

*BEATI PATRES:*  
USES OF AUGUSTINE AND GREGORY THE GREAT  
AT CAROLINGIAN CHURCH COUNCILS, 816–836

by

Joshua L. Timmermann

B.A. (hons.), The University of British Columbia (Vancouver), 2013

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES

(History)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

April 2015

© Joshua L. Timmermann, 2015

## Abstract

The Carolingian *renovatio* of the earlier ninth century was marked by an intensified interest in “the teachings of the ancient fathers.” Where the Church Fathers had long served as indispensable sources for biblical interpretation and exegesis, the reform agenda of the Church councils between 816 and 836 saw these Fathers employed increasingly as authoritative guides to the *ordines*, the orders of Christian society. Chief among these patristic authorities was Augustine of Hippo (354–430), whose influence in the early Middle Ages has often been cast as ubiquitous and all-encompassing by modern historians.

To be sure, Augustine was an important source for the Carolingian reforms. Yet, rather than presuming that his *nominal* impact was all-pervasive in ninth-century political and ecclesiastical discourses, I shall endeavor to show both the great utility and the discursive limits of Augustine’s name, and the authority tied to it, within the conciliar texts of this period. Despite the purportedly thorough Augustinianism of the Carolingian reforms, “Augustine” is often present via later, patristic mediators, the most significant and formidable among them being Pope Gregory the Great (540–604). Gregory was arguably the ultimate Augustinian mediator for the Carolingians (and beyond), but his great innovation was the development of an adaptable language of hierarchical, spiritual, and political authority, a mode of admonition particularly well-suited to the aims of the Carolingian reform program.

## **Preface**

This thesis is entirely the original, unpublished, and independent work of the author, Joshua Timmermann.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	ii
Preface .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	iv
List of Tables .....	v
Acknowledgements .....	vi
Introduction: <i>Ex auctoritate ueterum scriptorum catholicorum uirorum</i> .....	1
(Re)locating Augustine in the Early Middle Ages .....	4
Authors and Texts .....	15
<i>Beati patres</i> .....	19
The Presence of the Fathers at the Reform Councils .....	21
Augustine at Aachen .....	29
Interlude: Absent Fathers? .....	34
Exceptional Circumstances: The Council of Paris (825) .....	37
‘The Government of Souls’: The Council of Paris (829) .....	43
Augustine and Augustinians .....	51
Afterword: <i>Post Apostolos omnium ecclesiarum magister?</i> .....	56
Bibliography .....	63
Appendix .....	73

## List of Tables

Table 1: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Council of Aachen (816) .....	73
Table 2: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the <i>Libellus synodalis</i> of the Council of Paris (825) .....	76
Table 3: Augustine and Gregory in the Great in the Council of Paris (829) .....	79
Table 4: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Council of Aachen (836) .....	81

## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis concerns the use of writings by the Church Fathers in the Carolingian era. Just as ninth-century readers sought the wisdom and erudition of Augustine and Gregory the Great, I have similarly benefited from the expert guidance of learned doctors. Dr. Courtney Booker provided attentive, critical supervision throughout the research and writing process. Dr. Mark Vessey and Dr. Richard Pollard offered generous advice and assistance at crucial junctures in this project's development. I have learned much about late antique and early medieval history from these professors, but more than that, I have learned a great deal about what it means to be a serious scholar. They are each deserving of so much more than a simple 'thanks.'

I would also like to express my gratitude to my graduate advisor, Dr. Michel Ducharme, and my classmates in Dr. Ducharme's thesis-writing seminar, who provided helpful feedback on sections of this thesis; to Dr. Carla Nappi and Dr. Arlene Sindelar, both of whom I had the great pleasure of working under, as a teaching assistant; and, generally, to UBC's Department of History and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for their financial support of this project.

Finally, I wish to thank my family—especially Teresa and Logan, who have supported me every day in innumerable, large and small ways, even when I spent entire days staring at a computer screen, surrounded by books.

## INTRODUCTION

### *EX AUCTORITATE UETERUM SCRIPTORUM CATHOLICORUM UIRORUM*

\*

Writing in or around 826, the exiled poet Ermoldus Nigellus composed a lengthy panegyric poem describing the deeds of the emperor Louis the Pious (r. 814–840). Although little is known for certain about Ermoldus or his particular circumstances, it is clear from his laudatory verses that the “black” (*nigellus*) poet sought to return to the good graces of the emperor and his court. His poem, *In honor of Louis, the most Christian Caesar Augustus*, would serve to deliver him from his exile, or so Ermoldus hoped. Around the midway mark of the text, Ermoldus imagines Louis, still in the early years of his reign, giving careful instructions to his clerical and lay envoys. The emperor implores his trusted subordinates to

hurry through my empire—in orderly fashion, of course—and pay particular attention to specific things: Examine the canonical flock, both men and women, who live in holy fortresses. How do they live? Dress? What is the state of their learning and bearing? How do they practice their religion? What works of piety do they perform? Does harmony join the flock to the pastor? Does the flock love the pastor, and the pastor, the flock? Do the prelates provide walls, houses, food and drink, and clothing, in the right time and place? . . . Who lives well and maintains the teachings of the ancient fathers, who not so well, and who—heaven forbid—not at all?<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Ermoldus Nigellus, *In Honour of Louis, The Most Christian Caesar Augustus*, in Thomas F.X. Noble, trans., *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer* (University Park, Penn., 2009), 154. On Ermoldus’s poem, see Peter Godman, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987), 110–30; for a verse translation of an excerpt from Ermoldus, see Peter Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (Norman, OK, 1985), 250–7. Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici*, vv. 1161–69, 1175–76, in Edmond Faral, ed., *Ermold le Noir: Poème sur Louis le Pieux et épîtres au roi Pépin* (Paris, 1964), 90–92:

Atque per imperium currite rite meum,  
Canonicumque gregem sexumque probate virilem,  
Femineum necnon, quae pia castra colunt;  
Qualis vita, decor, qualis doctrina modusque,  
Quantaque religio, quod pietatis opus;  
Pastorique gregem quae convenientia jungat,  
Ut grex pastorum diligat, ipse ut oves;  
Si sibi claustra, domos, potum, tegimenque cibumque  
Praelati tribuant tempore sive loco. . . .

Ermoldus's intention, in putting these words in Louis's mouth, was no doubt to emphasize this "most Christian" ruler's commitment to thorough, Christian reform across his vast empire. Louis may not have spoken these exact words. Yet, he likely would have concurred that this list of pressing concerns, attributed to him, summarized neatly and accurately the imperatives of the reform program that had begun under Charlemagne and continued, with renewed vigor and urgency, during Louis's reign.

Not least among the essential characteristics of the Carolingian *renovatio* was an intensified interest in "the teachings of the ancient fathers." Where the Church Fathers—typically, conceptualized collectively as "ancient" by ninth-century admirers<sup>2</sup>—had long served as indispensable sources for biblical interpretation and exegesis, the reform agenda of the 810s saw these Fathers employed increasingly as authoritative guides to the *ordines*, the orders of Christian society.<sup>3</sup> The definition, delineation, and proper conduct of the *ordines* were of great importance to Louis's and the empire's ecclesiastical elites.<sup>4</sup> Voices, and names, from a Roman Christian past invariably imagined as more spiritually perfect than the present age, would, at least ostensibly, direct their Frankish heirs in this ambitious (re-)ordering of society.

Because of the forceful influence exerted by the Church Fathers, the Carolingians have often been historiographically cast as slavish adherents to an inherited "patristic tradition," dutifully copying the more complex and sophisticated works of earlier centuries.<sup>5</sup> To be sure, the Carolingians

---

Qui bene, quive minus, medieque nihilque (quod absit!)

Vivant seu teneant dogmata prisca patrum

2 On this point, see Michael E. Moore, "Ancient Fathers: Christian Antiquity, Patristics, and Frankish Canon Law," *Millennium* 7 (2010): 293–342.

3 On the evolving uses of the Church Fathers in the Carolingian era, see Bernice M. Kaczynski, "The Authority of the Fathers: Patristic Texts in Early Medieval Libraries and Scriptoria," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 16 (2006): 1–27; and Dominique Alibert, "La transmission des textes patristiques à l'époque carolingienne," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 91.1 (2007): 7–21. For an earlier description of the influence of the Fathers across the late eighth century and the first half of the ninth century, see Pierre Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth Through Eighth Centuries*, trans. from the third edition by John J. Contreni (Columbia, S.C., 1976), 497–99.

4 Regarding the importance of the *ordines* and the distinctions among them, see Mayke de Jong, "Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity," in Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl, and Helmut Reimitz, eds., *Staat im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 2006), 113–32; eadem, "Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer," in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1995), 622–53.

5 On this problem and its impact on historiographical evaluations of Carolingian culture, see especially Richard E. Sullivan, "Changing Perspectives on the Concept of the Middle Ages," *Centennial Review* 28 (1984): 77–99, reprinted in idem, *Speaking for Clio* (Kirksville, Mo., 1991), 152–69; idem, "The Carolingian Age: Reflections on Its Place in the



themselves sought to affect the appearance of unquestioning, eager compliance with revered patristic authority figures, as Louis's (purported) concern with the proper maintenance of the "teachings of the ancient fathers" suggests. Modern historians have often interpreted this emphatic compliance with the Fathers, and with Augustine above all, as one of the defining characteristics—if not the definitive characteristic—of Carolingian thought and culture. For example, in Henri-Irénée Marrou's classic 1954 study, *Saint Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*, the matter is framed in this way:

When the West, with the foreshadowings of the Carolingian renaissance, begins again to think, and with the very limited materials salvaged from the great disaster forces itself to elaborate afresh a culture of Christian inspiration, St. Augustine quite naturally becomes once more its counsellor and inspirer: more than ever he is the Master without rival, he who is placed so high that he ranks immediately after the Apostles: *post Apostolos omnium ecclesiarum magister* (after the Apostles, teacher of all the Churches). All, or nearly all, flows from him. The fact is so evident that the historian must be chiefly concerned with making this statement precise by limiting it.<sup>6</sup>

Within the space of a few sentences, Marrou says quite a lot, all of it important. What he offers here remains remarkably instructive in identifying the central challenges facing studies of Augustine's early medieval reception—including this one.

As this essay will endeavor to demonstrate, despite the purportedly thorough Augustinianism of the reform program during the earlier part of Louis the Pious's reign, "Augustine" is often present via later, patristic mediators, the most significant and formidable among them being Pope Gregory the Great (540–604). Gregory was arguably the ultimate Augustinian mediator for the Carolingians (and beyond), but his great innovation was the development of a language of hierarchical, spiritual, and political authority,<sup>7</sup> a mode of admonition particularly well-suited to the aims of the Carolingian reform

---

History of the Middle Ages," *Speculum* 64.2 (1989): 267–306; David Ganz, "Conclusion: Visions of Carolingian Education, Past, Present, and Future," in Richard E. Sullivan, ed., *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus, Ohio, 1995), 261–84; and Willemien Otten, "The Reception of Augustine in the Early Middle Ages (c. 700–c. 1200)," in Karla Pollmann and Willemien Otten, et al., eds., *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine* (Oxford, 2013), 23–39.

6 Henri-Irénée Marrou, *Saint Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*, trans. Patrick Hepburne-Scott (1954; New York, 1957), 156.

7 Here I follow Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000), 160–87.

program.<sup>8</sup> The sixth-century pope was not simply a generic Augustinian disciple. Rather, Gregory possessed his own patristic *auctoritas*. A sensitivity to the aspects of Gregory's work that were perceived as distinctive (and as distinctively useful) by his Carolingian readers will help us, in turn, to better understand the apparent convergence of ecclesiastical and political discourses in the early ninth century.

At the same time, we may cautiously be able to identify the construction a more particular Augustine—distinguishable from all this indirect, broadly conceived Augustinianism—by looking closely at the instances where Augustine himself is invoked by name and/or quoted directly. Reflecting on the central problem impeding studies of Augustine's early medieval reception, Conrad Leyser (echoing Marrou) writes, "If Augustine is the father who says 'everything,' then he says nothing distinctive."<sup>9</sup> As I shall argue in what follows, a more distinctive, delimited Augustine, specifically useful to the (changing) ecclesio-political imperatives of the Carolingian *renovatio*, evolved and took shape over the course of Louis the Pious's reign (814–840).

### (Re)locating Augustine in the Early Middle Ages

In order to better understand the historiographical challenge of locating this more particular, Carolingian Augustine, it is useful to begin by considering at greater length the key points raised by Marrou. In so doing, it will become readily apparent that subsequent studies of Augustine's early medieval influence have continued to grapple with the problems summarized in Marrou's statement quoted above.

---

8 Regarding Gregory's influence in the Carolingian era, see Bruno Judic, "La tradition de Grégoire le Grand dans l'idéologie politique carolingienne," in Régine Le Jan, ed., *La royauté et les élites dans l'europe carolingienne* (Lille, 1998), 17–57; Silke Floryszczak, *Die Regula Pastoralis Gregors des Großen: Studien zu Text, kirchenpolitischer Bedeutung und Rezeption in der Karolingerzeit* (Tübingen, 2005), esp. 279–399; and Francesca Sara D'Imperio, "Momenti della diffusione altomedievale di Gregorio Magno," in Rainer Berndt and Michel Fédou, eds., *Les réceptions des Pères de l'Église au Moyen Âge: Le devenir de la tradition ecclésiastique* (Münster, 2013), 121–35.

9 Conrad Leyser, "Augustine in the Latin West, 430–ca. 900," in Mark Vessey, ed., *A Companion to Augustine* (Chichester, 2012), 452. In the short time since Leyser's essay was published, the *Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine* became available to scholars. There is perhaps no better testament to Augustine's seemingly inexhaustible malleability and appeal than this massive, three-volume undertaking, to which Leyser was one among hundreds of contributors.

First, “the great disaster,” a dark-age cultural void separating the ancient (or late antique?) from the early medieval, is a precondition of Marrou’s conception of a “Carolingian renaissance” as such. Certainly *something* happened between ca. 430 and ca. 800. Or rather, to quote Gregory, bishop of Tours during the late sixth century and a witness to that “disastrous” interval: “A great many things keep happening, some of them good, some of them bad. . . .”<sup>10</sup> Yet, just which “things,” or events, or (historiographically traced) developments, should be taken as representative of this period and its character is not at all self-evident. Rather, as the variety of modern historiographical treatments of early medieval Europe suggests, one historian’s “disaster” is another’s “transformation.”<sup>11</sup> Even if many scholars generally accept that *some* of what occurred between the fifth and ninth centuries was deleterious to *some* spheres of life, the scale and scope of those negative effects remain contentious.

Given the long, deep roots of the “disaster” narrative within modern historiography—defended up to the present by staunch “Romanists” like Bryan Ward-Perkins—a major impediment to studies of Augustine’s early medieval reception is the meta-historical idea that “the West,” for a time, stopped “thinking,” as implied by Marrou. Yet, this alleged intervening dark age, despite its “non-thought,” yielded crucial, if limited, resources through which the Carolingians received the words and ideas of the Church Fathers.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, it would be very hard, if not impossible, to determine what was actually

---

10 Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, Praefatio prima, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH, SRM 1(1) (Hannover, 1951), 1; trans. by Lewis Thorpe, *History of the Franks* (London, 1974), 63.

11 On the wide range of interpretations within the historiography of this period, see Ian Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2013); Clifford Ando: “Narrating Decline and Fall,” in Phillip Rousseau, ed., *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Chichester, 2009), 59–76; idem, “Decline, Fall and Transformation,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1 (2008): 31–60; Guy Halsall, “Movers and Shakers: The Barbarians and the Fall of Rome,” *Early Medieval Europe* 8.1 (1999): 132–45; and Christopher Wickham, *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800* (Oxford, 2005), 10–14. Recent studies on the causes of change during this period include Bryan Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization* (Oxford, 2005), offering a staunch defense of the traditional narrative posited by Gibbon; Walter Pohl, Ian Wood, and Helmut Reimitz, eds., *The Transformation of the Frontiers: From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians* (Leiden, 2000), a significant collection representing the revisionist scholarship of the “transformation,” or “Germanist,” school; Peter J. Heather, *Empires and Barbarians: The Fall of Rome and the Birth of Europe* (Oxford, 2010), 92, which uses the modern notion of “globalization” to explain major changes in the Roman empire and its periphery; idem, *The Restoration of Rome: Barbarian Popes and Imperial Pretenders* (London, 2013), which argues that Roman ideas and forms continued to deeply influence notions of rulership and political culture between the fifth and ninth centuries; and Christopher Wickham, *The Inheritance of Rome: A History of Europe from 400 to 1000* (London, 2009), which tends more toward a “transformation” narrative than the traditional “catastrophe” narrative, while navigating a middle path between the extremes of “Romanist” and “Germanist” interpretations.

12 On this point, see Thomas O’Loughlin, “Individual Anonymity and Collective Identity: The Enigma of Early Medieval Latin Theologians,” *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 64 (1997): 291, who argues that, rather than

distinctive or remarkable about ninth-century uses of Augustine without first acknowledging that Charlemagne and his “renaissance” men inherited much from the centuries that separated them from Augustine.

Following from this first point, Marrou envisioned the Carolingians “elaborat[ing] afresh a culture of Christian inspiration.” Did they? Or were the ninth century’s brightest lights mere emulators, competent craftsmen at best? In Jacques Le Goff’s *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, Carolingian achievements are situated as a false start to the real cultural rebirth of the High Middle Ages. Le Goff writes:

Beyond [the] recruitment of managers for the monarchy and the Church, the intellectual movement of the Carolingian period manifested neither a zeal for propagating new ideas nor disinterest in their use of their newly acquired intellectual tools, or in their general outlook... What was more, [Carolingian manuscripts] were not produced to be read. They were meant to enhance the collections of churches, or of rich individuals. They were an economic, rather than a spiritual possession. Some of the scribes, copying the words of the ancients or of the Fathers of the Church, indeed asserted the superior quality of the works’ spiritual content. But owners only took their word for it. And that only added to their material worth. Charlemagne sold a few of his beautiful manuscripts to distribute alms. Books were considered only as precious decorative objects. The monks who copied them laboriously in the *scriptoria* of the monasteries were only marginally interested in their content—for them what was essential was the effort spent, the time consumed, and the fatigue endured in writing them.<sup>13</sup>

In contrast to Marrou’s more optimistic take on the Carolingians, Le Goff sees a culture that copied a great many manuscripts, but read few of them—hardly a reawakening of Western thought. Recent scholarship has sought to demonstrate that this type of pessimistic view sells the Carolingians far short.<sup>14</sup> For instance, an edited volume appeared in 2000 under the pointed title *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*; as the contributors to the book demonstrated, the Carolingians, among other

---

simply being stuck in a “holding action” between the age of the Fathers and the later Latin revival, the writers of this “dark,” intervening period were active agents in the creation of a “European, in contrast to Classical, theology”; “tradition,” in this light, is shown to be an active process (294). On the legacy of the earlier part of the eighth century, see Alain Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710–784)* (Geneva, 1993), esp. 434–67.

13 Jacques Le Goff, *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, trans. Teresa Lavendar Fagan (Cambridge, Mass., 1993), 7–8.

14 See, e.g., Patrick Wormald and Janet L. Nelson, eds., *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2007); John J. Contreni, “Carolingian Biblical Culture,” in Gerd van Riel, et al., eds., *Iohannes Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics* (Louvain, 1996), 1–24; Richard E. Sullivan, “The Context of Cultural Activity in the Carolingian Age,” in idem, ed., *The Gentle Voices of Teachers*, 51–105; Giles Brown, “Introduction,” in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1993), 1–51.

early medieval cultures, used the intellectual materials of the past pragmatically, creatively, and subtly.<sup>15</sup> Published more than a decade before *The Uses of the Past*, Rosamond McKitterick's *The Carolingians and the Written Word* argued that literacy—including the ability to read the texts contained in the “beautiful manuscripts” described by Le Goff—was considerably more widespread in the ninth century than had long been assumed. Furthermore, the fruits of learning were not, according to McKitterick, possessed exclusively by a small, privileged clerical elite.<sup>16</sup> Rather, a significant swath of the Carolingian laity may have attained at least very basic skills in reading and writing. While some of these readers may not have possessed the abilities required to read dense, complex Latin works like Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, the extraordinary proliferation of Augustine's diverse writings in ninth-century manuscripts nevertheless strongly suggests a high degree of *readerly* interest.<sup>17</sup>

The third point in Marrou's statement that warrants further consideration here is his contention that in the Carolingian renaissance Augustine “quite naturally becomes once more [the West's] counsellor and inspirer: more than ever he is the Master without rival . . . placed so high that he ranks immediately after the Apostles.” Marrou's vision of Augustine's towering presence at Aachen speaks to the broad sense of Augustinian exceptionalism that characterizes so much of the mid-twentieth-century historiography of Carolingian politics, theology, and culture.<sup>18</sup>

---

15 Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, eds., *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000). In the introduction to this timely volume, Innes writes, “Neither the volume as a whole, nor this introduction, should be read as a manifesto for any school or methodology. The coherence of these essays comes from the common concerns of scholars from diverse historiographical traditions writing from a multiplicity of perspectives and dealing with different kinds of source material. These common concerns are the result of a series of stimuli which have affected all the contributors, and—hardly surprisingly, as all are professional historians who specialized in the study of the early Middle Ages—elicited our responses (pp. 1–2).” Above all, what the articles in this collection make sure to emphasize is the active role that early medieval, and especially Carolingian, actors played in reshaping and re-purposing the sources and ideas of the past. See now Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder, eds., *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2015).

16 Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989). See also Charles F. Briggs, “Literacy, Reading, and Writing in the Medieval West,” *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000): 397–420.

17 On the transmission of Augustine's writings in the early Middle Ages, see the articles collected in Michael M. Gorman, *The Manuscript Traditions of the Works of St. Augustine* (Florence, 2001). See also Alain Stoclet, “Le *De civitate Dei* de saint Augustin: Sa diffusion avant 900 d'après les caractères externes des manuscrits antérieurs à cette date et les catalogues contemporains,” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 19 (1984): 185–209; and Jocelyn N. Hillgarth, “L'influence de la *Cité de Dieu* de saint Augustin au Haut Moyen Age,” *Sacris Erudiri* 28 (1985): 5–34.

18 An early, but largely overlooked, exception to this trend, is Thomas K. Sidey, “The Government of Charlemagne as Influenced by Augustine's *City of God*,” *Classical Journal* 14.2 (1918): 119–27.

Much of this historiography has been informed, either directly or indirectly, by Henri-Xavier Arquillière's *L'Augustinisme politique*.<sup>19</sup> In the decades since its initial publication in 1934, Arquillière's work has exerted a tremendous influence upon historiographical treatments of, at once, Augustine's early medieval reception and Carolingian political thought. The central contention of Arquillière's thesis is that, in the ninth century, Carolingian admirers of Augustine's *De civitate Dei* read Augustine's doctrine of the Two Cities as, essentially, a justification for the inextricable merging of political and ecclesiastical spheres. Thus, while Augustine had in fact argued against the strict association of the Roman Empire with the eternal, fundamentally mysterious City of God, Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and the influential ecclesiastics of the Carolingian renaissance had—according to Arquillière—interpreted Augustine's text as a call to action, to establish the City of God on earth through the expansion and eventual perfection of Christian *imperium*. Arquillière acknowledged in his “preliminary observations” that the “doctrinal material [of *L'Augustinisme politique*] was not made precisely out of the great doctor's thought, but certain passages of his works, especially *De civitate Dei*, gave it strength and consistency, while the general movement of Augustinian thought added to its power of propagation.”<sup>20</sup> And, again in his conclusion, Arquillière reminds his reader of the problematic quality of his titular term, writing, “[I]t is incorrect to attribute an ignorance of the State's natural law to Saint Augustine himself. He clearly acknowledged a legitimate authority that was in keeping with the providential design in all the old monarchies that had preceded Christianity.”<sup>21</sup> The “tendency to absorb the natural order into the supernatural,”<sup>22</sup> through the merging of “Church” and “State” or the perceived subordination of the latter to the former, was the result of early medieval readers (at least partially) misunderstanding and misapplying *De civitate Dei* and other

---

19 Although Marrou's description of Augustine's influence in the early Middle Ages strongly evokes *L'Augustinisme politique*, he does not explicitly cite Arquillière either in the main body of his study, nor under the abbreviated bibliographic sub-heading of “Influence.”

