The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture

*Selected Papers
from the 1991 Meeting of
the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*

Edited by
Paul E. Szarmach
and
Joel T. Rosenthal

THE FRANKS AND THE ENGLISH IN THE NINTH CENTURY RECONSIDERED

JANET L. NELSON

Before the Roman came to Rye or out to Severn strode
The rolling English drunkard made the rolling English road. . . .
A merry, a mazy road, and such as we did tread
The night we went to Birmingham by way of Beachy Head.[1]

I have taken my cue from Chesterton, not because I intend to talk about Anglo-Saxon trackways, or drinking habits, but to signal this paper's point of departure: that direct routes are not always the ones people take, nor are direct links therefore the only ones upon which historians ought to focus. Time-travelers to the ninth century need a map covering more than the English Channel. For ninth-century contacts between the Franks and the English often went a long way round: not rolling drunkenly, I hasten to add, but *carefully choosing* a route via Rome. Rome's unique combination of imperial and apostolic traditions was reinforced in the ninth century by the new historical reality of a western empire and by the papacy's newly asserted claims to jurisdictional authority. Anglo-Frankish contacts were pulled into a transalpine ellipse—and they can scarcely be understood unless we too feel the pull of Rome.

Over 40 years ago Michael Wallace-Hadrill argued that it was "Danish pressure" that "drew the English and the Franks—or at any rate their rulers—closer together than they had ever been before." It was in these "years of crisis" that "the full force of Frankish example hit England"—and Wallace-Hadrill saw the evidence in the historical

writing of Alfred's reign—the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Asser's *Life*.[2] Twenty years later, Wallace-Hadrill developed these insights in the latter part of *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent*.[3]

Ninth-century historical writing supplies evidence for political strategies in which a motive and motor, even more powerful than common concern with external defense, was competition. Wallace-Hadrill rightly diagnosed dynastic insecurity as a major problem for all ninth-century rulers; but his account of ninth-century remedies underestimated one that I see as of fundamental importance: the renewal of empire. This necessarily embroiled Franks and Anglo-Saxons in rivalry rather than in mutual support. Which brings me back to my starting point. The rulers and leaders of both Franks and English aspired—precisely because of their insecurity—to extend and defend their power by attaching it to imperial or papal authority. Ideologically speaking, and very often literally as well, all roads led to Rome. What follows is an investigation of three cases in point. They may seem only obliquely relevant to the continental reception of Anglo-Saxon culture. In fact, they should be read as evidence of the profound impact of that culture on the Franks. For it was not only Anglo-Saxon texts[4] but also Anglo-Saxon regimes that, through a variety of personal and institutional contacts, helped to re-focus the Franks' attention on Rome in the mid- and later-ninth century. Of course, that orientation was already congenial: short of legitimacy, Pippin, the first Carolingian king, had looked to papal authority, while his successors Charlemagne and Louis the Pious had drawn heavily on sanctity imported from Rome.[5] All that is well known. Later in the ninth century, however, established receptivity stimulated further kinds of reception of Roman models and Roman inspiration. Here too—and this is less well known—Anglo-Saxon culture continued to play an essential role. The very indirectness of the evidence is testimony to contacts so pervasive, influences so thoroughly absorbed, that they had become part of the air breathed in the Frankish world.

I. Imperial Strategies and Roman Legitimacy:
Æthelwulf King of Wessex and
Charles the Bald of West Francia

In recent years there have been two interesting accounts of the marriage of Æthelwulf with Charles the Bald's daughter Judith and its political context, both concentrating primarily on West Saxon interests.[6] If the focus is shifted to West Francia, the scene is dominated by Charles the Bald, restless, ambitious, inventive. He suffered the first major defeat of his career in August 851 at the hands of the Bretons; Charles salvaged his pride (at least) and put relations with the Breton leader Erispoë on a new footing: Erispoë "gave Charles his hands," and Charles granted him "royal vestments" but withheld a royal title. Charles himself thus implicitly assumed a superior "imperial" position.[7] In 855 he set up his second son as sub-king in Aquitaine; and in February 856 he set up his eldest son as sub-king in Neustria (the region between the Seine and the Loire), at the same time arranging the boy's betrothal to Erispoë's daughter.[8] These relationships, reinforced by public rituals, created a family of kings and princely allies, reminiscent of the Byzantine model. Charles was no emperor yet—but he had aspirations to imitate his grandfather Charlemagne.[9] The death of Charles' eldest brother, the emperor Lothar, in 855 had been followed by a parceling out of Lothar's realm among his three sons: the eldest of them ruled, as the West Frankish annalist put it, as "so-called emperor of Italy."[10] After 855, Carolingian political relationships altered fundamentally, and north of the Alps new prospects of empire-building opened up. Charles the Bald's initiatives in later 855 and early 856 must be seen in the light of a response to the new conditions. So too must the marriage of Charles' daughter to Æthelwulf: it brought the West Saxon king into Charles' "family of kings," succeeding where Charlemagne had in a sense failed with Offa. But Charlemagne was certainly his grandson's model for (at this stage) a *Romfrei* imperial ideal.[11]

