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The Carolingian System

[50] When Charlemagne became undisputed ruler of the Frankish realm soon after his father Pepin's death, the Carolingians already had forced the greater part of Southern France to accept their rule. Between 778 and 812, as has been noted, Charlemagne expanded his authority still further and added to the empire Gascony and a strip of Spanish territory stretching from Navarre to Barcelona. Though part of these gains was lost between 812 and 828, much remained. What was the method used during this period to control this region which consisted of the Midi and the Spanish March? How did Charlemagne and Louis the Pious govern this vast expanse of territory down to 828, and what changes did they make in the system of government which they found already present in these regions or which they had inherited from their predecessors? In short, what was the nature of the Carolingian governing system here?

We might begin by emphasizing that at the summit of the Carolingian governmental system was the head of the Carolingian family, who bore the title of king up to 800, of emperor afterwards. Backed by the power of the Church, this Carolingian monarch was ruler by the grace of God, and rebellion against him was, in theory at least, disobedience to the Almighty. As ruler of the Franks, Lombards, and the other peoples who made up this vast empire, he was supreme judge and lawgiver, general, and administrator. In practice he was head of the Church. He was not a despot, however, and his authority was absolute rather than arbitrary, since he was limited by both law and custom. He did not have the right, for instance, of taxing his subjects directly, nor could he arbitrarily interfere with their property or rights, except in war, without following the cumbersome legal procedures of the time.

The chief limitation upon the power of the Carolingian monarch, however, [51] does not appear to have been the result of the restraining influence of law, custom, and other precedents. It lay in the paucity of his financial resources. He did not have adequate money to pay for a self-perpetuating bureaucracy of officials who could govern in his name, or resources which enabled him to hire soldiers to fight for him. In this respect his government was inferior to that of his Moslem and Byzantine neighbors. In addition the extent of the Carolingian empire made it impossible for a monarch to supervise personally remote regions, as might have been possible had the empire been smaller. Though efforts were made, as we will note, to get around such limitations, no real solution of a governmental sort was ever devised in the Carolingian period. (1)

To deal with such a vast empire with the inadequate governmental machinery at his disposal, Charlemagne adopted some interesting expedients. One of them was to set up his heirs as sub-kings over portions of his domains. Thus in 781 he organized a kingdom of Aquitaine with his eldest son Louis as king. This kingdom of Aquitaine seems to have consisted of all of Southern France south of the Loire and west of the Rhone along with its Gascon and Spanish borderlands. (2) A little later he gave
Louis the Pious continued his father's policy after he became emperor himself in 814 and appointed one of his sons, Pepin, king of Aquitaine[52] though three years later he altered its boundaries by taking away from it the coastal counties of Septimania and Catalonia[6]. But he soon went much further and extended the practice of setting up sub-kingdoms in the empire to the point of dividing all of it among his three sons, Lothaire, Louis, and Pepin[7]. Charlemagne had never done this, but had kept direct authority over most of the empire[8]. Louis' action had evil results for the empire, not only in provoking his nephew Bernard in Italy to revolt[9] but even more so when Judith, his new queen, presented him with a fourth son Charles, whose inheritance had to be carved out of lands already allotted to his older brothers. This, of course, led directly to the civil wars in Louis' last years and afterwards, which did so much to weaken and destroy the Carolingian empire.

Down to 828, however, what authority was vested in the sub-king of Aquitaine? If one follows the Astronomus or Ermold the Black, one would believe that it was considerable. Other information, however, contradicts[53] them. Down to Charlemagne's last year it seems dear that Louis' role in his kingdom was unimportant, and that he was closely supervised from Aix-la-Chapelle[10]. Only when Count William of Toulouse had retired to his monastery do we find Louis having any real scope or initiative in policy matters. Similarly Pepin, his son, seems to have been given little room for maneuver as king of Aquitaine during his early years. This was to come later[11]. The use of sub-kingdoms which, as applied to our area, refers to the kingdom of Aquitaine, did not, then, down to 828, mean a really separate governmental system. Rather it meant a training ground for heirs and a useful regional adjunct to power exercised by Carolingian monarchs from their capital in the north.

If power was not really exercised in the Midi and the Spanish March down to 828 by the kings of Aquitaine, where does one find it? One finds it in the counts who were appointed by Carolingian rulers to govern various parts of Southern France and Catalonia. As had been true in the pre-Carolingian era, the count was the basic official of the Carolingian governmental system. He was a man of proven ability, often related to the royal house, who was given a charge or honorem as it was called, as ruler of a district, which he exercised in the name of the monarch. He was a kind of sub-king in this district, exercising all the functions of government. He led into battle the army of his county, consisting of the ban, or levy of free-born men, and was responsible for the county's defense and its fortifications. He managed the fiscus of the crown, that is to say, the royal estates of his county and such dues and levies as the king had a right to exact. He was responsible for law and order and presided over the royal courts in cases brought before them. He was in charge of the mint, which he operated in the name of the monarch. Except where royal immunities or private seigneurial jurisdiction intervened, he was supreme in his county. A count did not receive a salary for his services, but was rewarded by a share in the fines of the county courts and other revenues which were the perquisite of his office. Often too he was given land owned by the monarch as his own. The eagerness with which men sought the dignity of count seems to show that the office carried with it ample rewards.