20 Henri-Xavier Arquillière, *L'Augustinisme politique*, second ed. (Paris, 1955); trans. Catherine Bright, 27.

21 Arquillière, *L'Augustinisme politique*; trans. Bright, 154.

22 Arquillière, *L'Augustinisme politique*, 29, identifies this tendency as the core feature of *L'Augustinisme politique*.

texts associated with Augustine. Thus, contrary to the presumptions that some modern scholars may, rather understandably, form from the title of Arquillière's work, he is not claiming that Augustine's actual, "correctly" interpreted ideas of Church and State informed early medieval conceptions of the interaction of these spheres. The trajectory of reception that Arquillière traces is far more muddled and ambiguous than that.

Arquillière's formulation of an (imperfectly) Augustinian Carolingian politics came to serve as a convenient, meta-historical shorthand for Augustine's ninth-century reception, and is still today acclaimed as a "classic" by some admirers.<sup>23</sup> Yet, for some present-day Carolingian specialists, *L'Augustinisme politique* is "an unfortunate historiographical concept."<sup>24</sup> Mayke de Jong, for example, has shown that, where Arquillière thought he saw the inseparable, amorphous merging of "Church" and "State," there was, conversely, a discrete and important separation of *ordines*, both between and among branches of the clergy and laity.<sup>25</sup> Meanwhile, Courtney Booker, Dominique Alibert, and Geoffrey Koziol have suggested that, rather than Augustine's influence being all-pervasive and ever foremost among patristic authorities in the Carolingian era, other figures, such as Ambrose of Milan and Gregory the Great, may have been as, or even more, influential in shaping ninth-century discourses.<sup>26</sup> While Arquillière's formulation, correctly understood, does not claim that the ideas so central to early medieval politics were purely or authentically Augustinian, it does depend heavily on the idea that

---

23 Leyser, "Augustine in the Latin West," 455, admiringly describes Arquillière's book as "the pioneering study of early medieval Augustinianism." Geoffrey Koziol, review of Michael E. Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington D.C., 2011), in *Church History* 82.3 (2013): 695–98, calls *L'Augustinisme politique* a "classic."

24 John J. Contreni, "Carolingian Era, Early," in Allan D. Fitzgerald, ed., *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999), 128.

25 Mayke de Jong, "The State of the Church: *Ecclesia* and Early Medieval State Formation," in Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser, eds., *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat - europäische Perspektiven* (Vienna, 2009), 241–54. See also Florence Close, "Staat und Kirche im Reich Karls des Großen," in Frank Pohle, ed., *Karl der Große - Charlemagne: Orte der Macht* (Aachen, 2014), 328–37, which considers Arquillière's influence on historiographical assessments of Church and State in the Carolingian era.

26 Courtney M. Booker, "The Penance of Louis the Pious (833) and Episcopal *ministerium*: Political Augustinism or the Influence of Ambrose?" delivered as part of the panel "Carolingian Pragmatic Responses to Authoritative Texts," at the Medieval Academy of America 79th annual meeting, Seattle, Washington, 3 April 2004; Alibert, "La transmission des textes patristiques," 19–21; and Geoffrey Koziol, "Leadership: Why We Have Mirrors for Princes but None for Presidents," in Celia Chazelle, Simon Doubleday, Felice Lifshitz, and Amy G. Remensnyder, eds., *Why the Middle Ages Matter: Medieval Light on Modern Injustice* (New York, 2012), 183–98.

there was something distinctively, if perversely, Augustinian driving political discourses and influencing key events in the ninth century. In light of both Arquillière's work and that of his critics, the challenge for studying the reception and use of Augustine in the Carolingian era is to finally move beyond the powerful metanarrative of *L'Augustinisme politique* and its picture of a derivative, intellectually inept early medieval culture, while nevertheless making use of the important insights bequeathed to later scholars by Arquillière's "classic."<sup>27</sup>

More broadly than the particular thesis of "*L'Augustinisme politique*," the notion of the Church Fathers as deeply authoritative "Founders of the Middle Ages" (exemplified by E.K. Rand's famous survey of that title) and of Augustine as, unquestionably, foremost among them (in the Latin West) certainly presents a formidable challenge to more measured reassessments of patristic influences in the Carolingian era. Nevertheless, some early medievalists have focused considerable attention toward such reassessments. A number of the most path-breaking contributions to this topic have been published in the years since *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*. Bernice Kaczynski, for instance, has illustrated particular, illuminating patterns in the use of Augustine as an authority in relation to the names and texts of other Church Fathers. In her examination of manuscripts from Carolingian Saint-Gall, Kaczynski shows that different patristic texts, and indeed different Fathers, were regularly consulted at different stages of the Carolingian renaissance. The early period of the reform program was marked by its overriding aims of orthodoxy and uniformity in biblical interpretation, while the later phase of the *renovatio* was characterized by an increasing interest in more specialized theological topics. By her own admission, Kaczynski's brief study is preliminary in nature, and thus not comprehensive.<sup>28</sup> Yet, within the short space of her article, she outlines the manner in

---

27 Cf. Alain Boureau, *La religion de l'état: La construction de la République étatique dans le discours théologique de l'Occident médiéval (1250–1350)* (Paris, 2008), 118: "Ces considérations sur l'oeuvre de Henri-Xavier Arquillière ne me conduisent pas à abandonner la piste religieuse pour saisir la naissance du politique en Occident; bien au contraire, elles imposent de trouver un modèle alternatif, fondé sur l'exil intérieur et le cantonnement volontaire de la religion, au cours de la période scolastique."

28 See Kaczynski, "The Authority of the Fathers," 1 n. 1. Also, in personal email correspondence, dated 31 December 2012, Kaczynski noted that she intended her article to be "a stimulus to further research, a provocation."



which patristic authority was significantly delimited by Carolingian readers of Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, Gregory the Great, and other potential *doctores*. “The scholars of the early Middle Ages . . . did not inherit a patristic tradition canon,” writes Kaczynski. “They helped to shape it.”<sup>29</sup>

Michael E. Moore would no doubt concur with Kaczynski on this point. However, in Moore’s work, the key architects of patristic authority are less the anonymous monastic scribes toiling away in the scriptoria of Carolingian Francia than the politically formidable members of the Frankish episcopate. Carolingian bishops, argues Moore, placed great emphasis upon the “ancient,” and thus unimpeachably orthodox, quality of the patristic writers from whose texts they drew frequently as sources for synodal *acta* and an evolving canon law.<sup>30</sup> In Moore’s estimation, there remains room for the view of Carolingian culture as nominally “traditional,” insofar as the appearance of particular authors, texts, or practices being part of ancient, traditional Christianity lent them moral, spiritual, and political authority in the present. However, Moore, like Kaczynski, is critical of the historiographical perception of the Carolingians as mere emulators of an inherited patristic tradition. The durability of this perception of Carolingian culture speaks to the success of the Carolingians themselves in affecting the appearance of faithful, compliant, and above all, orthodox receptacles.

What Moore and Kaczynski, along with other historians noted above, demonstrate is the variety of patristic writers who were read and employed by the Carolingians. Thus, Augustine’s purportedly exceptional ninth-century influence may be better illuminated by examining what his early medieval presence and authority looked like vis-à-vis other Church Fathers. Scholars at present possess a better understanding of the early development of Augustine’s nominal authority, which had already begun to take shape in his own lifetime.<sup>31</sup> But, progressing beyond the fifth century, it is still not certain whether

---

29 Kaczynski, “The Authority of the Fathers,” 3.

30 Moore, “Ancient Fathers,” 293–342; idem, “Carolingian Bishops and Christian Antiquity: Distance from the Past, Canon-Formation, and Imperial Power,” in Alasdair MacDonald, et al., eds., *Learned Antiquity: Scholarship and Society in the Near-East, the Greco-Roman World, and the Early Medieval West* (Louvain, 2003), 175–84.

31 Regarding the nature and construction of Augustine’s authority, see James J. O’Donnell, “The Authority of Augustine,” *Augustinian Studies* 22 (1991): 227–55; Mark Vessey, “Opus Imperfectum: Augustine and His Readers, 426–435 A.D.,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 52.3 (1998): 264–85, reprinted in idem, *Latin Christian Writers in Late Antiquity and Their Texts*, VIII; Ralph W. Mathisen, “For Specialists Only: The Reception of Augustine and His Teachings in Fifth-Century Gaul,”

Augustine was indeed the “Master without rival,” as Marrou claimed, or if the type and degree of authority ascribed to his name were contingent upon (changing) early medieval exigencies. Did Augustine in fact—at particular moments, in certain textual settings—have legitimate patristic “rivals?” Marrou himself notes that, “from [the point of Augustine’s death] we come across no personality, after him, of the first rank, with the sole exception of Gregory the Great.”<sup>32</sup> Did Gregory’s influence at certain points eclipse that of Augustine? And if so, should scholars take this simply as *further evidence* of Augustine’s vast, expansive influence? Questions of this sort bring us inexorably to our fourth point of concern, as provoked by Marrou’s quotation.

The idea that “[a]ll, or nearly all, flows from [Augustine],” true or not, is of critical significance in approaching the complex problem of Augustine’s early medieval reception. Gregory, for example, is one among numerous later authorities who can—and to some extent, *must*—be understood as “Augustinian,” insofar as Augustine’s views informed their own thought and work to a great extent. Marrou cites Caesarius of Arles and Isidore of Seville as other such examples, but with regard to Gregory, he notes, “The work of Gregory the Great, whom the Middle Ages looked on as a master of mystical theology, is profoundly original, but a first reading of it will give this same impression of Augustinianism, elementary and popularized.”<sup>33</sup> Gregory’s work is original, but it *appears* derivative of Augustine: would Carolingian readers of Augustine and Gregory arrive at this same, rather subtle conclusion—of using ostensible Augustinianism as a trojan horse for originality in a deeply conservative culture? We will return to this important point below.

For now, it is enough to ask whether the reception of Gregory as a patristic author can, or should, be understood apart from that of Augustine; or whether “Gregorianism” is best treated as a sub-field of Augustinianism, as part of the all-encompassing “flow” of Augustine’s influence. In a recent

---

in Joseph T. Lienhard, ed., *Presbyter Factus Sum* (New York, 1993), 29–41; Karla Pollmann, “Christianity and Authority in Late Antiquity: The Transformation of the Concept of *Auctoritas*,” in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell, eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford, 2014), 156–75.

32 Marrou, *Saint Augustine and His Influence*, 154.

33 Marrou, *Saint Augustine and His Influence*, 154.

study of Augustine in the early medieval Latin West, Conrad Leyser draws a distinction between “maximalist” and “minimalist” assessments of Augustine’s early medieval presence, and evokes precisely this conundrum. Leyser associates the “maximalist” position with scholars who examine, in more or less empirical terms, the impressive diffusion of Augustine’s work in medieval manuscripts. “Minimalists,” meanwhile, focus less on the scope, or reach, of Augustine’s influence than on the quality, or nature, of that influence. They point to the failure of certain key Augustinian ideas to fully take hold or gain wide acceptance in the centuries immediately following his death.<sup>34</sup> According to this view, by the time we arrive at the Carolingian era, “Augustine” is a moderate, hollowed-out, catch-all authority.

In yet another recent study on Augustine’s early medieval reception, Willemien Otten frames the essential problem in terms similar to those described by Leyser (and Marrou): “The reception of Aug[ustine] in the early Middle Ages, perhaps more than in any other era treated in this project, forms an integral part of its wider intellectual culture. As a result, it proves surprisingly hard to point out Aug[ustine]’s influence without somehow subsuming the whole of early medieval culture under this one rubric.”<sup>35</sup> The notion of the early Middle Ages as wholly informed by its reception of Augustine—or some simplified mutation of Augustinian thought—is, again, the crux of the problem: whether Augustine’s all-encompassing influence is conceptualized in broad terms or more particularly as “*L’Augustinisme politique*.” Otten cautions that “[this] observation, however true, risks having a counterproductive effect on any attempt to evaluate Aug[ustine]’s actual reception in the early Middle Ages.”<sup>36</sup> Such a note of caution directly echoes Marrou’s conclusion that, “[t]he fact [of Augustine’s sprawling early medieval influence] is so evident that the historian must be chiefly concerned with making this statement precise by limiting it.” The need to ascertain some sort of limit to the scope of Augustine’s impact in the early Middle Ages is imperative to scholars. Traditionally grim estimations

---

34 Leyser, “Augustine in the Latin West,” 454.

35 Otten, “The Reception of Augustine,” 23.

36 Otten, “The Reception of Augustine,” 23.

of early medieval culture—in line with Le Goff’s dismissive remarks, quoted above—are ultimately inseparable from their assumption that Augustine reigned ever supreme and, for all intents and purposes, almost exclusively in early medieval thought.

Following this logic, Otten sketches such traditional conceptions of the early Middle Ages as an “intellectual wasteland” and a “theological no-man’s land,” before proposing an intriguing alternate context: the early medieval era as “the bearer of normative Christian identity.” Within this context, she emphasizes three particular aspects of early medieval Christianity that seem to have been shaped by “the explicit influence of Aug[ustine]”: the “divine Trinity, cosmic nature, and the converted self.”<sup>37</sup> Otten’s reference to Augustine’s *explicit* influence evokes the key distinction between implicit and explicit methods, *elocutio* and *inuentio*, respectively—that is, of reappropriating another writer’s words or thoughts within a new textual context. Mark Vessey has argued for the tremendous importance of *inuentio*, particularly “[t]he practice of explicit argument *ex auctoritate ueterum scriptorum catholicorum uirorum*,” to the construction and consolidation of Christian orthodoxy and the notion of “patristic” authority as such.<sup>38</sup> Although *inuentio* may have prevailed over *elocutio* in the history of orthodox Christian rhetoric, both explicit and implicit uses of other “authors” work remained in play as potential strategies of authorization for early medieval writers and editors.<sup>39</sup> Ann Freeman has

---

37 Otten, “The Reception of Augustine,” 23–25.

38 Mark Vessey, “The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4 (1996), 495–513; reprinted in idem, *Latin Christian Writers in Late Antiquity and Their Texts*, VIII (Aldershot, 2005). See also Thomas Graumann, “The Conduct of Theology and the ‘Fathers’ of the Church,” in Phillip Rousseau, ed., *A Companion to Late Antiquity* (Chichester, 2009), 539–55, who notes that, “[w]ith the growing reverence for the Nicene Council, the habit of calling and honoring its participants Fathers also emerged (546),” although, “while appealing to *tradition in general* was considered acceptable, even praiseworthy, resorting to *individual writers or texts* could seem rather more problematic and created its own difficulties (549; italics mine).” It would take more than a century and a half, with the further development of theology as a “specialized discipline with its own accepted methods and standards,” for the practice of quoting from, and commenting upon, earlier individual “Fathers” to become more widely accepted and commonplace (554). On the development of a patristic canon, whereby the works of the Fathers came to be regarded as uniquely “inspired,” see François Dolbeau, “La formation du Canon des Pères, du IV<sup>e</sup> au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle,” in Rainer Berndt and Michel Fédou, eds., *Les réceptions des Pères de l’Église au Moyen Âge: Le devenir de la tradition ecclésiastique* (Münster, 2013), 17–39. Dolbeau observes that, “Pour un homme du Moyen Âge, les *Moralia in Iob* sont un texte inspiré, au même titre que le livre biblique de Job, ce qu’illustre l’iconographie fameuse de Grégoire le Grand, surpris par un secrétaire en train de converser avec un colombe (p. 17).”

39 See now Sumi Shimahara, “Citations explicites ou recours implicites? Les usages de l’autorité des Pères dans l’exégèse carolingienne,” in Rainer Berndt and Michel Fédou, eds., *Les réceptions des Pères de l’Église au Moyen Âge: Le devenir de la tradition ecclésiastique* (Münster, 2013), 369–88, who argues that as the Carolingian era progressed, exegetes tended to use patristic sources more loosely and liberally, while at the same time relying increasingly on implicit methods of

demonstrated this important point with regard to the *Opus Caroli* (or *Libri Carolini*, a lengthy polemic composed ca. 790, in response to the Second Council of Nicaea), wherein patristic sources that were treated as *testimonia* were introduced with the name of their author, while other, less purportedly authoritative sources were used without any direct citation.<sup>40</sup> While the *Opus Caroli* is an exceptional, unusual work in many respects, the textual strategies that Freeman identifies are not unique to it.

### Authors and Texts

To be sure, Augustine was a source of tremendous influence in the age of the Carolingian reforms. Yet, rather than presuming that Augustine's *nominal* impact was all-pervasive in ninth-century political and ecclesiastical discourses, in what follows I will aim to show both the great utility and the discursive limits of Augustine's name, and the authority tied to it, during this period.<sup>41</sup> Both the nature and contours of his ninth-century presence have too often been misleadingly generalized, or else largely misunderstood. Alongside Augustine, the towering bishop of Hippo, stood Ambrose, Jerome, Leo the Great, Julianus Pomerius (often misidentified as Prosper of Aquitaine<sup>42</sup>), Caesarius of Arles,

---

reference rather than explicit citation of the Fathers.

40 Ann Freeman, with Paul Meyvaert, "Opus Caroli regis contra synodum: An Introduction," in eadem, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea* (Aldershot, 2003), 74–76, write, "Testimonia are drawn only from writers considered such lofty authorities that their sayings will evoke unqualified assent. These citations are the only ones introduced by an explicit mention of the author's name, which thus serves to set them apart from the context. The authorities among the Fathers are Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome and Gregory the Great. . . (pp. 74–75)." By contrast, "[a]uthors of lesser authority—Cassiodorus, Isidore, Bede and others—may be extensively used but are never named, and their works, like those of the major Fathers not being used as testimonia, are freely adapted to serve the author's own argument (p. 76)." Thus, "authors" are treated differently within the space of the text, in part due to the perceived authority of the patristic source in question and in part due to the specific function of the source in Theodulf's new work.

41 Cf. Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?" in Josué Harrari, ed., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1979), 141–60. According to Foucault's formulation of the "author-function," the proper name of a particular writer comes to represent that writer's "works" and the ideas contained therein. As Foucault argues, the idea of the "author" operates always in a close, complex relationship with the idea of the "work." In exceptional cases, a certain writer or group of writers are perceived as having "authored" an entire field of discourse. Foucault himself cites the Church Fathers as just such an exceptional assemblage of authorial figures (pp. 153–54). On postmodern theories of authorship, and how these notions might relate to the study of medieval texts, see now Atle Kittang, "Authors, Authorship, and Work: A Brief Theoretical Survey," in Slavica Ranković, et al., eds., *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages* (Toronto, 2012), 17–29.

42 On the Carolingian reception of Pomerius, and the frequent misattribution of his *De vita contemplativa* to Prosper, see Josh Timmermann, "Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue: Julianus Pomerius's Carolingian Audience," *Comitatus* 45 (2014): 1–44.

Isidore of Seville, Bede, and perhaps above all, Gregory the Great—all major (posthumous) players in the texts produced by later ecclesiastical reformers.<sup>43</sup> All these names, excepting possibly Jerome, indirectly evoked Augustine in one sense or another; and all save Ambrose and Jerome could reasonably be interpreted as “Augustinian,” especially insofar as “Augustinianism” (in contrast to *L’Augustinisme politique*) might well have been contemporaneously understood as, in essence, Latin Christian orthodoxy.<sup>44</sup>

This type of broad, indirect Augustinianism is vividly apparent in the texts resulting from the Carolingian Church councils of the ninth century.<sup>45</sup> These texts vary immensely in form, content, and length. Typically the *acta* of Frankish Church councils were ordered according to the “*placuit*-form,” a documentary format which may have derived from the *Libri sententiarum* of the Roman senate.<sup>46</sup>

Documents produced according to the *placuit*-form normally begin with a *praefatio* summarizing the council’s agenda, followed by the *canones*, or legal decisions, of the synod.<sup>47</sup> Church councils were

---

43 Matthias Tischler, “Le rythme des Pères: Le Moyen Âge des religieux vu par la tradition des écrits patristiques,” in Rainer Berndt and Michel Fédou, eds., *Les réceptions des Pères de l’Église au Moyen Âge: Le devenir de la tradition ecclésiastique* (Münster, 2013), 47–90, argues that early medieval conceptualizations of the Fathers were often shaped by more than just their status as “auteurs et écrivains,” but were products, too, of iconographic and biographical representations. These representations, while not directly authorial in nature, can nevertheless be understood as acting, at once, *on* and *within* a given Father’s “author-function” (see n. 41 above).

44 Marrou, *Saint Augustine and His Influence*, 83, famously remarked that “Augustinianism is first and essentially Christianity, and the whole of it.”

45 Critical editions of the Carolingian conciliar texts are published in *Concilia aevi Karolini, Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter MGH), *Leges, Sectio III, Tomus II*, ed. Albert Werminghoff (Hannover, 1906). The foundational modern works on the Frankish Church councils are Hans Barion, *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters* (Bonn, 1931) and Charles de Clercq, *La législation religieuse franque de Clovis à Charlemagne (507–814)* (Louvain, 1936). Notable subsequent contributions to the historiography of the councils include Walter Ullmann, “Public Welfare and Social Legislation in the Early Medieval Councils,” in G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker, eds., *Councils and Assemblies, Studies in Church History* 7 (Cambridge, 1971), 1–39; Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977); Hans Hubert Anton, “Zum politischen Konzept karolingischer Synoden und zur karolingischen Brüdergemeinschaft,” *Historische Jahrbuch* 99 (1979): 55–132; Odette Pontal, *Histoire des conciles mérovingiens* (Paris, 1989); Wilfried Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien* (Paderborn, 1989); Carine van Rhijn, “Texts: Conciliar Decrees, Capitularies, and Episcopal Statutes,” in eadem, *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period* (Turnhout, 2007), 13–33; Steffen Patzold, *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008); Gregory I. Halfond, *The Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils, AD 511–768* (Leiden, 2010); Michael E. Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington D.C., 2011); and Ralph W. Mathisen, “Church Councils and Local Authority: The Development of Gallic *Libri canonum* during Late Antiquity,” in Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell, eds., *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark* (Oxford, 2014), 175–93.

46 Hamilton Hess, *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica* (Oxford, 2002), 69–72.

47 Halfond, *The Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils*, 9.

usually called by the emperor himself, and were attended by both the ecclesiastical and lay elite of the empire. The agenda of a given council speaks to the most pressing concerns of the Church and the imperial government, as well as to the collective, aspirational ideals underlying these social spheres. Often, the same problems are addressed repeatedly in the texts produced by successive councils, thus suggesting the effective limits, or shortcomings, of the Carolingian reform efforts. My primary concern, however, is not the extent to which the legislation enacted at Church councils was successfully implemented and enforced. Rather, I shall instead focus on the uses of Augustine and Gregory within the reform-oriented discursive sphere of the conciliar *acta*. Of particular interest here are the ways in which these writers' names, words, and ideas were confidently employed as sources of authority in Carolingian texts. Through this lens, we can discern not only the particular value ascribed to certain patristic writers within the discursive sphere of the ninth-century councils, but also, rather more expansively, the relationship between authorship and authority in this period.

Thus, in addition to the conciliar documents themselves, I shall also examine other, roughly contemporaneous texts—most notably, Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel's *Diadema monachorum* ("Crown of Monks"). This guidebook for the regular clergy is formally, as well as temporally, congruous with the conciliar *acta* treated here, in that both tend to closely resemble the genre of *florilegia*. That is, the *Diadema monachorum* and (quite often) the conciliar texts consist of quotations compiled from the Bible and the Church Fathers. The selective process of composing *florilegia*, sometimes using other *florilegia*-like sources as models for the reduction and rearrangement of major authors and their works, was in itself an important form of authorship in the early Middle Ages.<sup>48</sup> The Carolingian conciliar texts, and contemporary sources like the *Diadema monachorum*, aptly serve to demonstrate this point.

---

48 On the generic development of the Latin *florilegia*, see Henri M. Rochais, "Florilèges spirituels latins," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire* (Paris, 1964), 5:435–60; and A.G. Rigg, "Anthologies and Florilegia," in F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg, eds., *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide* (Washington, D.C., 1996), 708–12. On the uses of Augustine in *florilegia*, see Anthony N.S. Lane, "Anthologies," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, 536–40; and Joseph T. Lienhard, "The Earliest Florilegia of Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* 8 (1977): 21–31. On the Carolingian composition of *florilegia*, see François Dolbeau, "Sur un florilège carolingien de Septimanie, composé par Benoît d'Aniane," *Revue Bénédictine* 118 (2008): 46–68.