In 849–50 when the Breton chief Nominoë deposed "his" five bishops, defying their Frankish metropolitan, the Archbishop of Tours,

King Charles had, it seems, sent a trusted agent, Lupus of Ferrières, to Rome to mobilize the authority of Pope Leo IV (847–55), and it was Lupus who could then draw on papal letters in composing the conciliar admonition sent to Nominoë by the assembled West Frankish bishops.[12] Æthelwulf of Wessex took a similar tack: in 853 (or end of 852?) he "sent his son Alfred to Rome. The Lord Leo was then pope in Rome, and he consecrated him king and stood sponsor to him at confirmation."[13]

Æthelwulf's decision can be seen in part as a defensive one: contacts with Charles' kingdom had been exceptionally close during the early 850's,[14] and Æthelwulf probably knew enough of Charles' imperial vision to wish to forestall any extension of it across the Channel. But Æthelwulf's frame of mind in 853 was less likely to have been defensive than quite positively assertive: in 850, at Sandwich in Kent, his son Athelstan had "slain a great army," while the following year Æthelwulf and his son Æthelbald "inflicted the greatest slaughter on a heathen army that we have ever heard tell of" at Aclea in Surrey.[15] In 853 the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records—immediately before the sending of Alfred to Rome—a West Saxon campaign across Mercia (at the Mercians' request) against the Welsh, and the Welsh "submission";[16] and the same annal ends with the marriage on Æthelwulf's territory[17] of Æthelwulf's daughter Æthelswith to the Mercian king. She may well have been crowned queen on this same occasion, following a Mercian precedent.[18]

There were new possibilities here. Could Æthelwulf set up his own family of kings? There is no evidence that in 853 or later he had set his face against a division of his realm: Asser c. 16 shows him dividing it in 856/58.[19] Given high mortality (Æthelwulf's eldest son, Athelstan, may have died in or soon after 851[20]) and the availability of potential sub-kingdoms, even a fourth son might hope for a realm. Contemporary arrangements were much more flexible than is often realized. Carolingian rulers who were Æthelwulf's contemporaries made and unmade succession arrangements to suit their own desires, and they created *regna* that modern historians call sub-kingdoms, without, apparently, staging formal king-makings for the recipients or conferring royal titles on them. Thus Charlemagne's eldest son and

namesake got a *regnum* in 790 but was crowned king by the pope only in 800, and apparently he did not have the title *rex* before that.[21] Louis the Pious' youngest son, Charles (the Bald), got a series of *regna* in the 830's and in 838 even received a crown without actually being consecrated king, or using the title *rex* before his father's death in 840.[22] It was not clear that Lothar's son Louis would rule in Italy rather than (as Lothar himself had finally succeeded in doing) in Francia. Only on his deathbed did Lothar make his final dispositions, and (evidently to some observers' surprise) carved out a *regnum* for his youngest son.[23] Æthelwulf in 853, I suggest, invoked papal authority to legitimize a similar possibility. Like Louis the Pious, like Lothar, Æthelwulf wanted his youngest son to succeed to a share in his composite realm, and in 853 he seemed in position to secure that. While Leo did not (strictly speaking) make Alfred a king, he set the seal of throne-worthiness on him: Alfred was now a prospective, a potential heir. The claim that Alfred was "consecrated king" in 853 simply drew out the implication of papally invented rituals that were probably intended anyway to be ambiguous.[24] Whoever, c. 890, entered this statement in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle had no intention of being controversial. The question of Alfred's truthfulness or otherwise seems to me a red herring.[25]

For two things seem certain. First, in sending Alfred to Rome, Æthelwulf was imitating Carolingian examples of the designation of kings' sons as potential heirs.[26] Charlemagne in 781 had taken (rather than sent) his third and fourth sons (aged four and three) to Rome, to be confirmed and consecrated kings by the pope,[27] and in 800 he had done the same with his son Charles the Younger.[28] Lothar I in 844 had sent his eldest son (aged eighteen) to Rome, where the pope (Sergius II) "anointed him king and invested him with a swordbelt"; and in 850, Lothar sent the same son again to Rome, where Pope Leo IV consecrated him emperor.[29] Second, Alfred was being kept in the running by being marked out for secular life; this is clear from Leo IV's own account of his reception of Alfred: as well as confirming him, he conferred the title of consul and invested him with a sword and belt.[30] In sending Alfred to Rome in 853, Æthelwulf was

