# 1 Introduction: History and memory in the Carolingian world

*History and memory in the Carolingian world*, the title of both this book and this chapter, is at once a reflection of the current interest in the ways by which various medieval societies constructed and understood their pasts and an acknowledgement of the degree to which memory has become a much-explored and much-theorised topic. The book's principal themes are the writing and reading of history in the early middle ages, with a primary focus on the remarkable manifestations of historical writing in the Frankish kingdoms in the eighth and ninth centuries. Within this framework I consider what is meant by history books, and the Franks' choice of historical texts, whether of Roman, Christian, 'barbarian' or Frankish history: where they appear and where, when and for whom they were made. Further questions concern the readership of these history books and how far the physical characteristics of the Carolingian manuscripts in which the texts survive reveal anything of what contemporaries may have thought about these texts and their wider cultural context.

Historians of western, middle-eastern and oriental history have looked at the way a common past could inform what Eggert and Patzold in 1994, and in relation to Saxony in the early middle ages, called 'Wir-Gefühl', that is, a sense of 'us-ness'.[1] It has become a commonplace that ideas about the past could define societies and that the present plays a crucial role in moulding understanding of the past.[2] The focus of the study of medieval historical writing in particular, moreover, has shifted in recent

[1] W. Eggert and B. Patzold, *Wir-Gefühl und Regnum Saxonum bei frühmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibern* (Berlin, 1984).

[2] I draw in part here on M. Innes, 'Introduction', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past in the early middle ages* (Cambridge 2000), pp. 1–8, but I have in mind also the early Islamic historiographical tradition: see A. al-D. al-Duri, *The rise of historical writing among the Arabs*, ed. and trans. L. Conrad (Princeton, 1983); A. Noth, *The early Arabic historical tradition: a source critical study*, 2nd edn in collaboration with L. Conrad, trans. M. Bonner (Princeton, 1994); F. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic origins. The beginnings of Islamic historical writing*, Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 14 (Princeton, 1998); C. F. Robinson, *Islamic historiography* (Cambridge, 2003); B. Lewis, *History – remembered, recovered, invented* (Princeton, 1975). On government-sponsored histories and the work of the T'ang 'historiographical office' in the eighth and ninth centuries in China

years away from a preoccupation with sources of information and textual affiliation. Now historical narratives are studied both as constructed texts and bearers of memory which were targeted for particular audiences, and as an important element in the promotion of the political culture and identity of particular groups. Studies such as those assembled by Guenée, Magdalino, Scharer and Scheibelreiter, or Hen and Innes,[3] to cite only four among the best and most recent, have focussed above all on perceptions and uses of the past.

All take the so-called 'linguistic turn' and post-modernism into account to a greater or lesser extent, but have resisted the reduction of historiography to literary history.[4] Examination of authorial intention, of the audiences for history, and of manuscript traditions of the surviving texts to try to determine a text's meaning in context offer what Geary has described as 'escape routes' out of the 'prison house of language' and sterile notions of intertextuality.[5] But too zealous a pursuit of the escape routes threatens to undermine the potential value of historical narratives as representations of a contemporary memory of reality, as accounts of events and people and attitudes, or as powerful combinations of both objective and subjective interpretations of the past, however difficult these may be for modern historians either to reconstruct or to distinguish.

It is in this respect that memory and the imperative to record what is remembered have been invoked as well. Here the work on both the mechanisms and the rituals of remembering in the middle ages by such scholars as Carruthers, Coleman, Geary, Geuenich, Oexle, Schmid and Treitler, quite apart from the contributions of the anthropologists, have greatly enlarged our understanding of the sheer capacity for remembering as well as the creative forms mnemonic devices could take in the middle ages.[6]

see W. G. Beasley and E. B. Pulleybank, *Historians of China and Japan* (Oxford, 1969); D. McMullen, *State and scholars in T'ang China* (Cambridge, 1988); and D. Twitchett, *The writing of official history under the T'ang* (Cambridge, 1992).

[3] B. Guenée, *Le Métier de l'historien au moyen âge* (Paris, 1977); P. Magdalino (ed.), *The perception of the past in twelfth-century Europe* (London, 1992); A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter (eds.), *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter* (Vienna, 1994); and Hen and Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past*.

