



KRISTINA MITALAITĖ

Lietuvos kultūros tyrimų institutas, Lietuva
Lithuanian Culture Research Institute, Lithuania

SOCIALINĖ ATMINTIS VIII A. FRANKŲ KONTROVERSIOJE DĖL ATVAIZDŲ KULTO

Social Memory in the 8th Century Frankish Controversy
Concerning the Cult of Images

SUMMARY

This article focuses on social memory as religious memory in the Carolingian late eighth century. In Latin Christian culture Greek icons and religious images were understood in terms of sacred memory. In his treatise *Opus Caroli Regis*, written in opposition to the Proceedings of the Second Council of Nicea (787), Theodulf of Orleans harshly criticized the condemnation of the participants of the iconoclast council of Hieria (754). He characterized the anathematizing of their spiritual forefathers at the Second Council of Nicea as a *damnatio memoriae*, that is, a kind of dishonouring that should not be countenanced by Christian society. In this way Theodulf sought to expose the Greeks' corruption of social memory arising from their cult of images.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojama socialinės atminties sąvoka VIII a. pabaigos frankų kontroversijoje dėl atvaizdų garbinimo ir laužymo. Ikona ir materialus atvaizdas lotynų krikščioniškoje kultūroje buvo apibrėžiami kaip atminties forma. Teodulfas iš Orleano traktate *Opus Caroli Regis* atmetė Antrojo Nikėjos Suvažiavimo (787) nutarimą grąžinti ikonų garbinimą. Jis itin griežtai kritikavo Nikėjos Bažnyčios Tėvų paskelbtą Hierėjos ikonoklastų sinodo (754) pasmerkimą, kurį jis apibrėžia kaip dvasinių tėvų prakeikimą ar *damnatio memoriae*. Retoriškai ir meistriškai konstruojamame autoriaus diskurse tėvų prakeikimas buvo parodytas kaip graikų korumpuotos socialinės atminties atspindys. Mirusiųjų prakeikimas čia suvokiamas kaip neleistina krikščioniško kulto forma, kuri atsispindi taip pat per atvaizdų garbinimą, kurį pasmerkė frankai.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: socialinė atmintis, *damnatio memoriae*, atvaizdų garbinimas, frankai, religinis kultas.

KEY WORDS: social memory, *damnatio memoriae*, veneration of images, Franks, religious cult.

The *damnatio memoriae* was a well-known practice in Rome dating to the Republican Period. It lay in the power of the Senate to erase someone from public memory. During the imperial period the Senatorial determination of *damnatio* concerned the corpse and the destruction of material images of the disgraced member of family and society. The dead person was thus erased from the collective memory (Jonquières, Holard 2008). Individual images were endowed with considerable symbolical power: *damnatio* or conviction of *perduellio* elicited various forms of iconoclasm directed against the images of those meeting such a fate. These were usually statues, which were hammered to the point of obliterating facial features (Huet 2004). The condemnation of someone's memory and the defacing of his images were thus closely associated. Iconoclasm is a form of discourse that takes place in society with a view to shaping it (Elsner 2012). During the Christian period, the triumph of orthodoxy brought with it rituals of *damnatio memoriae* directed against some important figures of Byzantine iconoclasm. For example, the remains of Constantine V (741–775), the most iconoclast of the Byzantine emperors, were removed from his sarcophagus, exposed at the hippodrome, mocked, and then destroyed by fire, sometime between 861–864 (Brouselle 2011). So it was that this emperor of evil repute was deprived of his resting place in a profanation that recalled the Roman *damnatio memoriae*. Albeit in less spectacular fashion, the process of

erasing the iconoclasts' memory was begun during the Council of Nicea II (787), as was the restoration of the cult of icons, with the result that Constantine V's theological writings were banned and ordered to be burned. The Byzantine iconoclast controversy engendered powerful ideologies. In this battlefield of political discourse, the iconophile party made every effort to blacken their adversaries and erase them from society's memory.

