Mediaeval Studies

Volume 84
2022

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

OFFPRINT

REPURPOSING THE UNBUILT: CAROLINGIAN VIEWS OF EMPEROR JULIAN'S PROJECT TO REBUILD THE TEMPLE

David Appleby

RETRIEVING information about ancient rulers was one aspect of the much wider engagement with the past that was characteristic of the reform-minded Carolingian elite. Already during the period of Pippin III and Charlemagne, and more so under Louis the Pious and his successors, scholars, church councils, scribes, revisers, forgers, architects, and purveyors of relics found ways to appropriate the resources of the past.[1] Their methods of appropriation were more complex than mere copying or imitating. Their inventiveness and ingenuity are apparent both in the

[1] Matthias M. Tischler, "Remembering the Ostrogoths in the Carolingian Empire," in *Historiography and Identity III: Carolingian Approaches,* ed. Rutger Kramer, Helmut Reimitz, and Graeme Ward (Turnhout, 2021), 65–122; Eric Knibbs, "Ebo of Reims, Pseudo-Isidore, and the Date of the False Decretals," *Speculum* 92 (2017): 144–83; *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe,* ed. Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (Cambridge, 2015); Helmut Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity and the Framing of Western Ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge, 2015); Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Fälschung als Mittel politischer Auseinandersetzung: Ludwig der Fromme (814–840) und die Genese der pseudo-isidorischen Dekretalen* (Paderborn, 2011); *Zwischen Niederschrift und Wiederschrift: Frühmittelalterliche Hagiographie und Historiographie im Spannungsfeld von Kompendienüberlieferung und Editionstechenik,* ed. Richard Corradini, Maximilian Diesenberger, and Meta Niederkorn-Bruck (Vienna, 2010); Lynda L. Coon, "Collecting the Desert in the Carolingian West," *Church History and Religious Culture* 86 (2006): 135–62; Rosamond McKitterick, "Constructing the Past in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Royal Frankish Annals," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 7 (1997): 101–29; Yitzhak Hen, "Unity in Diversity: The Liturgy of Frankish Gaul before the Carolingians," in *Unity and Diversity in the Church,* ed. R. N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 32 (Cambridge, 1996), 19–30.

Mediaeval Studies 84 (2022): 221–71.

range of sources Carolingians examined and in the several uses they sometimes found for a single image, anecdote, or figure. Emperor Theodosius I (r. 379–95), for example, appeared in art, poetry, historical texts, and polemical literature produced throughout the period.[2] The practice of assigning historical and scriptural bynames to members of the royal court, which went back to Charlemagne's reign, took on a new aspect after the Astronomer compared Louis the Pious to Theodosius I, both of whom the author presented as praiseworthy for undergoing public penance.[3] What had been flattering and jocose became critical in the *Epitaphium Arsenii,* the dialogue composed by Paschasius Radbertus as eulogy and apology on behalf of his late friend and patron Wala of Corbie. Here comparison of Louis the Pious to Theodosius I became the means of introducing Empress Justina and other members of the Theo-

[2] To name just four examples, paintings in the palace at Ingelheim described by Ermoldus Nigellus (*In honorem Hludowici Christianissimi Caesaris Augusti* 4.273, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini 2 [Berlin, 1884], 66) associated the ruling house with Theodosius, among other ancient rulers; Frechulf of Lisieux drew attention to Theodosius I as the destroyer of heathen temples (Graeme Ward, "Lessons in Leadership: Constantine and Theodosius in Frechulf of Lisieux's *Histories,*" in *Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe,* ed. C. Gantner, 68–83); in 844 Lupus of Ferrières dedicated to Charles the Bald an epitome of the deeds of the Roman emperors with the comment that he should attend in particular to Trajan and Theodosius (*Epistola* 37, ed. Léon Levillain, *Loup de Ferrières: Correspondence,* 2 vols. [Paris, 1964], 1:164); and about 860, Hincmar cited the example of Theodosius I four times in his work on the divorce of King Lothar (ed. Letha Böhringer, *Hinkmar von Reims: De divortio Lotharii Regis et Theutbergae Reginae,* MGH Concilia 4, Supplement 1 [Hannover, 1992], 201, 247, 253, and 256).

[3] Mary Garrison, "The Social World of Alcuin: Nicknames at York and at the Carolingian Court," in *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court,* ed. Luuk A. J. R. Houwen and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Groningen, 1998), 59–79; the practice continued through the reign of Louis the Pious, for example, Walahfrid Strabo, *De imagine Tetrici* (ed. Michael W. Herren, "The *De imagine Tetrici* of Walahfrid Strabo: Edition and Translation," *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 1 [1991]: 118–39); Peter Godman, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987); Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris* 35 (ed. Ernst Tremp, *Astronomus, Das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs,* MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum 64 [Hannover 1995], 405); Helena Siemes, *Beiträge zum literarischen Bild Kaiser Ludwigs des Frommen in der Karolingerzeit* (Freiburg, 1966), 47–52.

dosian family as invidious bynames of Louis's second wife Judith and her son and step-sons. Judith's enemy, Wala, appeared now as Arsenius, one time tutor to Justina's son, and now as the prophet Jeremiah, whose bold truth-speaking to power eventually resulted in exile and lamentation. Wala's suffering because of Judith resembled the suffering Justina had inflicted upon Ambrose. Radbertus employed what Mayke de Jong characterizes as an "eclectic and associative framework of late antique Christianity" in a strategy of identification he directed at important Frankish figures of his own time.[4] Certainly this esoteric mode of communication was the exclusive discourse of an educated cultural elite. It presupposed familiarity with the texts that preserved information about Theodosius and his world, and a willingness to transpose that information as template for representing events and actors in the present. Material selected from ancient texts became the medium in which Radbertus and others transcribed their response to contemporary events. This adaptive appropriation of the past was an act of remembering, not an act of copying or imitating ancient models.[5]

In this light it is worth considering how Carolingians remembered Emperor Julian (r. 361–63), who was in some respects an antitype of Theodosius I. Just as calumny, invective, and *ad hominem* abuse directed at living persons often expose what matters most within a society or community, so too notices of the actions and character of disreputable figures of the past reveal information about the assumptions, expectations, and self-presentation of the authors who mentioned them.[6] Although known

[4] Mayke de Jong, *Epitaph for an Era: Politics and Rhetoric in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2019), 137.

[5] For this use of the term "remembering," see Lawrence Nees, "Antique and Faux-Antique in Carolingian Manuscripts," in *Tributes to Richard K. Emmerson: Crossing Medieval Disciplines,* ed. Deirdre Carter, Elina Gertsman, and Karlyn Griffith (Turnhout, 2021), 19–39, at 24; idem, *A Tainted Mantle: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court* (Philadelphia, 1991); and Andrew J. Romig, "The Wrong Kind of Flattery: Critique and Praise in Walahfrid Strabo's *De imagine Tetrici,*" in *In This Modern Age: Medieval Studies in Honor of Paul Edward Dutton,* ed. Courtney M. Booker and Anne A. Latowsky (Budapest, 2023), 23–45.

[6] Irene van Renswoude, "Crass Insults: *Ad hominem* Attacks and Rhetorical Conventions," in *Das Christentum im frühen Europa: Diskurse – Tendenzen – Ent-*

through a small range of ancient sources which were almost entirely hostile to him, the figure of Julian took on several different meanings in ninth-century discourse. As a consequence, we should speak not of one but of several Carolingian receptions of Emperor Julian. The present study supports this claim by examining some of the main ninth-century references to Julian, and in particular Carolingian responses to the story of Julian's project to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem.[7]

Few Carolingians gave Julian much attention, and only Frechulf of Lisieux, Amulo of Lyon, and Ado of Vienne mentioned his plan to rebuild the Temple.[8] Although no brick-and-mortar Third Temple actually materialized, as a projected monument or even an anti-monument it assumed three noticeably different meanings in Carolingian culture examined in the sections below on history, polemic, and hagiography.[9] Frechulf showed that even this minor episode of the non-Temple was

scheidungen, ed. Uta Heil (Berlin, 2019), 171–94, at 182; also more generally eadem, *The Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2021).

[7] Scott Bradbury, "Julian and the Jews," in *A Companion to Julian the Apostate,* ed. Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich (Leiden, 2020), 267–92; Johannes Hahn, "Kaiser Julian und ein dritter Temple? Idee, Wirklichkeit und Wirkung eines gescheiterten Projektes," in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels: Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung,* ed. Johannes Hahn (Tübingen, 2002), 238–62.

[8] Amolo and Ado are numbers 38 and 40 in the inventory of David B. Levenson, "The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 35 (2004): 409–60, at 445, whose list omits Frechulf and includes a work probably from the twelfth century which is wrongly attributed to Haymon of Auxerre. See Rossana E. Guglielmetti, "Haimo Autissiodorensis mon.," in *La trasmissione dei testi latini del Medioevo. Mediaeval Latin Texts and Their Transmission* (Te.tra.), vol. 3, ed. Paolo Chiesa and Lucia Castaldi (Florence, 2008), 187–255, at 252; and Marie-Hélène Jullien, "Haimo [Autissiodorensis] mon.," in *Clavis des auteurs latins du Moyen Age, Territoire français 735–987, tomus III: Faof Cabillonensis–Hilduinus Sancti Dionysii,* ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien (Turnhout, 2010), 266–360.

[9] On the connection between unbuilt or destroyed monuments and memory, see the editors' Introduction to *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade,* ed. Robert S. Nelson and Margaret Olin (Chicago, 2003), 1–9; and Robert Harbison, *The Built, the Unbuilt, and the Unbuildable: In Pursuit of Architectural Meaning* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

significant when understood in relation to the role of the real Temple in the overall course of history; the anti-monument furnished probative evidence of the truth of providential history it was intended to reject. What impressed Amulo most about Julian's anti-monument were its implications not for judgments about the past but for expectations about the future; as one element in an effort to order, unify, and exclude outsiders from the church of Lyon, Amulo related the story in a denunciation of contemporary Jews for their wrong-headed anticipation of future deliverance from the captivity that had begun during the reign of Vespasian. Ado repurposed the anecdote of the unbuilt Temple in a chronicle that reflected his own interest in the numinous character of place; in this presentation Julian's mistake was not so much about the historical past or the messianic future but a blasphemous effort to alter holy topography as this had taken shape in the sixth age of the world. To clarify these points, it will be necessary to consider some of the wider evidence of Carolingian awareness of Julian and his reign alongside references to his project for rebuilding the Temple.

Sources.

A range of different images of the emperor appeared during his lifetime and immediately after his death.[10] The late antique Christian *oecumene* was so various, diverse, and shifting that no unanimous response to Julian emerged, but instead particular circumstances and anticipated audiences led the emperor's critics to adapt his image to one discursive mode or another, whether polemical, historical, or hagiographic.[11] Some of this complexity was flattened out, and most of the earlier contexts had been obscured in the sources to which Carolingian readers had access. The reception of the image of Julian, like that of other material from the ancient past, was not simple or direct but involved mediation through translators, epitomists, redactors, and other intervening agents.[12]

[10] See the studies collected in *A Companion to Julian the Apostate,* ed. Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Rebenich.

[11] Peter van Nuffelen, "The Christian Reception of Julian," ibid., 360–97, at 360–62.

