

KING, CLERGY AND WAR AT THE TIME OF THE CAROLINGIANS

Friedrich E. Prinz

As the Normans besieged Paris in 886, Bishop Gauzlin, though described by Abbo in the Bella Parisiaca urbis as presul domini et dulcissimus heros, stood on the walls of the city taking active part in the battle. His nephew, Abbot Ebolus of St. Germain-des Prés, is celebrated in the same account as fortissimus abba and is credited with having killed seven Normans with his spear in a single sortie. It is something akin to "black humour" for us that Abbot Ebolus shouted laughingly at the same time: "Carry them into the kitchen!"¹ How could such active participation in war by the higher clergy come about? Indeed, it seems inconceivable.²

Anyone who examines the phenomenon of participation in war by clergy during the Middle Ages is confronted with a paradox, the antinomies of which are perhaps to be balanced out in thought and belief but do little to explain the weather beaten bedrock of historical life. There is an element of the paradoxical inherent even in official expressions of the Church's attitude. As a result of the creation of the post-Constantinian State Church, the ecclesiastical hierarchy found an apparent solution, epitomized by St. Augustine's teaching on the "just war," which was as elegant as it was dangerous.³ Carl Erdmann has analyzed this change in the Church on the central question of war in his brilliant book on the emergence of the idea of the crusade, now available in English translation.⁴ Erdmann described most important phases of this idea whereby justification of war against pagans dwelling on the edge of the orbis christianus and the attitude of Pope Gregory VII emerge as powerful driving forces. Since the Church tended toward a position which may be described as pacifistic--one could not use this term too restrictedly in a modern sense!--it was bound to prove difficult for it to deal with the real problem of war in its system of teaching and to develop a positive response to them. Thus we may imagine how difficult it must have been for the Church to tolerate active participation in war by the clergy and even to make participation possible under canon law! Naturally enough we find in dogma and ecclesiastical

canones not inconsiderable resistance to these developments. Indeed later in the Middle Ages such opposition surfaced repeatedly in the epochs of ecclesiastical self-contemplation and regeneration. This opposition in the final analysis however was without lasting success, as illustrated by the famous lament by Richard of Cornwall: "Look what hostile and warlike archbishops there are in Germany!"⁵ In addition to discussing such activity, this paper will attempt to ascertain what historical forces and circumstances led to the active participation of the clergy in war since the middle of the eighth century and the process by which this became legitimate and institutionalized under the Carolingian rulers.

A warlike spirit among the highest representatives of the Imperial Church? How could it happen that such an ecclesiastical type, whom one would be most inclined to compare with the warlike priest castes in other cultures, came into being in a Christian culture? Is it perhaps here--as is now and then suggested in Erdmann's book--a question of exceptions which, even though numerous, simply represent a perversion by individuals? Or is it possible that certain social and intellectual circumstances combined to meld Church service and Imperial military service into a totally indissoluble union that created a mode approaching standardized conduct among those who rose to high ecclesiastical rank? If we compare ecclesiastical regulations and their development with real conditions in order thus to obtain a sort of system of coordinates from which the real conduct can be ascertained, the efforts at justifying the reality of clerical military service more or less convincingly by canonical regulations and the flexible interpretation of these become visible.

At a first glance this seems to cause great difficulty, for the ecclesiastical canones leave no doubt that the clerical estate is incompatible with the profession of arms and of hunting. Even the officially recognized pagan cults in the Roman Empire exempted their priests from military service, and after it had become state religion Christianity obtained the same position of exemption for its clergy.⁶ Accordingly the Council of Toledo in 400 laid down in Canon VIII: Si quis post baptismum militaverit et chlamydem supserit, aut cingulum, etiamsi graviora non admiserit, si ad clerum admissus fuit, diaconii non accipiat dignitatem.⁷ The Council of Chalcedon in 451 also excludes clergy and monks from military service.⁸ The individual decrees of the

great Imperial councils of late antiquity passed on into the synodal decisions of the kingdom of the Franks that were proclaimed by the king. If one only proceeds from the normative settlements, then one gains the impression that the Church had consistently expanded the prohibition of military service for clergy into a general prohibition on bearing arms and logically also of hunting for all clergy. The councils of Agde (506), Epaon (517) and Mâcon (585) forbid all clergymen down to deacons from hunting with hounds and falcons; for offences against this a bishop is excommunicated for three months, a presbyter for two, and a deacon for one month. What is remarkable here is the regulation that deacons are also relieved of their clerical duties for this period, whereas in the case of the bishops and presbyters nothing is said on this point.⁹ Is a hierarchical and perhaps even a social stratification implied here, at least in the sphere of ecclesiastical administrative practice? This question is raised without attempting an answer at this point; but it will concern us in another connection.

What appears to be consistent escalation of penal provisions against clerics for their participation in hunting or war suffers a clear break towards the end of the sixth century. The Council of Mâcon established in 585 that the clergy might not keep hunting hounds and falcons; yet instead of the threat of punishment there is only a paraenetic explanation of the prohibition.¹⁰ Three generations later a Court of Bordeaux (663-75) forbids in the first of its canones the bearing and use of arms, and also in this case no concrete penal provisions follow; the prospect of penalty is merely suggested in general remarks of an ecclesiastical sentence and coupled with a theological admonition.¹¹ One is almost tempted on the basis of this wording to accord the prohibition a declamatory rather than a practical value; that it is at the head of the council's decisions however points unmistakably to the fact that the council fathers were dealing here with a really urgent problem. The same is true of the last important council in the age of the Merovingians which took place in 673/75 in St. Jean de Losne and luridly illuminates the state of the Frankish Church. Canon II prohibits all bishops and clergy more seculario from bearing arms. This regulation is particularly important above all because alongside the clerici the bishops are mentioned separately. At first glance this seems to be nothing more than a trivial specification of the recipient of this prohibition. A

comparison with the prohibitions of arms for the clergy in Carolingian capitularies shows however, as will be discussed below more fully, that there the bearing of arms was generally prohibited for the clergy, but that the bishops have a clearly recognisable special status in this matter which again reveals a characteristic feature of the Carolingian Imperial Church. But here in the last third of the seventh century the prohibition of arms is still explicitly directed against the bishops and indeed not without good reason as shown by the warlike and almost sovereign behaviour of the bishops of the late Merovingian period.¹²

Penal provisions for the event of an infringement are also lacking in canon II of St. Jean de Losne. Did the king and council not have the power and authority here to take drastic measures? This question can not be conclusively answered for the moment; but the three councils of 517, 585 and 663/75 occur in the great epoch of Gaul's Germanisation, and thus in an age of return to barbarism, on which Carl Erdmann has correctly observed "that the development of the Christianisation of the state among the Germanic people had to be carried out once again under less favourable conditions."¹³ For Gaul this meant in the period from the fifth until the seventh century that, after the collapse of the super-structure of the late Roman central administration, the bishops, as city rulers of the civitates of antiquity, had to take over political-administrative duties and thus also the problems of defence, which often brought them into immediate contact with the reality of war. One should recall in this connection that bishops such as Hillary and Caesarius of Arles, Nicetius of Trier, Desiderius of Cahors and Leodegar of Autun who became involved in military and political battles and thus encountered circumstances which made the strict observance of canonical regulations impossible.

From the later sixth century and especially during the seventh century more bishops were drawn from the Germanic nobility. Thus social custom, class values, and family connections brought the ecclesiastical hierarchy to a new militancy.