At the time of Charlemagne, the general rule seems to have been that a count controlled only a single county in the Midi, with the exception of the count of Toulouse, often called a dux or duke in our sources, who always seems to have had a wider field of action, serving as a kind of viceroy in charge in the Southern French frontier[12]. Toward the end of Charlemagne's reign, however, one other
extraordinary command may have been created for Count Leibulf of Provence who seems to have controlled a number of counties in Septimania.\(^\text{13}\)

Under Louis the Pious this seems to have changed, and we get increasing evidence of several counties being entrusted to one man like Count Gaucelm of Ampurias-Roussillon, Count Bernard of Septimania, or Count Berengar of Toulouse.\(^\text{14}\) If a count controlled a border county facing the enemy, he seems to have borne the title of \textit{marchio} as well as \textit{count}. In one case, Gascony, where hereditary non-Carolingian rulers continued to exist, we find the title of \textit{dux} used -- the equivalent of the pre-Carolingian title \textit{princeps}, though even here there was, no doubt, an attempt made to force the Gascons to conform to Carolingian practices in use elsewhere.\(^\text{15}\)

Carolingian counts in the Midi made use of officials of their own in this period. They often had a deputy or viscount who assisted them in their court or presided over it in their absence\(^\text{16}\) and vicars, who were subordinate officials presiding over districts of their counties known as \textit{vicaria} and who seem to have had a competence to judge cases of minor importance.\(^\text{17}\) In areas of the Midi where Roman and Visigothic law was in use, when the counts or their viscounts held court, they were assisted by legal officials known as \textit{judices} or \textit{saiones}, men skilled and versed in the interpretation of the law.\(^\text{18}\) Whether Roman, Frankish, or Visigothic law was used, however, and whether count, viscount, or vicar presided over a tribunal, one essential ingredient which made such a court legal was the presence of a group of leading landowners or magnates of the district. These magnates or landowners are called \textit{scabini} or \textit{boni homines} in our documents, but they sometimes seem to have included some given the title of \textit{vassi dominici}.\(^\text{19}\) It was their presence which seems to have made public action taken by such courts legal and official.

While the count was the leading official of his county, there were others who, in a sense, shared his authority. These were the archbishops,\(^\text{56}\) bishops, and abbots of important monasteries. More often than not appointed by the Carolingian monarchs, possessing important lands in local areas of the Midi, such churchmen eagerly sought and generally received special privileges from the crown. The most important were the royal immunities which placed their churches or abbeys under royal protection and which gave them a right to hold their own courts and manage their properties free of fiscal interference by the counts.\(^\text{20}\) Often, as happened in the case of the archbishop of Narbonne\(^\text{21}\) and a number of abbeys, such rights led to disputes with counts of the region which could only be settled by court action. Equally frequent, however, is evidence of close co-operation between count and viscount on the one hand and bishop and abbot on the other.\(^\text{23}\)

To control their counts the leading weapon available to the Carolingians, besides support for their potential rivals, the abbots and bishops of the local region, was removal from office. Down to 828 such action was not uncommon. More common, however, seems to have been the practice of making certain that sons did not succeed to their father's \textit{honores} so that no family could make itself supreme in a particular region.\(^\text{24}\) Still another was the use of \textit{missi} sent out by the central government\(^\text{57}\) to investigate complaints and hold courts to correct abuses.\(^\text{25}\) None of these methods, however, seems to have been really satisfactory in keeping counts from entrenching their families firmly in particular districts of the Midi or the Spanish March.

This being the case, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious made use of another method which had been begun by their predecessors -- vassalage or \textit{fidelitas}. All counts, bishops, and abbots\(^\text{26}\) who were given \textit{honores} had to do homage to the monarch for them and in a special ceremony swear an oath of personal allegiance. This solemn oath and ceremony established a special tie between him who swore it and the ruler, a tie which, according to the \textit{Manual of Dhuoda}, could not be broken as long as either
was alive. Nor were counts and important churchmen the only ones who were bound to the ruler by such ties. In the Midi, as elsewhere in the empire, are to be found a class of important landowners known as *vassi dominici*, who were given land belonging to the royal *fisc* as life benefices in return for an oath of allegiance or *fidelitas*. These men, often Frankish in origin, and known as *fideles*, seem to have had special military responsibilities, which meant they were to present themselves fully equipped for campaigns upon call of king or count. In Septimania and Catalonia the important *aprisio* holders, who appear to have done homage to Carolingian rulers, were in many ways similar to the *vassi dominici*. Two ties then bound local leaders of Southern France and Catalonia to the Carolingian monarchs -- one the tie of office, lay or ecclesiastic, the other the bonds of vassalage or *fidelitas*. And so important did Carolingian rulers believe such ties of vassalage to be, that they encouraged the counts to bind their followers to them in the same manner.