In examining such texts, we can readily discern how often particular Church Fathers are employed, and to what uses their names and/or words are being put, within the context of the text itself and on the occasion of its composition. What we may also be able to detect is the relative proximity of the “author” quoted in the conciliar text to the original “work” from which the selected quotations has, nominally, been extracted. The interventions of other, less authoritative intermediaries, such as the authors of patristic *florilegia*, may be subtle—and nearly invisible when appropriated within Carolingian texts—but they are rarely completely seamless. Thus, we will look closely at the patristic texts *seemingly* employed at ninth-century councils, as well as the convenient, pared-down collections that were often used as substitutes for the “original” works. The implications of this distinction are not insignificant: while Carolingian ecclesiastics continually shaped, and re-shaped, the discursive meaning attached to patristic authors, they also inherited, and readily employed, representations of patristic thought that were already, to an extent, chiseled down and reduced by the previous compilers of patristic *florilegia*.

Finally, I shall also assess the “name-value(s)” of patristic writers by focusing on both the frequency of a name’s appearance within a given text, and the particular use, or uses, to which the name (and its field of associated meanings) is put in that text. In certain cases, Augustine himself appears only for crucial, fleeting cameos amid the purposefully ordered, purportedly “traditional” patristic *mise en scène* of the conciliar *acta*, much of it ostensibly, if imperfectly, “Augustinian” in his (relative) absence.<sup>49</sup>

---

49 Cf. Moore, “Carolingian Bishops and Christian Antiquity,” 184: “The Carolingian vision of the Christian past was a distinctive *mise en scène* in which episcopal and royal aspirations were staged. New awareness of the patristic past involved more than simple devotion to an inheritance. Royal power was mobilised on behalf of this cultural project, because of the implications for imperial and religious unity, and so was the power of bishops, with their special task of reforming the church and kingdom. There is an element of mystery bound up in the process of tradition. While a tradition may establish a union of wills across distances of time and circumstance, it nevertheless transforms what it preserves. Adherence to the past never truly maintains the past. A truer understanding of tradition must therefore take account of the discontinuity of time in respect to written traditions. Carolingian bishops had discovered an archaized patristic tradition, and the distance from it we still feel.” For a much longer view of Augustine’s use in conciliar texts, see Hermann J. Sieben, “Augustinus-Rezeption in Konzilien von seinen Lebzeiten bis zum Zweiten Vatikanum,” *Theologie und Philosophie* 84 (2009): 161–98.



## *BEATI PATRES*

\*

Upon the death of Charlemagne in 814, the emperor's sole surviving son, Louis, inherited his vast empire, which now expanded well beyond the traditional Frankish heartlands of Neustria, Austrasia, and Burgundy to include most of present-day continental Western Europe. One year earlier, Louis, formerly king of the relatively peripheral kingdom of Aquitaine, had been crowned "co-emperor" by his aging father. With the passing of the "great" Charles, Louis was (quite incidentally, following the deaths of his older brothers) the sole sovereign presiding over this new, distinctively Frankish *imperium Romanum*. As a Roman "Caesar," Louis's most pressing domestic priority—depicted accurately by his biographer-in-exile Ermoldus—was to ensure that Christianity was practiced and ordered according to its orthodox (Roman) form, as interpreted by Louis and his advisers, across the diverse territories over which he ruled.<sup>50</sup>

Consequently, one of the principal aims of the Carolingian reforms was the standardization of the religious *ordines*. Where the various religious orders of Frankish society had in the past tended to blur together amorphously, Louis, with crucial assistance from his monastic adviser, Benedict of Aniane, sought to precisely order the lives and social functions associated with the "secular" clergy (generally, bishops, and priests), in contrast to those clerics living under a "rule" (*regula*), whether monks, nuns, canons, or canonesses.<sup>51</sup> The Rule of Benedict of Nursia (Benedict of Aniane's adopted

---

50 On Carolingian conceptions of the Roman empire, and their sense of connection to it, see Rosamond McKitterick, "The Franks and Rome," in eadem, *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2006), 35–62; Heather, *The Restoration of Rome*, 229–95; and Wickham, *The Inheritance of Rome*, 375–426.

51 On Benedict of Aniane, see Josef Semmler, "Benedictus II: *Una regula - una consuetudo*," in Willem Lourdaux and Daniel Verhelst, eds., *Benedictine Culture, 750–1050* (Louvain, 1983), 1–49; Felice Lifshitz, *The Name of the Saint: The Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627–827* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2006), 2–6, 11–12; Pierre Riché, *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe*, trans. Michael I. Allen (Philadelphia, 1993), 145–49. See also James Williams, "The Adoptive Son of God, the Pregnant Virgin, and the Fortification of the True Faith: Heterodoxy, the Cult of the Virgin Mary, and Benedict of Aniane in the Carolingian Age" (Ph.D. diss., Purdue University, 2009), esp. 196–205.

namesake) was to be the uniform standard for all the empire's monasteries, while the *Regula canonicorum*, written by Chrodegang of Metz, should be followed by non-monastic canons. For bishops, compelled to practice their ministry in the wider world (*saeculum*), another "rule" was typically prescribed: the *Regula pastoralis*, composed by Pope Gregory the Great. In the reform legislation, these primary sources for ecclesiastical conduct were supplemented by secondary, patristic (in a broad sense) sources that were understood as congruous with the rules of Benedict, Chrodegang, and Gregory.

At the same time, the *Regula Benedicti*, *Regula pastoralis*, and *Regula canonicorum*—composed in the early- to mid-sixth century, the late sixth century, and the mid-eighth century, respectively—were themselves deeply synthetic in form. These texts were composed of words and ideas extracted from other, earlier texts, ranging from the Bible to the Fathers. Both Gregory and Chrodegang, for instance, can justifiably be read as orthodox, "Augustinian" teachers, yet Augustine is never cited by name in either the *Regula pastoralis* or the *Regula canonicorum*. The only source that Gregory explicitly identifies in his guidebook for pastoral care is Gregory of Nazianzus (330–390), after whom the sixth-century pope was named.<sup>52</sup> For his part, Chrodegang draws extensively from a variety of patristic sources, but he explicitly (and mistakenly) identifies only Prosper of Aquitaine, while quoting from Julianus Pomerius's *De vita contemplativa* (written at the end of the fifth century or in the first few years of the sixth).<sup>53</sup> These are the kind of complex textual legacies that ninth-century reformers would inherit and proceed to subtly re-shape. The Carolingian *renovatio*, overseen by Louis the Pious and negotiated by the empire's ecclesiastical elite, was nothing if not fundamentally intertextual in nature.

---

<sup>52</sup> Henry Davis, *St. Gregory the Great, Pastoral Care*, Ancient Christian Writers (Westminster, Md., 1950), 12–13.

<sup>53</sup> Martin A. Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula canonicorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004), 184.

## The Presence of the Fathers at the Reform Councils

As much as Louis's early reign is often characterized by modern historians as a pointed break with the (allegedly) less-than-fully-Christian tendencies in his father's governance, the overriding aims of the reform program ca. 816–17 are largely points of continuation with the reforms begun in earnest at the five synods called (though not attended) by Charlemagne in 813.<sup>54</sup> These earlier councils held at Arles, Reims, Mainz, Chalons, and Tours were each concerned, to varying extents, with the correct social roles to be performed by the realm's lay leadership and by the ostensibly distinct branches of the clergy.<sup>55</sup>

The Church Fathers are present in some, but not all, of these *acta* of 813. The conciliar texts from Arles and Tours contain no direct references to the Fathers. Rather, these shorter texts feature only biblical quotations and *canones* that echo the *acta* of earlier Gallo-Roman or Frankish Church councils.<sup>56</sup> The Council of Reims text makes reference to the *Regula Benedicti* and, briefly, to Gregory to note that passages from the *Regula pastoralis*, on the admonition of prelates and subjects, were read aloud to attendees.<sup>57</sup> As the Reims text includes only a very short quotation from Gregory, it is difficult, if not impossible, to know in what form the attendees possessed and used the relevant chapters from Gregory's work.<sup>58</sup> At the Council of Mainz, according to that conciliar text, epistles from the New Testament and the Acts of the Apostles were read alongside the works of "several holy fathers" (*diversa sanctorum patrum*).<sup>59</sup> Next, the monks assembled at Mainz read from the *Regula Benedicti*, while the bishops read from the *Regula pastoralis*.<sup>60</sup> The mention of Gregory's name and the reference

54 Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 128–40; Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, 279–85.

55 On the 813 councils, especially those at Tours and Reims, see Abigail Firey, *A Contrite Heart: Prosecution and Redemption in the Carolingian Empire* (Leiden, 2009), 196–220.

56 Council of Arles (813) [*Concilium Arelatense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 248–53; Council of Tours (813) [*Concilium Turonense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 286–93.

57 Council of Reims (813) [*Concilium Remense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 253–58; cc. VIII and X, p. 255, with reference to Benedict and Gregory, respectively.

58 Council of Reims (813), c. X, ed. Werminghoff, p. 255: "Lectae sunt sententiae libri pastoralis beati Gregorii, ut pastores ecclesiae intellegent, quomodo ipsi vivere et qualiter sibi subiectos deberent ammonere, quoniam teste eodem beato Gregorio aliter ammonendi sunt praelati atque aliter subditi." (*Regula pastoralis* III.4).

59 Council of Mainz (813) [*Concilium Moguntinense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, p. 259.

60 Council of Mainz (813), ed. Werminghoff, p. 259.

to the *Regula pastoralis* in this instance, and in the Council of Reims text, is doing little work, aside from summarizing for future readers (including Charlemagne) the order of the proceedings carried out at the synods. However, the remainder of the Mainz text, which is somewhat longer than the texts from Arles, Tours, and Reims, does contain more substantial citations of patristic writers, as does, to a lesser extent, the Council of Chalons text. The former cites Gregory's *Homiliae in Evangelium*, in addition to the *Regula pastoralis*, Jerome's commentaries on Matthew and Galatians, Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* and *De officiis ecclesiasticis*, a decretal of Pope Leo I, and Augustine's *Sermo 350* and *De agone Christiano*.<sup>61</sup> The Chalons text mentions the *Regula pastoralis*, quotes from Julianus Pomerius's *De vita contemplativa* (cited as Prosper of Aquitaine), Jerome's *Epistula ad Paulinum*, and Augustine's *De cura gerenda pro mortuis*.<sup>62</sup> Though a common reform agenda was probably largely shared among the five councils in 813, the Mainz and Chalons *acta*, evincing closer (textual) engagement with the Fathers, stand as the clearest immediate forebears to the Council of Aachen (816) text, which would be a much lengthier offering featuring a great abundance of patristic citations.<sup>63</sup> Generally speaking, there is no reason to believe that the 813 synods were much different in tone or character than the 816 synod—except perhaps for the presence of the emperor, as Louis himself presided over the Council of Aachen (816), the first great council of his reign and a decisive moment in the *renovatio*.<sup>64</sup>

The impressive length of the 816 text, as we have it today, derives in part from the fact that the text is actually a composite of several items, including *capitula* intended specifically for canons and canonesses and ordinances pertaining to the standardization of monastic life; the bulk of the conciliar text is comprised of the *Institutio canonicorum*, a widely circulated document, extant in no fewer than sixteen ninth- or tenth-century manuscripts.<sup>65</sup> Yet, the formal composition of the 816 text does not

---

61 Council of Mainz (813), ed. Werminghoff, pp. 258–73.

62 Council of Chalons (813) [*Concilium Cabillonense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 273–85.

63 On this council, its context, and its *acta*, see Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 155–60.

64 McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, 12; Mayke de Jong, *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814–840* (Cambridge, 2009), 22–23.

65 McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*, 112.

alone account for the discernible difference between that text and those produced three years earlier. Where even the lengthier texts left by Charlemagne's 813 reform councils (i.e., Mainz and Chalons) seem (in hindsight) abbreviated and ultimately summary in nature, the Council of Aachen (816) text is not only much longer—it is itself a key, two-fold site for the negotiation and construction of authority: first, the authority ascribed to authorship, among the patristic figures invoked, their names and words clustered amidst those of biblical figures; and second, the authority invested in the respective religious *ordines*, within these orders themselves, in their relation to one another, and, more implicitly, in their relation to the emperor and the other lay leaders of the empire.

The establishment of commonly understood and accepted hierarchies was an essential aspect of the reforms. On the one hand, for monks, this meant, above all, the authority invested in an abbot, following the *Regula Benedicti* with some small yet significant alterations inserted by ninth-century interpreters, most significantly Benedict of Aniane.<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, for those who intended to practice their ministry, and wield their spiritual authority, in the world, Gregory was the single most important, post-apostolic source of pastoral guidance. Although much of Gregory's ecclesiology is loosely adapted from Augustine's writings, it was Gregory's work, in particular the *Regula pastoralis*,<sup>67</sup> that provided Carolingian reformers with a language of hierarchical authority, admonition, and correction. Augustine's understanding of the relationship between the "two cities," wherein hierarchies of authority within the earthly city inevitably lacked any greater spiritual meaning or justification, precluded his elaboration of any unambiguous, "major" doctrine of ecclesiological authority.<sup>68</sup>

---

66 McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*, 115–16; Matthew D. Ponesse, "Smaragdus of St Mihiel and the Carolingian Monastic Reform," *Revue Bénédictine* 116 (2006): 367–92.

67 On the medieval transmission and reception of the *Regula pastoralis*, see Paolo Chisea, "Regula pastoralis," in Lucia Castaldi, ed., *La Trasmissione dei Testi Latini del Medioevo 5: Gregorius I Papa* (Florence, 2013), 174–90; and Floryszcak, *Die Regula Pastoralis Gregors des Großen*.

68 The classic modern studies on this topic are Étienne Gilson, *Les métamorphoses de la cité de Dieu* (Louvain, 1952) and Robert A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge, 1970). More recently, see the provocative critique of Markus's study by Michael J. Hollerich, "John Milbank, Augustine, and the 'Secular,'" in Mark Vessey, Karla Pollmann, and Allan D. Fitzgerald, eds., *History, Apocalypse and the Secular Imagination: New Essays on Augustine's City of God* (Bowling Green, 1999), 311–26; and Robert A. Markus, *Christianity and the Secular* (Notre Dame, Ind., 2006), 40–45, where Markus responds to Hollerich's criticisms.

Gregory, by contrast, resolved his tensions regarding the imperfect nature of worldly leadership and social stratification by asserting that properly ordered relationships of leadership and deference to authority were essential to bind together Christian society while it collectively awaited the perfect, divine order of God's kingdom.<sup>69</sup> This resolve in Gregory's thought is nowhere more evident than in his writings on admonishment. The third book of the *Regula pastoralis* includes chapters advising readers on how to admonish many different, contrasting types of individuals, from the poor and the rich (*inopes et divites*; III.2), to subjects and superiors (*subditi et praelati*; III.4), to the impudent and timid (*impudentes et verecundi*; III.7), to the kindly and envious (*benevoli et invidi*; III.10).<sup>70</sup> Several of these chapters are used in the *capitula canonum* of the Aachen text, thus providing ecclesiastical leaders with an authoritative language and methods by which to correct those under their spiritual care, including the empire's high-ranking *praelati*.

Beyond the *capitula canonum* section, Gregory is invoked by name and quoted throughout the Aachen text.<sup>71</sup> (See Appendix: Table 1.) The writers of the conciliar text (likely Benedict of Aniane, along with, perhaps, Amalarius of Metz and/or Ansegius, the later abbot of Fontanelle<sup>72</sup>) seemingly worked from an impressive variety of Gregorian works. The many references to Gregory in the Aachen text include quotations from the *Regula pastoralis* (Books I, II, and III), the *Moralia in Iob* (Books X, XIII, XIX, XXI, XXIII, and XXVI), the *Homiliae in Evangelium* (Books I and II), and the first book of the *Homiliae in Hiezechihalem*. However, not unlike the way Augustine's views are transmitted (mostly) second-hand via Gregory and other accepted, nominal Augustinians, Gregory's work itself is present here in a mediated, edited, reduced form. Rather than having directly used the above-named works by Gregory, the *acta* writers instead relied upon Taio of Saragossa's *Libri sententiarum*, a

---

<sup>69</sup> Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, esp. 156–60.

<sup>70</sup> Gregory the Great, *Regulae pastoralis liber*, *Patrologia cursus completus, Series latina*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1878–1890) (hereafter PL) vol. 77, col. 13–128; Bruno Judic, ed., *Grégoire le Grand: Règle pastorale, Sources chrétiennes* 381–82 (Paris, 1992); in English translation as St. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Henry Davis.

<sup>71</sup> Council of Aachen (816) [*Concilium Aquisgranense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 307–464.

<sup>72</sup> Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 159.

seventh-century *florilegium* divided into five books, whose content is culled mostly from various works by Gregory.<sup>73</sup> In fact, all but one of the citations to Gregory in the conciliar text are from Book II of Taio's *Sententiae*; the lone exception, chapter CXXIII in the conciliar text, still makes use of Taio's compilation (for *Homil. in Evang.* I.6), but draws from the fifth book of his *Sententiae*.<sup>74</sup> Taio, a pupil of Isidore of Seville, is not referred to as an (authorial) authority in his own right (indeed, he is never mentioned by name in the text). Yet, by altering the context of Gregory's words and views, as well as amalgamating quotations from different, independent works in a new intertextual setting, he has made some subtle, though quite significant, changes to Gregory's writings.<sup>75</sup> In Taio's *Sententiae*, direct or paraphrased quotations from the *Regula pastoralis* and the *Moralia in Iob*, the *Dialogi* and the *Homiliae*—works composed at different periods in Gregory's life, and for different reasons and audiences—are skillfully interwoven so as to cohere within the space of a single chapter.<sup>76</sup> Taio's *florilegium*, which survives in one eighth-century manuscript and two manuscripts from the ninth century, was an important and convenient source for Carolingians in need of a readily usable Gregory.<sup>77</sup>

This approach to using Gregory via Taio was similarly taken by Smaragdus, the abbot of Saint-Mihiel. Smaragdus likely attended the 816 council, and composed his *Diadema monachorum* sometime between 814 and 817.<sup>78</sup> The *Diadema monachorum* is a *florilegium* designed to serve as a paranetic guidebook for monks.<sup>79</sup> As in Smaragdus's slightly later work, his commentary on the *Regula Benedicti*, the points of advice that Smaragdus offers his monastic readers in the *Diadema* are mainly, though not wholly, in line with Benedict of Aniane's views, as enumerated in the *Concordia*

---

73 See Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 158; Judic, "La tradition de Grégoire le Grand," 40–41.

74 Council of Aachen (816) c. CXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 404.

75 On Taio (or Samuhel Taius, c. 600–683), Bishop of Saragossa, see Roger Collins, *Visigothic Spain, 409–711* (Oxford, 2004), esp. 84, 100, 169.

76 Taio of Saragossa, *Sententiarum libri V*, PL 80, col. 727–990A.

77 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 9565 (s. VIII); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, n.a. lat. 1463 (s. IX); Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale II.2569 (s. IX). Taio's *florilegium* also survives in five later manuscripts, dated between the tenth century and the fifteenth century.

78 Ponesse, "Smaragdus of St Mihiel," 11; Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 157.

79 Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum*, PL 102, col. 593–690; in English translation as Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, *Diadema monachorum: The Crown of Monks*, trans. David Barry (Collegeville, Minn., 2013).

*regularum*.<sup>80</sup> To be sure, Smaragdus's writings during this period are thoroughly informed by the spirit of the reform movement championed by Louis the Pious and his chief adviser.

On the face of it, Smaragdus's use of patristic sources in the *Diadema monachorum* seems squarely in line with the Council of Aachen (816) text: Gregory and Isidore (the illustrious archbishop of Seville, c. 560–636) lead the pack, with Gregory mediated, in nearly every instance, by the (not quite seamless) editorial strategies of Taio.<sup>81</sup> Upon closer inspection, however, while both Smaragdus and the writers of the conciliar *acta* make use of Taio's *Sententiae*, they use an almost completely different combination of chapters from Taio in their respective texts. The conciliar text and *Diadema monachorum* only overlap in their use of chapters 42 and 43 from Book II of the *Sententiae*. These chapters in Taio use quotations from the third book of the *Regula pastoralis*, chapters 4, 8, and 10, on modes of admonition. This theme, as suggested above, is highlighted across the texts associated with the Carolingian reform program, and Gregory was the strongest available source on the topic at hand. As Jean Battany has shown, Taio's treatment of *Regula pastoralis* III.4—a chapter from Gregory's work that is cited in both the Aachen *capitula canonum* and the *Diadema monachorum*—serves as a telling example of Taio's editorial (or authorial) strategies.<sup>82</sup> Taio draws from this chapter of the *Regula pastoralis*, explaining how to admonish subjects (*subditi*) and prelates (*praelati*), for multiple chapters in his compilation. In one chapter of his *Sententiae* (II.44), Taio substitutes *clerici* for Gregory's *subditi*, thus changing, not insignificantly, the original subject of Gregory's advice. This chapter in Taio's work is on the correct manner of life for members of clergy, and so Taio has gently altered Gregory's wording on a different matter so that it may speak more directly to the one at hand. In other instances, including just two chapters earlier (II.42), Taio retains Gregory's *subditi*, as it here

---

80 Ponesse, "Smaragdus of St Mihiel," esp. 11, 16; see also Jasmijn Bovendeert, "Royal or Monastic Identity? Smaragdus's *Via regia* and *Diadema monachorum* Reconsidered," in Richard Corradini, Rob Meens, Christina Possel, and Philip Shaw, eds., *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages* (Vienna, 2006), 239–52.

81 On Smaragdus's use of patristic sources, see Matthew D. Ponesse, "Standing Distant from the Fathers: Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel and the Reception of Early Medieval Learning," *Traditio* 67 (2012): 71–99.

82 Jean Battany, "Tayon de Saragosse et la nomenclature sociale de Grégoire le Grand," *Bulletin du Cange* 37 (1970): 173–92.



suits the topic of Taio's chapter on good subjects fulfilling their duties under pastoral governance. While Smaragdus uses only *Sententiae* II.42, and not II.44, the Council of Aachen text makes use of both chapters from the *Sententiae*, employing, alternately, the faithfully quoted Gregory and Taio's subtle, purposeful editorial intervention to further the conciliar text's myriad reform-oriented objectives.<sup>83</sup> Despite the fact that Taio's *Sententiae* was clearly an indispensable source for the writers of the Aachen *acta*, his presence in the text is nearly invisible, discernible only implicitly by his deliberate selections from among, and alterations to, Gregory's writings.

Whereas Pope Gregory was regarded among the most well-known names in Latin Christendom,<sup>84</sup> Taio was—and is—a much more obscure figure. His era was one of political and religious uncertainty, rife with violent quarrels over royal succession and frequent disputes between Catholic and Arian factions in Spain and Southern Gaul. Taio was made bishop of Saragossa ca. 651. Shortly thereafter, in 653, the Visigothic king Chindasuinth died, and while he had made arrangements for his son, Recessuinth, to succeed him, a rival count, Froia, instigated a revolt in the Ebro valley and allied with the Basques to challenge Recessuinth's royal claim. In a letter prefacing his *Sententiae*, Taio explained to Bishop Quiricus of Barcelona (later of Toledo) that a siege by Froia on Saragossa had delayed the completion of his Gregorian *florilegium*, which Quiricus had perhaps commissioned.<sup>85</sup> These are the perilous circumstances under which Taio's text was produced—a markedly less stable milieu than the Carolingian empire of the early ninth century. The resulting work, Taio's *Libri sententiarum*, has been praised by one modern historian, Jocelyn Hilgarth, as “a great technical advance” over earlier patristic *florilegia* (such as those compiled in the fifth and sixth centuries, respectively, by Prosper of Aquitaine and Eugippius), and remained unsurpassed even by the “authors”

---

83 Judic, “La tradition de Grégoire le Grand,” 40–41.

84 On the development of a Latin patristic canon, and Gregory's place within it, see Kaczynski, “The Authority of the Fathers,” 1–4; Vessey, “The Forging of Orthodoxy,” 509–13; and Willemien Otten, “The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology,” in Irene Backus, ed., *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (Leiden, 1997), 1:3–50.

85 Collins, *Visigothic Spain*, 83–84.

of the Carolingian renaissance. Yet, Hilgarth concedes that, compared to the works of Isidore and Julian of Toledo (Taio's approximate contemporaries), "Taio's work was never widely known."<sup>86</sup> While it appears true that Taio himself was little known in the centuries following his death, nevertheless his *work*, and its "systematic" re-ordering of Gregory's writings, proved very useful to Carolingian readers.

