

Diplomacy and the Carolingian Encounter with Byzantium down to the Accession of Charles the Bald

MICHAEL McCORMICK

THE CAROLINGIAN CONTEXT OF ERIUGENA'S THOUGHT continues to pose problems for the historian. After Maïeul Cappuyns, the studies of John Contreni on Laon or Edouard Jeuneau on Eriugena's Hellenism have done much to illuminate the immediate cultural background of John the Scot's achievement.¹ And yet, Eriugena's broader historical setting as an early medieval intellectual working to interpret and interrelate two cultures lying at opposite ends of the Mediterranean Sea continues to pose a profound historical enigma.

Since the time of Henri Pirenne, economic historians have usually admitted that the Mediterranean changed from the Roman Empire's royal road of commerce and therefore communication into a war-ravaged no-man's-land, with the result that direct contacts between Byzantium and the early medieval West withered to minimal levels. Cultural historians have documented a shrinking knowledge of Greek which seems to fit the overall reduction of contacts. Against this vision, how was it possible that an Irishman should discover in Frankland a talent for studying Byzantine thinkers like Ps.-Dionysius, Maximus Confessor, and Gregory of Nyssa? And even more remarkable perhaps, that he should find there the means to accomplish that study: the Greek manuscripts, the linguistic tools, the economic support of a patron willing and able to further the study of abstruse theological masterpieces of Byzantine high culture?²

It seems unlikely that we will ever identify precisely from whom Eriugena learned his Greek, or how exactly he was bitten by the Byzantine bug. The best efforts of accomplished

historians have turned up only a few, fugitive traces of Eriugena's physical presence.³

A better hope for deepening our understanding of Eriugena as a historical actor on the Carolingian stage may lie in seeking out the broader historical processes and societal dynamics within which recent work has situated John. Recovering another facet of the Carolingian encounter with Hellenism may prove fruitful to the Eriugenian enterprise, even if this discussion focuses on the years before Charles the Bald's accession and Eriugena's first documented appearance on the Continent. This means that my contribution aims to describe the immediate legacy within which John, his friends and rivals, his enemies and patrons, operated. And this study has a provisional character, since it must lean on early results of an ongoing investigation into patterns of cross-cultural contacts in the early Middle Ages.

Against the broader historical stage on which Eriugena strode, his achievement appears remarkable indeed. Outside of the Islamic world, Mediterranean commerce and travel between regions had diminished and, it is argued, practically disappeared. One of Pirenne's essential conclusions contended that the rise of Islam blockaded western Europe from its ancient center of gravity in the Mediterranean. This forced Europe to shift its attention northwards and triggered a radically new pattern of geographic, economic, and cultural development centering around the North Sea.

To be sure, a half-century of challenge and reexamination has altered many facets of the Belgian historian's initial formulation. Archaeologists and numismatists in particular have disclosed new and surprising links between Europe and modern-day Iraq along a northern arc, via the Vikings, the Baltic, and Russia. Excavations have delineated how shipping developed across the western zone of this route, as Frisian and Anglo-Saxon sailors plied the North Sea and Channel between England and the newly exhumed Frankish trade emporia of Dorestad on the old Rhine or Quentovic on the Canche River. It was this North Sea shipping that provided the infrastructure which brought so many insular scholars and pilgrims to the Continent, and it is by this route that Eriugena likely reached West Francia. The written sources are in harmony with what has emerged from the earth. In the 880s, Notker of St. Gall imagined that Irish scholars came to Charlemagne's court aboard these ships. His testimony surely reveals more about his

own era than that of Charlemagne. Earlier, however, Alcuin himself—and he should have known, since he certainly did not walk on water during his several trips between York and Frankland—shows other Irish holy men active in the coastal region between the Somme and the Canche Rivers, and St. Richarius appears as traveling from that region to England and back.⁴

Scholarly opinion on the subject of transmediterranean contacts in the Carolingian period remains uncertain. Excellent scholars like R. S. Lopez or F. Gabrieli have rejected Pirenne's conclusions in whole or in part. Many others have accepted them in modified form, so that Pirenne's fundamental views on the economic divorce of Charlemagne's Europe from the Mediterranean still command widespread adherence. As two noted specialists have trenchantly formulated it: "Between the reign of Heraclius and the Arab raids of the ninth century internal relations within the Mediterranean were reduced to an almost 'prehistoric' scale."⁵

In the face of such a verdict, the enigma of Eriugena's Hellenism—and of a Frankish court society which fostered, financed, and rewarded it—looms ever larger. One begins once again to wonder whether Eriugena was not some historical fluke, entirely independent of the Frankish or Byzantine societies between which he appears to us as a privileged intermediary. And it is a fact that more than physical distance separated Byzantium from the Franks. The Frankish kingdoms were essentially land-based networks of extended kinships originally rooted in the Rhine-Meuse basin. Like the society they encompassed, these kingdoms and their power networks were an affair of persons, not institutions. Literacy was more markedly ecclesiastical than in the East. By the time Eriugena appears on the scene, the hybrid Germano-Latin aristocracy known as the Franks were beginning to lose control over much of the western Europe which they had conquered in the last three generations.

Over the last thirty years, new insights have transformed the modern view of early medieval Byzantium. No longer is Byzantium viewed complacently as the unchanging heir and reservoir of an urbanized, classicizing, Hellenic civilization.⁶ Archaeology has now made clear that Byzantium's early medieval cities fared little better than those of Merovingian Gaul, and there too the withering of urban society brought with it an impoverishment and ruralization of culture.⁷ Over a century of catastrophe had reduced

the old empire to a shade of its former self, but the imperial capital of Constantinople still controlled much of the Balkan coast and large parts of Asia Minor; it was losing Sicily, the sheet-anchor of Byzantine power in Italy, but fighting gamely to defend Calabria and clinging still to its nominal overlordship of the Campanian seaports, Venice, and outposts along the eastern Adriatic coast. Newly reorganized institutions bound this Greek-speaking empire together: a relatively strong monarchy; an army, navy, and officer corps; and the bureaucracy required to finance and run them. Indeed the institutions which structured Byzantine society were beginning to make a remarkable comeback, after narrowly escaping annihilation at the hands of the Arabs and, later, the Bulgars.

The crises had helped to produce successive shifts in the ruling faction's view of the cult of icons and its christological implications. In turn these doctrinal shifts produced political and cultural stress even as they sparked renewed theological investigation.⁸ In fact, Byzantine literary culture which, in the eighth century, had flourished really only on the empire's fringes and beyond its frontiers—John of Damascus's family worked for the Caliph, not the Basileus—was now, in Eriugena's lifetime, stirring anew in an imperial city whose tattered urban fabric was itself showing signs of recovery.⁹ The Irish scholar's contemporaries in Constantinople were only the second or third generation of a nascent revival of Greek letters, members of a small coterie of scholar-bureaucrats struggling to find, compare, gloss, and transliterate old works. Their efforts would launch the "Macedonian renaissance," more aptly dubbed the "encyclopedic movement."¹⁰ Although the rebirth of high culture, wealth, and power in Byzantium is every bit as exciting as the western revival, the new vision of Byzantium underscores that Frankish fascination with Constantinople and its culture was anything but obvious.

Given the cultural and physical distance separating the centers of Frankish and Byzantine culture and the apparent absence of the commercial relations that might have encouraged interaction, one might expect little or no cross-cultural exchange between them. And yet, it is not only Eriugena who tells a different story.

The last two generations of scholars have uncovered much of Byzantium's impact on Carolingian Europe. Byzantine "influence" has been detected in the Frankish monarchy, art, liturgy, and literature. In 813, Charlemagne staged the final political act

of his long reign by crowning his sole surviving son Louis as co-emperor in his palace chapel at Aachen. The Frankish ceremony seems to derive directly from the Byzantine emperor's coronation of his heir two years before.¹¹ Byzantine artists or inspiration have been invoked to explain some aspects of Carolingian court art.¹² Greek liturgical chants like the great Akathistos hymn to the Virgin were translated and ultimately adapted into the purified Latin liturgy propagated by the Carolingians.¹³ This seems all the more remarkable in view of the liturgy's central role in early medieval culture and the Carolingian family's obsession with purging it of "foreign" accretions.

To this more traditional kind of Byzantine influence, I would add a more novel variety: information. Occasional but remarkable bits of information concerning Constantinople crop up in the oddest places in Carolingian literature. For example, the eighth-century Chronicle of Moissac interrupts its usual court fare of births, deaths, and battles to mention, quite out of the blue, the harsh weather conditions which prevailed one winter in the Gauls, Illyricum, and in *Byzantine Thrace*.¹⁴

Clearly, Eriugena's Hellenism was not a totally isolated phenomenon. Yet, for all the distinguished scholarship devoted to this theme, little evidence has hitherto been adduced to explain how, in concrete historical terms, borrowings from a distant Byzantium occurred if most long-distance contacts in the Mediterranean world had in fact ground to a halt.

One important reason behind this dilemma lies in the very notion of Byzantine "influence." For the conceptual connotations of "influence" supply a metaphor which misleads historical analysis.¹⁵ To speak of Byzantine "influence" is implicitly to suggest that Constantinople was a kind of medieval volcano actively spewing forth its culture across thousands of miles onto an inert, passive Frankish West. Yet historical observation suggests that just the opposite is true: when one culture encounters another, the receiving culture takes the initiative of appropriating something from the donor culture. But before the borrowing can occur, the two civilizations must meet somewhere, there must be sufficient contact for the donor culture to be available to the borrowing culture. This is the historical dilemma: historians of all obediences have detected not a few cross-cultural borrowings between the two empires at the same time that other historians have observed the

shrinking of relations between them. If contacts between Byzantium and the Franks shared the presumed fate of long-distance commerce, how could the Franks know enough about Byzantine civilization to appropriate it for themselves?

