

Flodoard, the will of St Remigius and the see of Rheims in the tenth century

Abstract

The ‘longer’ will of St Remigius of Rheims, as preserved in the mid-tenth-century *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* of Flodoard of Rheims, is widely agreed to be a forgery. But despite the fact that it is known almost exclusively from Flodoard’s work, historians have never suggested that this document was produced in his day. This article contends that the longer will was indeed an original component of the *Historia*. Read in this context, the will can throw new light on the *Historia* itself, the career of Flodoard and the tumultuous history of the church of Rheims in the first half of the tenth century.

Introduction

St Remigius, bishop of Rheims (d. 533), is best known for performing the baptism of Clovis around the turn of the sixth century and so bringing the Franks into the Catholic fold. The memory of this momentous occasion would prove instrumental in the establishment of Rheims as the *de facto* coronation centre of French monarchs by the early eleventh century.¹ Before the turn of the millennium, however, Rheims was just one of numerous possible sites of royal ordination. This article concerns a controversial document which has long been central to debates about the reification of this coronation tradition: the will or testament of Remigius. The will is known through two works: the *Vita Remigii* of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims (845–82), completed *c.*878, and the *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* of the canon Flodoard of Rheims (d. 966), written in 948–52.² Nowhere is its existence attested prior to these narratives. In addition, the version preserved in Flodoard’s *Historia* is substantially

¹ M. Bur, ‘Reims, ville des sacres’, in *Le sacre des rois. Actes du colloque international d’histoire sur les sacres et couronnements royaux (Reims, 1975)* (Paris, 1985), pp. 39-48; *idem*, ‘Aux origines de la “religion de Reims”. Les sacres carolingiens et post-carolingiens: un ré-examen du dossier (751-1131)’, in M. Rouche (ed.), *Clovis: histoire et mémoire*, 2 vols (Paris, 1997), II, pp. 46-72; both repr. in M. Bur (ed.), *La Champagne médiévale: recueil d’articles* (Langres, 2005), at pp. 655-66 and pp. 667-94 respectively.

² Hincmar of Rheims, *Vita S. Remigii*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM* 3 (Hanover, 1896), pp. 239-349; Flodoard of Rheims, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, ed. M. Stratmann, *MGH Scriptores* 36 (Hanover, 1998) [hereafter *HRE*]. The basic study of Merovingian wills is U. Nonn, ‘Merowingische Testamente. Studien zum Fortleben einer römischen Urkundenform im Frankenreich,’ *Archiv für Diplomatik* 18 (1972), pp. 1-129. More generally, see the essays collected in B. Kasten (ed.), *Herrscher- und Fürstentestamente im westeuropäischen Mittelalter* (Cologne, 2008), in particular J. Semmler, ‘Zum Testament des gallofränkischen Bischofs’, pp. 573-97. For a recent study of Anglo-Saxon wills in the period covered by the present article, see L. Tollerton, *Wills and Will-Making in Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2011).

longer than that found in the majority of manuscripts of Hincmar's *Vita*. The 'shorter will' is nowadays usually believed to be authentic, while the 'longer will' is agreed to be a forgery. Precisely when the latter was created, however, has been a matter of considerable debate. The longer will is contained in all the extant manuscripts of Flodoard's *Historia* and a single copy of Hincmar's *Vita*, but it has only ever been argued to either predate or postdate the time Flodoard was active.

However, by examining the history of the see of Rheims in the first half of the tenth century, this article will argue that substantial portions of the longer will do in fact reflect the wider aims of both Flodoard and Archbishop Artold of Rheims (931–40, 946–61). The church of Rheims in this period was dominated by a protracted dispute between Artold and a rival archbishop (and their respective supporters), a conflict which provided the main backdrop to the church's contemporary textual output. At the same time, Rheims was actively pursuing claims to metropolitan authority in the West Frankish kingdom and attempting to establish Remigius as the premier royal patron saint. Explored in these contexts, the will can cast new light on the political history of the West Frankish kingdom, the writing of history in this period, and even Flodoard himself. The historian frequently lurked behind the scenes he described, but his motivations and opinions have rarely been pinpointed. Flodoard was undoubtedly a central actor in the affairs of the church of Rheims, however, and the will of Remigius provides a unique window onto his world. I begin by outlining what we actually know about the will and recounting previous interpretations of its origins. I shall assess the nature of the additions found in the longer will, as well as the document's relationship with Flodoard's *Historia*. Remigius' testament will then be examined in the context of the Rheims archiepiscopal dispute. In particular, I shall explore how this controversy created significant problems for the church in its attempts to assert its proprietary rights, something the will was at pains to affirm. We shall also see just how deeply this dispute affected Flodoard and marked his writings. Finally, the testament will be read in light of the vigorous efforts of Rheims' late-ninth- and tenth-century archbishops to secure for themselves – as successors of Remigius – the ultimate rights of royal ordination. Taken together, these circumstances provide a plausible basis for the production and dissemination of a version of the will in the mid-tenth century. It will thus be argued that the longer will should be considered a product not only of contemporary episcopal and personal ambitions, but also of the turmoil which engulfed the see of Rheims in this period.

The will: origins and interpretations

Hincmar claimed to have based his *Vita Remigii* on an earlier *vita*, of which survives only a short excerpted version attributed (by Hincmar) to the poet Venantius Fortunatus.³ In the preface to his own *Vita Remigii*, Hincmar asserted that the unabridged redaction of this earlier life had been mostly lost. He described how he had personally heard old men, contemporaries of Archbishop Tilpin of Rheims (762/3–94), discuss how their own seniors had seen a great volume about Remigius. This book, Hincmar continued, had disappeared under the following circumstances: Bishop Egidius of Rheims (c.573–90) had asked Fortunatus to extract some miracles which could be read and enjoyed. This précis proved popular and spread quickly, while the lengthy original was increasingly neglected. Later, the church of Rheims was – according to Hincmar – reduced to penury during the time of Charles Martel, and the few clergymen who remained there were so poor that they were forced to trade for subsistence. From books they tore pages to wrap what little money they received. Thus the unabridged *vita*, already in poor condition (having been spoiled by damp and chewed by mice), was almost totally lost. Nevertheless, Hincmar wrote that he had managed to track down some of the dispersed pages of the work.⁴

What Hincmar found in these few scattered pages – if his story is to be believed – is a complete mystery. What is certain, however, is that the archbishop's own *Vita Remigii* furnished a great deal of information about the saint found nowhere else. The factual reliability of the *Vita* has sometimes been questioned due to Hincmar's modern-day reputation as an occasional forger.⁵ One novel feature of his *Vita* was the inclusion of Remigius' will.⁶ The will details Remigius' division of his estate (land, slaves, money and other personal items) among three principal heirs (the church of Rheims, his nephew Lupus and his grandson Agricola), ten other relatives and legatees, and six other churches (Laon, Soissons, Châlons-sur-Marne, Voncq, Mézières and the church of Sts Timothy and Apollinaris at Rheims). The bulk of the testament is concerned with the disposition of the bishop's many slaves, assigning named individuals to specific heirs and manumitting others. The will also makes reference to Remigius' baptism of Clovis.

³ *Vita Remedii*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH AA* 4.2 (Berlin, 1885), pp. 64-7. On this early *vita*, see M.-C. Isaïa, *Remi de Reims: Mémoire d'un saint, histoire d'une Église* (Paris, 2010), pp. 207-24, 373-81.

⁴ *Vita Remigii*, preface, pp. 250-2.

⁵ For an overview of some common accusations, see H. Fuhrmann, 'Fälscher unter sich: zum Streit zwischen Hinkmar von Reims und Hinkmar von Laon', in M.T. Gibson and J.L. Nelson (eds), *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, 2nd edn (Aldershot, 1990), pp. 224-34.

⁶ *Vita Remigii*, c. 32, pp. 336-40.

In 1895, Bruno Krusch emphatically argued that the shorter will had been forged by Hincmar, as there was no firm evidence of the document's existence prior to the *Vita* itself. He determined the will's legal phraseology, vocabulary and prescribed mechanisms all to be anachronistic because they were at odds with late Roman law or other surviving early Merovingian wills.⁷ Krusch was also convinced that Clovis had been baptized at Tours, not Rheims, which rendered him further suspicious of the document's authenticity.⁸ Krusch's arguments were greeted with scepticism, but it was not until 1957 that a formal rebuttal of his claims appeared in press. In a collaborative article, A.H.M. Jones, Philip Grierson and J.A. Crook contended that Krusch's criticisms of the shorter will were groundless and that the provisos and terminology of the document were entirely in line with what one could reasonably expect from a sixth-century will. Although admitting that the *Vita Remigii* was 'more or less a free composition by Hincmar', they saw nothing the archbishop could have gained through the fabrication of the testament. Hincmar was thus vindicated of any wrongdoing, and the shorter will's authenticity has been accepted ever since. Jones *et al.* conceded, however, that the longer version preserved by Flodoard was 'beyond salvation'.⁹

Flodoard's *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* is a text of tremendous importance to modern scholars. Written in the mould of *gesta episcoporum* (which in turn were modelled on the *Liber pontificalis*), the work narrates the history of the see of Rheims from its pseudo-apostolic foundation up to Flodoard's own day through the careers of its bishops and archbishops.¹⁰ Flodoard is renowned for reproducing documentary material throughout the *Historia*, quoting or summarising earlier diplomas, letters, inscriptions and more, many of which are otherwise unknown.¹¹ Moreover, his reporting of contemporary events has been

⁷ B. Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', *Neues Archiv* 20 (1895), pp. 509-68, at pp. 539-48; *idem*, *Vita Remigii*, pp. 242-4.

⁸ Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', pp. 511-12; and *idem*, 'Chlodovechs Taufe in Tours 507 und die Legende Gregors von Tours (Reims 496)', *Neues Archiv* 49 (1935), pp. 457-69. The literature on this controversy is summarized in H. Leclercq, 'Reims', in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 14.2 (Paris, 1948), cols 2232-3.

⁹ A.H.M. Jones, P. Grierson and J.A. Crook, 'The Authenticity of the "Testamentum S. Remigii"', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 35.2 (1957), pp. 356-73, quotes at pp. 366 and 357, n. 5, respectively.

¹⁰ The standard treatment of the *Historia* is M. Sot, *Un historien et son Église au X^e siècle: Flodoard de Reims* (Paris, 1993). Also fundamental on Flodoard is P.C. Jacobsen, *Flodoard von Reims: sein Leben und seine Dichtung 'De Triumphis Christi'* (Leiden, 1978). Flodoard also wrote a famous set of annals, ed. P. Lauer, *Les Annales de Flodoard* (Paris, 1905) [hereafter *Annales*]; English translation by S. Fanning and B.S. Bachrach, *The Annals of Flodoard of Reims, 919-966* (Peterborough, Ontario, 2004); and an epic verse history known as *De triumphis Christi*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *PL* 135, cols 491-885 (Paris, 1853). On *gesta episcoporum*, see M. Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*, *Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental* 37 (Turnhout, 1981).