[12] Christian Thrue Djurslev, "Hrabanus Maurus' Post-Patristic Renovation of 1 Maccabees 1:1–8," *Open Theology* 7 (2021): 271–88, at 274–75, points out that

Carolingian authors who mentioned the emperor used a remarkably small group of ancient texts. They had no access to most of the Greek sources, such as Julian's own writings and the orations of John Chrysostom. Only fragments of the important orations of Gregory of Nazianzus were available to them. Some of the Latin sources that could have been consulted were not, especially the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus, but also brief references in Ambrose and Jerome.[13] Widely available and often used in the Carolingian period was Rufinus's *Ecclesiastical History,* which treated the episode of the Temple at greater length than any other source that has survived.[14] Written in 401/402 and dedicated to Bishop Chromatius of Aquileia, Rufinus's work was a Latin translation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History,* which had ended with the con-

Hrabanus's reconstruction of the past was in fact a reconstruction of the past as mediated by the sources and translations he consulted.

[13] An important source on Julian's reign in general, Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res gestae* 23.2.3 mentioned the project to rebuild the Temple and is number 6 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 417; see Jan W. Drijvers, "Ammianus Marcellinus 23.1.2–3: The Rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem," in *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus,* ed. J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst, and H. C. Tietler [Amsterdam, 1992], 19–26). One manuscript of the *Res gestae* (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Vat. lat. 1873) was produced in the first third of the ninth century at Fulda, and another, which was produced in the first half of the ninth century at Hersfeld (Landesbibliothek Kassel 2° Ms. philol. 27 and 4° Ms. chem.31), has survived only in fragments; see Gavin Kelly and Justin Stover, "The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of Ammianus Marcellinus: A Reconsideration," *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 62 (2016): 108–29. Some Carolingian readers knew the work, but apparently none used it as a source of information about Julian. For example in Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris* (ed. Tremp, 561), Tremp identifies thirteen places in which the anonymous biographer of Louis the Pious borrowed from the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus. Ambrose, *Epistola* 74.12, ed. M. Zelzer, *Sancti Ambrosii opera* 10.3, CSEL 82 [Vienna, 1982], 61), and Jerome, *In Danielem* 11.34 (ed. F. Glorie, *Hieronymus: Commentariorum in Danielem libri III,* CCL 75A [Turnhout, 1964], 923–24) are numbers 5 and 8 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 417 and 421.

[14] Rufinus, *Historia ecclesiastica* [henceforth Rufinus, *He*] 10.38–40 (ed. Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke* 2.2, *Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* [Leipzig, 1908], 997–98); number 7 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 419.

version and subsequent pro-Christian policies of Constantine the Great (r. 306–37), and a continuation of the story down until the death of Theodosius I in 395. Aiming at thematic unity and continuity between the two sections, Rufinus produced what we might now call a "revised, updated, and expanded edition" of the earlier work.[15] The decades that had elapsed between the reign of Constantine and the first years of the fifth century made it impossible to sustain Eusebius's triumphant celebration of the peace of the church under a Christian Roman emperor. The fourth-century bishops of Aquileia had been involved in the theological and political conflicts between Arian and Nicene parties, and in 394 Theodosius had defeated the usurper Eugenius in battle not far from the city. With this horizon in view, Rufinus was less positive about Christian empire in itself but still rejoiced in Christian emperors who enjoyed earthly success because of their orthodoxy, piety, and deference to prelates and holy men. While his historical vision differed from that of Eusebius, Rufinus worked to unify the *Ecclesiastical History* as a whole by continuing to trace several themes that Eusebius had followed, including the disasters that overwhelmed the Jews because of their failure to acknowledge Jesus Christ as the Messiah. This is evident in his narration of the harm brought upon the Jews who got involved in Julian's plan to restore the Temple in Jerusalem.[16]

In the chapter on Julian which he included in *Historiarum adversus paganos libri vii,* written in 416/17, Paul Orosius did not refer to rebuilding the Temple but did mention the emperor's resolution to build an amphitheater in Jerusalem for the purpose of tormenting Christians.[17] Although God thwarted Julian's wicked plan by cutting short his life, his

[15] Mark Humphries, "Rufinus' Eusebius: Translation, Continuation, and Edition in the Latin *Ecclesiastical History,*" *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16 (2008): 143–64, at 163; Michael Hollerich, *Making Christian History: Eusebius of Caesarea and His Readers* (Berkeley, 2021), 141–70; Thomas C. Ferguson, *The Past Is Prologue: The Revolution of Nicene Historiography* (Leiden, 2005), 81–123.

[16] Françoise Thelamon, *Païens et chrétiens au IV^e^ siècle: l'apport de l'"Histoire ecclésiastique" de Rufîn d'Aquilée* (Paris, 1981), 294–96.

[17] Paul Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri vii* [henceforth *Historiarum*] 7.30 (ed. C. Zangenmeister, CSEL 5 [Vienna, 1882], 509–11); number 9 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 421.

reign showed that even after Constantine the empire's value in human history was limited and relative; what mattered to Orosius was the moral character of the emperor himself, whether Constantine, Julian, or Theodosius. Orosius's historical optimism was based not on the sacralized empire that Eusebius had extolled, but on an ecclesiology of progress and on the moral improvement of individual Christians since the Incarnation.[18] This outlook had implications for the Temple in Jerusalem which Frechulf would later notice. The supersession of the Old Covenant by the New meant that the Temple's role in providential history had ended, and so Titus razed the Temple for a reason he did not fathom.[19] Although Orosius's work was widely available in ninth-century Francia, it seems that only Frechulf drew upon it to craft his discussion of Julian.

For information about Julian and his reign, including an account of the project to rebuild the Temple, Carolingians depended above all on passages from the Greek ecclesiastical historians assembled by Cassiodorus sometime in the period 540–62 in his *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*.[20] A standard book in episcopal and greater monastic libraries, this work has survived in about a dozen manuscripts produced in the ninth century.[21] It was the go-to source of information about Julian and a great many other historical matters that occurred in the fourth and fifth centuries between the reigns of Constantine and Theodosius and during the time of several of the important church councils. Cassiodorus described the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* as a digest of selections from the mid-fifth-century ecclesiastical histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret which had been translated by Epiphanius and selected and ar-

[18] Peter Van Nuffelen, *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History* (Oxford, 2021), 186–206, esp. 190.

[19] Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.9.4–6 (ed. Zangenmeister, 460). Van Nuffelen, *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History,* 189, mentions other cases in which Roman emperors were ironically oblivious to what Orosius understood to be the true significance of their own actions.

[20] Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* [henceforth *Het*] 6.43 (ed. Walter Jacob and Rudolph Hanslik, CSEL 71 [Vienna, 1952], 365–66); number 36 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 445.

[21] *Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi (500–1500),* ed. Michael Lapidge, Gian Carlo Garfagnini, Claudio Leonardi, Francesco Santi, et al., vol. 2 (Florence, 2004–8), 578.

ranged in a single account stretching to twelve books.[22] Although Cassiodorus presented the name of each author at the head of each passage excerpted from his work, there is no further effort to distinguish the context, purpose, or anticipated audience of the three histories.[23] The *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* effaces those earlier contexts and purposes and instead, as Désirée Scholten has noted, bears traces of the interests and principles of selection of its sixth-century Italian compiler.[24] This was the period in which Emperor Justinian intervened twice (543/544 and 553) in a dogmatic issue which had been settled by the Council of Chalcedon, and engaged in a protracted struggle with the Ostrogoths and leading families of the Roman senate over political control of Italy. Scholten proposes that the selection and arrangement of material in the work suggest that piety and philanthropy are key attributes of the good sovereign, and that Cassiodorus attended particularly to "the question of the relationship of power between an emperor and his bishops."[25] Cassiodorus may have been thinking about the post-war organization of Italy and the unity of the empire. Although each of the three historians—Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret—had mentioned Julian's project to rebuild the Temple, only Theodoret's report found its way into Cassiodorus's digest.[26] This apparently made no difference in the ninth century,

[22] Cassiodorus, Praefatio (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 1–2).

[23] Peter van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété: étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène* (Louvain, 2004); Pier Franco Beatrice, "De Rufin à Cassiodore. La réception des Histoires ecclésiastiques grecques dans l'Occident latin," in *L'Historiographie de l'église des premiers siècles,* ed. Bernard Pouderon and Yves-Marie Duval (Paris, 2001), 237–57.

[24] Désirée Scholten, "Cassiodorus' *Historia tripartita* Before the Earliest Extant Manuscripts," in *Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe,* 34–50; Lieve van Hoof and Peter van Nuffelen, "The Historiography of Crisis: Jordanes, Cassiodorus and Justinian in Mid-Sixth-Century Constantinople," *Journal of Roman Studies* 107 (2017): 275–300.

[25] Scholten, "Cassiodorus' *Historia tripartita* before the Earliest Extant Manuscripts," 46.

[26] Theodoret, *Historia ecclesiastica* [henceforth Theodoret, *He*] 3.20 (ed. L. Parmentier and G. C. Hansen, *Théodoret de Cyr: Histoire ecclésiastique livres III–V,* Sources Chrétiennes 530 [Paris, 2009], 156–60), as presented in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.43.1–8 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 365–66). Entries for Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret are numbers 11, 12, and 13 in Levenson, "Ancient and

however, because Carolingian references to Julian's project to rebuild the Temple depended upon Rufinus's account, directly in the case of the scholarly Frechulf, indirectly in the cases of Amulo and Ado, who repeated the abridgment of the report of Rufinus contained in the *Chronica maiora* which Isidore of Seville wrote in the early seventh century.[27]

I. History

Julian, who had never been absent from the chronologies and histories of the early Middle Ages, was often mentioned briefly and sometimes received more sustained attention in histories written in the Carolingian period. His posthumous reputation as a persecutor induced some authors to exaggerate his rapacity.[28] At least one included Julian in a light context. In 885–86, Notker of St. Gallen incorporated him as a historical place marker in his collection of facetious anecdotes about Charlemagne. The second book of *Gesta Karoli magni* began with a highly condensed account of the disorder and disintegration of the Roman Empire between the divinely mandated death of Julian in the Persian War and the flare-up of Avar depredation in the Frankish orbit because of the murder of

Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 424–25. According to Levenson, Theodoret relied upon Rufinus's report, and perhaps a now lost Arian historian, as well as the orations of Gregory Nazianzen and perhaps the account of Sozomen.

[27] Isidore of Seville, *Chronica Maiora* [henceforth *Chronica*] 2.345 (ed. José Carlos Martin, CCL 112 [Turnhout, 2003], 163 and 165); number 37 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 445.

[28] In the 870s the papal librarian Anastasius included in his *Chronographia tripartita* Theophanes' story of Bishop Dorotheus of Tyre who had survived persecution and exile under Diocletian only to be beaten to death by Julian's agents at the age of one hundred and seven. But Theophanes apparently modified a story told by Eusebius, who listed Dorotheus as a learned priest of Antioch who had survived Diocletian's persecution and was a personal acquaintance of Eusebius. The detail of his death at the hands of Julian was something Theophanes added. Anastasius, *Chronographia tripartita* (ed. Charles de Boor, *Theophanis chronographia,* vol. 2 [Leipzig, 1885], 84–85); Theophanes the Confessor, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History, AD 284–813,* translated and annotated by Geoffrey Greatrex, Cyril Mango, and Roger Scott (Oxford, 1997), 38; Rufinus, *He* 7.32 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 717–19).