To answer this historical riddle means approaching it in terms that meant something in the eighth and ninth centuries. We should examine our assumptions about Mediterranean commerce even as we seek out other opportunities for interaction between Constantinople and the West. Abstractions like "influence" and even "appropriating milieux" are less helpful than specific people and places, the documented bridges between the two worlds. And there is a common thread to many Frankish borrowings from Byzantium which helps to guide the inquiry. That thread leads precisely to Eriugena's historical milieu: the Carolingian court.

The royal court's role in launching the Carolingian renaissance is well known. Key features of Carolingian society like kingship, personal bonds of kinship and friendship, patronage, gift-giving, and a lust for authenticity helped shape and structure this remarkable social group.¹⁶ The court fostered Charlemagne's efforts to improve education, foreign scholars' integration into the Frankish empire, and the introduction of rare works into northern libraries. We need think only of Charlemagne's library and its rare classical texts, including perhaps a unique translation of Euclid or, closer to Eriugena, the Byzantine-Frankish dossier on iconoclasm that may have belonged to Charles the Bald's library. In sum the Frankish royal court represented a highly charged locus of cultural receptivity and innovation. It boasted the greatest concentration of talented intellectuals, resources, and patrons of culture.¹⁷

The structures of Frankish society conditioned how this milieu fastened onto Byzantine culture. Given the predominance of person-to-person ties over institutional ones, long-distance relations involving individuals associated with the court should be very revealing.

Personal contacts with merchants may have been of limited importance. Even if ongoing research were to revise the current assessment of "stone-age" levels of Mediterranean commerce—my own work suggests a view which differs somewhat from the conventional wisdom outlined above—economic historians have challenged anachronistic assumptions about the importance of trade in ancient times. On present evidence, early medieval economies

were likely to be even more agrarian than ancient ones.¹⁸ In the best of times, that is, trade was a limited phenomenon, so that effective media for cross-cultural exchange should be sought outside or alongside of commerce. Where else should one look?

The reality of Byzantine provincial culture lay in the Franks' own backyard. Scholars are increasingly uncovering the role of border provinces in diffusing Byzantine civilization.¹⁹ For the Carolingians, this meant Italy, much of which was just leaving the Byzantine world in the eighth and ninth centuries.²⁰ Charlemagne was a child when the imperial administration finally abandoned Ravenna, and he later went to war with Constantinople for control of Byzantine outposts on the Adriatic, including Venice.²¹

Then as now, loss of political control coincided only roughly with cultural reorientation. Though the most recent research has tended to minimize Greek culture at contemporary Ravenna, the Lombards who attempted to absorb the Exarchate show signs of indebtedness to Byzantine military ritual, chancery practices, and court entertainment. When the Franks annexed northern Italy in 774, the last Lombard king fled to Constantinople where he joined the Byzantine aristocracy as a patrician.²² And the impact of Byzantine culture is clear on the imperial borders in the southern Lombard duchy of Benevento, where one duke founded a convent dedicated to "Sancta Sophia" and another, who had lived at Charlemagne's court as a hostage, married Evanthis, sister-in-law of emperor Constantine VI.²³

Byzantium's hand had once weighed even more heavily in Rome. When Charlemagne took the throne, the papacy was just emerging from its century-long "Byzantine period," during which most popes had been recruited from the Greek-speaking elites who had fled Byzantium's catastrophes in the East. Pope Zachary, who ruled the see of Peter in Charlemagne's childhood and underwrote St. Boniface's mission in Germany, translated the Latin dialogues of Gregory the Great into his own native Greek—quite possibly so that they could be read in the monasteries of Rome.²⁴ For the paradox is often forgotten that precisely when Monte Cassino's Benedictine rule was conquering abbeys north of the Alps, Byzantine monasticism prevailed at Rome itself. In fact a list of Roman monasteries drawn up in 807 reveals that Saint Sabas, Saint Anastasius, and Saint Silvester's were the city's three most important abbeys, and all three were Greek. Four other Byzantine

monasteries and convents figure in the list and, in 818/819, Pope Paschal I would found an eighth, Saint Praxedis.²⁵ Little wonder then that Rome ceased recognizing eastern sovereignty only late in the eighth century.²⁶

Thus Carolingian Rome and its inhabitants, like other areas of Italy, offered a complex cultural picture in which Byzantium figured prominently. Franks who traveled to Italy, and particularly to Rome, encountered Byzantine provincial civilization at firsthand. Byzantines also encountered Franks. It may have been Byzantine residents of Rome who coined the variant on a traditional Greek proverb cited by Einhard: "If you have a Frank who is a friend, you don't have him for a neighbor."²⁷

In addition to frequent pilgrimage south to Rome, six times in the eighth century's last forty-five years, the Frankish king, his court, and some thousands of his military followers crossed the Alps and campaigned in Italy. Charles the Bald would himself head south twice at the close of his reign, although after we lose certain sight of Eriugena. Indeed, Charles the Bald's famous experiment in Byzantine ceremony came hard on the heels of an expedition to Italy.²⁸

Firsthand experience of Mediterranean civilization must have made a profound impression on the Frankish aristocrats who constituted the army, and the results of these massive movements of men and material are reflected in the transfer of books, artworks, and people across the Alps. The surviving manuscripts which actually made the trip northward show how much more intensive this movement was under the Carolingians than in the tenth century.²⁹ Even more consequential, given the nature of Frankish society, was Charlemagne's systematic replacement of Lombard officials by northern aristocrats. This administrative policy insured an enduring transalpine presence in Italy and, for the first time since the Roman Empire, created a powerful, permanent medium for diffusing ideas and customs from the south: extensive aristocratic kinship networks now spanned the Alps and would endure over a century.³⁰ A splendid example from Eriugena's time is Charles the Bald's own sister Gisla and her cultivated husband, Eberhard, margrave of Friuli, who left a much-discussed library to his heirs. Although their hereditary properties lay chiefly in Charles the Bald's kingdom and Gisla would retire there, these aristocrats spent most of their active lives overseeing the Frankish

frontier of Byzantine Venice.³¹ Eberhard was well-enough connected with Irish circles north of the Alps that Sedulius Scottus celebrated him in panegyrics and composed his son's epitaph.³² It was in their household that the Saxon noble Godescalc—whose controversial ideas on predestination first bring John the Scot clearly into view—found temporary refuge en route to Byzantine Dalmatia. There, presumably, Godescalc learned the technical terminology which the Venetians used to describe their relations with the Byzantine emperor.³³

Early in its relationship with the Carolingians, the Roman church had played a key role as intermediary between Constantinople and the Franks: in the mid-eighth century, the popes had supplied the Frankish court with the experts on Byzantium that it so urgently needed.³⁴ Later on, the popes used their eastern connections to furnish Charlemagne with news bulletins on events in Constantinople.³⁵ And it is well known that Rome supplied the northern court with Latin books, but Greek ones also crossed the Alps.³⁶

There were more casual contacts too. For example, in Rome, Einhard's secretary Ratleic met and was inspired to pious theft by Basilus the monk who, with four disciples, had emigrated from Constantinople two years before entering the brand-new Greek monastery of St. Caesarius.³⁷ By the time Eriugena appears at Charles the Bald's court, Ratleic had succeeded Einhard as abbot of Seligenstadt and ascended to a key position at the court of Louis the German, where he would serve as head of the royal writing office until 854.³⁸

In the second half of the ninth century, however, the situation may have been changing. Every passing decade since the end of the doctrinal controversies at Constantinople and the later waves of immigration that they had triggered may have diluted the Byzantine component of local Roman culture. Certainly the city's Greek monasteries declined in the last quarter of the ninth century.³⁹ By then a cultural intermediary like Anastasius Bibliothecarius appears as a towering and, seemingly, rather isolated figure.⁴⁰ Since Latin into Greek may be a better gauge of an important Hellenic presence than the inverse, it is probably significant that the latest securely documented ninth-century translation at Rome from Latin into Greek dates from 824.⁴¹ But if Rome's connections with Byzantium did slacken somewhat as the ninth

century progressed, those of Venice intensified and opened a new set of possibilities. Already Louis the Pious had turned to Venice to find someone who could build a Byzantine organ for court ceremonies at the Aachen of Charles the Bald's childhood.⁴²

And so Frankish Italy defines one zone in which Byzantine and Carolingian cultures overlapped and created the person-to-person contacts which, in an early medieval society, were particularly propitious to cross-cultural exchange. Although far more distant, a second area linked Byzantine civilization beyond the imperial borders with the Frankish elite and deserves at least passing mention.

Jerusalem fascinated and attracted Christians from around the world, despite its distant location within the political boundaries of the Islamic caliphate. The Frankish court had connections there. These personal relations illuminate the unlikely fact that the most detailed description of Christian institutions in the Holy Land between the Arab conquest and the Crusades occurs in a Carolingian financial document. It instructed Charles the Great that seventeen women from his dominions lived in a convent attached to the Holy Sepulcher, that thirty-five monks inhabited the Frankish monastery on the Mount of Olives, and that the patriarch of Jerusalem spent 630 gold pieces on his clergy every year.⁴³ And it was the liturgical practice of the Franks in reciting their Creed at Jerusalem that first spotlighted the *filioque* formula and its rejection by the Byzantine—and papal—church.⁴⁴ Similar contacts continued into Eriugena's time, as we know from the lively account that a monk has left of his trip to Jerusalem and its Frankish establishment in the reign of Charles the Bald.⁴⁵ Like Byzantine Italy, in other words, Jerusalem promises some surprising rewards to further research.