¹¹ H. Zimmermann, 'Zu Flodoards Historiographie und Regestentechnik', in K.U. Jaschke and R. Wenskus (eds), *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Sigmaringen, 1977), pp. 200-14; M. Stratmann, 'Die *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*: Flodoards Umgang mit seinen Quellen', *Filologia Mediolatina* 1 (1994), pp. 111-27.

widely deemed impartial and reliable. As both a preserver of priceless records from Rheims' fabled past and a dependable guide to the events of his own day, Flodoard today enjoys a strong reputation for historicity and honesty. Indeed, as Jones *et al.* noted, in view of the respective renown of Hincmar and Flodoard, 'it is a curious paradox that it is the shorter will which has usually been taken as genuine and the second as false.'¹²

The longer will is found in the first book of the *Historia*, the bulk of which is concerned with the life and miracles of Remigius, as well as translations of his body.¹³ Unlike the shorter will, the disposition of Remigius' landed wealth is the central tenet of the longer form. Other additions are expressly concerned with emphasising the authority of Remigius (and his successors) and Clovis (and his family). Remigius' baptism of Clovis is reiterated several times (whereas it is mentioned only once in the shorter form), and in considerable detail the longer will describes the punishments to be dispensed to any layman, cleric or royal who might dare contravene the bishop's instructions.¹⁴ The longer will declares that it is the third version drawn up by Remigius: the first had been written fourteen years earlier, the second seven years after that.¹⁵

Naturally, Krusch also viewed the longer will as a forgery. This notion has seldom been contested, although there has been a great deal of debate about when the longer form was produced. Krusch – assuming that the will constituted an independent document – did not believe the interpolations had been made until the mid-eleventh century, at which point the will was copied into the *Historia*. His case rested on the use of the verb *eligere* ('to choose') in a sentence describing Remigius' elevation of Clovis' family to the throne.¹⁶ Krusch maintained that no bishop of Rheims had invoked this term until the election of Philip I in 1059.¹⁷ Michel Sot agreed that the will was a later interpolation of the *Historia*, and that Flodoard had never included any version of it in his work. However, he and others have doubted Krusch's arguments.¹⁸ Many scholars now date the longer will earlier, largely due to

¹² Jones *et al.*, 'Authenticity', p. 356.

¹³ *HRE*, 1.10-23, pp. 80-122, is devoted to Remigius. The will constitutes 1.18, pp. 97-105.

¹⁴ *HRE*, 1.18, pp. 98 (lines 3, 21, 31), 99 (line 12), 103 (lines 12, 33) for the references to the baptism; pp. 103-4 for the procedures to be followed in punishing those who ignore the will.

¹⁵ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 103.

¹⁶ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 103: *Generi tantummodo regio, quod ad honorem sancte ecclesie et defensionem pauperum una cum fratribus meis et coepiscopis omnibus Germanie, Gallie atque Niustrie in regie maiestatis culmen perpetuo regnaturum statuens elegi...* ('To the royal family, whom I, together with my brethren and all my fellow bishops of Germania, Gaul and Neustria, chose for the honour of the holy church and the defence of the poor, and placed on the summit of royal majesty to reign for eternity...').

¹⁷ Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', pp. 558-9; *idem*, *Vita Remigii*, pp. 243, 345, n. 3.

¹⁸ Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 751-3. For general reservations, G. Schneider, 'Reims und das Remigiusland im frühen mittelalter (6. bis 9. Jahrhundert)', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 119 (1971), pp. 471-80, at pp. 472-3, n. 11; Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, p. 60, n. 16.

the discovery that the author of the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* (c.1025) quoted from it.¹⁹ It has thus been contended that the longer will was produced under the aegis of Archbishop Adalbero of Rheims (969–89) to coincide with the election of Hugh Capet in 987, while a further study has attributed its appearance to the controversy surrounding the deposition of Archbishop Arnulf (989–91, 995–1021) and election of Gerbert of Aurillac (991–5).²⁰

Martina Stratmann argued that Hincmar actually fabricated the longer will.²¹ At first glance, there would seem to be much that supports this stance. First, Hincmar has been implicated in the manipulation of documents on multiple occasions. Particularly noteworthy for the present study are the forged papal privileges of Hormisdas for Remigius and Hadrian for Tilpin, both of which are widely believed to be the archbishop's doing.²² Second, the interpolations, being principally concerned with Rheims' property and its right of royal ordination, are consistent with Hincmar's wider aims in his final decades. Third, Stratmann observed that there are a few references to what must be the longer form of Remigius' will in other documents included in the *Historia*, such as Flodoard's summaries of Hincmar's correspondence.²³ Flodoard famously epitomized some 500 otherwise-unknown letters of the archbishop, and the *Historia* constitutes one of the most important sources for Hincmar's career.²⁴ Others, however, have placed the production of the longer will even earlier. The key evidence cited in this respect is a diploma purportedly granted by Charles the Bald just after Hincmar's ordination in 845, which restored a number of properties to the church of Rheims upon inspection of the will of Remigius. The restored properties are found only in the longer

¹⁹ *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, I, c. 9, ed. L. Bethmann, *MGH Scriptores* 7 (Hanover, 1846), pp. 393-525, at p. 407.

²⁰ For dating c.987, see A. Poensgen, *Geschichtskonstruktionen im frühen Mittelalter zur Legitimation kirchlicher Ansprüche in Metz, Reims und Trier* (Marburg, 1971), pp. 73-93; F. Oppenheimer, *The Legend of the Ste. Ampoule* (London, 1953), pp. 228-34; A.W. Lewis, *Royal Succession in Capetian France: Studies on Familial Order and the State* (Cambridge, MA, 1981), pp. 5, 19, 35; Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 656, 686. For the will and the Arnulf controversy, see V. Huth, 'Erzbischof Arnulf von Reims und der Kampf um das Königtum im Westfrankenreich: zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', *Francia* 21.1 (1994), pp. 85-124, at pp. 106-18.

²¹ M. Stratmann, *Hincmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kirchenprovinz* (Sigmaringen, 1991), pp. 48-9; *eadem*, *HRE*, pp. 10-11. Stratmann's arguments build on those of C. Brühl, 'Königspfalz und Bischofsstadt in fränkischer Zeit', *Rheinische Vierteljahresblätter* 23 (1958), pp. 161-274, at p. 198 with n. 198.

²² Stratmann, *Hincmar*, p. 48. For Hormisdas' privilege: Zimmermann, 'Flodoards Historiographie', p. 213; Fuhrmann, 'Fälscher unter sich', p. 233. For the privilege of Hadrian: É. Lesne, 'La lettre interpolée d'Hadrien I à Tilpin et l'église de Reims au IX^e siècle', *Le Moyen Âge* 26 (1913), pp. 325-51, 389-413, at p. 349; O. Schneider, *Erzbischof Hincmar und die Folgen: der vierhundertjährige Weg historischer Erinnerungsbilder von Reims nach Trier* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 52-6, 79-85.

²³ Stratmann, *Hincmar*, pp. 48-9 with n. 32; *eadem*, *HRE*, p. 11. See below.

²⁴ The full register of Hincmar's correspondence can be found in H. Schrörs, *Hincmar, Erzbischof von Reims: sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg, 1884), pp. 518-88. See also Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 537-626.

will, and this charter is known only from Flodoard's *Historia*.²⁵ As we shall see, however, this restitution was almost certainly not granted in the form preserved by Flodoard. At an extreme, the longer will has been considered genuine.²⁶ More common is the notion that the longer version was based on some sort of genuine property inventory that was then revised and expanded between the ninth and eleventh centuries.²⁷ Portions of a contemporary polyptych for the abbey of St-Remi survive in early modern copies, although there is virtually no correlation between them and the longer will.²⁸ Some have postulated the existence of an intermediate second redaction, owing to the longer will's claim to be the third version. Of particular note here is the fact that Heiric of Auxerre's *Miracula sancti Germani* (c.873) contains a reference to a bequest of money from Remigius to a church of St-Germain in Rheims, which Remigius himself built, according to Heiric. This gift is otherwise known only from the longer will.²⁹ But according to Flodoard, Bishop Romulfus (c.590–596/613) constructed an *oratorium* dedicated to St Germanus in the *atrium Sancti Remigii*. Romulfus also left a will, although Flodoard only briefly summarized it in his work.³⁰ Heiric's assertion may thus be confused, and it could equally be the case that the author of the longer will found this information in the *Miracula*.

However, these arguments have not adequately addressed the problem of the manuscript tradition of the *Vita Remigii*. While most copies preserve the shorter will, very few contain the longer form – according to Krusch, a single copy, Vatican Reg. lat. 561.³¹ If Hincmar possessed or produced a longer version of the will, then it would be difficult to account for the proliferation of a textual tradition which almost exclusively favoured the

²⁵ *HRE*, 3.4, pp. 194-5.

²⁶ L. Desailly, *Authenticité du grand testament de Saint Remi* (Paris, 1878).

²⁷ M. Rouche, 'La destinée des biens de Saint Remi durant le Haut Moyen Âge', in W. Janssen and D. Lohrmann (eds), *Villa, Curtis, Grangia. Landwirtschaft zwischen Loire und Rhin von Römerzeit zum Hochmittelalter* (Munich, 1983), pp. 46-61. On the possibility of a lost intermediate inventory, see W. Goffart, 'From Roman Taxation to Mediaeval Seigneurie: Three Notes (Part II)', *Speculum* 47.3 (1972), pp. 373-94, at pp. 393-4; J. Devisse, *Hincmar, Archevêque de Reims, 845-882*, 3 vols (Geneva, 1975), I, pp. 106-11.

²⁸ On this genuine but highly problematic document, see J.-P. Devroey (ed.), *Le polyptyque et les listes de cens de l'abbaye de Saint-Remi de Reims (IX^e-XI^e siècles)* (Rheims, 1984); with the essential revisions of P. Desportes and F. Dolbeau, 'Découverte de nouveaux documents relatifs au Polyptyque de Saint-Remi de Reims. À propos d'une édition récente', *Revue du Nord* 68 (1986), pp. 575-607.

²⁹ *Miracula sancti Germani*, 1.6, ed. *Acta Sanctorum, Julii*, VII, cols 255-83, at col. 268; see J. Lusse, 'À propos du testament de saint Remi', in Rouche (ed.), *Clovis*, I, pp. 451-67, at pp. 459-60; Oppenheimer, *Legend*, pp. 230-4.

³⁰ *HRE*, 2.4, pp. 140-1. Flodoard also refers to (and offers very brief summaries of) the wills of bishops Benagius (1.9, p. 79), Sonnatius (2.5, pp. 145-6) and Lando (2.6, pp. 147-8).

³¹ Krusch, 'Reimses Remigius-Fälschungen', p. 559. Recent historians have been reluctant to state how many manuscripts of the *Vita* contain the shorter will versus the longer: e.g. Stratmann, *HRE*, p. 11; Sot, *Un historien*, p. 752. Some manuscripts of the *Vita* apparently do not contain the will at all: Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 467-8. The only manuscript survey is still that of Krusch, *Vita Remigii*, pp. 244-8; however, this is severely lacking and the manuscript tradition is desperately in need of renewed investigation: see Devisse, *Hincmar*, II, pp. 1008-9.

shorter will. Furthermore, it must be noted that Rheims Bibliothèque municipale 1402 (*antea* 1146), written at the cathedral of Rheims, contains an eleventh-century copy of the *Vita* with the shorter will (ff. 75v–143v), and, independent of the *Vita*, a copy of the longer will (ff. 151v–155r). The longer will is found within a pair of quires which were written and inserted into the original codex at some point in the fourteenth or fifteenth century.³² This strongly suggests, then, that the *Vita* did not originally include the longer will. And as we shall see in a moment, the author of the *Vita* found in Vatican Reg. lat. 561 almost certainly derived the longer will from Flodoard's *Historia*. The nature of the surviving manuscripts of the *Vita* therefore renders Hincmar's familiarity with a longer version of the will extremely doubtful. None of the above-mentioned studies have explored in any detail the relationship between the longer will and the *Historia*, the work in which the document is first found. That relationship is therefore worth examining in closer detail.