[4] For a concise discussion of the 'linguistic turn' and its implications for the study of historical writing see W. Pohl, 'History in fragments: Montecassino's politics of memory', *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 343–74, especially pp. 343–54; and W. Pohl, *Werkstätte der Erinnerung: Montecassino und die Gestaltung der langobardischen Vergangenheit* (Vienna, 2001).

[5] P. Geary, 'Frühmittelalterliche Historiographie. Zusammenfassung', in Scharer and Scheibelreiter, *Historiographie*, pp. 539–42.

[6] M. Carruthers, *The book of memory. A study of memory in medieval culture* (Cambridge, 1990); J. Coleman, *Ancient and medieval memories. Studies in the reconstruction of the past* (Cambridge, 1992); P. Geary, *Phantoms of remembrance. Memory and oblivion at the end*

If historical narratives are statements about what people remember of the past as well as what they choose to forget, then the degree to which texts reflect collective memories needs to be further explored. Halbwachs's notion of the part shared memory plays in the self-definition of a social group has been wholeheartedly accepted by most historians and underpins Fentress and Wickham's rich account of what people in the past have done with respect to social memory.[7] I myself have taken the notion of 'shared memory' in the chapters of this book as something established by communication, whether oral or written. I have considered how recalled past experience and shared images of the past are the kinds of memories that have particular importance for the constitution of social groups.[8] I have also looked at the 'construction of the past', that is, the creation of accounts of past events that drew on memory but selected from it in distinctive ways that became accepted and thereafter shared by a group.[9] Nevertheless, the notion of 'shared memory' can only really be useful if tested, first of all, against the articulated memories of a specific group. Secondly, we should confront the problematic issues and methodological difficulties it raises, not least how we might be able to document how, or even whether, such accounts were indeed disseminated, known and accepted. It is with these issues in particular that this introductory chapter is concerned.

Because we are bound to concentrate on the surviving written evidence for the memory-keeping and historical composition of any group in the past, it may be helpful to look at an extract from the royal Frankish annals, first written at the end of the eighth century, in order to identify some of the main questions and methodological difficulties to which I have alluded.

In the entry for the year 788 which recounts the downfall of Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, and the annexation of his realm by his cousin Charlemagne, the annalist tells us that Charlemagne called an assembly

*of the first millennium* (Princeton, 1994); and *idem*, 'Land, language and memory in Europe, 700–1100', *TRHS* sixth series 9 (1999), pp. 169–84; K. Schmid and J. Wollasch (eds.), *Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 48 (Munich, 1984); D. Geuenich and O.-G. Oexle (eds.), *Memoria in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters*, Veröffentlichungen des Max Planck Instituts für Geschichte 111 (Göttingen, 1994); and L. Treitler, 'Homer and Gregory. The transmission of epic poetry and plainchant', *The Musical Quarterly* 60 (1974), pp. 333–72. For discussions of the role of gender see E. van Houts (ed.), *Medieval memories: men, women and their past 700–1300* (London, 2001). See also M. Innes. 'Memory, orality and literacy in an early medieval society', *Past and Present* 158 (1998), pp. 3–36.

[7] J. Fentress and C. Wickham, *Social memory* (Oxford, 1992); and see M. Halbwachs, *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris, 1925) and *La Mémoire collective* (Paris 1950).

[8] See especially chapters 7 and 8.

[9] See especially chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6.

at Ingelheim (near Mainz on the Rhine) and that Tassilo came there with his *fideles*.

> Bavarian *fideles* began to say that since giving his son and other hostages and taking oaths, Tassilo, incited by his wife Liutperga, had not maintained his faith (to Charlemagne) inviolate but had been seen to betray it. And Tassilo could not deny this but confessed that since then he had sent messengers to the Avars, had urged the vassals of Charlemagne to join him and had plotted their deaths. He has also ordered his *homines* to make mental reservations when they were swearing oaths and to swear deceitfully. What is more he confessed to having said that even if he had ten sons he would rather lose every one of them than accept that the agreements should remain as they were and that he would be better dead than living thus. And after he had been convicted of all these things, the Franks and the Bavarians, Lombards and Saxons, and those from every province gathered at that assembly, *remembering his earlier evil deeds and how he had even deserted the lord king Pippin on campaign* – which is called *harisliz* in German – saw fit to condemn him to death.[10] (My emphasis.)