Bishop Desiderius of Vienne († 607) and the banishment of Saints Columbanus and Gallus by Frankish princes and their queens.[29]

More serious in its intention and much wider in its scope was the *Histories* of Bishop Frechulf of Lisieux, a chronicle of world history stretching from Adam to about the year 600, which Frechulf completed in about 830.[30] The work comprised twelve books divided into two parts, the first part, in seven books, covering the period from the Creation to the birth of Christ, and the second, in five books, covering the period from the Incarnation to the papacy of Gregory I. The *Histories* depends extensively and often verbatim upon its sources, and Frechulf in his dedication of the first part to Abbot Helisachar presented himself as a compiler and epitomist of the histories, chronologies, and biographies of his predecessors.[31] These circumstances have challenged but not prevented recent

[29] Notker, *Gesta Karoli magni* 2.1 (ed. Hans F. Haefele, MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum 12 [Berlin, 1959], 49): "Cum Deo odibilis Iulianus in bello Persico cęlitus fuisset peremptus et a regno Romanorum non solum transmarinę provintię sed et proxima Pannonia, Noricus, Retia vel Germania Francique propter interfectionem sancti Desiderii Viennensis episcopi et expulsionem sanctissimorum advenarum, Columbani videlicet et Galli, retro labi cępissent, gens Hunorum." In a handbook addressed to his pupil Salomo in about 885, Notker, *Notatio de viris illustribus* (ed. Ernst Dümmler, *Das Formelbuch des Bischofs Salomo III von Konstanz* [Leipzig, 1857], 77) mentioned "detestandus apostata Julianus" as one of the persecutors whose activity had given Christian authors reason to record *passiones sanctorum*. On *Gesta Karoli magni,* see Matthew Innes, "Politics of Humour in the Carolingian Renaissance," in *Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages,* ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge, 2002), 131–56, at 148–53; and David Ganz, "Humour as History in Notker's *Gesta Karoli magni,*" in *Monks, Nuns, and Friars in Mediaeval Society,* ed. Edward B. King, Jacqueline T. Schaefer, and William B. Wadley (Sewanee, 1989), 171–83.

[30] After receiving an early formation at Fulda, Frechulf spent some time at the court of Louis the Pious before becoming bishop of Lisieux in 822/825, a position he held until his death in 850/852. See Graeme Ward, *History, Scripture and Authority in the Carolingian Empire: Frechulf of Lisieux* (Oxford, 2022), 11–15.

[31] Frechulf, *Prologus ad Elisacharum abbatem* 51–61 (ed. Michael I. Allen, *Frechulfi Lexouiensis episcopi opera omnia,* CCCM 169A [Turnhout, 2002], 20) presents himself not as an authoritative source but as the one who gathered and selected his material from the authoritative sources. He claimed to make a unified, single narrative account of memorable events that was true, clear, and succinct. Assurance of the veracity of Frechulf's narrative of events he himself had not

scholars from perceiving the intelligence behind the *Histories* and showing that Frechulf had characteristic means of selecting, reordering, and sometimes rephrasing his material into a whole that was not simply an indiscriminate hodgepodge.[32] The author himself wrote that his intention was to teach, a point he made in his dedication of the second part to the Empress Judith, with the recommendation that she use the *Histories* in the education of the young prince Charles. Frechulf's narrative of the "truth of history" was meant to act as a mirror in which the prince could discern in the experience of others what he should do and what he should avoid doing.[33]

The chapter on Emperor Julian (2.4.9) was more likely to furnish a Carolingian prince with examples of what to avoid than a pattern of good rule. Julian's reign had been brief and his place in the *Histories* was

witnessed lay in the authority of his sources. See Ward, *History, Scripture and Authority,* 28–54, 58, 63, and 65.

[32] Ward, *History, Scripture and Authority;* Sam Ottewill-Soulsby, "'Hunting diligently through the volumes of the Ancients': Frechulf of Lisieux on the First City and the End of Innocence," in *Remembering and Forgetting the Ancient City,* ed. Javier Martínez Jiménez and Sam Ottewill-Soulsby (Barnsley, UK, 2022), 225–45; Graeme Ward, "The Sense of an Ending in the Histories of Frechulf of Lisieux," in *Historiography and Identity III. Carolingian Approaches* (n. 1 above), 291–315; Elisabeth Mégier "Karolingische Weltchronistik zwischen Historiographie und Exegese: Frechulf von Lisieux und Ado von Vienne," in *Diligens scrutator sacri eloquii. Beiträge zur Exegese- und Theologiegeschichte des Mittelalters. Festgabe für Rainer Berndt SJ zum 65. Geburtstag,* ed. Matthias M. Tischler, Hanns Peter Neuheuser, and Ralf M. W. Stammberger (Münster, 2016), 37–52; Nikolaus Staubach, "*Christiana tempora*. Augustin und das Ende der alten Geschichte in der Weltchronik Frechulfs von Lisieux," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29 (1995): 167–206; R. Savigni, "Storia universale e storia ecclesiastica nel *Chronicon* di Freculfo di Lisieux," *Studi medievali,* Ser. III, 28 (1987): 155–92.

[33] Frechulf, *Prologus ad Iudith imperatoricem* 28–32 (ed. Allen, 436): "His enim velut in speculo per vestram sanctissime devotionis admonitionem atque iussionem dominus meus Karolus, gloriosissimus vestrae filius excellentiae, inspicere quid agendum vel quid vitandum sit poterit." Ibid. 43–46 (ed. Allen, 437): "Quibus imperatorum gestis sanctorumque triumphis atque doctorum magnificentium doctrinis inlustratus, cautius quid agendum sit, sive subtilius invenit quid sit vitandum." Frechulf, *Prologus ad Elisacharum abbatem* 37–40 (ed. Allen, 19), referred metaphorically to the work as painting: "Haec quidem omnia ceu picta breui in tabula meae ostendens paruitati nullam excusationis occasionem reliquisti, sed otius operam dare imperasti."

small, a chapter amounting to about half of one percent of the work's overall word-count. Nevertheless, to assemble this passage Frechulf drew material from more than one place in each of four sources: three from Rufinus's *Historia ecclesiastica,* two from the fourth-century *Epitome de Caesaribus,* three from Orosius's *Historiarum,* and nine from Cassiodorus's *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita*. Frechulf edited and arranged these excerpts to highlight antipathy to Christianity as the central theme of Julian's reign. He started by pointing out that Julian, once Constantius was gone, attacked the church indirectly, by excluding Christians from professorships of liberal studies.[34] Then, in an analeptic passage, Frechulf explained Julian's proclivity for indirection and the origin of his hatred for Christianity. Before Constantius's death, Julian protected himself by sporting a monkish haircut and openly reading Christian books while secretly indulging in philosophy and consulting oracles to find out whether he would gain the throne. Julian came to hate the sign of the cross when a soothsayer convinced him that it had no power over the demons that the *magus* had summoned.[35] Once he assumed sole authority, Julian feigned disapproval of his predecessor by recalling bishops Constantius had exiled.[36] Although the motivation for the disastrous project to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem might have seemed to be Julian's respect for Jewish custom, in fact his hatred of Christianity was behind it. This passage occupies the center of the chapter and comprises a combination of material borrowed mostly from Rufinus:

> Since Julian was a clever and cunning deceiver, out of hatred of the Christians he ordered Jews from everywhere to gather at Jerusalem and, paying the expenses from the public treasury, he instructed that they rebuild the Temple and there offer sacrifices according to the Law, so that at least in

[34] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 630.1–9), relying on Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.30.1–3 (ed. Zangenmeister, 509–10).

[35] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 630–31.10–34), relying on passages of Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* [henceforth Socrates, *He*] 3.1.1–11 (ed. G. C. Hansen, *Socrate de Constantinople: Histoire ecclésiastique livres II et III,* Sources Chrétiennes 493 [Paris, 2005], 244–48) and Theodoret, *He* 3.3.2–5 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 104), included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.1.12–15 and 16–19 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 307–8).

[36] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 631.35–37), relying on Rufinus, *He* 10.28 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 990).

> this way he could abolish Christianity. But by a wonderful dispensation of God most of the Jews who had gathered there were killed by an earthquake, while others were burned to death by avenging flames. Those who survived saw the sign of the cross both in the sky and marked indelibly on each person's clothing. Thus against their will they were compelled to confess that Christ is the son of God. Terrified by these signs they departed.[37]

Next Julian built what Frechulf termed pagan temples and reformed the rites and practices of the old cult to make them resemble those of the Christians.[38] When this too failed to draw people away from Christianity, Julian turned from persuasion and indirection to force.[39] One of the factors prompting this policy shift was Julian's arrogance and vainglory, which he expressed in word and deed. In the Senate he recited an oration criticizing all previous emperors, and he also wrote discourses against the Christians.[40] Now eager to gain glory in war, Julian vowed to his

[37] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 631–32.35–48): "Qui cum astutus atque callidus esset deceptor, Iudaeos ob Christianorum odium Hierosolimam undique convenire iubens et ex publico eis expensas largiri praecipiens ut templum reaedificarent et ibi hostias legales immolarent, ut sic saltim Christianismum aboleri posset. Sed mira Dei dispensatione maxima pars Iudaeorum qui illic convenerant terrae motu perempta, reliqui uero flammis ultricibus exusti. Qui autem superfuerunt signum etiam crucis tam in caelo quam et in uniuscuiusque ueste cernentes, quod et si uolentes nequaquam ex eis delere poterant. Itaque inuiti compulsi sunt Christum Dei Filium fateri. Quibus signis territi discesserunt." This report is an abridged version of Rufinus, *He* 10.38–40 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 997–98), and possibly with several words and phrases taken from Theodoret, *He* 3.20.1–8 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 156–60), which is number 13 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 425, as repeated in Latin by Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.43.1–3 and 6–8 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 365–66); see ibid., 445.

[38] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 632.49–60), relying on a passage of Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* [henceforth Sozomen, *He*] 5.16.1–4 (ed. Günter Christian Hansen, *Sozomenos: Historia ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte,* Fontes Christiani 73.2 [Turnhout, 2004], 626–28), quoted in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.29.1–3 and 6.30.1 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 345–46 and 349, respectively).

[39] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 632.60–62), relying on a passage of Sozomon, *He* 5.17.1 (ed. Hansen, 634) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.30.1 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 349).

[40] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 632–33.63–69), relying on a passage of Socrates, *He* 3.1.54–59 (ed. Hansen, 260) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.1.39 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 311–12).

gods the blood of Christians and ordered construction of an amphitheater in Jerusalem where they would be put to death upon his triumphant return.[41] But this plan was destined to fail too, for, after a traitor lured his army away from Ctesiphon into the desert, Julian ventured out alone, was mortally wounded, and died bitterly invoking the "Galilean" who had overcome him.[42]

Few words in the chapter on Julian's reign are Frechulf's, which is in keeping with his normal practice. But at the end of the passage Frechulf provided the following conclusion in his own voice:

> "Thus merciful God brought to nothing these blasphemous designs through the death of their blasphemous author." Because he had willingly deserted God the creator of everything, and in his insolent petulance trusted in nefarious magical arts, as if he, more daring than everyone, should precede all, he paid the deserved penalty. For it is not fitting that the emperor should surpass others in reckless daring, but [he should surpass them] in moderation and sound plans. "His own well-being, [and] with it always the safety of everyone, must be preserved, especially in war."[43]

The lessons to be gathered from Julian's record are several. Most obvious is that his determination to gain glory in battle no matter what the risk was not heroic but arrogant and irresponsible. Such reckless bravado

[41] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 633.72–83), relying on *Epitome de caesaribus* 43.1 and 8 (ed. Michel Festy, *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Abrégé des Césars* [Paris, 1999], 49–50) and Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.30.4–6 (ed. Zangenmeister, 510).

[42] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 633.79–86), relying on Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.30.6 (ed. Zangenmeister, 510–11) and on passages of Theodoret 3.25.7 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 172) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.47.3 and 6.4.12 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 372 and 316, respectively) and of Rufinus, *He* 10.36 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 996).