forging his own direct link with Leo IV and also registering his own *imitatio imperii*: just as Lothar had had his son girded with a sword by the pope, so too would the king of a West Saxon kingdom recently extended to include Kent, and Devon, and Cornwall, and already with sights set northwards to Mercia and Wales.[31] There is a striking contrast, though, with what Charles the Bald did the very next year in the case of his own four-year-old son, Carloman, the third of three sons borne by Charles' wife between 846 and 849: "Charles had [Carloman] tonsured and dedicated him to the church"—that is, he meant to exclude him from the succession.[32] Charles' plans envisaged a limitation of partibility from early on—just the opposite of Æthelwulf's. As if to underline the significance of *his* strategy, Æthelwulf himself visited Rome in 855–56, bearing gifts that rivaled those of Carolingian benefactors (a golden crown weighing five pounds, golden armrings and a gold-decorated sword, two golden statues, four silver-gilt Saxon platters, and some embroidered vestments)[33] and taking Alfred with him "for a second journey on the same route, because he loved him more than his brothers."[34]

But ninth-century royal family planning was a hit-and-miss affair; and even today strange things can happen at home when rulers take trips abroad. The involvement of Æthelwulf's eldest surviving son in a major revolt during his absence meant that Æthelwulf dropped his own quasi-imperial pretensions and instead attached himself to Charles the Bald's; that was surely what it meant to become Charles' son-in-law (though the bride's consecration, and coronation, as queen may have owed something to Æthelswith's example).[35] In 856 Æthelwulf was no longer in any position to maintain Alfred's claims to a *regnum* in the face of his elder sons' hostility: by the terms of the will drawn up during the last two years of Æthelwulf's life, his youngest son had to be content with a share of his father's personal property, and some money.[36]

II. MILITARY SERVICE, FRANKISH, ANGLO-SAXON, AND ROMAN

In the Edict of Pîtres (June 864), Charles the Bald enacted that "those who cannot perform military service in the army must, according

to the custom of antiquity and of other peoples (*aliae gentes*), work at building new *civitates* and bridges and ways across marshes, and perform watch-duty in the *civitas* and on the march."[37] Despite the formulation, Charles was not referring here to *a single custom* that was both antique and practiced by contemporary foreign peoples. He was making a distinction: he recognized that while Christian Roman emperors required work on the construction of "public and sacred buildings," roads and bridges, and on the repair of walls, there was in fact no Late Antique precedent for demanding work on the building of *civitates,* that is, of walls around them; nor was there a precedent in earlier Carolingian legislation.[38] Hence Charles had to appeal, uniquely in his extensive capitularies, to an alternative model, acknowledging that in this respect the West Saxons had extended the scope of the state's demands further than the Franks themselves—and further than the Christian Roman emperors who elsewhere in the Edict of Pîtres were Charles' role models.

The earliest West Saxon charter references to the reservation of the royal right to demand fortification work—*arcis* (or *arcium*) *munitio*—belong, as Nicholas Brooks pointed out, to the reign of Æthelbald. The first appearance is in a grant of 858 to Winchester.[39] That Charles knew about a recent extension of West Saxon royal claims is entirely plausible: contacts between the two kingdoms and courts had surely been closer than ever from 856 to 860, when Charles' daughter was married to Æthelwulf, then, on his death in 858, to his son Æthelbald;[40] and in 860 a group of Danes who had crossed the Channel from West Francia (where Charles was attempting to recruit them into his service) were repulsed from Winchester—an event recorded by the Annals of Saint-Bertin as well as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle—perhaps because *munitio arcis* had successfully been required by the West Saxon king and was already paying dividends.[41] If Æthelbald and his successor had been implementing a burghal program during those years, Charles would have heard about it—and it may well have inspired his own program in 864, implemented in the later 860's.[42]

What inspired the West Saxons? Mercian and Kentish example, no doubt. But those had been available before, yet not followed. Again the

route to the answer leads via Rome. When Alfred and his large entourage[43] reached Rome in 853, Pope Leo had just the year before completed the fortifications linking St. Peter's with the city of Rome itself on the other side of the Tiber. Leo's biographer says that work teams were required from all the estates and towns in the duchy of Rome. Surviving inscriptions make it clear that each team, called a *militia*, was responsible for a stretch of wall.[44] Forty feet high with 44 towers and stretching for something over two thousand meters, the new walls protected, as well as St. Peter's, the *schola Saxonum*,[45] where Alfred surely stayed during his two visits. In the OE version of Augustine's *Soliloquies*, Alfred says there is a difference between seeing a thing and being told about it: "me þincð nu þæt ic wite hwa *R*omeburh timbrode, and æac feala oðra þincga þe ær urum dagum geweordon wæs, þa ic ne mæg æalla ariman. nat ic no ði hwa (Rome)burh timbrede þe ic self hyt gesawe."[46] He is referring to the ancient city—*ær urum dagum*; but the point perhaps had extra piquancy because everyone knew that Alfred had only *just* missed seeing a modern timbering of Rome.