These pragmatic ninth-century readers seem to have recognized and ascribed different levels of authority to different types of (or approaches to) authorship.<sup>87</sup> Taio's *Sententiae* was evidently an important source, but it (or the obscure Taio in name) was not allotted any special authority independent of, or separable from, the patristic wisdom it preserved; it was employed with the understanding that it was inherently less "authorial" a work than the works of Gregory excerpted therein.<sup>88</sup> In contrast, while Gregory and Isidore—ubiquitous nominal presences in the conciliar text—are widely acknowledged by modern scholars to have formulated their ideas under the influence of Augustine,<sup>89</sup> they largely eschew explicit, nominal citation of Augustine's work, and often paraphrase loosely rather than quote directly. For example, in a chapter from Isidore's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* that is included in the Aachen *acta*, Isidore himself makes use of a passage from Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, although the chapter in the *acta* is simply attributed to Isidore.<sup>90</sup> At the level of their associative "name-value," Isidore, Gregory, and Augustine were, collectively and as individuals, Holy Fathers,

---

86 Jocelyn N. Hilgarth, "St. Julian of Toledo in the Middle Ages," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 21 (1958): 16–17; reprinted in idem, *Visigothic Spain, Byzantium and the Irish*, IV, praises the texts produced by Taio, Isidore, and Julian for their "systematic order," an improvement upon the *ad hoc* quality of earlier patristic anthologies, which had been made to address some then-contemporary point of controversy.

87 On this point, see n. 40 above. Additionally, see Patrick Geary, "Medieval Archivists as Authors: Social Memory and Archival Memory," in Francis X. Blouin Jr., William G. Rosenberg, eds., *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2006), 106–13; and Faith Wallis, "The Experience of the Book: Manuscripts, Texts, and the Role of Epistemology in Early Medieval Medicine," in Don Bates, ed., *Knowledge and the Scholarly Medical Traditions* (Cambridge, 1995), 101–26.

88 Cf. O'Loughlin, "Individual Anonymity and Collective Identity," 293.

89 See, e.g., Katharina Greschat, "Gregory the Great" in the *Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, 1080–85; Jose Carlos Martin, "Isidore of Seville," in the *Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, 1193–95.

90 Council of Aachen (816), c. VIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 323–24 (quoting from Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* II.5, which in turn draws from Augustine, *De civitate Dei* XIX.19).

each representing vital variations on the totalizing theme of Christian orthodoxy.<sup>91</sup> They were understood to agree where it mattered most. Yet, while their individual words were accepted as essentially harmonious, they were also read as sufficiently different and distinguishable from one another. This allocation of authorial *auctoritas* meant, in effect, that Gregory and Isidore operated, at least in certain textual settings, on a level (patristic) playing field with Augustine.

### Augustine at Aachen

As for Augustine himself—his name and his writings—he is, by comparison, a more marginal presence in the Council of Aachen text, as well as in the roughly contemporaneous *Diadema monachorum*. In the latter, Smaragdus draws twice, briefly from the *Enarationes in psalmos* in chapters on humility and on innocence,<sup>92</sup> and quotes directly from Augustine’s *Tractatus in evangelium Ioannis* in a chapter on the idea of monks as children of God.<sup>93</sup> In the latter chapter, Augustine’s words are inserted between a pair of quotations by Bede, from his commentary on John. In the Council of Aachen text, Augustine appears only a little more frequently, but when he does appear, his works are excerpted at greater length. In three instances, Augustine is present via his sermons. In chapter 12 of the Aachen text, following nine chapters drawing from Isidore and two drawing from Jerome, part of Augustine’s *Sermo* 46 is included under the heading “*excerptum ex libro Augustini de pastoribus.*” In this sermon, Augustine is positing an interpretation of verses from Ezech. 34 (1–2, 8) that describe the problem of “shepherds of Israel . . . nourishing only themselves,” rather than the sheep of their flock—as Augustine puts it, “shepherds who want the title of shepherd without wanting to fulfill a pastor’s duties.”<sup>94</sup> Augustine distinguishes between the two defining aspects that characterize dutiful pastors:

---

91 On Christianity as a “totalizing discourse” in Carolingian culture, see Geoffrey Koziol, “Truth and Its Consequences: Why Carolingianists Don’t Speak of Myth,” in Stephen O. Gloesbeck, ed., *Myth in Early Northwest Europe* (Tempe, Ariz., 2007), 71–103. On the concept of *auctoritas* in late antique Christian discourse, see Pollmann, “Christianity and Authority in Late Antiquity,” 156–75. More generally, on the problematic notion “that orthodoxy represents a pure and originary Christianity,” see Virginia Burrus, “History, Theology, Orthodoxy, Polydoxy,” *Modern Theology* 30.3 (2014): 7–16.

92 Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum* cc. 11 and 89, *PL* 102, col. 607–9, 681–82.

93 Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum* c. 81, *PL* 102, col. 675–76.

94 Council of Aachen (816), c. XII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 330: “Qui pastorum nomina audire volunt et pastorum officium

first, that they are Christians among Christians, and second, that they are leaders (*praepositi*), accountable to God for the souls under their care. With much greater clarity than in his “major” works, Augustine insists upon the absolute accountability of the pastoral office and the *praepositi* who inhabit it. “*Audite vos cum intentione audiamus nos cum tremore,*” the *acta* writers assert through Augustine, “You [the flock] must listen with interest, we [the shepherds] must listen with trembling.”<sup>95</sup> Such a call for dutiful, accountable *ministerium* was among the most urgent concerns of the reform program.

This pastoral Augustine—so thoroughly absorbed into Gregory’s ecclesiology and manifested through much of the *Regula pastoralis*—was a figure well-suited to the Carolingian reform agenda. It is little surprise then that when Augustine reappears in the *Capitula canonum* he is speaking once more in a similar, compatible register. Chapters 112 and 113 of the conciliar *acta* consist of sermons 355 and 356, included in their entirety. These sermons, which Conrad Leyser has recently highlighted as being especially important for demarcating the early medieval incarnation of Augustine, were often referred to together as the *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum* (“On the life and practice of his clergy”), with *Sermo* 355 cited as Part I of that work and *Sermo* 356 as Part II.<sup>96</sup> In these sermons, Augustine paints a vivid picture of the group of clerics living an ordered, communal life on the grounds of his episcopal estate in Hippo.<sup>97</sup> The apostolic ideal of the common life, as described in Acts 4:32–35, is the guiding force behind Augustine’s regulation of this clerical community.<sup>98</sup> This is why, as Augustine laments to his audience, he is so severely disappointed upon the occasion of these sermons being composed and delivered: A priest within said community, Januarius, while appearing to have “disposed of almost all

---

implere nolunt, quid ad eos per prophetam dicatur, sicut lectum audivimus, recenseamus.”

95 Council of Aachen (816), c. XII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 330.

96 Leyser, “Augustine in the Latin West,” 458–59.

97 Augustine, *Sermones* 355, 356, PL 39, col. 1569–81; English translations of both sermons are included in Adolar Zumkeller, *Augustine’s Ideal of the Religious Life*, trans. Edmund Colledge (New York, 1986), 406–22. See also Goulven Madec, *La vie communautaire: Traduction annotée des Sermons 355–356* (Paris, 1996).

98 On Augustine’s understanding of these verses, see Luc Verheijen, *Saint Augustine’s Monasticism in the Light of Acts 4:32–35* (Villanova, Penn., 1979).

he seemed to own,” kept some significant amount of silver aside on the pretense that he was simply holding it for his daughter, still in her youth. As Januarius approached death, however, he composed a will, “as though the money were his own,” and asserted that the outstanding silver was still his property, not that of his daughter. Augustine is appalled by this development, which he perceives as an affront to the core principles of his religious community.<sup>99</sup> Consequently, he concedes that clerics in Hippo who are unwilling to part with their belongings may continue to serve as clerics without entering into the monastic, or semi-monastic, community he has established. But he firmly insists that those who have professed to the common life at his community, and have subsequently withdrawn from it, shall henceforth not be counted among its members. This Augustine—the pastor-cum-abbot of these essentially straightforward sermons—was an Augustine well-suited to the discursive climate of the Carolingian reforms.

The issue of individual versus communal or Church property addressed in sermons 355 and 356 is a recurring topic across most of the conciliar texts of our period. Beyond these particular sermons, Augustine’s essential position and his conception of the common life, via Acts 4:32–35, is reiterated in Book II, chapter nine of Pomerius’s *De vita contemplativa*, which was also used at the 816 council; the assertion therein that “the possessions of the Church are but the vows of the faithful, the ransom of sinners, and the patrimony of the poor” was an absolute staple between the mid-eighth and mid-ninth centuries.<sup>100</sup> Pomerius’s remarks on this topic were a key source for Chrodegang’s *Regula canonicorum*,<sup>101</sup> which, in turn, is used extensively in the *Institutio canonicorum* in the Aachen (816) text. While the lives and *ordines* of canons and canonesses were conceptualized as distinct from the monastic life detailed in the *Regula Benedicti*, a general aspiration to the apostolic ideal of community

---

99 Augustine, *Sermo* 355, PL 39, col. 1568–75; trans. Zumkeller, Colledge, *Augustine’s Ideal*, 408–9.

100 Julianus Pomerius, *De vita contemplativa* II.9, PL 59, col. 454: “Et idcirco scientes nihil aliud esse res ecclesiae, nisi vota fidelium, pretia peccatorum pauperum; non eas vindicaverunt in usus suos, ut proprias, sed ut commendatas pauperibus diviserunt”; trans. Mary Josephine Suelzer, *The Contemplative Life*, Ancient Christian Writers (Westminster, Md., 1947), 73. On the importance of Pomerius’s quotation, see Timmermann, “Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue,” 10–11.

101 On this point, see Timmermann, “Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue,” 11–14.

is pervasive throughout the texts associated with the Carolingian reform program.<sup>102</sup>

The presence of Augustine as a semi-monastic pastoral leader—an Augustine who was perfectly congruous with this ecclesio-social aspiration—is again invoked vividly, if fleetingly, in a chapter of the *Capitula canonum* concerning the clothing to be possessed and worn by canons. This chapter of the Aachen conciliar text urges canons to exercise moderation and discretion in outfitting themselves. First, an excerpt is included from Jerome’s *Epistula ad Eustochium*, followed by a quotation from Gregory’s *Homiliae in evangelium* (I.6, from Taio V.2).<sup>103</sup> Then, near the end of the chapter, the *acta* writers include a short section from Possidius’s *Vita Augustini*, describing Augustine’s views on the manner of dress appropriate for canons.<sup>104</sup> In this chapter of the *acta*, Jerome and Gregory serve as the principal authorities on the topic at hand, while Augustine, as depicted by his biographer, serves as an example demonstrating the correct approach to the issue. Here, Augustine is an addendum of sorts to the views expressed by his contemporary, Jerome, and his patristic heir, Gregory. Certainly, Possidius’s Augustine is consistent with the figure discernible from sermons 46, 355, and 356. The *Vita* excerpt stands as apparent evidence that Augustine practiced what he preached.<sup>105</sup>

The conciliar use of the *Vita*, together with the lengthy quotations from Augustine’s sermons, suggest that Augustine’s nominal presence, or connotative “name-value,” within this discursive context is not nearly as broad or expansive as historiographical estimates of his influence in the Carolingian era would seem to indicate. While texts like Sermons 355 and 356 may take on the greater coherence of a single “work” (i.e., as the *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum*) by virtue of Augustine’s authorial

---

102 David Ganz, “The Ideology of Sharing,” in Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre, eds., *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1995), 17–30.

103 Council of Aachen (816), c. CXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 404–5.

104 Council of Aachen (816), c. CXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 405: “Non enim specialiter praesumi debet ab aliquo quod non generaliter teneatur ab omnibus, id est nec plus iusto cultior vestis nec insolita atque deformis, quia in utro illorum aut elationis aut certe simulationis noxa patescet. Inter utrumque enim virtus discretionis moderatissime tenenda est, quae plenissime in vita beati Augustini in laudem illius prolata ita legitur: *Vestis eius et calciamenta vel lectualia ex moderato et competenti habitu erant nec nitida nimium nec abiecta plurimum, quia his plerique vel iactare se insolenter homines solent vel abicere, ex utroque non quae Iesu Christi, sed quae sua sunt quaerentes. At iste, ut dixi, medium tenebat neque ad dexteram neque ad sinistram declinans.*” (Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, c. 22).

105 On the importance of Pomerius’s *Vita* for early medieval conceptions of Augustine, see Leyser, “Augustine in the Latin West,” 457–58.

status, the field of discourse for which Augustine's name stands, as a kind of shorthand, is relatively specific and delimited. For the purposes of the Carolingian reforms, an Augustine "who says everything" (per Leyser's critique) was not needed. Instead, Augustine's is a complementary, and not domineering, patristic voice, speaking usefully to the pastoral and monastic issues of the day.

Augustine's final, nominal appearance in the Council of Aachen (816) text comes ten chapters later, amid a discussion of the manner by which canons ought to be corrected. This chapter claims to incorporate the view of blessed (*beatus*) Augustine, but Albert Werminghoff, the modern editor of the conciliar text, was unable to locate an equivalent statement anywhere in Augustine's authentic work.<sup>106</sup> This same, long chapter later includes a purported quotation from "blessed" Gregory, which the MGH editor was likewise unable to locate in Gregory's work,<sup>107</sup> followed by yet another unidentified quotation ascribed to *beatus Augustinus*.<sup>108</sup> The writer, or writers, of this chapter from the *Capitula canonum* may have been working from a *florilegium* (possibly a text that is no longer extant) that mistakenly attributes otherwise obscure quotations to Augustine and Gregory; or perhaps these statements were understood (by whatever means) by the *acta* writers to have been written or endorsed by Augustine and Gregory, hence their inclusion here. These brief statements could be readily understood as consistent with Augustine's and Gregory's well-known writings on correction and order within the Church. Here, as elsewhere in the Aachen *acta*, the names of the Church Fathers are put purposefully to work, in the service of grounding the spirit of this reform measure in ostensible patristic wisdom.

---

106 Council of Aachen (816), c. CXXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 410: "Quamquam contemptores canonicarum institutionum episcopali praecipuae iudicio plectendi sint, qua poena, ut ait beatus Augustinus, in ecclesia nulla maior esse potest, demonstrandum tamen est, qualem caeteri praelati, qui illis dignitate inferiores esse noscuntur, in locis sibi commissis, in quibus canonice vivitur, ergo subiectos quosque delinquentes et ea, quae proprie ad eorum propositum pertinent, observare nolentes adhibere debeant correptionis modum."

107 Council of Aachen (816), c. CXXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 411.

108 Council of Aachen (816), c. CXXXIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 412.

## Interlude: Absent Fathers?

The text resulting from the Council of Aachen in 817 appears mainly as an addendum, and perhaps as a slight corrective, to the 816 *acta*.<sup>109</sup> The close resemblance between these reform-minded texts—along with the sometimes jumbled chronologies in other contemporaneous sources—led modern historians to assign the voluminous 816 *acta*, including the *Institutio canonicorum*, to the 817 council. It was not until the 1960s that Josef Semmler, by identifying new sources used in the 816 and 817 conciliar texts, conclusively demonstrated that the longer, composite text had in fact resulted from the council held in August 816.<sup>110</sup> Arguably the most significant textual product of the meeting convened in July 817 in Aachen was the so-called *Ordinatio imperii*, which has been categorized separately from the conciliar text by the modern editors of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (who printed it with the *Capitularia* rather than *Concilia*).<sup>111</sup> With this text, Louis the Pious announced his plan for succession, which was determined (the text relates) after three days of fasting and extensive reflection. Louis would, “at the command of almighty God,” bequeath the title of *imperator* to his eldest son, Lothar, while assigning sub-kingdoms to Lothar’s younger brothers, Pippin and Louis (“the German”). Excluded from this divinely sanctioned ordinance are the emperor’s nephew, King Bernard of Italy (the illegitimate son of Charlemagne’s son, Pippin), and Bernard’s own heirs, who would thus not inherit his royal title. The *Ordinatio imperii*’s modern English translator, Paul Dutton, asserts that this text is “surely the most important constitutional document of the ninth century.”<sup>112</sup> Dutton notes both the

---

109 Council of Aachen (817) [*Concilium Aquisgranense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:1, pp. 464–66. On this council, see Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 160–61.

110 See Josef Semmler, “Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 74 (1963): 15–82. The earlier confusion was certainly understandable. Read in view of Semmler’s insights and those of subsequent scholars, the 817 text seems to pick up where the monastic *capitula* of the 816 text leave off; but when seen in a different historiographical light, the 817 text might just as well have been interpreted as a prelude to (what we now know as) the 816 text. The 817 text is principally concerned with the (continued) regularization of all the empire’s monasteries under the *Regula Benedicti*, with some small modifications, perhaps moderate concessions, engineered by Benedict of Aniane. On these points, see also McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*, 112–24.

111 *Ordinatio imperii*, MGH *Capitularia* 1, ed. Alfred Boretius, pp. 270–73. The classic work on this text is François L. Ganshof, “Some Observations on the *Ordinatio Imperii* of 817,” in idem, *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy* (London, 1971), 273–88.

112 Paul E. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader*, second ed. (Toronto, 2009), 199.



apparent precedent that Louis's decree set for the heritability of imperial or royal titles, and the profound effect that the exclusion of Bernard would have throughout the subsequent period of Louis's reign. On this first point, most scholars acknowledge that the *Ordinatio imperii* represents, to some extent, a discernible break with the traditional Frankish practice of partible inheritance among royal heirs. A minority view, however, claims that the constitutional innovation of Louis's 817 succession plan has been greatly exaggerated, and that, in most respects, the *Ordinatio imperii* is closer in spirit to Charlemagne's *Divisio regnorum* of 806.<sup>113</sup> To be sure, this ongoing disagreement will not be settled here. What is unambiguous enough—and immediately relevant for our purposes—is the absence of both Augustine and Gregory from the *Ordinatio imperii*. Louis sought the counsel of key ecclesiastical leaders in reaching the decisions recorded in this text, yet his ordinance lacks any clearly discernible references to any of the Church Fathers. If the *Ordinatio*'s aim was to maintain a single, unified Christian *imperium*, a right-ordered city of God on earth, this objective did not, apparently, require any direct patristic guidance.

Although the political (or ecclesio-political) implications of the *Ordinatio imperii* remain debatable, the second reason listed by Dutton for the text's historical importance—the pointed omission of Bernard and his offspring—would unequivocally yield serious short-term consequences. Bernard and a faction of his supporters staged a revolt against Louis. When these efforts failed, Bernard was convicted of treason and blinded in April 818. Following this punishment, a lesser penalty than execution, Bernard nevertheless died, probably due to an infection.<sup>114</sup> As we shall soon see, this unfortunate turn of events would continue to haunt the emperor in the years to come. Where the first few years of Louis's reign had been marked by the reforming zeal of the Aachen synods—if not, necessarily, the wholly successful empire-wide implementation of the conciliar legislation<sup>115</sup>—

---

113 See, e.g., Steffen Patzold, "Eine 'loyale Palastrebelle' der 'Reichseinheitspartei'? Zur 'Divisio Imperii' von 817 und zu den Ursachen des Aufstandes gegen Ludwig der Frommen im Jahre 830," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2006): 43–77; De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 25–28.

114 De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 28–30.

115 McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*, 112–17.

domestic strife was now the order of the day. To make matters worse, Benedict of Aniane, one of the reform program's most fervent proponents, died in February 821. Amid criticisms persisting in the wake of Bernard's death, Louis was suddenly without his closest, most trusted advisor.

This is a snapshot of the immediate context for the Council of Attigny, held in August 822. Once again, the conciliar record is relatively brief—and it is silent regarding the Fathers. What transpired in Attigny, either within or adjacent to the ecclesiastical synod itself, was not merely a standard reiteration of the 816–17 reform agenda. The events at Attigny were altogether more remarkable. For the first time in more than four centuries, a “Roman” emperor performed an act of public penance.<sup>116</sup> Louis repented and sought forgiveness both for his own sins (the treatment of Bernard presumably among them) and those of his late father, who, in the minds of some current critics, was suffering punishments in the afterlife due to some of his less than Christian deeds.<sup>117</sup> Although generations of scholars have typically perceived the penitential ceremony at Attigny as evidence of Louis's weakness, both contemporary ninth-century accounts and present-day revisionist historians (who tend to take the convictions of Carolingian witnesses more seriously than did their more skeptical forebears) generally agree that Louis emerged revitalized from his public show of remorse.<sup>118</sup> If Louis was being held to an increasingly high standard of conduct by the bishops of his realm—who were diligent readers of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*, perhaps especially the chapters on admonition and correction—then he had satisfactorily risen to their challenge.

Yet, while Gregory's instructions regarding the ministerial duty of correction may very well

---

116 On concepts and practices of penance in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, see Abigail Firey, ed., *A New History of Penance* (Leiden, 2008); Rob Meens, *Penance in the Middle Ages, 600–1200* (Cambridge, 2014); Natalie Brigit Molineaux, *Medici et medicamenta: The Medicine of Penance in Late Antiquity* (Lanham, Md., 2009); Courtney M. Booker, *Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009); Mayke de Jong, “Transformations of Penance,” in Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson, eds., *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2000), 185–224; De Jong, *The Penitential State*.

117 Paul E. Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, Neb., 1994), 50–80; Thomas F.X. Noble, “Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the Charlemagne Legend,” and Paul E. Dutton, “KAROLVS MAGNVS or KAROLVS FELIX: The Making of Charlemagne's Reputation and Legend,” in Matthew Gabriele and Jace Stuckey, eds., *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages* (New York, 2008), 3–22 and 23–40, respectively; David Ganz, “Charlemagne in Hell,” *Florilegium* 17 (2000): 175–94.

118 See, e.g., Booker, *Past Convictions*; De Jong, *The Penitential State*.

have informed the thoughts of the bishops in Attigny, Gregory is not mentioned by name in the texts relating to Louis's penance. We should observe, again, that the *names* of patristic writers, including Augustine and Gregory, are (conspicuously?) absent from both the 817 *Ordinatio imperii* and the 822 *acta*. The ideas and even the language included in these texts are indirectly inspired by patristic figures, thus following the looser, implicit form of *elocutio*. For example, although Augustine is absent from Attigny, his early mentor, Ambrose, is implicitly present in the extraordinary ritual performed there. It was the formidable Bishop of Milan who urged and presided over the public penance of Emperor Theodosius I in 390, the most recent precedent for Louis's penance.<sup>119</sup> But a general, shared memory of Ambrose's ministerial performance is not the same thing as a direct reference to Ambrose's name or his writings. This significant distinction suggests that the explicitly stated names, and associated "name-values," of patristic figures are performing some special discursive work in the texts where they *do* appear. The purposefully delimited Augustine and the ubiquitous Gregory (via Taio) in the Aachen (816) *acta* bolster the *canones* with a *nominal* patristic authority, serving, at least ostensibly, to resolve matters of some uncertainty or anxiety. At the same time, the type of authority ascribed to Fathers as authors, and to their "works," was not so general as to be merely perfunctory, or to be thoughtlessly included in every text.

#### Exceptional Circumstances: The Council of Paris (825)

In light of this point, let us turn our attention to a conciliar text that, like Aachen (816), makes extensive and explicit use of the Fathers: the Council of Paris (825). The wider context for this council is complex and has been examined extensively in recent scholarship.<sup>120</sup> A short rehearsal of the immediate events leading up to the council should suffice in order to appreciate the exceptional nature

---

119 On Theodosius's penance and Ambrose's role in this famous episode, see Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley, 1994), 291–360; Irene van Renswoude, "License to Speak: The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages" (Ph.D. diss., Universiteit Utrecht, 2011), 137–57.