[43] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 634.87–92): "'Sic misercors Deus impia consilia impii morte dissolvit.' Quia Deum auctorem omnium sponte deseruit nefariis confisus artibus magicis suae leuitatis petulantia, quasi omnibus audacior cunctos anteiret, meritas luit poenas. Non enim decet imperatorem audacia aliis praeferre, sed moderatione et salubribus consiliis: cuius salus propria cum semper ad securitatem omnium, in bello maxime conseruanda est." The first sentence is Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.30.6 (ed. Zangenmeister, 510) and the last sentence appears to be modeled on *Epitome de caesaribus* 43.7 (ed. Festy, 50): "audax plus, quam imperatorem decet, cui salus propria cum semper ad securitatem omnium, ⟨tum⟩ in bello maxime conservanda est."

was incompatible with the craft of military leadership as discussed in Vegetius's *Epitoma rei militaris,* a copy of which Frechulf had edited and presented to Charles the Bald.[44] More fundamental, however, was Julian's distorted perception of the forces at work in the world and consequent overestimation of his own power to shape affairs. How far his aspiration exceeded his grasp is evident in Frechulf's account of the construction of temples and the plan to institute a reformed worship of the gods in the inverted image of the Christian cult, clergy, and care of the poor. Still more striking as an index of his blasphemous plans was Julian's determination to memorialize successes not yet achieved. This is plain in his two monumental building projects in Jerusalem, the restoration of the Temple and the initiative to build an amphitheater in which to torment Christians. The enormity of Julian's plans for Jerusalem can only be appreciated in light of the place of the Temple in Frechulf's account.

The importance of the Temple in the *Histories* reflects the tradition of chronicles and ecclesiastical histories Frechulf drew upon. His Christian sources, especially the graphic, tabular *Chronicle* of Eusebius-Jerome, were concerned not only to show the progress of Israel and the establishment and growth of the church and orthodox faith, but to synchronize those developments with the wider panorama of world history as this had been chronicled in ancient times.[45] They identified nodal points at which the stories of different kingdoms and empires converged, for these boundary moments punctuated the stages of the providential course of history.[46] Graeme Ward has observed that the Temple in Jerusalem,

[44] Frechulf, *Prologus ad Karolum Calvum regem in libellos Flavii Vegeti Renati de re militari nuper emendatos* (ed. Allen, 725–29).

[45] Although Frechulf was aware of the six-ages schema that Bede had favored, for example, Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.1.2 (ed. Allen, 442) echoing Bede, *De temporum ratione liber capita lxvi–lxxi, Chronica maiora* 66.268 (ed. Charles W. Jones, CCL 123B [Turnhout, 1977], 495), Ward, *History, Scripture and Authority,* 89, shows that he "routinely followed Eusebius-Jerome's Septuagint-based chronology." On the implications of Frechulf's reversion to the Eusebian-Hieronymian tradition of reckoning historical time, see Johannes Heil, "'Nos Nescientes de Hoc Velle Manere'—'We Wish to Remain Ignorant about This': Timeless End, or: Approaches to Reconceptualizing Eschatology After A.D. 800 (A.M. 6000)," *Traditio* 55 (2000): 73–103, at 87.

[46] Frechulf's story unfolded in a series of books, seven in the first volume and

which appears several times as one of those nodal points in the *Histories,* also provided Frechulf with "guiding principles" in the treatment of Jewish history.[47] Solomon's construction of the Temple marked an epoch, to which Frechulf reckoned from the flight from Egypt; from Abraham and King Ninus; from the flood; and from Adam. From its construction he calculated to the Temple's destruction by the Babylonians; to Cyrus's release of the Israelite captives to return to Jerusalem where they rebuilt the Temple; to Alexander's peaceful visit to Jerusalem; and to the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus. The first book of Frechulf's second volume traces events from Christ's birth in the reign of Augustus down to the destruction of the Temple by Titus during the reign of Vespasian.[48] The fall of Jerusalem and the fate of its people Frechulf presented as God's just vengeance for the passion of Christ and the persecution and murder of his servants.[49] This event marked the end of Israel as a world-historical entity; the vertical column in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius-Jerome simply ceases in the second year of Vespasian's reign.[50] Frechulf quoted Orosius's claim that while Titus deliberated about whether to preserve the Temple as a monument to the Roman victory, God willed it to

five in the second, each of which is organized chronologically around one or more noteworthy events. These epochal events included the highlights of the scriptural history of Israel and the church side by side with the major developments of world history: the creation, the reign of Ninus, the life of Abraham, the reigns of David and Solomon, the rise of the Persian empire under Cambyses and Darius, the battle of Marathon, the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the translation project of the Septuagint, the Maccabean revolt, the reign of Augustus, and Incarnation, the scandalous reign of Elagabalus, Constantine's closing of the pagan shrines, Theodosius's destruction of the pagan shrines, Justinian's reign, the ascendence of the Franks in Gaul, and the pontificate of Pope Gregory I.

[47] Rosamond McKitterick and Graeme Ward, "Knowledge of the History of the Jews in the Early Middle Ages," in *Barbarians and Jews: Jews and Judaism in the Early Medieval West,* ed. Yitzhak Hen and Thomas F. X. Noble (Turnhout, 2018), 231–56, at 252; Ward, *History, Scripture and Authority,* 94–99.

[48] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2, Capitula libri primi (ed. Allen, 438–39).

[49] Ibid. 2.1.22–23 (ed. Allen, 481–88) quoted Gospel passages in which Jesus foretold the destruction, and he reproduced long passages from Josephus describing the fall of the city.

[50] McKitterick and Ward, "Knowledge of the History of the Jews," 252. This epochal event closed the period that went back to Christ's nativity, and before that to the captivity of Antiochus, to the rebuilding of the Temple under Darius, and to the construction of the Temple under Solomon.

be destroyed, because now that the church was spreading through the world, the Temple was an empty shell that had outlasted its usefulness.[51]

Whether present, as a monumental expression of the devotion of Israel, or absent, in the wake of the supersession of the Old Covenant, the Temple was important in the *Histories* because of its pivotal role in the flow of world history. It is against this background that we should understand Frechulf's use of the story of Julian's project to rebuild it. The emperor's self-aggrandizing plans for a Third Temple and an amphitheater in Jerusalem were as blasphemous as the inverted version of Christian worship and practice with which he refashioned the traditional worship of the gods. His project in Jerusalem clearly reflected Julian's denial of the epochal significance of the destruction of the Temple by Titus within the long course of providential history. Several of the stories Frechulf recounted made it clear that Julian's malevolent plans were ironically, already encompassed in advance by divine power.[52] The deadly earthquake and fire that ended the episode of the Temple, which occurred "by a wonderful dispensation of God," showed clearly enough that Julian's true motivation for the project had not been his respect for the Jews and their traditional worship, but his animosity toward Christianity.[53] Julian's exaggerated estimate of his own power in that episode echoed in the misguided Persian campaign which ended his reign and cut short his life. How much of this Judith and her son Charles would have understood about the story of Julian and the Temple is impossible to say.

[51] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.2.3 (ed. Allen, 500), relying on Orosius, *Historiarum* 7.9.4–6 (ed. Zangenmeister, 460).

[52] See Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.10 (ed. Allen, 634–35), depending upon Theodoret, *He* 3.23–24 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 166–70) as included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.44–45 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 368–69). On the day and at the hour of the emperor's death far away, the Syrian monk, Julian Saba, received a miraculous revelation of the event in answer to his prayers for deliverance from the cruel emperor. Divine grace reportedly enabled a teacher in Antioch to respond to the anti-Christian sarcasm of the sophist Libanius with an accurate prediction of the emperor's demise.

[53] Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.4.9 (ed. Allen, 632): "Sed mira Dei dispositione maxima pars Iudaeorum qui illic conuenerant terrae motu perempta, reliqui uero flammis ultricibus exusti." Frechulf's use of the phrase "mira Dei dispensatione" elsewhere in the *Histories* reflects his interest in manifesting the historical causal force of God's will. See Frechulf, *Historiae* 2.3.1; 2.5.5; 2.5.22 (ed. Allen, 558, 685, and 717, respectively).

But Frechulf's presentation of the anecdote is a clear instance of an exemplary story taken from the Christian Roman past as a means of informing the mind of a Carolingian prince.[54]

About two decades after Frechulf's work appeared, another author referred to Julian in a text that was intended to instruct a Carolingian prince in a more focused and practical way than Frechulf's *Histories* had taught. Julian is mentioned twice in the prosimetric *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* which Sedulius Scottus composed for a Carolingian prince, perhaps the second son of Emperor Lothar I or perhaps Charles the Bald, in the 850s.[55] Sedulius described the work as a handbook of instructive information about good and bad rulers selected from Scripture and the ancient historians both non-Christian and Christian, for the instruction and enjoyment of its princely reader.[56] The key to mastering the practical art of rule is recognizing that regal authority is in fact a ministerial responsibility to God for the guidance of the realm and its people.[57] According to Sedulius, the condition of the realm, for better or for worse, depends upon the piety and righteousness of the monarch, and much of the book offers historical examples showing the connection between virtue and temporal success, and between sin and failure. The work presents the princely virtues, which are themselves the "arts very pleasing to the Almighty," through examples intended to instruct and move the reader.[58] Apparent deviations from God's retributive justice should be understood either as tests of the sort Job endured or as indications that the prosperity or adversity of the present life bears no proportion to life eternal.[59] In a

[54] Rosamond McKitterick, "Charles the Bald (823–877) and His Library: The Patronage of Learning," *English Historical Review* 95 (1980): 28–47, at 30–31.

[55] S. Hellman, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1906), 5, dates *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* between 855 and 859, and sees Lothar II as the likely recipient. Nikolaus Staubach, *Rex Christianus: Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen. II: Die Grundlegung der "religion royale"* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 1993), 105–97, argues that the work was written for Charles the Bald.

[56] Sedulius Scottus, *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* [henceforth *LrC*] 20 (ed. S. Hellmann, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* [Munich, 1906], 88–89).

[57] Ibid. 1 (ed. Hellmann, 22).

[58] Ibid. 20 (ed. Hellmann, 90).

[59] Ibid. 16 (ed. Hellmann, 72–77), where Sedulius—after acknowledging, as

chapter describing the earthly failure and eternal damnation of bad and impious rulers, Julian is one of a trio of emperors, the others being Nero and Geta, which appears after four bad rulers of Scripture, namely Pharaoh, Antiochus, Herod, and Pontius Pilate, and before the Arian King Theodoric, whose shade was said to have been pushed into hell by Pope John I and the patrician Symmachus whom he had persecuted.[60] Although Sedulius referred to him as *impiissimus,* Julian is one among several generic bad rulers whose particular shortcomings are not enumerated here. Only Theodoric receives closer attention with information Sedulius gleaned from *The Dialogues* of Gregory I.[61]

The second reference to Julian also illustrates the author's thesis that God's retributive regulation of earthly affairs is manifest in historical examples, but this time with attention to a particular flaw of the emperor. In chapter 17, *De non superbiendo post oblatam etiam ab hostibus pacem seu prostratos hostes,* the focus of which is the importance of mercy, kindness, and the willingness to make peace even with enemies, Sedulius drew upon Orosius to explain that prudent rulers such as Publius Scipio know that success in extending, ordering, and governing the realm depends on the union of peace within the realm. Swollen with his own success, the victor sometimes undervalues concord, pushes his advantage too far, and undertakes further, unjust wars.[62] Sedulius described the grim punishment meted out by the "rod of divine vengeance" to rulers who rejected offers of peace, first with an example from the Christian Old Testament. Not content with his victory over Edom, Amaziah of Ju-

Augustine had, that sometimes events may not reflect a discernible pattern of divine retribution—related the vicissitudes of the realm to a natural model of continuous change, namely lunar waxing and waning. Like Boethius, Sedulius pictured natural cycles of growth and decay as subsumed within a transcendent providential plan within which both adversity and success play positive roles, but sometimes in ways that surpass human understanding. See F. P. Pickering, *Augustinus oder Boethius? Geschichtsschreibung und epische Dichtung im Mittelalter—und in der Neuzeit,* 2 vols. (Berlin, 1967 and 1976), 2:93.