III. FULK OF RHEIMS, ALFRED, AND THE ROMAN MODEL OF MISSION

Archbishop Fulk of Rheims was a key participant in the last phase of Frankish contacts with the English in the ninth century. It was Fulk to whom Alfred applied for a scholar who would help restore the learning and morale of the church in his kingdom.[47] Grimbald's arrival in 886 may not have been the necessary stimulus to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle's production, but it seems to have contributed, sufficiently, to the annals' content. On events in 885, continental information reached Wessex from East as well as West Francia: like the East Frankish Annals of Fulda, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle called Charles the Bald's grandson "Carl" instead of "Carloman";[48] and Asser knew that Charles the Fat had been king of the Alamans (not, *pace* Whitelock, "Germans").[49] The account of events s.a. 887 has not so much a West Frankish as a Fulk-ish slant—or to be more accurate, reflects Fulk's views on Carolingian legitimacy in 888 (but not before) and Fulk's persisting interest in Guy of Spoleto. Fulk had supported Guy for the

West Frankish throne in 887, despite Guy's lack of Carolingian blood in male or female line. Only once it became clear that Guy's bid would fail did Fulk switch his support to Odo, yet he remained keen to give the impression that Odo had become king only with Arnulf's permission: the *Annals of St-Vaast* reflect this in the story about Arnulf's sending a crown with which Odo was crowned on 13 November at Rheims— presumably by Fulk—and acclaimed by *omnis populus*, those who had previously opposed Odo now being received into "fellowship" (*societas*). Fulk had in fact pushed Guy's candidature because the two men were close kinsmen,[50] but he could offer the justification that Guy had been picked by the pope as an adoptive son.[51] Like Æthelwulf, and like the emperor Lothar, Fulk was playing the card of papal authority to legitimize a succession strategy.

The same authority underpinned Fulk's dealings with the English, as is directly evidenced in his letter to Alfred. Dorothy Whitelock resented that letter's "patronizing tone."[52] But patronage—*patrocinium*— in heaven as well as on earth was exactly the name of Fulk's game. Reading the letter to Alfred in the light of the quite substantial dossier on Fulk's career and political contacts before 886, one becomes aware of the Roman dimension to Fulk's conception of his own primatial position at Rheims. Fulk himself had been to Rome[53] (he continued to hope for a return visit that never materialized); and his first act on becoming Archbishop of Rheims early in 883 was to write to Pope Marinus, whom he already knew personally. In 884 he was writing to Hadrian III, and in 886 to Stephen V.[54] His repeated invocations of papal authority, and assertions of Rheims' primatial status, were two sides of a coin. Rheims was a Petrine foundation: its first bishop had been endowed with the primacy of Gaul by Peter himself. Peter's successors had held the see of Rheims in special honor. And the purpose and substance of this claim, in Fulk's mind, was quite literally its apostolic role. *Quamdiu apostolus sum gentium, ministerium meum honorificabo*: Fulk could quote St. Paul (Romans 11:13) with a real sense of historic unity between past and present in Rheims' specific task of mission.[55] Of Fulk's ninth-century predecessors, Ebbo had evangelized the Danes in the 820's, and Hincmar had identified St. Remi as the

apostle of the Franks, inventing the tradition of Remi's baptism of Clovis that was also a royal anointing, with oil sent from heaven.[56] Fulk fused these two themes—patronage and mission—in his letter to Alfred. Of course the English had already been evangelized; they already had their apostle, Gregory (in Fulk's eyes, and he had history on his side, the *apostolus Anglorum—apostolus vester*—was modeled on the *apostolus Francorum* rather than vice versa[57]): but the English, unlike the Franks, urgently needed a second dose of mission. Alfred had knocked on the right door—"quia una est catholica et apostolica ecclesia, sive Romana sive transmarina."[58] Fulk did not quite claim jurisdiction over the church of the English, though he came close in suggesting that church councils had assembled "non solum ex vicinis civitatibus vel provinciis, sed etiam ex transmarinis regionibus." (Was Fulk thinking of the Council of Frankfurt in 794?[59]) But what he did have to offer was *patrocinium*: and Grimbald too, endowed with Remi's authority, would extend his *patrocinium* over those who received him in England—descendants of the *gens rudis et barbara* to whom Gregory's decrees had been sent. Remi's successor did not have to pose as the middleman between the English and Rome: he actually functioned as such, writing to the pope after 886 *pro quorundam susceptione Anglorum.*[60] Like Charles the Bald with Æthelwulf, Fulk with Alfred exploited his strategic location on the route to Rome. At the outset of his pontificate, with *timor hostilis* real and immediate at Rheims, Fulk could understand all too well Alfred's anxieties about the irruption of pagans: Rheims' safety was credited to St. Remi's protection—but Fulk then rebuilt the city walls. His successor, Harvey, was to take the lead in converting Viking settlers in Normandy.[61] Mission and defense were necessary responses at Canterbury or Winchester as well as at Rheims. Fulk, and Alfred, had their sights set on a more distant destination even than Rome, but *patrocinium* with all it entailed of responsibility as well as power imposed a busy agenda meanwhile—one which both Fulk and Alfred (like Chesterton[62]) contemplated with zest and ultimately with optimism.

