

*With greetings and all
best wishes from K*

Leyser

BYZANTIUM AND THE WEST

c.850-c.1200

Proceedings of the XVIII Spring Symposium
of Byzantine Studies

Oxford 30th March - 1st April 1984

Edited
by
J.D. HOWARD-JOHNSTON



0149731



ADOLF M. HAKKERT - PUBLISHER - AMSTERDAM
1988

IV

ENDS AND MEANS IN LIUDPRAND OF CREMONA

K.J. LEYSER / OXFORD

It is possible and indeed tempting to see the whole of the tenth century through the eyes of a few quintessential writers, to find it personified and characterised in all its richness and variety, its fertile diversities no less than its Latin Christian unities, in the pages of Widukind of Corvey, Thietmar of Merseburg, Flodoard, Richer and more still than any of these, in Liudprand of Cremona. For Italy as the centre of a Mediterranean axis and the hub of a northern world he is our chief spokesman, not least of all because he himself was conscious of this situation and cast himself in the role of a European historian. He is also the representative of a vigorous, legally literate and articulate urban life which began to gather momentum, autonomy and above all wealth under the blanket of its alien, immigré, neither wholly absorbed nor yet wholly unabsorbed ruling class, the Carolingian high aristocracy. To even the most purist Byzantinist Liudprand of Cremona is and must be an arresting and inescapable figure. To understand his writings and his aims as the self-conscious portrayer of divine justice visiting the doings of enervate kings, as the agent and apologist of Otto I's dealings with the papacy and lastly as the irate pamphleteer against Nicephorus Phocas's Byzantium, we must first of all locate him socially.¹ Where should we place his family and connections?

1. A specific survey and characterisation of tenth-century historiography is not readily to hand. On Liudprand of Cremona see above all his editor, Joseph Becker, *Liudprandi Opera*, MGH, SRG (Hannover and Leipzig, 1915), pp.VII-XXIII, M.Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1923), pp.166-175, W.Wattenbach and R.Holtzmann, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter Deutsche Kaiserzeit*, 1,2 (Tübingen, 1948), pp.318-321 and *Nachträge in Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter Die Zeit der Sachsen und Salier*, Dritter Teil, ed. F.-J.Schmale (Darmstadt,

They belonged to the royal *familiaritas*, the *palatium* of Pavia, the men who controlled the sophisticated, slippery and at the same time profitable levers of government under a succession of royal adventurers from the North, eventually the Ottonians and Salians. Their views, attitudes and interests did not always coincide with those of their masters, nor did Liudprand, for all his devotion to Otto I and his family, strike all the right notes in the *Legatio*, as we shall see. The future envoy to Constantinople came from an influential, local family. His *parentes* gained for him, not without much outlay of cash, the post of a confidential secretary to Margrave Berengar, the controlling power after the fall and departure of King Hugh whom Liudprand had served from boyhood onwards.² His relations with Byzantium were in fact hereditary. Both his stepfather and his father had been on embassies to the East, the one in 941, the other in 927.³ Liudprand himself was to go on them at least three times, most probably four: in 949 when he acted as emissary for Berengar, in 960 when his mission for Otto I seems to have been halted on the island of Paxos and he described himself as a prisoner, in 968/69, the mission which is recorded in the *Legatio* and lastly, if the *Translatio Sancti Hymerii* is to be believed, in 971 when he was one of two bishops who accompanied Archbishop Gero of Cologne to the court of John I Tzimiskes to escort a long-hoped-for bride for Otto II and her treasures back to Italy. From this journey, according to the *Translatio*, he never returned to Cremona again. He is thought to have died though on

1971), p.102f. More recently see J.N.Sutherland, 'The Idea of Revenge in Lombard Society in the Eighth and Tenth Centuries: The Cases of Paul the Deacon and Liudprand of Cremona', *Speculum*, L(1975), pp.391-410, J.Koderth-Weber, *Liutprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel, Untersuchungen zum griechischen Sprachschatz und zu realienkundlichen Aussagen in seinen Werken*, *Byzantina Vindobonensia*, 13 (Vienna, 1980) and M.Rentschler, *Liudprand von Cremona, Eine Studie zum ost-westlichen Kulturgefälle, im Mittelalter, Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Kulturwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 14 (Frankfurt, 1981) – often questionable.

2. *Liudprandi Antapodosis*, iv, I, ed. Becker, p.104 and *Antapodosis*, v, 30, p.149: 'secretorum eius conscium ac epistolarum constituunt signatorem'.

3. *Antapodosis*, iii, 22-24, pp.82-83, his father's embassy. For his stepfather's see *Antapodosis*, v, 14, 15, pp.137-139 and see R.Hiestand, *Byzanz und das Regnum Italicum im 10. Jahrhundert* (Zürich, 1964), pp.154f., 181ff.

Italian soil. Whether he wanted to or not -and the *Translatio* has it that he was forced to go - his expertise and speaking knowledge of Greek were indispensable. Of late the *Translatio S. Hymerii* has come to be regarded as a better source than it was in Becker's and Max Manitius's day.⁴

Girolamo Arnaldi, in his Spoleto paper 'Liutprando e la storiografia contemporanea nell'Italia centro-settentrionale' thought that Liudprand came of merchant stock but it seems unlikely.⁵ This is not to underrate the roles and functions of merchants in tenth-century diplomacy. Liudprand himself has described how he met Otto I's envoy to Byzantium, Liutfrid, in Venice before August 25, 949, the day of their joint departure, and Liutfrid was a very rich Mainz merchant.⁶ John of Gorze's embassy to Cordoba in 953 relied heavily on the services of experienced Verdun merchants and the relief mission which had to be sent to extricate John from Cordoba was conducted and manned by a Verdun trader.⁷ But while Liudprand treated Otto I's envoy with respect, elsewhere he talks of merchants with an air of distance, not to say disdain. The Venetians and Amalfitans earned their livelihood by selling 'us' Byzantine purple-dyed cloaks, he reported himself saying to the imperial authorities, and he bitterly resented that his purchases of purple mantles should be treated like the merchants'.⁸ He was of course a bishop by then but his voice became one of scorn in

4. For 960 see *Antapodosis*, iii, 1, p. 74. For the embassy of 971 see the *Translatio S. Hymerii*, *MGH, SS*, III, p. 266, n. 23, Becker, *Liudprandi Opera*, p. XII, Manitius, II, p. 171f. Already Dümmler in R. Köpke and E. Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse, Jahrbücher der Deutschen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1867), p. 478, n. 3 was inclined to accept the report of the *Translatio*. For a more recent endorsement of the *Translatio* as a contemporary source and of Liudprand's last visit to Constantinople in 971 see W. Ohnsorge, 'Die Heirat Ottos II. mit der Byzantinerin Theophano', *Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch*, 54 (1973), p. 39 and n. 69.

5. *La Storiografia Altomedievale, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, XVII (Spoleto, 1970), II, p. 517f.

6. *Antapodosis*, vi, 4, p. 153f. and Arnaldi, p. 518.

7. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, cc. 116, 117, 130, 134, *MGH, SS*, IV, pp. 370, 375, 376 and see also Arnaldi, p. 518.