A third "zone" for direct personal contact between eastern and western elites might appear, at first glance, quantitatively insignificant. With more insight than evidence, Maëul Cappuyns, for instance, argued that Eriugena found his Greek at the royal court.⁴⁶ Whether or not that was the case, Jeauneau is surely right to emphasize that the prestige Byzantium enjoyed at court conditioned the context of Eriugena's activity.⁴⁷ This raises the problem of direct contacts between the Frankish court and Constantinople, that is, the place of diplomacy in the cultural encounter between East and West. Now it might be objected that diplomatic relations are

not a promising place to seek significant cultural exchange. But was that true in the early Middle Ages? Certainly Frankish-Byzantine relations were rocky, swinging—literally—from near honeymoon idyll to war and back again. It might be observed too that dark-age diplomats had little time for the niceties of cross-cultural exchange and, even had they had the time, the rarity of diplomatic contacts and tiny numbers of persons involved in a Mediterranean reduced to "stone-age" relations could scarcely reward detailed scrutiny. And what substance could there be to such exchanges between societies so different and so distant?

Even a quick glance at the diplomatic record demonstrates that substance was not lacking. Byzantine diplomacy was a prized instrument of power, and Constantinople initiated relations as soon as the Franks intervened in the sphere of Byzantine interests in Italy. Down to 840, diplomats negotiated four or five marriage contracts between the ruling dynasties and—a not unconnected fact—concluded two wars. This suggests substantive diplomatic relations.⁴⁸

Several factors make these contacts a privileged path for uncovering the early medieval dynamics of cross-cultural exchange. The naked fact of the embassies is often, if not invariably, attested in the scanty surviving sources; we can sometimes identify the ambassadors themselves and so analyze their social and cultural profile. And, most importantly, the legations concerned and connected the summits of the two societies, their courts. Given the Carolingian court's cultural vigor, even the most limited contact here could work far broader consequences than comparable encounters between private individuals.

How many people were involved? Diplomatic exchanges between the Carolingian court and Constantinople from the beginning in 756 to 840, over the three generations of Carolingian power represented by Pippin, Charlemagne, and Louis the Pious, comprised some nine embassies sent by the Frankish king to Constantinople and at least twenty-one Byzantine legations in the opposite direction for a total of about thirty missions over eighty-four years.⁴⁹ By the most conservative count the nine western embassies involved more than seventeen documentable ambassadors, while the twenty-one eastern legations included thirty-eight officials of status exalted enough to be named in the surviving

sources. This total of over fifty-five officials very likely underrepresents the real number of ranking ambassadors, irrespective of how many legations actually took place.⁵⁰

More than fifty-five persons physically linking the two early medieval courts over nine decades seems a surprisingly high number, given conventional wisdom on the state of Mediterranean-borne traffic between Byzantium and the West. But even this intriguing figure fails to convey how many people were directly involved. It does not take into account an essential historical characteristic of early medieval society, when power was reckoned not so much in how many pieces of silver one owned but in the number of men that one commanded. True to their laconic and aristocratic slant, the same Carolingian historical records which virtually ignore the Irish court teacher without Frankish kin, bishopric, or abbey, mention only the heads of embassies.⁵¹ Yet in the early Middle Ages, people were power, and every grandee, in both societies, prided himself on the size and impressiveness of his personal retinue.⁵² What is more, a Frankish bishop or a Byzantine patrician could hardly be expected to cook for himself, write his own letters, or feed his own horses, and the legations needed to protect their precious gifts. So purely practical concerns combined with prestige to force ambassadors to surround themselves with grooms, soldiers, secretaries, priests, interpreters, and cooks. Earlier and slightly later sources clearly attest that embassies and their personnel were structured along these lines; a few stray allusions from our period confirm the pattern.⁵³

How large were the retinues? The only precise and certain figure I have found for a western ambassador's entourage to Constantinople in the early Middle Ages comes from the tenth century. But surely it furnishes a good idea of the order of magnitude of such expeditions: the legation which Liutprand led to Constantinople in 968 included the bishop's personal retinue of twenty-five followers.⁵⁴ That this figure is valid and even on the low side for our period is suggested by a Carolingian capitulary regulating the daily supplies furnished to envoys on royal business. A bishop's *per diem* included forty loaves of bread, three suckling piglets, one young pig, three measures of drink, three chickens, and fifteen eggs, while the supplies furnished to a count, an abbot, or a royal vassal are only slightly lower, starting with thirty loaves of bread. The amounts are specifically earmarked for each envoy.

The conclusion is inescapable: each grandee traveled with his own personal retinue. One loaf per day per person was the usual Carolingian rule of thumb for calculating food rations. This means that Louis the Pious's court presumed that bishops' retinues on government business numbered around forty persons, while those of abbots and counts counted around thirty, and royal vassals traveled with seventeen followers.⁵⁵

While the actual attested size of Liutprand's entourage may be on the low side, it is certainly believable. Using Liutprand's escort to remain on the safe side, and multiplying it by the seventeen Frankish ambassadors, we are forced to reckon that some 425 followers accompanied the ambassadors to Constantinople. In all probability, then, a minimum of 442 Franks traveled to the Byzantine court on official business over three generations. If roughly the same figures hold for Byzantine embassies to the Frankish court—and several Byzantine sources suggest they do—we must assess their total numbers at somewhere around 936 Byzantines traveling to Aachen and the other Carolingian palaces.⁵⁶

And so, well over one thousand persons from Constantinople and the Carolingian courts seem to have traveled across the length and breadth of each other's empire to visit their respective courts in the eighty-four years preceding Charles the Bald's accession. Even allowing for overlapping due to individuals who may have repeated the journey, the general order of magnitude offers a startling challenge to received wisdom about the levels of direct interaction between the two early medieval court societies. Clearly, it is time to start revising our assumptions about dark-age diplomacy.

Nonetheless, this figure of many hundreds of travelers says little about their social status and therefore cultural weight. This is fundamental in an era when, in the West at least, aristocratic kindreds set the tone for civilization. Many of the travelers must have been subordinates, and some were probably even of servile status.⁵⁷ In any case, we can usually verify the backgrounds of known ambassadors. Thirteen of seventeen Frankish ambassadors are identified by name. Typically, these men came from the most influential and aristocratic kinship groups of their time. One example may speak for all: Count Hugh the Timid served as ambassador to Constantinople in 811–812. Hugh came from an Alemannian family which was prominent throughout the empire, and Hugh himself was a dominant personality at the court into which Charles the Bald was

born. The man's nobility and political status enabled him to marry one daughter to Lothar I, while a second daughter married Charles the Bald's maternal uncle.⁵⁸ When kinship networks of this prominence and power are implicated in the journey to Constantinople, the potential cultural consequences among the Carolingian elite are great indeed. It bears remembering that the records usually mention only the heads of embassies. Yet the nature of Carolingian society dictated that, wherever they went on the king's business, Frankish aristocrats were accompanied by their kinsmen and their closest associates. So, over a decade after the fact, we learn quite incidentally that another of Charlemagne's ambassadors to Constantinople, Haito, bishop of Basel and abbot of Reichenau, had taken his future successor at Reichenau with him on his voyage to Constantinople.⁵⁹ And in this society of blood bonds and feuds, some followers were probably close relatives of the noble ambassadors themselves.⁶⁰ Nor were intellectuals missing from the ranks of Carolingian ambassadors: the famous liturgical commentator Amalarius of Metz, the moral theologian Halitgar, bishop of Cambrai, and the great translator Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who criticized Eriugena's Greek, all sailed to Byzantium as ambassadors of Frankish emperors.⁶¹

How long did these large parties of aristocrats and their retainers spend at each other's courts? The ninth-century infrastructure of travel dictated the rhythm of contacts. Since the Mediterranean was closed for travel between November and March, Frankish legations of this era usually left for Byzantium in the spring or summer and returned to the Frankish court at the same time of the following year. Six of the nine documented Frankish embassies certainly wintered in the Byzantine empire, and Amalarius, who, Eriugenists will recall, was consulted along with John the Scot about the Godescalc affair, complains that his embassy spent eighty days at Constantinople awaiting the return of Emperor Leo V.⁶² This pattern provides an intriguing correlation with what we know of the annual rhythms of the Byzantine court, which tended to cluster key social, ceremonial, and political activities around the great liturgical feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter.⁶³ In other words, the Frankish missions tended to spend several months in the Byzantine capital, and they were just the months that corresponded to the imperial court's greatest activity.

Data on eastern ambassadors is less complete, which is not surprising given the scarcity of Byzantine sources of the eighth and ninth centuries. On general grounds, however, it is probably safe to assume that after two or three months of arduous travel, tired Byzantine ambassadors usually did not do an abrupt about face as soon as they had reached their goal. Since the ceremonial audience granted ambassadors sometimes coincided with the annual general assemblies of the Frankish aristocracy and their king, ambassadors would have had to wait at court until that date, a point which is explicitly confirmed for the Byzantine embassy of 765. Moreover, the itinerant style of Carolingian rulership meant envoys sometimes arrived at one of the main palaces only to find that the king was absent, forcing them to remain there until his return. This explains why a familiar figure at the court both of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald later insisted that a senior official should constantly remain at the palace in case any delegations might arrive in the prince's absence.⁶⁴ Finally, a late report which seems reliable claims that the Byzantine embassy of 812 spent the winter holidays, including Epiphany, with Charlemagne at Aachen.⁶⁵ We may therefore lend some credence to the sources' implication that an eastern legation usually stayed longer than a few days and less than three months.⁶⁶ And to the temporary sojourn of the Greek ambassadors themselves must be added the long-term presence of Byzantine eunuch teachers and etiquette experts who certainly arrived with eastern legations but who were left at the Frankish court to prepare Carolingian princesses for the weddings arranged between the courts, even though unbeknownst to the principals those marriages were destined never to occur.⁶⁷ In other words, ample time was available to both parties for deepening their acquaintance with the other's culture.