KING'S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

NOTES

1. "The Rolling English Road," G. K. Chesterton, *Collected Poems*, 10th ed. (London, 1943), p. 203. I should like to thank Joel Rosenthal and Paul Szarmach for scholarly inspiration over the years, and, in reference to the present paper, for their moral support and editorial patience.

2. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "The Franks and the English in the Ninth Century: Some Common Historical Interests," *History*, 35 (1950), 202–18, rpt. in his collected essays, *Early Medieval History* (London, 1975), pp. 201–16, at p. 209. The title of the present paper is intended to suggest a coda to Wallace-Hadrill's work.

3. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1969), chs. 5 and 6.

4. For that type of Anglo-Saxon cultural influence see the masterly paper by George H. Brown in the present volume.

5. P. Riché, "Les Carolingiens en quête de sainteté," in *Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (IIIe–XIIIe siècles)* (Rome, 1991), pp. 217–24.

6. M. J. Enright, "Charles the Bald and Æthelwulf of Wessex: The Alliance of 856 and Strategies of Royal Succession," *Journal of Medieval History*, 5 (1979), 291–302; P. Stafford, "Charles the Bald, Judith and England," in M. T. Gibson and J. L. Nelson, eds., *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, 2nd ed. (London, 1990), pp. 139–53, stresses Æthelwulf's wish to concert a common defense policy with Charles, against Enright's view of the marriage as Æthelwulf's response to the rebellion of his son. Stafford thinks the marriage provoked the son's revolt. See below, p. 144.

7. *Annales de Saint-Bertin* 851, ed. F. Grat, J. Vielliard, and S. Clémencet (Paris, 1964) (hereafter AB), pp. 63–64, tr. J. L. Nelson, *The Annals of St-Bertin* (Manchester, 1991), p. 73. For the significance of Charles' dealings with Erispoë see now J. M. H. Smith, *Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 108–15.

8. AB 855, 856, pp. 70, 856, tr. Nelson, pp. 80–82; and cf. on the latter episode the supporting evidence of charters: G. Tessier, *Receuil des Chartes de Charles II le Chauve*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1943–55), vol. 1, nos. 113, 114.

9. See Nelson, "Translating Images of Authority: The Christian Roman Emperors in the Carolingian World," in M. M. Mackenzie and C. Roueché, eds., *Images of Authority: Essays in Honour of Joyce Reynolds* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 196–205. For the broader context see A. Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe* (Berlin, 1984).

10. AB 863, 864, pp. 96, 105, tr., pp. 104, 112. Cf. AB 858, 859, pp. 78, 82, tr., pp. 87, 91, where Louis is called "king."

11. "Rome-free" empire was the phrase coined by C. Erdmann, *Forschungen zur politischen Ideenwelt des Frühmittelalters* (Berlin, 1951). See further Nelson, "Kingship and Empire," in J. H. Burns, ed., *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 230–34.

12. Lupus of Ferrières, *Correspondance,* ed. L. Levillain, 2 vols. (Paris, 1935), vol. 2, Epp. 75–77, 81, pp. 16–23, 56–65. See also W. Hartmann, ed., *Die Konzilien der karolingische Teilreiches 843–859* (Hanover, 1984), MGH *Concilia* 3, pp. 185–93; and Smith, pp. 154–55. Lupus' mission may well have had several other objectives: see E. Lockwood, "Lupus of Ferrières," Ph.D. thesis Univ. of London 1992, ch. 9.

13. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, general eds. D. Dumville and S. Keynes, vol. 3, *MS A*, ed. J. M. Bately (Woodbridge, 1986) (hereafter ASC), s.a. 853, p. 45, tr. G. N. Garmonsway (London, 1953), p. 64. Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, c. 8, ed. W. Stevenson (Oxford, 1904), p. 7, tr. S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* (Harmondsworth, 1981), p. 69, translates this into Latin, with additions: see below, p. 143.