By observing that the origins of the bishops were to be found in a traditionally warlike nobility we touch an important element, namely a sort of hereditary psychological blocking mechanism which simply prevented those prelates of

aristocratic origin from being able to observe Christianity's clear prohibitions against fighting and war. The acute threats of the epoch of the Migrations of the Peoples contributed their part to pushing possible objections against this active participation in war into the background. Against this background which is only hinted at here must also be seen the development of the normative settlements in the eighth and ninth centuries.¹⁵ With the Concilium Germanicum of 21 April 742 the great Anglo-Saxon missionary and church reformer Boniface made a determined attempt, within the area of the Frankish Church which he had reorganised and which was loyal to Rome, to impress again upon the clergy the prohibition of weapons and war. He had reason enough for this as he had to prevail with the help of Carloman against warlike bishops (such as Milo of Trier) who as powerful supporters of Charles Martel had gained influence in the Frankish Church and were offering bitter resistance to Boniface.¹⁶ Canon II of the decisions of the Germanicum prohibits the clergy from bearing arms and fighting, yet consideration is expressly taken of the practical requirements of "ministering to the troops": priests who travel with the army and carry out functions relating to divine service or carry (victory bringing) relics with them are excluded from the prohibition. There is mention here also of one to two bishops together with their chaplains and presbyters whom the princeps, i.e., Carloman, has with him in his army.

In the same section of the canon hunting with hounds and falcons is prohibited.¹⁷ One is inclined to see in this important modification of the prohibition of arms a cautious regard for the wishes of the Carolingian princeps. Equally the tendency of the regulation drawn up by Boniface must strike one, that the number of bishops participating in the campaign is to be kept as low as possible, restricting it namely to one or two dignitaries. Clearly he was here already energetically contending with the alien usage of the Carolingian technique of war which is clearly evident from other sources of the period. Thus it is certainly striking that, in the western part of the kingdom of the Franks which was under the rule of Carloman's brother Pippin, the ecclesiastical reform at the Synod of Soissons in 744 was much more cautious: indeed one has doubtless correctly spoken of a stagnation in Boniface's work of renewal.¹⁸ For our purpose here, the result of this new situation at Soissons was that nothing more was enacted concerning the conduct of priests in war;

similarly the prohibition on the bearing of arms was omitted. At Soissons the assembled magnates contented themselves with Canon III which forbade the clergy from wearing lay clothing.¹⁹ One gains a better insight into the real situation however with a further regulation made at Soissons whereby the real abbots abbati legitimi of the monasteries--i.e., not the lay abbots!--were not allowed to go to war; admittedly this prohibition was also valid only with a certain restriction which amounted to rendering the ecclesiastical regulations meaningless.²⁰ The prohibition on the abbots' going to war did not apply if they sent their homines (to the army): . . . et abbati legitimi hostem non faciunt, nisi tantum hominis eorum transmittant. Thus compared with the more radical regulations of the Concilium Germanicum for which Carloman was jointly responsible, Pippin III countered the war service of the higher clergy only cautiously with a prohibition--or to put it more positively: in the form of a compromise he secured the prelates' participation in the realm's military service, and thereby prepared the path for his son Charles. These cautious regulations from the reform council could be described as "blanks," leaving everything open in comparison with the firm positive regulations of the clergy's participation in war which followed. One should perhaps recall Charles' famous letter of summons to Abbot Fulrad or the strict regulations in the capitularies with regard to bishops' and abbots' military duty. Charles was only continuing logically what his father Pippin had already embarked upon with great energy.

The correspondence of St. Boniface provides us with a very definite view of the actual state of affairs far distant from the normative one. Soon after the beginning of the reign of Pope Zacharias, the Anglo-Saxon reformer reported to Rome that there were bishops in the kingdom of the Franks who fought armed in the army and spilt the blood of pagans and Christians, that they were drunkards, negligent in their office and addicted to hunting.²¹ The pope's reply²² and the decisions of the Concilium Germanicum referred quite obviously to this state of affairs. The regressive position of the Council of Soissons showed how far ecclesiastical standards and the actual state of affairs diverged. Boniface himself had long since been excluded²³ when the Frankish council of 747 and King Pippin's synod in Verberie in 756 urged once again²⁴ the prohibition of the bearing of arms on the clergy, so to speak, in a routine fashion. Whether Charlemagne soon after

the beginning of his reign in the eastern half of the realm in 769 literally adopted the ordinances of his uncle Carloman enacted in 742 concerning the function and participation in war by the clergy is uncertain because the capitulary which provided this information is a forgery.²⁵ At the beginning of his reign Charlemagne probably departed little from his father's and uncle's practice. In this he was not guided primarily by St. Boniface's concern to forbid the clergy to bear arms and to hunt but rather by his interest in an orderly "military religious welfare" on his numerous campaigns.²⁶ Indeed Charles' military system made it clear that abbots and bishops were bound to take the field; as he variously dispensed ecclesiastical vassals by privileges of exemption from the duty of participation in the campaign, the latter must have been normal for them. However with this commitment of the bishops he was hardly thinking of "military religious welfare," it was a case of definite performance of military service with all its consequences down to active participation in the fighting.²⁷

After this brief sketch of the Church's normative settlements we have reached that point in which the normative part of canonical regulations can be confronted with what is to be heard from other sources on the actual conduct of the clergy in war. At this point we might straight away warn against an opinion which is often to be found in literature on the subject, namely the opinion that the warlike activity of the higher clergy was essentially a result of the Germanisation of Gaul; this pushes the problem in my opinion in inadmissible fashion onto an ethnic plane and contradicts the evidence of the sources, especially since in the fifth century there is sufficient evidence for military activity by the Gallo-Roman bishops--we would merely recall here St. Hilary of Arles and Bishop Sagittarius of Gap. This martial activity was, as already mentioned, an almost inevitable consequence of the duties and exigencies of the bishops' rule in the towns, demonstrated even in Trier by the construction of the citadel and the organisational improvements by the great Bishop Nicetius who came from southern Gaul.

Archbishop Hilary of Arles,²⁸ according to Gennadius genere clarus and a famous pupil of the south Gaulish island monastery of Lerins, wanted to have the Imperial administration for the western province centred in Arles--as indeed took place at the beginning of the fifth century after Trier had been abandoned--in order to obtain a position of primacy

for his church. Hilary came into conflict with Pope Leo the Great who accused him of having attacked with armed bands certain cities where the bishop had died, and of having placed his own supporters in the vacant episcopal sees. Hilary's strict monastic education and also the great esteem which he enjoyed among his contemporaries and among later ecclesiastical authors mitigates against the view that Hilary's was some kind of aberration or a downright secularization in his attitude. Conflicts of this kind show rather how much a bishop was involved at this time in the interplay of political forces, and had defensive functions as the ruler of a city, as shown by the fact that he led an armed force. The activity of men like Hilary continues into the sixth century and is shown by the praise of the bishops as defensores civium, or put more generally: in the active care for dependents and wards in which is to be seen a point of departure for episcopal formation of power in the Middle Ages.

This can also be expressed for example in the poem by Venantius Fortunatus on Bishop Nicetius of Trier²⁹ in which Nicetius is celebrated as the "shepherd of his flock," however not or at least not just in the purely spiritual sense of the tradition of the early church which is derived from Christ as the Good Shepherd and which found purely artistic expression in the mosaic decoration of early Christian basilicas. The Bishop of Trier appears rather as the good shepherd in the very tangible connection of citadel construction which served the military protection of Trier--as pastor, the giver of protection in the strictly narrow sense of military security. Thereby the religious symbol of the Good Shepherd is filled with real military-political content--a process which came particularly clearly to the fore with Archbishop Brun of Cologne--indeed through a conscious conception which gives a model character to the pastor bonus who cares for the pax with military might. But back once again to the sixth century: the picture of actual episcopal power is illuminated ex negative by the angry comment of King Chilperich on the real rulers of the towns: "Nobody rules now at all except the bishops: our power had gone and come to the bishops of the towns."³⁰

If thus the office and the historical reality of the sixth century were already bringing the bishop sovereign rights, these circumstances are also joined by a mental change in society itself which justified politico-military activity by a higher cleric or at least did not allow it

appear reprehensible. Military activity by a bishop which until then as for instance in the case of Leodegar of Autun, Bishops Desideratus of Chalon-sur-Saône, Bobo of Valence,³¹ or Bishop Genesisius of Lyons,³² was recognised implicite, i.e., by reports without comment on their battles as something "normal," gains unmistakably positive accents since the end of the age of the Merovingians.