The will and Flodoard's *Historia Remensis ecclesiae*

Krusch's argument about the production of the longer will hinged on his understanding of Vatican Reg. lat. 561, written at the abbey of St-Remi in Rheims. Krusch maintained that the codex dated to the mid-eleventh century; that is, to around the time of Philip's 'election'.³³ However, this dating was flawed, and Krusch never actually saw the manuscript.³⁴ Frederick M. Carey, who was highly familiar with the scriptoria of Rheims, dated Vatican Reg. lat. 561 to the second half of the tenth century.³⁵ Furthermore, this manuscript unquestionably postdates the production of Flodoard's *Historia*, because it also contains a unique life of St Basle – written in the same hand as the *Vita Remigii* – which borrowed four miracles composed by Flodoard for the *Historia*. Flodoard's authorship of these miracles is confirmed by the fact that one of them concerned his own maternal uncle. That this life of Basle was composed after the time Flodoard was active is further suggested by two other features: the impossible attribution of its authorship to Archbishop Seulf of Rheims (922–5), and its

³² Krusch, *Vita Remigii*, p. 246; H. Loriquet, *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France, Départements*, vol. 39, pt. 2 (Paris, 1904), pp. 576-7, 581. This manuscript is the sole witness to the will independent of the works of Hincmar and Flodoard.

³³ Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', p. 559.

³⁴ Stratmann, *HRE*, p. 11, n. 103.

³⁵ F.M. Carey, 'The Scriptorium of Rheims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar (845-882 AD)', in L.W. Jones (ed.), *Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand* (New York, 1938), pp. 41-60, at p. 59.

incorrect dating of a 937 Magyar assault on Rheims to 938.³⁶ It is highly unlikely that Flodoard – a close acquaintance of Seulf and our source for the invasion – would have made these mistakes. This manuscript is probably the earliest extant witness to the longer will, but the notion that it is where the longer will originated is doubtful. As Flodoard's *Historia* was a source for at least one of the additional texts of Vatican Reg. lat. 561, it is very likely that it was also the source for the longer will.

Curiously, nobody has ever entertained the prospect that the longer will was produced during Flodoard's day. This is all the more striking as it is found in all surviving manuscripts of the *Historia*. The relationship between the *Historia* and the will has attracted little comment because, as we have seen, historians have usually assumed either that the longer version was available to the historian and he simply inserted it in his work, or that somebody tampered with the will long after the *Historia* was completed. The manuscript tradition of the *Historia* is rather problematic because the earliest copy of the work dates to the third quarter of the twelfth century. This redaction and its subsequent copies represent one branch of the stemma, while a separate tradition is uniquely preserved in a fifteenth-century manuscript from St-Remi.³⁷ This later copy features some notable differences and includes information omitted from all other manuscripts, so modern editors have considered it to represent a valuable redaction of the work.³⁸ One such difference is the placement of Remigius' will: in one branch, it constitutes chapter eighteen of the first book, while in the other it is switched with chapter nineteen. It is partly for this reason that Sot argued that Flodoard never actually included any version of the will in the work. In his view, the will interrupts the flow of Flodoard's narrative, and he noted that it contains information which is repeated elsewhere in the first book of the *Historia*.³⁹ Be that as it may, the quotation of such a document is entirely in line with what one would expect from a source-driven historian like Flodoard.⁴⁰ The *Historia* offers plenty of letters and diplomas recorded in full, while synodal legislation, saints' lives and other narrative sources are quoted at length. Flodoard was operating within a tradition of history-writing firmly grounded in the use of documentary material, as

³⁶ *Pseudo-Seulfi Vita Sancti Basoli*, ed. M. Goulet, *Adsonis Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, CCCM 198 (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 257-69; cf. pp. 267-9 and *HRE*, 2.3, pp. 138-40. For the Magyar invasion of 937, see *Annales*, s.a. 937, pp. 65-8. Vatican Reg. lat. 561 is the sole witness to this text prior to the fifteenth century. See also the commentary of Goulet, *Adsonis*, pp. 187-216.

³⁷ For details and a full survey, see Stratmann, *HRE*, pp. 31-5.

³⁸ Stratmann, *HRE*, pp. 36-9, 45, 48.

³⁹ Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 751-3. Cf. Isaiia, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 467-8, arguing that Hincmar likewise never included any will in his *Vita Remigii*.

⁴⁰ Cf. the so-called *Libellus Artoldi*, which constitutes *HRE*, 4.35, pp. 428-34, but largely reprises the previous seventeen chapters of Flodoard's narrative.

established by Eusebius and emulated by early medieval historians from Gregory of Tours to Regino of Prüm. Indeed, the influence of Eusebius' model on Flodoard and his works has been widely acknowledged.⁴¹ There are thus good reasons to view the longer will as an original component of Flodoard's *Historia*. In addition, there is in fact a much stronger correlation between both the content and aims of the will and the *Historia* than has hitherto been appreciated. With all this in mind, let us now explore in more detail how certain aspects of the longer testament relate to what we know about Flodoard, his *Historia* and the circumstances in which it was produced.

The Rheims dispute, 925–948

The history of Rheims in the first half of the tenth century was framed by a long-running struggle between two rival archbishops and the respective powers behind each candidate. Flodoard provides the only detailed narratives (in his *Annales* and *Historia*) of this far-reaching political dispute. The conflict began, according to the historian, when the incumbent archbishop Seulf promised the powerful magnate Count Heribert II of Vermandois the right to select the next archbishop in exchange for the count's assistance in restoring some lands which had been unjustly taken from the church of Rheims. Seulf died in 925, and Heribert infamously chose as the new archbishop his five-year-old son, Hugh. The count's rapid accumulation of resources and power soon aroused suspicion among his colleagues, however. In 931, Heribert's former allies Raoul (king of West Francia, 923–36) and Hugh the Great (the Robertian count of Paris and Tours) ousted him from Rheims. They ejected the young Archbishop Hugh and oversaw the election of a new archbishop, Artold, a monk from the monastery of St-Remi. The troubles once again came to a head in 940, however, when Count Heribert, now back in league with Hugh the Great, besieged and captured Rheims from Louis IV (r. 936–54). Artold was deposed and Heribert's son Hugh – still only twenty years old – was reinstated. The early 940s were a dismal time for Louis as he struggled to come to terms with his domestic enemies. The king's authority scarcely extended beyond the key stronghold of Laon. Even after Heribert's sudden death in 943, his situation did not improve. In 945, Louis was taken prisoner by Hugh the Great, who probably sought to depose him. He was

⁴¹ Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, pp. 94-110; Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 92-3; 634. On Eusebius' general influence on Frankish historians, see M. Innes and R. McKitterick, 'The writing of history', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 193-220, at pp. 195-6.

only released upon the intervention of his fellow kings Edmund of Wessex (his mother Eadgifu's half-brother) and Otto I of East Francia (his wife Gerberga's brother). In 946, Louis and Otto together recaptured Rheims, ejected Archbishop Hugh and restored Artold to the see. Four synods were convened in 947–8 to settle the archiepiscopal dispute once and for all. The most important of these was held in Ingelheim in June 948. This assembly was attended by Louis and Otto, a papal legate and over thirty bishops. Here the deposed Archbishop Hugh was excommunicated and Artold's claim was formally recognized. Artold remained archbishop until his death in 961, at which point Hugh made an unsuccessful bid to reclaim the see. In the event, however, Hugh himself died in early 962.⁴²

Crucially, Flodoard became caught up in this dispute. He himself tells us that in 925 he was stripped of his benefices and duties by Heribert for abstaining from Hugh's 'election'.⁴³ Then, in 940, Heribert placed Flodoard in custody for six months and once more confiscated his temporalities after the historian unsuccessfully attempted to flee the turmoil at Rheims.⁴⁴ In assessing Flodoard's position in the dispute, scholars of late have variously suggested that Flodoard was a supporter of Hugh of Vermandois;⁴⁵ that he considered the two archbishops equally legitimate;⁴⁶ that his true commitment was rather to the church of Rheims itself;⁴⁷ or that he genuinely did not know who was the lawful candidate, and thus submitted the facts of the matter to God's judgement in a manner which appears 'objective' to us.⁴⁸ Almost perversely, Flodoard has scarcely been considered a supporter of Artold. Recent commentators have argued that Flodoard disliked Artold by pointing to his terse, un-eulogistic notice of the archbishop's death in his *Annales*; the 'Visions of Flothilde', a little-known text composed by Flodoard in 940–2, in which a local girl witnessed a vision of Artold being rebuked by St Remigius and then consumed by flames; and finally the fact that Flodoard did not use the *Historia* – written in the aftermath of the Ingelheim settlement – as

⁴² For helpful overviews of the dispute, see Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 245–318; J. Glenn, *Politics and History in the Tenth Century: The Work and World of Richer of Reims* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 215–34; and for Rheims in general in this period, R. McKitterick, 'The Carolingian Kings and the See of Rheims, 882–987', in P. Wormald, D.A. Bullough and R. Collins (eds), *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J.M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 228–49.

⁴³ *HRE*, 4.20, pp. 411–12.

⁴⁴ *Annales*, s.a. 940, p. 78; *HRE*, 4.28, p. 420.

⁴⁵ Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 311–18.

⁴⁶ Glenn, *Politics and History*, pp. 228–34.

⁴⁷ R. McKitterick, 'The Church', in T. Reuter (ed.), *New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. III (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 130–62, at pp. 146–7.

⁴⁸ G. Koziol, *The Politics of Memory and Identity in Carolingian Royal Diplomas: The West Frankish Kingdom (840–987)* (Utrecht, 2012), pp. 418–22.

an occasion to denigrate the deposed Hugh or heap praise upon Artold.⁴⁹ But the historian's apparent indifference in his report of Artold's passing is mirrored by the similar tone he adopted in reference to other archbishops of whom he clearly approved.⁵⁰ Moreover, it is not at all clear that the 'Visions of Flothilde' attest to a widespread popular (or authorial) opinion of Artold. The text may simply represent how Flodoard and his contemporaries sought to understand the turmoil at Rheims around 940 and rationalize Artold's deposition. In addition, it must be remembered that when Flodoard composed his *Historia*, it was by no means certain that the archiepiscopal dispute was definitely over. Indeed, Hugh *did* try to recover the see once more in 962, and there were bishops prepared to support him.⁵¹ It made sense for Flodoard to write in a deliberately ambiguous manner, for he had had his fingers burned on two previous occasions for protesting Hugh's election. In stark contrast with the punishments meted out by Heribert and the likelihood that his duties within the cathedral chapter were diminished under Hugh,⁵² Flodoard enjoyed a position of prominence in Artold's entourage, serving on multiple diplomatic embassies for the archbishop and Louis. In addition, the nature of Flodoard's reporting in his annals for 943–6 strongly indicates that he was in fact away from Rheims on the road with Louis and Artold.⁵³

There is much to suggest that Flodoard wrote the *Historia* in part to commemorate the resolution of the archiepiscopal dispute. All extant manuscripts of the work are dedicated to a *presul R.*, who is widely agreed to have been Archbishop Robert of Trier (931–56).⁵⁴ Robert, one of Otto's chief counsellors, took a leading role in the settlement of the Rheims dispute and in Ottonian intervention in West Frankish affairs. Robert stood to gain from his supervision of the settlement, for this role would enhance his own claims to metropolitan

⁴⁹ E.g. Glenn, *Politics and History*, p. 231; Koziol, *Politics of Memory*, pp. 421-2. For Flodoard's comment on Artold's death, see *Annales*, s.a. 961, p. 150. For Flothilde, see *Visiones Flothildis*, ed. Lauer, *Les Annales*, pp. 168-76.