[60] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 8 (ed. Hellmann, 44).

[61] Ibid. 8 (ed. Hellmann, 44), drawing upon Gregory I, *Dialogorum libri quatuor* 4.31 (ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, *Grégoire le Grand: Dialogues,* Sources Chrétiennes 266 [Paris, 1980], 104–7).

[62] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 21, title; 77–78, text), drawing upon Orosius, *Historiarum* 2.17 and 5.8 (ed. Zangemeister, 127 and 295–96, respectively).

dah (2 Kings 14:8–12) was defeated and Jerusalem captured after he refused to make peace with King Jehoash of Israel.[63] Sedulius then described the act of divine vengeance that ended Julian's life while campaigning against the Persians. According to the account of Socrates included in the *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* of Cassiodorus, although Julian had already captured many towns and strongholds, he showed no pity to Persian emissaries who begged for peace. Failing to see that while to conquer is honorable, to be more than conqueror incurs retribution, Julian instead trusted in magic arts and, elated with false hope, claimed victory before it was his.[64] Reports differed as to who threw the javelin that pierced Julian's side, but whoever it was executed divine judgment. The last, blasphemous words of the mortally wounded emperor—"you have won, O Galilean!"—showed that Julian recognized the identity of his vanquisher.[65] Sedulius blames Amaziah and Julian for not knowing when to stop, but also for losing sight of the need to wage war in service of peace. Unlike them, King David (2 Samuel 1:19–20) had treated his enemies mildly, and had not rejected offers of peace or exulted over defeated foes. The defect this passage magnifies is not Julian's apostasy or his abuse of Christians, but his presumption and excess in waging war. Although Sedulius mentioned Julian's trust in magic arts, a detail he gathered from Socrates as presented by Cassiodorus, he omitted Cassiodorus's further explanation, contained in the same passage of *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita,* that Julian rejected the Persian king's offer of peace because, encouraged by the philosopher Maximus and according to the Pythagorean and Platonic doctrine of the transmigration of souls,

[63] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 78), where "uirga diuinae ultionis" may have been inspired by a passage from Theodoret, *He* 1.24.25, included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 3.3.8 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 140), "quaedam virga iracundiae divinae," which Sedulius copied into his commonplace book, *Collectaneum miscellaneum* [henceforth *Collectaneum*] 26.28 (ed. Dean Simpson, CCCM 67 [Turnhout, 1988], 192).

[64] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 78), where Sedulius does not name Cassiodorus but mentions "historia ecclesiastica," which evidently refers to Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.46–47 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 370–72), quoting Socrates, *He* 3.21.1–6 (ed. Hansen, 326–28) .

[65] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 78–79), where Julian's last words are quoted from Theodoret, *He* 3.25.7 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 172) as included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.47 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 372).

Julian thought that the soul of Alexander the Great lived in him.[66] Thus Sedulius certainly indicates the culpable misapprehension which led Julian to overreach, but in this chapter the focus is Julian's fatal haughtiness and refusal to make peace while he had the chance.

The author's process of zeroing in on this character flaw of Julian in chapter 17 of *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* seems to be attested in another work of Sedulius, a miscellany of commonplaces and memorable texts known as *Collectaneum miscellaneum*. One division of the work is given to seventy-one excerpts from Orosius, four of which appear in chapter 17 of *Liber de rectoribus Christianis,* three describing how Scipio learned that internal discord had led to the fall of Numantia, and one characterizing the Spartans as excessively warlike.[67] Although Orosius had devoted a chapter (*Historiarum* 7.30) to Julian's reign, Sedulius did not include material from it in *Collectaneum miscellaneum*. Another division of the commonplace book is devoted to ninety-seven passages selected from Cassiodorus's *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita,* one of which includes the image of "uirga iracundiae diuinae" from Theodoret's version of a letter of Emperor Constantine to the Persian king. Sedulius modified the phrase to "uirga diuinae ultionis" in the chapter of *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* on Amaziah and Julian.[68] Of the five passages

[66] After the words "magicis artibus," Sedulius omitted the following remarks of Socrates, *He* 3.21.6 (ed. Hansen, 328) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.46.7 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 370–71): "credens praecipue magi[ci]s artibus, quas ei Maximus philosophus exhibebat, et arbitratus Alexandri Macedonis se gloriam percepturum aut certe potiorem. Putabat enim secundum Pythagoraeam Platonisque sententiam ex mutatione corporum Alexandri animam possidere aut esse potius in altero corpore alius Alexander. Ob hanc itaque causam Persarum regis noluit preces ammittere." On the criticisms of Julian's teacher Maximus of Ephesus written by Eunapius and Ammianus Marcellinus, see van Renswoude, *Rhetoric of Free Speech in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (n. 6 above), 71.

[67] Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum* 27.27, 38, 39 and 61 (ed. Simpson, 149–51), which correspond to Orosius, *Historiarum* 2.17, 5.8, 5.7 and 1.21 (ed. Zangemeister, 127, 296, 293, and 78, respectively) and which appear in Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 77–78).

[68] Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 78), "uirga diuinae ultionis," was likely inspired by a passage from Theodoret, *He* 1.25.6 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, *Théodoret de Cyr: Histoire ecclésiastique, tome I. Livres I–II,* Sources Chrétiennes 501 [Paris, 2006], 302) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 3.3.8 (ed. Jacob

taken from *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* which mention Julian and episodes during his reign, Sedulius singled out just one, the proverbial phrase "uincere bonum est, superuincere nimis inuidiosum," to illustrate his point about Julian's overreaching.[69] In this way, comparison of the *Collectaneum* to chapter 17 of *Liber de rectoribus Christianis* illuminates the process by which Sedulius selected and shaped the material he had received into the precise image of Julian he wished to present. Sedulius Scottus related the story of Julian's death to warn a Carolingian prince, perhaps Charles the Bald, of the fatal consequences of overreaching in waging war, and of disregarding the adage that "while to conquer is honorable, to be more than conqueror incurs retribution."

II. Polemic

A few of Julian's contemporaries had responded in kind to the emperor's anti-Christian polemics, and some of this material found its way into Carolingian commentaries on Scripture.[70] Some western readers

and Hanslik, 140), "quaedam virga iracundiae divinae," which Sedulius copied into his commonplace book, *Collectaneum* 26.28 (ed. Simpson, 192): "De ultione diuina: Quaedam uirga iracundiae diuinae Valerianum imperatorem percussit."

[69] The proverbial phrase that Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum* 26.54 (ed. Simpson, 196), found in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.46.6 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 370), translated from the Greek of Socrates, *He* 3.21.5 (ed. Hansen, 328), also appears in Sedulius Scottus, *LrC* 17 (ed. Hellmann, 78). One sixth-century historian who praised Julian's Persian war was Jordanes, *Romana* 304 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, *Iordanis Romana et Getica*, MGH Auctores Antiquissimi 5.1 [Berlin, 1882], 39); see Walter Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History (A.D. 550–800): Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton, 1988), 50.

[70] For example Jerome, *Commentariorum in Mathaeum libri iv* 1.1.16 and 1.9.9 (ed. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, CCL 77 [Turnhout, 1969], 9 and 55, respectively), which are repeated in Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Matthaeum* 1.1.16 and 3.9.9 (ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCCM 174 [Turnhout 2000], 18); Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matheo libri xii* 9.9.9 (ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 56A [Turnhout, 1984], 519 and 263); Sedulius Scottus, *In evangelium Matthaei* 1.1.16 and 1.9.9 (ed. Bengt Löfstedt, *Sedulius Scottus: Kommentar zum Evangelium nach Matthäus 1:11–11:1,* Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 14 [Freiburg, 1989], 30 and 266, respectively; Heiric of Auxerre, *Homilia* 46.78 (ed. Riccardo Quadri and Roland Demeulenaere, *Heiricus Autissiodorensis, Homiliae per circu-*

knew the story of the eighth-century Byzantine monk Andrew Kalybites whose invidious comparison of Emperor Constantine V to Julian was said to have provoked the emperor to order him scourged to death in the Hippodrome of St. Mamae and his body thrown in the Bosporous.[71] Though never with such dire consequences, Julian's name also appeared as a term of rebuke, calumny, and invective in polemical writings of ninth-century Frankish authors such as Jonas of Orléans and Hincmar of Reims.

Jonas mentioned Julian twice in *De cultu imaginum,* his acrimonious response to Claudius of Turin, which he dedicated to Charles the Bald in 840 well after Claudius's death. Throughout the work, Jonas addressed Claudius not only as mistaken and inept, but as out of control, unhinged, and insane. Jonas rebuked Claudius for straying from the practice of venerating crosses and painted images of saints endorsed by Pope Gregory I: "Why, I ask, are you seized by such insane fury that, emulating Julian the Apostate, you removed from the church a cross bearing the image of Christ, and prevented the faithful from having it in basilicas of Christ in accordance with ecclesiastical tradition?"[72] The implication is that only

lum anni, CCCM 116A [Turnhout, 1992]); see also Jerome, *De viris inlustribus,* Prologus 40–43 (ed. Carl Albrecht Bernoulli [Freiburg i.Br., 1895], 2); see also Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 5.21 (ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCL 47 [Turnhout 1955], 157), which may have influenced Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matheo libri xii* 4.7.6 (ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 56 [Turnhout, 1984], 434).

[71] Writing in the 870s, Anastasius, *Chronographia tripartita* (ed. de Boor [n. 28 above], 284, recounting an episode from 761/762 he found in Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronicle* [ed. Greatrex, Mango, and Scott, 598]): "Constantinus persecutor Andream memorabilem monachum, qui dicebatur Calybites, apud Blachernas flagris in hippodromio sancti Mamae peremit, redarguentem impietatem eius, et Valentinianistam ac Iulianum appellantem eum."

[72] Jonas of Orléans, *De cultu imaginum* 1 (PL 106:333D): "Scito ergo quia nisi tua errata humiliter confiteri et corrigere praepropere studueris, procul dubio ad periculum salutis tuae et ad ruinam gradus tui, tanti doctoris excellentissimis dictis et discretissimis institutionibus contraria dogmatizasti: Utquid, rogo te, tam vesano furore raperis, ut Julianum Apostatam imitatus, crucem imaginem Christi gestantem ab ecclesia abstuleris, ac ne a fidelibus, juxta traditionem ecclesiasticam, in basilicis Christi haberetur inhiberis?" On the meaning and rhetorical background of the expression "vesano furore," which also appears at *De cultu imaginum* 1 (PL 106:331C) and 2 (PL 106:345A), see Kelly Gibson, "Claudius of Turin's Insane Fury: The Rhetoric of Emotions and Community," *The Heroic Age: A Journal of*

angry derangement could impel Claudius to behave as Julian had, removing from a church traditionally acceptable objects of devotion. Just which ancient story about Julian's hostility to images Jonas had in mind is not clear, but an anecdote Jonas recounted about him later in *De cultu imaginum* shows that Julian recognized the power of the cross despite himself. Claudius was reported to have asserted that the cross was no more entitled to be an object of reverence than other things with which Jesus had come into contact, such as the clothing of infants, mangers, and donkeys. Jonas wrote that none of the faithful except Claudius was so demented or so stupid as to compare the cross to a donkey, and that even pagans accorded the standard of the cross more honor and reverence than Claudius does. Jonas then supported this claim with three examples, two taken from Cassiodorus's *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* and one from the *Dialogues* of Gregory I.[73] The second anecdote from *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita* was the story Cassiodorus had found in Theodoret's *Historia ecclesiastica* about the young Julian visiting a soothsayer at a precinct of idols. Having been admitted to the mantic chamber, Julian was so terrified when the demons summoned by the diviner actually appeared that he impulsively formed the sign of the cross before himself and drove them off.[74]

By 840, when he dedicated *De cultu imaginum* to Charles the Bald, Jonas was already associated with two polemical texts that mentioned Julian's aversion to images of Christ. In 825 Jonas was one of two Frankish envoys sent to Rome with the *Epitome* of the *Libellus* produced by an *ad hoc* group of theologians whom Louis the Pious had assembled at

Early Medieval Northwestern Europe 20 (2021); and van Renswoude, "Crass Insults: *Ad hominem* Attacks and Rhetorical Conventions" (n. 6 above).