Saintliness and military prowess are not mutually exclusive, rather the latter appears as a natural prerequisite for the former. Thus from the seventh century on, noble origin became a prerequisite for saintliness.³³ The precious old vita of Bishop Arnulf of Metz, ancestor of the Carolingians, praises his martial virtues with complete ingenuousness and approval.³⁴ The account of the life of Bishop Eligius of Noyon from the pen of his noble friend and fellow-bishop Audoen of Rouen testifies that this clerical dignitary had carried out his duties at the court of Dagobert I admirably and that he had possessed martial spirit.³⁵ As Eligius was one of the few Merovingian bishops of non-noble origin, this praise gains particular importance since it shows what was close to the heart of an aristocratic contemporary and fellow-cleric. Thus as far back as the seventh century martial virtues are incorporated positively and accepted in a system of coordinates of Christian ways of behaviour.

Military prowess is mentioned during this period as a positive aspect in the secular past of a saint; however it is not yet placed into immediate connection with his characteristics as a saint.³⁶ Thus the vita of Abbot Ermeland is able to describe the saint as perfectus . . . miles so long as he was still living in the secular state.³⁷ The Passio Ragneberti calls it here fortis corde and armis doctus³⁸ and the Vita Austrigisili describes to us how the saint without any misgivings on principle submits to a duel and ordeal commanded by the king.³⁹ All three saints' lives date from the ninth century and thus already reflect the spirit of an age for which military service by the higher clergy was almost a matter of course. The vita of St. Lambert of Liège from the first half of the eighth century put expression vividly and in almost classical form to the intellectual conflict which esteemed martial courage in a saint but yet shrank back from creating a completely military type of saint. Lambert is celebrated in the description of his life as fortis et velox, agilis multum, firmus in bello. . . The description of his murder which

a later age restyled as a martyrdom lets one see on the other hand his militant spirit in the oldest version, the fortissimus proelior grasps his sword at the approach of the murderers in order to do battle. Not until the last moment does Lambert decide to throw away his weapon as it is better to die in the Lord.⁴⁰ One sees that the esteem for military virtue is also present in saints, yet it stands alongside the real events more or less still in dialectical discord with the real battle.

With the "aristocratisation of the saintly ideal" from the seventh century⁴¹ one obtains at the same time the social-historical point of departure in order to be able to understand the emergence of martial virtues in the descriptions of the lives of the saints. The next step, namely the practical participation in war by the clergy and the official sanction of such proceedings by ecclesiastical literature, was brought by the wars since the second half of the ninth century, as Normans, Saracens and Hungarians threatened the kingdom of the Franks as invaders. The fight against these peoples became both the bitter necessity of self-defence as also the defence of Christendom, whereby basic ecclesiastical objections to warfare and also to the war against the pagans which still continued⁴² were rendered largely ineffectual. A sort of anticipation of this positive evaluation of war in the case of defence against disbelievers is given by the attitude of Bishop Ebbo of Sens who stood at the head of the defenders of his city against the Saracens and won a victory against them.⁴³

The victory of the Carolingians over the Merovingian dynasty meant at the same time a shifting of importance in favour of Austrasia,⁴⁴ especially since the rise of Charles Martel and his sons Pippin and Carloman a regrouping of the higher clergy of the kingdom of the Franks came about. The "Frankisation" of the episcopacy which had begun gradually in the seventh century increased sharply in the eighth century⁴⁵ the Gallo-Roman element receded accordingly, and the victorious nobility which had gathered around the Carolingians occupied important positions in the formation of the new Carolingian imperial administration. Thus a new dominant political class arose in the kingdom of the Franks which has been described as a fränkische Reichsaristokratie.⁴⁶ Charles Martel's so-called secularisation, a political necessity in the struggle against internal and external enemies, together with the appointment of followers and comrades in arms of the Carolingians to the bishoprics,

brought at the same time an ethnic and structural change in the episcopal rule in the civitates. The influence of the Gallo-Roman regional aristocracy on the appointments to the bishoprics in central, southern, and western Gaul dropped drastically, a process which was accelerated and sharpened by the severe ravaging of Gaul south of the Loire in the course of the fighting in defence against the Arab invaders. Southern Gaul only now in the first third of the eighth century lost its late classical character and became a "medieval landscape" through the rigorous incorporation into the kingdom of the Franks after Charles' victory over the Arabs.⁴⁷

The Frankish imperial aristocracy, as the new class upholding the state, was recruited mainly from Austrasian noble families between the Meuse and the Rhine who had come to power with the Carolingians; it occupied not only the secular positions of command but also the bishoprics and the great imperial abbeys. We have a characteristic figure for the later part of the eighth century in Abbot Fulrad of St. Denis in whom secular tasks, such as the political reorganisation of Alamannia after the "blood bath in Cannstatt" in 747 and the negotiations in Rome about Pippin's elevation to king, were closely connected with purely ecclesiastical aims.⁴⁸ A coarser preliminary form of their "staff policy" was the appointment of followers of the early Carolingians to bishoprics and abbeys, for instance Milo of Trier. That this led to a decisive reshuffling of regional ruling arrangements is shown by the fate of Bishop Eucharius of Orléans and his family. His uncle Savaric had seized the bishopric of Auxerre after the murder of Bishop Tetricus and exercised almost unrestricted regional sovereignty in the area of Orléans, Nevers, Tonnerre, Avallon, and Troyes. In 715 while marching against Lyons he was struck dead by lightning.⁴⁹ Charles Martel banned Bishop Eucharius of Orléans, his nephew, initially to Cologne then to more distant Hesbaye whither all his relatives had to accompany him; that means the Carolingian broke the rule of this mighty regional noble family from which at this opportunity the material bases of their power was taken, namely their estates. The same was the case with Bishop Ainmar of Auxerre, Savaric's successor, who was initially a follower of Charles Martel but later, as related in the history of the diocese of Auxerre, exercised such great secular power that he rose to be duke of nearly the whole of Burgundy and was thus quite obviously going his own political way, so that Charles had him taken prisoner.⁵⁰

By the appointment of his followers to such bishoprics Charles certainly did nothing towards the improvement of ecclesiastical affairs, rather the opposite. But from the point of view of the political structure it was great progress for the Carolingians that in this fashion the old aristocratic Gallo-Roman "civitas-republics" which had been enriching themselves with political powers increasingly since the late classical period were reduced in their power; by the appointment of Charles Martel's followers they could be integrated politically-territorially as regards the people involved into the new Austrasian centre of power.⁵¹

It is necessary to examine the larger context of the late classical Merovingian and early Carolingian bishops' rule in order to understand why the higher clergy adopted an attitude towards weapons which departed more and more from conciliar enactments. Since the fourth century bishops had to exercise functions that went far beyond parochial duties. In addition by virtue of his aristocratic origins the bishop regarded and exercised his office more and more as a regional city sovereignty. It is perhaps one of the Carolingians' greatest political accomplishments that they energetically incorporated these episcopal "sub-sovereignities" into the state and thus stopped a process of disintegration in the kingdom of the Franks which developed during the late Merovingian period, particularly during the power struggles around the Neustrian mayor of the palace Ebroin, as bishops with their town domains also became politically and militarily the main supporters of the quarrels (Leodegar of Autun, Praejectus of Clermont, Desideratus of Chalon-sur-Saône, Bobo of Valence, Audoenus and Ansbert of Rouen, Savaric of Auxerre, etc.).⁵²

From the time of Pippin II of Heristal and even more from the time of his son Charles Martel and the grandsons Pippin and Carloman, the military-political strength of the episcopacy and of the important abbots is employed almost only in the service of the king. The independent late Merovingian episcopal lords of the civitates became imperial bishops in the later meaning of the term. Participation in war by clerics was now no longer a punishable "individual case," but the inclusion of the higher clergy in imperial and military service made the development of special standards of action necessary for a military duty which had now become institutionalized.⁵³ From the purely normative point of view an apparent progress with clear definitions was emerging which in fact was scarcely more than a

legalising adjustment to the reality of feudal service; at the best they were ecclesiastical and royal attempts at checking and canalising the disastrous consequences of a clerical feudal service.