⁵⁰ Cf. Flodoard's report of Heriveus' death: *Annales*, s.a. 922, p. 10. The historian held Heriveus in high regard, not least because he had awarded Flodoard and other canons numerous benefices: *HRE*, 4.13, p. 406.

⁵¹ *Annales*, s.a. 962, pp. 151-3.

⁵² Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, p. 23, n. 33, arguing that the shorter annals for the period 926–31 are indicative of a reduced role in political activities.

⁵³ N.R. Freudenthal, *Flodoard of Rheims: A Study in Tenth-Century Historiography*, Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University (1974), pp. 25-7, 91-3; S. Bricout, S. Lecouteux and D. Poirel, 'Flodoardus Remensis can.', in M.-H. Jullien (ed.), *Clavis scriptorum latinorum medii aevi: auctores Galliae, 735-987* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 10-21, at p. 11. Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, pp. 47-8, agrees that Flodoard was away from Rheims, but argues that he was rather in the entourage of Hugh the Great.

⁵⁴ Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, pp. 52-3; Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 101-3. For an alternative view, see S. Lecouteux, 'Une reconstitution hypothétique du cheminement des *Annales* de Flodoard, depuis Reims jusqu'à Fécamp', *Tabularia 'Études'* 4 (2004), pp. 1-38, at p. 25. Flodoard also dedicated a now-lost manuscript of his verse epic *De triumphis Christi* to Robert: Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, pp. 63-4.

rights for the church of Trier within the East Frankish episcopacy.⁵⁵ He was in the company of Louis and Otto when they recaptured Rheims in 946, and he led the re-ordination of Artold.⁵⁶ Robert presided over each of the four synods convened in 947–8 to resolve the archiepiscopal conflict. In addition, Flodoard wrote that he and Artold stayed with Robert in Lotharingia for four weeks following the Ingelheim summit.⁵⁷ In the dedicatory preface of his *Historia*, Flodoard asserted that *R.* had frequently urged him to complete the work.⁵⁸ Though Robert's request may be an authorial topos, it is nevertheless clear that the *Historia* was partially intended to help close a disreputable chapter in Rheims' history by recalling its illustrious past.

Flodoard, the will and church property

Robert's intervention in the affairs of the neighbouring archbishopric of Rheims may have partly prompted another aspect of the *Historia*: its repeated assertion of the proprietary rights of the church of Rheims. Flodoard went to extraordinary lengths throughout the work to describe the territorial acquisitions of successive bishops and to illuminate the basis for his church's ownership of individual places. For Sot, this was a crucial aspect of Flodoard's construction of a 'sacred space', a collection of local churches, villages and communities which shared a Rémois identity through the transfer of relics, the naming patterns of churches and altars, and incorporation in the church's patrimony. This informed his wider argument that the work represented a carefully constructed literary work, a masterpiece of institutional *gesta* uniquely fashioned as a *historia* in the vein of Gregory of Tours or Eusebius. Sot considered Flodoard's prefatory claim to have written a *liber historiarum* to be a direct emulation of Gregory.⁵⁹ But this conviction about historiographical genres is perhaps too rigid, and in privileging the literary merits of Flodoard's *Historia*, the more immediate, practical functions of the text are obscured. Institutional *gesta* could also serve as property inventories, and numerous scholars have shown how these histories gradually evolved into more documentary-based 'chronicle cartularies' in the tenth century, which in turn laid the

⁵⁵ E.-D. Hehl, 'Erzbischof Ruotbert von Trier und der Reimser Streit', in E.-D. Hehl, H. Siebert and F. Staab (eds), *Deus qui mutat tempora: Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Alfons Becker* (Sigmaringen, 1987), pp. 55-68.

⁵⁶ *Annales*, s.a. 946, p. 103; *HRE*, 4.33, p. 425.

⁵⁷ *Annales*, s.a. 948, p. 115; *HRE*, 4.35, p. 436.

⁵⁸ *HRE*, preface, p. 57.

⁵⁹ Sot, *Un historien, passim*; on genre, see pp. 103-4; on sacred space, pp. 669-707.

groundwork for the emergence of cartularies in eleventh-century France.⁶⁰ Ultimately, historiographical genres were fluid in the tenth century, and attempting to deduce the functions of any work by ascribing it to a particular genre risks obscuring other contexts of production. In the case of Flodoard's *Historia*, we can be confident that proprietary prerogative was in fact a key circumstance of the work's composition because of what happened to Rheims' property in the course of the archiepiscopal dispute, and because Flodoard himself actually had personal interests in some of this property.

When Hugh was installed as archbishop in 925, Heribert appointed a suffragan to perform the necessary liturgical duties, and reserved for himself the right to administer Rheims' temporalities.⁶¹ He subsequently assumed control over many of Rheims' most important holdings, including *villae* and *castra* at Châtillon-sur-Marne, Coucy-le-Château, Douzy, Épernay, Mézières, Mouzon, Omont and Roucy.⁶² Flodoard's reporting of contemporary events in both his *Annales* and *Historia* reveals that these properties were all the subject of a great deal of dispute in the mid-tenth century. For instance, the *castrum* at Mouzon, situated on the eastern banks of the Meuse – in principle the border between the archbishoprics of Rheims and Trier – was the site of numerous clashes in the 930s and 940s, having become a key Vermandois stronghold and serving as Archbishop Hugh's base following his second deposition in 946.⁶³ Omont and Mézières, located in the same area around the Meuse, were likewise keenly contested, and Flodoard made clear his church's pretensions there.⁶⁴ The church of Rheims visibly struggled to maintain its hold of the *castrum* at Coucy, which lay much closer to Heribert's powerbase around Saint-Quentin.⁶⁵ Épernay, too, was lost to the church for much of this period; it was only returned by

⁶⁰ R.-H. Bautier, 'L'historiographie en France aux X^e et XI^e siècles (France du Nord et de l'Est)', *Settimane* 17 (1970), pp. 793-855, at pp. 816-22; P. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 102-3; G. Declercq, 'Originals and Cartularies: The Organization of Archival Memory (Ninth-Eleventh Centuries)', in K. Heidecker (ed.), *Charters and the Use of the Written Word in Medieval Society* (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 147-70, at pp. 156-8; C.B. Bouchard, 'Episcopal *Gesta* and the Creation of a Useful Past in Ninth-Century Auxerre', *Speculum* 84.1 (2009), pp. 1-35, at pp. 29-33.

⁶¹ *Annales*, s.a. 925, pp. 32-3; *HRE*, 4.20, pp. 411-12.

⁶² H. Schwager, *Graf Heribert II. von Soissons, Omois, Meaux, Madrie sowie Vermandois (900/06-943) und die Francia (Nord-Frankreich) in der 1. Hälfte des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1994), p. 65.

⁶³ See in particular Flodoard's reports of conflicts there in 930 (*Annales*, s.a. 930, p. 46; *HRE*, 4.23, p. 415), 943 (*Annales*, s.a. 943, pp. 87-8; *HRE*, 4.30, p. 422) and 947 (*Annales*, s.a. 947, p. 104; *HRE*, 4.33, p. 425), and on Hugh's occupation of the *castrum*, *HRE*, 4.33, p. 425; 4.35, p. 432.

⁶⁴ For Omont, see his reports for activity there in 922 (*Annales*, s.a. 922, p. 8), 943 (*Annales*, s.a. 943, pp. 87, 89; *HRE*, 4.30, p. 422), 945 (*Annales*, s.a. 945, p. 99) and 949 (*Annales*, s.a. 949, pp. 121, 124-5). For Mézières, see the reports of 920 (*Annales*, s.a. 920, pp. 2-3; *HRE*, 4.16, pp. 408-9) and 960 (*Annales*, s.a. 960, p. 148).

⁶⁵ See the activities reported by Flodoard in 927 (*Annales*, s.a. 927, p. 39), 930 (*Annales*, s.a. 930, pp. 45-6; *HRE*, 4.23, p. 415), 949 (*Annales*, s.a. 949, pp. 123-4), 950 (*Annales*, s.a. 950, p. 128), 958 (*Annales*, s.a. 958, p. 145), 964 (*Annales*, s.a. 964, p. 155) and 965 (*Annales*, s.a. 965, p. 156).

Archbishop Hugh's brother, Heribert III ('the Elder') in 964.⁶⁶ Heribert II's spoliation of the see, coupled with Hugh's twelve-year occupation of the archbishopric, created great difficulties for the status of the church's patrimony: were these places the property of the church of Rheims or the House of Vermandois? It was often not possible to make such a distinction, and this conflict of interest illustrates precisely why the church of Rheims was keen to reclaim possessions which had been expropriated during Hugh's two tenures. Alienation of property by Rheims archbishops to members of their families was not uncommon in the tenth century, and Flodoard certainly frowned upon this.⁶⁷ However, this was a relatively minor problem in light of the substantial malappropriation that occurred in the course of the Vermandois conflict.

The will of Remigius contains provisions for a number of the properties contested during the course of the archiepiscopal dispute. Some of these places can be found in both versions, such as Mézières and Mouzon, the churches of which were beneficiaries in the will.⁶⁸ Others, however, such as Coucy (and the adjacent *villa* of Leully), Douzy and Épernay are only found in the longer version. The will describes in detail the basis for Rheims' ownership of each of these *villae*. Coucy, Leully and Douzy had apparently been granted to the church by a certain Ludowaldus (usually identified as St Clodoald, grandson of Clovis⁶⁹) with the consent of Clovis, while Épernay had been purchased by Remigius from a certain Eulogius. What is particularly striking, however, is that these properties are located within a section of bequests bearing an unusually strong correlation with what Flodoard wrote elsewhere in his *Historia*.⁷⁰ Douzy, for instance, crops up at numerous points in the work, especially within Flodoard's summaries of the letters of Archbishop Hincmar.⁷¹

Another area with which this same segment of the longer will is concerned is the land in and around the *pagus* of the Vosges, which was apparently formed through gifts from Clovis and purchases by Remigius. This area included the *villae* of Kusel, Altenglan, Behrenlès-Forbach and Bischmisheim, as well as all the woodlands, meadows and pastures in

⁶⁶ *Annales*, s.a. 964, p. 155.