[73] *De cultu imaginum* 2 (PL 106:349D–350A). The first of these examples was the report from Sozomen, *He* 2.1 (ed. Hansen, 200) that the pagan Sybil referred to the cross as "thrice blessed wood on which god is stretched," which was included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 2.18.9 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 114). The third example comes from Gregory I, *Dialogorum libri quatuor* 3.7.3–7 (ed. de Vogüé and Antin [n. 61 above], 280–82) and concerned a Jew sheltering for the night in a temple of Apollo, who used the sign of the cross to ward off the demons which gathered there.

[74] *De cultu imaginum* 2 (PL 106:349D), repeating a story of Theodoret, *He* 3.3.2–3 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 104) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.1.16–18 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 308).

Paris and commissioned to gather a florilegium of material for the Frankish Church's response to the recent renewal of the ban on devotional images under the Byzantine rulers Emperor Michael II and his son Theophilus. Jonas was very likely among the handful of experts who drafted the *Libellus,* and he may also have been one of those who used the *Libellus* to craft the *Epitome* which was finally delivered to Pope Eugenius II.[75] The same anecdote about Julian is recounted twice in the *Libellus* and once in the *Epitome*. It is Cassiodorus's Latin version of Sozomen's story of the incident in the town of Caesarea Philippi, or Paneas, in which Julian removed the famous statue of Jesus said to have been set up by the woman in the Gospel who had been healed of the flow of blood (Matthew 9:20–22), and replaced it with a statue of himself. In what Sozomen described as a sign of Christ's power and divine anger, a lightning bolt broke the statue of Julian. As for the statue of Christ, although "pagans" smashed it, Christians later repaired it and placed it in a church where Sozomen affirmed it could still be seen, and where according to Eusebius a previously unknown and wonderfully curative herb grew up at its base.[76] The epitomist glossed the anecdote with the following rhetorical question: "What wonder if the image of Christ was taken down by apostate Julian and broken by pagans, since Christ himself was condemned by Caiaphas and crucified by the Jews?"[77] The equation of the violence that Julian and pagans directed at an image of

[75] For an account of what he terms the Paris Colloquy of 825, the documents produced there, and Jonas's role in it, see Thomas F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009), 263–68.

[76] Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.41–42 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 363–64) relying on Sozomen, *He* 5.21.1–4 (ed. Hansen, 654–56), who mentioned Eusebius, *He* 7.18.2 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 672); on the theurgic character of Julian's own interest in statues, see Maria Carmen De Vita, "Giuliano Imperatore e il culto delle immagini sacre: un esempio de ΤΕΧΝΗ ΤΕΛΕΣΤΙΚΗ?" in *Statue, Rituali, Scienza e Magia dalla Tarda Antichità al Rinascimento,* ed. Luigi Canetti (Florence, 2017), 67–85.

[77] *Libellus synodalis Parisiensis* (ed. A. Werminghoff, MGH Concilia 2.2 [Hannover, 1908], 487 and 517) and *Epitome libelli synodalis Parisiensis* 11 (ed. Werminghoff, 538–39): "Quid mirum si imago Christi a Iuliano apostata sit deposita et a paganis confracta, cum ipse a Caipha adiudicatus et a Iudaeis sit crucifixus?" Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians,* 268–85, astutely reconstructs the likely reasons for and process of shaping the florilegium of the *Libellus* into the *Epitome*.

Christ with the violence that the high priest and Jews directed at Christ himself is developed no further, and the sources offer no indication of how the *Epitome* was received in Rome. But it is at least possible that the epitomist's intention was to suggest that their hostility to devotional images associates Michael II and Theophilus with Caiaphas and Christ's tormentors.

In a chapter of his *Opusculum LV capitulorum* written in 870, Hincmar of Reims quoted a passage from one of the two orations against Julian of Gregory of Nazianzus. The pair was important as a fourth-century response to Julian's exclusion of Christians from liberal arts teaching posts on the hypothesis that Christian faith and traditional Hellenic education are antithetical.[78] Instead of rehearsing that material, however, Hincmar repeated Gregory's unflattering description of the appearance and comportment of the young Julian.[79] Both Hincmar and Sedulius Scottus encountered the passage in Cassiodorus's *Historia ecclesiastica tripartita,* which included an excerpt of Gregory's *Fifth Oration* quoted in Socrates' *Historia ecclesiastica*.[80] Hincmar repeated it, along with two other unsavory examples, in a chapter admonishing his nephew, Bishop Hincmar of Laon, and illustrating some of the ways in which disheveled appearance and agitated, indecorous movement provide an index of a person's state of mind. Hincmar the elder considered this to be particularly egregious when a prelate's inordinate behavior justifies an inference that his spiritual condition is unsound.[81]

[78] Gregory of Nazianzen, *Orationes* 4 and 5 (ed. Jean Bernardi, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours 4–5 Contre Julien,* Sources Chrétiennes 309 [Paris, 1984], 336–38; *Oratio* 5.3–7 (ed. Bernardi, 298–306) is number 3 in Levenson, "Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," 416. On their wider importance, see Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2012).

[79] Gregory of Nazianzen, *Oratio* 5.23–24 (ed. Bernardi, 336–38); Pierre Somville, "Portrait physique de l'empereur Julien," *L'antiquité classique* 72 (2003): 161–66, at 164–65.

[80] Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum* 26.57 (ed. Simpson, 196), which also appears in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 7.2.15–16 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 379–80), relying upon Socrates, *He* 3.23.23 (ed. Hansen, 338–40).

[81] Hincmar, *Opusculum LV capitulorum* 53 (ed. Rudolf Schieffer, *Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon 869–871,* MGH Concilia 4,

Unlike these other Carolingian polemicists who mentioned Julian, Archbishop Amulo of Lyon included the story of Julian and the Temple in his *Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum,* a work he wrote no later than 846.[82] A striking feature of Amulo's use of the story is that his main focus was not Emperor Julian but instead the Jews whom Julian had misled. The *Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum* was a polemic denouncing the mistaken beliefs and intransigence of contemporary Jews. In several now famous diatribes written in the years 823–28, Agobard of Lyon had complained about what he considered to be the indulgent imperial policy toward the Jews under Louis the Pious.[83] Recently reevaluated manuscript evidence suggests that some other prominent Lyonnais ecclesiastics shared Agobard's anti-Jewish animosity in the 830s and 840s.[84] The learned Deacon Florus, who was so outspoken against the liturgical reforms imposed by Agobard's replacement, Amalarius, in the years 835–38, may also have objected to his toleration of the Jews. As Warren Pezé convincingly reconstructs these events, Amulo inherited his predecessor's hostility to-

Supplementum 2 [Hannover, 2003], 359): "Faciebat me cautum adeo inconstantia morum eius et excessus uberior. Vatis enim egregius est, qui bene considerat. Nullum enim signum mihi in eo utile videbatur, cervix inflexibilis, humeri iactabiles, oculi currentes, huc illucque directi et furiose respicientes, pedes impatientes, nares spirantes iniurias atque contemptum, scemata risibilia et hoc ipsum semper habentia, risus incontinens et quasi subbulliens, consensus et negatio simul, ratio nulla ratione consistens, interrogatio inordinata atque responsio nulla convenientia sibi conveniens."

[82] Amulo had been a student of Agobard, and after Agobard's death in 840 succeeded him as archbishop of Lyon, a position he held for eleven years until his death in 852.

[83] In particular, *De baptismo mancipiorum Iudaeorum*, *Contra praeceptum impium de baptismo iudaicorum mancipiorum*, *De insolentia Iudaeorum*, *De iudaicis superstitionibus et erroribus, De cavendo conuictu et societate Iudaeorum,* collected in *Agobardi Lugdunensis opera omnia* (ed. L. van Acker, CCCM 52 [Turnhout, 1981], 113–234); Johannes Heil, "Agobard, Amolo, das Kirchengut und die Juden von Lyon," *Francia* 25 (1998): 39–76; Robert Bonfil, "Cultural and Religious Traditions in Ninth-Century French Jewry," in *Jewish Intellectual History in the Middle Ages,* ed. Joseph Dan (London, 1994), 1–17; and F. Parente, "La controversia tra ebrei e cristiani in Francia e Spagna dal VI al IX secolo," in *Gli ebrei nell'alto medioevo,* Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 26 (Spoleto, 1980), 592–616.

[84] Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist* (Stuttgart, 1999), 72–76.

wards the Jewish community of Lyon as one facet of a wider impulse to order and unify his church and to identify and exclude outsiders.[85] The immediate occasion for producing a polemical treatise of his own was apparently Amulo's desire to influence the participants of the church council held at Meaux and Paris in 845 and 846. The acts of that council included several explicitly anti-Jewish recommendations which overlapped with Amulo's treatise. Although the synodal transcript was presented to Charles the Bald at Épernay in June 846, the king declined to implement the resolutions regarding Jews in the realm.[86] Royal disinterest in curbing the Jews may be connected to the very limited circulation of Amulo's treatise, which has survived in only two manuscripts.[87]

Amulo compiled a dossier of passages drawn from Scripture, the fathers, and the edicts of Christian rulers with information about the character of their unbelief and about how to treat Jews.[88] Amulo repeated Jerome's account of the emergence of the scribes and Pharisees, and of the descent of Jewish belief into what he termed fables and superstition especially after Pentecost.[89] Not content only to recycle older ideas,

[85] Warren Pezé, "Amalaire et la communauté juive de Lyon. À propos de l'antijudaïsme lyonnais à l'époque carolingienne," *Francia* 40 (2013): 1–25.

[86] The council, which included three archbishops, Wenilo of Sens, Hincmar of Reims, and Radulf of Bourges, along with their suffragan bishops, issued acts which included three chapters on the Jews. *Acta* of Meaux-Paris Juni 845 und Februar 846, 73–75 (ed. Wilfried Hartmann, MGH Concilia 3 [Hannover, 1984], 119–24); see the Introduction of Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut in Amulo von Lyon, *Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum* [henceforth *LpI*] (ed. Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 29 [Wiesbaden, 2017], xix–xxiii); Amélie Sagasser, *Juden und Judentum im Spiegel karolingischer Rechtstexte* (Berlin, 2021), 214–34; and Heil, "Agobard, Amolo, das Kirchengut und die Juden von Lyon."

[87] One from the ninth or tenth century and now in Montpellier (Montpellier, Bibliothèque Interuniversitaire, Section Médecine, H. 237), the other from the tenth century and now in Padua (Padua, Biblioteca Antoniana, Ms. 73 Scaff. IV).

[88] Amulo, *LpI* 1 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 2).