14. The victory at Sandwich (ASC 851, p. 44, tr., p. 64) was recorded in northern Francia within months if not weeks of the event (AB 850, pp. 59–60, tr., p. 69); and Lupus of Ferrières wrote to congratulate Æthelwulf on his victory at Aclea (*Correspondance*, vol. 2, Ep. 84, p. 70). Further, at Æthelwulf's court, acting not just as a scribe but (if we take Lupus literally) head of the royal chancery (*Correspondance*, vol. 2, Ep. 84, p. 70, "epistolarum vestrarum officio fungebatur"; cf. vol. 1, Ep. 17, p. 98, on Charles' chancellor Louis, "epistolare in palatio gerens officium"), was a Frank called Felix, an old acquaintance of Lupus and also the recipient of a letter from him (Ep. 85) in 851. Lupus had just recovered control of Ferrières' dependent church of Saint-Josse near Quentovic, hence on the obvious route for English travelers to the Continent: see Stafford, pp. 140–41; and S. Lebecq, "La Neustrie et la mer," in H. Atsma, ed., *La Neustrie*, Beihefte der *Francia*, 2 vols. (Sigmaringen, 1989), vol. 1, pp. 405–40,

esp. 427–28. West Saxons were certainly interested in Breton affairs a generation later: ASC 885, 890; and Æthelwulf had very probably learned about dealings between Franks and Bretons very soon after the event.

15. See preceding note. Note Æthelwulf's contact right at the beginning of his reign with Louis the Pious, AB 839, pp. 28–30, tr., pp. 42–43. Could this be linked with the journey of Archbishop Wigmund of York (to whom Lupus also wrote c. 851) to Rome to collect his pallium, c. 839?

16. ASC, pp. 44–45; tr. Garmonsway, pp. 64–66.

17. Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, c. 8, ed. Stevenson, p. 8, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 69: "at the royal estate called Chippenham."

18. See Stafford, p. 149 and n. 65.

19. Asser, *Life of Alfred*, ed. Stevenson, pp. 14–15: "regni inter filios suos, duos scilicet seniores, . . . divisionem ordinabiliter literis mandari procuravit." Cf. tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 72. On Æthelwulf's intentions see D. P. Kirby, *The Earliest English Kings* (London, 1991), pp. 198–204. I read Kirby's book only after delivering this paper; though my conclusions differ somewhat from his, I have found his discussion characteristically thought-provoking.

20. Cf. Keynes and Lapidge, pp. 231–32: "[Æthelstan] is not heard of again after 851."

21. See P. Classen, "Karl der Grosse und der Thronfolge im Frankenreich," in *Festschrift für H. Heimpel*, vol. 3 (Göttingen, 1972), pp. 109–34.

22. See Janet L. Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London, 1992), pp. 92–97.

23. AB 855, p. 71; cf. 856, p. 73, tr., pp. 81, 83.

24. Cf. AB 869, p. 155, tr., p. 156, for symbolic papal gifts to Lothar II, and their interpretation. There is of course no question of confusing distinct liturgical rites in 853: the ambiguity centers on the status of *regna* and *reges* in kingdoms that were family firms.

25. I took a rather different view in "The Problem of King Alfred's Royal Anointing," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 18 (1967), 145–63, rpt. in my essays, *Politics and*

Ritual in Early Medieval Europe (London, 1986), pp. 309–27 (cited hereafter from the reprint).

26. He may also have been mindful of the Mercian precedent of Offa, whose son Ecgfrith had perhaps been consecrated by papal legates in England; see Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship*, p. 114. If so, Æthelwulf meant to go one better.

27. *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. F. Kurze, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum* (Hanover, 1895), pp. 56–57.

28. Unmentioned in the *Annales Regni Francorum*, but clearly stated in *Vita Leonis III*, c. 24, *Liber Pontificalis*. ed. L. Duchesne, rev. C. Vogel, 3 vols. (Paris, 1955–57), vol. 3, p. 8; tr. R. Davis, *The Lives of the Eighth-Century Popes (Liber Pontificalis)* (Liverpool, 1992), p. 191.

29. AB 844, pp. 45–46: ". . . Hlodouuicum pontifex Romanus unctione in regem consecratum cingulo decoravit," tr., p. 57 (taking *cingulum* to imply 'sword'), and AB 850, p. 59, tr., p. 69.

30. ". . . consulatus cingulo honore vestimentisque ut mos est Romanis consulibus decoravimus," ed. A. de Hirsch-Gereuth, MGH *Epistolae* 5 (Berlin, 1899), p. 602. I argued 25 years ago that the consulship and investiture with sword were anachronisms branding the letter fragment of Leo IV an 11th-century forgery. I am now fairly sure that I was wrong: the so-called *Tract on Offices*, convincingly argued by P. S. Barnwell, "*Epistula Hieronimi de Gradus Romanorum*: An English School Book," *Historical Research*, 64 (1991), 77–86, to be an Anglo-Saxon schoolbook diffused on the Continent in the 9th century, shows *consul* a familiar term for viceroy; and for instances of papal *imitatio imperii* in the Donation of Constantine (where c. 15 specificies the papal right to appoint consuls) and elsewhere, see my "Problem of King Alfred's Royal Anointing," pp. 312–13. The appointment of Alfred as consul does fit within this context.