Such a description of the system used by the Carolingian to govern the Midi, however, leaves out certain things of importance. The first is the matter of the Frankish character of their administration. In an earlier chapter we noted how, as they conquered regions in the Midi, Charles Martel and Pepin made a practice of introducing into such areas their own officials. The *fideles* and *judices* to whom Charles Martel gave the governing power and church offices in Burgundy and the Rhone Valley, the Frankish Count Radulf whom Pepin placed over Uzès and Nîmes, and the garrisons he established in *castella* in Aquitaine are cases in point. According to the Astronomus, Charlemagne followed the same policy in Aquitaine about 778, when he appointed as abbots and counts men of Frankish origin exclusively. The county of Fézensac in Gascony, given to a series of non-Gascons, seems to illustrate a similar policy used in this part of the Midi as well.

In examining men who were appointed as counts later on by Charlemagne and Louis the Pious many historians have been impressed by the number of these officials who were of Frankish origin. Specific families like that of the Nibelungen, of Count William of Toulouse, of Count Frédélon of Toulouse, or Rannoux of Poitiers immediately spring to mind. So does the removal of Count Bera and his replacement after 820 by a series of Frankish counts of Barcelona. So important have these facts seemed to some historians that they have pictured the Carolingians as leaders of a group of Austrasian noble families, tied to them by blood and vassalage, through whom they conquered and governed their empire and kept control over the Church. Such a view regards Carolingian government in the Midi as one run by a Frankish minority who used it and the Church to dominate a large and inarticulate Southern French and Catalan majority.

Did the Carolingians go further than this, however, and establish throughout Southern France colonies of Franks as military garrisons to hold down the local population? The Astronomus certainly implies as much when he tells us of Franks, who were called *vassi*, whom Charlemagne established throughout Aquitaine. But what evidence can we find to back up his assertion? Here Septimania seems of particular importance since it had never been Frankish prior to the eighth century and any evidence of Frankish colonies there must date from the Carolingian period. It seems important then to note that we do find much evidence of a Frankish element in the population of these regions which, a century or more later, still considered itself somewhat distinct. At Nîmes the presence of a Frankish element seems to be clearly indicated by the use of Frankish or Salic law as late as 898. A century later about Maguelonne the local counts specifically state they still are following it too. Nearby in the vicinity of Agde and Béziers we hear of a certain "villa Franconica," while a charter of a century or more later contains the name of a witness who still calls himself Salic. Two *vassi dominici*, who, judging by their names, seem to be Franks, are mentioned as attending a court held at Narbonne in 782, while the use of Salic as well as Visigothic and Roman law in the law courts as late as the tenth
century\(^{(43)}\) seems to point to Frankish settlers in this part of the Midi. For Provence our information is scantier but here too the use of Salic law in courts which were held near Marseille in the late eighth and early \(^{(60)}\) ninth centuries\(^{(44)}\) seems to indicate the presence of a Frankish element. Further north in Aquitaine we find more evidence of a Frankish population. As late as the tenth century a landholder giving land to the abbey of Saint-Chaffre speaks of himself as being of Frankish origin.\(^{(45)}\) In the Rouergue, near Conques, we hear of a *vassus dominicus* who, judging from his name, was Frankish.\(^{(46)}\) In the Limousin an examination of the names of those who cultivated the *villa* of Cavalicus, once part of the royal *fisc*, shows clearly that they were Franks.\(^{(47)}\) In fact an analysis of family names in the Limousin found in charters dating from this and later periods by Tenant de la Tour seems to show that a surprising proportion of this province's population came from north of the Loire originally.\(^{(48)}\) In all of the Midi north of Narbonne, Carcassonne, and the Garonne, then, we can establish the presence of sufficient Franks to indicate that a certain colonization took place here in Carolingian times and perhaps even later.

But there is still another way in which the problem might be approached -- through an examination of castles and fortifications. We know that when the Carolingians were conquering Southern France their task was made difficult by the presence of large numbers of fortified *civitates* and *castella*. If we have evidence that they maintained such fortresses after conquest, this could be considered to represent a continuing need for the use of military force during the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious -- a possible index of basic resistance to their rule. Now there seems to be some indication that many of the fortified *civitates* of the Midi, whose walls were destroyed by the Carolingians in the course of conquest, were not refortified. Cases in point are Mauguio, Limoges, Périgord, Bordeaux, Marseille,\(^{(49)}\) and others which fell easy \(^{(61)}\) prey to Viking and Moslem raiders later in the century. Some like Barcelona, Gerona, Toulouse, Vienne, and perhaps Avignon\(^{(50)}\) remained fortified.