[89] Ibid. 7 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 12): Beyond the heinous deeds of Jews in the past, such as murdering Jesus and the prophets (1 Thessalonians 2:14–16), the "synagogue of Satan" mentioned in the Book of Revelation (Revelation 2:9 and 3:9) continues to spread error in ways foreseen by the Lord, St. Paul, and the prophet Isaiah (with a quotation from Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri iv* 2.12.45–44, ed. D. Hurst and M. Adriaen, CCL 77 [Turnhout, 1969], 99). Amulo

Amulo filled out his account with information he gathered from contemporary Jews in Francia. He is one of the earliest authors to refer to the *Toledot Yeshu* tradition, though whether he actually saw and read or only heard reports about a satirical *Life of Jesus* is disputed.[90] Of particular interest are the messianic ideas some contemporary Jews continued to hold and which Amulo traced to writings of the ancient teacher Joshua ben Levi. According to this there were two messiahs, the first from the line of David had been born in Judaea on the same night as the Temple in Jerusalem was destroyed under Vespasian and Titus. Mysteriously transported to Rome, he had been hidden away and subjected to torture down to the present. Amulo claimed that Jews believe that through his wounds they have forgiveness for their sins, and that he had come to endure punishment for his people to "redeem them from captivity". The messiah ben David was expected to fulfill Daniel's prophecy by coming on a cloud in the end to gather the Jews from captivity.[91] As for the second anticipated messiah, this one from the tribe of Ephraim, Amulo wrote that he was expected to die in battle against the savage peoples Gog and Magog after the end of the Jewish captivity.[92]

A central feature of Amulo's refutation of these ideas was the timing of the messiah's arrival in relation to the destruction of the Temple by Titus. He held that Daniel's prophecy showed that the fall of Jerusalem

explained in his own words that the Jews have abandoned the truth of the Law and prophets and down to the present day follow the errors of those perverse and impious teachers. In their synagogues they read and discuss the traditions of those teachers and preach their own twisted understanding of the divine law. They mock the Christian people, terming the apostles apostates, and claiming that the Gospel is a revelation of iniquity that has put the world into error. Amulo, *LpI* 9 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 16): "Tales scribarum et Pharisaeorum magistri exstiterunt, doctores fabularum et superstitionum, pro quibus eos frequenter in Evangelio Dominus increpat, et praecipue, ubi omnes eorum errores uno prophetico testimonio destruit."

[90] Amulo, *LpI* 25 and 40 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 48 and 80); *Toledot Yeshu: The Life Story of Jesus,* ed. Michael Meerson and Peter Schäfer, Two Volumes and Database. Vol. I: Introduction and Translation. Vol. II: Critical Edition (Tübingen, 2014); Peter Schäfer, "Agobard's and Amulo's Toledot Yeshu," in *Toledot Yeshu ("The Life Story of Jesus") Revisited: A Princeton Conference,* ed. Peter Schäfer, Michael Meerson, and Yaacov Deutsch (Tübingen, 2011), 27–48.

[91] Amulo, *LpI* 12 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 20 and 22).

[92] Amulo, *LpI* 13 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 22) did not mention Joshua ben Levi as the source of this teaching.

and the Temple not only occurred after the execution of Christ but happened because of it; and that the new captivity of the Jews that began in Vespasian's reign would be unending, the desolation of their homeland enduring to the last.[93] Amulo suspected that the whole messiah ben David story might have been an invention to distract attention from Jewish responsibility for the death of Jesus.[94]

This is the context in which Amulo recounted the episode of Julian's Temple project. He speculated that either Joshua ben Levi contrived the story about two messiahs as a consolation to the Jews amidst the hardships of the new captivity, or the Lord permitted Satan in disguise to appear and make prophecies that aroused false expectations and empty desires for deliverance.[95] Amulo adduced proof texts to support his claim about diabolical seduction: "For we read in the ecclesiastical histories that several times they were deluded in such ways, either by apostate men or by the devil himself transfiguring himself into an angel of light."[96] The first story Amulo recounted was that of Julian and the Temple, which he borrowed from Isidore's *Chronicle,* but with the addition not only that Julian had been converted from Christianity to the cult of idols, but that he "altogether became an antichrist":

> Emperor Julian turned from being a Christian to the worship of idols and altogether became an antichrist. Among his other blasphemies, out of hatred of Christ he permitted the Jews to restore the Temple in Jerusalem, so that there they could make sacrifices according to the Law. When Jews

[93] Amulo, *LpI* 15 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 26 and 28). In addition Amulo, *LpI* 16 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 28) mentioned that prophecies of Malachi indicated that no remission of the Jewish captivity, no return to the Judaean land, no restoration of the city and Temple and ceremonies of the Law would occur. On the normative view that the Temple would not be rebuilt before the second-coming of Jesus at some unknown time in the future, see Johannes Heil, "'Nos Nescientes de Hoc Velle Manere'" (n. 45 above), 89–91, on Paschasius Radbertus; see also Peter Darby, "Bede's History of the Future," in *Bede and the Future,* ed. Peter Darby and Faith Wallis (London, 2014), 115–38, esp. 132–34, on the expected role of the Jews.

[94] In 846 when he wrote, Amulo, *LpI* 17 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 30), said that effort to mislead had gone on for some 776 years since the destruction of the Temple by Titus.

[95] Amulo, *LpI* 18 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 32 and 34).

[96] Amulo, *LpI* 19 (ed., Herbers-Rauhut, 34): "Nam et in historiis ecclesiasticis legimus eos aliquoties sive per apostatas homines sive per ipsum diabolum transfigurantem se in angelum lucis ad talia esse delusos."

> had gathered from all the provinces and were laying the new foundation of the Temple, suddenly in the night because of an earthquake rocks knocked out from under the foundation were scattered far and wide. Also a ball of fire came out of the precinct of the Temple and burned many of them to death. Terrified by this, some confessed [belief in] Christ even against their will, and, to prevent them from thinking that this had happened by chance, the next night the sign of the cross appeared on their clothing.[97]

Next, Amulo recalled the incident of the false Moses of Crete, who in the fifth century had led Jews to their deaths by convincing them he would guide them safely through the ocean to the Promised Land. Amulo explained that in fact this had been the devil posing as Moses, and that the survivors had immediately become Christians.[98] Amulo pointed out that Jerome too had been aware of a proposal that 430 years after the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple under Vespasian the

[97] Amulo, *LpI* 19 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 34): "Sicut Iulianus imperator ex christiano ad idolorum cultum conversus et per omnia antichristus effectus inter ceteras impietates suas in odium Christi templum in Hierosolymis eis reparare permisit, ut ibi velut legales victimas immolarent. Cumque ex omnibus provinciis Iudaeis collectis nova templi fundamenta iacerent, subito nocte oborto terrae motu saxa ab imo fundamentorum excussa longe lateque sparsa sunt. Igneus quoque globus ab interiori parte aedis templi egressus plurimos eorum suo prostravit incendio. Quo terrore aliqui pavefacti Christum confitebantur inviti. Et ne istud casu crederent factum, sequenti nocte in vestimentis eorum crucis apparuit signum." Amulo added "per omnia antichristus effectus" to the abridgment of the account of Rufinus *He* 10.38–40 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 997–98) of Isidore, *Chronica* 2.345 (ed. Martin, 163 and 165): "Qui cum in odio Xristi templum in Hierusolimis Iudaeis reparare permisisset atque ex omnibus prouinciis Iudaeis collectis noua templi fundamenta iacerent, subito nocte oborto terrae motu saxa ab imo fundamentorum longe lateque excussa sunt. Igneus quoque globus ab interior aede templi egressus plurimos eorum suo prostrauit incendio. Quo terrore reliqui Iudaei pauefacti Xristum confitebantur inuiti, et ne hoc casu crederent factum, sequenti nocte in uestimentis cunctorum crucis apparuit signum."

[98] Amulo, *LpI* 19 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 34) with reference to a story recounted by Socrates, *He* 7.38 (ed. G. C. Hansen, *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique livre VII,* Sources Chrétiennes 506 [Paris, 2007], 136–38), on which see Van Nuffelen, *Un héritage de paix et de piété,* 400–401, and included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 12.9 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 677–78), and where Amulo changed Cassiodorus's "fuerat daemon erroneous humano schemate circumamictus" into "diabolus in specie Moysi."

present captivity would end and the Jewish people would return to its former condition. Although that period had not elapsed at the time Jerome wrote, in Amulo's day nearly twice as many years had passed, and this was enough to show that hopes and expectations of literal earthly deliverance were utterly vain.[99] If they had converted and sought true salvation, Amulo observed sententiously, the Jews would long ago have understood that it is not the sanctuaries that need restoring but themselves.[100]

Amulo's focus on what he considered to be the wrong-headed messianic expectations he attributed to contemporary Jews everywhere seems to presuppose as norm what Johannes Heil has termed the "eschatological correctness" of the Frankish church. Because reconstruction of the Temple by the Jews at the instigation of the antichrist was a feature of mainstream Christian thinking about the end time, the story of Julian's project to build an unholy of holies was likely to attract the attention of Carolingian authors who were concerned to calm popular and some learned eschatological speculation about an imminent end.[101] Some of the key passages from the prophets Daniel and Isaiah, Matthew 24, and the book of Revelation that Amulo used to controvert what he understood to be Jewish expectations for the future also had a place in discourses of ecclesiastics such as Hrabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbertus, Christian Druthmarus, and Haimo of Auxerre which appear to be aimed at easing anxieties caused by end time expectations coupled with disagreement over how to calculate historical time.[102]

[99] Amulo, *LpI* 19 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 34 and 36).

[100] Amulo, *LpI* 20 (ed. Herbers-Rauhut, 38): "Si veram salutem et libertatem, quae in his dei verbis promittitur, quaererent, iamdudum intelligere potuissent ita deserta facta esse sanctuaria sua, ut, sicut deus ipse testator, non recipiat ab eis ultra odorem suavissimum, nec eorum restaurationem, quae nulla est, exspectarent, sed seipsos restaurandos humiliter deo subderent confitendo iniquitates suas et majorum suorum et orando pro impietatibus suis ut indulgentiam consequi mererentur."

[101] For references to the repetition by Hrabanus Maurus, Haimo of Auxerre, and Sedulius Scottus of Jerome's expectation that Jews would rebuild the Temple under the direction of the antichrist, see Johannes Heil, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion? Die Juden in den Pauluskommentaren des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Hannover, 1998), 166–73.

[102] Heil, "'Nos Nescientes de Hoc Velle Manere'" (n. 45 above), 88 for "eschatological correctness," and 83–95 for the other authors mentioned.

III. Hagiography

The third Carolingian author who mentioned Julian's project to rebuild the Temple was Ado, archbishop of Vienne on the Isère from 860 until his death in 875. Although he referred to the project in the chronicle of world history he wrote, Ado's treatment of Julian was deeply informed by the Carolingian culture of commemoration. The image of Julian was material ready-at-hand for local chroniclers and hagiographers in part because it was already present in the ninth-century calendrical-order name lists of martyrs. Like other persecuting emperors and their henchmen who are mentioned in the martyrologies, Julian was remembered along with the saints who were commemorated in the Frankish church.[103] It is not surprising that Julian's name appeared in other works, such as hymns and reliquary inscriptions, written by the authors of martyrologies.[104] But the image of Julian was taken into the culture of commemoration in several more ambitious ways too.

