deportatur. . ." (ch. 21, p. 634). On Ansbert's exile and its implications, see J. Semmler, "Episcopi Potestas und Karoligische Klosterpolitik," *Vorträge und Forschungen*, 20 (1974), 305-95, esp. 306-09.

20 *Gesta Sanctorum Patrum Fontanellensis Coenobii*, ed. F. Lohier and J. Laporte, *Société de l'histoire de Normandie*, 91 (Rouen, 1936), esp. ch. 2.3, pp. 18-19.

21 *CLA* no. 576.

22 MGH Diplomata, vol. 1, Diplomata Maiorum Domus, pp. 91-110, no. 12, p. 100.

23 We know of Everhard's attack from the *Vita* of Anstrudis, the convent's abbess: *Vita Anstrudis*, ed. W. Levinson, vol. 6 of MGH SRM (1913), pp. 64-78, esp. ch. 15, pp. 72-73. Everhard would seem to have been a local man, *iuvenis*, in 679. The source also mentions an earlier attack by one Chariveus wielding a drawn sword. Though the source has him struck down in God's wrath, a Chariveus *comes* appears in the Ardennes region in a ninth-century copy of a *praeceptum* of 692 (MGH Diplomata, vol. 1, no. 62, p. 55). If the two were identical, then it would appear that Chariveus had, at least to 692, escaped Pippin's retribution.

24 *CLA* no. 576.

25 *CLA* nos. 572-74, 576-79, 581, 583-91, 593.



26 These are most readily available as abstracts, with the genuine documents distilled from the spurious in a fine piece of work: I. Heidrich, "Titular und Urkunden der arnulfingischen Hausmeier," *Archiv für Diplomatik*, 11-12 (1965/66), 71-279.

27 The institutional bias in documentary survival, the very low numbers of surviving documents, and the fact that Merovingian documents do not use witness lists means that one cannot, with any certainty, gauge the extent of royal influence or magnate involvement in royal government as, for instance, J. Lemarignier was able to do from early Capetian royal documents (*Le gouvernement royal aux premier temps capétiens* [Paris, 1965]). That magnates from all over the Merovingian *regnum* did, on occasion, attend the Neustrian courts is beyond doubt (*CLA* nos. 576, 581). Attendance seems to have been governed by two factors: the desire of the magnate to attend, and the ability of the faction closest to the king to make attendance undesirable or even impossible. For the former, see *Erchanberti Breviarum*, ed. G. Pertz, vol. 2 (1829) of *MGH Scriptorum*, 30 vols. (Hannover/Leipzig, 1826-1934), ch. 1, p. 328. For the latter, see *Passio Leudegarii*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM*, 5:282-322, esp. ch. 4, pp. 286-87. Arguments about the political history of this period are always bound to be tentative, resting on impressions formed by particular pieces of evidence; hence the need to re-examine our assumptions in the light of what little evidence there is.

28 Contemporary, or near contemporary, sources give the impression that when the Austrasian king, Childeric II, ruled in Neustria, with an Austrasian Mayor of the Palace (673-75), the *Franci* of the previous regime were excluded from influence. See *Passio Leudegarii*, ch. 7, p. 289, and *LHF*, ch. 45, p. 318. The early ninth-century *Vita Lantberti*, ed. W. Levison, *MGH SRM*, 5:608-12, drawing on a document issued for the monastery of St. Wandrille by Childeric, gives us a glimpse of his entourage. Of ten men named we can identify five Austrasians: two Neustro-Burgundians who had helped Childeric to the