8. *Liudprandi Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*, c. 55, *Liudprandi Opera*, ed. cit., p. 205, henceforth cited *Legatio*.

Legatio, c.9 when he belittled the onlookers who lined the route of the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas's procession. The crowd which gathered along the way from the palace to Hagia Sophia was made up of traders and ignoble persons, he wrote.⁹ From this it would appear that Liudprand sprang from a family of urban nobles with hereditary palace connections. He thought himself a cut above merchants and is anxious to let us know that he was by birth a man of rank as well as substance. In the first chapter of Book III of the *Antapodosis* he explains to his mandatory, Bishop Recemund of Elvira, the strange title he had chosen for his work: it was to be one of retribution against Berengar, now king of Italy and his wife Willa with whom he had fallen out and broken so that he fled northwards to the Ottonian court where he was able to enter the service of Otto I's chapel. He would repay Berengar and Willa for their lies, their plunder and the impieties they had committed against his, Liudprand's house, his *cognatio* and his *familia*. Let us weigh his words carefully. He spoke of his house as if he had now become the head of it – we do not know when his stepfather or his mother died. He had a *cognatio* and a *familia* which meant men who served him, unfree and free, for their keep and perhaps their prospects, and all this well before he had become a bishop.¹⁰

Diplomacy in the tenth century may well have been a rewarding if dangerous occupation. We know from Liudprand that his father rendered valuable services to the Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and was richly repaid for them. He had apparently been assaulted by Slav rebels near Thessalonica but the attack must have been beaten off and some of the leading assailants were captured. He himself could present them to the emperor.¹¹ It could well be that not only the standing but also the wealth of Liudprand's family owed something to these occasions. His own experience in 949 can serve as an illustration. Liudprand in the *Antapodosis* is very bitter about Berengar's meanness. The costs of the embassy were borne by his stepfather – it must be remembered that Berengar was not

9. *Legatio*, c.9, p.180.

10. *Antapodosis*, iii, 1, p.74.

11. *Antapodosis*, iii, 24, p.83.

yet king – and Liudprand himself (or rather his stepfather) had to provide the indispensable gifts to present to Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Berengar had only furnished him with a letter. He has told us what he offered: 9 hauberks, 7 shields with gilded bosses, 2 silver-gilt cups, swords, lances, spits and 4 eunuch slaves.¹² Constantine not only honoured him with a relatively early second audience at which he himself conversed with the envoy which was unusual. Dinner followed and afterwards the emperor also gave him and his followers a great gift.¹³ But this was not all. In the week before Palm Sunday Liudprand, no doubt to impress him, was invited to watch the annual payment of their *δῶμα* to the *rector domus*, the commander-in-chief and the admiral, followed by the highest-ranking dignitaries, the *magistroi* and *patrikioi*, then the *protospatharioi* and many others. Liudprand saw the ‘pay-parade’ and noted, as he was meant to, particularly its dignity and orderliness. Asked what he thought of it by Constantine but through the logothete, Liudprand had the wit, not to say effrontery, to reply that it would please him very well if it were of any use to him, just as the rich man parching in hell would have been pleased by Lazarus’s case if it had given him any relief but since this did not happen, how could it please him? Constantine took this well and gave the ambassador a great court dress and a pound of gold.¹⁴ Altogether Liudprand may have gone home scarcely any poorer than when he arrived with his presents. In the *Antapodosis*, in sum, he can be seen as something of a client of the Macedonian dynasty, a clientage which echoed and had resonance still in the *Legatio*.

Hitherto Liudprand has been known to us through three works to which a few papal privileges, exchanges, *placita*, a diploma and a letter of Otto I’s, where he appears, can be added: the *Antapodosis* which he began to write in 958 and had not yet finished in 962 when Otto I had been crowned emperor by Pope John XII, the *Historia Ottonis* which he wrote in 964/65 cutting out abruptly with the

12. *Antapodosis*, vi, 3, 6, pp.153, 155f.

13. *Antapodosis*, vi, 7, p.156: ‘magnaque post convivium me meosque assecular munere donavit’.

14. *Antapodosis*, vi, 10, p.157f. for Liudprand’s thorough description of the occasion.

degradation of Pope Benedict V as an *invasor*, then finally the *Relatio de Legatione Constantinopolitana*.¹⁵ This, in the form of a letter addressed to Otto I, his son and fellow-emperor, Otto II, and Adelheid, the *Augusta*, must have been written in 969 shortly after Liudprand's return to Italy from Corfu where we hear of him by his own account early in January with strident complaints about further delays and extortion. The *Legatio*, as we have it, also breaks off unfinished. It may well rest on notes Liudprand made *en route* and it must be distinguished from any written report he may have submitted to the Ottonians on his return.

To these three *opera* must now be added a fourth. It has long been known that Bishop Abraham of Freising (957-993/4) possessed a copy of the *Antapodosis* and the *Historia Ottonis*. Italian peculiarities have been traced in this Freising manuscript (now at Munich, cIm 6388), an important branch in the transmission of the text which became one of the channels of its early propagation.¹⁶

15. For the papal privileges see *Papsturkunden 896-1046*, I, ed. H. Zimmermann, *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften*, 174 *Veröffentlichungen der Historischen Kommission*, III (Vienna, 1984), Nos. 179, 185, 186, 187, a *spurium* for Meissen, 197, all 967-969. For Liudprand's participation in a royal judgement at Ravenna, April 967, see C. Manaresi, *I placiti del "Regnum Italiae"*, II, i, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia* (Rome, 1957), No. 155, p. 51 and also No. 156, p. 56 of June 12, 967 at Monte Veltraio where he subscribed: 'Hliuto episcopus interfui'. He intervened on behalf of the Patriarch Rodald of Aquileia in Otto I's diploma of April 29 of 967. See *MGH, Diplomatum Regum et Imperatorum Germaniae Tomus I. Conradi I. Heinrici I. et Ottonis I. Diplomata* (Hannover, 1879-84), No. 341. For his prominent role as Otto I's representative at a synod in Milan in 969 see *I placiti*, II, i, No. 206, pp. 242-44. In 970 he also presided over a plea together with Count Heccico 'comes vassus et missus imperialis' at Ferrara. See *I placiti*, No. 164, pp. 97-99. The last two can serve as evidence to show that Liudprand remained high in the esteem and confidence of Otto I after his embassy to Constantinople in 968.
16. On Bishop Abraham of Freising see *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, I, herausgegeben von der Historischen Kommission bei der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1953), p. 21 and K. Leyser, 'Liudprand of Cremona, Preacher and Homilist' in *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in memory of Beryl Smalley, Subsidia IV to Studies in Church History*, ed. K. Walsh and D. Wood (Oxford, 1985), pp. 45ff. On Clm. 6388 see N. Daniel, *Handschriften des zehnten Jahrhunderts aus der Freisinger Dombibliothek - Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung*, xi, Arbeits-Gesellschaft (Munich, 1973), pp. 105-6 and J. Koder, 'Liutprand von Cremona