When we consider castles, however, the situation seems to be a little different. Though our information is scant, there is indication of the continued use of *castella* and the building of new ones in parts of the Midi and the Spanish March between 778 and 828. Some of these fortresses were near the frontiers, like Tarrassa\(^{(51)}\) close to Barcelona and Ausona, or like Casserès and Cardona which Louis the Pious ordered Count Borell to rebuild in 798,\(^{(52)}\) or Fronsac, constructed by Charlemagne near the Gascon border in 769.\(^{(53)}\)

Others, located in the interior, cannot have been the result of the needs of frontier defense. This seems true of the *castellum* owned by the church of Gerona in the *vellula nova* of Vellosoa in Ampurias in 834.\(^{(54)}\) It also \(^{(62)}\) applies to the fortress called Tures in Agde which a certain Rainald owned in 824\(^{(55)}\) or the nearby castles of Mesoa and Tures granted by Charles the Bald as benefices to certain landowners of the Béziers region in 844.\(^{(56)}\) Further east in Lodève, we learn that the abbey of Aniane owned a castle called Montecalmense, which is mentioned in 787 and 829\(^{(57)}\) and seems to have been near the monastery. To the south we hear of a *castrum* of Substantion in 801, and one at Novumvillaco in 813,\(^{(58)}\) both in the county of Maguelonne or Melgueil, as well as that of Anduze near Nîmes mentioned in 821.\(^{(59)}\)

We have less information concerning Provence. But we do know that in 798 there was a *castrum* near the abbey of Lérins\(^{(60)}\) and in 781 one at Nantes\(^{(61)}\) outside Marseille. Further north along the Rhone it seems probable that the castles of Pilep and Saint-Just at Vienne mentioned between 865 and 870\(^{(62)}\) date from this earlier period, as does the Alpine fortress of Maurienne which guarded *clusae* leading to Italy.\(^{(63)}\)
For Aquitaine too there are indications of the existence of castles dating from this period. There is the castle of Vitry built in Velay by Count Berengar about 830[64] and the rocca in Rouergue which Liutard gave to the abbey of Conques. In Auvergne the abbey of Saint-Julien de Brioude seems to have been located in or near the Castrum Victoriacum,[66] while in the Limousin the castle of Turenne is mentioned in the mid-eighth century as well as later on.[67] There may also have been other castra in the Limousin-Quercy region which Count Roger gave to the abbey of Charroux [63] between 769 and 799[68] South of Poitou and Burgundy, then, castles continued to be built and occupied, and they remained of some importance.

All this would seem to show that in some respects Carolingian government in the Midi remained an alien one, which was imposed on the local population by means of Frankish officials and churchmen and buttressed by the establishment of vassi dominici and other colonists from the north who kept control of local areas for the Carolingian monarchs by maintaining older castles and fortresses and building new ones. But before we accept this as a final conclusion, we should consider other evidence which points to quite different conclusions for the period after 778 -- especially as far as Septimania and Catalonia are concerned.

Let us first consider those counts whom the Carolingians appointed to office in regions south of the Loire and in the Valley of the Rhone. Even as early as the reign of Pepin many were not Frankish. There is that Gothic count of Mauguio or Maguelonne, the father of St. Benedict of Aniane, who delivered this city to Pepin and was maintained in office afterwards even under Charlemagne.[69] Then there were those Goths to whom Pepin in 759 guaranteed the use of their own laws and who, in return, delivered over to him the city of Narbonne. From this time on there is every indication that most of the counts south of Carcassonne and Narbonne were Gothic rather than Frankish, like Borell of Ausona, Bellon of Carcassonne, and Bera of Barcelona.[70] Even the removal of Bera in 820 does not appear to have been based on his nationality but, as has been noted, was the result of other factors. And the almost simultaneous appointment of Asnar Galindo, a Spaniard from Aragón as count of Urgell-Cerdanya is further indication of a willingness to use a non-Frank in a sensitive border area of the empire.[71] Can we be sure also that Dhuoda of Uzès was not, as her name certainly implies, of Southern French origin, like Count Leibulf of Provence, who, if he was not Provençal, certainly owned private allodial property in Arles?[72]

[64] In Aquitaine one finds a similar situation. It was a group of Aquitanian counts led by Count Humbert of Bourges who made the final surrender of this region to Pepin in 768.[73] And while historians have paid close attention to the Astronomus' statement that Charlemagne gave to Franks the honores of counts and abbots throughout Aquitaine, they have failed to notice the contradiction to be found in his next statement. For he lists among the nine counts actually appointed at least two who were non-Frankish, Humbert of Bourges, who is obviously the same Aquitanian count mentioned in 768, and Séguin of Bordeaux, who was a Gascon.[74]