Under Pippin II of Heristal and his son Charles Martel there is no question that the circumstances of episcopal feudal service for the mayor of the palace dominated the picture clearly. Pippin for instance entrusted a bishop (whose name is not known to us) with the leadership of an army on a campaign.⁵⁴ Certainly the bishops were now no longer fighting in the renewed kingdom of the Franks for the interests of their own regional rule or in the ranks of the various noble groups fighting for special rights; instead they went to war for the kingdom; yet the fact of military participation remained in their "institutionalised" form and thus also the effects on the higher clergy. From the point of view of strict reforming ecclesiastical discipline this was not a very pleasant fact. The papal legate Boniface candidly informed the new pope, Zacharias, in his report in 742 that one section of the Frankish bishops was not only devoted to hunting but also fought in the army and spilt the blood of pagans and Christians,⁵⁵ as already mentioned.

A perfect example of this sort was Milo of Trier. Milo came from one of the most powerful Austrasian noble families among the followers of the early Carolingians, namely the family of the Widones. His father and predecessor in the episcopal see was Liutwin, the founder of the Widones family's own monastery, Mettlach. One can speak virtually of a "bishops' dynasty" which ruled the diocese of Trier for nearly a century with Basin (d. 705), Liutwin (d. 717), Milo (d. 757), and Weomad (d. 791).⁵⁶ Milo was, like his father, bishop in Trier and Rheims, a double position which he doubtless owed to the fact that he was among Charles Martel's closest followers.⁵⁷ The Gesta Treverorum paint a very significant picture of Milo from the ecclesiastical point of view,⁵⁸ a picture which is of course a retrospective one from a later age yet corresponds so completely in its substance with Boniface's gravamina⁵⁹ that there is no need to doubt its authenticity. He leads troops alongside Charles Martel and receives the two bishoprics after the victories of the mayor of the palace. Only his very non-ecclesiastical end, namely that while out hunting he was impaled on the tusk of a boar, is disputed decidedly in the chronicle of the Widones monastery of Mettlach which

specifically praises him at this opportunity as a benefactor and pius heres.⁶⁰

The fame of Milo's warlike nature is also preserved in his second bishopric, Rheims; Hincmar knows about it, as does Flodoard in his history of the church of Rheims who is also informed about Milo's appointment by Charles Martel.⁶¹ It is not possible to establish exactly in what form Milo held his bishoprics. In my opinion it is hardly getting to the heart of the matter if one wishes to presume something such as an institutional division between laymen as holders of bishoprics on the one hand and chorepiscopi and monastic bishops on the other who administered the spiritualia.⁶² Boniface in any event did not succeed in removing Milo from his office; certainly a role was played here by the fact that the bishop of Trier, as has already been mentioned, was a member of a noble family which had helped the early Carolingians in their rise to power and to whom political consideration had to be given.⁶³ On the other hand Boniface succeeded in a similar case, namely that of Bishop Gewilib of Mainz whose attitude gives us some particularly important information for our subject. In Boniface's letter Gewilib appears as a seductor called Geleobus qui antea false episcopi honore fungebatur.⁶⁴ After his deposition by Boniface in 745 he went to Rome in order to protest to Pope Zacharias against his removal from office and to justify himself. Both the Vita quarta Bonifatii auctore Moguntino of the eleventh century which is based on valuable traditions and Othloh of St. Emmeram relate more about Gewilib and his family.⁶⁵ According to this Gewilib's father Gerold was responsible as Bishop of Mainz for the mission to the pagans in Hesse and Thuringia, but he preferred to go to war against them rather than to preach the Gospel to them. During Charles Martel's campaign against the Saxons, Gerold fell in battle and his son Gewilib who was present in the camp received the bishopric of Mainz as his successor. During the next campaign against the Saxons Gewilib took blood vengeance on the enemy who had killed his father.⁶⁶ Boniface was indeed able to achieve his removal from office at a synod in 745, but he was not able to have him punished according to the strict rules of the canones. According to Mainz tradition Gewilib lived for another fourteen years "in honour" as Lord of Sponheim and as lord of the proprietary church of Kempten near Bingen; even here then Boniface's "staff political" victory proved only partially successful. Behind it was a necessary compromise and the Carolingians' regard for the

indispensable Austrasian nobility.⁶⁷

About the middle of the eighth century then, the Carolingian "Imperial Episcopacy" existed as a body, even if viewed from an ecclesiastical point of view, only in unfinished form, i.e., in that intellectual and disciplinary ruditas which the fourth Vita of St. Boniface agrees is a mitigating circumstance for the people and clergy of the Franks. Nevertheless the Carolingian mayors of the palace, Carloman and Pippin the Younger, since Charles Martel's death (741), had in the episcopacy an ecclesiastical as well as a political instrument which they used as they used the Frankish "Imperial aristocracy" which was then coming into being. Indeed the Frankish clergy was nothing other than the imperial aristocracy in ecclesiastical vestments and part of the Carolingian ruling structure both by birth and by function. (Theodore Schieffer has shown in his biography of Boniface how the mayors of the palace were able with the aid of the Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical reforms to form from this tributary imperial episcopacy a provincial church renewed also in the spiritual sense and subject to canonic rules and loyal to Rome which was equal to the tasks of service to the Frankish ruler and the duty of the care of souls.)

By comparison with his brother Carloman who ended his life at Montecassino as a monk, Pippin III brought a typically political solution to the canonically impossible and politically unavoidable military service of the imperial clergy. As already recounted, he checked the radical application of ecclesiastical prohibition of war for the clergy at the Synod of Soissons in 744 and at the same time created an area free of punishment for the prelate's military service. The full extent of this decision first became obvious under Charlemagne and in the ninth century. It is no more and no less than the conscious separation of an aristocratic "prelates' church" from the general hierarchy. Episcopi and abbates appear in the capitularies closely linked with the comites and the missi but nevertheless clearly and sharply distinguished from the bulk of the clerici for whom the canonical prohibition on the bearing of arms remained valid. One must thus speak of a clear socio-structural stratification carried through by the ruler and of important modifications in the canonical regulations against the clergy's bearing arms, a modification which conceded special rights to the prelates.