Bishop Abraham of Freising had however an even more famous codex, now clm 6426, his handbook as a bishop with homilies, including one by Rather of Verona, canonistic snippets, *formulae*, blessings and Old Slavonic texts which had a part to play in the missionary efforts of the See of Freising in Carinthia.¹⁷ Here, also, there is a homily by Liudprand, an Easter sermon. We owe its discovery to Bernhard Bischoff who has now edited it. He can show that the fascicule with the sermon was handled by Liudprand himself who gave it its superscription in Greek.¹⁸ Bischoff dated the sermon about the year 960, a difficult time because we know that Liudprand was then employed on a mission eastwards and suffered arrest in Paxos but this may have happened in summer so that there was room for the homily before he departed.¹⁹ As he calls himself a deacon it must fall into the time before his promotion to the episcopate but from internal evidence it could have been written and delivered when it was imminent and expected. In his sermon Liudprand reveals himself as a schooled theologian and a dialectician. The Trinity is triumphantly vindicated against a Hebrew whose arguments are taken to task one by one. This leads him to expound the Incarnation and to extol Easter as the victory of life over death. However deeds must follow words. Liudprand above all exhorts his brethren, fellow clerks, to works of charity. It is here that we can once again locate him socially and recognise his own situation in his vivid images: if we meet the *familiares* of kings and princes we receive them with great honour and offer them precious

und die Griechische Sprache' in J.Koder-Th.Weber (as in n.1), pp.62-65.

17. On this manuscript see B.Bischoff, 'Über gefaltete Handschriften, vornehmlich hagiographischen Inhalts'; in his *Mittelalterliche Studien*, I (Stuttgart, 1966), pp.93-100 and Daniel, *Handschriften*, pp.114ff.
18. B.Bischoff, 'Eine Osterpredigt Liudprands von Cremona (um 960)', in his *Anecdota Novissima Texte des vierten bis sechzehnten Jahrhunderts, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, VII (Stuttgart, 1984), pp.20-34.
19. For Liudprand's mission halted on Paxos see *Antapodosis*, iii,1, p.74 and K.Leyser, 'The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships', in *Relations between East and West in the Middle Ages*, ed. D.Baker (Edinburgh, 1973), p.30 and n.7 and in Leyser, *Medieval Germany and Its Neighbours 900-1250* (London, 1982), p.104.

gifts even if they protest. The poor are the *familiares* of our Lord, Christ, but we offer them little or nothing.²⁰

In its vivacity and social forcefulness the sermon is very much the authentic and familiar voice of Liudprand. What light does this newcomer throw on the works we know? Here we must above all look at the *Antapodosis* and leave aside for the moment the *Historia Ottonis* and the *Legatio*. Not only were sermon and *Antapodosis* conceived in temporal closeness to one another, the *Book of Retribution* is also much less of a *livre d'occasion* than were both the *History* and the *Embassy*. Here the sermon only strengthens an impression that can already be gained without it: it is Liudprand's seriousness and homiletic urgency throughout. He will not countenance any accommodation and self-interested cow-bargaining between Christians and their heathen attackers, Saracens, and Magyars alike. Those who engaged in such practices for their own ends like the nobles of Provence, the Emperor Arnolf and later, Hugh of Arles, King of Italy, who allowed the Saracens of Fraxinetum to survive in order to block the Alpine passes for him, all incurred the just penalties of God's wrath. The Emperor Arnolf was in the end eaten by worms.²¹ Liudprand has often been regarded as a light-hearted, scurrilous writer, only too anxious to entertain, revelling in sexual anecdote and without a larger or

20. Bischoff, 'Osterpredigt', pp.21-22 and Leyser, 'Liudprand of Cremona', (as in n.16), pp.47-53.

21. For Liudprand's condemnation of the Emperor Arnolf whom he accused of opening the Magyars' way into Western Europe see *Antapodosis*, i,13, pp.15-16. He blamed him also for outrages committed by his men during the invasion of Italy in 896, *op. cit.*, i,33, pp.25-26. For Arnolf's death see *Antap.* i,36, p.27. Here Liudprand did not want to be sure whether Arnolf suffered on earth and eternally for his crime of letting in the Magyars or whether his horrible illness atoned for this. For Liudprand's censure of Hugh of Arles's *foedus* with the Saracens of Fraxinetum see *Antap.* v, 17, p.139. It too was followed by divine retribution: *Antapodosis*, v, 31, p.149. However, while Liudprand (*Antap.* iii,37, p.91) denounced Romanos Lekapenos for giving himself and one of his sons precedence over Constantine VII as *basileis*, he did not animadvert on him for allegedly inviting the African Saracens to help him subdue rebellious Byzantine provinces in Southern Italy (*Antap.*, ii,45, p.57f.).

deeper message.²² That does him scant justice. In the very opening of the *Antapodosis* he has told us that the minds of academicians, peripatetics and stoics, tired if they were not refreshed again by the 'utilis comoediarum risus' and the enjoyable histories of heroic deeds. If this is true of the execrable pagans, if we read of Pompey, Hannibal, Hasdrubal and Scipio Africanus, which is noxious, why should the deeds of their Christian equals be ignored, and – he adds by implication – the 'utilis comoediarum risus' not also be harnessed to the exposure of vice, sloth or merit, here for didactic purposes? This is what in the sequel he does.²³

Liudprand the Byzantinist must be placed into a larger setting. The very ample space assigned to Byzantium in the historical landscape of the *Antapodosis* can only be understood if we are aware of what Liudprand had in mind when he planned and wrote it. Here we must turn to the dedication of the *Antapodosis*. It was addressed to and its very composition had been prompted by Recemund, bishop of Elvira, in Spain under the rule of the Umayyad Caliph Abd ar-Rahman III.²⁴ Liudprand had escaped from Italy and at first his exile seems to have been far from easy. He may not have found at once a ready welcome in the Ottonian entourage and until 955 Otto was engaged in almost continuous warfare. Of Charlemagne Einhard had written that he loved

22. For these judgements on Liudprand see Leysler, 'Liudprand of Cremona, Preacher and Homilist', p.55f. More recently J.N.Sutherland in his articles, 'The Idea of Revenge', *cf. supra*, n.1 and 'The Mission to Constantinople in 968 and Liudprand of Cremona', *Traditio*, xxxi (1975), pp.55-81 did not join this chorus of dismissal but he concluded all the same: 'Liudprand was neither a profound thinker nor a specially religious man' (*Speculum*, L, p.408) and, to my mind a sad misjudgment, 'The *Antapodosis* shows few signs of a well-developed sense of God, his nature and power, or his purpose in creating the world', (*ibid.*).

23. *Antapodosis*, i,1, pp.3-5.