My interest in this introductory chapter is not so much in the vivid picture of Tassilo's despair and hopeless defiance, nor how the narrative works as an account of the triumph of Charlemagne and of justice over the hapless Tassilo, for these have been fully explored by Matthias Becher and by Stuart Airlie.[11] What I wish to highlight are the implications of the phrase *reminiscentes priorum malorum eius* about remembering Tassilo's evil deeds and an earlier desertion of Pippin.

The Royal Frankish annals is the only text to refer to this remembrance on the part of the assembly. The revised version of the Royal Frankish annals, produced in the early years of the ninth century omits this statement.[12] Other texts drawing on the Royal Frankish annals, but writing later into the ninth century, such as the annals of Fulda, also omitted it. Only the more nearly contemporary 'Lorsch annal' entry for 788 refers in a more general way to how the assembly recalled all the wicked deeds Tassilo had done.[13]

The allusion in the Royal Frankish annals is to the desertion from Pippin's army in 763. Both Airlie and Becher commented on the

[10] *Annales regni francorum*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH SRG*, VI (Hannover, 1895), p. 80; English translation P. D. King, *Charlemagne. Translated sources* (Kendal, 1987), p. 86.

[11] See S. Airlie, 'Narratives of triumph and rituals of submission: Charlemagne's mastering of Bavaria', *TRHS* sixth series 9 (1999), pp. 93–120; and M. Becher, *Eid und Herrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen*, Vorträge und Forschungen Sonderband 39 (Sigmaringen, 1993).

[12] *Annales Einhardi*, ed. F. Kurze, *MGH SRG*, VI (Hannover, 1895), p. 81.

[13] *Annales laureshamenses*, ed. G. Pertz, *MGH SS*, I (Hannover, 1826), pp. 22–39, at p. 33. See also the facsimile edition of ÖNB cod. 515: F. Unterkircher (ed.), *Das Wiener Fragment der Lorscher Annalen. Christus und die Samariterin. Katechese des Niceta von Remesiana. Codex Vindobonensis 515 der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek Facsimile Ausgabe*, Codices Selecti 15 (Graz, 1967). See also below, pp. 104–10.

unlikelihood of either the Lombards or Saxons remembering something that had happened in 763, for neither people was even under Frankish rule, let alone part of the army. Neither Airlie nor Becher mentioned the possibility, however, that this memory was an allusion to something recorded in the annals themselves. Indeed, it is the annals which present the damning account of Tassilo's relations with his uncle Pippin III and Charlemagne, how he was given Bavaria to rule in 748, swore oaths of fidelity to Pippin III in 757, deserted the Frankish army in 763, renewed his oath of fidelity to Pippin's son Charlemagne in 781 and was forced to acknowledge his subordinate status in 787 with the handing over of hostages, including his own son.

The following questions emerge, therefore. In what sense was the memory described in the annals one that was part of collective memory? Who is included in the notion of 'collective memory'? Is the memory based on knowledge of the annals or a real memory among those at Ingelheim in 788 of disgraceful behaviour in 763? Does the allusion then support an early date for the composition of the annals? Is the 788 entry perhaps a witness to the expectation that this text would be in circulation and form the basis of subsequent knowledge? Is this why the Franks, Bavarians, Lombards and Saxons are credited with retrospective knowledge in this way? Was their knowledge formed by this particular piece of historical writing? The entry also underlines one of the fundamental difficulties in charting memory, namely that we are bound to do it from the evidence of surviving written texts and that these in their turn raise the problem of how we can determine the impact and influence of such an historical text. To suggest knowledge of the contents of a text is to make assumptions about the process of production, methods of circulation, speed of reception and the impact of the text itself, all of which must be tested. Thus we also need to consider the relevance of literacy to the extension and record of memory, and the degree to which literacy, and thus the recoverable indicators of memory, are the preserve of an elite.