A full description of the cultural characteristics of Byzantine ambassadors who visited the Frankish court must await another venue. But the fact that lay ambassadors tended to be high-ranking bureaucrats and that, beginning in 798, secular clergy were well represented, supplies an important clue: they correspond closely to the contemporary social profile of Byzantine literacy and litterati.⁶⁸ This observation is comforted by the fact that one of Byzantium's greatest intellects, Photius, seems actually to have participated in a diplomatic mission around 845.⁶⁹ Even

though this was to the caliphate and even though the most cultivated aristocrat could scarcely approach the achievement of Photius, it warns against underestimating the cultural level one might encounter among Byzantine diplomats.

The Byzantine ambassadors who visited the court of Charles the Bald's father and grandfather in fact confirm this impression. Michael, metropolitan of Synada, was sent to Charlemagne and Pope Leo III with Count Hugh in 812 and looks like a learned theologian by contemporary Byzantine lights. At a young age he played an important role in the deliberations of the Second Council of Nicaea in 787/788, and he would figure again in the conference on icons convened by Emperor Leo V at Constantinople some years later.⁷⁰ Theodore Krithinos, a high official in the administration of the Hagia Sophia, had participated in the embassy to Louis the Pious in 824 and, it has been thought, led that of 827. These embassies' theological concerns, Theodore's role in sponsoring translation from Latin into Greek, his subsequent career as archbishop of Syracuse, and the fact that he was remembered as the arch-heretic of iconoclasm all suggest an intellectual background.⁷¹ A final case from Frankish Italy which may be of interest to specialists of Eriugena merits mention. In 867, Photius selected his childhood friend Zachary, metropolitan of Chalcedon, as his ambassador to the court of Louis II, emperor of Italy. Though Zachary's mission was never completed, in this instance the patriarch actually chose a philosopher for an exceedingly delicate mission to a western court.⁷² Zachary authored one of the rare Byzantine philosophical treatises contemporary with Eriugena. This work on time and the soul reflects an Aristotelian background and, quite probably, the teaching of Zachary's mentor Photius. Even more interesting: this treatise's textual transmission links Zachary to the group of mid-ninth-century Greek manuscripts from the "Allen" scriptorium which constitute a key witness to the text of Plato, and also transmit Ps.-Dionysius.⁷³

These then are some preliminary indications on the conditions which fostered cultural interaction between Byzantium and the Franks down to the accession of Charles the Bald. Yet the opportunities for person-to-person contact between Franks and Byzantines were wider still. An exhaustive account would have to include Byzantine servants at the Frankish court, the forgotten Greek eunuch chamberlains who attended to Charlemagne, Louis

the Pious, or their families.⁷⁴ And other Byzantines of higher status lurked there as well, like Photius's kinsman Sisinnius who spent a decade of his life as a Frankish hostage.⁷⁵ But these individuals and the cross-cultural contacts they provided are better left for another occasion.

Whatever further research may reveal about the state of trans-mediterranean commerce, in the three generations preceding Eriugena's appearance at the court of Charles the Bald, person-to-person relations, precisely the kind of contacts that counted in Frankish society, were not infrequent and they were of significant duration. They concerned hundreds of individuals, some of whom represented the social and cultural apex of their respective civilizations. And these personal encounters occurred at the court, that is, in the most propitious context possible for affecting a civilization in the making. Here at last the certain historical context which has been so often postulated begins to emerge. But did cross-cultural exchange actually occur there?

A full response would detail the cultural artifacts transmitted by diplomatic exchange, of which the best-attested are diplomatic gifts. The earliest surviving middle-Byzantine bureaucratic memorandum on gifts comes only in 935 and concerns a rather low-level delegation to King Hugh of Provence. But it does provide two key insights. On one hand, the inclusion of objets d'art like an onyx chalice, glassware, and gilded silverware confirms the contention of some scholars that Byzantine diplomatic gifts familiarized foreign elites with Constantinopolitan art. On the other, the memorandum specifies who should get what among the seven counts and six bishops associated with Hugh's court. This is essential: it reveals Constantinople's shrewd understanding of the diffuse structure of power that typified an early medieval court, and shows that gifts were tailored to prospective recipients.⁷⁶ Both points were no less true of earlier Byzantine dealings with the Franks.

Frankish sources often allude to diplomatic gifts and occasionally mention the most spectacular by name. The freshly copied Greek manuscript of the works of Ps.-Dionysius presented to Louis the Pious's court at Compiègne in September 827 reveals the subtlety with which such gifts were chosen. One of Constantinople's primary diplomatic objectives in this period was negotiating the unification of the eastern and western churches.⁷⁷ In contempo-

rary Byzantine terms this could only mean the adoption of iconoclasm in the West. Now Theodore Krithinos had gotten to know Louis's entourage during his visit to Rouen in 824. The ambassadors of 827 capitalized on that experience by astutely exploiting Frankish court politics. Negotiations aiming to unite the western and eastern churches would inevitably have involved Hilduin, one of Louis's chief advisors. As head of the imperial chapel, Hilduin coordinated ecclesiastical affairs in Frankland. He also happened to be abbot of St. Dionysius or St. Denis in Paris, where he was leading a campaign to prove that the disciple of Saint Paul and putative author of those Neoplatonic treatises was in fact the patron saint of his abbey. Now, thanks to Greeks bearing gifts, Hilduin could claim that the presentation of the book to him in Compiègne set off a series of miracles in Paris, thereby proving the identity of the two Dionysii to any but the most vile unbeliever.⁷⁸ It was, presumably, this precise historical situation that explains why one of Hilduin's closest and most faithful proteges, a young canon of St. Denis named Hincmar, was rummaging in the palace archives for the original manuscript of Charlemagne's refutation of icon veneration, the *Libri Carolini*.⁷⁹

And it is no less significant that this same Byzantine embassy reveals the lesser-known phenomenon of Frankish influence on Byzantium. For the cross-cultural exchange fostered by such diplomatic contacts was no one-way street. Hilduin's preposterous claim and the Parisian legend of St. Denis entered Byzantine literature on the return trip, since it shows up at Constantinople almost immediately in Greek hagiography.⁸⁰

As the cult of St. Denis shows, more than just books moved between the two courts and their cultures. In a famous anecdote, Charlemagne is reported to have been so moved by the beauty of the Greek chant he heard coming from a Byzantine ambassador's retinue that he ordered a Latin translation of the same text set to the same music. Liturgists and musicologists have demonstrated that these Latin antiphons for the octave of Epiphany, *O veterem hominem*, do indeed preserve an archaic Byzantine chant.⁸¹ What is more, and this underscores the enduring relevance of the events of the first half of the ninth century to the precise historical context of Eriugena, the early textual transmission of the piece turns precisely on a manuscript somehow connected with the court of Charles the Bald, the Antiphonary of Compiègne.⁸² In fact, the

saints mentioned in it seem to suggest that the manuscript was originally copied for the monastery of St. Médard of Soissons, one of the places where scholars have located John the Scot.⁸³ Whether in the chapel of his royal patron or at St. Médard, in other words, Eriugena could well have listened to Byzantine chant which had reached the West with ambassadors to Charlemagne. It is symbolically significant that these cross-cultural transfers center on the things that really counted for the ninth century, both Greek and Latin. Whatever we moderns may feel about them, saints and the liturgy lay close indeed to the hearts of early medieval men and women.

The unparalleled mention of winter conditions in Byzantine Thrace in 763 from the Chronicle of Moissac was mentioned above as a kind of random fact of Carolingian court literature. But it too calls out for explanation, and diplomatic relations clarify it. To explain the Chronicle of Moissac's sudden interest in Byzantine weather conditions requires only a fact which the Chronicle does not mention: that a Carolingian legation to Emperor Constantine V was caught outside of Constantinople precisely by the terrible early winter of autumn 763.⁸⁴

This case and others like it begin to suggest that not only objects, like organs or books, but information too is trackable. And this suggests an exciting perspective: because material on Byzantium is proportionally uncommon in the abundant literary production of the Carolingian renaissance, it is identifiable and manageable. In a sense, it resembles a trace element injected into Frankish literature which, because of its unique character, can sometimes be correlated with a limited number of individuals and kinship networks. In other words, the ongoing analysis of early medieval cultural borrowing and diffusion in its authentic social dimension promises to show how, in concrete historical terms, ideas, books, information, in a word, how culture, disseminated. In some privileged cases at least, this promises to illuminate not only what happened in one sector of the Carolingian renaissance but how and why it happened, with whom and where it happened. It promises to move from the cataloguing of literary production to the historical explanation of one facet of literary production.

Though this essay has only begun to sketch the role of dark-age diplomacy in precipitating cross-cultural exchange, even this first approach has pointed to a remarkable number and range of per-

sonal contacts between the western and eastern courts. It begins to hint that the human and historical channels of communication may be recoverable to a degree hitherto unsuspected. The developments I have sketched, though they directly affect only the years preceding Eriugena's documented appearance on the Continent, give an idea of the atmosphere at the court at which his great patron grew up and which supplied the early entourage of Charles the Bald, the entourage to which Eriugena himself belonged.

Imperfect and rough though they are, these observations mark the path to a clearer, more precise understanding of the Carolingian elite's cultural encounters and attitudes. Expanding scholarly horizons to tracking the movement of people as well as books, ideas, and pictures, and correlating the results with contemporary social structures may cast some new light on the early medieval interaction of Byzantium and the West. In so doing we may hope better to grasp how early medieval diplomacy helped foster the encounter of East and West in the cultural context which prevailed when John the Scot first set foot on the European continent.

NOTES

1. J. J. Contreni, *The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, no. 29 (Munich, 1978); E. Jeaneau, "Jean Scot Erigène et le grec," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 41 (1977–1978 [1979]): 5–50 is the indispensable introduction to the problem treated here; P. Riché, "Le grec dans les centres de culture d'Occident," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. W. Herren and S. A. Brown (London, 1988), 143–168, here 147–153, provides a quick overview. The present study originated in a broader research project on personal contacts and cross-cultural exchange in early medieval Christendom and was launched under the excellent conditions provided by support from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. I am now preparing a monograph based on that research.