This article will deal with the Latin reaction to the iconophile sanctioning of the memory of the iconoclastic leaders during the Second Nicean Council (787). The treatise *Opus Caroli Magni*, commonly known as the *Libri Carolini*, the main focus of this article, was composed between 790 and 793 to refute the decisions of the second Nicean council that marked the return of the Church of Constantinople to the cult of icons¹. Though written in the name of Charlemagne, this voluminous refutation's real author was Theodulf of Orléans (*Opus Caroli Magni* 1998). Theodulf fully grasped the iconophile intentions to sanction the memory of their iconoclastic predecessors. His response on this point, which the article will examine presently, offers a glimpse of the way in which social memory was perceived during the Carolingian period. In the Roman period as well as during Early Middle Ages, an artificial image was also perceived as a material instantiation of past memory. To this matter we shall return. Finally, yet another purpose of this article is to analyse the articulation of the material image in the context of social memory.

SHARED AS RELIGIOUS MEMORY

Here something must be said about the meaning of the term “social memory”. Figuring largely here is the account of Maurice Halbwachs’. As he would have it, every religion has its “shared memory” (*mémoire collective*), and “religious memory” (*mémoire religieuse*) must always function and define itself within the framework of a given society. So understood, the religious past is not preserved, but constructed on the basis of given psychological and social data (Halbwachs 1925: 243–300). The second sense by which the notion of social memory is used is inspired by Marie-Dominique Chenu’s reflections on the notions of “orthodoxy” and “heresy”. He notes

that heresy always marks a social separation from the community that preserves and embodies orthodoxy (Chenu 1958: 11). In the case of the *Opus Caroli Regis*, the author wants to be seen as representing all Christian orthodoxy and the social religious community that considers itself threatened by a division arising from the Greeks’ propagating dogmatic errors and threatening others with heresy. Figuring prominently among the Carolingian authors’ lines of defence against heresy was the reassessment of the social Christian memory embedded in the Frankish Church (McKitterick 2004). Theodulf’s argumentation similarly moves in this direction.

MEMORY IN THE OPUS CAROLI REGIS:
A WITNESS BOTH PASSIVE AND ACTIVE

The *Opus Caroli Regis* puts forward several subtle understandings of the notion of “memory”. Theodulf describes material images as instantiations of memory of past deeds, by endorsing the idea that “images reveal history” (*Opus Caroli Regis* II, 27)². On his view, images are intimate legates that return the past not only to our eyes but also to our hearts. As he puts it: “through the eyes <...> as through emissaries [images] confide the memory of history to hearts” (*Opus Caroli Regis* II, 30)³.

Theodulf ascribes to them the specific task of recalling the memories of actual past deeds. What is more, on his view, images can direct one’s thoughts from what is false to what is true: “[the image] moves the soul from a lie to the truth” (*Opus Caroli Regis* III, 23). Clearly,

for Theodulf images have to do with the past (*Opus Caroli Regis* I, 10; I, 15), yet they nevertheless remain its mere passive witnesses. He views depictions of any kind as simple reminders of the past, incapable of embodying memory as a living reality. More precisely, he sets them in contrast to memory as the active, present revelation of the past’s righteous deeds. For example, he quotes Psalm 103, 18, to find therein an example of God’s holy men who remember his laws by expressing the living memory of God in their deeds, (Ps 102 (103): “To such as keep his covenant, and to those that *remember his commandments to do them*” (*Opus Caroli Regis* I, 29)⁴.

According to Theodulf, images encapsulate memory and indeed serve to preserve it, but they do not partake in

the reenactment of religious memory as does, for example, the Eucharist, which

re-presents Christ's sacrifice, about which more later.