120 See in particular Thomas F.X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009); and Ann Freeman, "Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the *Libri Carolini*," *Viator* 16 (1985): 65–108, reprinted in eadem, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea*.

of the circumstances and the resulting conciliar text. In the years preceding the reign of the Byzantine emperor Michael II (r. 820–829), a renewed dispute over the use of religious icons had developed in the East. This dispute resulted in the Council of Hagia Sophia (or Council of Constantinople) in 815. Presided over by the Byzantine emperor Leo V and the iconoclastic Patriarch of Constantinople, Theodotos I, this council reaffirmed the iconoclastic position put forth at the Council of Hieria (754), hence rejecting the Second Council of Nicaea (787), which had restored the practice of venerating icons. By 824, this controversy had seemingly come to a head, and Michael wrote to Louis the Pious to seek the Western emperor’s intercession on his behalf with Pope Paschal I. In this letter, as Thomas F.X. Noble observes, the Byzantine sovereign sought to show that he was not, like some of his predecessors, a “maniacal iconoclast,” and that the approach to icons and images that he was advocating was in fact consistent with points of established orthodoxy accepted in both the Greek East and the Latin West. Michael does not explicitly try to convince Louis to endorse his particular policy concerning icons, but he does frame the issue in terms that would have seemed acceptable and inoffensive to the Western sovereign. There is no mention, for instance, of the word *filioque* in Michael’s letter (a point of controversy in the East-West debate over the procession of the Holy Spirit); nor are the Council of Hieria or the Second Council of Nicaea cited as ecumenical, as the Carolingian church had not accepted the ecumenicity of either eastern council.<sup>121</sup> This was not the first serious dispute over icons within the Constantinopolitan Church, nor the Byzantine state’s first quarrel with the Roman episcopate over this issue, nor was it the first time the Frankish sovereign and Church had been compelled (by developments in Constantinople and Rome) to weigh in on this thorny theological topic.<sup>122</sup> In the *Opus Caroli*, Theodulf of Orléans had advocated a middle-ground position on the use of icons and images—a position that Charlemagne endorsed.<sup>123</sup>

---

121 Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, 262–63.

122 For a discussion of the eighth- and early ninth-century context, see Florence Close, *Uniformiser la foi pour unifier l’Empire: La pensée politico-théologique de Charlemagne* (Brussels, 2011).

123 On Theodulf and the *Opus Caroli*, see the various articles collected in Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne’s Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea*.

The text—or rather, texts—associated with the Council of Paris (825) stake out similarly moderate doctrinal territory regarding the use of icons, images, and related theological concerns.<sup>124</sup> Theodulf’s successor, Jonas, likely played a key role in the composition of the 825 *acta*, which, curiously, does not unambiguously, directly employ the *Opus Caroli*.<sup>125</sup> Noble has persuasively argued that the classification of the meeting that yielded the 825 texts as a “council” is a historiographical misnomer. Opting instead for the term “colloquy,” Noble suggests, first, that perhaps as few as five participants attended the meeting, which had been called by Louis upon receiving Michael’s letter. Amalarius of Metz, Frechulf of Lisieux, Halitgar of Cambrai, Jeremias of Sens, and Jonas of Orléans seem fairly certain to have been present in Paris in early November 825. Determining additional attendees, if indeed there were any, is essentially speculation. Second, the task facing this small group of ecclesiastics was not to produce readily implementable, canonical legislation in the manner of the five reform councils of 813 and the 816–17 Aachen synods, but rather to “provide raw material” on a complicated theological problem. In this respect, Noble likens the Paris “colloquy” to the meeting between Theodulf and Alcuin of York that resulted in the *Opus Caroli*, or the small-scale gathering in 809 to consider the procession of the holy spirit.<sup>126</sup>

In a formal sense, the *Libellus synodalis*, by far the lengthiest text included among the 825 “conciliar” documents, basically resembles other *acta* of the period. Like much of the Council of Aachen (816) text, the *Libellus synodalis* is in essence a *florilegium* of biblical and patristic quotations, in addition to references to the *canones* of earlier councils. It is not hard to see why—as a text—this was classified among the MGH’s *Concilia*. However, in terms of the substance and the sources of its patristic content, the 825 Council of Paris and specifically its *Libellus synodalis* are quite exceptional.

---

124 Council of Paris (825) [*Concilium Parisiense*], ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:2, pp. 473–551.

125 Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, 268; and Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 169, speculate that the apparent avoidance of the *Opus Caroli* by the writers of the 825 *Libellus synodalis* may have been due to an understanding of the *Opus Caroli* as being contrary to the views expressed by the current pope, Paschal I. Judic, “La tradition de Grégoire le Grand,” 42, however, observes that the uses of Gregory the Great in the *Libellus synodalis* are consistent with those in Pope Hadrian I’s letters and in the *Opus Caroli*.

126 Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, 266–70.

In the *acta* of the reform councils (813–17), Augustine was present mainly through the pastoral lens of his sermons or as the saintly subject of Possidius’s *Vita Augustini*; most of the time, he remained a relatively minor presence in the text, overshadowed by the likes of Gregory and Isidore. By contrast, Augustine’s name and voice dominate the patristic chapters of the *Libellus synodalis*. (See Appendix: Table 2.) Gregory, Isidore, and Jerome make their expected appearances, but it is Augustine who is consistently front and center. More remarkable than simply the large quantity of citations to Augustine, however, is the wide variety of (authentic and apocryphal) Augustinian works employed by the Carolingian episcopal contingent. These include the more deeply speculative, “major”<sup>127</sup> works absent from the conciliar texts of the previous decade (except via the nominally cited work of other, later sources, like Isidore<sup>128</sup>). The *De civitate Dei* (Books IV, VII, VIII, X, XII, XVI, and XIX) is drawn

---

127 Early medieval readers may, or may not, have recognized a significant distinction between “major” and “minor” works by Augustine or other patristic writers. The use of direct quotations from Augustine’s more complex works in a textual setting like the 825 *Libellus synodalis*, in contrast to the (less dense) sermons favored in other *acta*, may suggest some awareness of a difference between “high” and “low” Augustine in the ninth century. On the other hand, such distinctions clearly inform modern, historiographical conceptions of Augustine’s *oeuvre*. Well-known and exhaustively studied works like the *De civitate Dei* and *Confessiones* are inextricably tied to modern scholars’ understanding of Augustine’s thought. Regarding this point, cf. Hubertus R. Drobner, “Studying Augustine: An Overview of Recent Research,” in Robert Dodaro and George Lawless, eds., *Augustine and His Critics: Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner* (London, 2000), 19–20, who notes that “*Confessions* and *City of God* are . . . by no means only accidentally the most studied of all the numerous works of Augustine [as they both ‘belong to the world’s heritage of the greatest works in the history of literature, known far beyond the circles of theologians, historians, and other scholars’], comprising some 15 per cent of all publications concerning Augustine. In second place, but trailing by a long distance, follow the *Sermons* and the *Letters*, adding another 7 per cent between them. Following next are *De trinitate*, *De doctrina Christiana*, and his biblical commentaries on John and the Psalms, together sharing a further 8 per cent of scholarly literature devoted to Augustine. This statistic reveals a fundamental feature of all Augustinian scholarship: it is by no means evenly distributed. Those eight treatises have been edited, translated and studied many times over, while some of the remaining 109 works of Augustine have largely been neglected. The *Quaestiones euangeliorum* are the least studied, with only four entries in the bibliography. Of course, one is entitled to ask if this selection is not wholly justified. If two handfuls of rightly famous works correctly and fully represent the thoughts of Augustine, why bother with the remainder? It is exactly this question, however, that in recent times has raised serious doubts. Scholars are also discovering that Augustine’s doctrinal, and, especially, his polemical treatises represent only a partial view of his entire theology, given the fact that in them he sought to defend the true faith in what amounts at times to extreme terms. Yet in his pastoral writings, and, in particular, his sermons to the faithful, he avoided the relentless polemic witnessed so often in his doctrinal treatises. As a result, his explanations of doctrinal matters in the sermons and other, less-known works offer new, more balanced formulations for many of his theological positions.”

128 See, e.g., n. 90 above.

from extensively,<sup>129</sup> sections of the *De doctrina Christiana* (Books II and III) are quoted at length,<sup>130</sup> and the *De trinitate* (Books I and III) is cited twice.<sup>131</sup> The *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (especially Augustine’s exposition of Ps. 113) are also employed very frequently in the *Libellus synodalis*. Such diverse texts as the *De haeresibus* and the *Quaestiones in Genesim*, the *De vera religione* and the *De adulterinis coniugiis*, among other titles, are consulted at various points in the Parisian *acta*. Augustine’s ubiquity throughout the *Libellus synodalis* is doubtless representative of his perceived preeminence within the “ancient” Christian theological tradition, standing as the Latin West’s best and brightest. Here, he shares textual space with Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius of Alexandria, Lactantius, and Origen. If “high” theology and foreign policy were the order of the day, the Carolingian bishops came to Paris prepared with the most suitable works and “internationally” impressive names known to them. Augustine and his diverse *oeuvre* clearly topped the list.

Furthermore, Augustine is not only employed as a high theological source in this conciliar text, but also as a source for relevant history. As Noble observes, the writers of the *Libellus synodalis* drew from examples of icon worship described by Augustine in various texts in order to re-situate the practice as a problem of the “remote, and safe, past,” rather than as a matter of serious concern for contemporary Christians.<sup>132</sup> For example, the excerpt from Augustine’s *Liber de haeresibus* illustrates the case of Simon Magus, while a quotation from Book VIII of the *De civitate Dei* places the image-worship of Hermes Trismegistus within the distant context of Egyptian superstition.<sup>133</sup> The purported verdict of Augustine, as suggested by the clustering of these extracts in the *acta*, is that history has shown image worship to be a marginal problem, primarily among pagans (or crypto-pagans), not right-believing Christians. In his capacity as an authority on both ancient history and theological orthodoxy,

129 Council of Paris (825), c. VII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 487; c. VIII, p. 487; c. XVIII, p. 490; XXXIII, p. 493; c. XXXVII, p. 494; c. XXXVIII, p. 494; c. XLI, p. 495; c. XLVI, pp. 495–96; c. XLVIII, p. 496; c. LIII, p. 497; c. LV, pp. 497–98; c. LXIII, pp. 501–2; c. LXXIII, p. 505.

130 Council of Paris (825), c. LXII, ed. Werminghoff, pp. 500–1; c. XXVI, p. 516.

131 Council of Paris (825), c. LXXVI, ed. Werminghoff, p. 515, p. 519.

132 Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, 271.

133 Council of Paris (825), c. XV, XVIII, ed. Werminghoff, pp. 489, 490.

Augustine's nominal presence dominates the conciliar text.

For his part, Gregory the Great plays a more limited, less broadly authoritative role than in the “domestic,” reform-oriented *acta* of this period. Book X of the *Moralia in Iob* is cited once in the *Libellus synodalis*.<sup>134</sup> Otherwise, when Gregory is invoked it is through several of his letters.<sup>135</sup> In this respect, Gregory is a pope among popes, cited alongside Sylvester I, Gregory II, and Gregory III. Given the immediate context for this “conciliar” text and its intended papal audience, these appearances by ancient as well as relatively recent bishops of Rome are important. The excerpts selected from Gregory's letters show the great sixth-century pope in his administrative, political capacity governing the Roman Church and engaging in the diplomacy necessitated by his office.<sup>136</sup> In contrast to the broadly ministerial author of the *Regula pastoralis*, these snapshots of Gregory's papal career place him in a more constrained (if still crucial) role than the one he typically inhabits in Carolingian *acta*.

What must be emphasized again, however, is the exceptional nature of the *Libellus synodalis* and the exceptional (though not unprecedented) circumstances that facilitated its composition. The writer, or writers, of the *Libellus synodalis* pulled out all the stops in producing a remarkably wide-ranging *florilegium*. The occasion called, above all, for Augustine himself, in his own words, including his staggering magnum opus, the *De civitate Dei*. In qualitative terms, the Augustine encountered here is a markedly different figure than the semi-monastic pastor discernible in the Aachen (816) *acta*. The Augustine of the Paris *acta* (825) is positioned as the Latin West's foremost theological authority, and as an important, credible source for historical edification. The operation of Augustine's “name-value” within ninth-century discourses facilitated both of these textual iterations of “Augustine,” and many

---

134 Council of Paris (825), c. LX, ed. Werminghoff, p. 500.

135 Council of Paris (825), c. XI, ed. Werminghoff, p. 487, and c. LXXVI, p. 507 (*Ep. ad Serenum episcoporum Massiliensem*); c. XIII, p. 488 (*Ep. Ad Ianuarium*); c. XIII, p. 489, and c. LXXVI, p. 507 (*Ep. ad Secundum*); LXXVI, p. 507 (*Ep. laud.*).

136 On Gregory's letters, see Celia Chazelle, “Pictures, Books and the Illiterate: Pope Gregory I's Letters to Serenus of Marseilles,” *Word and Image* 6.2 (1990): 138–53; and Richard M. Pollard, “A Cooperative Correspondence: The Letters of Gregory the Great,” in Neil Brownen and Matthew Dal Santo, eds., *A Companion to Gregory the Great* (Leiden, 2013), 291–312.



additional, possible iterations. Yet, these distinct Augustines do not, in either the Aachen (816) or Paris (825) texts, exist simultaneously within a shared textual space. Carolingian writers had myriad potential Augustines from which to draw. They did so pragmatically, with a shrewd awareness of the particular needs of the conciliar text and the occasion of its composition.

### ‘The Government of Souls’: The Council of Paris (829)

While Augustine, and some of his most complex, major works, loomed large at the Council of Paris in 825, the *beatus* bishop of Hippo would play a far more peripheral role at another Parisian council convened four years later. Meanwhile, Gregory the Great, and in particular his *Regula pastoralis*, would again prove as indispensable at the 829 Council of Paris as he and his most famous work had at Aachen in 816. (See Appendix: Table 3.) As I have argued, the *Libellus synodalis* of 825 was largely exceptional among conciliar texts produced during Louis’s reign, a product of extraordinary circumstances and an “international” theological context. By contrast, the *acta* resulting from the Council of Paris in 829 are more congruous with the earlier reform councils in terms of the patristic authorities and texts consulted. This council, convoked by Louis the Pious and his eldest son, Lothar (by this point, the co-emperor), was intended to remedy serious ills among the secular clergy, the laity, and the political leaders of the empire.<sup>137</sup> In the years since Louis’s public penance at Attigny, several controversies had arisen: avaricious members of the upper clergy had neglected the responsibilities of their sacred ministry, while the co-emperors, and especially Louis, had behaved in ways that were considered as iniquitous and sinful by some ecclesiastical critics. Such scandalous behavior on the part of those entrusted with the spiritual and material care of the empire’s subjects could result in serious disasters, such as plagues and famine, clear signs of God’s anger.<sup>138</sup> Thus, like

---

137 Four councils were convoked on the Octave of Pentecost in 829, but for the other three councils, in Lyons, Toulouse, and Mainz, there is no extant written record. On this point, see De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 176. For the broader context of the Council of Paris and the texts resulting from it, see Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 179–87.

138 See De Jong, “The Wages of Sin (828–829),” in eadem, *The Penitential State*, 148–84. On contemporary views regarding Louis’s alleged *iniquitas*, see Booker, “Eloquence in Equity, Fluency in Iniquity,” in idem, *Past Convictions*, 213–46.

the reform councils of the previous decade, the 829 council sought to firmly instill proper order in the empire and its leadership, to please God through the diligent correction of the *imperium Christianum* and its *ordines*.

Given this explicit aim, the 829 council might well be interpreted as simply a continuation of the broad-scale reform objectives of the councils held between 813–17, which were similarly focused around the correction of the *ordines*. Yet, according to historian Steffen Patzold, the texts stemming from the 829 council—*acta* addressing the clergy, the ruler(s), and the lay nobility—spawned an innovative and enduring “model” of episcopal consciousness and authority, whereby Carolingian bishops firmly asserted their role as “*mediatores inter Deum et homines*,” of being the *ordo* “responsible for the salvation of the people of the whole of *ecclesia*.”<sup>139</sup> Despite this apparent novelty, however, Patzold rightly acknowledges that the individual elements woven together in the 829 *acta* were nothing new in or of themselves. Rather, they were “manufactured” in Late Antiquity and incorporated into the educational reforms instituted during the reigns of Pippin III and Charlemagne.<sup>140</sup> Under Charlemagne’s heir, the resources of the patristic past were continually, if subtly, re-shaped and re-purposed, whether in the service of monastic reform, international diplomacy, or, in 829, a bold new model of episcopal government. The names and words of the Church Fathers proved remarkably adaptable in the hands of creative Carolingian writers and compilers. Different “works” by Augustine and Gregory lent themselves to different ecclesio-political imperatives, but the nominal *auctoritas* of these “ancient” authors extended usefully from their *magna opera* to relatively “minor” texts, such as sermons and letters.

At the same time, nominal references to these Fathers in the conciliar texts of this period were not automatic or merely *pro forma*. As we have seen, Augustine and Gregory were missing in name from the *Ordinatio imperii* (817) and the Council of Attigny (822). So too are they absent from the

---

139 Patzold, *Episcopus*, 154.

140 Patzold, *Episcopus*, 153.

texts of the so-called *Concilia in Francia habitum*, two councils convoked at unidentified locations at some point between 825 and 829.<sup>141</sup> The brief *acta* of these councils stand as important precursors to the unified assertion of episcopal strength at Paris in 829. The first text, which survives in only one manuscript,<sup>142</sup> makes note of the special status of the bishop, who on account of his innocent life stands above others in the sight of God.<sup>143</sup> The second conciliar text emphasizes the importance of admonition to the bishop's *ministerium*, which had been a major aspect of concern at the reform Council of Aachen in 816 and would remain so at the forthcoming Council of Paris (829).<sup>144</sup> As a further point foreshadowing Paris, the first text includes a paraphrase from a papal decretal of Gelasius I (d. 496), who would prove to be a particularly important source in the Parisian *acta*.<sup>145</sup> While Gelasius will be invoked by name in the Council of Paris texts, a brief embellishment of his words was apparently sufficient here, in the *acta* of this council of indeterminate provenance.

The names of the Fathers, as well as their words, are ubiquitous across the three thematically-arranged books of *canones* composed following the Council of Paris in 829. In some cases, patristic names are even invoked independent of any particular reference to an author's works or ideas. For instance, the *acta* at one point draw a pair of quotations from the Council of Chalcedon (Canon 4), pertaining to the proper behavior of monks—who should “meddle neither in ecclesiastical nor in secular affairs”—and the administrative authority of bishops over the monasteries in their districts. The spirit of this canon is then logically extended to the notion that monks should avoid conversation with women, a point “clearly shown,” too, in the “*vita beati Augustini et beati Ambrosii et dicta sanctorum*

---

141 *Concilia in Francia habitum*, ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:2, pp. 589–95. Where Werminghoff places the council relating to the first text (no. 48) between 816 and 829, and the second between 818/19 and 829, Patzold, *Episcopos*, 148–49 situates these councils more narrowly between 825 and 829. See also Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 171–72.

142 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 130 Blankenb., fol. 104r–105v.

143 *Concilia in Francia habitum*, no. 48, c. III, ed. Werminghoff, p. 590: “Officium episcopi curam esse et fervorem ecclesiasticarum rerum et fidei firmamentum tam virtute verbi quam iusto rerum moderamine sacrae lectionis serie comprobamus. Sed tunc conversatio illius congruit officio, cum pro vitae innocentia actione praecipuus et prae cunctis fit contemplatione suspensus.”

144 *Concilia in Francia habitum*, no. 49, c. VI, ed. Werminghoff, p. 595.

145 *Concilia in Francia habitum*, no. 48, c. VI, ed. Werminghoff, p. 591.

*Cipriani et Hieronomi et aliorum plurimorum.*<sup>146</sup> Much like the earlier reference to Possidius's biography of Augustine in the Council of Aachen (816) text, it is again the virtuous life of Augustine (and his Milanese mentor) that are invoked as exemplary, alongside, here, the words of Cyprian, Jerome, and "many" unnamed others. Both the lives *and* words of these ancient Fathers are represented as standing in unison with the letter of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. As Karl Morrison has observed, "The body of canons held its position as the supreme law of the Church because it had been defined by the approval of 'all bishops throughout the whole word,' by 'all the Catholic Church.'" Ecumenical councils, like Chalcedon, were "special channels of that universal assent."<sup>147</sup> Of course none of the four Fathers invoked to support the statements from Chalcedon could have possibly been authors of, or signatories to, the canons of that great council: all were dead long before 451. But they are roughly parallel, commensurate sources of authority and orthodoxy, human equivalents to the ecumenical councils.

Although Gregory (who had not yet been born when the Council of Chalcedon met) is excluded from the above-noted patristic cluster, his presence is recurrent throughout many other sections of the 829 *acta*. Given that the purpose of this council was to correct both the clerical and lay orders, who through their improper behaviour had (evidently) elicited God's deep displeasure, Gregory's formidable role in the conciliar texts—in this case without Taio as a textual intermediary—should come as little surprise: the *Regula pastoralis* could be broadly applied and interpreted as speaking not only to the duties of bishops and other members of the clergy, but also to the right conduct of political sovereigns.<sup>148</sup> Often in that work Gregory addresses his instructions to *rectores* ("rulers"), thus

---

146 Council of Paris (829) [*Concillium Parisiense*], bk. I, c. XLVI, ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:2, p. 641: "His ita ex canonica auctoritate praemissis oportet, ut canonici et monachi se ab hoc illicito facto cohibeat, ne contingat eos canonica censura percelli, qua dicitur: 'Transgredientem vero hanc definitionem nostram excommunicatum esse decrevimus, ne nomen Domini blasphemetur.' Qualiter autem conlocutiones feminarum his, qui sacris officiis mancipati sunt, vitande sint, vita beati Augustini et beati Ambrosii et dicta sanctorum Cipriani et Hieronomi et aliorum plurimorum aperte ostendunt."

147 Morrison, *Tradition and Authority*, 244. On the apostolic origins of the church councils and the recognition of the seven ecumenical councils, see John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), 94.

148 Surveys of the citations to Gregory at the Council of Paris (829) can be found in Floryzszak, *Die Regula Pastoralis Gregors des Großen*, 328–32; and Judic, "La tradition de Grégoire le Grand," 42–43.

extending his ideal of pastoral care to include the care that Christian kings and emperors ought to provide for the souls living under their authority.<sup>149</sup> For instance, in *Regula pastoralis* II.7, on the proper balance between the active life and the contemplative life, Gregory writes, “Let the ruler not relax the care of the inner life by preoccupying himself with external matters, nor should his solicitude for the inner life bring neglect of the external, lest, being engrossed with what is external, he be ruined inwardly, or being preoccupied with what concerns only his inner self, he does not bestow on his neighbors the necessary external care.”<sup>150</sup> Advice of this sort is equally applicable to a bishop harried by the worldly obligations of overseeing his diocesan flock; or a “pious” emperor, concerned with both the material and spiritual welfare of his subjects. Given this adaptable quality in Gregory’s work, his pronouncement that “gold is dimmed when a holy life is corrupted by earthly deeds” serves as a potentially wide-reaching note of caution. Gregory’s statement, from the same chapter of the *Regula pastoralis* cited above (II.7), was prompted by his reflection upon Lamentations 4.1: “How is the gold become dim, the finest color is changed, the stones of the sanctuary scattered in the top of every street?” Both the verse from Lamentations and Gregory’s exegetical conclusions are included in a chapter of the *Paris acta*.<sup>151</sup> Although this chapter is explicitly directed at presbyters, Gregory’s answer

149 Robert A. Markus, “Gregory the Great’s *Rector* and His Genesis,” in Jacques Fontaine, et al., eds., *Grégoire le Grand: Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* (Paris, 1986), 142, observes regarding Gregory’s use of the term *rector* in the *Moralia in Iob*, “Gregory’s idea of the *rector* articulates a very broad and general notion of authority, exemplified, among other spheres, in the ecclesiastical. . . . In many [instances], however, the discussion of the ecclesiastical *rector* slides very easily into a general discussion of anyone in authority, and a fair number of Gregory’s discussions of the *rector* are so indeterminate in character that they leave the question as to whether they concern secular or ecclesiastical authority undecidable.” On the use of *rector* in the *Regula pastoralis*, Markus notes, “As in the *Moralia*, the *rector* is either a bearer of authority in general, or the specific equivalent of ‘bishop’” (143). Thus, even if Gregory sometimes meant to address bishops exclusively in referring to *rectores*, it is the frequent ambiguity and apparent generality of Gregory’s *rector* that helped to make his work so adaptable and applicable to *ordines* beyond the episcopate. See also Donald Bullough, *Alcuin, Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2004), 381 n. 157, who notes that Augustine occasionally used the term *rector* to refer to God, and Ambrose used it once in this way, but Gregory did not: “In Gregory’s writings and in the seventh and eighth centuries, *rectores* are most commonly officials, lay or ecclesiastical, or bishops.”

150 Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis*, II.7, PL 77, col. 38, “Sit rector interiorum curam in exteriorum occupatione non minuens, exteriorum providentiam in interiorum sollicitudine non relinquens; ne aut exterioribus deditus ab intimis corruat, aut solis interioribus occupatus, quae foris debet proximis non impendat”; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 68.