24. On Recemund of Elvira see *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église wisigothique et mozarabe d'Espagne du cinquième au onzième siècle*, publié par D.Marius Férotin, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica*, v (Paris, 1904 and reprint, Farnborough, 1969), pp.xxxiii-xxxv. See also H.Florez, *Espana Sagrada*, xii (Madrid, 1754), pp.171-174 and E.Lévi-Provençal, *Histoire de l'Espagne Musulmane*, II (Paris, Leiden, 1950), pp.139,148-149,161-162 and vol.III (Paris, 1953), pp.222-23 and p.239f.

foreigners and spared no trouble and expense to entertain and keep them at his court.²⁵ Widukind of Corvey who followed Einhard's *topoi* and used his words so skilfully in presenting Otto I to his readers did not repeat this, like other Einhard passages, when he wrote of the Saxon king. Perhaps Otto I did not like foreigners but it was inevitable with his growing prestige that they should flock to his court and seek his protection and goodwill. He also had uses for their services, not least of all Liudprand's. Liudprand met Recemund of Elvira at Otto's February *curia* in Frankfurt in 956.²⁶ He had come there as the envoy of Abd ar-Rahman III to find a way out of a quandary. Three years before Otto had sent a mission to Cordoba headed by none other than John of Gorze. They came with presents and the usual letter but here the trouble lay. The letter's contents were known in Cordoba before the ambassadors presented them.²⁷ They contained a few commonplaces aimed at the *perfidia* of the Caliph which could only be regarded as blasphemy of the Islamic faith. The penalty for this was death and not even the diplomatic immunity of the envoys could have shielded them from this fate if Otto I's missive, drafted under the auspices of his brother Brun, the *archicapellanus*, had been read aloud and interpreted to the Caliph's court. He himself was compromised if he connived and knowingly countenanced such utterances. The two great empires, Cordoba and Byzantium at the western and eastern ends of the Mediterranean both feared diplomatic surprises and maintained what might be called a diplomatic early warning system. That Otto I chose two reforming monks, like John and his companion Garamannus for the embassy to Cordoba was in itself very significant. These men were already *perfecti* and dead to the world, ready, if need be, to face martyrdom. The real point of this mission was not so much the Saracen raiders' nest at Fraxinetum, only nominally

25. *Einhardi Vita Karoli Magni*, c.21, 6th. ed., O.Holder-Egger, *MGH, SRG* (Hannover and Leipzig, 1911 and reprints, 1940,1967), p.26.

26. Köpke, Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, pp.277-280 and J.F.Böhmer, E. v. Ottenthal, *Regesta Imperii*, II *Sächsisches Haus 919-1024*, 1: *Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter Heinrich I. und Otto I. 919-973* (Innsbruck, 1893 and Hildesheim, 1967), No.241a.

27. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, cc.119,120, *MGH, SS*, IV, p.371.

under the Caliph's jurisdiction, but a kind of religious reconnaissance. In the *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis* by John of St. Arnulf the last 22 chapters dealt with this Cordoban mission and the true villains in it were not Abd ar-Rahman and his court but the local Christians, the Mozarabs with their compromises, their assimilative practices, their anxiety not to give offence to their Moslem overlords.²⁸

Recemund of Elvira had been a well-educated, bilingual, lay court official, a secretary who redacted petitions and drafted their answers since all traffic into and out of the palace had to be in writing. The object of his mission was to persuade Otto I to re-draft the letter which his envoys had to present to the Caliph. John of Gorze had remained deaf to all proposals to suppress the original letter and offer the presents only. Recemund had volunteered for the counter-embassy after he had ascertained that it would not be dangerous. The bishopric of Elvira was his immediate reward.²⁹ That an envoy from Cordoba and Liudprand, the political refugee from the Italian kingdom could meet and make one another's acquaintance under Otto I's patronage says much for the new stature and eminence of the Saxon *Reich*. At his February court in Frankfurt Otto I also received ambassadors from Byzantium, Rome and other parts of the world, including 'Saracens', perhaps from Ifriqiya. They all came to congratulate him on his recent victories over Magyars and Obotrite Slavs and to honour him with the exotic, costly presents that were almost the purpose of these exchanges.³⁰

Recemund of Elvira, the Cordoban diplomat and Liudprand of a Pavese family, no doubt landed, but urban in upbringing and outlook, had much in common. They were the servants of princes with sophisticated courts, in Liudprand's case those of Hugh of Arles and Berengar II. They were *litterati* and men of talent. Recemund too was an author and part of the famous Cordoban

28. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, cc.122,123, p.372.

29. *op. cit.*, cc.128,129, pp.374-75.

30. *Widukindi Monachi Corbeiensis Rerum Gestarum Saxonicarum Libri Tres*, iii, 56, 5th. ed. P.Hirsch and H.-E.Lohmann, *MGH, SRG* (Hannover, 1935), p.135.

Calendar with its survey of crop cultivations, one of our principal sources for the economy of Moslem Spain, is linked with him. Their Mediterranean likeness cannot be overlooked. It was Recemund who asked for a history with the 'deeds of the emperors and kings of the whole of Europe' to which Liudprand in the *Antapodosis* responded cautiously offering the 'deeds of the kings and princes of part of Europe'.³¹ That Liudprand did not offer his first major literary work to his Ottonian patrons and protectors but to a bishop *in partibus infidelium* is at first sight very surprising indeed, but I hope to show that in doing so he did not act against the wishes of his Liudolfing benefactors. The *Antapodosis* is a parallel history of Italy, the East-Frankish kingdom and Byzantium, roughly from the late ninth to the mid-tenth century. It is remarkable how little notice Liudprand took of Western *Francia* and Anglo-Saxon England. The deeds of emperors and kings are presented in a rough, sometimes very rough, chronological order and despite his switch to the theme of being even with Berengar II and his wife Willa, Liudprand adhered to a certain scheme. There is no doubt however that the pivot of his, for the most part Mediterranean world as far as it belonged to *Christianitas*, was Byzantium. Liudprand treated the Empire readily as the *caput* of the Christian universe as he skirted along his story: Rome, Italy, East-Francia and the Burgundian Kingdom with Provence being the other *regna* and principalities he kept under review all through. They are seen as parts of a larger whole, Europe, presided over by Constantinople, and Liudprand looked upon the Hungarian attacks and the depredations of the Saracens of Fraxinetum and Southern Italy as a compound threat to this whole. Now the inscription to Recemund of Elvira, the Spanish bishop *in partibus*, is not forgotten throughout the six books of the *Antapodosis*. He is addressed at least twelve times in the text. Some scholars, e.g. Martin Lintzel, thought that this was a mere literary

31. For Recemund's share in the calendar see Férotin (*supra*, n.24), pp.xxxiii-xxxv and esp. R.Dozy, *Le Calendrier de Cordoue*, new ed. and French translation by Ch.Pellat, *Medieval Iberian Peninsula Texts and Studies*, vol.I (Leiden, 1961). For Liudprand's programme in the *Antapodosis* cf. i,1, p.4: 'totius Europae...imperatorum regumque facta' with the well-attested heading: 'Regum atque principum partis Europae', p.1.

fiction and therefore of no special importance. It seems to me to be, on the contrary, decisive for understanding the *Antapodosis* and its massive Byzantine component.³²

At this point it is necessary to glance briefly once more at the last 22 chapters of the *Life of John of Gorze* with their harsh criticism of the Mozarabs' temporising attitudes, the temptation to succumb to the attractions of Islamic urban culture only half resisted, the spread of syncretistic practices like refusing to eat pork and practising circumcision. In the ninth century this process of erosion had been checked and resisted by a spate of notoriously deliberate martyrdoms. By openly and publicly attacking Islam the Christian 'activists' forced the Moslem authorities in al-Andalus to persecute and so again harden the boundaries between the ruling and the ruled communities.³³ It seems that the challenge to assimilative and culturally fusing Christian urban society or at least its wealthier cells, now no longer came from within but from without. The author of the Lotharingian monk's *Life* told his readers that the Latins in Cordoba needed to be reminded of their duties as Christians. Their culture and their pleasures were suspect and wrong