31. The significance of Æthelwulf's reign is underlined by P. Wormald, "The Ninth Century," in J. Campbell, ed., *The Anglo-Saxons* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 140–42, and also by Kirby, p. 195.

32. AB p. 70, tr., p. 79. See Nelson, "A Tale of Two Princes: Politics, Text and Ideology in a Carolingian Annal," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 10 (1988), 105–41, at p. 109.

33. *Vita Benedicti III, Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. 148: "gabatae saxiscae de argento exaurato IIII, saraca de olovero cum chrisoclavo I, camisa alba sigillata olosyrica cum chrisoclavo I, vela maiora de fundato II."

34. Asser, *Life of Alfred*, c. 11, ed. Stevenson, p. 9: "iterum in eandem viam secum ducens. . . ." In my 1967 article, pp. 325–26, I mistakenly rejected Asser's unequivocal statement about Alfred's second journey. For suggestive observations on important, and hitherto neglected, evidence see S. Keynes, "Anglo-Saxon Entries in the 'Liber Vitae' of Brescia," in J. Roberts and J. L. Nelson, eds., *Alfred the Wise. Studies in Honour of Janet Bately* (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 99–119.

35. See above, p. 142; for Æthelwulf's intentions cf. Enright, "Charles the Bald and Æthelwulf of Wessex."

36. Asser, *Life of Alfred*, c. 16, ed. Stevenson, pp. 14–15, tr., p. 72.

37. MGH *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause (Hanover, 1897), vol. 2, no. 273, c. 27.

38. See N. Brooks, "The Development of Military Obligations in Eighth- and Ninth-Century England," in P. Clemoes and K. Hughes, eds., *England before the Conquest: Studies Presented to Dorothy Whitelock* (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 69–84.

39. B 495/S 1274. In this and following references to Anglo-Saxon charters, B signifies the number in W. de G. Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, 4 vols. (London, 1885–99), and S, the number in P. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968). B 451/S 298 shows Æthelwulf already reserving host- and bridge-service in 847. See Brooks, p. 81, for further references to reservation of *arcis* [*arcium*] *munitio* in B 500/S 326 (860); B 504–5/S 335 (862); and B 508/S 336 (863—for 868). To these may be added B 520/S 340 (868) and B 886/S 341 (869), both with a possibly authentic base.

40. Judith's marriage to her stepson evoked "magna infamia," according to Asser, *Life of Alfred*, c. 17, ed. Stevenson, p. 16, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 73, but it is recorded without comment in AB 858, p. 76, tr., p. 86.

41. AB 860, p. 83, tr., p. 92, records the Anglo-Saxons' repulse of Danes from the Somme; ASC 860, p. 46, tr., p. 68, says they had attacked Winchester, and Asser, *Life*

of Alfred, c. 18, ed. Stevenson, p. 18, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 74, adds that they fled "like women." AB 861, p. 85, tr. p. 95, records the return of this group (now naming their commander as Weland) from England. Charles seems to have employed a Dane named Ansleic as cross-Channel negotiator with these Danes while they were in England: *Miracula Sancti Richarii, Acta Sanctorum Aprilis III*, p. 456. See F. Lot, "La Grande Invasion normande de 856–862," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 69 (1908), 5–62, rpt. in Lot, *Receuil des travaux historiques*, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1968–73), vol. 2, p. 756, n. 1.

42. At Angoulême, *Annales Engolismenses* 868, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH *Scriptores* 16 (Hanover, 1859), p. 486; and at Pîtres, Le Mans, and Tours, AB 868, 869, pp. 150, 166, tr., pp. 151, 163–64. For later-9th-century royal demands for "maintenance and defence" of fortifications in Wessex see the Burghal Hidage, tr. Keynes and Lapidge in *Alfred the Great*, pp. 193–94.

43. Asser, *Life of Alfred*, c. 8, ed. Stevenson, p. 7: "magno nobilium et etiam ignobilium numero constipatus."

44. On 27 August 846 the basilica of St. Peter had been sacked by Saracens and St. Peter's tomb desecrated. Though his biographer says the pope acted on Lothar's orders, Leo himself organized the building project, celebrated its successful completion, and reaped the propaganda harvest; Frankish annalists credit the work to Leo and say nothing about the emperor. For this and Leo's other projects, including frescoes and mosaics, see *Vita Leonis IV, Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, pp. 123–24 and nn. at pp. 137–38.