It is easy to label literacy as the 'preserve of an elite' in the early middle ages but it is much harder to define it. It has, after all, become a commonplace, voiced by me as much as by everyone else, that the great majority of our sources are primarily those of the 'social elites' of early medieval Europe. These 'social elites' might be defined as the groups in society who had power or some measurable superiority in some sphere over other individuals or groups of people.[14] But what we all actually mean by saying that should be challenged. I have also maintained, for example, that the local charter evidence from centres all over western Europe and dating

[14] See R. Le Jan (ed.), *La Royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (du début du IXe siècle aux environs de 920)*, Centre d'Histoire de l'Europe du Nord-Ouest 17 (Lille, 1998).

from the period from the seventh to the tenth centuries is an indication of the exploitation of literate modes by landowners down a social hierarchy that may have included peasant farmers and small-scale landowners.[15] Since 1989 a number of studies have explored the degree to which local lay communities used the written word for their legal transactions and played some role in their production or preservation in the early middle ages.[16] Even so, how great a proportion of the 'peasant' population, estimated at 90 per cent of the total in this period, had any regular access or customary familiarity with the written word?

I stress the words 'regular' and 'customary', for we should also remember that this is a world in which even a freed slave is known by the word *cartularius*, that is, 'charter man'.[17] It is a world in which religions of the book, Christianity, Islam or Judaism, predominate. In the Carolingian empire, above all, there is an insistence from the second half of the eighth century onwards on the central role of texts for the consolidation and harmonization of the Christian religious faith and practice, for the transmission of knowledge, and for the exercise of justice and government. In the course of the ninth century, even a written musical notation is developed to provide a written supplement for the transmission of melodies for the liturgical chant, hitherto passed on by cantors.[18] Certainly, the possession of the skills of writing may have been the preserve of the specially trained. Similarly, those who could read complex material, as distinct from those who could simply recognise the letters of the alphabet, may have formed an intellectual elite. This intellectual elite, owing to the limited opportunities for education, could also have been a social elite, though it is important to remember that Ebbo, archbishop

[15] McKitterick, *Carolingians and the written word*, pp. 77–134, in relation to the evidence of the St Gallen material.

[16] For discussions of Lorsch and Bavaria see M. Innes, *State and society in the early middle ages 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000); and W. Brown, *Unjust seizure: conflict, interest and authority in an early medieval society* (Ithaca, 2001). For Italy see N. Everett, *Literacy in Lombard Italy, c. 568–774* (Cambridge, 2003). See also R. Schieffer, *Schriftkultur und Reichsverwaltung unter den Karolingern*, Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Opladen, 1996); and the studies emanating from the Utrecht University Centre for Medieval Studies *Pionier* Project on medieval communications: Marco Mostert (ed.), *New approaches to medieval communication*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 1 (Turnhout, 1999); and K. Heidecker (ed.), *Charters and the use of the written word in medieval society*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 5 (Turnhout, 2000). The new early medieval charter study project which younger scholars such as Warren Brown, Marios Costambeys, Adam Kosto and Matthew Innes are coordinating is likely to bring more valuable material to the fore.

[17] A point stressed by J. L. Nelson, 'Literacy in Carolingian government', in McKitterick (ed.), *Uses of literacy*, pp. 258–96.

[18] For the background see S. Rankin, 'Carolingian music', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian culture: emulation and innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 274–316.

of Rheims, among others, was of humble origin and thus the extent to which the acquisition and possession of literate skills may have enabled an individual to cross other social barriers.[19]

If so many men and women in Carolingian Europe had some kind of access to written culture, however restricted in scope, right the way down the social scale, and if literacy could offer a passport into an elite group, then of what value is the concept of an elite at all? Should we rather regard access to a written culture as defining an elite? Did the possession of literate skills make one eligible to be or to become a member of the elite in the Carolingian world? To focus exclusively on levels of literacy in any social or political group defined according to criteria which do not include the criterion of literacy, therefore, is to miss the point. We should focus instead on the extent to which the exploitation of written culture provided the means for contemporaries at the time to define themselves as an elite. What really matters, therefore, is what men and women in the Carolingian world hoped to achieve by exploiting the written word and why they chose that medium of communication.