Now Liudprand in the *Antapodosis*, in a less ascetic manner, had exactly the same message for the Spanish Christians or at least for one of their leading lights, an influential man whom he had come to know. Recemund of Elvira is addressed as one who had perforce to

32. M.Lintzel, 'Studien über Liudprand von Cremona', *Historische Studien*, 233 (Berlin, 1933), p.53 and M.Lintzel, *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Berlin, 1961), II, p.382. The places in the *Antapodosis* where Recemund is directly addressed or referred to are: i,1, pp.3-4; i,2 p.5 (Fraxinetum); i,11, p.13 (the vigilance of the Emperor Leo the Wise); i,30, p.24 (re-ordinations); i,44, p.31 (in praise of King Lambert, ob.898); iii,1, p.73 (explaining *antapódosis*); iii,3, p.75 (the burning of Pavia, 924); iv,1, p.104 (Liudprand henceforth a participant of what he relates); iv,6, p.105 (on Manasses of Arles); iv,24, p.117 (Otto I's victory at Birten); iv,28, p.123 (Otto resists temptation); v,2, p.131 (the Battle of Simancas); v,19, p.141 (a reference to Cordoba).

33. On these persecutions see F.R.Franke, 'Die freiwilligen Martyrer von Cordoba und das Verhältnis der Mozaraber zum Islam', *Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft, Erste Reihe*, vol.13 (1958), pp.1-170 and E.Colbert, *The Martyrs of Cordoba (850-859): A Study of the Sources*, The Catholic University of America. Studies in Mediaeval History New Series, xvii (Washington D.C., 1962 and Ann Arbor, 1977).

live among infidels. He must therefore be kept in touch and instructed. He must know what went on inside *Christianitas* and above all where its righteous interests and those of the Saracens and other enemies clashed. Recemund is asked to commemorate in his prayers the Pavese who were burned to death on March 12, 924, 'hora tertia' when the Hungarians assaulted the city and set it on fire.³⁴ When Liudprand mentioned a battle [at Simancas] fought on July 19 (939) where Abd ar-Rahman III suffered a sharp defeat at the hands of King Ramiro II of Leon, the bishop is meant to sympathise with the victors and not with his worsted master.³⁵ It is not for nothing that the very first topic of the *Antapodosis* was the Hispano-Arabic colony at Fraxinetum and the terrible damage it had inflicted on Provence and the Alpine regions. The *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis* and the *Antapodosis* had something startling in common despite their profoundly differing origins. John of Gorze's biographer dwelt above all on his hero's *constantia* when under duress in Cordoba and on his aggressive, not to say dangerously impolitic behaviour, especially towards the anxious Mozarabic dignitaries, the leading members of the Christian community in al-Andalus. The manners and the habitus of the Caliph were described up to a point in a tone of distance and an affected lack of curiosity. John remains a monk throughout. He would not wear the right clothes when the time for the long-awaited reception audience at last came, no court dress. The Caliph is made to be impressed by this. He had sent John ten pounds in coins to acquire robes and the envoy had given it all to the poor. Abd ar-Rhman in the end agreed to receive him in his black habit, saying he would see him even if he wore a sack.³⁶ To the biographer this irony served as proof for John's observance of the Rule at all times.

Behind the *Vita Iohannis* and the *Antapodosis* lay a hardening of attitudes which accompanied success. They hardened because

34. *Antapodosis*, iii, 3, p.75.

35. On the Battle of Simancas which was fought on August 1, 939 see R. Collins, *Early Medieval Spain Unity in Diversity, 400-1000* (London and Basingstoke, 1983), pp.197, 241 and Lévi-Provencal, *Histoire de l'Espagne Musulmane*, II, pp.56-62.

36. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, c.131, p.375.

Europe had until recently suffered too much from Norse, Saracens and Magyars not to be harsh and intolerant in its responses. It is this mood which shaped the pages of Ludprand no less than the biography of John of Gorze. Other texts, like *Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim's Pelagius*, a poem in honour of one of the latest Christian martyrs in al-Andalus († 925) who rejected both conversion and homosexuality, strengthen the sense of a new aggressiveness.³⁷ It expressed itself in a profound distaste for everything associated with the enemies of Christianity. What matters here is that in Ludprand Byzantium is, like the West, surrounded by ferocious *gentes* and some of their enemies, like Magyars, North-men and Saracens, they shared. Even though Otto I is, in Book IV of the *Antipodosis*, called 'nunc imperator', the problem of the two emperors does not cloud the pages of the *Antipodosis*.^{37a}

We do not know whether Reccmund of Elvira ever received a *Wiedmungs exemplar* of the work especially written for him. We should assume he did rather than not even though it lacked a formal conclusion and a Spanish branch of its transmission has barely been limited at. The *Antipodosis* had an important literary afterlife and spread in Lotharingia, Bavaria and Austria, not apparently in Italy. Writers like Sigebert of Gembloux and Frutolf of Michelsberg used and valued it.³⁸ It has been suggested that the Ottomans may not have felt slighted that the *Antipodosis* in which they were after all referred to almost always in a panegyric tone, was addressed to Reccmund of Elvira rather than one of them, say the literate Empress Adelheid with her own interests in Italy. The letter John of Gorze had to take to Cordoba was the Saxon king's rejoinder to the Caliph's own, matter of course, Islamic self-assertion. Its Christian counterthrust was, as we saw, deliberate. To extricate the

37. *Hrotsvithae Opera*, ed. P. Winterfeld, *MGH, SRG* (Berlin, Zürich, 1965), pp. 52-62 and *Hrotsvithae Opera*, ed. H. Homeyer (Paderborn, 1970), pp. 123-146.

37a. *Antipodosis*, vi, 4, p. 153.
38. For the spread of Ludprand's *Antipodosis* see the introduction of Becker's edition, pp. xxxii-xxxiv and J. Becker, *Textgeschichte Ludprands von Cremona, Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, iii, 2 (Munich, 1908), pp. 39-46 and also Manitius, p. 174.

ambassador it had to be suppressed but a historical survey of Christian Europe's sufferings and then its growing strength and solidarity sent to a Christian servant of the Umayyads, made really the same point, albeit in a more roundabout way. The destruction of Fraxinetum remained high on Otto I's programme as late as 968 when Liudprand was in Constantinople and the showdown with the Greeks in Southern Italy had taken a menacing turn.³⁹

To it and the *Legatio* we must now turn. Liudprand was in Constantinople only from 4 June to 2 October, 968. For an embassy over such distances this was in the tenth century not an exceptionally long time. John of Gorze had been detained in Cordoba for three years and the envoys Abd ar-Rahman III had previously sent to Otto I spent no less time involuntarily in Germany. The Caliph's principal ambassador, a bishop, had died.⁴⁰ The general prospects for Liudprand's mission were poor after Otto I's setback and retreat from Bari in March 968.⁴¹ Without a fleet he could not take it but he had found allies in the south and could continue to threaten the Greeks there. Even so, it must be remembered that Liudprand received a chrysobull and it is quite possible that the exchanges between him and his interlocutors were nothing like as shrill and heated as the *Legatio* suggests.⁴² If Nicephorus Phocas denied Otto the *basileus Francorum* title which we find twice in Cedrenus, he certainly did not break all bridges with Liudprand.⁴³ Nor must we

39. For this see Otto I's letter of 968 in Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae*, iii, 70, *ed. cit.*, p.147 announcing his intention to return home via Fraxinetum and to destroy the Saracens there.

40. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, c.115, p.370.

41. For the situation on the eve of Liudprand's embassy see Köpke, Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, p.436f., Bömer-Ottenthal, *Regesta Imperii*, ii,1, No.468b, c and R.Holtzmann, *Geschichte der Sächsischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1943), pp.217-218. On Liudprand's mission, besides the literature cited *supra*, n.1, see M.Lintzel, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, ii, pp.370-384, J.N.Sutherland, 'The Mission to Constantinople in 968' (as in n.22) and P.Lamma, 'Il problema dei due imperi e dell'Italia meridionale nel giudizio delle fonti letterarie dei secoli IX e X', *Atti del 3° Congresso Internazionale di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1959), esp. pp.229-246.

42. For Liudprand's chrysobull see *Legatio*, c.56, *ed. cit.*, p.206.

43. W.Ohnsorge, 'Die Anerkennung des Kaisertums Ottos I. durch Byzanz', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 54 (1961), pp.28-52 and esp. pp.29-32 and in

believe, as some scholars suggest, that the bishop of Cremona lacked all diplomatic skills.⁴⁴ We don't know. Diplomacy is only the *setting*, not the substance of the *Legatio*. It does not tell us what Liudprand could or could not offer. Occasionally the text allows us to see that what the bishop of Cremona purported to say and what he did say, differed. This is particularly the case after the arrival of Pope John XIII's letters and envoys where the *imperator Graecorum* title gave of course deep offence. Liudprand withdrew here at once and did his best to pacify the Greeks by promising the correct address next time: 'Romanorum imperatores et Augusti'.⁴⁵

The *Legatio* is clearly a call to war and offers the justification for such a war with a call to judgement on Nicephorus and his patriarch. It sought to win over opinion for more hostilities in Liudprand's own ambience, the Italian great and their *familiares*. They were to be informed, disillusioned and re-educated about the Greeks. The libel set the tone for Otto I's military operations of 969 which at Bovino suffered a bad setback with the capture of Count Pandulf of Capua, his chief ally, and later, at Ascoli, achieved a brutal success.⁴⁶ In the *Legatio* Liudprand tendered advice to the two Ottos which reflects the momentarily close relations with Pope John XIII. When he addressed them as *imperatores Romanorum* however, we know that Otto I, in his diplomata, remained firmly 'imperator augustus' and no more. He treated this advice and its manifestations with reserve. The murder of Nicephorus in December 969 and the accession of John Tzimisces did his work for him shortly afterwards. So much for the course of events.

The most arresting feature of Liudprand's vision of Constantinople and the imperial court in the *Legatio*, that which strikes us most

W. Ohnsorge, *Konstantinopel und der Okzident* (Darmstadt, 1966), pp.176-207 and esp. pp.178-181.

44. e.g. Rentschler, *Liudprand von Cremona* (as in n.1), p.56.

45. *Legatio*, cc.47,51,53, pp.200f., 202-203.

46. On the 969 campaign in Southern Italy see Köpke, Dümmler, *Kaiser Otto der Grosse*, pp.460-465, 468f. and see also Vera von Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süditalien vom 9. bis ins 11. Jahrhundert*, *Schriften zur Geistesgeschichte des Östlichen Europa*, 1 (Wiesbaden, 1967), pp.47-51, 83.

and must have struck his contemporary audience at once were the details, the minute observations, comments and outbursts. Liudprand was a glutton for the taste, the feel and the smell of everything he came across in Constantinople and he succeeded in conveying this to his readers. The food, the sauces, the wine, the clothes worn at processions, the Greeks' headgear, all these received the closest attention in the *Legatio*, much more still than they had done in the *Antapodosis*.⁴⁷ They do not all carry the allegorical overtones of the wild asses he saw in Nicephorus's parks. What were Liudprand's purposes? Why does he tell us so much about these things, grateful though we are to possess them? Travellers books were rare in the Latin West of the tenth century, much rarer than among the Arabs. We have the Alfredian reports of Ohtere's and Wulfstan's journeys added to the Orosius translation and we have again that other *Legatio* of the tenth century already discussed here, the last 22 chapters of the *Life of John of Gorze*.⁴⁸ We should be doing an injustice to the *legatio*-part of the *Vita Iohannis* if we failed to see it as the splendid source it is for the Verdun slave trade, the routes it used, the entry formalities at the frontier between Christian and Moslem Spain between Barcelona and Tortosa. Despite the deliberate austerity of the text, it does in the end devote a paragraph to the *apparatus* of the solemn, formal reception which echoes Arab accounts of the arrival of an embassy sent by Constantine Porphyrogenitus: the files of soldiers lining the route, both foot and horse, the mock combats staged by various bodies of troops all of different armament, men on mules and Moors who were posted

47. Th. Weber, 'Essen und Trinken in Konstantinopel des 10. Jahrhunderts nach den Berichten Liudprands von Cremona', in J.Koder-Th. Weber, *Liudprand von Cremona in Konstantinopel*, pp.73-99.

48. For these travel reports see *The Old English Orosius*, ed. J.Bately, *Early English Text Society*, Supplementary Series, 6 (London, 1980), pp.lxxif., 13-18 and *Anglo-Saxon Prose*, Edited and translated by M.Swanton (London, Melbourne and Toronto, 1975), pp.32-37.

there to frighten the ambassadors and apparently did, the precious carpets and hangings, all these descriptions are not so unlike the scenes narrated by Liudprand; at least the genres are comparable.⁴⁹

For Constantinople, however, Liudprand seems to stand on his own. His *Legatio* as a polemic has none of the solemnity of the great ninth-century controversy between the emperors Louis II and Basil I enshrined in Louis's letter of 871 with its hard-strained arguments to justify the Carolingian *imperiale nomen*.⁵⁰ These problems were there in 968 but they do not hold the centre of the stage in Liudprand's harangue and not even the fluctuating allegiances of the South Italian Lombard princes seem to dominate the exchanges between Nicephorus and Otto's envoy all the time.⁵¹

Liudprand's techniques in denigration here deserve some attention. You may recall his slighting remarks about the old and torn clothes worn by many of the *optimates* in Nicephorus's Whitsun procession from the Palace to Hagia Sophia. He wrote that they must have had these clothes from their great grandfathers and even then they were not new.⁵² The rhetorical exaggeration is brilliant. Now the Byzantine aristocracy was fluid enough, there were plenty of *novi homines* and *arrivistes*. For a Byzantine noble it may well have been a cause of honour and pride to be seen wearing now and

49. *Vita Iohannis Gorziensis*, cc.117,118, pp.370-371 for John's journey, cc.132,133, pp.375-376 for the reception by the Caliph. The embassy sent by Constantine VII to Cordoba is described in Lévi-Provencal, *Histoire de l'Espagne Musulmane* II, pp.151-153 and see A.A.Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*, II,1, *La Dynastie Macédonienne* (867-959), édition française préparée par M.Canard, *Corpus Bruxellense Historiae Byzantinae*, 2,1 (Brussels, 1960), pp.323-331 and 2,2 (Brussels, 1950), pp.276-281, a translation of the text of Maqqari, citing Ibn Hayyan.