THE USE OF AUGUSTINIAN THEORY OF MEMORY BY THEODULF

Profoundly inspired by Augustine's reflections on memory, Theodulf considered the *imago Dei* a reflection of the Trinity. It was a theme particularly popular among the Carolingians. Theodulf explores the matter in book 1, chapter 7, where he explains that in the Trinity the Father begets the Son as intellect produces will, and memory proceeds from the two as does the Holy Spirit from the first two divine Persons. The Augustinian notion which Theodulf finds especially appealing in his argumentation against icons is that the absence of any of these three faculties renders imperfect the image of God in the soul. Augustine had explained in his *De Trinitate* (XII, 15) that the soul, or *mens*, appears as a real image of God when its object of contemplating, willing and memorizing is God Himself. As the *Opus Caroli Regis* would have it, this would be the Trinity itself⁵. Theodulf dispassionately concludes that the souls of lovers of images are left deficient by their need for painted images of God in order to think of Him and his saints (*Opus Caroli Regis* II, 22). He not only condemns the dependence of memory on the material *res* and the sight of it, but asserts, as did Augustine, that the human soul (*mens*), created in the divine image, needs the mediation of no material image to come between it and its Creator, because it never forgets God⁶. Such Augustinian speculation on Trinitarian anthropology allows Theodulf to expose and draw attention to what he considers the false Greek perception of

the image of God in the soul, an idea that also implies a distorted perception of the self, grounded in a particular material image.

In book 4, chapter 2, Theodulf argues again that those are "unhappy" who need to see images in order to remember Christ. On his view, the Saviour should never leave the breast and heart of believer. He derides those "poor lovers of images" who are unable to have Christ be present in themselves without seeing him painted on a wall. Memory of this sort arises not from love originating in the heart, he asserts, but from the need for corporeal vision, since the sight of something painted leads to its vision in the soul (*mens*) (*Opus Caroli Regis* IV, 2). Once again, Theodulf alludes to the deficient memory of the Greeks, whom he considers consumed by the passion for material images. Here it would appear that he tacitly moves to another of Augustine's theories of vision and memory. The threefold Augustinian⁷ division of kinds of vision – corporeal, spiritual and intellectual – prompts Theodulf to despise memory based on icons of Christ and the saints. In his perspective, the sight of icons remains merely corporeal, and fails to rise above the sort of vision enjoyed by animals (*Opus Caroli Regis* III, 26). Augustine clearly points out that spiritual vision always draws nourishment from corporeal vision: our imagination or phantasmata can use images stored in the memory to create new images of things or people not yet seen.

Augustine calls such reasoned usage of the imagination cogitation (Lagouanère 2007: 512). Augustin even understands intellectual perception to derive indirectly from images stored in memory. Nevertheless, Theodulf endorses another one of Augustine's positions, according to which memory is understood to be self-productive, capable of acting independently of sensate images. This is particularly important in the case of intellectual memory (Müller 2015: 94–97). From what we have seen, we can infer that Theodulf most likely adopted Augustine's theory of intellectual *vision*, conceived as the most perfect, for it occurs *without corporeal images*. It is obvious that according to Augustine's theory, spiritual vision would be the most relevant for explaining the artist's representation of Christ and the saints. Spiritual vision makes use of corporeal images stored in memory, but then this sort of vision, as far as Christ and the saints are concerned, can be based only on our *phantasmata*. This is clearly not acceptable to Theodulf. Thus, he asserted that

if the Greeks lose their vision, they "must forget" (*obliviscantur*) Christ forever. The only possible vision of God, as of Christ, is intellectual.

What is at stake here is not Theodulf's usage of Augustine's account. Here he widens the chasm between the churches of Constantinople and of the Franks by questioning the former's integrity and purity of faith. He casts doubt on the Greeks' capacity to build a Christian society founded properly on Christian memory. On Theodulf's reasoning, the Greeks' love of images bespeaks the imperfection and mediocrity of their Christian memory and ways of constructing it. He also points out that the Greeks do not hesitate to transmit their actions and deeds in writing as a form of memory: "<...> and they do not fear to show their preaching by their present conduct or way of life and to entrust it in writing to posterity's memory" (*Opus Caroli Regis* IV, 22). In this respect, understanding written memory's importance to Carolingian authors is of no small importance to the would-be critic of Theodulf.

