Introduction: The penitential state

In the autumn of 833, a crowd of prominent Franks gathered in the
monastic church of St-Médard in Soissons. Those present witnessed the
extraordinary spectacle of the mighty Emperor Louis prostrating himself in
front of the altar, on a hair shirt, and publicly confessing 'that he had very
unworthily handled the ministry that had been entrusted to him; that in so
doing he had offended God in many ways and had put the church of Christ
in public scandal, and that his neglect had led the people entrusted to him
to multifarious disorder'.[1] Most of those present had come down from the
nearby palace of Compiègne, where they were attending a royal assembly.
This had been summoned for 1 October 833 by the Emperor Louis the
Pious (814–40), yet it was not Louis himself, but his eldest son Lothar, who
presided over the gathering. In June of that year, a military alliance of the
emperor's three elder sons had confronted their father in the Alsace. Both
sides were camped on either side of a wide-open space known as the
Rothfeld. Before the armies could engage in battle, however, Louis's
troops walked over to the sons' camp. Here, the massive desertion was
taken as a sign that Louis's rule no longer enjoyed God's favour. After this
divine judgement, as it was viewed by many, Lothar took over the leader-
ship of the Frankish polity from his father. The assembly of Compiègne
confirmed that he, Lothar, was now the legitimate emperor; the verdict of
the bishops was that Louis should save his soul by submitting to a public
penance. Lothar was among the witnesses in Soissons, with his retinue of
great men, along with a throng of clerics and secular dignitaries, as many as
the church would hold. They saw and heard Louis 'requesting' a public
penance, so that he might atone for his sins and save his soul. Presenting
the assembled bishops with a written confession, Louis exchanged his royal
garb for that of a penitent. The public penance thus undertaken was
intended to entail a definitive departure from secular office, which was
effected by the bishops' imposition of hands, accompanied by the solemn

---

[1] *Relatio* (833), p. 53; see below, Appendix.

1

recitation of psalms and prayers. The emperor was to spend the rest of his life as a penitent, attempting to appease God, who had been offended.

This version of events comes from a document (*cartula*) in which the bishops who imposed this public penance painstakingly justified what they had done.[2] By voluntarily accepting this 'ecclesiastical' public penance, they claimed, Louis had definitively relinquished his imperial authority. He was to spend the rest of his life in atonement, placating God and saving his soul. From thenceforth, Louis's eldest son Lothar was to rule as sole emperor.[3] Things turned out differently, however. Within less than five months, Louis was back on the throne again: on Sunday 1 March 834, bishops solemnly reconciled him to the Church and reinstated him as a ruler. The rebellious alliance between Lothar and his brothers Pippin, king of Aquitaine, and Louis, king of Bavaria, had proved fragile. Their father cleverly made use of the fraternal rivalry that resurfaced almost immediately after the summer of revolt, secretly enlisting the support of his son Louis. A concerted offensive of paternal forgiveness was then unleashed on the rebellious sons. Louis and Pippin quickly returned to the fold. Lothar resisted, but in the course of 834 he too felt compelled to make an uneasy peace with his father. Bound by oaths that he would never rebel again, he was sent back to rule the kingdom of Italy, as he had before. None of those involved in the rebellion suffered bodily harm or loss of property. The only one of the bishops to be punished was Archbishop Ebo of Rheims, the ultimate scapegoat of this affair. It was now Ebo's turn to confess publicly and do penance.[4]

What is one to make of this imperial penance and its rapid undoing? Traditionally, Louis's humiliation has been viewed as one of the nadirs of Carolingian history. The great French medievalist Louis Halphen called the entire ceremony in Soissons an 'odious comedy', staged by the usurper Lothar and his accomplices.[5] More recently, the accusations against Louis and the penance imposed on him have been compared to the Stalinist show trials of the 1940s.[6] Did the emperor's authority ever recover from this profound onslaught? The general answer remains predominantly negative: the 'final years' from Louis's restoration in 834 until his death in 840 are usually presented as an unimportant epilogue to his reign.[7] Viewed from an

---

[2] See below, ch. 6.

[3] For a survey of the sources pertaining to the penance of 833, see BM[2], pp. 369–71; Simson, *Jahrbücher*, II, pp. 63–78. For a more extensive analysis of the penance and its context, see Halphen, 'La pénitence'; Noble, 'Louis the Pious', pp. 321–52.