2. For a list of Greek manuscripts which Eriugena would have needed, see Jeaneau, "Erigène et le grec," 28–29; for the kind of linguistic tools he might have had, *ibid.*, 26–40, and, in particular, A. C. Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars and Dictionaries in Carolingian Europe," in *Sacred Nectar*, 1–56, esp. 13.

3. See M. Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Erigène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Louvain, 1933); for recent overviews: J. J. O'Meara, *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1988); and G. Schrimpf, "Johannes Scottus Eriugena," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 17 (1988), 156–172, esp. 160–161, for the evidence suggesting John's stay at Soissons. For what his poems suggest, see P. E. Dutton, "Eriugena, the Royal Poet," in *Jean Scot écrivain*, ed. G. H. Allard (Montreal, 1986), 51–80. On the question of his trace in the manuscripts: T. A. M. Bishop, "Autographa of John the Scot," in *Jean Scot Erigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris, 1977), 89–94; J. Vezin, "A propos des manuscrits de Jean Scot: Quelques remarques sur les manuscrits autographes du haut moyen âge," in *Erigène et l'histoire*, 95–99. For his life in Ireland, P. P. O'Neill, "The Old-Irish Words in Eriugena's Biblical Glosses," in *Jean Scot écrivain*, 287–297.

4. On the archaeological evidence: R. Hodges, "Trade and Market Origins in the Ninth Century: Relations between England and the Continent," in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, ed. M. T. Gibson and J. L. Nelson, 2d ed. (London, 1990), 202–223. Notker, *Gesta Karoli magni imperatoris*, 1, 1, ed. H. F. Haefele, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* n.s. 12 (Berlin, 1959), 1. On Irish holymen and St. Richarius (Riquier): Alcuin, *Vita Richarii*, 2 and 8–9, ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 4 (Hanover, 1902), 390–391 and 393–394. Cf. Alcuin's eighth-century source: *V. Richarii*, 2 and 7, ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 7 (Hanover, 1920), 445 and 448.

5. H. Pirenne, *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (1937; reprint, Cleveland, 1959); further reprinted with valuable essays as H. Pirenne, B. Lyon et al., *Mahomet et Charlemagne: Byzance, Islam et Occident dans le haut moyen âge* (Antwerp, 1987). Cf. L. Genicot, "Mahomet et Charlemagne après 50 ans," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 82 (1987): 277–281. Cf. R. S. Lopez, "The Trade of Medieval Europe: The South," in *Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, vol. 2, *Trade and Industry in the Middle Ages*, 2d ed., ed. M. M. Postan and E. Millar (Cambridge, 1987), 306–401, esp. 316ff. and 320ff.; and F. Gabrieli, "Effets et influences de l'Islam sur l'Europe occidentale," in *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, 195–247, esp. 199. For a selection of the extensive reactions to Pirenne's thesis, see *Bedeutung und Rolle des Islam beim Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter*, ed. P. E. Hübinger (Darmstadt, 1968); and esp. R. Hodges and D. Whitehouse, *Mohammed, Charlemagne, and the Origins of Europe: Archaeology and the Pirenne Thesis* (Ithaca, 1983), from which the quotation is taken, p. 75. The written evidence has been reexamined by D. Claude, *Der Handel im westlichen Mittelmeer während des Frühmittelalters*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3d ser., no. 144 (Göt-

tingen, 1985), who concludes that long-distance shipping involving the western Mediterranean reached a nadir c. 700.

6. The chief architect of this new view of Byzantium is A. P. Kazhdan, beginning with his study of Byzantine cities, "Vizantyskie goroda v VII–IX vv.," *Sovetskaya arheologiya* 21 (1954): 164–188; cf. more recently A. P. Kazhdan and A. Cutler, "Continuity and Discontinuity in Byzantine History," *Byzantion* 52 (1982): 429–478.

7. For a recent survey of the transformations of the urban landscape in the East, see J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century* (Cambridge, 1990), 92–124.

8. C. Mango, "The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire," in *Byzantine Books and Bookmen: A Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium* (Washington, 1975), 30–45, here 44–45, observes the bibliographic impulse generated by the controversy. On the roots of iconoclasm in the crises of the seventh and early eighth centuries, see C. Mango, "Historical Introduction," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, 1977), 1–6, here 2–3.

9. On the geographical marginalization of Byzantine culture, see C. Mango, "La culture grecque et l'Occident au VIII^e siècle," in *I problemi dell'Occidente nel secolo VIII*, Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, no. 20 (Spoleto, 1973), 683–721; and R. Blake, "La littérature grecque en Palestine au VIII^e siècle," *Le Muséon* 78 (1965): 367–380, which needs updating. Cf. N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore, 1983), 69 and 76–78; as well as R. Browning and A. P. Kazhdan, "Greek outside the Empire," *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1991), 2:873–874 (hereafter cited as *ODB*). On Constantinople: C. Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV^e–VII^e siècles)* (Paris, 1985), 51–62. For the re-emergence of Constantinopolitan literary culture, see P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 108ff. Immigration to the capital may have played a role in this reemergence and, in any case, suggests increasing opportunities there: cf. the careers of Michael Syncellus, Theophanes Graptus, and Patriarch Methodius, on whom see the relevant articles in the *ODB*. The incorporation of Palestinian usages into the Constantinopolitan liturgy was perhaps part of this broader centripetal movement of culture and people: see, e.g., R. Taft, "Byzantine Rite," *ODB* 1:343–344.

10. Lemerle, *Premier humanisme*, 268. Cf. A. Kazhdan, "Encyclopedism," *ODB* 1:696–697.

11. Michael I's coronation of Theophylactus: W. Wendling, "Die Erhebung Ludwigs d. Fr. zum Mitkaiser im Jahre 813 und ihre Bedeutung für die Verfassungsgeschichte des Frankenreiches," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 19 (1985): 210–238, esp. 217–223.

12. E.g., Wien, Schatzkammer s.n.: Cautiously: W. Koehler, *Die karolingischen Miniaturen* 3, 1 (Berlin, 1960), 49–51, esp. 51. More emphatically: J. Beckwith, "Byzantine Influence on Art at the Court of Charlemagne," in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, vol. 3 (Düsseldorf, 1965): 288–300, here 297–299; but cf. the more careful and convincing appraisal of F. Mutherich, "Die Buchmalerei am Hofe Karls des Grossen," in *Karl der Grosse* 3:9–53, here 45–53.

13. The exact circumstances of the translation remain unclear, although part of the text occurs in a s. ix MS (Zurich C 78). M. Huglo, "L'ancienne version latine de l'hymne Acathiste," *Le Muséon* 64 (1951): 27–61, argues for the Frankish court and Hilduin of St. Denis's milieu. G. G. Meersseman, *Der Hymnos Akathistos im Abendland*, vol. 1, *Akathistos-Akolutie und Grusshymnen*, Spicilegium Friburgense, no. 2 (Fribourg, 1958), 49–57, attributed it to a Venetian bishop in exile at Charlemagne's court. A. Pertusi, "Episodi culturali tra Venezia e il Levante nel medioevo e nell' Umanesimo fino al sec. XV," in *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV*, ed. A. Pertusi, vol. 2 (Florence, 1974), 331–360, here 332–334, rightly rejects Meersseman's reasoning as fragile; he also hesitates to accept Huglo's arguments. Cf., too, M. Huglo, *Scriptorium* 37 (1983): 4*–5*, no. 10. For further liturgical borrowing attested in Eriugena's circle, see Jeaneau, "Erigène et le grec," 38.

14. *Chronicon Moissacense*, a. 762, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH *Scriptores* 1 (Hanover, 1826), 294. On this work's connections with the court: W. Wattenbach, W. Levison, and H. Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger*, vol. 2 (Weimar, 1953), 265–266.

15. P. E. Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, Schriften der MGH no. 13, 3 (Stuttgart, 1956), 1068–1072; cf. P. Brown, *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1982), 171–172.

16. Although much has been written about its activities and personnel, this key institution still awaits a general study. See, e.g., J. Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, Schriften der MGH no. 16, 1 (Stuttgart, 1959); S. Airlie, "Bonds of Power and Bonds of Association in the Court Circle of Louis the Pious," in *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. P. Godman and R. Collins (Oxford, 1990), 191–204; R. McKitterick, "The Palace School of Charles the Bald," in *Charles the Bald*, 326–339. Cf., too, next note.

17. See, for instance, Charlemagne's *Epistola de litteris colendis*, ed. A. Boretius, MGH *Capitularia* 1 (Hanover, 1883), 79. On the courts and scholars, see, e.g., F. Brunhölzl, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Munich, 1975), 244–249; for Charlemagne's

court and MS traditions, B. Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1981), 149–169; on the fragmentary Euclid translation copied c. 800 (Munich, Univ. B. 2° 757), Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien* 3:158, n. 43. The iconoclast dossier of 825 is in Paris, B.N. lat. 1597A, from a scriptorium which did work for Charles the Bald, according to Bernhard Bischoff as cited by R. McKitterick, "Charles the Bald (823–877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning," *English Historical Review* 95 (1980): 28–47, here 40, n. 3.

18. A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey*, vol. 1 (1964; reprint, Baltimore, 1986), 465, and 2:864–872; cf. M. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c. 300–1450* (Cambridge, 1985), 157.

19. *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1990), 232.

20. P. Classen, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, ed. J. Fleckenstein et al. (Sigmaringen, 1983), 85–115.

21. The best overall study of Charlemagne's relations with Constantinople remains P. Classen, *Karl der Grosse, das Papsttum und Byzanz*, 3d ed., ed. H. Fuhrmann and C. Märtl (Sigmaringen, 1985).