"CORRUPTED MEMORIES" OF THE GREEKS

Having examined Theodulf's explanation of the material image as material memory, let us turn our attention to his account of the act of memorializing the past. Figuring largely here is his expression "to entrust to posterity's memory" (*memoriae posteritatis mandare*), which he applies especially to the Greeks, iconophiles and iconoclasts alike, fighting over images (*Opus Caroli Regis, Praefatio*; I, 17; IV, 22). In the treatise's preface he puts it as follows: "by wanting to entrust the succession of their deeds to

posterity's memory, they would break the bonds of ecclesiastical unity" (*Opus Caroli Regis, Praefatio*). Worth noting is that Theodulf points to specific doings, i.e. the organising of the council and the writing of its decrees, as creative of the social memory of a Christian group, the Church of Constantinople, from which he wishes to ward off the Frankish Church. Crucially, Theodulf defines the Greek way of memorizing as schismatic and heretical, and this for its breaking of the bonds of unity.

Seeking to outline the breakdown of Greek society set in motion by the veneration of icons, Theodulf highlights the poor treatment of their memory of forebears he claims to find in the Council's proceedings. Here, forebears are understood to be spiritual as well as corporeal predecessors or ancestors. The condemnation of the iconoclastic council of Hieria was viewed by the Carolingians as particularly harsh for one reason: the Greeks at Nicaea had anathematised their fathers. This had been identified as a serious error in the Capitulare sent to Hadrian I prior to Theodulf's undertaking of the treatise⁸. It is a point to which Theodulf subsequently returns with some frequency. He discusses it in the work's biblical section (book I, chapters 26 to 28) and in the section concerning the sacraments and *res sacra*. The authors of the Capitulare had explained their criticisms in clear terms: the casting of the anathemas is an act of "disobedience to the divine voice's command" (*contra dominicae vocis imperium*) (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 31), which clearly enjoined the honouring of forebears. Theodulf takes this argument further by stating that if the Greeks consider their forebears heretics, they must face the fact that "they were begotten, taught and consecrated to religious life by heretics" (*Ibid.*).

Above it was observed that in composing his treatise Theodulf inserted a discussion of the condemnation of forefathers into the section given to the sacraments and *sacra res*, and this in an effort to show that icons and their cult have no place among them. Of no small importance is the placement of chapter 31 of book 2, where the question of honouring forefathers is taken up, immediately after

discussions of Scripture, the Cross, liturgical vessels and the Eucharist. Such an arrangement unambiguously situates the aforementioned divine commandment within the context of spiritual realities of the highest importance. This is confirmed by the initial words introducing the argumentation of chapter 31, where Theodulf holds that the Greeks who presume that the material image is equivalent to the body and blood of Christ end up condemning their fathers. As mentioned, here he is clearly establishing a semantic link between the remembrance of ancestors and the Holy Mass, or the Eucharist, as the most perfect act of Christian memory⁹. In Christian practice, the liturgical anamnesis involves keeping alive the memory of Christ's Passion and Resurrection. Here, Theodulf presents memory as one of the basic mechanisms of Christian faith, or even as the essence of Christianity, which can be understood as the religion of memory encapsulated in the Eucharist. It is worth recalling, here, that while establishing the sacrament of the Eucharist during the Last Supper, in offering the bread, Christ said that this was henceforth to be done in his memory. In chapter 27 of the same book two, Theodulf quotes a long extract from the Roman Missal, where Christ orders the celebration of the mass in his memory ("Do this in remembrance of me") (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 27).

In his treatise Theodulf also quotes and explores other biblical verses dealing with the religious precept of honouring fathers and forbidding their dishonour (for example, Deuteronomy 5, 16; 27, 16). As he would have it, by their casting of anathemas, the Greeks betray their arrogance and abominable behaviour, as

they put curses on the individuals concerned. Worth noting here is a matter previously found in the Capitulare, specifically, the Carolingians' mention of the dishonouring of deceased forefathers: "Those shouldn't be judged who have already left this world" (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 31)¹⁰. Nevertheless, many participants of the Council of Hierea were still alive at the time of the Second Council of Nicaea. Thus Theodulf considers such dishonour a sanctioning of the memory of the deceased.