[4] *AB*, s.a. 835, pp. 15–7.   [5] Halphen, *Charlemagne*, p. 252.

[6] Magnou-Nortier, 'La tentative', p. 640 ('le premier procès de type stalinien dans l'histoire de l'Occident').

[7] E.g. Boshof, *Ludwig*, p. 214; Kölzer, 'Kaiser Ludwig der Fromme', p. 16. The one explicit exception to this rule is Nelson, 'The last years'.

even more sombre perspective, the road which led to the battle of Fontenoy (841), and to the disintegration of the Carolingian empire, began at Soissons, where reform-minded bishops supported Lothar against his father. Having first gained far too much influence on Louis, this 'reform party' turned against the emperor when its ideals of political and religious unity were thwarted.[8] First, in 830, they drove the Empress Judith and her allies from the palace, and then, in 833, radical churchmen served as the instrument of Louis's deposition by cynically turning him into a public penitent. In short, it was the combination of ambitious churchmen and a weak emperor that succeeded in wrecking Charlemagne's inheritance. Bishops and other high-ranking clerics had their own goals, such as dominating laymen in general and rulers in particular, and they used their control of religion to achieve these aims.[9] This persistent view was sustained by a heritage of strident nineteenth-century anti-clericalism which has now largely vanished. It prevailed almost without challenge until the late 1970s, when a young American historian, Thomas Noble, argued that religion had not so much undermined Louis's empire as strengthened it.[10] At first, his arguments made little impression; even now, the notion that churchmen played a key role in undermining the Frankish state still lingers, and so does the idea that 'the Church' functioned as a separate and often antagonistic entity within the Carolingian body politic.[11]

When it comes to the impact of Christianity on the political theory and practice of this period, Louis's public penance in 833 is a test case, which poses some important questions. If this was indeed no more than the cynical deposition of a ruler who had become powerless, only thinly disguised as a religious ritual, why the need for such a disguise, and who exactly did Lothar and the bishops think they were fooling or convincing? If they claimed that Louis had offended God and scandalised the church, was this just empty rhetoric on the part of radical clerics? In my view, such rhetoric could work only if others shared its basic tenets as well. The imperial penance makes sense only if one accepts that there was an emperor who, together with his bishops and magnates, feared divine

---

[8] T. Schieffer, 'Krise'.

[9] Cf. Ullmann, *Carolingian Renaissance*, pp. 111–34, on the 'king's stunted sovereignty'; also Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms*, pp. 36–67.

[10] Noble, 'Monastic ideal' and 'Louis the Pious'; Noble built on his teacher François Louis Ganshof's article 'Louis the Pious reconsidered' (1957), which was more appreciative of Louis, but left religious aspects mostly aside; T. Schieffer, 'Krise', did integrate religion into his perspective, but blamed the reformers ('Reichseinheitspartei') for the break-up of the Carolingian empire.

[11] For a contrary view, see De Jong, '*Ecclesia*'.

retribution as the inevitable consequence of sin, and directed his policies accordingly. The notion that the leadership of this polity was accountable to God because of its divinely bestowed 'ministry' (*ministerium*) – as a ruler, a bishop, an abbot or abbess, or a count – was not just a figment of the clerical imagination, but a fascinating Carolingian adaptation of the ideas on ministry developed in Gregory the Great's *Regula Pastoralis*; by the ninth century, those with a *ministerium* included kings and counts. The implicit notion of accountability to God was shared by Louis (and Charlemagne, for that matter), the members of the ruling family, and their most trusted and high-ranking followers, the *proceres*. This expression often referred to lay magnates, but it would be a mistake to assume that this was always the case: a group of *proceres* could be headed by a bishop and three counts.[12] The ideal of exalted service held by this upper echelon was also being instilled into the ranks of the retainers and local sub-office-holders referred to as the *plebs*. The co-operation of such lesser men of honour, including the *Franci homines* and *centenarii*, and the *boni homines* judging at the royal/comital courts (*placita*), was crucial.[13] In the 830s, men from these middle ranks were to form the grumbling chorus that supported the rebellions against Louis, or suddenly stopped doing so.[14]