⁶⁷ Fulk's brother held land from the church (*HRE*, 4.1, pp. 365-6). Heriveus gave property to his brother and nephew, who were especially obstinate about their claims following the archbishop's death: see *Annales*, s.a. 940, p. 76; 947, pp. 105-6; 949, p. 123. Ironically, Seulf promised Heribert selection of his successor in exchange for the count's help in expelling Heriveus' pesky relatives: *HRE*, 4.18, pp. 409-10. Artold also entrusted property to his brother and nephew: *Annales*, s.a. 943, p. 89; 960, p. 148.

⁶⁸ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 102.

⁶⁹ E.g. Stratmann, *HRE*, p. 98, n. 30.

⁷⁰ This section extends roughly from *HRE*, 1.18, pp. 98 (line 2) to 99 (line 28).

⁷¹ *HRE*, 1.4, p. 71; 3.20, pp. 267-8; 3.21, p. 276; 3.24, p. 321; 3.26, pp. 331-2; 4.2, p. 372.

between.⁷² Throughout the *Historia*, Flodoard was at pains to demonstrate Rheims' proprietary rights in Kusel and the Vosges. He included accounts of punitive miracles inflicted upon those who dared to illegally occupy the land;⁷³ he cited diplomatic evidence validating Rheims' claims there;⁷⁴ he wrote out summaries of numerous letters concerning the area written by Hincmar;⁷⁵ he reported how Heriveus had travelled there in 902 to consecrate a church in Kusel dedicated to Remigius.⁷⁶ Taken together, Flodoard provided an extremely detailed historical basis for his church's claims to these lands. He was probably so familiar with the area because in 951 he himself had been sent to Aachen, where he represented the church of Rheims in a dispute over the abbey of Kusel with Ragemboldus, a vassal of Duke Conrad the Red of Lotharingia. The case was heard at the Easter court of Otto I. According to Flodoard in his *Historia*, Artold had entrusted the land to Conrad, who had in turn delegated it to Ragemboldus, who had oppressed the *coloni* and plundered the land. Flodoard wrote that, despite speaking with Otto personally about the matter, he was unable to prevent Ragemboldus' continued abuses. Soon after, however, Ragemboldus was struck one evening by an invisible assailant, lost his mind, and soon died. Conrad, terrified by the prospect of being similarly punished by Remigius, immediately gave the land back to Artold, who assigned it to Hincmar, abbot of St-Remi in Rheims.⁷⁷ A 952 diploma of Otto confirmed the rights of Hincmar and his monks to the abbey of Kusel and its adjoining territory.⁷⁸ The church of Rheims' possessions in the Vosges area, therefore, were also the subject of considerable dispute in the mid-tenth century. Moreover, it is significant that Flodoard was personally involved in the reclamation of lands about which he wrote extensively in his *Historia*.

⁷² *HRE*, 1.18, p. 98. On the dubious origins of Rheims' claims in this area, see the critical study of Schneider, 'Remigiusland'.

⁷³ *HRE*, 1.20, pp. 108-12; 3.21, p. 272.

⁷⁴ *HRE*, 2.2, p. 133; 4.2, p. 372.

⁷⁵ *HRE*, 3.10, p. 210; 3.18, p. 259; 3.20, p. 267; 3.21, p. 272, 3.23, p. 316, 3.26, pp. 340-1.

⁷⁶ *HRE*, 4.13, p. 406. Heriveus came to terms with Archbishop Hatto of Mainz over Rheims' territorial rights in the area. A copy of this agreement and the verses of Heriveus' dedication of the church in Kusel has survived: *Notitia de conventu Hattonis archiepiscopi Moguntini et Herivei archiepiscopi Remensis*, ed. F. Baethgen, *MGH Scriptores* 30.2 (Leipzig, 1934), pp. 755-6. They exist in a single manuscript, Vatican Reg. lat. 418. R.-H. Bautier, 'Un recueil de textes pour servir à la biographie de l'archevêque de Reims, Hervé (X^e siècle). Son attribution à Flodoard', in C.-E. Perrin (ed.), *Mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen Âge: dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen* (Paris, 1951), pp. 1-6, argued that Flodoard had used and perhaps even written this manuscript, although this has been disputed by G. Schmitz, 'Das Konzil von Trosly (909): Überlieferung und Quellen', *Deutsches Archiv* 33 (1977), pp. 341-434, at pp. 350-1; and Jacobsen, *Flodoard*, pp. 59-60, n. 15.

⁷⁷ *HRE*, 1.20, pp. 111-12.

⁷⁸ *MGH Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae* I, ed. T. Sickel (Hanover, 1879-84), no. 156, pp. 237-8. It is only from Otto's diploma that we know the land in question was definitely Kusel. Flodoard described the subject of the dispute as land *in Vosago*.

A few lines later, after recounting the origins of Épernay, Douzy, Coucy and Leully, the longer will relates various gifts made by Clovis to Remigius of land in Septimania and Aquitaine, by a certain Benedictus of land in Provence, and by somebody (perhaps Clovis) of land in Thuringia and Austrasia.⁷⁹ Precisely what these holdings consisted of is something of a mystery, although Flodoard occasionally provides hints in his summaries of Hincmar's correspondence. The archbishop apparently wrote to various counts, bishops and kings about Rheims' *res* in the Auvergne, Limousin and Poitou, but he (or Flodoard) was extremely vague about exactly what was supposed to belong to the church. Most of Hincmar's correspondence about land in southern France (as preserved by Flodoard) referred only to unspecified possessions in 'Provence', 'Aquitaine' or 'the Cisalpine province'.⁸⁰ For the land in Thuringia and Austrasia, we can do only slightly better – in one instance, Flodoard reports that Hincmar received restitution from Louis the German of *Scavenheim* in the *pagus* of Worms, of Kusel and Altenglan in the Vosges, and of *Sconerunstat* and *Helisleba* in Thuringia and Austrasia.⁸¹ More frequently the names of these places were eschewed in favour of *res* or *villae* in 'Thuringia' or 'Austrasia'.⁸² Significantly, however, we know that the church was still attempting to keep hold of these distant properties in the tenth century. Flodoard wrote in his annal for 924 that during a royal excursion to Aquitaine on which he and Seulf were present, Seulf succeeded in regaining from Count Hugh of Vienne and Arles (later king of Italy) a tract of land in the province of Lyon which belonged to Rheims.⁸³ In addition, it is not unreasonable to assume that Flodoard, a negotiator at Otto's court in 951, operated in a similar capacity on other occasions – his thorough account of Louis' embassy to Otto in 944, for instance, strongly suggests he was part of that mission.⁸⁴ We also know Flodoard was in Rome around 936–7, perhaps on diplomatic service, a journey of which he left no trace in either his *Annales* or *Historia*.⁸⁵ Flodoard was clearly involved in the management of the property of his church. It is therefore quite possible that the canon had discussed Rheims' other East Frankish holdings with Otto when they met at other times. The fact that so many of the properties which the church – and in particular Flodoard himself –

⁷⁹ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 99.

⁸⁰ *HRE*, 3.18, p. 254; 3.20, p. 268; 3.21, pp. 271, 274, 286; 3.24, p. 325; 3.26, pp. 332-4, 345; 3.27, p. 352; 3.28, pp. 359-60.

⁸¹ *HRE*, 3.10, p. 210. On possible identifications of these places, see Stratmann, *HRE*, p. 210, nn. 52, 55-6. This act is known only through Flodoard. See also Schneider, 'Remigiusland', pp. 476-7.

⁸² E.g. *HRE*, 3.20, p. 263; 3.23, p. 303; 3.24, pp. 322-3.

⁸³ *Annales*, s.a. 924, pp. 20-1.

⁸⁴ *Annales*, s.a. 944, pp. 92-3.

⁸⁵ Flodoard's presence in Rome is known solely through his remark in *De triumphis Christi apud Italiam*, 12.7, col. 832.

was actively working to retain in this period were included in the longer will strongly suggests the document was produced to bolster contemporary territorial claims.

Charles the Bald's diploma of restitution (845)

There is, however, a further complication in demonstrating exactly when these additions to the will were made. As noted, it has often been argued that they were Hincmar's doing. Indeed, what we have just seen reinforces this notion in certain respects. For instance, it will be clear from the references above that the properties in question often featured in Flodoard's summaries of Hincmar's correspondence. Moreover, some of the longer will's information concerning the origins of the church's acquisition of these lands is only otherwise found in Hincmar's *Vita Remigii*.⁸⁶ Flodoard also wrote that the archbishop had mentioned in three letters that he was acting in accordance with the *testamentum* of Remigius when he insisted upon Rheims' rights to certain properties, and in these instances, the property concerned is found exclusively in the longer will.⁸⁷

Another crucial piece of evidence is a diploma of restitution from Charles the Bald recorded by Flodoard in full. Like so many other early medieval restitutions of property to Rheims, Charles' grant of 1 October 845 is known solely from Flodoard's *Historia*.⁸⁸ This diploma, given on the feast day of Remigius, shortly after Hincmar's ordination, restored Épernay, Leully and Cormicy to the church of Rheims. These *villae* had apparently been plundered during the episcopal vacancy that followed the expulsion of Archbishop Ebbo in 835 for his part in the deposition of Louis the Pious. The diploma asserts that the restitutions were made following consultation of the will of Remigius.⁸⁹ Épernay, Leully and Cormicy,

⁸⁶ The *Vita Remigii* is the only other source for Benedictus' grant in Provence (c. 9, p. 285); Ludowaldus' grant of Douzy (c. 20, p. 313); the purchase of Épernay from Eulogius (c. 17, p. 308); and the purchase of Kusel, Altenglan and the surrounding land (c. 17, p. 309). Note, however, the confusion over the origins of Coucy and Leully: *Vita Remigii*, c. 17, p. 307 (and quoting it, *HRE*, 1.14, pp. 91-2), states that Clovis granted Remigius the dues of all the land the bishop could circumambulate while the king napped one afternoon. The longer will (*HRE*, 1.18, pp. 98-9), however, asserts that the two *villae* were gifts from Ludowaldus granted with Clovis' consent.

⁸⁷ The letters to Count Gerard of Vienne about land in Provence (*HRE*, 3.26, pp. 333-4); to Count Bernard of Toulouse about land in Aquitaine (*HRE*, 3.26, p. 338); and to Erluin, a royal agent and local property owner whom Count Megingoz entrusted with Rheims' land in the Vosges (*HRE*, 3.26, p. 341). See Stratmann, *Hincmar*, pp. 48-9, n. 32.

⁸⁸ *HRE*, 3.4, pp. 194-5; *Recueil des actes de Charles le Chauve, roi de France*, vol. I, ed. G. Tessier (Paris, 1943), no. 75, pp. 210-13.