22. On Greek at Ravenna, see, e.g., T. S. Brown, *Gentlemen and Officers: Imperial Administration and Aristocratic Power in Byzantine Italy A.D. 554–800* (Rome, 1984), 66–69. For Byzantium and the Lombard royal court milieu, see *Eternal Victory*, 287–294. For the Byzantine jester Gregorius at the court of king Liutprand (ob. 744), see Charlemagne's diploma, ed. E. Mühlbacher et al., MGH Diplomata Karolinorum 1 (Hanover, 1906), 247, no. 183. On Adalgis, king of the Lombards, son and co-ruler of Desiderius, who changed his name in Byzantium to Theodotos, see *Annales Einhardi*, a. 774, ed. F. Kurze, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum (Hanover, 1895), 62; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, a.m. 6281, ed. C. De Boor, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1883), 464.2–8.

23. See H. Belting, "Studien zum Beneventanischen Hof im 8. Jh.," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 16 (1962): 141–194. On Evanthia's marriage to Grimald: Nicetas, *Vita Philareti*, ed. M. H. Fourmy and M. Leroy, "La Vie de S. Philarete," *Byzantion* 9 (1934): 85–170, here 143.20–35. For the identification: A. A. Vasiliev, "Zhitie Philareta Milostivago," *Izvestiya Russkago arkheologicheskago instituta v Konstantinople* 5 (1900): 49–86, here 58–61, accepted by Fourmy and Leroy, 105–108.

24. On Zachary's translation and Roman monasteries, see J. M. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs et orientaux à Rome aux époques byzantine et carolingienne*, Académie Royale de Belgique: Mémoires de la classe des lettres 8, 2d ser., vol. 66, nos. 1–2 (Brussels, 1982), here 1:75.

25. Sansterre, *Les moines grecs*, 1.32–33 and 90–91.

26. *Eternal Victory*, 385.

27. Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, 16, 6th ed., ed. O. Holder-Egger and G. Waitz (Hanover, 1911), 20; the suggestion of Rome was made by Classen, *Karl der Grosse*, 23. The proverb looks to be an authentic middle-Byzantine utterance. It is closely linked to an adage about Armenians which is preserved in the collection of Maximus Planudes (ob. c. 1305), ed. E. Kurtz, *Die Sprichwörtersammlung des Maximus Planudes* (Leipzig, 1886), 20, no. 53: "Armenon echeis philon, cheiron' echthron me thele"; cf. K. Krumbacher, "Mittelgriechische Sprichwörter," *Sitzungsberichte, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1893, no. 2: 1–272, here 246–248. The proverb, in various forms and applied to various ethnic groups, was still alive in the nineteenth century, if not later: N. G. Polites, *Meletai peri tou biou kai tes glosses tou ellenikou laou: Paroimiai*, vol. 2 (1900; reprint, Athens, 1965), 465–466.

28. *Annales Fuldenses*, a. 876, ed. F. Kurze, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum (Hanover, 1891), 86. Cf., e.g., Jeaneau, "Erigène et le grec," 17, with n. 47.

29. For the movement of MSS, see, e.g., D. Bullough, "Roman Books and Carolingian renovatio," in *Studies in Church History*, 14 (1977): 23–40. On the comparison with the tenth century: B. Bischoff, "Italienische Handschriften des neunten bis elften Jahrhunderts in frühmittelalterlichen Bibliotheken ausserhalb Italiens," in *Il libro e il testo*, ed. C. Questa and R. Raffaelli (Urbino, 1984), 171–194, here 193–194.

30. G. Tellenbach, "Der grossfränkische Adel und die Regierung Italiens in der Blütezeit des Karolingerreiches," in *Studien und Vorarbeiten zur Geschichte des grossfränkischen und frühdeutschen Adels*, ed. G. Tellenbach, *Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte*, no. 4 (Freiburg, 1957), 40–70; and E. Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien (774–962)*, *Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte*, no. 8 (Freiburg, 1960).

31. On Eberhard and his career from 828 to 866: Hlawitschka, *Franken*, 169–172. By one hypothesis he was the son of Beggo, count of Paris; see F. Vianello, "Gli Unruochingi e la famiglia di Beggo, conte di Parigi," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo* 91 (1984): 337–369. On his will and books: R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), 245–248. For Gisla's presence in West Francia in, e.g., 869 and 870: see her acts, ed. I. De Coussemaker, *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Cysoing et des dépendances* (Lille, 1886), 7–9.

32. See, e.g., the poem ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetae 3 (Berlin, 1896), 220–221, no. 67; or the epitaph about little Eberhard, *ibid.*

201, no. 37. Cf. R. Düchting, *Sedulius Scottus: Seine Dichtungen* (Munich, 1968), 181–184 (possibly 860 A.D.), and 125–128. On Sedulius and the dispatch of a copy of Vegetius to Eberhard: Düchting, *Sedulius Scottus*, 158–159.

33. On Godescalc's stay with Eberhard: Hrabanus Maurus, Ep. 42, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae 5 (Berlin, 1899), 481–487, esp. 481: "... constat quendam sciolum nomine Gotescalcum, apud vos manere..."; and 487: "... et si quis iuxta te manens impudenter docet... prohibeas eum..." His travels on the Byzantine frontier are documented by the battle near his villa between a Byzantine patrician and the Slavic king: *Responsa de diuersis*, ed. C. Lambot, *Oeuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, no. 20 (Louvain, 1945), 169. For his knowledge of Venetian and Dalmatian terminology for the Byzantine emperor: *De praedestinatione*, 6, ed. Lambot, *Oeuvres*, 208.

34. It is possible to identify some of them by name. For instance, Marinus, a Roman priest resident at Pippin III's court, was of sufficient stature that his mother had daily access to the pope (*Codex Carolinus* [= C.C.] 29, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH Epistolae 3 [Berlin, 1892], 535). He received the titular church of St. Chrysogonus from Pope Paul I at Pippin's request (C.C. 24, p. 529). Emperor Constantine V's accusations against him prove that he advised Pippin on relations with Constantinople (C.C. 25, p. 529).

35. "Codex Carolinus," *ODB* 1:473.

36. Latin books: Bullough, "Roman Books." Greek books in 758–763: C.C. 24, p. 529 (liturgy, grammar, Ps.-Dionysius, etc.), on which see Sansterre, *Moines grecs* 1:182–183. This isolated mention could be supplemented by careful analysis of the actual surviving Greek books or texts known to have existed in ninth-century libraries, on which some preliminary indications may be had from Jeaneau, "Erigène et le grec," 6–7; W. Berschin, *Griechisch-lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern, 1980), 137ff.; Dionisotti, "Greek Grammars," 24–31.

37. Einhard, *Translatio Marcellini et Petri*, 1, 5, ed. G. Waitz, MGH Scriptores 15, 1 (Hanover, 1887) [hereafter *Trans. Marc. et Petri*], 242. Sansterre, *Moines grecs* 1:48, identifies the monastery.

38. H. Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre für Deutschland und Italien*, 2d ed., vol. 1 (1912; reprint, Berlin, 1958), 431.

39. J. M. Sansterre, "Le monachisme byzantin à Rome," *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, no. 34 (Spoleto, 1988), 701–746, here 709.

40. On Anastasius and Byzantium, see *ODB* 1:89–90. The case of one of his most cultivated contemporaries, John Hymmonides, may be illustrative: according to G. Arnaldi, "Giovanni Immonide e la cul-

tura a Roma al tempo di Giovanni VIII," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo* 68 (1956): 33–89, here 35–36, he did not know Greek, although Sansterre, *Moines grecs* 1:70–71, believes that he had at least some acquaintance with the language. For the study of Greek in a private Roman household in the late ninth century, as well as the generally provincial graphic level of contemporary Greek inscriptions, see G. Cavallo, "Le tipologie della cultura nel riflesso delle testimonianze scritte," in *Bisanzio*, 467–516, here 490–492. T. F. X. Noble, "The Declining Knowledge of Greek in Eighth- and Ninth-Century Rome," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 78 (1985): 56–62, surveys the evidence.

41. *Passio Anastasiae*, ed. F. Halkin, *Légendes grecques des "martyres romaines"*, Subsidia Hagiographica, no. 55 (Brussels, 1973), 89–131; translator's epilogue, 131. On Theodore: J. Gouillard, "Deux figures mal connues du second iconoclisme," *Byzantion* 31 (1961): 371–401, here 387ff.; cf. R. Loenertz, "La légende parisienne de S. Denys l'Aréopagite: Sa genèse et son premier témoin," *Byzantion* 69 (1951): 217–237, here 233.

42. The Venetian priest George entered Louis's service in June 826 and received the abbey of St. Saulve near Valenciennes as his reward; *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a., ed. F. Kurze, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum (Hanover, 1895) [hereafter *Ann. regni Franc.*], 170; cf. Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, 40, ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH Scriptores 2 (Hanover, 1829), 629–630; and Einhard, *Trans. Marc. et Petri*, 4, 8, and 10, p. 258 and 259–260. On the organ at Aachen, cf. Ermold Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici*, ed. E. Faral, *Ermold le Noir, Poème sur Louis le Pieux et épîtres au roi Pépin*, lines 2519–2525 (Paris, 1932), 192. For Venice's ninth-century contribution to relations between Byzantium and the West, see in general Pertusi, "Episodi."