50. Louis II's letter, ed. W:Henze is in *MGH, Epistolarum Tomus VII* (Berlin, 1928), pp.385-394 and discussed by F.Dölger, 'Europas Gestaltung im Spiegel der fränkisch-byzantinischen Auseinandersetzung des 9. Jahrhunderts', in F.Dölger, *Byzanz und die Europäische Staatenwelt* (Darmstadt, 1964), pp.311ff., 336ff. and by W.Ohnsorge, 'Die Entwicklung der Kaiseridee im 9. Jahrhundert und Süditalien', in his *Abendland und Byzanz* (Darmstadt, 1958), pp.219-226 and Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim, 1947), pp.40-45, also Lamma, *op. cit.*, n.41, pp.181ff.

51. They are however one of the *Legatio*'s most persistent themes as Lamma, *op. cit.*, n.41, has shown.

52. *Legatio*, c.9, p.181.

again an ancestral garb at these festive functions. It could even be a demonstration of opposition. New robes and court dress were distributed lavishly every year as Liudprand himself has described in *Antapodosis* so that the wearing of old clothes must have been deliberate. Liudprand may have known this too but chose to ignore it in order to gain his effect and depict the grand ceremonial as a threadbare occasion. Here not only Nicephorus but the whole of his court, his *optimates*, were being slated.

To find out what Liudprand intended we must in fact consult another text, only to discover to our surprise that the Bishop of Cremona did not stand alone, that he followed in fact, one could almost say, a tradition. Some of the things he tells us had been told before and seen together they reveal which features of the Byzantine polity, which rituals and procedures struck Western observers, mainly ambassadors, most and clashed most severely with their own ruling habitat. To the best of my knowledge Byzantinists have not used the incidents in Notker of St. Gallen's *Gesta Karoli* very much, above all systematically, though stray references have been made here and there to compare them with Liudprand's *Legatio*.⁵³

Notker wrote his *Gesta Karoli* in the 880ies nearer the end rather than the beginning of the reign of the unfortunate Charles III who had encouraged him to set down his tales. Notker's source for Charlemagne's embassies and wars must have been Adalbert, the father of one of his fellow-monks and his *nutritor*, a great warrior-noble with much experience. We can thus locate the Frankish lay circles who possessed some knowledge of the Eastern Empire and its court. The first surprising discovery the Byzantinist makes when looking at Notker, is one about communications. He furnishes clear evidence that the land-route between Byzantium and the East-

53. *Notkeri Balbuli Gesta Karoli Magni Imperatoris*, ed. H.F.Haefele, *MGH, SRG* (Berlin, 1959). They have been referred to by Weber (cf. *supra* n.47), p.89 and n.90 and by Becker in his edition of the *Legatio*, c.63, p.210, n.3. On the *Gesta Karoli* see H.Löwe, 'Das Karlsbuch Notkers von St. Gallen und sein zeitgeschichtlicher Hintergrund', in H.Löwe, *Von Cassiodor zu Dante, Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Geschichtsschreibung und politischen Ideenwelt des Mittelalters*, pp.123ff. and J.M.Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp.333ff.

Frankish Kingdom was open and passable. Norker credited Charlemagne with having opened the route by victories over Slavs, Avars and Bulgars.⁵⁴ From what he said it can be deduced that the overland journey in the later ninth century, until the Magyars came, was possible and by no means unusual. The real reasons for this were the temporary pacification of the Bulgars and the rise of the Grand-Moravian principality, perhaps also the great, competitive, missionaryary enterprises from Byzantium, Rome and East Francia in this region.

One parallel to Liudprand offers itself readily in the *Gesta*. You will recall (*Legatio*, c.63) his bitter words about Greek bishops when, on his way back, he had a poor reception from the one in Leucas. He had not found a single hospitable bishop in all Greece, he complained.⁵⁵ There is a story to match this in the *Gesta* (ii,6). A Carolingian embassy to Byzantium arrived in the autumn and Charles's *legatus* was made to stay with a bishop who imposed a regime of dearth and abstinence and was much given to fasting and prayer. Next spring he presented his charge to the *basileus*, here called *rex*. The emperor asked him how he found the bishop and the envoy replied: he, your bishop, is a most holy man in as far as it is possible to be so without God. The emperor was naturally shocked and asked how could anyone be holy without God. The envoy is made to reply: 'Scriptum est Deus caritas est', of which he has none.⁵⁶

It seems to have been frequent Greek practice to break up the cohesion of foreign embassies by separating their members from one another. It is vouched for in Menander Protector and Liudprand's mentions it too.⁵⁷ For instance at his first dinner at Nicophorus's

54. *Gesta Karoli*, i,27, p.37f.

55. *Legatio*, c.63, pp.210-211.

56. *Gesta Karoli*, ii, c.6, p.53.

57. *Excerpta de legationibus gentium c Menandro*, 6, in *Excerpta de Legationibus*, i,

ed. C. de Boor (Berlin, 1903), p.447f. The separation of foreign emissaries from

one another was not invariable Byzantine custom, e.g. *Anapodosis*, vi,7, p.156

(see *supra* n.13) when Liudprand and his following were, it seems, all invited

together to the imperial banquet but it could be, and often was used to

disconcert them.

table where he complains at being seated only fifteenth, his *comites*, he writes, were not even allowed to dine in the same building.⁵⁸ At most of his interviews, it appears, his *leones*, his military [and clerical] following, were left behind in his quarters. Exactly the same practice is hinted at in the *Gesta Karoli* (II,6) where the various members of Charlemagne's mission were divided from one another.⁵⁹ We must understand how disconcerting this was to Westerners. Their entire lives were lived in *Hausgenossenschaft* and *familiaritas*, the close association of kinsmen, followers and servants under the same roof. This is no less true of a bishop than a layman and some of Liudprand's irritation, even some of his *gaffes* might be explained by his being unable to consult his following, and from finding himself isolated from his *leones* as he called them. Confronted by the unexpected the Latins sought shelter by going into a huddle.

Yet by far the most important and profound difference of political styles between East and West, also Cordoba and the West, lay in the all-embracing ritual and formality, the elaboration and matchless ubiquity of Byzantine court ceremonial.⁶⁰ It is not that the Carolingian and Ottonian courts knew no ritual, solemnities and formalities but they were intermittent and punctuated a routine of close companionship and *familiaritas*. It would also be mistaken to think that this western ritual only embraced crown-wearings. A

58. For Liudprand's isolation from his staff and following see *Legatio*, c.11, p.181. Elsewhere he speaks usually in the first person, e.g. c.15, p.183,19, p.185,21, p.186f., 25-29, pp.188-190. The plural 'invitaremur' (c.19, p.185) refers to Liudprand and the Bulgarian envoys. Altogether Liudprand had 25 men in his company (c.34, p.193), including five knights (c.24, p.188) and four Greek guards had been attached to him (c.34, p.193).