As the quotation from the preface shows, Theodulf defines memory as a "bond" or a "chain" (*vinculum*). In his judgement, Greek memory amounts to a "bond of condemnation" (*vinculum damnationis*). The bond of Christian memory consists of prayers for the dead, forming a bond that joins not only one's ancestors, but all deceased faithful Christians. The *vinculum* of anathema is clearly tantamount to an exclusion of the dead from prayers and from common Christian social memory (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 31). To Theodulf, such banishment of their forefathers from the bond of prayer, and therefore from memory, amounts to consigning them to the ranks of heretics, such as Arius, Nestorius, and Eutyches. Sanctioning and excluding, as opposed to honouring, dead Christians joins the semantics of memory in Theodulf's treatise. As an excellent rhetorician, he implies that we have good reason to doubt that the Greek lovers of images correctly understand Christian faith and its various forms, since they love and adore images excessively, yet fail to honour their forefathers, and thus condemn them by obliterating them from the social memory kept in everyday prayers.

Thus Theodulf subscribes to the view that the memory of the dead can only be positive or, as Chilon of Sparta's aphorism puts it, "of the dead, nothing but good (is to be said)" (*de mortuis nihil nisi bonum*). In this connection he quotes the canonical collection of Dionysius Exiguus to the effect that those who have left this earth must not be judged harshly (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 31). Nevertheless, harsh judgement of the dead does indeed appear in Carolingian historiographical sources. One of the best examples would be the remembrance of Tassilo's evil deeds in the Royal Frankish annals (*Annales regni Francorum*, anno 763). One explanation for this difference of attitudes would be that, for his part, Theodulf clearly upholds memory as honouring of the dead¹¹ in a theological context. He describes it as a form of Christian worship which excludes all disrespect: "<...> concerning those who have died <...> you should know that serenity is to be observed, for indeed neither fathers should be disrespected by the sons, nor should the dead be judged rashly by the living" (*Opus Caroli Regis II*, 31)¹².

Following the Capitulare, Theodulf takes up what he considers the illicit Greek condemnation of ancestors in chapters 6 and 7 of book four. In chapter 6 he inveighs against the iconophile comparison of the iconoclasts to Samaritans, describing their anathemas against their forebears as "alarming" (*formidolosus*), their reproofs as "egregiously slanderous" (*conviciis lacerare*), and their insults as utterly most atrocious. In chapter 7 he returns to the matter by quoting the biblical precepts from the Old and New Testaments' precepts concerning the honouring of parents (Exodus 20, 12;

Leviticus 19, 3; etc.). In these two chapters Theodulf does not consider the condemnation of forebears in terms of the sanctioning of memory. Nevertheless, we may wonder: why would he dwell with such interest on the disrespect of forefathers? It seems that his aim is to show that the feeble foundation of Greek

Christian culture undermines its social memory. Describing them as infringing on divine law, despising their physical origins and their introduction into the divine scriptures, as well as their initiation into Christian faith, Theodulf views the Greeks as bereft of social memory, and lacking any societal foundation.

THE ANSWER OF THE POPE

Surprised by the insistence of the Frankish authors on the Greeks' disrespect of their forefathers, Pope Hadrien I, in his answer to the Capitulare, failed to perceive the link that the Carolingians had established between the honour of forebears and social memory (*Epistolae Hadriani papae I*, 51). Reminding the Franks of Gregory the Great's recounting in his Dialogues of the Arian Visigothic King Liuvigild's killing of his son Hermenigild for converting to the Christian faith, Hadrian praises the conversion. He goes on to quote Augustine's commentary on Psalm 84 to the effect that children are not responsible for the faults of their parents. It is remarkable that the Pope, who had been a careful reader of the Capitulare, failed to grasp the importance of the social-commemorative aspect of the Carolingians' condemnation. Thus, he concludes unambiguously in the favour of the Nicaean council's condemnation of the iconoclasts, whom he, too, considers the worst of all heretics (*Epistolae Hadriani papae I*, 17).