What had been initiated under Pippin III and should be seen as a tendency is however only to be understood so to speak in its aims and effects ex post, and comes into full light only during the reign of Charlemagne, whose Admonitio generalis in 789 prohibited all priests and deacons from bearing arms in the traditional ecclesiastical sense.⁶⁸ Bishops and abbots however, often referred to in other connections, remain unmentioned at this point. In Charlemagne's Capitulare missorum speciale of 802 (?) priests and deacons are forbidden to bear arms; bishops and abbots however again remain unmentioned in this regard.⁶⁹ In the collection of capitularies of Abbot Ansegis of St. Wandrille (822-833) the prohibition of weapons is also directed only at the presbyteri and diaconi, the reason given as in the previous cases is purely religious.⁷⁰ The council of Tribur (5 May 895) decreed the removal from office of any clergyman, be he presbyter or diaconus, who has killed anyone. It is striking here that reference is made to apostolic canones according to which a bishop, priest, or deacon who is convicted of unchastity, perjury, or theft is to be removed from office. How much more then, the eleventh chapter of the Council of Tribur continues, must a clericus be removed from office who has committed such a serious crime (homicidium).⁷¹ The mention of the bishop is however omitted in the case of homicidium, although the reference would have been plain on the basis of the apostolic parallel examples.

One could regard these cases as inconclusive or set aside the omission of the bishop as an argumentum e silentio if there were not other evidence. In contrast to the prohibition of weapons and war for the clergy one finds in the same capitularies prohibition of bishops from hunting. Boniface had the prohibition of hunting included in the decisions of the Concilium Germanicum in view of Milo et eiusmodi similes⁷²; it is also to be found in Pippin's synod in Soissons.⁷³ Under Charlemagne in an Aachen edict of 789 it is impressed on bishops, abbots, and abbesses(!) that they should not keep any packs of hounds, falcons, and jesters; several years before in Italy Charlemagne had prohibited all bishops, priests, deacons, abbots, and monks from hunting and ullo iocorum genera.⁷⁴ In the Capitulare missorum generale of March 802 mentioned before, this prohibition was repeated to all bishops, abbots, priests, and deacons under threat of loss of office.

It is thus even more remarkable that in the

Capitulare missorum speciale of October of the same year which prohibits any form of bearing of arms, only priests in general, deacons, and the other clergy are mentioned as the recipient of the prohibition. In this case it is clear that bearing of arms means active participation in war, i.e., that these clerics should place more trust in God's protection than in weapons.⁷⁵ An order by Bishop Haito of Basel,⁷⁶ a Roman council under Pope Eugenius II in 826,⁷⁷ a synod held in Padua in 850⁷⁸ and a capitulary issued by Charles II in the same place in 876⁷⁹ all prohibit hunting for the clergy. Particularly informative is the prohibition of hunting by the council at Mainz in 852; not only is the rhetoric particularly harsh, but also it makes reference to Boniface and Chapter 2 of the Concilium Germanicum of 742 in which is prohibited the bearing of arms and fighting for all servi Dei, and in which the prohibition on hunting appears in the context only as logical consequence of this general prohibition.⁸⁰

The failure to make what could have been more reference in 852 to the work of the great Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical reformer and only to recall the prohibition of hunting seems to have been important for the Mainz synod. First, it is clear that passion for hunting in the ninth century among the clergy was widespread and that the Carolingians made an important if only an implicit differentiation between hunting and participation in war. A summary of the above legislation indicates that the prohibition of hunting is generally valid particularly for the higher clergy, the bishops, because hunting is a private amusement behind which lies no necessitas. However the higher clergy, the episcopi and abbati, are omitted from the prohibition on weapons and war for the clergy in general. Under Charlemagne only the clerici, presbyteri, and diaconi are always listed as being affected by the prohibition. It is hard to imagine that this is a coincidence; rather something is emerging here which may be considered as a special status for the higher imperial clergy.

Let us recall once more the regulations of the Merovingian councils. The Council of St. Jean de Losne (673/75) explicitly referred to the prohibition on weapons to the bishops. This shows that the episcopate was not excluded from this normative settlement and also permits the recognition that it was often contravened. There was a clear contrast between required and actual episcopal

behaviour. But under Charlemagne and his successors the relationship between legal standards and reality were complicated by the fact that the military service of the higher clergy was not exactly expressis verbis canonically sanctioned but received from the ruler indirect support and institutionalization. Thus the jurisdiction of the canones were in actuality restricted to the general clergy--the bishops and imperial abbots were omitted. A hierarchical differentiation of ecclesiastical law came about in questions of military service which--seen from the sociological point of view--at the same time founded de facto a special law for the imperial nobility within the Church and--regarded from the point of view of the structure of the state--brought with it a separation of the higher clergy from the rest of the Church in favour of its employment in imperial service; a trend which can be described as the instrumentalisation of the imperial Church by Pippin III and Charlemagne.

It would be going too far now to present the numerous examples from annalistic and biographical sources for the active military service of bishops and abbots during the ninth century.⁸¹ Instead a few general remarks may be permitted in conclusion: it should have become clear how difficult it was gradually to realise the Christian message with its clear and radical postulates in conflict with the stubborn structures of an archaic aristocratic society and the royal rule of the Carolingians being built upon it. From Boniface's time this was a steady struggle, full of reverses, with a nobility firmly anchored in seigneurial rule that also dominated the upper ranks of the Church. The example of the prelates' participation in war within the ecclesiastical rule of the Carolingians, as it was introduced by Pippin III and fully expanded by Charlemagne, may at any rate warn one to see the fate of the instrumentalised imperial Church not only in a positive light. Equally it would be incorrect to regard the military presence of the warlike prelates' Church purely as an unavoidable consequence of the necessary defence against the attacks of the Normans, Saracens, and Hungarians in the ninth and tenth centuries. These certainly important external circumstances however only make more than clear what had long since taken place in the bosom of the Frankish imperial Church since Pippin and Charlemagne, the change of the Church into a military instrument and an instrument for rule by the Frankish king.

*

Dem verehrten Jubilar, dem diese Festschrift gewidmet ist und der seine Lebensarbeit in so erfolgreicher Weise der geistigen Kultur des Mittelalters gewidmet hat, dürfte es vielleicht nicht unwillkommen sein, wenn in diesem Beitrag eine durchaus problematische Realität geistlich-monastischen Lebens näher beleuchtet wird,--eine Realität, die aber für die gesamte Kultur des Mittelalters und damit für dessen Verständnis!--grosse Bedeutung besass.

- 1 Abbonis Bella Parisiaca urbis liber I, v. 21 seq., ed. Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poet. Lat. IV 1, 80 and 81; *ibid.* 83: (Ebolus) Septenos una potuit terebrare sagitta, Quos ludens alios iussit prebere coquinae.
- 2 Cf. F. Prinz, Klerus und Krieg im früheren Mittelalter (Stuttgart: Verlag A. Hiersemann, 1971).
- 3 For the general problem: War and Christian doctrine, cf. e.g. A. Vanderpol, La doctrine scolastique du droit de guerre (Paris 1919); J. Leclercq, Guerre et Service militaire devant la morale catholique (Paris 1934); R. Regout, La doctrine de la guerre juste de St. Augustin à nos jours, d'après les théologiens et les canonistes catholiques (Paris 1935), esp. p. 40f; M. Chasle, La Guerre et la Bible (Paris 1940); B. de Solages, La théologie de la guerre juste (Paris 1946); G. Bouthoul, Les Guerres (Paris 1951), esp. p. 49f. Dict. de Théologie catholique VI (1920) 1899 ff; G. Hubrecht, "La juste guerre dans le Décret de Gratien," Studia gratiana III (Bologna 1955) 159-177; H. Finke, "Das Problem des gerechten Krieges in der mittelalterlichen theologischen Literatur," Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters - Martin Grabmann zur Vollendung des 60. Lebensjahres gewidmet (Beiträge zur Geschichte, Philosophie und Theologie a. MA, s. Suppl. 3, 2 (1935) 1426-1434; DW 10 Lfg. 39, p. 2884; A. Noth, Heiliger Krieg und heiliger Kampf im Islam und Christentum (Bonner histor. Forschungen 28, Bonn 1966).
- 4 C. Erdmann, Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens (Stuttgart 1935, 2 ed 1965); English translation by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart: The Origin of the Idea of Crusade (Princeton University Press, 1977).
- 5 MGH. Scriptores XXVII 480: Ecce quam animosos et bellicosos archiepiscopos habemus in Alemannia.