45. On this hostel for Anglo-Saxon pilgrims and visitors see P. Llewellyn, *Rome in the Dark Ages* (London, 1972), pp. 178–79, and map at pp. 16–17.

46. *King Alfred's Version of St Augustine's Soliloquies*, ed. T. Carnicelli (Cambridge, MA, 1969), p. 97. 'Now it comes into my mind that I know who built Rome, and also many other things that happened before our days, so many that I can't list them all. It's not because I saw it myself that I know who built Rome.' Cf. the text of Augustine that Alfred is following here, quoted by Carnicelli, p. 107: ". . . unde sciremus civitates ubi numquam fuimus; vel a Romulo conditam Romam. . . ?" Augustine's point was that knowledge comes from sources other than direct experience; Alfred takes this on board but adds an allusion to his own visit to Rome.

47. Alfred's request is described in Fulk's reply: D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke, eds., *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church,*

I (Oxford, 1981), vol. 1, pp. 6–12, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, "Fulk's Letter to Alfred," pp. 182–86. Despite the doubts I expressed in "'A King across the Sea': Alfred in Continental Perspective," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 36 (1986), 45–68, at pp. 48–49, about the authenticity of this letter as it stands, I have been persuaded that its substance is genuine. See below and also my " '. . . *sicut olim gens Francorum . . . nunc gens Anglorum*': Fulk's letter to Alfred Revisited," in Roberts and Nelson, eds., *Alfred the Wise*, pp. 135–44.

48. ASC 885, p. 52, tr. p. 79; cf. the Mainz Continuator of the *Annales Fuldenses* 884, ed. F. Kurze, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum* (Hanover, 1891), p. 101 (though not the Regensburg Continuator, 885, p. 113); see now the translation by T. Reuter, *The Annals of Fulda* (Manchester, 1992), p. 96, with comment on the divergent continuations at pp. 5–9.

49. Asser, *Life of Alfred*, c. 70, ed. Stevenson, p. 52, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 87; cf. D. Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (London, 1979), p. 198, n. 12.

50. Flodoard, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae IV*, c. 1, pp. 555–56, says Guy was Fulk's *affinis*; at c. 3, p. 565, his *propinquus*.

51. For Guy's adoption by Pope Stephen V see G. Schneider, *Erzbischof Fulco von Reims (883–900) und das Frankenreich* (Munich, 1975), pp. 44–45. Curiously enough, Schneider has nothing to say about Alfred.

52. *English Historical Documents*, ed. Whitelock, vol. 1, p. 883.

53. Flodoard, *Historia* IV, c. 1, p. 555—with Charles the Bald in 875–76.

54. See Schneider, pp. 30–38.

55. Flodoard, *Historia* III, c. 5, p. 566 (addressing the dowager empress Richildis). P. Depreux, *Étude sur la devotion à Saint Remi de Reims*, unpub. Mémoire de Maitrise, Paris, 1989, has invaluable comments on the 9th-century association of Rheims with mission. I am very grateful to Philippe Depreux for sharing his insights with me. He does not deal with Fulk's letter to Alfred, however.

56. AB 869, pp. 162–63, tr., p. 161. The author of the AB at this point was Hincmar himself. For Hincmar's sense of Rheims' history see 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, esp. 48, 54–55.

57. ". . . sicut olim gens Francorum . . . nunc gens Anglorum. . . .": letter to Alfred, ed. Whitelock, Brett, and Brooke, p. 7, tr. Keynes and Lapidge, p. 183.

58. Ibid., p. 11: ". . . for the Catholic and Apostolic Church is one, whether Roman or across the sea."

59. To this council Alcuin brought back from Britannia a formal letter to add to the synodical letters of other *gentes*: *Annales Nordhumbrani*, MGH *Scriptores* 13, ed. J. Heller and G. Waitz (Hanover, 1881), p. 155; MGH *Concilia* 2, ed. A. Werminghoff (Hanover, 1908), i, no. 19, pp. 120–21. Cf. *Libri Carolini* IV, 28, MGH *Concilia* 2, Supplement, ed. H. Bastgen (Hanover, 1924), p. 227, on the participation at councils of "praesules duarum vel trium provinciarum—et fortasse dici potest universale, quoniam, quamvis non sit ab omnibus orbis praesulibus actum, tamen ab universorum fide et traditione non discrepat."

60. Flodoard, *Historia* IV, c. 1, p. 556.

61. D. Bates, *Normandy before 1066* (London, 1982), pp. 11–12.

62. "For there is good news yet to hear and fine things to be seen / Before we go to Paradise by way of Kensal Green" (Chesterton, "The Rolling English Road").