Theodulf is among the first Carolingian thinkers to attempt an outline of the main features of Frankish Christian social memory. He is also among the first

Carolingian authors to discuss disgrace in the practice of remembrance. There is, therefore, no small irony in his own emergence as one of his period's most notorious cases of *damnatio memoriae*. By his involvement in some way in the plotting of Bernard of Italy against Louis the Pious and against the new division of 817, he fell out of the King's graces. Dietrich Schaller (Schaller 1992) supposes that a large number of his poems and letters have been lost as a result. Further, Elisabeth Dahlhaus-Berg has shown (Dahlhaus-Berg 1975: 17–21) that Matfrid, count of Orléans, with whom the bishop was on bad terms, took advantage of the fall of this adversary of his. The powerful count erased all the positive accounts and memories of Theodulf from contemporary local sources. Such actions on the part of his enemies were highly effective. At the prompting of Louis the Pious, the most prominent bishops met in Paris in 825 to discuss once again the Greek crisis concerning the cult of images, and tried to find arguments to convince the Pope to endorse the Frankish position on the matter. Convened under the direction of Jonas of Orléans, the bishops were well informed of the previous Frankish debate

on images. And yet, in their recounting of the controversy's key points, they failed to mention either the *Opus Caroli*

Regis or its author's name, all the while drawing both their inspiration and main arguments from him.

CONCLUSIONS

Theodulf admitted that painted images embody material memory and that they integrate discourse on society and memory. Nevertheless, he viewed images as devoid of any real worth. Here, it should be kept in mind that the religious images in Western world did not serve the same function as icons do for the Greeks. Indeed, by contrast with the Eastern Churches' beliefs and practices, images have never functioned sacramentally in the Latin Church. Also worth keeping in mind is that painted images are by no means the only material objects used in everyday Christian religious practice and in the construction of religious memory. Scripture, even if considered in its material form, is continually re-enacted in multiple ways (reading, singing, etc.). Relics and memorials of the saints similarly serve to recall and re-present for believers their Christian heritage. By venerating them, Christians enter into and relive the memories of the saints. In his *The legendary topography*

of the Gospels in the Holy Land, Maurice Halbwachs notes that visiting holy places provides us with a sensitive testimony, with a certainty and perhaps most importantly, with a veracity about the past (Halbwachs 2017: 1–2). The past becomes present. We can touch it and interact directly with it. And yet, for Theodulf an image is often a *res insensata*, a dumb and even superfluous thing that offers no possibility of enacting living social memory.

Rhetoric often meets theology in the brilliant argumentation Theodulf puts forward in the *Opus Caroli Regis*. Going to great length to persuade his readers of the Greeks' disrespect for their forebears, he endeavours to show that at the Second Nicean Council they have sanctioned their memory. He also tries to "reveal" their love for material images, which he has defined as "dumb things". Such efforts allow him to sharpen his rhetoric against what he considers the corrupted state of Greek society.

Literature

- Annales regni francorum*. 1895. *Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Hannoverae: Impensis bibliopolii Hahniani.
- Belting Hans. 1990. *Bild und Kunst. Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*. München: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Brousselle Isabelle. 2011. *Une damnatio memoriae byzantine: le châtement post mortem de deux « défunts très spéciaux », l'empereur Constantin*

- V et le patriarche de Constantinople Jean le Grammairien, Gautier A., Martin C. (eds.). *Échanges, communications et réseaux dans le haut Moyen Âge*: 101–116, Turnhout: Brepols.
- Brubaker Leslie and Haldon John. 2011. *Byzantium in the iconoclast era c. 680–850. A history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chenu Marie-Dominique. 1958. *Orthodoxie et hérésie: le point de vue du théologien*, J. Le Goff (dir.).