- 6 E. Hildesheimer, L'activité militaire des clerc à l'époque franque (Thèse, Paris 1936), p. 62.
- 7 J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio III (Florenz 1761), p. 1000.
- 8 Ibid. VI, p. 1227: Eos, qui semel in clero ordinati sunt vel monachos, definimus neque ad militiam neque ad saecularem dignitatem venire. Quod si hoc ausi fuerint, nec ad poenitentiam venerint, . . . anathematizentur.
- 9 MGH. Concilia (ed. Maassen) I, p. 20 Concilium Epaonense IV: Episcopis, presbyteris adque diaconibus canis ad venandum et acepitris habere non leceat. Quod si quis talium personarum in hac fuerit voluptate detectus, si episcopus est, tribus mensibus se a communione suspendat, duobus presbyter absteneatur, uno diaconus ab omni officio et communione cessabit. Cf. the general prohibition of hunting for the clergy in c. XIII of the council of Mâcon, ibid. I 170, note 10.
- 10 Ibid. I 170 c. XIII: . . . Custodienda est igitur episcopalis habitatio hymnis, non latratibus, operibus bonis, non morsibus venenosis. Ubi igitur Dei est assiduitas cantilenae, monstrum est de dedecoris nota comes ibi vel accipitres habitare.
- 11 Ibid. I 215 c. I: Ut abitum concessum clerici religiose habitare debeant et nec lanceas nec alia arma nec vestimenta secularia habere nec portare debeant, sed secundum quod scriptum est: Non in gladium suum possidebunt terram et brachium eorum non liberabit eos, sed dextera tua et brachium tuum et inluminatio vultus tui, statutum est, ut, qui post hanc definitionem hoc agere aut adtemptare presumserit, canonica feriatur sententia.
- 12 Ibid. I 217f; Concilium Latunense a. 673-675 c. II: . . . Ut nullus episcoporum seu clericorum arma more seculario ferre praesumat.
- 13 C. Erdmann, Kreuzzugsgedanke, p. 33.
- 14 F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am

Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung, 4-8. Jahrhundert (München - Wien 1965), p. 485f.

- 15 Cf. further M. Hofmann, "Ist die Militärfreiheit der katholischen Geistlichen auch heute noch rechtlich begründet und zeitgemäss?" Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie (1916) 452f. A. M. Koeniger, Die Militärsel-sorge der Karolingerzeit (Veröffentl. a.d. Kirchen-histor. Seminar München, 4. Reihe, Nr. VII; München 1918), p. 9f; W. Erben, Kriegsgeschichte des Mittel-alters (Beiheft XVI der Historische Zeitschrift; München-Berlin 1929), p. 55f; C. Erdmann, Kreuzzugsge-danke, p. 12f.
- 16 Th. Schieffer, Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas (Freiburg i. Br. 1954); E. Ewig, "Milo et eiusmodi similes," Bonifatius-Gedenkgabe (2 ed Fulda 1954) 412-440.
- 17 MGH. Cap. I. p. 25, No. 10 c. 2: Servis Dei per omnia omnibus armaturam portare vel pugnare aut in exercitum et in hostem pergere omnino prohibuimus, nisi illi tantummodo qui propter divinum ministerium, missarum scilicet solemnia adimplenda et sanctorum patrocinia portanda ad hoc electi sunt. Id est unum vel duos episcopos cum capellanis presbiteris princeps secum habeat, et unusquisque praefectus unum presbiterum, qui hominibus peccata confitentibus iudicare et indicare poenitentiam possint. Necnon et illas venationes et silvaticas vagationes cum canibus omnibus servis Dei interdiximus, similiter ut acceptores et walcones non habeant. A. M. Koeniger, Militärseel-sorge p. 13f.
- 18 Th. Schieffer, Winfrid-Bonifatius, p. 215f.
- 19 MGH. Conc. II 1, p. 34 c. III: . . . habitu laicorum non portent.
- 20 MGH. Conc. II 1, p. 34 c. III: . . . et abbati legitimi (h)ostem non faciant, nisi tantum hominis eorum transmittant.
- 21 Epist. Bonif. (ed. M. Tangl) No. 50, MGH. Epistolae selectae I p. 83: . . . Et inveniuntur quidam inter eos episcopi, qui, licet dicant se fornicarios vel adulteros non esse, sed sunt ebrioso et incuriosi vel

venatores, et qui pugnant in exercitu amati et effundebant propria manu sanguinem hominum, sive paganorum sive christianorum.

22. Epist. Bonif. No. 51, p. 86f.
- 23 MGH. Conc. II 1, p. 147; cf.: Th. Schieffer, Winfrid-Bonifatius, p. 241f.
- 24 MGH. Cap. I, p. 41, No. 16 c. 16.
- 25 MGH. Cap. I, p. 44f, No. 19 (769 vel paulo post) c. 1 (a falsification). Cf. F. Lot, "Le premier capitulaire de Charlemagne," Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes. Section philologique et historique, Annuaire 1924/25; cf. H. Barion in Zeitschrift der Savignystiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistische Abteilung XXVI (1937) 566-568; P. W. Finsterwalder, "Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu den Kapitularen Karls des Grossen," Historisches Jahrbuch LVIII (1938) 419-434, esp. p. 421.
- 26 In a different way: A. M. Koeniger, Militärseelsorge, 24f.
- 27 G. Waitz, Verfassungsgeschichte IV 595; E. Mühlbacher, Deutsche Geschichte unter den Karolingern (2 ed. Darmstadt 1959), p. 312. A. Pöschl, Bischofsgut und mensa episcopalis. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Vermögensrechtes (Bonn 1908/09) I 154f.
- 28 F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 50f.
- 29 Gregory of Tours, Vitae Patrum c. XVII and De Gloria confessorum p. 92, SS. rer. Merov. I 2, p. 727-733; E. Winheller, Die Lebensbeschreibungen der vorkarolingischen Bischöfe von Trier (Bonn 1935), p. 3f. Venant. Fortunatus, MGH. Auct. ant. IV 2, p. 63-65 = Carmen III 11 und 12; MGH. Epist. III (Epist. Austras.) No. 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 21, 24. Cf. F. Prinz, Klerus und Krieg, p. 46.
- 30 Gregory of Tours, Historiae Francorum VI, SS. rer. Merov. I 1, p. 320: (Chilperich) Sacerdotes Domini assidue blasphemabat nec aliunde magis, dum secricius esset, exercebat ridicola vel iocos quam de ecclesiarum episcopis. Illum ferebat levem, alium superbum, illum

habundantem, istum luxoriosum; illum adserebat elatum, hunc tumidum nullum plus odio quam ecclesias habens. Aiebat enim plerumque: 'Ecce pauper remansit fiscus noster, ecce divitiae nostrae ad ecclesias sunt translatae; nulli penitus nisi soli episcopi regnant; periet honor noster et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum.'