Although Carolingian authors distinguished between *clerici* and *laici*, theirs was not a vision of society that sharply opposed the clerical and the secular spheres. The different orders within the ninth-century leadership were thought to function in a complementary way, within a body politic that was modelled after the *ecclesia*. Just as Christ was the head of the body, his church, Louis was the head whose authority flowed into the various orders that were the limbs of this polity.[15] The emperor and his 'faithful men' (*fideles*), that is, the upper echelon of those who had sworn allegiance to Louis as lord, spoke the same kind of language and shared similar values.[16] Just as bishops needed to be at home in the world of high politics, high-born members of the laity needed to have access to the Latin Christian culture that was the norm at the court.[17] Even when opinions diverged and dissension was rife, this happened within a similar, or at least

[12] Astronomer, c. 61, pp. 534–6; the *proceres* who declared their loyalty to Louis in 814 (Astronomer, c. 21, p. 356, line 19) must also have comprised ecclesiastical magnates, or differently, Koziol, 'Is Robert I in hell?', pp. 250–1.
[13] MGH *Capit.* II, no. 260, p. 274; my thanks to Janet Nelson for making this important point.
[14] Astronomer, c. 48, p. 476, line 18; see also Astronomer, c. 7, p. 304, line 11.
[15] Fried, 'Herrschaftsverband', Guillot, 'Une *ordinatio* méconnue'.
[16] Nelson, 'The voice of Charlemagne'; Noble, 'Secular sanctity'.
[17] Patzold, 'Bischöfe'; McKitterick, *Carolingians*; Nelson, 'Literacy'; Wormald and Nelson (eds.), *Lay Intellectuals*.

mutually recognisable, frame of reference, which was not exclusively
religious, but certainly heavily dominated by biblical and patristic
thought. Regardless of their conflicting interpretations of Louis's penance
in Soissons, contemporaries took this to be a religious ritual with poten-
tially binding consequences. To eliminate God from early medieval nar-
ratives and their interpretation is to miss the point.[18]

At the court of Louis the Pious there existed a common agenda, a
'moral high ground' that was shared by and competed for by members
of the emperor's inner circle. *Admonitio*, warning others of the dangers of
sin, was a duty not just of bishops, but also of the ruler himself, and of the
elite among his lay advisers. This moral high ground, and the way it was
shared and competed for by those connected with Louis's court, including
the ruler himself, is the focus of this study. Of Carolingian 'correction and
emendation', the surveillance and social discipline which would ensure
salvation, Michael Wallace-Hadrill remarked that, had this worked out, it
would have resulted in a police state.[19] This is of course what the
pre-modern Carolingian state could never become, even if its methods
of defaming political opponents could at times be highly effective.[20]
Rather than a police state, we are dealing with a political elite that was
markedly preoccupied with sin and salvation – their own, and those of
the 'Christian people' that made up the Frankish polity. The notion of
correctio – otherwise known as 'reform' – was not a Carolingian invention,
yet when Charlemagne seriously and systematically enlisted the
co-operation of Alcuin and other learned courtiers, correction undeniably
became a royal priority.[21] During Louis's reign, these ideas were tried and
tested, and adapted accordingly. The turbulent years from 828 up to 834
are particularly interesting in this respect. Apart from a surge of texts
during this brief period itself, an even more formidable body of narratives
was produced in the next two decades, reflecting on the disturbing events
of the recent past.

In writing this book, I have explored a substantial part of the historiog-
raphy, biography, hagiography, letters and panegyrics of Louis's reign and
shortly thereafter, trying to find out how this upper echelon of the
Frankish polity aspiring to the moral high ground talked to each other,
criticised each other and convinced each other. Put differently, what kind
of political discourse prevailed in this period? To begin with, the

---

[18] As argued by Koziol, 'Is Robert I in hell?', pp. 236–8, 261–3, and Buc, 'The monster and
the critics', pp. 444–6.
[19] Wallace-Hadrill, *Frankish Church*, p. 299. Wallace-Hadrill's views were inflected by his
own life experiences, on which see I. N. Wood, 'John Michael Wallace-Hadrill'.
[20] See, for example, Airlie, 'Private bodies'.
[21] Ladner, *The Idea of Reform*; Brown, 'Introduction'.