A more productive approach might be to look at the problem of the elites and written culture in the Carolingian world from the opposite direction. I propose to consider the idea of elites in relation to written culture as a phenomenon reflected in and thus defined by their use of texts, and especially historical texts. In particular I should like to pursue the possibility for the Carolingian period that there was an elite, lent cohesion by their particular use of the written word to provide that elite with a recorded memory, and thus identity, that would transcend other political or social divisions. If we consider how the past was understood by the Franks in the Carolingian period, that is, in the period from the eighth to the tenth centuries, and how a group placed itself in relation to that past, we may be able to see how that group becomes defined as an elite with special characteristics, and how the written texts act as an enabling mechanism in the expression of an elite memory and identity. In other words, the study of history and memory in the Carolingian world is a study both of the texts in which an elite defines itself and of the extant Carolingian manuscripts which provide the indications of the Franks' understanding of the past.

The understanding of history and the past in the Frankish kingdom embraced Roman, Christian and 'Germanic' (Lombard, Anglo-Saxon, Gothic and Frankish) history. Records of its past included historical

[19] On Ebbo see S. Airlie, 'Bonds of power and bonds of association in the court circle of Louis the Pious', in P. Godman and R. Collins (eds.), *Charlemagne's heir: new perspectives on the reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 191–204.

chronological syntheses and narratives, and records of other kinds.[20] From the work recorded elsewhere in this book as well as still in progress, it seems clear that there was a concerted effort to acquire and copy history books throughout the Carolingian realm from the late eighth century onwards. There is also the well-known phenomenon of the remarkable number of contemporary histories written in the late eighth and the ninth centuries.[21] These two phenomena, that is, the copying of older history books and the writing of new history, are arguably related and interdependent. The possibility of a connection between the copying of older history, primarily in monastic scriptoria, and the composing of new history, incidentally also raises the issue of the distinctiveness of the role of the monastery itself in Carolingian record keeping and history writing, and the role monasteries may have played in the formation of Frankish perceptions of the past, but I shall have to leave detailed consideration of these to another occasion.

I have set out the evidence about the history books and history writing of the Carolingian world in the remaining chapters of this book. It is clear that, for the Franks, an understanding of the past worked at several levels and was manifested to them in a number of different textual contexts. What these Carolingian history books reveal is the interplay between memory, forms of historical record and the writing of history. It is this interplay which is an essential component of the process of defining an elite and a people. The books read and produced in Frankish centres indicate the formation of a sense of the past – biblical, Roman and Christian – to which the Franks collectively belonged and which they had inherited.

In their own history writing the Franks also show an impulse to forge an identity that explicitly placed the origin of the Franks in a far distant Roman and Trojan past. It is to the forging of this identity by means of the creation of a common memory in the form of a distinctive narrative that I now turn. There is only space to do so with specific reference to one example, the *Liber historiae francorum*, and the implications of one ninth-century copy of it now in Paris. With the *Liber historiae francorum* in this codex is the text of the *Annales regni francorum*. The association of complementary accounts of Frankish history and its implications will form the final section of this introductory chapter.

[20] For fuller discussion see below, chapters 7, 9 and 12.
[21] See Innes and McKitterick, 'Writing of history'; and for the general context see A. Momigliano, 'Pagan and Christian historiography in the fourth century A.D.', in A. Momigliano (ed.), *The conflict between paganism and Christianity in the fourth century* (London, 1962), pp. 79–99.

## Frankish historical writing and the *Liber historiae francorum*

Although it provides evidence of the process of the reception of a complex cultural heritage, the interest in the Judaeo-Greco-Roman past needs to be used and developed in order to constitute evidence of the definition of an elite identity and the enhancement of historical memory. The *Liber historiae francorum* was one of the new Carolingian historical works produced in the eighth century and copied extensively in the ninth century. It constructs a specific past for a particular group of people. First of all, it provides them with a group memory and identity. Secondly, it places them, both culturally and historically, within the wider history of the Roman empire and Christian Roman Gaul. The *raison d'être* of this text, indeed, could be described as the definition of a people by means of its history. The *Liber historiae francorum* is customarily dated 727 due to its reference at the end to the sixth year of Theudebert (IV). From the outset the text insists that it is about both kings and the people of the Franks: let us present the beginnings of the kings of the Franks, the origins and deeds of the kings and those peoples (*Principium regum francorum eorumque origine vel gentium illarum ac gesta proferamus*).