throne; two who are unidentifiable; and one, a Neustrian, who was count in the area with which the document was concerned. The petitioners were Bilichild (King Childeric's wife), Leudegarius (bishop of Autun) and his brother Gaerinus, leaders of the faction which had called Childeric into Neustria. They figure in a number of sources. See, for instance, *LHF*, ch. 45, pp. 317-18. For Nivardus, bishop of Rheims, from the Champagne border region, see *Vita Nivardi*, ed. W. Levison, MGH SRM, 5: 160-70. For Fulcoald, an Austrasian magnate with lands in the Champagne and possibly *dux* there, see Ebling, p. 152. For Amalric, an Austrasian magnate seen in a Speyer privilege of 664/65, see Ebling, p. 51. For Wulfoald, the Austrasian Mayor seen in numerous sources, see, for instance, *LHF*, ch. 45, pp. 317-18. For Waning, the local count, see *Vita Waningi*, ed. Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum, vol. 3, (1669) pp. 971-74. For Adalbert, probably an Austrasian from Alsace, see Ebling, p. 29. Bishop Ermeno is known only from this grant, and Bavo is unidentifiable.

<sup>29</sup> See Ebling, pp. 196-97.

<sup>30</sup> *LHF*, ch. 48, p. 323. "Thesauris acceptis, Nordberctun quondam de suis cum rege relicto, ipse [Pippin] in Austria remeavit."

<sup>31</sup> He appears in a document of 693 (*CLA* no. 567), ordering a case to be heard: "ordenante inlustri viro Nordbercto." This phrase--and underlying function--is associated with the Mayors of the Palace, and it most often appears in the Tironian notes appended to charters.

<sup>32</sup> *CLA* no. 581.

<sup>33</sup> MGH, Diplomata, vol. 1, no. 94, p. 84.

<sup>34</sup> Ebling, pp. 167-69.

<sup>35</sup> *Annales Mettenses Priores*, pp. 1-2.

36 According to the *Annales Mettenses Priores*, Pippin killed Gundoin before his return to power, thus pre-680 (p. 2). This story has been traditionally regarded as an unreliable legend; thus, for example, I. Haselbach, "Annales Mettenses," p. 45. M. Werner has recently questioned the supposed unreliability of the tale. Werner's work, however, focused on "der lütticher Raum", and he used little Neustrian evidence. It is in the latter, in a charter for 692/93,<sup>2</sup> that Gundoin appears in the West. Ebling, p. 168, identifies him as Gundoinus the son-in-law of Wulfoald and notes that in 692/93 he was "an der Seite der Merowingers". On Gundoin's family and on the aristocracy of Austrasia see: M. Werner, *Der Lütticher Raum in frühkarolingischer Zeit* (Göttingen, 1980), esp. pp. 100-11; and M. Werner, *Adelsfamilien im Umkreis der frühen Karolinger. Die Verwandtschaft Irminas von Oeren und Adelas von Pfalzel, Vorträge und Forschungen*, Sonderband, 28 (Sigmaringen, 1982).

37 For Savaric, see L. Duchesne, *Fastes Episcopaux de l'Ancienne Gaule*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1907-15), 2:448. Duchesne would not give a common identity to Savaric of Auxerre and Savaric of Orleans (p. 462), but the *Gesta* of the bishops of Auxerre do say that he (Savaric of Auxerre) held Orleans. For Chagneric, see Ebling, pp. 96-97. For Antenor, see Ebling, pp. 57-58.

38 *Vita Eucherii*, ed. W. Levison, vol. 7 of MGH SRM (1920), pp. 46-53, esp ch. 4, p. 48.

39 *Gesta Pontificum Autissioderensium*, ed. L. Duru, Bibliothèque Historique de l'Yonne (1850), esp. ch. 27, p. 348.

40 *Vita Eucherii*, ch. 9, p. 50: "[Charles Martel] praecepit eumque [Eucherius] in exilio cum relinquis propinquis. . . ."

41 *Gesta Pontificum Autissioderensium*, ch. 28, p. 349.

42 The *Testamentum Abbonis* is to be found in *Diplomata, Chartae, Leges, Epistolae*, ed. J. Pardessus, 2 vols. (Paris, 1849, rpt. 1969), 2:370-79.

43 *CLA* no. 581.