6   The Penitential State

contemporary expressions used to define Louis's penance in 833 merit
further investigation, within their textual context. What, for example, was
meant by notions such as *perturbatio populi*, *negligentia* or *scandalum*, the
three key expressions in the accusations levelled at Louis in 833? This idiom
mattered deeply, for it defined both reality as perceived collectively, and the
limits of legitimate political action. My exploration of the political discourse
at Louis's court includes the writings of the emperor's critics. Even when
such men furiously rebuked Louis and those in his favour at the time, there
was always the longing to be back at the court once more, as part of the inner
circle. Whether authors criticised or supported the emperor, those who
participated in the public debates of this period shared a common ground of
ideals and values. Detecting the common ground of these debates and
altercations has been another purpose of this project, and so has situating
these debates within as precise a political context as possible.

What I do not offer, therefore, is pure 'discourse analysis'. Admittedly,
I am interested in chronology, events and actions, and if there is enough
information to do this, I cheerfully move back and forth between
what happened and what was said about it. Neither is this book a full-
scale study of Louis's reign, however, even though a study of this kind
is long overdue, as is the critical edition of Louis's charters on which
such a political biography should be based.[22] The continuity between
Charlemagne's approach to governing the Christian people, now brought
out in Rosamond McKitterick's new book on Charlemagne,[23] and that of
Louis the Pious merits further investigation. In this book, however, I am
mainly interested in a political community governed by the consciousness
of having sinned, and by its search for strategies of atonement. To this
community both Louis and those who opposed him belonged. Already in
Charlemagne's reign, large-scale acts of collective expiation occurred with
some regularity.[24] Louis returned to an older and more imperial model,
however, exemplified by the Emperor Theodosius I and his public pen-
ance in 391: the emperor himself, admonished by Ambrose, publicly
confessed his guilt in order to regain God's favour. At the assembly at
Attigny in 822, the emperor voluntarily confessed his sins, especially those
he had committed against members of his own family. During this public
manifestation of atonement, Louis took the lead, while the bishops fol-
lowed his 'salubrious example'. Together with their emperor, they were
accountable to God for guiding their people to salvation.[25]

---

[22] Dickau, 'Kanzlei', I; Depreux, 'Kanzlei'; but see now Kölzer, 'Kaiser Ludwig de Fromme'.
[23] McKitterick, *Charlemagne*.
[24] Mordek, 'Zweites Kapitular von Herstal'; De Jong, 'Charlemagne's Church'.
[25] See below, chapter 3, pp. 122–9.

It is this fusion of a personal yet *ex officio* penance by political office-holders on the one hand, and the collective atonement they initiated in the polity at large on the other, that I have tried to capture in my title *The Penitential State*. Its connotations are deliberately ambiguous, referring to persons or groups who were penitents, and therefore in a 'state of penance', but also to a polity ('state') in which atonement had become one of the standard responses to adversity, disaster or endemic conflict. Whether wielded by the ruler, his bishops or his lay magnates, in this world authority was by definition of a religious nature. This is why my subtitle is simply 'Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious': to add the qualification 'religious' would be superfluous.[26]

Research for this book started well over two decades ago, in 1986, when I still worked at the Catholic University of Nijmegen. With a group of advanced undergraduates, I began to study the texts generated by Louis's penance of 833. At the back of my mind, at the time, was Georges Duby's *Dimanche de Bouvines*, an admirable book in which one particular event, the battle of Bouvines of 27 July 1214, was put into its wider political, social and economic context, creating a window upon a society that experienced sweeping changes in all these areas. Likewise, we treated Louis's penance of October 833 as our access road into ninth-century politics and religion, but we also spent much time on the texts themselves: their structure, meaning and contradictory nature.[27] Increasingly fascinated, in the early 1990s I began to put Louis's public penance on my research agenda, to begin with in a pilot article addressing humility in the context of Christian kingship, and the way in which public penance in this period had worked as an instrument of royal discipline.[28] Subsequently, I set about exploring the wider context of 'Soissons, 833', investigating aspects such as the status of *paenitentia publica* in the post-Roman world, the structure of narrative texts on penance, biblical commentary as a hallmark of Christian kingship, the overlap between penance and monastic exile, and the changing connotations of *ecclesia* and *sacrum palatium*.[29]

An enduring interest during these years of circumnavigation was the semantic field I had explored with my students in Nijmegen: the Latin vocabulary used by ninth-century authors when they wrote about what

[26] My thanks to Conrad Leyser, who suggested this.
[27] In 1986, this resulted in an internal publication with fifteen articles and a translation of the key sources, notably the *Relatio* (833) and Agobard of Lyons's *Cartula*. This little grey book has accompanied me throughout my subsequent research.
[28] De Jong, 'Power and humility'.
[29] De Jong, *'Paenitentia publica'*, 'Transformations of penance', 'Pollution', 'The empire as *ecclesia*', 'Monastic prisoners' and **'***Sacrum palatium*'.