The *Liber historiae francorum* is a short but remarkable history which has suffered unreasonable neglect. More crucially it has been underestimated as a piece of historical writing largely as a result of the way it is printed and presented in modern editions. Most of its earlier sections (apart from the first four chapters) are held to be so derivative from the sixth-century Gallo-Roman author Gregory of Tours as not to be worth mentioning. Attention has thus focussed more or less exclusively on the last eleven chapters, 43–53 (in which the *Liber historiae francorum* author writes a completely independent account of the seventh and early eighth centuries) without a consideration of how these chapters fit into the structure and message of the text as a whole.

Dependence on Gregory, however, is a misleading way in which to understand the *Liber historiae francorum* author's use of the earlier text. It would be far better to describe the process of composition as judicious selection, with some highly significant changes. Further, there are substantial additions. The changes and additions are most notable at the beginning of his work. Certainly the judicious use of Gregory is important, but more as a witness to Gregory's high status as a history book than as a symptom of derivative and impoverished history writers in the eighth century. The many small changes and larger insertions are even more significant, however. These, as we shall see, alter the emphasis in crucial ways which are entirely consistent with the opening chapters.

Above all, one needs to read the whole narrative as it is presented in the early manuscripts of the *Liber historiae francorum*. Although the whole text is undoubtedly printed in Krusch, even he diminished the impact of the text by presenting it visually as a text full of borrowings signalled in a much smaller typeface.[22] As a result he confuses the purpose of the original manuscripts. In the manuscripts, the *Liber historiae francorum* demands to be read on its own terms, for no such distinction is made. It should not be seen in terms merely of what is borrowed or new, but as a complete text with very distinctive emphases of its own. The themes of war and kingship and the elaborate account of the marriages and role of queens, of treasure, of devotion to particular saints and particular churches in Paris, are all reiterated throughout the text.

The *Liber historiae francorum* rejected Gregory's emphasis at the beginning of the work and Gregory's picture of biblical Franks as the new chosen people, with its emphatically Judaeo-Christian chronology and framework.[23] Instead, he or she (and it may well be the latter) provides a spirited alternative view of the Franks and their origins.[24] Thus the Franks' superiority in relation to other barbarian groups (Alans, Huns, Burgundians) is stressed and illustrated with the story of their origins. The text begins with a statement about the origins of the Franks. It locates them to Troy and thereafter to the refuge a group of Trojans found north-west of the Black Sea. They thus have historical, rather than mythical, origins. These historical origins are rooted in a past linked with Rome because of the association with Trojan origins. The author contrives nevertheless to convey a sense of Frankish superiority even over the early Romans.[25] Thus Aeneas, who is provided with the significantly pejorative

[22] *Liber historiae francorum*, ed. B. Krusch, *MGH SRM*, II (Hannover, 1888), pp. 241–328.

[23] For a useful context see M. de Jong (ed.), *The power of the word: the influence of the Bible on early medieval politics*, special issue, *EME* 7 (1998), pp. 261–357. Compare M. Garrison, 'The Franks as the new Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in Hen and Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past*, pp. 114–61.

[24] R. Gerberding, *The rise of the Carolingians and the Liber historiae francorum* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 150–9, locates the author to Soissons but dismisses the notion that the text could have been produced at Notre-Dame, 'simply because it was a nunnery'! For an alternative view see J. L. Nelson, 'Gender and genre in women historians of the early middle ages', in Nelson, *The Frankish World 750–900* (London, 1996), pp. 183–97; and R. McKitterick, 'Frauen und Schriftlichkeit im Frühmittelalter', in H.-G. Goetz (ed.), *Weibliche Lebensgestaltung im frühen Mittelalter* (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1991), pp. 65–118, and revised English version 'Women and literacy in the early middle ages', in McKitterick, *Books, scribes and learning*, chapter 13, pp. 1–43.

[25] See M. Innes, 'Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic past' in Hen and Innes (eds.), *The uses of the past*, pp. 227–49; F. Graus, 'Troja und trojanische Herkunftssage im Mittelalter', in W. Erzgraber (ed.), *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike im Mittelalter* (Sigmaringen, 1989), pp. 25–43; I. N. Wood, 'Defining the Franks: Frankish origins in early medieval historiography', in S. Forde, L. Johnson and A. V.