Gascony, Aragón, and Navarre were certainly areas of Southern France and its borderlands which were least responsive to Carolingian authority. Yet even here the same policy seems to have been followed. In Navarre Charlemagne backed Count Velasco, a Basque of Spanish descent,[75] and in Aragón accepted as successor to Aureolus, who was probably a Frank, Asnar Galindo, a native of the region.[76] This latter's loyalty was such, as a matter of fact, that when he was overthrown, he sought refuge in Carolingian territory. Even in Gascony use was made of the native Basque ducal family, though attempts seem to have been made to diminish their over-all authority.[77]
More striking, however, than this use of non-Franks as counts is another policy which was inaugurated about 780 -- that of welcoming Spanish refugees into the Midi. These *hispani*, who were frequently given large tracts of vacant land to settle as *aprisiones*, were probably few in number. Abadal estimates them as numbering some fifty in all, and we know of some forty-two by name who went to Aix-la-Chapelle in 812 to present their grievances to the emperor. But what is significant is not their numbers, but the fact that from 780 on these refugee *milites* were given special treatment by the Carolingians -- not only in Catalan counties like Barcelona, Gerona, Ampurias, and Roussillon, but in Septimania in the counties of Carcassonne, Narbonne, Béziers, and also in Provence. Their quasi-proprietorship was protected from the encroachment of the local counts by a special capitulary, and, like the *vassi dominici*, they even appear to have done homage in person to Carolingian rulers for their lands. Can one still consider that the Carolingians followed a policy of Frankish domination of the Midi in the light of their use and treatment of such large *aprisio* holders -- not to mention the more numerous proprietors of small *aprisiones* who were given land by the emperors of Aix-la-Chapelle and their subordinates?

As a matter of fact we cannot even be sure that all *vassi dominici* and other similar landholders in the Midi were Franks. The case of Dodila is instructive in this respect. In 813 Dodila, an important landholder, left property to Psalmodi and two other abbeys. This land, the charter reveals to us, was located in Rouergue, Uzès, and Maguelonne and was allodial and had been inherited from his father Gregory. Yet in the same charter we learn that Dodila, whose name does not seem Frankish, served Charlemagne as a warrior, just as the better known John of Fontjoncouse had done.

This reliance on non-Frankish *milites* and warriors, as a matter of fact, seems to have been a regular feature of Carolingian policy -- particularly after 778. The most important military effort of the Carolingians during this period was the expedition sent into Catalonia in 801-802 which ended in the conquest of Barcelona. What troops were used on this expedition? Our sources are explicit in explaining that they were Franks, a contingent of Provençals under Count Leibulf, some Aquitanians, Gascons commanded by Duke Lupo, and an important Gothic element under Count Bera. As late as 820 we find a Frankish Count Rampon fighting side by side with a Spaniard, Count Asnar Galindo, in an invasion of Moslem territory, while a Frankish Count Ebles joins a Gascon Count Aznar in attacking Navarre.

A closer look at those holding interior castles proves equally revealing, for it shows how few seem to have been in the possession of the Frankish lay officials of the region concerned. Thus it is the church of Gerona which owned the castle of Vellosa in Ampurias, the abbey of Aniane that of Montecalmense. Conques was proprietor, after 801, of the *rocca* given it by Liutard just as Charroux gained possession of certain fortresses given this abbey by Count Roger of Limoges. It also seems probable that Brioude was the immediate proprietor of that castle located nearby in Auvergne. Other *castra* were under private control, like that Turres near Agde, those nearby *castella* granted *jure beneficario* by Charles the Bald in 844 or the castle of Nantes in Provence which was a privately owned allod. Thus, at the time of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious many fortresses seem to have been used more for the protection of abbeys, churches, and private individuals than as an integral part of the governmental system.

When one examines the Church during the same period, its non-Frankish character seems just as obvious. The most important churchman in the Midi was St. Benedict of Aniane, who served as an important advisor to the emperor Louis the Pious. His abbey of Aniane and its *cellas* were in large measure responsible for the monastic revival which took place in the Midi from Psalmodi to Carcassonne. Yet he was a Goth, the son of a count of Maguelonne. Maurontius, who was a bishop
of Marseille about 780, seems to have been a member of the old family of Gallo-Roman patricians of Provence. St. Benedict's principal collaborators in the Midi consisted of Gothic and refugee Spanish churchmen like Nimfridius of Narbonne, Abbot Castellanus of Arles, and Archbishop Agobard of Lyon. Without exception those churchmen and abbots who were responsible for the somewhat later revival of monasticism in Catalonia and Pallars and Ribagórça were non-Frankish. Even in Aquitaine the [67] names of men like Aquarnius, bishop of Cahors in 783, or Ferreolus, abbot of Broioude (817-834), or Anastasius, abbot of Conques about 823, reveal that they sprang from Gab-Roman stock. The Church south of Poitou and Burgundy was even less Frankish than lay officialdom. Finally it is worth emphasizing that the Carolingians allowed the inhabitants of Southern France and Catalonia to use their own law -- which would have been unlikely if they had been intent on dominating these regions in the interests of a Frankish minority. Thus not only were the Goths of Narbonne promised their own laws in 759, but afterwards records reveal a use of Visigothic law and procedure in every court south of Narbonne and Carcassonne. Aprisio holders were similarly allowed to continue the use of a non-Frankish legal system. Roman law also continued to be important over much of the Midi both in courts and in a more private capacity. We find it used in courts in Provence between 780 and 845, in tribunals a little later held at Nîmes, and it seems to have been the basis of the property law used in Rouergue. The personality of the law, which was maintained, whether it be Salic, Roman, or Visigothic is a rather clear indication of the equal treatment which the Carolingians accorded all the inhabitants of the Midi -- whatever their origins.