43. *Breve commemoratorii*, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier, *Itinera hierosolymitana* 1, 2 (Geneva, 1880), 301–305; cf. K. Schmid, "Aachen und Jerusalem: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Personenforschung der Karolingerzeit," in *Das Einhardkreuz: Vorträge und Studien der Münsteraner Diskussion zum arcus Einhardi*, ed. K. Hauck, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl. 3d ser., vol. 87 (Göttingen, 1974), 122–142, esp. 138, n. 57, for B. Bischoff's paleographical expertise (upper Rhineland, 2d quarter of s. ix); and M. Borgolte, *Der Gesandtenaustausch der Karolinger mit den Abbasiden und mit den Patriarchen von Jerusalem*, Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, no. 25 (Munich, 1976), 45ff.

44. See V. Peri, "Leone III e il 'filioque': Echi del caso nell'agiografia greca," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia* 25 (1971): 3–58.

45. Bernard the Monk, *Itinerarium*, ed. T. Tobler and A. Molinier, *Itinera hierosolymitana* 1, 2 (Geneva, 1880), 309–320.

46. Cappuyns, *Erigène, sa vie*, 135–137.

47. Jeauneau, “Erigène et le grec,” 16–22.

48. The best study of the technical aspects of Carolingian diplomacy to date remains F. L. Ganshof, “The Frankish Monarchy and Its External Relations from Pippin III to Louis the Pious,” in *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy*, trans. J. Sondheimer (London, 1971), 162–204 (originally published in 1964). A more detailed account will be supplied in my monograph. See also the following notes.

49. For Byzantine embassies to the Franks, see F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565–1453* 1 (Munich, 1924), nos. 318 (756 A.D.), 320 (757), 322 (pre-764), 325 (c. 765), 326 (766), 339 (781), 345 (787), 350 (797), 353 (798), 354 (799), 357 (802), 361 (803), 371 (810), 385 (811/812), 391 (814), 397 (816), 398 (817), 408 (824), 413 (827), 429 (833), 438 (838). Cf. the useful material in T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des Etats barbares jusqu'aux croisades* (Athens, 1980), here 143–168. For Frankish embassies: J. F. Böhmer, E. Mühlbacher et al., *Die Regesten des Kaiserreiches unter den Karolingern, 751–918*, 2d ed., ed. C. Brühl and H. Kaminsky, *Regesta Imperii*, 1 (Hildesheim, 1966) [hereafter cited as B.M.], no. 84a (756?); C.C. (above, n. 34) 28 and 29, pp. 533 and 534–535 (762/764 A.D.); C.C. 37, p. 549 (764/766 A.D.; possibly identical with preceding); C.C. 36, p. 544–545 (766/767); B.M. 282c (786/787 A.D.); B.M. 379b (802); B.M. 459a (811); B.M. 476 (813); B.M. 528a (814); B.M. 844a (828). These figures may underrepresent the actual total, since the Carolingian court annals suppress all reference to certain Frankish missions: 763/764 A.D.: C.C. 28–29, p. 533 and 534–535; 787/788: *Gesta sanctorum patrum Fontanellensis coenobii*, 12, 1, ed. F. Lohier and J. Laporte (Rouen, 1936), 85. On tactful omissions in the royal annals, see *Les annales du haut moyen âge*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, no. 14 (Turnhout, 1975), 40.

50. Whenever the sources mention only an abstract collective noun like *legatio*, I have counted only one ambassador, and whenever the ancient records refer only to anonymous ambassadors in the plural, I have counted only two, even though a legation led by only one ambassador was exceptional and embassies involving three or four ambassadors, not unknown. Here is the reckoning: at least four anonymous western ambassadors: one for 756? (“legatio”), *Fredegarius Continuatus*, 40 (123), ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 2 (Hanover, 1888) [hereafter *Fred. Cont.*], 186; one for 762/764, C.C. 28–29, pp. 533 and 534–535; two for 766/767 (“cum vestris missis”), C.C. 36, p. 545. For the thirteen named western ambassadors

from 786/788 to 828, see the references above, n. 49. Ten anonymous Byzantine ambassadors: one (757) “legatio” (*Fred. Cont.* loc. cit.); two (766) “Graecos” (*Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 767, p. 24); two (787) “cum missis imperatoris” (*Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 786, p. 72); two (817) “legatos” (*Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 817, p. 146); three (827) “echonomus . . . et ceteri missi” (Hilduin of St. Denis, *Epistolae variorum* 20, 4, ed. E. Dümmeler, MGH *Epistolae* 5 [Hanover, 1899], 330). There were twenty-eight or thirty named Byzantine ambassadors, depending on the identity of ambassadors with the same name. For the references, see above, n. 49. Full details on eastern and western ambassadors will be supplied in my monograph.

51. As Ganshof, “Relations,” 166–167, has also noted.

52. On western retinues, e.g., W. Schlesinger, “Herrschaft und Gefolgschaft in der germanisch-deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte,” in *Herrschaft und Staat im Mittelalter*, ed. H. Kämpf (Darmstadt, 1956), 135–190. In the East, precisely an aristocrat’s desire to surround himself with a large number of impressive physical specimens and so outshine his peers introduced the future Emperor Basil I to Byzantine high society: H. G. Beck, “Byzantinisches Gefolgschaftswesen,” *Sitzungsberichte, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl. no. 5 (1965), esp. 6ff.

53. Thus a Frankish embassy to Constantinople was sizable enough to become involved in a pitched battle with “two or three thousand” Byzantines at Carthage in the 580s, lose several members, and survive: Gregory of Tours, *Historiarum libri x*, 2d ed., ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 1 (Hanover, 1951), 482; cf. 486f.; Liutprand of Cremona incidentally sheds some light on the structure of a tenth-century legation. His retinue was too big to fit into two boats: *Legatio*, 58–59, ed. J. Becker, MGH *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum* (Hanover, 1915), 207; it included five *milites* from Cremona (*Legatio* 6, p. 179; 24, p. 188), an interpreter (46, p. 200; cf. 54, p. 204), a western cook (46, p. 200), and unidentified companions of his own exalted social status, since he was displeased that they could not accompany him to an imperial banquet (11, p. 181), not to mention the four live-in Byzantine guards assigned to him (39, p. 193.7–8), a *diasostes*, and two imperial *mandatores* who escorted his party from Constantinople (58–59, p. 207). His party must have included clergy to aid Liutprand in his liturgical duties, and this would have been even truer in the Carolingian period, before “private” Masses had developed very far.

54. *Legatio*, 34, p. 193, where his companions are called *asseclae* (in Liutprand’s mouth, the word seems not necessarily to connote the lower social status it did in classical Latin; see index, s.v.). The figure

explicitly excludes Liutprand's four Byzantine guards, whom he was also expected to feed; these figures are judged to be on the low side by V. Menzel, *Deutsches Gesandtschaftswesen im Mittelalter* (Hanover, 1892), 196–197. The forty horses from the imperial stable sent to the papal legates of 869 do not provide clear evidence on the size of the legates' retinue, since earlier Byzantine practice suggests that the number of beasts supplied to a diplomatic mission symbolized imperial favor rather than actual need. Cf. *Le Liber pontificalis*, 2d ed., ed. L. Duchesne and C. Vogel, vol. 2 (Paris, 1955), 180; and Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis*, 1, 89, ed. J. J. Reiske (Bonn, 1829), 400.8–12.

55. Ed. A. Boretius, MGH Capitularia 1, 291, c. 29. On the loaf ration, see M. Rouche, "La faim à l'époque carolingienne: Essai sur quelques types de rations alimentaires," *Revue historique* 250 (1973): 295–320, esp. 308–309. On the fundamental similarity of *missi* sent to a foreign court and those entrusted with missions within the far-flung Frankish dominions, Ganshof, "Relations," 163–164.

56. I have found, to date, no clear statement on numbers involved in Byzantine embassies to the West from this period. Later evidence shows that they were sizable and included all manner of attendants like their western counterparts, e.g., the embassy of November 1190, when Frederick I humiliated the Byzantine ambassadors in reprisal for a perceived slight to his own envoy. Frederick seated them in his presence along with "their servants and not even allowing to stand aside the cooks, grooms, and bakers . . . to insult the Romans . . ."; N. Choniates, *Historiae*, ed. J. A. Van Dieten, *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 11, 1 (Berlin, 1975), 410.61–72. The eighth- or ninth-century *Narratio sanctae Sophiae*, 11, ed. T. Preger, in *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* 1 (Leipzig, 1901), 88.20–89.5, describes a miraculous eunuch who appears to Justinian and receives from him three officials and their retinue of fifty servants. Although the story is fiction, the figure may reflect contemporary notions of what was appropriate. (I owe these references to the kindness of A. P. Kazhdan.) The figures for the Franks seem very low when compared to those of the chieftain Olga of Kiev in the next century. Her retinue (excluding the separate retinue of her son) included eighty-six men, six kinswomen, and eighteen ladies-in-waiting, i.e., 110 who were of status high enough to be invited to the imperial banquet: Constantine VII, *De ceremoniis*, 2, 15, 596.14–598.12; cf. A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World* (London, 1973), 504–505.

57. Thus the slaves (*pueri*) in the Merovingian incident at Carthage (above, n. 53).

58. G. Tellenbach, *Königtum und Stämme in der Werdezeit des Deutschen Reiches* (Weimar, 1939), 52; and F. Vollmer, "Die Etichonen: Ein

Beitrag zur Frage der Kontinuität früher Adelsfamilien," in *Studien und Vorarbeiten*, 137–184, here 163ff.

59. Erlbald: see Walafrid Strabo, *Visio Wettini*, 134–138, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetae 2 (Berlin, 1884), 308.

60. For more on the individual Frankish ambassadors to the East and their social status, see my monograph (in preparation).

61. For Amalarius and Halitgar, see, e.g., B.M. 476a and 844a. Anastasius was Louis II's ambassador: see G. Arnaldi, *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 3 (Rome, 1961), 25–37, here 30–32.

62. Embassies which wintered in the Byzantine empire: 762/764 A.D.; 786/787; 802; 811; 813; 814 (cf. above, n. 49). For Amalarius's stay, see his *Versus marini*, 38, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetae 1 (Berlin, 1881), 427.