- Hérésies et sociétés dans l'Europe pré-industrielle, 11^e–18^e siècles: 9–14.* Paris, La Haye: Mouton: 9–14.
- Huet Valérie. 2004. *Images et Damnatio memoriae, Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 15: 237–254.
- Jonquière Céline de, Hollard Virginie. 2008. *La damnatio memoriae dans les œuvres historiques de Suétone et de Tacite, Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 19: 145–163.
- Concilii Nicaeni Secundi Continuatio.* 1767. Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, J. D. Mansi (ed.). Tomus XIII. Florence.
- Dahlhaus-Berg Elisabeth. 1975. *Nova antiquitas et antiqua novitas. Typologische Exegese und isidorianisches Geschichtsbild bei Theodulf von Orléans.* Köln, Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Elsner Jas. 2012. Iconoclasm as Discourse: From Antiquity to Byzantium, *The Art Bulletin* 94, 3: 368–394.
- Freeman Ann, Meyvaert Paul (eds.). 1998. *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini).* Monumenta Germaniae Historica, concilia 2, Supplementum 1. Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Gy Pierre-Marie. 1987. *La doctrine eucharistique dans la liturgie romaine du haut moyen-âge. Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale.* Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo: 533–557.
- Hadrien. *Epistolae Hadriani papae.* 1899. Ep. 2. *Monumentae Germaniae historica, Epistolarum tomus V.* Berolini: Apud Weidmannos.
- Halbwachs Maurice. 1925. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire.* Paris: F. Alcan.
- Halbwachs Maurice. 2017. *La topographie légendaire des évangiles en Terre sainte. Étude de mémoire collective.* Édition préparée par M. Jaisson. 2^e édition de Quadriga. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Hendel Ronald. 2005. *Remembering Abraham. Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lagouanère Jérôme. 2007. *Vision spirituelle et vision intellectuelle chez Saint Augustine: Essais de topologie, Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 108: 509–538.
- McKitterick Rosamond. 2004. *History and Memory in the Carolingian World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Müller Jörn. 2015. *Memory in Medieval Philosophy. Memory: A History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schaller Dieter. 1992. *Briefgedichte als Zeitzeugen. Theodulfs Sturz 817/818, H. Mordek (hgs.), Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken: Festschrift für Raymund Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag.* Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York, Paris: P. Lang: 107–119.

Endnotes

- ¹ The secondary literature is voluminous. The comprehensive and the most recent monograph on the question: Brubaker, Haldon 2011.
- ² Cf. also Praefatio; 102; II, 9; II, 13; II, 21.
- ³ Cf. also II, 31; III, 16; IV, 18; IV, 19; IV, 21. This function of image is shortly discussed by Belting 1990: 20–21.
- ⁴ *Beatos dicit eos qui memoria tenent mandata eius, ut faciant.* We are using King James Bible translation.
- ⁵ The theology endorsed by Theodulf in the treatise is mainly Trinitarian.
- ⁶ The same idea appears in chapter 23, book 4.
- ⁷ Theodulf discusses the matter in book 3, chapter 26. Nevertheless, he is not using Augustine himself (Book XIII of *De Genesi ad litteram*), where the core of the threefold vision is exposed, but the Pseudo-Augustinian *Dialogus quaestionum* 63 (*Opus Caroli Regis* III, 26). For the analysis and classification of the Augustinian visions, cf. Lagouanère 2007.
- ⁸ The *Capitalurie* was drafted after the official reading of the proceedings on Nicea II that arrived in the court of Charlemagne before 792. Brought to Rome by Angilbert, the document served as the backbone of the treatise written by Theodulf.
- ⁹ On the Eucharist as a memorial of Christ's Passion and Resurrection, cf. Gy 1987: 540–541.
- ¹⁰ *De non iudicandis his, qui de saeculo recesserunt.*
- ¹¹ In his discourse, he lingers between all the dead and forefathers.
- ¹² *<...> de his, qui iam transierunt... observandum esse tranquillitas tua cognoscat. Quia ergo nec a filiis parentes inhonorandi nec a viventibus mortui temere iudicandi sunt.*