44 Quoted in M. Chaume, *Les origines du Duché de Bourgogne* (Dijon, 1926), p. 31, n.1.

45 *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de St. Victor de Marseille*, ed. M. Gèurard (Paris, 1847), document 31, pp. 43-46.

46 On the Marseilles coinage and the possible connection with Antenor's revolt, see J. Lafaurie, *Revue Numismatique*, 11 (1969-70), 98-218, esp. 118.

47 I am grateful to R. Gerberding for impressing this point upon me.

48 *CLA* no. 558. The document is a confirmation of a privilege of immunity granted to St. Denis. Fifty signatures are legible following that of the king, Clovis.

49 He appears in a document of 677 (*CLA* no. 565), issued: "ordinanté Ebroino majore domus," according to the accepted reading of the Tironian notes.

50 Chaino received land, "ordinante Ebroino majore domus," again according to the accepted reading of the Tironian notes (*CLA* no 566).

51 Magnoald received a confirmation of immunity for the monastery of Tussonval built by "avuncolus suus Chardericus" (*CLA* no. 579).

52 Vulfoelaecus appears in 688 in the last recorded document of Berchar's regime (*CLA* no. 570), in a document of 693 (*CLA* no. 576), and in the document in which Pippin first appears (in the Tironian notes) as Mayor in 695 (*CLA* no. 577).

53 *CLA* nos. 588-91, 593.

54 The most recent account of these events and discussion of their significance is J. Semmler, "Zur Pippinidisch-Karolingisch Sukzessionskrise," 1-36.

55 Thus *CLA* nos. 586, 588, 591.

56 Thus *CLA* nos. 576, 578. See Ebling, p. 115 for Chrodobert's possible connections with Lantbert, bishop of Lyons.

57 Thus *CLA* nos. 581, 590.

58 Thus *CLA* nos. 573, 590.

59 Thus *CLA* nos. 576, 588, 593.

60 "Theudoaldo etiam fugata, Regamfredo in principatum maiorum palatii elegerunt" (*LHF*, ch. 51, p. 325).

61 For a brief synopsis of Ragamfred's career, see Ebling, pp. 206-7.

62 ". . . opes et potentis regni penes palatii praefectos, qui maiores domus dicebantur, et ad quos summa imperii pertinebat tenebantur" (Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, ed. G. Pertz and G. Waitz, MGH SRG [1911], ch. 1, p. 3; written c. 836). Einhard's view has remained largely unchallenged. See K-H. Haar's portrayal of the mayoralty, "Studien zur Entstehung und Entwicklungsgeschichte des fränkische 'major domus' Amts," Diss. Heidelberg 1968.

63 The temptation to follow Einhard's analysis should be balanced against the fact that of the twelve identifiable mayors in power from 614 to 716, seven were either killed or fell from power when they lost magnate support. Of the remaining five, only two (Erchinoald and Pippin) held the post for more than three years. On the conditional aspect of mayoral power, see P. Fouracre, "Merovingians, Mayors of the

Palace and the Notion of a 'Low Born' Ebroin," *The Bulletin of The Institute of Historical Research*, 57 (1984), 2-14.

<sup>64</sup> On the infant kings, see E. Ewig, "Studien zur Merowingischen Dynastie," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 8 (1974), 15-59. Theuderic III (673-90) can be seen as a discredited king, rejected by the magnates in 673 because of his association with Ebroin, captured by Ebroin in 675, and on the losing side with Berchar at Tertry in 687.