What emerges when one examines the Carolingian governmental system of Southern France and Catalonia, then, is a very different picture from that given us by Auzias, Calmette, and Dhondt. There was a use made of Frankish officials as counts throughout these regions, which is not surprising considering that they helped win the Midi for the Carolingians and were their relatives and familiars. There is evidence of some Frankish settlement or even colonization of these same regions. But except for the extreme southwest beyond the Garonne in Gascony, Aragón, and Navarre, the Carolingian system of government after 778 stands revealed as a multinational or multi-racial one. Once conquest had been completed, this became even truer than it had been earlier under Pepin and Charles Martel. One change, the use of aprisiones in Septimania and Catalonia is a specially good example of privileges given the non-Frankish population. Even more important, as we approach 828 we become more and more aware of the fact that there was a steady infiltration of non-Franks into both the Carolingian secular administration and the Church, which was resulting in a slow but inexorable modification of both toward a very different system than that envisaged by the distant emperors of Aix-la-Chapelle. Two forces, then, were at work in the Midi and Catalonia during this period and interacting upon one another. The first was that system of government imposed by the Carolingians. The second was the society of the Midi, which, surviving Carolingian conquest, continued as an element of importance.

Notes for Chapter 4

1. On the structure of the Carolingian empire see A. Kleinclausz, L'Empire Carolingien; H. Fichtenau, Charlemagne et l'empire Carolingien; and L. Haiphen, Der karolingische Imperium.

2. Astronomus, Vita Hludovici, ch. 4, p. 609; and Chron. of Moissac, anno 781, p. 297.

3. See the formal division of the empire between Louis the Pious and his brother Pepin which Charlemagne prepared in 806 in anticipation of his death in "Divisio Imperii," in Boretius, Capitularia, I, no. 45.
4. It is worth noting that Charlemagne included in his son Louis' kingdom of Aquitaine areas like Gascony, Septimania, and the Spanish March which had never been included in the earlier independent duchy of Aquitaine of Eudes, Hunald, and Waiffre. Auzias' contention, then, that the setting up of this kingdom was a sop to Aquitaine's particularism seems somewhat exaggerated. See L. Auzias, *L'Aquitaine Carolingienne* (778-987), pp. 1-63.

5. Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici*, ch. 24, p. 619. See the arguments against the young Pepin's bearing the royal title this early in L. Levillain, *Recueil des actes de Pépin I et Pépin II, rois d'Aquitaine*, p. cliv. At any rate at this early date Pepin was too young to exercise any effective royal authority.


7. On Louis the Pious' determination to set up an indivisible empire in 817, in contrast to the divided empire which Charlemagne planned in 806 see F. Ganshof, "Observations sur l'Ordinatio Imperii de 817," in *Festschrift Guido Kisch*, pp. 16-28. Perhaps a more logical comparison, however, would be between the "Ordinatio of 817" and Charlemagne's early investiture of Louis as king of Aquitaine in 781 and Pepin as king of Italy a little later. The "Divisio of 806" was a will which was only effective for the future. Louis' division of 817, if it is regarded as a will, was certainly written too early. If it was a system of setting up his sons and nephews as viceroys, it was so all-inclusive that it compromised Louis' own power as emperor. Despite Ganshof's contentions, then, it seems to have been a major blunder, from which much evil arose. Not the least of these evils was the revolt in Italy of Bernard, Louis' nephew, who as viceroy felt slighted by the "Ordinatio of 817."

8. See note above on the basic differences between the way in which Charlemagne and Louis planned the division of the empire, and Charlemagne's greater wisdom. To mark out the entire empire for such a division seems folly so early in his reign despite the obvious safeguards to imperial unity which the "Ordinatio of 817" contained.

9. The *Ordinatio* left Italy as a kingdom in the hands of Bernard ("Ordinatio Imperii," ch. 17, in Boretius, *Capitularia*, I, no. 136, p. 273). This did not satisfy Bernard, however, who revolted almost at once. The revolt was put down and the kingdom of Italy was extinguished. Haiphen, *Charlemagne et l'empire*, pp. 242-245.

10. All evidence seems to show that Charlemagne handled foreign affairs which affected the borders of the kingdom of Aquitaine, though Louis was its king after 781. See his removal of Duke Chorson in 789 for making an unsatisfactory agreement with the Gascons (Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici*, ch. 5, p. 609). This incidentally also shows him disposing of honores in this subkingdom. Note also that after a preliminary visit of an Asturian embassy to Louis' court at Toulouse in 794 (ibid., ch. 8, p. 611) serious negotiations between the empire and the Spanish kings in 797 and 798 were transferred to Aix-la-Chapelle. See M. Défourneaux, "Charlemagne et la monarchie Asturienne" in *Mélanges Louis Halphen*, pp. 179-184. Most important we have no evidence that Louis, as king of Aquitaine, ever disposed of any honores or any of the royal fisc. All charters we possess from this period bear the name of Charlemagne not Louis.