63. The famous *mare clausum* custom virtually excluded winter travel by sea: Claude, *Handel*, 31f. L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1971), 270–299, and J. Rougé, *Recherches sur l'organisation du commerce maritime en Méditerranée sous l'empire romain* (Paris, 1966), 99ff., suggest that with favorable winds a direct trip from Rome to Constantinople might have taken c. 20–30 days in the classical period. In the late seventh century, three months were considered the minimum for the round trip between Ravenna and Constantinople: Claude, *Handel*, 63. The problem of travel time and changing infrastructures will be treated at length in my monograph. On seasonal rhythms of Byzantine court activities, see *Eternal Victory*, 198. A somewhat different pattern emerges from an analysis of the activity of the imperial chancery which, between the eleventh and thirteenth century, peaks between March and June: M. Bartusis, "The Rhythm of the Chancery: Seasonality in the Issuance of Byzantine Imperial Documents," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 13 (1989): 1–21.

64. Hincmar, *De ordine palatii*, 25, ed. T. Gross and R. Schieffer, MGH Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui in Usus Scholarum 3 (Munich, 1980), 78. For the Byzantine embassy which awaited the assembly of Frankish grandees: C.C. 37, p. 549; cf. Ganshof, "Relations," 163.

65. Notker, *Gesta Karoli*, 2, 7, p. 58; cf. J. Lemarié, "Les antiennes 'Veterem hominem' du jour octave de l'épiphanie et les antiennes d'origine grecque de l'épiphanie," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 72 (1958): 3–38; O. Strunk, "The Latin Antiphons for the Octave of the Epiphany," in *Mélanges Ostrogorsky*, ed. F. Barišić, vol. 2 (Belgrad, 1964), 417–426.

66. The only two occasions on which court records explicitly state how long ambassadors from distant regions stayed indicate, on one hand, "a few days" (*Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 797, p. 100) and nearly four

months, on the other (*ibid.*, a. 800–801, p. 112), suggesting that both may have been considered exceptional enough to warrant mention and implying that embassies' sojourns at the Frankish court usually fell somewhere in between. Cf. Ganshof, "Relations," 175–177.

67. Such was certainly the case of Elissaios, eunuch and *notarius* left at the Frankish court in 782 (Theophanes, *Chronographia*, a.m. 6274, p. 455.22–25); his mission was to teach Charlemagne's daughter Rotruda "ta te ton Graikon grammata kai ten glossan, kai paidousai auten ta ethe tes Romaion basileias." It also seems to explain why another Byzantine legation left the eunuch Sinesius at Pipin III's court after the marriage agreement involving Gisela and Leo IV (C.C. 36, p. 545).

68. On secular clergy as ambassadors, cf. Lounghis, *Ambassades*, 320–324. This was demonstrated by C. Mango in an unpublished paper on Byzantine literacy c. 800 which he delivered at a Dumbarton Oaks symposium in 1983. His conclusions can be summarily verified by examining the addresses of Theodore Studite's letters (PG 99: 1896–1904).

69. For Photius's embassy see *Bibliotheca*, 1, 1, ed. R. Henry, 1 (Paris, 1959), 1; on the date and circumstances, W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington, 1980), 16–36.

70. *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 812, p. 136. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, a.m. 6304, p. 494.20–25 (Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *ibid.* 2:332). Cf. Ganshof, "Relations," 190–191, n. 77; *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum*, ed. *Acta Sanctorum*, Novembris, Propylaeum (Brussels, 1902), January 5 (Gregory of Akritas), 373.10–15; and V. Grumel, *Les registres des actes du patriarchat de Constantinople* 1, 2 (n. pl., 1936), no. 382. Cf. J. Pargoire, "Saints iconophiles," *Echos d'Orient* 4 (1901): 347–356, here 347–350; and R. Janin, in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* 9 (Rome, 1967): 457–458.

71. B.M. 793a; B.M. 842b; cf. Dölger, *Regesten*, nos. 408 and 413. Cf. Hilduin of St. Denis, MGH *Epistolae* 5:330; *Concilium Constantinopolitanum a. 869, actio* 8, ed. J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio* 16 (Florence, 1771), 139C–142E. For his seal: V. Laurent, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin* 5, 1 (Paris, 1963), no. 886; notwithstanding Laurent's remarks, the evidence seems less than convincing to me for *Corpus* 5, 1, no. 84. On Theodore and the two embassies, see J. Gouillard, "Deux figures," 399ff.

72. Zachary of Chalcedon's mission of 867 was interrupted by the fall of Emperor Michael III: Grumel, *Regestes*, nos. 483–484. Photius wrote several letters to Zachary; his treatise *On Time* is edited by K. Oehler, "Zacharias von Chalkedon über die Zeit," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 50 (1957): 31–38. Cf. H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane*

Literatur der Byzantiner, 1 (Munich, 1978): 31–32; and S. Vailhé, in *Echos d'Orient* 11 (1908): 351.

73. Wilson, *Scholars*, 86–87. Ps.-Dionysius: Vat. Gr. 2249.

74. Thus, Theodulf of Orleans's description of Charlemagne's court mentions three chamberlains. "Putifar" is explicitly identified as "Graeculus"; "Bagao" and "Egeus" are not. The pseudonyms are allusions to biblical eunuchs (e.g., Jth 12:12; Est 2:3) in keeping with Theodulf's style: *Carmen* 27, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH *Poetae* 1:493. Drogus (note the Slavic name), *cubicularius* of Louis the Pious, is called "natione Graecus" by Einhard, *Trans. Marc. et Petri*, 4, 1, p. 256. Sedulius Scottus, *De rectoribus christianis*, 7, ed. S. Hellmann, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*, 1, 1 (Munich, 1906), 41, demonstrates nothing, since it is borrowed from the *Historia Augusta*, *Aurelius* 43, 1, 2d ed., ed. E. Hohl and C. Samberger, 2 (Teubner, 1955), 182.

75. Sisinnius, brother of patriarch Tarasius: *Ann. regni Franc.*, a. 798, p. 104; cf. *Ann. Ein.*, p. 105. Their relationship is confirmed by a Byzantine source that identifies Tarasius's grandfather as a high official named Sisinnius: *Catalogus patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum*, ed. F. Fischer, "De patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum catalogis," *Commentationes Philologicae Jenenses* 3 (1884):263–333, here 291.2–3, a reference I owe to M. Herlong. Photius himself calls Patriarch Tarasius his *patrotheios*, which usually means paternal uncle; Photius's brother was named Sisinnius. We do not certainly know the name of Photius's father, although it was very possibly Sergius. C. Mango's important contribution admits a paternal kinship tie but argues that Sergius cannot have been of the same generation as Tarasius, suggesting that the latter may have been Photius's great uncle ("The Liquidation of Iconoclasm and the Patriarch Photius," in *Iconoclasm*, 133–145, here 136–139).

76. *De cer.* 2, 44, 661.13–21.

77. This goal is implied by the phrasing of Michael II and Theophilus's letter to Louis the Pious, ed. A. Werminghoff, MGH *Concilia Aevi Karolini* 1, 2 (Hanover, 1908), 481. It is explicitly stated by Theodore Krithinos in his epilogue to the Greek translation of the *Passio Anastasiae*, p. 131.

78. See M. McCormick, "Byzantium's Role in the Formation of Early Medieval Civilization: Approaches and Problems," *Illinois Classical Studies* 12 (1987): 207–220, here 218–219.

79. Hincmar of Reims, PL 126:360. Cf. J. Devisse, *Hincmar: Archevêque de Reims 845–882* (Geneva, 1976), 2:1090; and esp. A. Freeman, "Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the *Libri Carolini*," *Viator* 16 (1985): 65–108, here 96–98.

80. R. Loenertz, "Le panégyrique de S. Denis l'Aréopagite par S. Michel le syncelle," *Analecta bollandiana* 68 (1950): 94–107; cf. Loenertz, "La légende parisienne." On the authenticity of ascriptions to Michael Syncellus: H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 503–505; whether one accepts this ascription or not, the text exists in a MS of s. ix (Loenertz, "Panégyrique," 106–107).

81. On the chant, see above, n. 65.

82. Its earliest witness is the Antiphonary of Compiègne (Paris, B.N. lat. 17436); for the MS's connection with the court of Charles the Bald—clearly suggested by the inclusion of antiphons "de susceptione regum" (f. 93v–94v)—see P. E. Schramm and F. Mutherich, *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser* (Munich, 1962), 131–132. Cf. the similar conclusions of R. Jonsson, *Historia: Etudes sur la genèse des offices versifiés* (Lund, 1968), 31–32 and 54–62. More recently, J. Froger, "Le lieu de destination et de provenance du *Compendiensis*," in *Ut Mens Concordet Voci: Festschrift Eugene Cardine zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. J. Berchmans Göschl (St. Ottilien, 1980), 338–353, concluded on the basis of the sanctorale that the MS was copied for St. Médard of Soissons. The sanctorale shows affinities as well with St. Germain des Prés and St. Denis, and, as Froger notes, this would hint at a link with Hilduin of St. Denis, who was abbot of all three and of course linked as well with the court. I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. Ruth Steiner; cf., too, her "Antiphons for the *Benedicite* at Lauds," *Journal of the Plainsong and Mediaeval Music Society* 7 (1984): 1–17.

83. See, most recently, Schrimpf, "Eriugena," 160–161.

84. C.C. 28, p. 533; cf. L. Oelsner, *Jahrbücher des fränkischen Reiches unter König Pippin* (Leipzig, 1871), 383, n. 2, who documents the veracity of the report from Theophanes but never wonders how the Frankish annalist learned about it.

Part 2

THEMES OF THE EAST-WEST ENCOUNTER