- 31 Passio Leudegarii I c. 20, SS. rer. Merov. V, p. 301: Erant enim in hoc mendatio primi et quasi rectores palatii Desideratus cognomine Diddo, qui in urbe Cabillono quondam habuerat principatum, necnon et eius collega Bobo, qui civitatem Valentiam habuerat in dominum.
- 32 Ibid. I c. 17, p. 298f: Cum enim vir Domini cum sociis superscriptis eodem festinarent itinere, factum est, quantum nec unius diei itineris spatium, antequam Agustidunum urbe accederent, urgentibus factoribus, Ebroinus inmemor amicitiae dudum promissae eum ibidem voluit comprehendere, si non Genesi metropolis Lugdunensis episcopi consiliis fuisset prohibitus, aut manu valida qui cum eo adherant perteritus: et fictam rursus simulans amicitiam et mixto agmine pariter pervenerunt in urbem.
- 33 F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 489f.
- 34 Vita Arnulfi c. 4, SS. rer. Merov. II, p. 433: Nam virtutem belligerandi seu potentiam illius deinceps in armis quis enarrare queat, praesertim cum saepe phalangas adversarum gentium suo abigisset mucrone? Cf. Wattenbach-Levison, Geschichtsquellen I 126; F. Graus, Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger (Prag 1965), p. 368.
- 35 Vita Eligii c. 12, SS. rer. Merov. IV, p. 680: . . . et animo etiam ad belligerandum fortis. Cf. Wattenbach-Levison, Geschichtsquellen I, p. 127f; F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 124f, 132f.
- 36 Cf. C. Erdmann, Kreuzzugsgedanke, p. 12f.
- 37 Vita Ermenlandi c. 1 SS. rer. Merov. V, p. 685, C. F. Irsigler, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des frühfränkischen Adels," Rhein. Archiv. LXX (Bonn 1969), 124ff.

- 38 Passio Ragneberti c. 2, SS. rer. Merov. V, p. 209.
- 39 Vita Austrigisili c. 4, SS. rer. Merov. IV, p. 193f.
- 40 Vita Landiberti ep. Traiectensis c. 3, SS. rer. Merov. VI, p. 356, and c. 14, ibid. p. 367f: . . . hoc audito nuntio velocissimus surgens, tunc sacerdos illico Landibertus . . . fortissimus proelior, continuo adprehenso gladio in manibus suis, ut contra hostes pugnaturus accederet; et Christus, quem semper in auxilium sibi postolaverat, non longe ab illo erat . . . gladio de manibus proiecit ad terram, ait: 'Si fugiero, gladium devitavi, et si perstitero, aut cadendum mihi aut vincendum est. Sed nec aliquando perdam victoriam: melius est mihi mori in Domino, quam super iniquis manibus bellaturus iniecare.' Cf. Wattenbach-Levison, Geschichtsquellen II, p. 165f.
- 41 Cf. F. Graus, Volk, p. 117, 206f, 270, 279, 348, 362f, 370, 380 note 461: Vita Desiderii I 2, SS. rer. Merov. III, p. 630: Hic vir de stimate claro Romanis a parentibus ortus . . . nobilissimam satis trahebat prosapiem. Vita Praeiectionis c. 1, ibid. V, p. 226: Romane generis stemate praefulsit. Passio Leudegarii I 1, ibid. V, p. 283: . . . terrena generositate nobiliter exortus; II 1, p. 324: . . . ex progenie celsa Francorum ac nobilissima exortus; Passio Ragneberti c. 2, ibid. V, p. 209: . . . ex praecelso Francorum genere ortus, Radberti ducis filius; see also F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 496f, 500f (Vita Corbiniani).
- 42 C. Erdmann, Kreuzzugsgedanke, p. 12f.
- 43 Acta Sanctorum Nov. II, 2 (1931) p. 469f; AA. SS. Aug. VI (1743) p. 98f; and bibliography in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche III 622.
- 44 See F. Steinbach, "Das Frankenreich," in L. Just, Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte I 2, p. 2-84, esp. p. 41f.
- 45 H. Wieruszowski, "Die Zusammensetzung des gallischen und fränkischen Episkopats bis zum Vertrag von Verdun mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Nationalität und des Standes," Bonner JHB. H. CXXVII (1922) 2f.

- 46 Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des grossfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels, ed. G. Tellenbach (Forschungen zur oberrhein. Landesgeschichte, vol. 4; Freiburg i. Br. 1957).
- 47 Cf. F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 545f.
- 48 Cf.: E. Hlawitschka, Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien (774-962), (Forsch. z. oberrhein. Landesgeschichte, vol. 8; Freiburg i. Br. 1960); J. Fleckenstein, "Fulrad von Saint-Denis und der fränkische Ausgriff in den süddeutschen Raum," in G. Tellenbach, Studien und Vorarbeiten 9-39; F. Prinz, "Stadtrömisch-italische Märtyrerreliquien und fränkischer Reichsadel im Maas-Moselraum," Historisches Jahrbuch LXXXVII (1967) 1-25.
- 49 Gesta ep. Autissiod. I, 26, MGH. SS. XIII, p. 394; A. Hauck, Kirchengeschichte (7 ed Berlin 1952-53) I, p. 407f.
- 50 For Ainmar see: Gesta ep. Autissiod. I 27, MGH. SS. XIII 394: [Ainmar] in tantum eius potestas seculariter excrevit, ut usque ad ducatum pene totius Burgundiae perveniret.
- 51 Cf. J. Semmler, "Episcopi potestas und karolingische Klosterpolitik," in Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau (Vorträge und Forschungen, Vol. XX; Sigmaringen 1974), p. 305-395.
- 52 Cf. F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 490f; E. Ewig, "Milo," p. 432-440.
- 53 F. Prinz, Klerus und Krieg, p. 73f.
- 54 Annales s. Amandi, MGH. SS. I, 6: quidam episcopus duxit exercitum Francorum in Suavis contra Vilario (s. J. 712); A. Pöschl, Bischofsgut I, p. 115.
- 55 See above note 21. Cf. Th. Schieffer, Winfrid-Bonifatius, p. 205f.
- 56 E. Ewig, "Milo," p. 432f; Th. Schieffer, Angelsachsen und Franken, zwei Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des 8. Jahrhunderts (Wiesbaden 1951), p. 143f; F. Prinz, Frühes Mönchtum, p. 200, 209 et passim.

- 57 Prologue of the Vita s. Remigii, SS. rer. Merov. III, p. 251.
- 58 Gesta Treverorum c. 24 MGH. SS. VIII, p. 161f; Post quem Milo, filius eius, sacerdotali functus est officio apud Trebiros et Remos, primo quidem imitator patris, deinde tyrannus effectus est, nichilque in eodem de clericali honore vel vita nisi tonsura enituit. Eo enim bella gravia et intestina parricidalia in hac provintia orta sunt, quando Karolus tyrannus laicis episcopatus denavit, et episcopus nullam potestatem habere permisit. Cum hoc Karolo Milo supradictus ad bellum profectus est sola tonsura iam clericus, habitu et moribus inreligiosus laicus, et post victoriam episcopatibus Trebirorum et Remorum ab eodem Karolo donatus est . . .
- Ibid. c. 25, p. 162: Milo igitur tyrannus, his ita peractis, venationi inserviens, ab apro percussus moritur in villa quae dicitur Arno primo a Treberi miliario, ubi et sepelitur post 40 annos suae tyrannicae invasionis.
- 59 Epist. Bonif. No. 87, p. 198: De Milone autem et eiusmodi similibus, qui ecclesiis Dei plurimum nocent, ut a tali nefario opere recedant, iuxta apostoli vocem oportune inportune predica . . .
- 60 Ex miraculis s. Liutwini auctore monacho Mediolacensi, MGH. SS. XV 2 c. 3, 1262: Milonis autem, filii eius, finis et actus est memoria dignus, quiamvis Hincmarus, Remorum episcopus perversorem eum episcopatus sue describit, cum de eo in prologo Vite sancti Remigii talis dicit: 'Et Milo quidam, tonsura clericus, actione autem irreligiosus laicus; per quadraginta annos Treverensium pariter et Remorum episcopatum pessunderat.' Cuius etiam finis non ideo infamis extitit, quod canes sequentem aper silvaticus extinxit; quia iustus, quacunque morte preoccupatus fuerit, in refrigerio erit. A quo multum utilitatis accepimus loco nostra collatum, multum esse honoris audivimus impensum. Quo enim pietatis studio non proveheret sibi relicta, qui paterna pius heres gubernanda suscepit ut propria.