59. *Gesta Karoli*, ii, c.6, pp.53,55.

60. On Byzantine court ceremonial and its expressive range see above all O.Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (Jena, 1938 and Darmstadt, 1969), pp.1-6 and pp.197-202, on receptions. See also the editor, A.Vogt's introductory remarks to *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète le Livre des Cérémonies, Commentaire*, I, *Collection Byzantine* (Paris, 1935), pp.xviii-xxxiii. Ceremonial are also the purposes and setting of the *Kletorologion* of Philotheos, ed. J.B.Bury in his *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century, The British Academy Supplemental Papers*, I (1911) and reprinted (New York, no date).

careful reading of e.g. Ermoldus Nigellus suggests that there was more. But the Ottonian court and society developed such occasions only slowly and they rejected Otto III's attempts to innovate here.⁶¹

Liudprand of course knew of this profound difference and was prepared for it as he prides himself in the *Antapodosis*. Not for him to be surprised by the artificial singing birds in the tree, the mechanical roar of the lions, the sudden elevation of the *basileus* at the reception audience.⁶² Yet the helplessness of the Latins faced by this unremitting ceremonial is well exposed in a tale of the *Gesta Karoli* where an attempt is made to ape and so ridicule Byzantine procedures. Notker seems to allude to a traceable embassy of Charlemagne's, that of Bishop Heito of Basle and Count Hugh of Tours in 811. Once again they were dragged hither and thither, ill-treated and 'per diversissima loca divisi'. On their return they persuaded Charlemagne to make an example of the Byzantine counter-embassy, to make their journey unpleasant for them and their arrival even more so. The latter took the form of taking the Greeks from one Carolingian household officer to the next: first the Constable, then the Count-Palatine, then the Butler (*magister mensae*) and finally the Chamberlain. Each of these officers is represented as sitting in dignity surrounded by his attendants and minions and each time the envoys mistook him for Charlemagne himself only to be abused by their guides and pushed on. When they

61. Ermold le Noir, *Poème sur Louis le Pieux*, ed. E. Faral, *Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age* (Paris, 1964), l.684 (p.54): 'Hic cadit ante pedes, vestigia basiat alma', Einhard before Charlemagne in 813 and cf. ll.173 (p.18), 213 (p.20), 582 (p.46). Solemnities of the court, processions and well-ordered meals played their part in the baptism of King Heriold and his Danes in 826. See Ermold, *Poème*, pp.166ff. Otto III's attempts to manifest his kingship in new ways and so change its character e.g. by dining alone and creating a new palace hierarchy were widely criticized. See Thietmar of Merseburg's *Chronicon*, iv,47, ed. R. Holtzmann, *MGH, SRG, nova series*, ix (Berlin, 1955), p.184f. For other sources and comment see P.E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1957), p.148 and n.2, Leyser, 'The Tenth Century in Byzantine-Western Relationships' (as in n.19), p.44 or *Medieval Germany*, p.118 and Leyser, *Rule and Conflict in an Early Medieval Society* (London, 1979), p.103 and n.29.

62. *Antapodosis*, vi,5, p.155: 'nulla admiratione commotus, quoniam quidem ex his omnibus eos qui bene noverant fueram percontatus'.

finally came to Charlemagne he is characteristically shown standing at a window surrounded by his family rather than alone on a throne.⁶³ This by no means exhausts the parallels to Liudprand in Notker. Even the notorious fish-sauce, the fish dipped in *pigmenta* is there.⁶⁴ Throughout the West the Greeks were reputed to be cunning and astute. In the *Gesta Karoli* the Carolingian envoy is made to outwit them. In Widukind of Corvey they won their victory at Bovino by trickery.⁶⁵ Liudprand is anxious to convince his Italian audience that they were a match for the Byzantines in war, no less than in other dealings.

What conclusions can be drawn from these analogies between the *Legatio* and the stories of the *Gesta*? It would be rash to say that all Western envoys nursed the sentiments we encounter in these two so different works. Greek court ceremonial must not be thought of as wholly inflexible, unbending and rigid. If the Greeks wanted to they could charm and flatter their foreign visitors as they did Liudprand himself in 949. The *Legatio* was, even more than the *Historia Ottonis a livre, d'occasion* which by itself left no trace and had no known literary afterlife, unlike the *Antapodosis*. It is a text we possess precariously, one of several medieval transmissions resting on no surviving manuscript whatsoever. All the same the sentiments of the *Legatio* had a deep resonance and audible echoes. It is possible that Bishop Dietrich of Metz, a nephew of Queen Mathilda and cousin to Otto I, possessed a copy and we know of his deep indignation with the Empress Theophano from Alpert of Metz's *Fragment*.⁶⁶

63. *Gesta Karoli*, ii,6, pp.55-57.

64. *Ibid.*, p.54: 'piscis fluvialis et pigmentis infusus'.

65. *Ibid.*, p.54f. and Widukind, *Res Gestae Saxonicae*, iii,71, p.148.

66. Alpertus Mettensis, *Fragmentum de Deoderico primo episcopo Mettensi*, cc.2,4, ed. H. van Rij and A.S.Abulafia, *Alpertus van Metz* (Amsterdam, 1980), pp.110,114. The *Legatio* was first edited by H.Canisius, professor of civil and canon law at Ingolstadt. His manuscript was sent to him from Augsburg but it had lain at Trier. H.Pertz thought that perhaps the Ottos themselves or the Empress Adelheid had sent it there (*MGH, SS*, III, pp.269,273). What happened to this codex is not known. Canisius's edition is entitled thus: *Chronicon Victoris Episcopi Tununensis, Chronicon Ioannis Biclarensis, Episcopi Gerundensis, Legatio Liutprandi Episcopi Cremonensis, ad Nicephorum*

Liudprand in the *Antapodosis*, we have said, became the spokesman of Christianity's hardening attitudes towards Islam, one of the first signs of an incipient counter-offensive. The *Legatio* too marks a divide. As late as 962 Constantinople was almost the centre of gravity of Liudprand's Christian world. It had been that for the Pavese hitherto. In the *Legatio* this centre has shifted to Rome and the itinerant Ottonian court. It was not to move again for three hundred years. Among the makers of Latin Europe Liudprand holds an important place. He was indeed one of the architects of a new, self-centred polarity in the Latin West. It did not rule out gusts of benevolence towards the Greeks and their Church but the matter-of-fact, unquestioned solidarity we meet in the *Antapodosis* was now, only six years later, a thing of the past. Efforts, self-conscious efforts, had to be made and sometimes were made to try and regain it, most of them in vain. In the wake of Ottonian policy, as the likely participant in yet another diplomatic mission to Constantinople, Liudprand may not have wished the *Legatio* to be his last word but it became just that. He chose to rouse self-awareness not by pointing to mounting political and religious differences but by dwelling on everyday *habitus* and ingrained responses and whether he knew it or not, his means for all their ease, matched his ends at a much deeper level.

Phocam... Synodus Bgarica sub Tassilone Bavariae Duce Tempore Caroli Magni, Omnia Nunc primum in lucem edita Studio et Opera Henrici Canisii Noviomagi I C et SS Canonum Professoris Ordinarii in Academia Ingolstadiensi (Ingolstadii, 1600).

1