<sup>65</sup> Namely the *Annales Mettenses Priores* (pp. 14-15) and Einhard, *Vita Karoli* (ch. 1, pp. 3-4). The earliest statement that these assemblies were a charade comes, in fact, from the Byzantine chronicler Theophanes who, writing at the latest in c. 814, gives a description identical to that found in Einhard and in the *Annales Mettenses Priores* (*The Chronicle of Theophanes*, trans. H. Turtledove [Philadelphia, 1982], p. 94). It seems reasonable to suppose that Theophanes' source here was the Carolingian version of the deposition of Childeric III given by Frankish ambassadors to the Byzantine court. The description of the assemblies is associated with the events of 751, although it is given under the year 723-24. This description may thus have already been in the nature of a *topos* by the time Einhard composed the *Vita Karoli*. It is far removed from a fresh memory of Childeric III's *fainéance* and very distant from the political situation of Pippin of Heristal's days, a description seen as "Ohne Werth" by G. Waitz well over a century ago (*Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, 8 vols. [Kiel, 1844-78] 2:277. More recent discussion has concentrated on the military aspect of the assemblies; see B. Bachrach, "Was Marchfield a Part of the Frankish Constitution?," *Medieval Studies*, 36 (1974), 178-85. In Merovingian sources, however, their military aspect finds less emphasis than their political function in which the magnates and king met: "pertractare de quascumque condiciones," as the preamble to late sixth-century Spring legislation put

it (MGH, Legum, vol. 1, ed. G. Pertz [Hannover, 1835], p. 9). For further discussion of this, see Ebroin, pp. 303-07.

66 This was certainly the case at an assembly in 673, which met at the death of Clothar III. There, magnates hitherto prevented from attending the royal court took the opportunity provided by the manifestation of their collective power to drive out Ebroin, a particularly unpopular Mayor of the Palace. See *Passio Leudegarii*, chs. 5, 6, pp. 287-88.

67 *CLA* no. 581. Drogo was told to return land to the monastery of Tussonval, land which he had claimed was his through his marriage to Anstrudis, who had, in turn, received it from Berchar.

68 *CLA* nos. 586-87. Bergmann, "Gerichtsurkunden" sees these two judgements as fictional: "Scheinprozesse", but they are distinguished from the other surviving Merovingian "Scheinprozesse" (of which there are six), by referring back to actual disputes which had been settled before the royal court sat to issue these judgements. For discussion of the "Scheinprozesse" phenomenon, see Bergmann, "Gerichtsurkunden," 93-102.

69 *LHF* ch. 49, p. 323: Childebert is described as "vir inclytus." In ch. 50, he is described as: "bonae memoriae gloriosus dominus Childebertus rex iustus."

70 *The Fourth Book of the Chronicle of Fredegar and its Continuations*, ed. and trans. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (London, 1960). In *Continuations*, ch. 7, p. 86, Childebert is simply "Childebertus rex."

71 In *Annales Mettenses Priores* (p. 16) Childebert is included in a description which covers all the kings of the period: "Illis quidem nomine regum imponens, ipse [Pippin] totius regni habens privilegia cum summa gloria et honore tractabat."

72 This situation is described by K. F. Werner, "Le principautés périphériques." Werner discusses the relationship between the center and the border duchies of the *regnum*. Only in a footnote does he consider the lands between the border duchies and the center, lands not *périphériques* but still far away enough from the center to be beyond direct control (Burgundy, for example). As he says, *en passant*, such lands lay in much the same relationship to the center as the border duchies. Witness in the present essay the relationships between the royal court and Savaric, ruler in North Burgundy, and Gottfried, *dux* of the Alemans, respectively.

73 *Erchanberti Breviarum* ch. 1, p. 328. This passage is also quoted by K. F. Werner in "Les principautés périphériques," 504.

74 Such conflict and personnel change stands out very clearly in a variety of sources. See, for instance, *The Chronicle of Fredegar, Continuations*, ch. 14, p. 91; *Vita Eucherii*, chs. 7, 8, 9, pp. 49-51; *Gesta Pontificum Autissiodorensium*, chs. 26, 27, pp. 347-48; the ninth-century *Vita Rigoberti*, ed. W. Levison, MGH SRM, 7:52-79, esp. chs. 12-13, pp. 68-71. On this process and the English missionary Boniface's reaction to it, E. Ewig's work is still unsurpassed: "Milo et eiusmodi similes," *Sankt Bonifatius Gedenkengabe zum zwölfhundertsten Todestag*, (Fulda, 1954), pp. 412-40.