⁸⁹ *HRE*, 3.4, p. 195: *...inspecto coram cetu fidelium nostrorum tam ecclesiastici quam laicalis ordinis testamento sancti Remigii, presentialiter case sancte Marie et sancti Remigii atque Hincmaro archiepiscopo cum omni integritate reddimus vel restituimus...* ('...with the will of St Remigius having been examined in the

however, are only found in the longer version of the will. This charter was one of five from the *Historia* copied into the formulary collection known as the *Codex Udalrici* (c.1125), where its reference to the will of Remigius was excised.⁹⁰ As the *Codex* predates the earliest *Historia* manuscripts by half a century, it has been considered an important witness to the diploma and has led to speculation over the authenticity of its reference to Remigius' will.⁹¹ However, eliminating the names of specific people and places was standard formulary practice, so the version preserved by the *Historia* was very likely the same as what the author of the *Codex* had before him. Krusch assumed that the diploma had been tampered with in the eleventh century, but its authenticity is now accepted.⁹² What has been overlooked, however, is the history of the three *villae* restored by the diploma. Épernay was of little material concern to Hincmar, but it certainly mattered in Flodoard's day. Leully, on the other hand, was of some interest to Hincmar: it was regularly mentioned in tandem with Coucy, and in 870 the *villae* played a part in the famous quarrel between Hincmar and his namesake nephew, the bishop of Laon.⁹³ But Leully and Coucy were still objects of significance to Rheims in the tenth century, as we have seen.

The revealing aspect of this diploma is actually its mention of Cormicy. A relatively extensive but seemingly uncontroversial estate, Cormicy is about ten miles northwest of Rheims on the road to Laon. Hincmar was unconcerned with the *villa*, seldom referring to it in his works and never in his correspondence. It did, however, matter to Flodoard. In fact, it was his personal benefice. His administration of the church of St-Cyr (Cyrus) in Cormicy is one of the very few things we definitely know about Flodoard. Cormicy mattered so much to him that the historian, normally so unforthcoming with personal information, wrote in both his *Annales* and *Historia* how Heribert had deprived him of the prebend in 940 when he unsuccessfully attempted to flee Rheims.⁹⁴ Cormicy was a valuable benefice of substantial size, and Flodoard also administered two churches in Cauroy-lès-Hermonville, which lay

presence of an assembly of our faithful subjects, as much as from the ecclesiastical as the lay order, we return or restore immediately with whole integrity to the church of St Mary and St Remigius and to Archbishop Hincmar...').

⁹⁰ T. Reuter, 'Codex Udalrici', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 2 (Munich, 1983), col. 2209.

⁹¹ Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', p. 563; Tessier, *Actes de Charles, I*, p. 212.

⁹² Krusch, 'Reimser Remigius-Fälschungen', pp. 562-3. By contrast, see F. Lot and L. Halphen, *Le règne de Charles le Chauve (840-877)* (Paris, 1909), p. 152, n. 1; W. Goffart, *The Le Mans Forgeries: A Chapter from the History of Church Property in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1966), pp. 188-9 with n. 65; Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 650-1, 753.

⁹³ On this dispute, see P.R. McKeon, *Hincmar of Laon and Carolingian Politics* (Chicago, 1978); Fuhrmann, 'Fälscher unter sich'; and R. Schieffer (ed.), *Die Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon, 869-71, MGH Concilia* 4 supp. 2 (Hanover, 2003). Coucy and Leully also cropped up in the visions of Pippin and Bertha recorded by Hincmar in the *Vita Remigii*: c. 25, pp. 321-2; c. 28, p. 324; reproduced by Flodoard in *HRE*, 1.20, pp. 107-9.

⁹⁴ *Annales*, s.a. 940, p. 78; *HRE*, 4.28, p. 420.

immediately to the south.⁹⁵ Flodoard wrote about Cormicy widely. His references to it are slightly problematic, because the Latin names for Cormicy and Chaumuzy, another *villa* southwest of Rheims, are virtually identical. The various manuscripts of the *Annales* and *Historia* offer a plethora of indistinguishable spellings for these two places, giving such forms as *Calmiciacum*, *Calmisciacum*, *Colmisciacum*, *Culmisciacum*, *Culmisacum* and *Culmissiacum*. Modern scholars are equally undecided in their identifications.⁹⁶ Given the late manuscript traditions of the *Annales* and *Historia*, the two places cannot often be reliably distinguished.⁹⁷ Flodoard must have possessed Cormicy and not Chaumuzy, however, because a church of Sts Cyr and Juliette was recorded in Cormicy from as early as the twelfth century.⁹⁸ Furthermore, beyond those instances in which Chaumuzy can be safely deduced, Flodoard was most likely referring to Cormicy simply because it was his prebend.⁹⁹ He wrote about it on numerous occasions in the *Historia*.¹⁰⁰ In his *Annales*, he reported in 922 that Robert of Neustria established a camp in Cormicy, something he would have known well if, as is likely, Cormicy was one of the benefices he had received from Heriveus.¹⁰¹ Flodoard complained when Cormicy was unjustly plundered by Hugh the Great in 947 and 948.¹⁰² Crucially, Cormicy was also named in the longer will of Remigius. No basis for its acquisition is given, but the will directs the *decima* from Cormicy and two other *villae* to provide for forty widows who regularly sought alms outside the cathedral church in Rheims.¹⁰³

Charles probably did effect some kind of restitution, as suggested by the synod of Beauvais, which elected Hincmar to the vacant see in 845.¹⁰⁴ But it could not have been given in the form which has come down to us, and there is a strong case for viewing the restoration of 845 as a document which was interpolated in the mid-tenth century, perhaps even by

⁹⁵ On the size of Cormicy, see Rouche, 'La destinée', p. 52. For Flodoard's comments on Cauroy, see *HRE*, 4.28, p. 420.

⁹⁶ Cf. Devisse, *Hincmar*, I, p. 110; Rouche, 'La destinée', p. 47; Sot, *Un historien*, p. 495; Stratmann, *HRE*, pp. 158, n. 40; 162, n. 39; 195, n. 8.

⁹⁷ On the manuscripts of the *Historia*, see above. For the *Annales*, see Lauer, *Les Annales*, pp. xxxii-lxiv; with the important caveats noted by M. Lawo, 'Der *codex unicus* der Annalen Flodoards und ihre postume Überarbeitung', in O.B. Rader and M. Lawo (eds), *Turbata per aequora mundi: Dankesgabe an Eckhard Müller-Mertens*, *MGH Studien und Texte* 29 (Hanover, 2001), pp. 81-7.

⁹⁸ F. Poirier-Coutansais, *Les abbayes bénédictines du diocèse de Reims*, *Gallia Monastica I* (Paris, 1974), p. 181; see also an early fourteenth-century pouillé of Rheims: *Recueil des historiens de la France. Pouillés, t. VI. La province de Reims*, ed. A. Longnon (Paris, 1908), pt. 1, p. 14.

⁹⁹ It may be deduced that Chaumuzy is likely the subject of *HRE*, 2.7, p. 149; 2.11, p. 158; 3.10, p. 209.

¹⁰⁰ *HRE*, 1.20, p. 112; 2.12; p. 162; 2.13, p. 162; 4.28, p. 420; 4.36, p. 437.

¹⁰¹ *Annales*, s.a. 922, p. 9; on Flodoard's receipt of benefices from Heriveus, *HRE*, 4.13, p. 406.

¹⁰² *Annales*, s.a. 947, p. 106; 948, p. 117.

¹⁰³ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 99.

¹⁰⁴ W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankreich und in Italien* (Paderborn, 1989), pp. 207-8.

Flodoard himself. The historian's obvious ties with Cormicy partly explain why he was so keen to demonstrate the basis for Rheims' ownership of the *villa*. This intention is further explained by the fact that there does not seem to have been much trace of the church's association with Cormicy (or Chaumuzy for that matter) in the historical record before the late ninth century. Rheims' – and Flodoard's – claims to Cormicy may well have been legitimate, but in the mid-tenth century, there was no evidence of the church's ownership. When there was no such textual basis, it needed to be constructed, and this explains why documents such as Charles the Bald's act of 845 and the will of Remigius were amended and interpolated. Often there was a foundation on which to build, as when information was taken from Hincmar's *Vita Remigii* and fed into Remigius' will. But this was not a one-way street, and it is clear that the revised will must have then been used to buttress earlier claims, as in the case of the three summarized letters of Hincmar and the grant of Charles which all contain impossible references to the will of Remigius. Through all of this, an intricate web of proprietary justification was spun at a time when the church of Rheims was working harder than ever to protect its patrimony. At least part of the longer will must have been produced within this context. There are distinct correlations between the dispositions of the will and a) lands which were contested as part of the archiepiscopal dispute, b) lands which Flodoard was personally involved in reclaiming, and even in one particular case, c) a property which the historian himself definitely possessed. It is probably correct to see the will as having been amended on multiple occasions: there are, for instance, chunks of the longer will containing dispositions for places which are otherwise mentioned nowhere else in Flodoard's writing. However, the numerous links between certain parts of the will, the history of the see of Rheims in the mid-tenth century and the career of the author from whose work the longer will is ultimately known have not hitherto been appreciated. In addition, while scholars have often assumed that some of the will's procedural amendments were written in the context of the Capetian accession of 987 and the controversy over Arnulf's deposition and Gerbert's election in the early 990s, similarly tumultuous political conditions prevailed in the late 940s. The longer will laid out specific instructions for the deposition of a bishop who contravened its arrangements and alienated the church's property.¹⁰⁵ It is probably not simply a

¹⁰⁵ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 103: *Si vero, quod non opto nec cupio, sed neque spero, successor quilibet michi in hac sede Remorum episcopus execrabili cupiditate ductus res prefatas, sicut a me auctore domino meo Iesu Christo ad illius honorem et eius pauperum consolationem ordinate sunt, aliorum distrahere immutare, commutare seu quolibet obtentu in usus laicorum beneficii gratia dare aut a quolibet datas favere aut consentire presumpserit, convocatis totius dioceseos Remorum episcopis presbiterisque ac diaconibus necnon et ex filiis meis karissimis Francis religiosis quam plurimis reatus sui penam privatione sui episcopatus persolvat et nequaquam ultra recuperationem gradus amissi in hoc seculo promerebitur* ('But if – and this I do not want or desire, and neither

coincidence that Archbishop Hugh was deposed and excommunicated at Ingelheim in 948 along similar lines, for it was with him that responsibility lay for the usurpations and infractions of the House of Vermandois.

Episcopal primacy and royal legitimation

The church of Rheims' attempts to assert itself as the metropolitan seat of the West Frankish kingdom provide a final contextual consideration for the revision of the will. Hincmar's great efforts to establish his church's episcopal primacy and Remigius' status as the *apostolus Francorum* in the late ninth century have been well documented. During his episcopate, the reputation of Remigius was transformed. Hincmar had spent much of his early life at the abbey of the famous St Denis, the martyr reckoned to be the first bishop of Paris who had enjoyed the patronage of both the Merovingian and Carolingian royal houses. Remigius' baptism of Clovis made him a respectable saint, but his cult was distinctly more local. He lacked the widespread fame of St Denis or St Martin.¹⁰⁶ Hincmar set about remedying this. He oversaw the translation of Remigius' relics to a lavish new crypt in the presence of Charles the Bald in 852 and composed an inscription for the new tomb.¹⁰⁷ The archbishop then claimed to have recovered the holy ampoule used by Remigius in the baptism of Clovis, in which was still preserved some of the heavenly chrism from the occasion. Hincmar used this chrism to anoint Charles as king of Lotharingia in an elaborate ceremony at Metz in 869.¹⁰⁸ In addition, the archbishop's *Vita Remigii* played a crucial role in his promotion of

do I expect – whoever succeeds me as bishop in this see of Rheims, carried away by detestable greed, will presume to divert elsewhere, to alter or change the aforementioned things as they have been arranged by me by the authority of my lord Jesus Christ, for His honour and for the relief of His poor, or under any pretext whatsoever to give them as a benefaction for the laity to use, or to support or consent to their granting by anyone at all, then [should this happen] once the bishops, priests and deacons of the entire diocese of Rheims have been assembled, along with as many as possible of my most beloved and devout sons of the Franks, let the accused pay the penalty by being deprived of his bishopric. Furthermore, he will in no way be considered worthy in this world of recovering his lost rank.'). p. 104: ...*quod utique, si successores mei, Remorum scilicet archiepiscopi, operari, sicut a me ordinatum est, neglexerint, in se, quicquid in principibus reseandum fuerat, maledictionibus depravati repperiant: 'Ut fiant dies eorum pauci et episcopatum eorum accipiat alter'* [Psalm 109:8]. ('...and undoubtedly, if my successors – that is to say, the archbishops of Rheims – neglect to carry this out in the way I have instructed, let them, subjected to abuse and curses, discover for themselves everything which has been invoked to curtail the princes: "Let his days be few and let another take his office".').