11. For limitations on Pepin's power as king of Aquitaine see the "Ordinatio Imperii," ch. 4-5, 708, 10, 12-16, 18, in Boretius, *Capitularia*, I, 270-274; and Ganshof, "Observations sur l'Ordinatio Imperii de 817," p. 24. On the other hand he was also given, in theory, a right to exercise certain powers in disposing of the crown's revenues in his domains (the fisc), in allotting honores, and in fighting defensive wars, which Louis himself never seems to have had as king ("Ordinatio Imperii," ch. 3, 7, 12, in Boretius, *Capitularia*). Until 827, however, he does not appear to have exercised such authority, for as late as 826 it was Louis who called to Aix-la-Chapelle the "custodios limitibus Hispaniae" according to *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. G. Kurze, anno 826; and Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici*, ch. 40, p. 630.
Then in 827 Pepin began to issue royal charters in his own name, which marks the beginning of later troubles. See the grant of Pepin to the abbey of Lagrasse in 827 in Levillain, *Recueil des actes de Pépin I et II*, no. 23, and in 828 a grant to the abbey of Montolieu in *Cartulaire et archives des communes de l'ancien diocese et de l'arrondissement de Carcassonne*, ed. M. Mahul, I, 70.


16. Actual reference in local charters to viscounts are rare indeed for this period, though we know the Carolingians had a place for them in their governing system. One is found at Narbonne, however. His court is mentioned in a charter of 791 (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, no. 10). And a certain Viscount Stephen is mentioned in a charter dealing with a court held there in 834 (*Catalunya Carolingia*, II, 442-444).

17. Our documents give us no references to vicars in the Midi during this period. The first reference is in a document of 845 from Marseille which mentions Rothbert, vicar of Count Adelbert as presiding over a court (*Cart. de Saint-Victor*, no. 26).

18. These are mentioned in documents dating from 780 and 845 from Marseille (*Cart. de Saint-Victor*, nos. 26, 31), and at Narbonne in 782 and 791 (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, nos. 6, 10).

19. Two *vassi dominici* are reported present at a court in Narbonne in 782 (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, no. 6). There is also a mention of a certain Bertrand, *vassus dominicus*, in a document from Auvergne dating from 823 (*Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Conques en Rouergue*, ed. A. Desjardins, no. 460).

20. All important abbeys in the Midi and Catalonia possessed such immunities from the time of Louis the Pious. So did almost all bishoprics and archbishoprics. On the Midi see E. Lesne, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France*, I-II. For Catalonia see Abadal, "La Catalogne sous l'empire de Louis le Pieux," pp. 32-53, and *Els Primers Comtes Catalans*, pp. 115-147.


22. See, for instance, an argument in 832 over a *cella* belonging to the abbey of Arles (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, no. 80). Or in 835 similar troubles over the usurpation of land belonging to the church of Urgell (*Catalunya Carolingia*, II, 284-285). For land belonging to the church of Maguelonne during this period see *Cartulaire de Maguelonne*, ed. J. Rouquet and A. Villamagne, I, no. 1. On land of Saint-Victor's near Marseille lost to a count see *Cart. de Saint-Victor*, no. 31, and on other interference with the rights of the bishop of Marseille by comital agents in 845 see *ibid.*, no. 26.


24. For an exception to this rule see the county of Carcassonne where control remained in the hands of

25. For examples of such *missi* see the record of a court held at Marseille in 780 in *Cart. de Saint-Victor*, no. 31, and in 782 in Narbonne in *Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, no. 60.

26. The first proof of such oaths of *fidelitas* and homage by bishops, abbots, counts, and *vassi dominici*, according to Ganshof, dates from 837 (*Annales Bertiniani*, ed. Waitz, anno 837, p. 15). See also for 838 Astronomus, *Vita Hludovici*, ch. 59, p. 644. On the other hand, as early as 802 a ceremony similar to this swearing of *fidelitas* or homage to the ruler took place when such royal vassals as counts, bishops, and abbots swore to be loyal to Charlemagne in a ceremony presided over by *missi dominici*. See "Capitulare missorum," ch. 2 and 4 in Boretius, *Capitularia*, I, no. 25, pp. 66-67. Again in a charter of 842 Pepin II calls an abbot, Radulf, a *fidelis* of his (*Cart. de Beaulieu*, no. 6).


28. Such *vassi dominici* are mentioned along with bishops, abbots, and counts as doing homage to Charles the Bald in 837 (*Annales Bertiniani*, anno 837, p. 15).


30. See the charter in which John of Fontjoncouse is called a *fidelis* in *Catalunya Carolingia*, II, appendix XIII, 443, and the general oath of homage given Louis the Pious in 816 by the large *aprisio* holders (*ibid.*, appendix IV, 420).


40. *Cartulaire d'Aniane*, ed. A. Cassan and E. Meynial, no. 306, which dates from the period 814-840. See also the charter of 802 which mentions a number of Frankish names, as well as a *villa franconica* (*ibid.*, no. 12).