8   The Penitential State

really mattered in the world of politics and religion. My fascination with
the construction of narratives owed very little to postmodernism, and
almost everything to the *histoire des mentalités* of the 1970s. What inter-
ested me was how authors perceived their world, and what this revealed
about a wider circle of men and women in their societies who shared this
perspective. In the 1980s, I increasingly turned to British early medieval-
ists for inspiring new approaches. For me, the outstanding model of how
early medieval politics could be investigated effectively by the close read-
ing of contemporary narratives was Janet Nelson's study of Nithard's
Histories.[30] Nithard's history-writing was driven by the painful rhythm of
the politics of 840–3, by an author who was part of the world he wrote
about, and who tried to change it by his writings. In the second half of the
1990s there were others as well who inspired me to make narratives the
basis of my work, as it had been before I got sidetracked by monasticism
and child oblation.[31] Ian Wood's work on early medieval missionary
hagiography was unabashedly text-oriented, and the same held true for
Philippe Buc's *Dangers of Ritual*.[32] Reading fresh chapters as these books
were completed, I increasingly felt that what we could know of the past
was to be found in these multiple and complex narrative texts, and in the
perspectives of their authors. This was also the general mood in the
European research programme on the 'Transformation of the Roman
World' (1992–7) in which I was privileged to take part. As Ian Wood
concluded, in his summing up of our results, uncovering the ways in
which individuals or communities represented themselves both con-
sciously and unconsciously, in private and in public, had become one of
the central concerns of this enterprise.[33] This approach, now with a firmer
basis in manuscript studies, has been continued since 1997 in a research-
student-oriented project called 'Texts and Identities in the Early Middle
Ages'.[34] What interested and still interests us are the ways in which early
medieval texts, narrative and otherwise, not just reflected but also affected
perceptions of collective or individual identity, and how one might iden-
tify and understand such an impact. Our assumption is that texts can
change human perceptions and conduct, and thereby, ultimately, the
world as experienced by our authors and their audiences. It was mainly
within the inspiring intellectual context of 'Texts and Identities' and those
associated with it that I finally wrote this book.

[30] Nelson, 'Public *histories*'.   [31] De Jong, *In Samuel's Image*.
[32] I. N. Wood, *Missionary Life*; Buc, *Dangers of Ritual*.   [33] I. N. Wood, 'Report'.
[34] An enterprise founded by Walter Pohl, Ian Wood, Rosamond McKittterick and me in
   1997, to ensure that what we had learned from the TRW project would be shared with a
   younger generation; since then, Régine Le Jan and her students have also joined in. The
   first collective publication is Corradini *et al.*, (eds.), *Texts and Identities*.

Back in 1986, when my students and I first studied the *dossier* of
Louis's public penance of 833, our guides into the topic were Thomas
Noble's two inspiring articles[35] and Rudolf Schieffer's highly informat-
ive survey of imperial penance from Theodosius the Great in Milan to
Henry IV in Canossa.[36] None of us was particularly worried by the
fact that for generations, Louis the Pious had been considered to be a
failure, for we were only dimly aware of it. What we saw was precisely
the opposite, namely a ruler who managed to regain his throne in less
than half a year, who simply bided his time and played along (as we
thought then), and had successfully bolstered his authority by atoning
publicly in 822, without being forced to do so by anybody. An impor-
tant development at the time was the integration of that what had
once been 'church history', artificially segregated from political history,
into mainstream historical research, in its new guise as 'religious
history'.[37] Was this also on the minds of the organisers of a star-
studded international conference that met in Oxford in 1986, to reas-
sess 'Charlemagne's heir'? It is not clear from the proceedings, which
were published only in 1990 and lack an editorial introduction.[38]
Presumably, Karl-Ferdinand Werner's big, bold and beautiful overview
of Louis as a Christian ruler was meant to serve as such, but the fact
that this rich text comes to well over a hundred pages and, for reasons
unknown, was published in French, has not helped its dissemination.[39]
Whether consciously or not, the rebellions of 830 and 833 in general,
and Louis's penance in Soissons and its consequences in particular,
were not directly addressed by the Oxford conference. Even indirectly,
almost all participants to the conference managed to avoid the rebel-
lions. Apart from Karl-Ferdinand Werner, who tried to include every-
thing that might be remotely relevant to the reign of Louis in his
contribution, there was Janet Nelson, who wondered to what extent
the revolt of 833 and Louis's penance had impaired the last six years
of this emperor's reign. Hardly at all, was Nelson's conclusion, but she
seems to have delivered this message among a deafening silence of
disapproval.[40] In 1986, the turbulent early 830s were still too conten-
tious for a revisionist agenda. As Philippe Depreux concluded in his
comprehensive historiographical overview of 1994, not much had
changed, despite all the decades of reconsidering Louis the Pious.[41]