¹⁰⁶ J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, 'History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar', in R.H.C. Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (eds), *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to R.W. Southern* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 43-70, at pp. 61-4.

¹⁰⁷ *HRE*, 3.9, p. 205.

¹⁰⁸ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 869, ed. F. Grat, J. Vielliard, S. Clémencet and L. Levillain, *Annales de St-Bertin* (Paris, 1964), pp. 158-64. For a recent assessment of the ampoule controversy, see N. Staubach, 'Regia scepra

Remigius' cult.¹⁰⁹ But Hincmar was not simply attempting to produce a facsimile Denis or Martin. Rather he was staking out a special position for Remigius and his successors as the Frankish kingmakers. In doing so, Hincmar was also seeking to establish his own office as the spiritual chair of the kingdom.

However, this programme was not altogether successful in the short term. For most of his tenure, Hincmar had been Charles' right-hand man. But during Charles' last years, Hincmar fell from royal favour, replaced as the king's chief counsellor by Archbishop Ansegisus of Sens. In 876, Charles obtained papal confirmation of Ansegisus' appointment as apostolic vicar north of the Alps, which granted him episcopal primacy over the West Frankish kingdom.¹¹⁰ Although Hincmar oversaw the coronation of Charles' son Louis the Stammerer at Compiègne in 877, his rival Ansegisus crowned Louis' sons Louis III and Carloman in 879.¹¹¹ Following the death in 888 of the sole remaining legitimate Carolingian adult male, Charles the Fat, the Robertian count Odo was elected king of West Francia and consecrated by Ansegisus' successor Walter at Compiègne in February.¹¹² Fulk (882–900), Hincmar's successor at Rheims, opposed Odo's elevation, but was in due course compelled to acknowledge his kingship, and even carried out his own coronation of Odo at Rheims in November 888.¹¹³ Fulk also received papal confirmation of the primacy of Rheims from Pope Formosus in 892.¹¹⁴ Then, with the backing of other nobles, Fulk crowned his own candidate, Charles the Simple, a posthumous son of Louis the Stammerer, at Rheims in 893.¹¹⁵ This rebellion failed, but Odo was forced to designate Charles as his successor. Charles thus became king outright in 898. In 922, Charles himself faced a major rebellion from Robert of Neustria (Odo's brother) who was consecrated at Rheims by Walter of Sens.¹¹⁶ Although Robert died in battle against Charles the following year, the West Frankish magnates chose Robert's son-in-law Raoul as king. Raoul was crowned at Soissons, also by Walter.¹¹⁷ In 936,

sacrans. Erzbischof Hinkmar von Reims, der heilige Remigius und die "sainte ampoule", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 40 (2008), pp. 79-101.

¹⁰⁹ Isaiä, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 417-64. Naturally, Hincmar included the story of Remigius' baptism of Clovis with the sacred chrism: *Vita Remigii*, c. 15, pp. 296-300.

¹¹⁰ See J.L. Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London, 1992), pp. 241-2, 244; Sot, *Un historien*, p. 718.

¹¹¹ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 877, pp. 218-19; 879, pp. 238-9.

¹¹² *Annales Vedastini*, s.a. 888, ed. B. von Simson, *Annales Xantenses et Annales Vedastini, MGH SRG in usum scholarum* 12 (Hanover, 1909), p. 64.

¹¹³ *Annales Vedastini*, s.a. 888, p. 67.

¹¹⁴ *HRE*, 4.2, p. 372; see G. Schneider, *Erzbischof Fulco von Reims (883-900) und das Frankenreich* (Munich, 1973), pp. 193-4.

¹¹⁵ *Annales Vedastini*, s.a. 893, pp. 73-4.

¹¹⁶ *Annales*, s.a. 922, p. 10; *Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis*, s.a. 922, ed. G.H. Pertz, *MGH Scriptores* 1 (Hanover, 1826), pp. 102-9, at pp. 104-5.

¹¹⁷ *Annales*, s.a. 923, p. 14; *Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis*, s.a. 922, p. 105.

Raoul was succeeded by Charles' son Louis IV, who was crowned at Laon by Artold.¹¹⁸ When Louis died in 954, Artold performed the consecration of his son Lothar at Rheims.¹¹⁹

That the rights of royal constitution in the late ninth and early tenth centuries were hotly contested between these rival churches is further demonstrated by a number of contemporary sources. A surviving manuscript of royal consecration *ordines* from Sens has recently been read as Walter's 'defence... against legitimist (Rémois) arguments of royal authority.'¹²⁰ From Rheims, we possess a pair of vision texts which stress Remigius' role as rightful consecrator of the kings of the Franks. The first is the 'Vision of Raduin', perhaps composed by Hincmar in his final years. Purported to have occurred around the time of the 833 deposition of Louis the Pious, Raduin, a Lombard monk, was visited by the Virgin Mary, accompanied by John the Evangelist and Remigius. At one point, Mary took Remigius' hand and told Raduin that this saint alone possessed the right to constitute the kings and emperors of the Franks.¹²¹ The second text is the 'Vision of Charles the Fat'. Written in Fulk's circle probably in 890, this work similarly emphasized Remigius' authority and role as rightful consecrator of the Frankish kings.¹²² Finally, one may also note that contemporary annalists from Rheims and Sens always made sure to point out when their own archbishop had consecrated a ruler, whereas they never admitted when their rival counterparts had conducted proceedings.¹²³

In the tenth century, there was a marked upturn in royal interest in Remigius.¹²⁴ Two late diplomas of Charles the Simple declared him and his wife Frederun patrons of the saint.¹²⁵ However, it was during the reigns of Charles' son and grandson, Louis and Lothar, that veneration of Remigius peaked. A charter of Louis indicates that he considered his kingship to be derived ultimately from Remigius through the agency of his successor

¹¹⁸ *Annales*, s.a. 936, pp. 63-4; *Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis*, s.a. 936, p. 105.

¹¹⁹ *Annales*, s.a. 954, p. 139; *Annales Sanctae Columbae Senonensis*, s.a. 954, p. 105.

¹²⁰ S. Bobrycki, 'The Royal Consecration *ordines* of the Pontifical of Sens from a New Perspective', *Bulletin du centre d'études médiévales d'Auxerre* 13 (2009), pp. 131-42.

¹²¹ *Visio Raduini*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Neues Archiv* 11 (1886), pp. 262-3; well-known because of its reproduction by Flodoard: *HRE*, 2.19, pp. 182-3. See P.E. Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, NE, 1994), pp. 230-3.

¹²² *Visio Karoli*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH Scriptores* 10 (Hanover, 1852), p. 458. For discussion and context, see Dutton, *Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 233-51; S. MacLean, *Kingship and Politics in the Late Ninth Century: Charles the Fat and the End of the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 166.

¹²³ Cf. the respective Sénonais and Rémois accounts of Walter's consecrations of Robert in 922 and Raoul in 923 and Artold's consecrations of Louis IV in 936 and Lothar in 954: above, nn. 115-18.

¹²⁴ P. Depreux, 'Saint Remi et la royauté carolingienne', *Revue Historique* 115 (1991), pp. 235-60; *idem*, 'Imbuendis ad fidem prefulgidum surrexit lumen gentibus: La dévotion à saint Remi de Reims aux IX^e et X^e siècles', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 35.2 (1992), pp. 111-29; Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 617-54.

¹²⁵ *Recueil des actes de Charles III le Simple, roi de France (893-923)*, ed. P. Lauer (Paris, 1949), nos. 87-8, pp. 196-9. See Depreux, 'Saint Remi', p. 250.

Artold.¹²⁶ Queen Gerberga, the wife of Louis and sister of Otto I, was especially fervent in her promotion of the cult. She herself had been crowned at Rheims by Artold, and she arranged for both the burial of her husband and the coronation of her son Lothar at the abbey of St-Remi.¹²⁷ Early diplomas of Lothar reiterated his family's patronage of the saint, and both he and his mother were also interred at St-Remi.¹²⁸ Finally, it has been convincingly argued that the contemporary *Vita Chrotildis*, a life of Clovis' wife Clothild, was written for Gerberga. Of particular interest in this text is the space accorded to the story of Remigius' baptism of Clovis with the heavenly chrism.¹²⁹

Small wonder, then, that in the midst of this intense appropriation of the cult of Remigius appeared Flodoard's *Historia*. Its production should certainly be viewed as part of the church's vigorous promotion of its patron saint. Furthermore, this championing of Rheims (and St-Remi in particular) was closely linked with the formation of Remigius' reputation as the true source of royal legitimation. Flodoard's little-known account of the visions of the young girl Flothilde (written 940–2) similarly advocated Remigius' role as rightful kingmaker. In one of Flothilde's visions, she apparently witnessed Remigius angrily chastising the people for breaking their oaths of fidelity to Louis, for lying to him and thus – via the saint's own intercession, since it was through him that kingship was bestowed – to God.¹³⁰ The longer will of Remigius also defended this right. Repeated reference was made in the longer form not only to the baptism of Clovis, but also to the bishop's enthronement of the king. Moreover, the fact that this document was presented as an integral part of Flodoard's *Historia* further reinforces the notion that they shared this purpose.

As we have seen, Hincmar's response to the challenge from Sens over his metropolitan rights had been to stress the historical basis for the primacy of his see – that is, the fact that the bishop of Rheims had baptized and crowned the first Catholic king of the Franks. It was probably also around this time that he produced the forged papal privileges of

¹²⁶ *Recueil des actes de Louis IV, roi de France (936-954)*, ed. P. Lauer (Paris, 1914), no. 44, pp. 98-100. See Depreux, 'Saint Remi', pp. 255-6.

¹²⁷ For Gerberga's coronation, *HRE*, 4.35, p. 430; and on the burial of Louis and coronation of Lothar, *Annales*, s.a. 954, pp. 138-9. On the influence of Gerberga in this period, see S. MacLean, 'Reform, Queenship and the End of the World in Tenth-Century France: Adso's "Letter on the Origin and Time of the Antichrist" Reconsidered', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 86 (2008), pp. 645-75.