151 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. XXVIII, ed. Werminghoff, pp. 631–32: “Praesbyteri porro, qui non sui praelati imperio coacti, sed potius voluptatum suarum delectatione, immo avaritiae estuatione succensi, id facere praesumunt, perpendant necesse est, qua luctuosa descriptione Hieremias propheta Dei sub significatione auri eiusque coloris optimi lapidumque sanctuarii personam carnalium sacerdotum describat. Ait namque: *Quomodo obscuratum est aurum; mutatus est color optimus; dispersi sunt lapides sanctuarii in capite omnium platearum*. Quod beatus Gregorius in libro pastorali ita

to the prophet Jeremiah’s question might well speak to anyone endeavoring to live a life of Christian leadership. This type of flexibility in Gregory’s writings contributed greatly to his enormous appeal. The instructions of the *Regula pastoralis* are just particular enough to be practically applicable to the delineation and definition of the *ordines*—still a major concern for emperor and episcopate alike, hence the division of the Paris *acta* into sections concerning the various orders of society. Yet, at the same time, Gregory often cast a wide net; he was acutely attuned to the inherent imperfection shared by all of the ostensibly distinct orders of this world.<sup>152</sup>

This generality notwithstanding, Gregory’s words, and the authority that his name carried, could also be used to bolster the special status of the secular clergy. In the opening chapter of the *Regula pastoralis*, Gregory famously asserted that “the government of souls is the art of arts!”<sup>153</sup> Though all *rectores*, clerical or lay, would need to contribute to this vision of Christian governance, those occupying the “pastoral office” (*pastorale magisterium*) were ultimately, uniquely responsible for the souls of their flock. Thus, at a council emphasizing the unique and privileged role of the episcopate, the *magnus* pope was employed as an expert witness to the deep importance of mindful ecclesiastical administration and correct preaching. In one crucial chapter of the *acta*, *sancti sacerdotes* are situated as *successores apostolorum*; the example set by the clergy, through their manner of life and teaching, is described as being absolutely critical to the salvation of the empire’s lay subjects.<sup>154</sup> This chapter includes a quotation from Pomerius’s *De vita contemplativa*—albeit credited to Prosper of Aquitaine—

---

exponit: ‘Quid namque auro, quod metallis ceteris praeminet, nisi excellentia sanctitatis, quid colore optimo nisi cunctis amabilis reverentia religionis exprimitur, quid sanctuarii lapidibus nisi sacrorum ordinum persone signantur, quid platearum nomine nisi presentis vitae latitudo figuratur? Cf. Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* II.7, PL 77, col. 40; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 70–71.

152 On this important point, see especially Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 131–59; Robert A. Markus, “*Integritas animi*: Ministry in the Church,” in idem, *Gregory the Great and His World*, 17–33; Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988), esp. 1–27, 147–61.

153 Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* I.1, PL 77, col. 14: “Ab imperitis ergo pastorale magisterium qua temeritate suscipitur, quando ars est artium regimen animarum”; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 21.

154 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. IIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 611, citing Pomerius, *De vita contemplativa* II.2. Joseph C. Plumpe, “*Pomeriana*,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 1.4 (1947): 227–33, has demonstrated that Pomerius employed the terms *sacerdotes* and *pontifices* interchangeably in referring to bishops. De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 179–84, argues for a similar reading of *sacerdotes* as it is used in many instances throughout the Council of Paris text.

a paranetic source for the episcopate, wherein, significantly, the term *sacerdotes* is generally meant to refer to bishops. Before and after Pomerius (or “Prosper”) are quotations from the *Regula pastoralis*. First, the *acta* writers draw upon Gregory’s comparison in *Regula pastoralis* III.40 of the good preacher to the cock, which makes a great effort to wake and alert itself before crowing. In a similar fashion, insists Gregory, “they, who give utterance to words of holy preaching, should first be awake in the earnest practice of good deeds, lest, being themselves slack in performing them, they stir up others by words only.”<sup>155</sup> Then, following the excerpt from the *De vita contemplativa*, are a series of quotations from *Regula pastoralis* I.2, which attest further to the importance of diligent pastoral guidance—and the profound danger of negligence. “No one does more harm in the Church than he, who having the title or rank of holiness, acts wickedly,” writes Gregory, an assertion that he strengthens by quoting from Matt. 18:6 on this point. This scriptural verse (also quoted in the *acta* chapter) provides an utterly unambiguous condemnation of ministerial misconduct: “He that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drown in the depth of the sea.” And then Gregory again, his own rhetoric now intensified to echo the furious language of the evangelist: “Therefore, if a man vested with the appearance of holiness destroys others by word or example, it certainly were better for him that his earthly deeds, performed in a worldly guise, should press him to death, rather than that his sacred offices should have pointed him out to others for sinful imitation; surely, the punishment of Hell would prove less severe for him if he fell alone.”<sup>156</sup> Before all this daunting hellfire, in the same

---

155 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. III, ed. Werminghoff, p. 611, citing Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* III.40: “Unde beatus Gregorius in libro pastorali, cum per gallum boni praedicatoris speciem tractando exponeret, inter cetera sic ait: ‘Gallus, cum iam edere cantus parat, prius alas excutit et semetipsum feriens vigilantiozem reddit. Quia nimirum necesse est, ut hi, qui verba sanctae praedicationis movent, prius studio bone actionis evigilent, ne in semetipsis torpentes opere, alios excitent voce, prius se per sublimia facta excutiant et tunc ad bene vivendum alios sollicitos reddant’; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 233.

156 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. III, ed. Werminghoff, p. 612, citing Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* I.2: “Unde fit, ut, sicut in supra memorato libro beatus Gregorius scribit, ‘cum pastor per abrupta graditur, ad precipitium grex sequatur. Nemo quippe,’ ut idem ait, ‘amplius in ecclesia nocet quam qui perverse agens nomen vel ordinem sanctitatis habet.’ Pertimescenda porro nihilominus sacerdotibus sententia ewangelica est, qua dicitur: *Qui scandalizaverit unum de pusillis istis, qui in me credunt, expedit ei, ut suspendatur mola asinaria in collo eius et dimergatur in profundum maris*, quod quibusdam interpositis isdem doctor ita exponit: ‘Qui ergo ad sanctitatis speciem deductus vel verbo ceteros destruit vel exemplo, melius profecto fuerat, ut hunc ad mortem sub exteriori habitu terrena acta constringerent quam sacra officia in

conciliar chapter, there is a reference to Matt. 16:19, that is, to the idea that bishops inherited the keys to the kingdom of heaven so as to bind and loose souls on earth as well as above. This notion, taken from Matthew's gospel, is central to the discursive construction of bishops as *mediatores inter Deum et homines*. Yet, with such profound power comes perilous consequences for that power's misuse, a point established by the evangelist, through Christ, and reconfirmed by the patristic authors cited here. Gregory's extended reflections upon this point serve to reenforce the idea that *sancti sacerdotes* make up the empire's most vital *ordo*, ultimately responsible for the salvation of all Christians. Gregory's work, and the sense of authority invested in his name, are thus key to the conception of episcopal supremacy expressed in the Paris *acta*.

This assertion of episcopal power raises the question of precisely what—or how much—power bishops held vis-à-vis the emperors in 829. Recent, historiographical estimates differ markedly on this point. Mayke de Jong, for example, notes that when the conciliar record quotes from Gelasius's letter, the bishops “had no intention of proclaiming a doctrine of the two swords, or of undermining the position of Louis the Pious; on the contrary, these bishops dealt with an extremely powerful ruler, and tried to reaffirm their own authority (*pondus sacerdotum*) by projecting themselves as the only valid mediators between an enraged deity and a penitent Carolingian leadership. . . . The bishops in Paris in 829 did not claim any real ascendancy over the emperor, nor did they consciously develop a ‘*Staatstheologie*’ of any sort.”<sup>157</sup> In contrast to this image of a relatively insecure episcopate, grasping at a kind of *auctoritas* (or *potestas*) that it did not in fact possess, Michael Moore contends that “[t]he bishops had assembled in Paris . . . as the *rectors* of society, confident of their potency as the Vicars of the Apostles, and confident, too, in their ability to govern and teach, an order of men distinct from the rest of society, and in their purity and connection to God having a duty to guide and correct society.”<sup>158</sup>

---

culpa ceteris imitabilem demonstrarent, quia nimirum, si solus caderet, utcumque hunc tolerabilior inferni poena cruciaret.”; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 24–25.

<sup>157</sup> De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 177.

<sup>158</sup> Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, 327. See also on this point, Patzold, *Episcopus*, 510.



With regard to Gregory's "name-value" in the conciliar text, this question of episcopal self-consciousness, self-confidence, and power does not necessarily need to be settled here; but it is nevertheless a question interesting to consider in evaluating the *acta* writers' use of patristic sources. Gregory, and with him Isidore, are frequently invoked throughout the *acta*; in addition to the numerous quotations from the *Regula pastoralis*, the conciliar writers also make use of Gregory's *Homiliae in Evangelia* and *Moralia in Iob*.<sup>159</sup> At another point in the text, a quotation from Isidore's *Sententiae* is attributed to Gregory.<sup>160</sup> Whether the power of Carolingian bishops was actual or merely aspirational, Gregory's name and his words were recognized as useful sources of authority, either in preserving a rightful *potestas* or in attempting to achieve it by asserting the moral authority of the episcopate.

### Augustine and Augustinians

While the writings and ideas, and not just the nominal authority, of Gregory, Isidore, and Gelasius were distinctively useful toward the aims of Carolingian bishops in 829, Augustine's work was, evidently, decidedly less so. In 825, the *acta* writers of the earlier Council of Paris took full advantage of Augustine's writings, including works like the *De civitate Dei* and *De doctrina Christiana*. The writers of that conciliar text went to great lengths to assert the authority and orthodoxy of their *canones* for an "international" audience; Augustine, the Latin West's great theologian, was vital to this strategy. Not only are Augustine's "major" works absent from the 829 *acta* (as they were in the 816 Council of Aachen), but the conciliar text is nearly devoid of references to his authentic writings.

This point is slightly baffling when one considers that bishop Jonas of Orléans is widely accepted to have been one of the principal writers of the 829 *acta*. Lengthy sections of Jonas's *De institutione*

---

159 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. XII, ed. Werminghoff, pp. 618–19, citing Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* II.14, 17; bk. I, c. XIII, p. 621, citing Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia* II.23; bk. III, c. XXV, p. 678, citing Gregory, *Moralia in Iob* I. c. 9/13.

160 Council of Paris (829), bk. II, c. I, ed. Werminghoff, p. 651, citing Isidore, *Sententiae* III.48 as "Gregorius in moralibus."

*laicali* (composed prior to 828) appear within the conciliar text.<sup>161</sup> In this *speculum*, Jonas makes extensive use of Augustine, evincing a broad familiarity with him that is indeed comparable with the *Libellus synodalis* of 825, which modern historians have also attributed, at least in part, to Jonas.<sup>162</sup> Yet, the presence of Augustine’s actual work in the texts resulting from the 829 council is remarkably scant. His *Sermo* 46 is used, as it was at Aachen in 816.<sup>163</sup> Two short extracts from Augustine’s *Tractatus in epistulam Iohannis* share space here with Cassiodorus, Jerome, and Pseudo-Jerome.<sup>164</sup> There is also a direct quotation of Augustine’s authentic writings—a passage from the *Enchiridion* (c. LXVII)—in a chapter of the *acta* re-purposed from Jonas’s *De institutione laicali* (bk. I, chapter 19). In the section quoted by Jonas (and the *acta*), Augustine argues:

It is believed, moreover, by some, that men who do not abandon the name of Christ, and who have been baptized in the Church by His baptism, and who have never been cut off from the Church by any schism or heresy, though they should live in the grossest sin, and never either wash it away in penitence nor redeem it by almsgiving, but persevere in it persistently to the last day of their lives, shall be saved by fire: that is, that although they shall suffer a punishment by fire, lasting for a time proportionate to the magnitude of their crimes and misdeeds, they shall not be punished with everlasting fire. But those who believe this, and yet are Catholics, seem to me to be led astray by a kind of benevolent feeling natural to humanity. For Holy Scripture, when consulted, gives a very different answer.<sup>165</sup>

This contention, which is preceded by quotations from Bede and Origen, is then followed by unimpeachable evidence from Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians. Augustine is here part of a rapid-fire deployment of patristic and biblical authorities attesting to the importance of penance and good works in achieving salvation. A nominal faith in Christ is not on its own enough. The successors to the

161 In addition to the excerpts taken from the *De institutione laicali*, the Paris *acta* also includes sections from Jonas’s later *De institutione regia* (ca. 834).

162 On Jonas and the sources used for his writings, see James Lepree, “Sources of Spirituality and the Carolingian Exegetical Tradition” (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 2008), 13–45; Mary Jegen, “Jonas of Orléans (c. 780–843): His Pastoral Writings and Their Social Significance” (Ph.D. diss., Saint Louis University, 1967). Regarding Jonas’s role at the Council of Paris, see Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 182.

163 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. XXVIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 628.

164 Council of Paris (829), bk. I, c. LIII, ed. Werminghoff, pp. 645–48.

165 Council of Paris (829), bk. II, c. X, ed. Werminghoff, p. 662 (from Augustine, *Enchiridion*, c. 67): “Augustinus quoque in libro Enchiridion: ‘Creduntur, inquit, etiam hi, qui nomen Christi non relinquunt et eius lavacro in ecclesia baptizantur nec ab ea ullo schismate vel heresi praeceduntur, in quantilibet sceleribus vivant, que nec diluant paenitendo nec elemosynis redimant, sed in eis usque ad ultimum huius vitae diem pertinacissime perseverent, salvi futuri per ignem, licet pro magnitudine facinorum flagitiorumque diuturno, non tamen aeterno igni puniri. Sed qui hoc credunt et tamen catholici sunt, humana quadam benevolentia mihi falli videntur. Nam scriptura divina aliud consulta respondit.’”; Augustine, *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love*, trans. J. B. Shaw (Washington, D.C., 1996), 78–79.

apostles, binders and loosers in the government of souls, can alone provide the vital mediation so as to ensure that faithful Christians avoid the eternal fire of Hell. Augustine precisely articulates a soteriologically dangerous notion that some ninth-century lay Christian leaders may have maintained.

Beyond, however, this important quotation from the *Enchiridion* and the few other aforementioned references to Augustine, there are only some extracts from *Pseudo-Augustinian* sermons, here ascribed to Augustine. These nominal citations to Augustine share the same authorial currency as do the references to Augustine's actual writings, but apparently the need for Augustine in name—whether tied to authentic or apocryphal works—is far less urgent here than it was in the discursive context of the 825 conciliar texts. For a purportedly key moment in the political ascendance of the Western episcopate, the “Political Augustinianism” of the 829 *acta* is notably short on Augustine himself.

Of course, this relative shortage of references to Augustine's authentic work does not mean that the conciliar text is short on ostensibly Augustinian names and voices. Beyond Gregory and Isidore, there are also key references to Fulgentius of Ruspe and Pomerius/Prosper. Fulgentius of Ruspe, whose *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae* is quoted at length alongside passages from Isidore and Pseudo-Cyprian,<sup>166</sup> was perceived as a devout disciple of Augustine, an heir of sorts within the North African Church.<sup>167</sup> Pomerius's *De vita contemplativa* is employed at numerous points in the conciliar text, although sometimes the council writers ascribe quotations from it to Pomerius himself and other times to Prosper.<sup>168</sup> Pomerius, a native of Africa who fled to Gaul in the later part of the fifth century, was relatively obscure in name by the Carolingian era, though his extant work, an Augustinian guidebook for bishops, was frequently cited in the mid-eighth to mid-ninth century.<sup>169</sup> Prosper's name,

---

166 Council of Paris (829), bk. II, c. I, ed. Werminghoff, p. 650, citing Fulgentius, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae* II.38.

167 On Fulgentius's Augustinianism, see now Francis X. Gumerlock, “Fulgentius of Ruspe on the Saving Will of God,” in Alexander Y. Hwang, Brian J. Matz, and Augustine Casiday, eds., *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius* (Washington, D.C., 2014), 155–79.

168 Regarding the use of the *De vita contemplativa* at the Council of Paris, see Timmermann, “Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue,” 36–43.

169 On Pomerius's Augustinianism, see Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism*, 65–80; and Timmermann, “Sharers in the

meanwhile, like that of Fulgentius, was closely associated with Augustine, on account of Prosper's tireless defense of Augustine against the so-called "semi-Pelagians."<sup>170</sup> His own polemical writings are not included in the conciliar text, but his name alone carries with it an unmistakably Augustinian connotation.<sup>171</sup> If Augustinianism in the Latin West—the Augustinianism of Fulgentius, Pomerius, and Prosper, of Gregory and Isidore—was very broadly synonymous with orthodoxy for the Carolingians, perhaps this equation rendered the actual, authentic Augustine increasingly less necessary, at least within the particular discursive space of the Church councils. The "father who says 'everything,' [and thus] says nothing distinctive,"<sup>172</sup> *could* in fact say rather distinctive things when called upon directly, *because* more often than not later Augustinians, with their own patristic name-values, said everything else for him in his stead.

Carolingian writers had plenty of indirect options for incorporating generally "Augustinian" ideas, articulated in a more accessible fashion by another authoritative voice. Gregory, as we have seen, served well as a particularly effective Augustinian intermediary, at least under typical conciliar circumstances. Robert Markus has argued that "[t]he grand simplification of Gregory's model had more influence on medieval political thought than the complexities of Augustine's theology of social living."<sup>173</sup> The *acta* of the Council of Aachen (816), Smaragdus's roughly contemporaneous *Diadema monachorum*, and the Council of Paris (829) certainly stand as evidence of Gregory's tremendous importance for the ecclesio-political reforms attempted between the late reign of Charlemagne and the early years of Louis's reign. However, it is precisely a particular branch of Augustine's "theology of social living," namely his views on the ideal communal life of clerics (articulated in sermons 355 and

---

Contemplative Virtue," 5–11.

170 See Alexander Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine* (Washington, D.C., 2009), who argues for the term *doctores Gallicani* to describe Prosper's opponents in Gaul.

171 See Timmermann, "Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue," esp. 14–17. Also, on the use of Prosper and Fulgentius as recognizably Augustinian sources at a slightly later point in the ninth century, see Brian J. Matz, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination," in Alexander Y. Hwang, Brian J. Matz, and Augustine Casiday, eds., *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius* (Washington, D.C., 2014), 235–70.

172 Leyser, "Augustine in the Latin West," 452.

173 Robert A. Markus, "The Latin Fathers," in James H. Burns, ed., *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c. 350–c. 450* (Cambridge, 1988), 122.

356), that Carolingian reformers recognized as readily usable and compatible with Gregory's pastoral "model," as well as with Pomerius's work instructing bishops on how to attain the spiritual perfection associated with the monastic life. In *Sermo* 46, meanwhile, Augustine sketched his own "model" of pastoral responsibility and accountability; this illustration did not require Gregory's "simplification," but it was rendered more adaptive and expansive when situated alongside Gregory's broadly applicable language of leadership.

If Gregory, as a name and voice distinct from an "Augustinian" Latin Christian orthodoxy, was regarded as the chief authority for the evolving imperatives of the Carolingian reform program, it was Carolingian ecclesiastics themselves who served to construct that heightened authority through their ubiquitous use—if indirectly, via, principally, Taio's synthetic *Sententiae*—of Gregory's names and works. Gregory's views on pastoral care and leadership were distinctly useful, not least for their elaboration and embellishment of recognizably Augustinian principles, and thus they were used. But the authority attributed to Gregory was also useful in and of itself, providing a strong, ostensibly ancient foundation to support the prerogatives of Carolingian reformers who would rather appear as dutiful adherents to the "teachings of the ancient fathers" than as innovators—or as "authors" in their own right. Except in special circumstances, such as the treatment of icons in the "Council" of Paris (825) texts, Augustine's textual role here appears rather more limited and supplemental in nature, particularly when compared with that of his some of his nominal disciples: Isidore, Julianus Pomerius, and especially Gregory. The authority ascribed to sources of patristic thought, or to the "authors" of those sources, was not constant and uniform across textual settings. Rather, that authority was situational, contingent upon the objectives, and the presumed audience, of a given conciliar text. Yet, if the relationship between authorship and authority in these texts was variable and less than consistent, the interdependence of authority and utility was absolutely fundamental.

## AFTERWORD

### *POST APOSTOLOS OMNIUM ECCLESiarUM MAGISTER?*

\*

When Louis the Pious convoked the synods of 829, including the Council of Paris, his explicit aim was to restore the empire and its concomittant *ordines* to a state of stability. The worried emperor reasoned that God had evidently grown displeased with mismanagement in all corners of Christian society. The correction of the secular clergy, the lay nobility, and the rulers themselves—following the words of scripture, the Church Fathers, and the *canones* of the ancient councils—would serve to right the course of these wayward *ordines*, and thus the empire as a whole would return to the harmony of divine favor.

Things did not play out accordingly.

A series of rebellions in the years between 830 and 833, led by Louis's older sons, Lothar, Pippin of Aquitaine, and Louis the German, resulted in the emperor's deposition in October 833. For the second time in just over a decade, Louis performed an act of public penance. This ritual, and Louis's removal from the throne, were intended to stand as binding, having been dutifully administered by a high-ranking group of bishops. Yet, while the episcopate had boldly asserted its status as mediators between God and men in the *acta* of the Council of Paris, they also sensed that they were venturing into *terra incognita*.<sup>174</sup> Thus, in the document produced by these bishops, the *Relatio episcoporum*, they are indeed careful to cite the key verse from Matthew's gospel, standing here as firm evidence of their power to bind and loose souls, on earth as in heaven.

Shortly after their use of Matt. 18:18–19, and before listing the particular offenses of which

Louis is guilty, the *Relatio* authors briefly invoke Gregory. They write:

<sup>174</sup> On the sense of anxiety and uncertainty discernible in the bishops' performance of authority in the *Relatio episcoporum* of 833, see Booker, *Past Convictions*, 175–82; De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 234–41.

[W]ith respect to the errors of sinners, these same shepherds of Christ [i.e., the bishops presiding over Louis's penance] should avidly seek to maintain the most prudent temperance, so that [on the one hand] in accordance with the example of blessed [Pope] Gregory [the Great]'s teaching, *they may be through humility partners with those doing well, but through the zeal of justice resolute against the vices of sinners...*<sup>175</sup>

A passage similar to the italicized portion above appears in the *Regula pastoralis* in both Book II, chapter one and Book II, chapter six. It is worth noting that both of these chapters speak generally to the ideal conduct of rulers. In the above-quoted passage's first appearance, it is preceded by Gregory's contention that "[t]he conduct of a prelate should so far surpass the conduct of the people, as the life of a pastor sets him apart from his flock."<sup>176</sup> It is principally the behavior of the *praesul* that is being discussed here; the exemplary life of the *pastor* is in this instance taken as a given, and is simply meant to be instructive to leaders broadly-conceived. In the second iteration of the short quotation deployed in the bishops' text (Bk. II, ch. 6 of the *Regula pastoralis*), Gregory implores *rectores* to be fair and humble, but also stern when necessary. Multiple quotations from this chapter of the *Regula pastoralis* appeared earlier in the Council of Aachen (816) *acta*; they are all excerpted from the same chapter of Gregory's work, but are subtly re-woven together as follows:

Wherefore, all who are superiors should not regard in themselves the power of their rank, but the equality of their nature. For, as we said before, our ancient fathers are recorded to have been not kings of men, but shepherds of flocks. Yet it is necessary that rulers should be feared by subjects, when they see that the latter do not fear God. Lacking fear of God's judgments, these must at least fear sin out of pride when superiors seek to inspire fear, whereby they do not seek personal glory, but the righteousness of their subjects. In fact, inspiring fear in those who lead evil lives, superiors lord it, as it were, over beasts, not over men, because, in so far as their subjects are beasts, they ought also to be subjugated by fear.<sup>177</sup>

---

175 Courtney M. Booker, "The Public Penance of Louis the Pious: A New Edition of the *Episcoporum de poenitentia, quam Hludowicus imperator professus est, relatio Compendiensis* (833)," *Viator* 39 (2008): 11–12, "Quapropter eisdem pastoribus Christi summopere studendum est, ut erga errata delinquentium moderationem discretissimam teneant, ut sint iuxta beati Gregorii doctrinam *bene agentibus per humilitatem socii, contra delinquentium uero uitia per zelum iustitiae erecti. . .*"; trans. Booker, *Past Convictions*, 258.