41. See charter of 955 in "Cartulaire de l'Évêché d'Agde" (unprinted), no. 7, p. 36.


43. At Alzonne in 918 (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, nos. 137-140) and at Narbonne in 955 (*ibid.*, V, nos. 160-161).
44. See reference in a charter of 845 to scabini called "tam romanes quam salices" (Cart. de Saint-Victor, no. 26).


49. The walls of Mauguio were destroyed by Charles Martel in 739 (Chron. of Moissac, anno 739, p. 291; Annals of Aniane, col. 5-6; and Fredegarii cont., ch. 20, pp. 177-178). They were not rebuilt until late in the tenth century ("Chronicon Vetus Magalonense," in Cart. de Maguelonne, 1). On Pepin's destruction of the walls of Limoges in the eighth century and Bishop Turpin's refortification of the city in 905-914 see "Historia monasterii Uzercensis," in Cart. d'Uzerche, pp. 13-14. On the destruction of the fortifications of Périgord and of other civitates in the Limousin and Angoulême see Fredegarii cont., ch. 129-130, pp. 189-190, and Annales Laurissenses, anno 765, 766, pp. 144-145. There is no mention of Bordeaux's walls in records from the ninth century, which leads one to assume that they did not exist. Marseille presents the same situation as Bordeaux in this century. Note that the canons of Marseille in 923 had to take refuge in the castle of Fos to escape Moslem attack (Cart. de Saint-Victor, no. 1).

50. On the walls of Barcelona, which were able to resist a Moslem siege in 828 see Astronomus, Vita Hludovici, ch. 43, pp. 636-637. Both Gerona and Narbonne had fortifications which allowed them to resist Moslem attack in 793 (see P. Ponsch, "Les origines de l'abbaye d'Arles," in Etudes Roussillonnaises, IV, 70-72; and also Chron. of Moissac, anno 793, p. 290; Chron. of Uzès, col. 27; and Annals of Aniane, col. 9-10). In 844 Toulouse possessed city walls (Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Sernin de Toulouse, ed. C. Douais, no. 3). About Vienne see G. Letonnelier, "Essai sur l'origine des châtelains et des mandements en Dauphiné," in Annales de l'Université de Grenoble, I (1889), 7; Cartulaire de Vienne, no. 4, in Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-André-le-bas de Vienne, ed. U. Chevalier, pp. 214-215. About Avignon see Cart. de Vienne, no. 4, pp. 214-215; also see R. Poupardin, Recueil des actes des rois de Provence (855-928), p. 38.


52. Astronomus, Vita Hludovici, ch. 8, p. 611.


55. Cartulaire de Gellone, ed. A. Cassan and E. Meynial, no. 278.

56. Hist. Gén. de Lang., II, no. 105. See also mention of the castle of Popian in 804 (Cart. de Gellone, no. 143).

57. Cart. d'Aniane, nos. 1, 55. See also mention of a castellanus in "Cart. de l'Évêché d'Agde" (unprinted), no. 15.
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73. Fredegarii cont., ch. 131-135, pp. 190-192; and Annales Laurissenses, anno 767, 768, p. 146.
76. J. Lacarra, Orígenes del condado de Aragón, pp. 1-14.
78. Catalunya Carolingia, II, 313-314.
79. See Abadal's excellent account of these aprisio holders in "La Catalogne sous l'empire de Louis le Pieux," pp. 257-274.
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92. See *Vita Benedicti Anianensis*, and *Annals of Aniane*, anno 782, col. 9-10 on Benedict's role in founding abbeys "in Gociam" and Aquitaine.
95. R. de Abadal i de Vinyals, "La batalla del adopcionisme en la desintegración de la Iglesia visigoda" in *Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, and *Els Primers Comtes Catalans*, pp. 115-147.
98. *Cart. de Conques*, no. 460.
100. See record of courts held in Narbonne in 855 (*Cart. de Carcassonne*, IV, 192-193), and in 862 (*ibid.*, I, 71-72); or record of courts held in Roussillon in 832 (*Hist. Gén. de Lang.*, II, no. 80), and in 865 (*Cartulaire roussillonnais*, ed. B. Alart, no. 1); or in Nîmes in 898 (*Cart. de Nîmes*, no. 8).
103. See record of court held in Nîmes in 876 in *Cart. de Nîmes*, no. 1, and in 902 (*ibid.*, no.9).
104. In a grant of land to Conques in 801 Liutard states he is acting "secundum quod lex romana docet de post mortem causa donatis" (*Cart. de Conques*, no. 1). And see the very similar statement of Rudolf, count of Turenne in a charter of 823 from the Limousin (*Cart. de Beaulieu*, no. 185).
105. It is not surprising that this should be so, for those scholars whom Charlemagne drew to Aix-la-Chapelle during this same period were also multinational as far as their origin was concerned. If the Carolingian renaissance was more than a Frankish affair, why not the Carolingian administrative system too?