¹²⁸ *Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V, rois de France (954-987)*, ed. L. Halphen and F. Lot (Paris, 1908), nos. 3-4, pp. 6-10. See Depreux, 'Saint Remi', p. 256. For the burial of Lothar and Gerberga, Richer of Rheims, *Historiae*, 3.110, ed. H. Hoffmann, *MGH Scriptores* 38 (Hanover, 2000), p. 231.

¹²⁹ *Vita S. Chrothildis*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM* 2 (Hanover, 1888), pp. 341-8. See K.F. Werner, 'Der Autor der *Vita Sanctae Chrothildis*. Ein Beitrag zur Idee der "Heiligen Königin" und der "römischen Reiches" im X. Jahrhundert', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 24-25 (1989-90), pp. 517-51.

¹³⁰ *Visiones Flothildis*, pp. 172-3.

Hormisdas for Remigius (which he included in his *Vita Remigii*¹³¹) and Hadrian for Tilpin, each of which made Rheims the vicariate of Gaul. Save for the few sentences of an anonymous annalist, we possess no contemporary version of events from the perspective of Sens. Yet there is every reason to believe that control over the rights of royal ordination was still a live issue around 950. That is precisely why, for instance, the two false papal privileges were also included in Flodoard's *Historia*, in addition to other key documents such as Charles the Bald's restitution of 845 and the will of Remigius.¹³² Moreover, Louis' kingship was not completely secure: Hugh the Great had attempted to engineer his deposition in 945.¹³³ Although a significant peace agreement between the two was struck (via the mediation of Otto and Gerberga) in 950, it was impossible to know just how long this accord would stand, especially if recent history was anything to go by. To defend Remigius' right to crown kings was thus to defend Louis' own ordination. That Flodoard's *Historia* supported his kingship in this respect should come as no surprise, given that Flodoard was so often present at the royal court in the 940s and early 950s, and that Artold was the king's archchancellor. The relationship between the see and the West Frankish monarchy was tighter around 950 than it had ever been in Hincmar's day. Hence the longer will of Remigius' concern to stress not only the saint's elevation of Clovis, but also its proclamation that this family should reign for eternity.¹³⁴ Readers can scarcely have failed to notice the parallel being drawn between Clovis and Louis IV, each of whom was of course *Hludowicus*.

Finally, the notion that securing metropolitan primacy was a major ambition of the church in the mid-tenth century is further suggested by the involvement of Robert of Trier in the settlement of the archiepiscopal controversy. Robert, as mentioned, was the dedicatee of

¹³¹ *Vita Remigii*, c. 20, p. 312.

¹³² Hormisdas' privilege is referred to at *HRE*, 1.15, p. 93; 4.1, pp. 365-6; Hadrian's privilege is reproduced in full at 2.16, p. 167; 2.17, pp. 168-9.

¹³³ See Koziol, *Politics of Memory*, pp. 256-8, 550.

¹³⁴ *HRE*, 1.18, p. 104: *Si vero dominus meus Iesus Christus vocem orationis mee, quam cotidie pro genere illo in conspectu divine maiestatis spetialiter fundo, audire dignatus fuerit, ut, sicut a me accepit, ita in dispositione regni et ordinatione sancte dei ecclesie perseveret, benedictionibus, quas spiritus sanctus per manum meam peccatricem super caput eius infudit, plurime super caput eius per eundem Spiritum sanctum superaddantur et ex ipso reges et imperatores procedant, qui in presenti et futuro iuxta voluntatem domini ad augmentum sancte sue ecclesie, virtute eiusdem in iudicio et iusticia confirmati et corroborati, regnum obtinere atque augere cotidie valeant et in domo David, hoc est in celesti Iherusalem, cum domino in eternum regnaturi, sublimari mereantur. Amen.* ('But if my lord Jesus Christ should deign to listen to the voice of my prayer (which I pour out daily in the presence of the divine majesty especially for that family) that, just as he received [the kingship] from me, so may he continue to govern the kingdom and direct the holy church of God with the blessings which the Holy Spirit poured over his head by my sinful hand. May very many further [blessings] be added to his head by that same Holy Spirit, and from him may kings and emperors come forth who, in the present and the future, in accordance with the will of the Lord for the growth of His holy church, strengthened and invigorated in judgement and justice by her virtue, have the ability daily to maintain and expand the kingdom, and be worthy of being raised in the house of David (that is, the heavenly Jerusalem), to reign with the Lord forever. Amen.')

the *Historia* and a close acquaintance of Flodoard. By judging the Rheims dispute, Robert was attempting to bolster his own claims to metropolitan rights in the Ottonian kingdom and to counter those of Archbishop Frederick of Mainz (who had been confirmed by papal privilege as apostolic *vicarius* of the realm¹³⁵). In turn, Artold stood to benefit from the pre-eminence of Trier because the validity of the judgement decreed by its archbishop would be strengthened. It was thus in the interest of each see to accentuate the status of the other. This explains why, for instance, Flodoard presented the synod of Ingelheim differently than it was recorded in the official synodal acts. Whereas the official proceedings began the list of participating bishops with those of Mainz, Trier, Cologne and Rheims (in that order), Flodoard recorded them in his *Annales* in the order of Trier, Rheims, Mainz and Cologne. And whereas the synodal acts depicted the council as being as much about the Rheims dispute as about the conflict between Louis and Hugh the Great (of which Otto was the primary intercessor), Flodoard minimized this aspect, stressing Ingelheim's preoccupation with ecclesiastical affairs and amplifying Robert's role.¹³⁶ The relationship between Rheims and Trier and their shared metropolitan ambitions can also be glimpsed in the longer will of Remigius. In describing how rulers who contravened the will were to be rebuked, it is remarkable that one of its provisions asserted that the bishops of the archdiocese of Rheims were to be joined in council by those of its 'sister' the church of Trier.¹³⁷ This language echoed that of Hincmar's *ordo* for Charles the Bald's coronation at Metz in 869, which he reproduced in his *Annales Bertiniani*.¹³⁸ Archbishop Thietgaud of Trier (847–67) had aroused Hincmar's ire by arguing for the metropolitan prerogative of his see over all of Francia through reference to the late antique *Notitia Galliarum*, which declared Trier the metropolitan of the Roman province of *Belgica Prima* and Rheims that of *Belgica Secunda*.¹³⁹ In this light, Hincmar's coronation of Charles at Metz – in the province of Trier – was a powerful demonstration of the link between royal unction and episcopal primacy. In the tenth-century political landscape, however, reference to the ancient sisterhood of Rheims and Trier came to symbolize the two churches' mutual aspirations.

¹³⁵ *Papsturkunden 896-1046*, ed. H. Zimmermann, 3 vols (Vienna, 1984-9), 1, no. 79, pp. 133-4.

¹³⁶ Cf. E.-D. Hehl (ed.), *Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens, 916-1001, Teil 1: 916-960, MGH Concilia* 6 (Hanover, 1987), pp. 157-63; and *Annales*, s.a. 948, p. 110. See Hehl, 'Ruotbert'.

¹³⁷ *HRE*, 1.18, pp. 103-4: *...et deinde ecclesia urbis prefata, adiuncta sibi sorore ecclesia scilicet Trevirensi, iterum conveniatur* ('...and then let the aforementioned church of the city [of Rheims], in conjunction with its sister, that is, the church of Trier, be assembled once again.').

¹³⁸ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 869, pp. 160-4.

¹³⁹ H. Fuhrmann, *Einfluß und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen. Von ihrem Auftauchen bis in die neuere Zeit, MGH Schriften* 24, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1972-4), 1, pp. 197-9; Schneider, *Hincmar*, pp. 87-8.

The longer will of Remigius was very much a product of its age. It reflects the conflicts which so deeply ravaged the church of Rheims in the first half of the tenth century, as well as its leaders' attempts to recover what was lost in this time and to boost the see's metropolitan claims. By divorcing the longer testament from its original context – Flodoard's *Historia* – many historians have overlooked the remarkable parallels between the contents of the will, the turmoil at Rheims, and the writings and career of Flodoard himself. To be sure, the will has a complicated textual history, and attempting to unravel it in light of the very late manuscript tradition of the *Historia* is always going to be a somewhat hazardous affair. For instance, numerous properties with which the will dispenses appear nowhere else in Flodoard's corpus and were evidently of little concern to Rheims in his day. There are also clear parallels between the will's procedural provisions and the tumult of the late 980s and 990s. We should therefore remain open to the possibility of some degree of tampering in the late tenth century, as many have argued. But the history of the archbishopric and the wider West Frankish political upheaval of the mid-tenth century provide a clear basis for a redaction of the will.

This study has further suggested that Flodoard was probably involved in the will's production, owing to its concern for places in which he took a personal interest. This assertion may seem surprising in light of the historian's modern-day reputation as a beacon of honesty and objectivity. But as we have seen, Flodoard was no isolated bystander. He was an actor in the West Frankish and Lotharingian political mainstream. That his works were shaped by his own agenda is perhaps no great surprise: in recent years, scholars have repeatedly demonstrated how medieval texts were conditioned by their authors' personal circumstances.¹⁴⁰ However, while this has sometimes also been presumed to be true of Flodoard, his political motivations and reasons for writing history have rarely been pinpointed, and the consequences of his participation in contemporary politics for the records he preserves have not been sufficiently appreciated. In addition, we should perhaps not be so surprised by the prospect of Flodoard's tampering with documents. There was, after all, a systematic culture of forgery and manipulation in ninth- and tenth-century West Francia, and there is no reason to assume that Flodoard was immune to these practices.¹⁴¹ It has often been

¹⁴⁰ A succinct overview of this and related developments in the study of early medieval historical writing can be found in M. Innes, 'Introduction: Using the Past, Interpreting the Present, Influencing the Future', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 1-8. To cite two near-contemporary examples, see on Regino, S. MacLean, 'Insinuation, Censorship and the Struggle for Late Carolingian Lotharingia in Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*', *EHR* 124 no. 506 (2009), pp. 1-28; and on Richer, Glenn, *Politics and History*, pp. 110-67.

¹⁴¹ See the recent emphatic critique of this culture in Koziol, *Politics of Memory*, pp. 315-99.

recognized that Hincmar cast a long shadow over his successors, but as Michel Sot showed, this shadow clearly fell over Flodoard too.¹⁴² One need only imagine the scene that must have greeted Flodoard in the cathedral archives: the documentation preserved there would have been overwhelmingly dominated by the archbishop's voluminous writings. As the epitomizer of some 500 of his letters, Flodoard probably felt a real affinity for Hincmar. Indeed, he actively sought to emulate the archbishop in many respects. Like Hincmar, Flodoard maintained a set of annals until his death. He was interested in visions and the truths they contained, and he wrote them up at length. He tirelessly promoted the memory of St Remigius and Rheims' illustrious past. And he staunchly defended his church's proprietary rights, even if it meant bending what we would consider 'the truth' along the way. Flodoard probably knew when some of Hincmar's claims were stretched. But it was the canon's job to find textual justification for his church's estates. Hincmar left Flodoard with not only an awful lot of material to work with, but also a lot of ideas about how to go about accomplishing this task. The fact that it is sometimes hard to find where Hincmar ends and Flodoard begins is therefore unsurprising, for in Flodoard the archbishop had a man who was prepared to fully appropriate not only his worldview but also his working methods.

¹⁴² Sot, *Un historien*, pp. 708-39.