For Mettlach cf. Th. Raach, Kloster Mettlach/Saar und sein Grundbesitz (Mainz 1974).

- 61 Flodoard, Hist. Remens. eccl. II, c. 12, MGH. SS. XIII, p. 460: Prefatus itaque Karolus, ut principatum bello adeptus est, hunc virum Domini Rigobertum patronum suum, qui, ut traditur, eum de lavacro sancto susceperat, episcopatu deturbavit et cuidam Miloni, sola tonsura clerico, quod secum processerat ad bellum, didit episcopium hoc.
- 62 In this sense E. Ewig, "Milo," without any proof.
- 63 Th. Schieffer, Winfriid-Bonifatius, p. 217f.
- 64 Epist. Bonif. No. 60, p. 124.
- 65 Wattenbach-Levison II, p. 177.
- 66 Vita Bonifatii auctore Moguntino (ed W. Levison), MGH. SS. in usum scholarum (1905), c. 1, p. 90f: Contigit namque predictum principem cum exercitu contra Saxones ire simulque Geroldum antistitem cum suis Karolo suffragando et hostibus refragando certamini interesse. Quid plura? Certantibus altrinsecus exercitibus venerabilis antistes Geroldus irruentibus iaculorum nubibus interemptus occubuit. Fuit autem eodem tempore quidam nomine Gewelib in palatio regis acceptissimus, supra memorati antistitis filius dictus, qui post obitum patris eandem gubernare suscepit ecclesiam. Hic autem honestis moribus, ut ferunt, suam vitam circumspexit, nisi tantum quod cum herodiis et canibus per semet ipsum iocabatur. Sed tamen diligentibus inquirens et explorans nomen viri, qui suum seniore[m] occiderat, exercitu non multo post adunato, una cum venerando Karolo ad eosdem Saxones, ubi pater eius fuerat extinctus, perrexit . . . 'En, inquit Gewelib, accipe quo patrem vindico ferrum,' dictoque pariter transfodit eum, et ille cadens in flumine exalavit vitam . . . Episcopus autem, a cede regressus, rudi populo rudis adhuc presul-licet etate maturus, tamen fide preficitur, non computantibus nec rege nec ceteris optimatibus vindicatam patris crimen esse dicentibus: 'Vicem reddidit patris morte.'
- 67 Th. Schieffer, Winfriid-Bonifatius, p. 230f. For the archaic character of the frankish nobility see F. Irsigler, "Untersuchungen," op. cit. (note 37).
- 68 MGH. Cap. I, p. 59, No. 22 c. 70 (Sacerdotibus): . . .

Et omnimodis dicendum est presbyteris et diaconibus, ut arma non portent, sed magis se confidant in defensione Dei quam in armis. See also the capitula of bishop Gaerbald of Liège, MGH. Cap. I, p. 243 No. 123 c. 3: Sicut dudum iam interdiximus et sancti canones prohibent, nullus presbyter arma portare audeat; cf. c. 67: Episcopis, omnibus. Item ut homicidia infra patriam, sicut in lege Domini interdictum est, nec causa ultionis nec avaritiae nec latrocinandi non fiant . . .

- 69 MGH. Cap. I, p. 103 No. 35 c. 37: Ut presbyteri et diacones vel reliqui clerici arma non portent, sed magis confidant in defensione Dei quam in armis. See also note 68.
- 70 MGH. Cap. I, p. 403 c. 66: Et omnimodis dicendum est presbyteris et diaconibus, ut arma non portent, sed magis confidant in defensione Dei quam in armis. Cf. R. Buchner, Die Rechtsquellen (Beiheft zu Wattenbach-Levison 1953), p. 48f. Cf. also: Notitia de conciliorum canonibus in villa Sparnaco (Epernay) a Karolo rege confirmatis (846), in c. 10 (MGH. Cap. II, p. 262 No. 257); and council of Meaux (845/46), ibid. II, p. 407 No. 293 c. 37.
- 71 MGH. Cap. II, p. 219 No. 252 c. 11: Si quis clericus homicidium fecerit, ab ordine cessare debet. Si quis clericus quamvis nimium coactus homicidium fecerit, sive sit presbyter sive diaconus, deponatur. Legimus in canonibus apostolorum, 'quod episcopus, presbyter et diaconus, qui in fornicatione aut periuro aut furto captus est, deponatur.' Quanto magis is, qui hoc inmane scelus fecerit, ab ordine cessare debet?
- 72 MGH. Cap. I, p. 25 No. 10 c. 2: . . . Necnon et illas venationes et silvaticas vagationes cum canibus omnibus servis Dei interdiximus; similiter ut acceptores et walcones non habeant.
- 73 Ibid. I, p. 29 No. 12 c. 3: . . . Et omnes clericali fornicationem non faciant et habitu laicorum non portent nec apud canis venationes non faciant . . . nec acceptores non portent.
- 74 Ibid. I, p. 64 No. 23, Duplex legationis Edictum (23. 3. 789), c. 31: Ut episcopi et abbates et abbatissae

cupplas canum non habeant nec falcones nec accipitres nec ioculatores. For Italy ibid. I, p. 231 No. 113 (781) Capitula excerpta canonica c. 6, and (787) ibid. I, 195 No. 92 Capitulare Mantuanum I c. 6.

- 75 Ibid. I, p. 95 No. 33, Capitulare missorum generale c. 19 and Capitulare missorum item speciale, ibid. I, p. 103 No. 35 c. 37: Ut presbyteri et diacones vel reliqui clerici arma non portent, sed magis confidant in defensione Dei quam armis.
- 76 MGH. Cap. I, p. 364 No. 177 c. 11 (807/823).
- 77 Ibid. I, p. 373 No. 180 c. 12 (826).
- 78 Ibid. II, p. 117 No. 228 c. 4.
- 79 Ibid. II, p. 102 No. 221 c. 9: . . . Ventationem quoque nullus tam sacri ordinis exercere praesumat neque arma militaria pro qualicumque seditione portare audeat . . .
- 80 Ibid. II, p. 187 No. 249 c. 6 (3. Oct. 852): (Ut episcopi venationem non exercent) . . . contra episcopis, qui canes vel cetera ioca habere volunt, in psalmo XXIV. sicut scriptum est . . . Pensandum omnibus est in hac sententia, quia, si principibus et laicis hominibus, etiam paganis nichil prodest, quia 'dominantur bestiarum et in avibus ludunt,' quanto magis episcopis obest et quibus portare neque saeculum neque peram licet neque duabus indui tunicis, et quibus possidere aurum vel argentum vel aes in zona non licet, quomodo possidere canes licebit; et qui in via virgam ferre non debent, quomodo accipitres portare debeunt? . . . Nam pastor a pascendis ovibus vocatus est, non a canibus, sicut per prophetam dicitur: 'Nonne oves pascuntur a pastoribus?' Hinc Bonifacius in synodalibus decretis sub Carlomanno duce et principe Francorum habitis ait: 'Venationes et silvaticas vagationes cum canibus omnibus servis Dei interdicti; similiter, ut accipitres et falcones non habeant.' Ibid. I 25, c. 2.
- 81 Cf. F. Prinz, Krieg und Klerus, and for the 10th and 11th century L. Auer, "Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den Sächsischen Kaisern," MIOG LXXXIX (1971) 316-407, and LXXX (1972) 48-70.