176 Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* II.1, PL 77, col. 25: "Tantum debet actionem populi actio transcendere praesulis, quantum distare solet a grege vita pastoris"; trans. Davis, *Gregory the Great*, 45.

177 Council of Aachen (816), c. XIII, ed. Werminghoff, p. 337, citing Gregory, *Regula pastoralis* II.6: "Cuncti, qui praesunt, non in se potestatem debent ordinis, sed aequalitatem pensare conditionis. Nam, sicut praefati sumus, antiqui patres nostri pastores pecorum et non reges hominum fuisse memorantur. Necesse est ergo, ut rectores a subditis timeantur, quando ab eisdem Deum minime timeri deprehendunt, ut humana saltim formidine peccare metuant qui divina iudicia non formidant. Nequaquam prepositi ex subiectorum timore superbiant, in quo non suam gloriam, sed subditorum iustitiam quaerunt. In eo autem, quod metum sibi a perverse viventibus exigunt, quasi non hominibus, sed animalibus dominantur, qui videlicet ex qua parte bestiales sunt subditi, ex ea debent etiam formidine iacere substrati."; trans. Davis,

It is precisely this type of leadership posture that the group of bishops, nearly two decades later, sought to demonstrate in overseeing Louis's penance—humble and egalitarian, but also justly authoritative, inspiring fear where necessary. Yet, this chapter in Gregory's work was addressed explicitly to *rectores; pastores* as a special category of leaders are, again (as in *Regula pastoralis* II.1), mentioned only as a point of aspiration. It is Taio of Saragossa who re-worked this chapter from the *Regula pastoralis*, interweaving it with other Gregorian quotations, to create a chapter in his own work addressed specifically to *pastores*. That chapter from Taio's *Sententiae* (II.32) was subsequently the basis for the above-quoted chapter from the Aachen (816) *acta*. Between the uses of *Regula pastoralis* II.6 at the Aachen reform council and the *Relatio episcoporum* (833), Gregory's advice for *rectores* was increasingly understood as advice for bishops. They were a special type of leader, standing "resolute against the vices of sinners," and equipped with the unique, apostolic right (and duty) of correcting even wayward emperors. It is the powerful authorial currency of "blessed Gregory" (coupled, of course, with the testimony of scripture) that allows these bishops to unequivocally assert this righteous claim in such a fraught, precarious setting.

Along with Gregory, it is not Augustine but another "great" pope, Leo I (a short quotation from *Ep.* 167, not cited by name), who makes it into the *Relatio episcoporum*. This is interesting, given that in a letter issued some four months earlier, Pope Gregory IV berated the faction of Frankish bishops still supportive of Louis, using, among other patristic passages, a very pointed quotation from the *De civitate Dei* (Bk. 5, ch. 24) illustrating the qualities of a Christian emperor worthy of his subjects' fidelity.<sup>178</sup> Gregory IV asks the loyalist bishops why they do not, by the duty of their ministry, teach Augustine's words to their errant ruler. Certainly, in quoting Augustine at length, the pope means to

---

*Gregory the Great*, 60–61.

<sup>178</sup> Gregorius IV, *Epist.*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH, *Epp.* 5 (Berlin, 1899), 231. See Cornelia Scherer, "Gregor IV. im Kampf um das Erbe Ludwigs des Frommen I: Die Riese ins Frankenreich 833," in eadem, *Der Pontifikat Gregors IV. (827–844): Vorstellungen und Wahrnehmungen päpstlichen Handelns im 9. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2013), 165–95; Booker, *Past Convictions*, 133–36; and Van Renswoude, "License to Speak," 337–50. De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 220–21, suggests that the letter may not in fact have been written by Gregory, but perhaps by Agobard of Lyons.



suggest that Louis had come to sorely lack these admirable qualities. A similar use of this quotation from the *De civitate Dei* (whether prompted by the fiery papal letter or not) would have been entirely appropriate, and effective, in the *Relatio episcoporum*.<sup>179</sup> Yet, Augustine is absent from the text.

Gregory the Great, Leo the Great, and numerous references to the Bible were, in the judgment of the *Relatio*'s authors, sufficient for producing an (ostensibly) eternally binding, virtually unprecedented ritual.<sup>180</sup>

Whatever the case, Louis's deposition and monastic incarceration did not last long. By early 834, Louis was restored to the throne, despite the best efforts of the *pastores-cum-rectores* who had orchestrated his penance and deposition. Recent historiographical judgments have suggested that the restored emperor was in fact strengthened politically by his second display of public penance,<sup>181</sup> and that he remained a formidable, effective sovereign until his death in 840.<sup>182</sup> A council held in Aachen in 836 was intended as a demonstration of this new imperial stability—a return to the right order of things.<sup>183</sup> In the *acta* of this council, Gregory once again plays a very prominent role, with most of the citations

---

179 Booker, *Past Convictions*, 339 n. 25, observes that Jonas of Orléans had recently used this quotation from the *De civitate Dei* (in his *De institutione regia*), which supports the notion, posited by Booker, that Gregory IV's letter may have been composed in response to a letter from Jonas.

180 This selection of sources, considered alongside the use of Gelasius I at Paris (829), may perhaps suggest a special respect for, or reliance upon, *papal* authority—that is, as a type of authority similar to, but distinguishable from, patristic authority more broadly. The Franks, and specifically the Frankish episcopate, had a complex, sometimes seemingly contradictory relationship with the idea of centralized papal power. Regarding this point, Morrison, *Tradition and Authority*, 228–29, observes that, “For Frankish thinkers, the pre-eminence of the Roman bishop and his see were indisputable. In the ninth century, Franks normally accorded popes the title ‘universal pope,’ often combined with ‘supreme pontiff’ . . . [Yet] [e]ven so, many Frankish thinkers placed severe qualifications on the doctrine of Roman primacy.” More recently, Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, 245, notes that, “[Carolingian] [b]ishops . . . strove to establish a ‘standard library’ of canonical books in a series of great councils and other initiatives countering local episcopal independence. They believed that they were thereby furthering the aims of a ‘Roman Catholic Church.’ It even appears that Roman Catholicism was a Frankish invention. Yet . . . bishops were prepared to oppose the popes themselves in pursuing their ideas. The centrality of Rome therefore remained an ambiguous ideal.” On the presence and function of popes in the slightly later Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, see Clara Harder, *Pseudoisidore und das Papsttum: Funktion und Bedeutung des apostolischen Stuhls in den pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen* (Cologne, 2014), esp. 95–144.

181 De Jong, *The Penitential State*, 241–49.

182 See Janet L. Nelson, “The Last Years of Louis the Pious,” in Roger Collins and Peter Godman, eds., *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)* (Oxford, 1990), 147–59.

183 On this council generally, see Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, 190–94. Scholars have noted the many similarities between this conciliar text and that of Paris (829); although much had, of course, changed in the seven years separating these councils, the model of episcopal authority produced at Paris was largely reiterated, and reconfirmed, at Aachen. The “Paris Model” would indeed continue to loom large in conciliar legislation over the decades that followed. On these points, see especially Patzold, *Episcopus*, 199–221; and Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, 340–48.

coming from the *Regula pastoralis*.<sup>184</sup> (See Appendix: Table 4.) Isidore is, predictably, a major player here, too. Pomerius-as-Prosper and Fulgentius put in appearances. This is not a conciliar text that is anywhere near bereft of patristic sources. And yet Augustine, while cited twice in an epistle to King Pippin compiled with the conciliar text,<sup>185</sup> is nowhere to be found in the main *acta*.

\*

Where we began with Augustine so prominently at the fore—as (per Marrou) the “Master without rival” in the early Middle Ages, *post Apostolos omnium ecclesiarum magister*—we end our survey of two decades of Carolingian church councils with an Augustine who is a rather more spectral figure. Not a domineering Father, but a supporting one. In principal, all, or at least much, may well have flowed from him, as Marrou argued, but it flowed into other, distinctive tributaries of patristic authority, including, perhaps most significantly of all, Gregory.

A focus on Augustine’s textual presence *in relation to that of Gregory* has made it possible to discern some suggestive limitations in the reach of Augustine’s authority, within the particular, circumscribed textual context under investigation here. By contrast, a study tracing the manuscript transmission of Augustine’s authentic, “major” works would no doubt tell a very different story.<sup>186</sup> Alternately, an approach focused more intensely upon the circulation and embellishment of particular Augustinian ideas would likely, as I have suggested above, confirm as at least partly credible the notion that everything flowed forth from Augustine in the early Middle Ages. Yet, what the route I have taken

---

184 Council of Aachen (836) [*Concillium Aquisgranense*], c. I, ed. Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia* 2:2, p. 706 (*Regula pastoralis* I.8); c. VII, p. 707 (*Regula pastoralis* I praef.); c. VIII, p. 708 (*Regula pastoralis* II.1); c. X, p. 708 (*Regula pastoralis* II.8); c. XV, p. 709 (*Regula pastoralis* I.1); c. XVI, p. 709 (*Regula pastoralis* I.1); c. XVII, p. 709 (*Regula pastoralis* II.11); c. XVIII, p. 709 (*Regula pastoralis* III praef.); c. XLI, p. 715 (Isidore, *Sententiae* III.48, incorrectly attributed to Gregory); c. LIII, p. 720 (*Moralia* I.9,13). On the use of the *Regula pastoralis* in this conciliar text, see Floryzszak, *Die Regula Pastoralis Gregors des Großen*, 332–35.

185 Council of Aachen (836): *Epistola concilii Aquisgranensi ad Pippinum regem directa*, ed. Werminghoff, p. 730 (a quotation nominally citing Augustine but unidentified as such by Werminghoff), and p. 760 (citing Augustine, *Tractatus 50 in evang. Iohannis*). Regarding the conciliar epistle to Pippin, see Patzold, *Episcopus*, 218–21.

186 See Gorman, *The Manuscript Traditions*.

has shown is that those very ideas, which may have stemmed from Augustine, were not, and did not need to be, *nominally* connected to him in order to support the *canones* of the Church councils in our period. What this means, in effect, is that, rather than shrugging off Augustine's presence in a given conciliar text because it is only (and always) to be expected, scholars can instead *make something* of his presence where it does appear, can determine what work it is doing that is distinctive or useful.

Authorship did matter to the Carolingians. If it did not, or if the ideas being expressed were all that mattered, we would not find, across the spectrum of texts that they produced, so many *nominal*, *explicit* citations to the Church Fathers, not to mention, of course, the even more numerous references to the particular, presumptive authors of biblical books.<sup>187</sup> This does not mean that Carolingian writers or compilers infallibly provided a nominal citation for the patristic passages that they reappropriated;<sup>188</sup> or that when they did offer a citation, that it was necessarily correct, or direct. But, put simply, *names* were generally very important within the ecclesio-political culture of the Church councils. The most significant names were associated with key texts, which they had, at least purportedly, written. Whether in the service of bolstering the program of reforms championed by a pious emperor, or in carefully administering that same emperor's deposition and penance, the names of prophets, apostles, and Church Fathers performed vital, and versatile, discursive functions. The pragmatic, ninth-century ecclesiastical writers who composed the conciliar texts authored, or *re*-authored, the authority of patristic writers by continuously reiterating the orthodoxy and canonicity of the names they cited again and again. This was particularly true for later Fathers, like Gregory and Isidore—both of whom accrued a heightened authorial interest in our period—but it was also true for Augustine, who was always ready

---

187 Furthermore, as Richard Rouse, "The Transmission of Texts," in Richard Jenkyns, ed., *The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal* (Oxford, 1992), 47, observes, the Carolingians sometimes actively sought out the autograph manuscripts of texts considered to be particularly important, such as the *Regula Benedicti* and Gregory's sacramentary. This point suggests that at least some members of the Carolingian elite were sensitive not only to matters of authorship and authenticity, but also to the idea of the "work" as a discrete, coherent entity—even if synthetic texts like Taio's *florilegium* were often consulted and used instead, presumably on account of expediency and utility.

188 On the editorial principles underlying the work of Carolingian writers, using Smaragdus as a case-study, see Matthew D. Ponesse, "Editorial Practice in Smaragdus of St Mihiel's Commentary on the Rule of St Benedict," *Early Medieval Europe* 18.1 (2010): 61–91.

to be deployed when needed, in whatever form was needed: as, for instance, the monk-pastor of the Aachen (816) *acta*, or perhaps as the high theological authority of Paris (825). These are just two, among many other, identifiable roles inhabited by Augustine in the early Middle Ages. Such incarnations could operate somewhat discretely, while at the same time implicitly evoking the totality of Augustine's nominal authority. This observation is, finally, only a small part of a much larger story—still yet to be told in full—of how Augustine himself, in his long medieval afterlife, became an “Augustinian” “author.”

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

- Augustine of Hippo. *De civitate Dei*. Edited by Bernardus Dombart and Alphonsus Kalb. *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* (hereafter CCSL) 47, 48. Turnhout, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *De doctrina Christiana*. Edited by R.P.H. Green. Oxford, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Enchiridion ad Laurentiam, de fide et spe et caritate*. Edited by Ernest Evans. CCSL 46. Turnhout, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Enchiridion on Faith, Hope, and Love*. Translated by J.B. Shaw. Washington, D.C., 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Enarrationes in Psalmos*. Eligius Dekkers and Johannes Fraipont. CCSL. 38, 40. Turnhout, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sermones*. PL 38, 39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *La vie communautaire: Traduction annotée des Sermons 355–356*. Translated by Goulven Madec. Paris, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sermons 355–356: “The Perfect Common Life.” In Adolar Zumkeller, *Augustine’s Ideal of the Religious Life*. Translated by Edmund Colledge. 406–422. New York, 1986.
- Benedict of Nursia. *Regula Benedicti*. Edited by Adalbert de Vogue and Jean Neufville. *Sources chrétiennes* 181–186. Paris, 1971–72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Rule of St. Benedict*. Translated by Carolinne White. New York, 2008.
- Chrodegang of Metz. *Chrodegangi Metensis episcopi (742–66) Regula canonicorum aus dem Leidener Codex Voissianus Latinus 94 mit Umschrift der tironischen Noten*. Edited by Wilhelm Schmitz. Hannover, 1889.
- Council of Arles (813): *Concilium Arelatense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1:248–53. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Chalons (813): *Concilium Cabillonense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 273–85. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Mainz (813): *Concilium Moguntinense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 258–73. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Reims (813): *Concilium Remense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 253–58. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Tours (813): *Concilium Turonense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 286–93. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Aachen (816): *Concilium Aquisgranense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 307–464. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Aachen (817): *Concilium Aquisgranense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.1: 464–466. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Attigny (822): *Concilium Attiniacense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.2: 468–472. Hannover, 1906.
- Council of Paris (825): *Concilium Parisiense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.2:

- 473–551 . Hannover, 1908.
- Council of Paris (829): *Concillium Parisiense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.2: 596–680. Hannover, 1908.
- Council of Aachen (836): *Concilium Aquisgranense*. Edited by Albert Werminghoff. MGH, Conc. 2.2: 704–767. Hannover, 1906.
- Einhard. *Vita Karoli Magni*. Edited by Oswald Holder-Egger. MGH. SRG 25. Hannover, 1911.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Life of Charlemagne.” In *Charlemagne’s Courtier: The Complete Einhard*. Edited and translated by Paul E. Dutton. 15–40. North York, Ont., 2009.
- Episcoporum de poenitentia, quam Hludowicus imperator professus est, relatio compendiensis*. Edited by Courtney M. Booker. *Viator* 39 (2008): 1–19.
- Ermoldus Nigellus. *In honorem Hludowici*. In *Ermold le Noir: Poème sur Louis le Pieux et épitres au roi Pépin*. Edited by Edmond Faral. Paris, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “In Honour of Louis, The Most Christian Caesar Augustus.” In *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer*. Translated by Thomas F.X. Noble. 127–186. University Park, Penn., 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “*In honorem Hludovici Pii*: I. The paintings at Ingelheim, II. Louis the Pious at the hunt.” In *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*. Translated by Peter Godman. 250–257. Norman, OK, 1985.
- Gregory (I) the Great. *Homiliae in Evangelia*. PL 76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Homiliae in Hiezechielem Prophetam*. Edited by Marcus Adriaen. CCSL. Turnhout, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Moralia in Iob*. PL 75, col. 509–1162.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Registrum epistularum*. Edited by Dag Norberg. CCSL 140, 140A. Turnhout, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Letters of Gregory the Great*. Translated by John R.C. Martyn. Toronto, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Regula Pastoralis*. PL 77, col. 13–128; *Grégoire le Grand: Règle pastorale, Sources chrétiennes*. Edited by Bruno Judic. Paris, 1992;
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Pastoral Care*. Translated by Henry Davis. *Ancient Christian Writers*. Westminster, Md., 1950.
- Gregory IV. *Gregorius IV ad Francorum episcoporum epistolam acerbe severque respondet, castigat eorum insolentiam, convicia repellit, minas deridet*. Edited by Ernst Dümmler. MGH. *Epistolae* 5. 228–232. Berlin, 1899.
- Isidore of Seville. *Sententiae*. Edited by Pierre Cazier. CCSL 111. Turnhout, 1998.
- Julianus Pomerius. *De vita contemplativa, libris tres*. PL 59, col. 415–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Contemplative Life*. Translated by Sr. Mary Josephine Suelzer. *Ancient Christian Writers*. Westminster, Md., 1947.
- Ordinatio imperii* (817). Edited by Alfred Boretius. MGH. Capit. 1: 270–273.
- “The *Ordinatio imperii* of 817.” In *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader*. Edited and translated by Paul E. Dutton. 199–202. North York, Ont., 2009.
- Possidius. *Vita Augustini*. Edited by Michele Pellegino. Alba, 1955.

Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel. *Diadema monachorum*. PL 102, col. 593–690.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Diadema monachorum: The Crown of Monks*. Translated by David Barry. Collegeville, Minn., 2013.

Taio of Saragossa. *Libri sententiarum quinque*. PL 80, col. 727–990.

### Secondary Sources

Alibert, Dominique. “La transmission des textes patristiques à l’époque carolingienne.” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 91.1 (2007): 7–21.

Ando, Clifford. “Narrating Decline and Fall.” In *A Companion to Late Antiquity*. Edited by Phillip Rousseau. 59–76. Chichester, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Decline, Fall and Transformation.” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1 (2008): 31–60.

Anton, Hans Hubert. “Zum politischen Konzept karolingischer Synoden und zur karolingischen Brüdergemeinschaft.” *Historische Jahrbuch* 99 (1979): 55–132.

Arquillière, Henri-Xavier. *L’Augustinisme politique: Essai sur la formation des théories politique du Moyen-Age*. Translated by Catherine Bright (unpublished, forthcoming). Paris, 1934/1955.

Barion, Hans. *Das fränkisch-deutsche Synodalrecht des Frühmittelalters*. Bonn, 1931.

Battany, Jean. “Tayon de Saragosse et la nomenclature sociale de Grégoire le Grand.” *Bulletin du Cange* 37 (1970): 173–192.

Berndt, Rainer and Michel Fédou, eds. *Les réceptions des Pères de l’Église au Moyen Âge. Le devenir de la tradition ecclésiastique. Congrès du Centre Sèvres - Facultés jésuites de Paris (11-14 juin 2008)*. Archa Verbi, Subsidia 10. Münster, 2013.

Booker, Courtney. *Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians*. Philadelphia, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Penance of Louis the Pious (833) and Episcopal Ministerium: ‘Political Augustinianism’ or the Precedent of Ambrose?” Delivered as part of the panel “Carolingian Pragmatic Responses to Authoritative Texts,” at the Medieval Academy of America 79th annual meeting, Seattle, Washington, 3 April 2004.

Boureau, Alain. *La religion de l’état: La construction de la République étatique dans le discours théologique de l’Occident médiéval (1250–1350)*. Paris, 2008.

Bovendeert, Jasmijn. “Royal or monastic identity? Smaragdus’s *Via regia* and *Diadema monachorum* reconsidered.” In *Texts and Identities in the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Richard Corradini, Rob Meens, Christina Possel, and Philip Shaw. 239–252. Vienna, 2006.

Briggs, Charles F. “Literacy, Reading, and Writing in the Medieval West.” *Journal of Medieval History* 26 (2000): 397–420.

Brown, Giles. “Introduction.” In *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*. Edited by Rosamond McKitterick. 1–51. Cambridge, 1993.

Bullough, Donald. *Alcuin, Achievement and Reputation*. Leiden, 2004.

Burrus, Virginia. “History, Theology, Orthodoxy, Polydoxy.” *Modern Theology* 30.3 (2014): 7–16.

- Cavadini, John. *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820*. Philadelphia, 1993.
- Chazelle, Celia. “Pictures, books and the illiterate: Pope Gregory I’s letters to Serenus of Marseilles.” *Words and Images* (1990): 138–53.
- Chisea, Paolo. “*Regula pastoralis*.” In *La Trasmissione dei Testi Latini del Medioevo 5: Gregorius I Papa*. Edited by Lucia Castaldi. 174–90. Florence, 2013.
- Claussen, Martin A. *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula canonicorum in the Eighth Century*. Cambridge, 2004.
- Close, Florence. “Staat und Kirche im Reich Karls des Großen,” In *Karl der Große - Charlemagne: Orte der Macht*. Edited by Frank Pohle. 328–37. Aachen, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Uniformiser la foi pour unifier l'Empire: La pensée politico-théologique de Charlemagne*. Brussels, 2011.
- Collins, Roger. *Visigothic Spain, 409–711*. Oxford, 2004.
- Dolbeau, François. “Sur un florilège carolingien de Septimanie, composé par Benoît d’Aniane.” *Revue Bénédictine* 118 (2008): 46–68.
- Drobner, Hubertus R. “Studying Augustine: An overview of recent research.” In *Augustine and His Critics: Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner*. Edited by Robert Dodaro and George Lawless. 18–34. London/New York, 2000.
- Dutton, Paul E. *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire*. Lincoln, Neb., 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “KAROLVS MAGNVS or KAROLVS FELIX: The Making of Charlemagne’s Legend.” In *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Matthew Gabriele. 23–40. New York, 2008.
- Firey, Abigail. *A Contrite Heart: Prosecution and Redemption in the Carolingian Empire*. Leiden, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_, editor. *A New History of Penance*. Leiden, 2008.
- Fitzgerald, Allan D., editor. *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1999.
- Floryszczak, Silke. *Die Regula Pastoralis Gregors des Großen: Studien zu Text, kirchenpolitischer Bedeutung und Rezeption in der Karolingerzeit*. Tübingen, 2005.
- Foucault, Michel. “What Is an Author?” *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. Edited by Josué V. Harari. 141–160. Ithaca, NY., 1979.
- Freeman, Ann. *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne’s Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea*. Aldershot, 2003.
- Ganshoff, F.L. *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy*. London/New York, 1971.
- Gantner, Clemens, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder, editors. *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe*. Cambridge, 2015.
- Ganz, David. “Charlemagne in Hell.” *Florilegium* 17 (2000): 175–194.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Ideology of Sharing.” In *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre. 17–30. Cambridge, 1995.