[35] See above, n. 10.   [36] R. Schieffer, 'Von Mailand nach Canossa'.
[37] See the articles collected in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*; Staubach, *Herrscherrbild*, *Rex
christianus* and '*Cultus divinus*'. On these changes, see De Jong, 'Foreign past'.
[38] *Charlemagne's Heir*.   [39] Werner, '*Hludowicus Augustus*'.   [40] Nelson, 'The last years'.
[41] Depreux, 'Louis le Pieux reconsidéré?'

This can no longer be said. Over the past decade, the interest in 'Charlemagne's heir', his reign and his representation have been steadily growing. This has resulted, for example, in Matthew Innes's publications on royal representation and courtly socialisation,[42] as well as in Courtney Booker's investigation of the textual tradition and the long-term memory of Louis's penance in 833.[43] Not only has the once languishing edition of the charters of Louis the Pious received a new impetus;[44] there is now even an internationally funded project with the significant title 'The Productivity of a Crisis: The Reign of Louis the Pious and the Transformation of Carolingian Imperial Rule'.[45] This was a crisis that produced many texts, and yielded a transformation rather than a decline. Within the context of this project, some time-honoured concepts are in the process of being critically assessed, or even deconstructed, such as 'reform' or the 'party for the unity of the empire' (*Reichseinheitspartei*).[46] Here we touch upon a quintessentially German discussion, fuelled by the overwhelming importance of state formation in German history and historiography. For generations, German historians have tended to judge Carolingian political history by the measure of *Staatlichkeit* – or, rather, by the failure to live up to the ideals of modern state formation.[47] One of the key issues with regard to Louis's reign was the ideal of the unity of the Carolingian *Reich* (empire) as formulated in Louis's succession arrangement of 817, and the subsequent dissolution of this unity from the 830s onwards. Against the grim background of the ultimate failure of the Frankish state, different 'parties' were identified, which were pitted against each other, such as Judith's party, or Lothar's party, or the 'party for the unity of the empire' (*Reichseinheitspartei*) which, radicalised and turning against Louis, helped to undermine the very unity it had aspired to. To a large extent, these discussions have been an internal and German affair which the rest of the scholarly world has tended to steer clear of. It took a German historian, therefore, Steffen Patzold, to argue that there is

[42] Innes, 'Politics of humour' and 'Place of discipline'.

[43] Booker, 'A new prologue', 'Demanding drama', pp. 170–5, and 'Histrionic history'.

[44] As a project of the Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften in Bonn; cf. Kölzer, 'Kaiser Ludwig der Fromme', with a provisional list of Louis's charters.

[45] 'Produktivität einer Krise: Die Regierungszeit Ludwigs des Frommen (814–840) und die Transformation des karolingischen Imperiums', funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Agence nationale de la recherche, co-ordinated by Stefan Esders (Berlin) and Philippe Depreux (Limoges).

[46] Boshof, 'Einheitsidee' and *Ludwig* (with chapter headings such as 'The Reichseinheitspartei in die Defensive'. The notion of a 'Reichseinheitspartei' is central to T. Schieffer, 'Krise'; for an early critique of this concept, see Staubach, *Herrscherbild*, p. 45.

[47] E.g. Faulhaber, *Reichseinheitsgedanke*; Wehlen, *Geschichtsschreibung*. For a recent critical discussion, see Airlie, Pohl and Reimitz (eds.), *Staat*.