- Geary, Patrick. "Medieval Archivists as Authors: Social Memory and Archival Memory." In *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*. Edited by Francis X. Blouin Jr., William G. Rosenber. 106–13. Ann Arbor, Mich., 2006.
- Gilson, Étienne. *Les métamorphoses de la cité de Dieu*. Louvain, 1952.
- Godman, Peter. *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry*. Oxford, 1987.
- Gorman, Michael M. *The Manuscript Traditions of the Works of St. Augustine*. Millennio Medievale 27. Florence, 2001.
- Graumann, Thomas. "The Conduct of Theology and the 'Fathers' of the Church." In *A Companion to Late Antiquity*. 539–55. Chichester, 2009.
- Gumerlock, Francis X. "Fulgentius of Ruspe on the Saving Will of God," In *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*. Edited by Alexander Y. Hwang, Brian J. Matz, and Augustine Casiday. 155–179. Washington, D.C., 2014.
- Halfond, Gregory I. *The Archeology of Frankish Church Councils, AD 511–768*. Leiden, 2010.
- Halphen, Louis. "La pénitence de Louis le Pieux à Saint Médard de Soissons," *Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres de Paris XVIII, troisièmes mélanges d'histoire du Moyen Âge*. 177–185. Paris, 1904. Reprinted in idem, *A travers l'histoire du Moyen Âge*. 58–66. Paris, 1950.
- Halsall, Guy. "Movers and Shakers: The Barbarians and the Fall of Rome." *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999): 132–45.
- Harder, Clara. *Pseudoisidor und das Papsttum: Funktion und Bedeutung des apostolischen Stuhls in den pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen*. Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 2014.
- Hartmann, Wilfried. *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien*. Paderborn, 1989.
- Heather, Peter J. *Empires and Barbarians: The Fall of Rome and the Birth of Europe*. Oxford, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Restoration of Rome: Barbarian Popes and Imperial Pretenders*. London, 2013.
- Hess, Hamilton. *The Early Development of Canon Law and the Council of Serdica*. Oxford, 2002.
- Hilgarth, Jocelyn N. "L'influence de la Cité de Dieu de saint Augustin au Haut Moyen Âge." *Sacris Erudiri* 28 (1985): 5–34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Visigothic Spain, Byzantium and the Irish*. London, 1985.
- Hollerich, Michael J. "John Milbank, Augustine, and the 'Secular,'" In *History Apocalypse and the Secular Imagination: New Essays on Augustine's City of God*. Edited by Mark Vessey, Karla Pollmann, and Alan D. Fitzgerald. 311–326. Bowling Green, Ohio, 1999.
- Jegen, Mary. "Jonas of Orléans (c. 780–843): His Pastoral Writings and Their Social Significance." Ph.D. diss.: Saint Louis University, 1967.
- Jong, Mayke de. "Admonitio and Criticism of the Ruler at the Court of Louis the Pious." In *La culture du haut Moyen Âge: Une question d'élites?*. Edited by François Bougard, et al. 315–338. Turnhout, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Edited by Rosamond McKitterick. 622–653. Cambridge, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity." In *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*. Edited by Stuart

- Airlie, Walter Pohl, and Helmut Reimitz. 113–132. Vienna, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814–840*. Cambridge, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The State of the Church: Ecclesia and Early Medieval State Formation.” In *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat - europäische Perspektiven*. Edited by Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser. 241–254. Vienna, 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Transformations of Penance.” In *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson. 185–224. Leiden, 2000.
- Judic, Bruno. “La tradition de Grégoire le Grand dans l'idéologie politique carolingienne.” In *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne*. Edited by Régine Le Jan. 17–57. Lille, 1998.
- Kaczynski, Bernice M. “The Authority of the Fathers: Patristic Texts in Early Medieval Libraries and Scriptoria.” *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 16 (2006). 1–27.
- Kittang, Atle. “Authors, Authorship, and Work: A Brief Theoretical Survey.” In *Modes of Authorship in the Middle Ages*. Edited by Slavica Rankovic, et al. 17–29. Toronto, 2012.
- Koziol, Geoffrey. “Leadership: Why we have mirrors for princes but none for presidents.” In *Why the Middle Ages Matter: Medieval Light on Modern Injustice*. Edited by Celia Chazelle, Simon Doubleday, Felice Lifshitz, and Amy G. Remensnyder. 183–198. New York, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Review of Michael E. Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington D.C.: 2011). *Church History* 82.3: 695–698.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Truth and Its Consequences: Why Carolingianists Don't Speak of Myth.” In *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*. Edited by Stephen O. Glosecki. 71–103. Tempe, Ariz., 2007.
- Ladner, Gerhart B. *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*. New York, 1967.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*. Translated by Teresa Lavendar Fagan. Cambridge, Mass., 1993.
- Lepree, James. “Sources of Spirituality and the Carolingian Exegetical Tradition.” Ph.D. diss.: City University of New York, 2008.
- Leyser, Conrad. “Augustine in the Latin West, 430–ca. 900.” In *A Companion to Augustine*. Edited by Mark Vessey. 450–64. Chichester, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*. Oxford, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Let Me Speak, Let Me Speak: Vulnerability and Authority in Gregory's Homilies on Ezekiel.” In *Gregorio Magno e il suo tempo*. 169–182. Rome, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Pope Gregory the Great: Ego-Trouble or Identity Politics?” In *Ego Trouble: Authors and Their Identities in the Early Middle Ages*. Edited by Richard Corradini, et al. 67–78. Vienna, 2010.
- Lienhard, Joseph T. “The Earliest Florilegia of Augustine.” *Augustinian Studies* 8 (1977): 21–31.
- Lifshitz, Felice. *The Name of the Saint: The Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627–827*. Notre Dame, Ind., 2006.
- Madec, Goulven. *La vie communautaire: Traduction annotée des Sermons 355–356*. Paris, 1996.
- Markus, Robert A. *Christianity and the Secular*. Notre Dame, Ind., 2006.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The End of Ancient Christianity*. Cambridge, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Gregory the Great and His World*. Cambridge, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Gregory the Great’s *Rector* and His Genesis.” In *Grégoire le Grand: Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*. Edited by Jacques Fontaine, et al. 137–146. Paris, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Latin Fathers.” In *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c. 350 –c. 450*. Edited by J.H. Burns. 92–122. Cambridge, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine*. Cambridge, 1970.
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée. *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique*. Paris, 1938; republished in 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*. Translated by Patrick Hepburne-Scott. New York/London, 1957.
- Mathisen, Ralph W. “Church Councils and Local Authority: The Development of Gallic *Libri canonum* during Late Antiquity.” In *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*. Edited by Carol Harrison, Caroline Humfress, and Isabella Sandwell. 175–193. Oxford, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “For Specialists Only: The Reception of Augustine and His Teachings in Fifth-Century Gaul.” In *Presbyter Factus Sum*. Edited by Joseph T. Lienhard. *Collectanea Augustiniana*. 29–41. New York, 1993.
- Matz, Brian J. “Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination.” In *Grace for Grace*. 235–70. Washington D.C., 2014.
- McKitterick, Rosamond. *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789—895*. London, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751—987*. London, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*. Notre Dame, Ind., 2006.
- McLynn, Neil B. *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*. Berkeley, 1994.
- McNally, Robert E. “Isidoriana.” *Theological Studies* 20.3 (1959): 432–442.
- Meens, Rob. *Penance in the Middle Ages, 600–1200*. Cambridge, 2014.
- Molineaux, Natalie Bridgit. *Medici et Medicamenta: The Medicine of Penance in Late Antiquity*. Lanham, Md., 2009.
- Moore, Michael E. “Ancient Fathers: Christian Antiquity, Patristics, and Frankish Canon Law.” *Millennium* 7 (2010): 293–342.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Carolingian Bishops and Christian Antiquity: Distance from the Past, Canon-Formation, and Imperial Power.” In *Learned Antiquity: Scholarship and Society in the Near-East, the Greco-Roman World, and the Early Medieval West*. Edited by Alasair A. MacDonald, Michael W. Twomey, and R.J. Reinink. 175–184. Leuven, 2003.
- Nelson, Janet L. “The Last Years of Louis the Pious,” In *Charlemagne’s Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*. Edited by Roger Collins and Peter Godman. 147–159. Oxford, 1990.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850*. Washington D.C., 2011.
- O’Loughlin, Thomas. “Individual Anonymity and Collective Identity: The Enigma of Early Medieval Latin Theologians.” *Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales* 64 (1997): 291–314.
- Otten, Willemien. “The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology.” In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*. Edited by Irene Backus. 1. 3–50. Leiden, 1997.
- Noble, Thomas F.X. “Greatness Contested and Confirmed: The Raw Materials of the Charlemagne Legend.” In *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages*. 3–22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*. Philadelphia, 2009.
- Patzold, Steffen. “Eine ‘loyale Palastrebellion’ der ‘Reichseinheitspartei’? Zur ‘Divisio Imperii’ von 817 und zu den Ursachen des Aufstandes gegen Ludwig der Frommen im Jahre 830.” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2006): 43–77
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts*. Ostfildern, 2008.
- Plumpe, Joseph C. “Pomeriana.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 1.4 (1947): 227–33.
- Pohl, Walter, Ian Wood, and Helmut Reimitz, editors. *The Transformation of the Frontiers: From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians*. Leiden, 2000.
- Pollard, Richard M. “A Cooperative Correspondence: The Letters of Gregory the Great.” In *A Companion to Gregory the Great*. Edited by Neil Brownen and Matthew Dal Santo. 291–312. Leiden, 2013.
- Pollman, Karla. “Christianity and Authority in Late Antiquity: The Transformation of the Concept of *Auctoritas*.” In *Being Christian in Late Antiquity*. 156–175. Oxford, 2014.
- Pollman, Karla and Willemien Otten, editors. *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*. Oxford, 2013.
- Ponessa, Matthew D. “Editorial Practice in Smaragdus of St Mihiel’s Commentary on the Rule of St Benedict.” *Early Medieval Europe* 18 (2010): 61–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Smaragdus of St Mihiel and the Carolingian Monastic Reform,” *Revue Bénédictine* 116 (2006): 367–92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Standing Distant from the Fathers: Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel and the Reception of Early Medieval Learning.” *Traditio* 67 (2012): 71–99.
- Riché, Pierre. *The Carolingians: A Family Who Forged Europe*. Translated by Michael I. Allen Philadelphia, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth Through Eight Centuries*. Translated from the third edition by John J. Contreni. Columbia, S.C., 1976.
- Rigg, A.G. “Anthologies and Florilegia.” In *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*. Edited by F.A.C. Mantello and A.G. Rigg. 708–12. Washington, D.C., 1996.
- Rochais, Henri M. “Florilèges spirituels latins.” In *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique, doctrine et histoire.*, vol. 5. Paris, 1964. 435–460.
- Rouse, Richard H. “The Transmission of Texts.” In *The Legacy of Rome: A New Appraisal*. Edited

- by Richard Jenkyns. 37–60. Oxford, 1992.
- Scherer, Cornelia. *Der Pontifikat Gregors IV. (827–844): Vorstellungen und Wahrnehmungen päpstlichen Handelns im 9. Jahrhundert. Päpste und Papsttum 42.* Stuttgart, 2013.
- Semmler, Josef. “*Benedictus II: Una regula - una consuetudo.*” In *Benedictine Culture, 750-1050.* Edited by Willem Lourdaux and Daniel Verhelst. 1–49. Louvain, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816.” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 74* (1963): 15–82.
- Sidey, Thomas K. “The Government of Charlemagne as Influenced by Augustine’s *City of God.*” *Classical Journal 14.2* (1918): 119–27.
- Sieben, Herman Josef. “Augustinus-Rezeption in Konzilien von seinen Lebzeiten bis zum Zweiten Vatikanum.” *Theologie und Philosophie 84* (2009): 161-198.
- Stoclet, Alain. *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710–784).* Geneva/Paris, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Le *De civitate Dei* de saint Augustin: Sa diffusion avant 900 d’après les caractères externes des manuscrits antérieurs à cette date et les catalogues contemporains.” *Recherches Augustiniennes 19* (1984): 185–209.
- Sullivan, Richard E. “The Carolingian Age: Reflections on Its Place in the History of the Middle Ages.” *Speculum 64.2* (1989): 267-306.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Changing Perspectives on the Concept of the Middle Ages.” *Centennial Review 28* (1984): 77–99. Reprinted in idem, *Speaking for Clio.* 152–69. Kirksville, Mo., 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_., editor. *The Gentle Voices of Teachers: Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age.* Columbus, Ohio, 1995.
- Timmermann, Josh. “Sharers in the Contemplative Virtue: Julianus Pomerius’s Carolingian Audience.” *Comitatus 45* (2014): 1–44.
- Ullman, Walter. “Public Welfare and Social Legislation in the Early Medieval Councils,” In *Councils and Assemblies.* Edited by in G.J. Cuming and Derek Baker. *Studies in Church History 7.* 1–39. Cambridge, 1971.
- Van Renswoude, Irene. “License to Speak: The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.” Ph.D diss., Universiteit Utrecht, 2011.
- Van Rhijn, Carine. *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statues in the Carolingian Period.* Turnhout, 2007.
- Verheijen, Luc. *St. Augustine’s Monasticism in the Light of Acts 4: 32-35.* St. Augustine Lecture Series, 1975. Philadelphia, 1979.
- Vessey, Mark. *Latin Christian Writers in Late Antiquity and Their Texts.* Aldershot, 2005.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M. *The Frankish Church.* Oxford, 1983.
- Wallis, Faith. “The Experience of the Book: Manuscripts, Texts, and the Role of Epistemology in Early Medieval Medicine.” In *Knowledge and the Scholarly Medical Traditions.* Edited by Don Bates. 101–26. Cambridge, 1995.
- Ward-Perkins, Bryan. *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization.* Oxford, 2005.
- Wickham, Christopher. *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400–800.* Oxford, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Inheritance of Rome: A History of Europe from 400 to 1000*. London, 2009.

Williams, James. "The Adoptive Son of God, the Pregnant Virgin, and the Fortification of the True Faith: Heterodoxy, the Cult of the Virgin Mary, and Benedict of Aniane in the Carolingian Age." Ph.D diss., Purdue University, 2009.

Wood, Ian. *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*. Oxford, 2013.

Wormald, Patrick and Janet L. Nelson, editors. *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge, 2007.

Zumkeller, Adolar. *Augustine's Ideal of the Religious Life*. Translated by Edmund Colledge. New York, 1986.

APPENDIX

For each conciliar chapter where a reference to, or quotation from, Augustine or Gregory appears, I have listed the source of the reference or quotation (if identifiable). Where other patristic writers are cited within the same conciliar chapter, I have listed these additional citations after the initial listing for Augustine or Gregory. Thus, the sequential order of patristic citations listed in the cell for a given conciliar chapter does not necessarily follow the order in which those citations appear in the conciliar chapter itself.

**Table 1: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Council of Aachen (816)**

Chapter in the Council of Aachen text	Use of Augustine or Gregory
c. VIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> XIX.19, quoted by Isidore of Seville in a chapter excerpted from, and ascribed to, Isidore ( <i>De ecclesiasticis officis</i> II.5)
c. XII	Augustine, <i>Sermo</i> 46
c. XIII	<p><b>From Taio of Saragossa, <i>Sentent.</i> II.32:</b>            Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.prooem.                              I.10                              II.4                              II.6                              II.11</p> <p><b>From Taio II.32:</b>            Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XIII.20:23                              XXI.15:22–23</p>
c. XIII	<p><b>From Taio II.37:</b>            Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.prooem.                              I.1                              I.2                              I.3</p>
c. XVII	<p><b>From Taio II.41:</b>            Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.5                              I.6</p>
c. XXI	<p><b>From Taio II.34:</b>            Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.4                              II.6</p> <p><b>From Taio II.34:</b>            Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> X.6:8</p>

Chapter in the Council of Aachen text	Use of Augustine or Gregory
c. XXIII	<p><b>From Taio II.35:</b>  Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.3  II.4  III.prooem.</p> <p><b>From Taio II.35:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XXIII.13:25</p>
c. XXVII	<p><b>From Taio II.39:</b>  Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.2  I.3  I.11</p> <p><b>From Taio II.39:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XI.15:23</p>
c. XXXIII	<p><b>From Taio II.36:</b>  Gregory, <i>Homil. in Ezech.</i> I.12:29–32</p> <p><b>From Taio II.36:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> V.45:82–83</p>
c. XXXVII	<p><b>From Taio II.38:</b>  Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang.</i> II.26:4–6</p> <p><b>From Taio II.38:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XIX.25:46</p>
c. XXXVIII	<p><b>From Taio II.40:</b>  Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang.</i> I.4:4</p> <p><b>From Taio II.40:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XII.54:62</p>
c. CII	<p><b>From Taio II.44:</b>  Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang.</i> I.17:18</p> <p><b>From Taio II.44:</b>  Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> III.4  III.7</p>
c. CIII	<p><b>From Taio II.42:</b>  Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> III.4  III.10</p>
c. CV	<p><b>From Taio II.43:</b>  Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> III.8  III.10</p> <p><b>From Taio II.43:</b>  Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> XXVI.1:1</p>
c. CXII	Augustine, <i>Sermo I de vita et moribus clericorum suorum</i>



Chapter in the Council of Aachen text	Use of Augustine or Gregory
	<i>(Sermo 355)</i>
c. CXIII	Augustine, <i>Sermo II de vita et moribus clericorum suorum</i> <i>(Sermo 356)</i>
c. CXXVIII	<b>From Taio V.2:</b> Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang. I.6:3</i>  Jerome, <i>Ep. ad Eustochium</i>  Possidius, <i>Vita Augustini c. 22</i>
c. CXXXVIII	Augustine, unidentified quotation  Gregory, unidentified quotation
c. VII ( <i>Institutio sanctimonialium</i> )	Gregory, unidentified quotation

**Table 2: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the *Libellus synodalis* of the Council of Paris (825)**

Chapter in the <i>Libellus synodalis</i>	Use of Augustine or Gregory
Prooemium	Gregory, general reference
c. VII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> XVI.8:1–2
c. VIII	Augustine, <i>Sermo</i> 9:5
cc. X-XI	Gregory, <i>Ep. ad Serenum episcopum Massiliensem</i>
c. XII	Gregory, <i>Ep. ad Serenum</i>
c. XIII	Gregory, <i>Ep. ad Ianuarium</i>
c. XIII	Gregory, <i>Ep. ad Secundinum</i>
c. XV	Augustine, <i>Liber de haeresibus</i> 1
c. XVI	Augustine, <i>Liber de haeresibus</i> 7
c. XVII	Augustine, <i>Ep. 118 ad Dioscorum</i>
c. XVIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> VIII.23:1 VIII.24:1 VIII.26:2
c. XVIII	Augustine, <i>Ep. 138 ad Marcellinum</i>
c. XX	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> VII.27:2
c. XXVIII	Augustine, unidentified quotation
c. XXX	Augustine, <i>Enarr. in psalm.</i> 113 s. 2:1
c. XXXII	Augustine, <i>Ep. 17 ad Maximum</i>
c. XXXIII	Augustine, <i>De quantitate animae</i> 2
c. XXXIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> VIII.23:2 VIII.24:3
c. XXXVI	Augustine, <i>De vera religione</i> 1:3 10:18 54:108
c. XXXVII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> X.4
c. XXXVIII	Augustine, unidentified quotation
c. XXXVIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> X.19, X.3:2, X.4
c. XL	Augustine, <i>Enarr. in psalm.</i> 96:12
c. XLI	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> X.26 XXII.10
c. XLII	Augustine, unidentified quotation
c. XLIII	Augustine, <i>De quantitate animae</i> 34:78

Chapter in the <i>Libellus synodalis</i>	Use of Augustine or Gregory
c. XLV	Augustine, <i>De vera religione</i> 55:109
c. XLVI	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> VIII.27:1
c. XLVIII	Augustine, unidentified quotation
c. L	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> XIX.23:4
c. LI	Augustine, unidentified quotation
c. LIII	Augustine, <i>Enarr. in psalm.</i> 113 s. 2:4
c. LIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> IV.30
c. LV	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> X.8
c. LVII	Augustine, <i>De coniugiis adulterinis</i> 15:16–18 15:22, with Ps.-Ambrose, <i>Comment. in epist.</i> <i>Pauli ad Corinthos I</i>
c. LVIII	Augustine, <i>Quaest. in Genesim</i> I.162
c. LX	Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> X.6:9
c. LXI	Augustine, <i>Enarr. in psalm.</i> 113 s. 2:5
c. LXII	Augustine, <i>De doctrina Christiana</i> III.5:9 III.7:11 III.8:12 III.9:14
c. LXIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> X.1:2, quoting Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> I v. 12
c. LXIII	Augustine, <i>Quaest. in Genesim quaest.</i> 84, 96
c. LXXIII	Augustine, <i>De civ. Dei</i> XXII.8:4
c. LXXVI <sup>189</sup>	Augustine, <i>Enarr. in psalm.</i> 73:6 93:4  <i>Sermo</i> 6.5:7  <i>Tractatus in evang. Iohannis</i> XII.11  <i>De trinitate</i> I.6:13 III.10:20  <i>De octo dulcitii quaestionibus, quaest.</i> 6:3  <i>De doctrina Christiana</i> II.1:1–3

189 On this extended chapter of the *Libellus synodalis*, see Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* 278, 340–44.

Chapter in the <i>Libellus synodalis</i>	Use of Augustine or Gregory
	<p style="text-align: right;">II.7:9 II.9:13 II.19:29 II.20:30 II.25:38–39</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Liber de magistro</i> 12:39–40</p> <p>Gregory, <i>Ep. ad Serenum</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Epist. Laud.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Ep. ad Secundinum</i></p> <p>Many other sources, e.g., Paulinus of Nola, Pope Gregory II, Pope Gregory III, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, Ps-Basil, Athanasius of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem, Isidore</p>

**Table 3: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Council of Paris (829)**

Book, chapter in the Council of Paris text	Use of Augustine or Gregory
I c. III	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> III.40, with Pomerius (cited as Prosper)  <i>De vita contemplativa</i> I.2 II.2
I c. VII	Ps.-Augustine, <i>Sermo</i> 168:3, with Gelasius <i>Decreta</i> c. 10; Leo I, <i>Decreta</i> c. 11
I c. XI	Gregory, <i>Regula pastoralis</i> (general reference)  <i>Homil. in Evang.</i> II.17:13, with Council of Chalcedon (451) c. 2  ref. to Gregory of Nazianzus, <i>Oratio apologetica</i> (unidentified quotation)
I c. XII	Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang.</i> II.14:1  <i>Reg. Past.</i> I.praef., I.10, with ref. to Gregory of Nazianzus, <i>Oratio apologetica</i> ; Jerome, <i>Comment. in Ezech.</i> ; <i>Comment. In Aggaeum</i> ; <i>Comment. in Malachiam</i>
I c. XIII	Gregory, <i>Homil. in evang.</i> II.23, with Jerome <i>Comment. In epist. ad Titum</i> ; Origen, <i>Comment. in epist. ad Romanos</i>
I c. XVIII	general ref. to Gregory, Augustine, Ambrose
I c. XX	Council of Rome (595) c. 2, attributed to Gregory  general ref. to Augustine and Ambrose
I c. XXI	general ref. to Augustine
I c. XXIII	Augustine, <i>Sermo</i> 46
I c. XXVIII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.7
I c. XXXVIII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.1
I c. XLIII	general ref. to Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine
I c. XLVI	general ref. to Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, Jerome

Book, chapter in the Council of Paris text	Use of Augustine or Gregory
I c. LIII	Augustine, <i>Tractatus 5 in epist. Iohannis</i> :12, with Cassiodorus, <i>Expositio in psalm. 54</i> ; Jerome, <i>Comment. in Amos</i> ; <i>Comment. in Ezech.</i> ; Ps.-Jerome, <i>Comment. in psalm. 14</i> (unidentified quotation)
II c. I	Isidore, <i>Sentent. III.48:7</i> , attributed to Gregory, <i>Moralia</i>
II c. VII	Ps.-Augustine, <i>Sermo 100</i> : 1–2
II c. X	Augustine, <i>Enchiridion</i> : 18  Origen, <i>Homilia 8 in Exodi c. 20</i>  Bede, <i>Expositio in evang. Lucae c. 11</i> ; cf. Jonas of Orléans, <i>De inst. laicali I.19</i> and <i>De inst. regia c. 12</i>
II c. XII	Ps.-Augustine, <i>Sermo 265</i> : 3 (cf. Caesarius of Arles, <i>Homilia 33</i> )  Bede, <i>Homiliarum I.19,22</i>  Origen, <i>Homilia 12 in Exodi c. 34</i> ; cf. Jonas of Orléans, <i>De inst. laicali I.13</i> and <i>De inst. regia c. 14</i>
III c. XXV	Gregory, <i>Moralia I.9:13</i> ; cf. Jonas of Orléans, <i>De inst. laicali II.14</i>

**Table 4: Augustine and Gregory the Great in the Council of Aachen (836)**

<b>Chapter in the Council of Aachen text or <i>Epistola Concilii ad Pippinum Regem Directa</i></b>	<b>Use of Augustine or Gregory</b>
c. I	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.8
c. VII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.praef.
c. VIII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.1
c. X	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.8
cc. XV–XVI	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> I.1
c. XVII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> II.11
c. XVIII	Gregory, <i>Reg. past.</i> III praef., referencing Gregory of Nazianzus, <i>Oratio</i> II
c. XLI	Isidore, <i>Sentent.</i> III.48:7 (attributed to Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> ), with other misc. quotations from Isidore correctly attributed to him
c. LIII	Gregory, <i>Moralia</i> I.9:13
c. II ( <i>Ep. ad Pippinum</i> )	Augustine, unidentified quotation
cc. LXXIII–LXXVI ( <i>Ep. ad Pippinum</i> )	Augustine, <i>Tractatus</i> 50 in <i>evang. Iohannis</i> : 10–11