Sometimes hagiographers and local chronographers introduced Julian into their stories, a case in point being the cult of St. Quintinus of Ami-

[103] Julian's name appeared in the martyrologies of pseudo-Jerome and Bede as well as those of Hrabanus Maurus, Florus of Lyon, Usuard, and Notker of St. Gallen. On Julian in the martyrologies, see van Nuffelen, who appends a list of confessors and martyrs *sub Iuliano* to his "Christian Reception of Julian" (n. 11 above), 382–92; and Baudoin de Gaiffier, "*Sub Iuliano Apostata*" dans le martyrologe romain," *Analecta Bollandiana* 74 (1956): 5–50. On the historical martyrologies, see Felice Lifshitz, *The Name of the Saint: The Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627–827* (Notre Dame, 2006); John M. McCullough, "Historical Martyrologies in the Benedictine Cultural Tradition," in *Benedictine Culture 750–1050,* ed. W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Leuven, 1983), 114–31; and Jacques Dubois, *Les martyrologes du moyen âge latin,* Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 26 (Turnhout, 1977).

[104] Florus, *Ymnus in natale sanctorum Iohannes et Pauli* 9–10 (ed. Ernest Dümmler, MGH Poetae Aevi Carolini 2 [Berlin, 1884], 541): "tyrranus contemptor Christi Iulianus rabidus." See also Florus, *Expositio in epistulas beati Pauli ex operibus sancti Augustini* 121 (ed. P. I. Fransen, L. De Coninck, B. Coppieters't Wallant, and R. Demeulenaere, CCCM 220B [Turnhout, 2011], 435): "Iulianus extitit infidelis imperator. Nonne extitit apostate, iniquus, idololatra?"; Alcuin, *Vita Martini* 2 (PL 101:659A), following Sulpicius Severus, *Vita sancti Martini episcopi et confessoris* 2 (ed. C. Halm, CSEL 1 [Vienna, 1866], 111), situates Martin's military service in the reign of Julian.

ens. Quintinus appears among the victims of Rictiovarus, the prefect of Maximian Augustus (285–305) tasked with rooting out Christianity in northern Gaul, and who is the antagonist in a group of *passiones* written in the seventh and eighth centuries and then redacted in the Carolingian period.[105] What seem to be the oldest stories (BHL 6999) about him relate that after a series of adventures, interrogation, and torture, Quintinus was decapitated near Augusta Veromandorum and his body secretly dumped in the Somme by Rictiovarus to prevent Christians from honoring him.[106] That aim was later thwarted (BHL 7000) when, with angelic guidance, the blind Roman matron Eusebia found the relics and built a chapel to house them in Augusta Veromandorum. In turn, this chapel fell into disuse and the body of Quintinus was lost until the time of Eligius of Noyon (†660), who showed the searchers where to dig and then installed the relics in an ornate tomb near the altar of the enlarged church.[107] While the Merovingian *Vita Eligii* (BHL 2474) itself offered no explanation for the loss of the relics Eusebia had earlier retrieved from the river, a ninth-century collection of Quintinus's miracles (BHL 7018) blamed Julian's anti-Christian policy if not his direct action for the loss of the relics which Eligius later rediscovered. According to this report, the fear and confusion imposed on Christians during Julian's persecution disrupted the divine worship and obliterated memory of the martyr's burial place.[108] Perhaps the author who collected the miracle stories had access to a source that connected Julian with the misplacement of Quin-

[105] Brigitte Meijns and Charles Mériaux, "Le Cycle de Rictiovar et la topographie chrétienne des campagnes septentrionales à l'époque mérovingienne," in *Les premiers temps chrétiens dans le territoire de la France actuelle: hagiographie, épigraphie et archéologie: nouvelles approaches et perspectives de recherche,* ed. Marie-Céline Isaïa (Rennes, 2019), 19–33; Michèle Gaillard, "Un 'Cycle' hagiographique du haut moyen âge en Gaule septentrionale: les passions des martyrs de Riciovar," *Hagiographica* 21 (2014): 1–28; A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire Volume 1 A.D. 260–395* (Cambridge, 1971), 766, consider the character of Rictiovarus to be a fiction.

[106] *Prima passio et inventio S. Quintini* 12–13 (ed. Benjamin Bossue, AASS October 13 [Paris, 1883], 783).

[107] *Vita Eligii* 2.6 (ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 4 [Hannover, 1902], 697–99).

[108] *Prima et secunda sacri corporis inventio. Prodigia tum edita. Vir quidam a morte ereptus* 3–4 (ed. Bossue, 803).

tinus's relics after the time of Eusebia. But he may have borrowed that detail from another text, for example, the *Vita sancti Cassiani episcopi* (BHL 1630), and used it both to balance the earlier tale of Rictiovarus's malevolent submersion of the body of Quintinus, and to provide an appropriate prequel to the story of Eligius's miraculous rediscovery of the relics.[109] Either way, however, Julian's name entered the record and was soon included in several late Carolingian or Ottonian poetic texts associated with the cult of Quintinus.[110]

The boundary between liturgical and historical commemoration was always porous, and sometimes the intermingling of hagiographic and chronicle material is discernible. This is how Ado came to mention Julian's project for the Temple in light of wider commemorative concerns.[111] While Ado wrote his *Chronicle* in the late 860s, around 855 during his stay in Lyon, he produced a first recension of his *Martyrology,* which included many entries for martyrs connected with Lyon, and which Ado said was copied from the *Martyrology* of Florus of Lyon. A second version included information on popes, saints, and martyrs associated with Rome, and which depended upon what Ado described as *venerabile perantiquum matyrologium* from Rome, but which appears to have been something Ado invented to enhance the prestige of his own

[109] According to the ninth-century *Annales sancti Quintini Veromandensis* (ed. L. C. Bethmann, MGH Scriptores 16 [Hannover, 1869], 507), relics of St. Cassian of Autun were installed in the church of St. Quintinus in 840. The *Vita sancti Cassiani episcopi* 1–3 (ed. J. B. Sollerius, AASS August 2 [Paris, 1867], 64) mentioned the persecution of Christians and closing of churches during Julian's reign. A record of Cassianus's translation to the church of St. Quintinus in Augusta Veromandorum in 840 survives (BHL 1635), *Historia translationis et miraculorum* (ed. J. B. Sollerius, AASS August 2 [Paris, 1867], 66–68). The story of church closings under Julian told in Cassian's Life may have influenced the ninth-century authors who introduced Julian into the record of Quintinus.

[110] *Inventio s. Quintini altera* 49–64 (ed. Carolus Strecker, MGH Poetae Aevi Carolini 4.2–3 [Berlin, 1923], 997) and *Carmen de sancto Cassiano* 1.81 (ed. Paul Winterfeld, MGH Poetae Aevi Carolini 4.1 [Berlin, 1899] 183), which Winterfeld suggests (180) may have been written along with verse Lives of Quintinus and Benedicta in the late Carolingian or Ottonian period and included in this edition with the Life of Cassianus.

[111] On Ado's background, see Nathanaël Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence: La province ecclésiastique de Vienne au haut Moyen Âge (V^e–XI^e siècle)* (Rennes, 2014), 140–42.

work.[112] The third recension included information on the bishops and saints of Vienne which Ado was in a good position to collect during his time as archbishop beginning in 860. Ado's work is considered to be one of the historical martyrologies because many of its entries present not only the name of a saint and its associated date but background information about the saint and often an account of the saint's suffering and death excerpted from the sources the author drew upon.

Since Julian was not a saint, he received no entry of his own. But his name appears in eighteen entries of Ado's *Martyrology,* in which the emperor is referred to variously as "apostate and impious," "most impious," "sacrilegious," "most hostile to Christians," "angry," and "zealous" in his pursuit of anti-Christian policy. Such characterizations were standard in the sources upon which Ado depended. Nine of these references appear in entries that are very brief, and nine in entries of the more extended, discursive sort for which Ado's *Martyrology* is known.[113] A recurrent theme in several of the entries that mention Julian is his proclivity for altering the topography of sacred sites.[114] The author's interest in what Pierre Maraval terms "a sacred geography" does not appear exclusively in connection with Julian, however.[115] Even in passages not involving Julian, Ado described contests to decide whether a given place

[112] Jacques Dubois and Geneviève Renaud, *Le martyrologe d'Adon. Ses deux familles, ses trois recensions, text et commentaire* [henceforth *Martyrologium*], Centre National de la Recherce Scientifique [Paris, 1984], xx–xxviii; Henri Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen-Âge: étude sur la formation du martyrologe romain* (Paris, 1908), 409–64 and 649–72.

[113] The short entries in which Julian is mentioned are Ado, *Martyrologium* II NON. IAN. 3; II NON. IAN. 4; IIII NON. MAI. 6; XII KL. IUL. 2; XI KL. IUL. 2; VIIII KL. IUL. 2; XVII KL. AUG. 1; KL. AUG. 2; IIII NON. DEC. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 45, 46, 147, 200, 200, 201, 226, 242, 405, respectively). The longer entries in which Julian is mentioned are Ado, *Martyrologium* VIIII KL. FEBR. 2; VIIII KL. APRL. 1; VI ID. MAI. 2; VII KL. IUL. 2; ID. IUL. 1; VII. ID. AUG. 1; IIII KAL. SEPT (= Libellus 51); X KAL. NOV. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 69, 111, 154, 204, 226, 255, 28–29, 363, respectively).

[114] There were more of these in circulation than Ado repeated. For instance the report of Sozomon, *He* 5.2.12–13 (ed. Hansen, 566–68) included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.41.3 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 313–4) that the earth itself rejected Julian's insincere effort to build a shrine for Mamas the martyr of Caesarea.

[115] Pierre Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient: Histoire et géographie, des origins à la conquête arabe,* 2d ed. (Paris, 2004), 23–60.

would be dominated by temples of idols or basilicas of saints. His long entry for the anniversary of the discovery of the true Cross narrated the dramatic reversals by which Christian holy sites in Bethlehem and Jerusalem were first profaned by shrines of Adonis and Venus and subsequently reclaimed with churches and ennobled by the discovery of relics of Christ's passion.[116]

As for Emperor Julian, Ado's references to him in the *Martyrology* suggest that along with his renunciation of the Christian faith and revival of pagan worship, he developed sensitivity to the numinous disruption that proximity to living holy persons or the tombs of Christian saints might cause. Banishing the living was one way to cleanse an area by weakening its Christian churches.[117] Ado was aware that Julian had projected his religious policy within various cities and areas by exiling bishops and other holy figures. Amplifying Florus's notice of the death of the holy priest Pigmenius, Ado explained that this was a childhood teacher of Julian who was exiled to Persia by his former pupil because he had buried the bodies of the emperor's Christian victims. When under divine guidance the now blind Pigmenius returned to Rome, Julian had him thrown from a bridge into the Tiber.[118] Again, Ado reported that Julian closed four Christian hospitals in Ostia and sent their patron, the holy man Gallicanus, whose very gaze drove away demons, into exile

[116] Ado, *Martyrologium* V NON. MAI. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 141–44) supplementing Florus's brief indication with a long passage Ado wrote using Paulinus of Nola, *Epistula* 31.3–6 (ed. W. Hartel, CSEL 29 [Vienna, 1894], 269–75) and Rufinus, *He* 10.7–8 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 969–70). On knowledge of this episode in the Carolingian period, see Rosamond McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), 259–61. Again, both in his *Chronicon* (PL 123:108B) and in his *Passio sancti Desderii* (PL 123:436) Ado noted the miraculous discovery of the body of St. Antony and its burial in the Church of John the Baptist in Alexandria during the reign of Justinian.

[117] For orientation on exile in the Carolingian period, see Steven A. Stofferahn, "Nebuchadnezzar and Charlemagne: Exile in Ninth-Century Carolingian Exegesis," in *From Theodulf to Rashi: Texts, Techniques, and Transfer in Western European Exegesis (800–1100),* ed. Johannes Heil and Sumi Shimahara (Leiden, 2022), 463–84.

[118] Ado, *Martyrologium* VIIII KL. APRL. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 111), which depends upon *Passio Pigmenii* (BHL 6849; ed. G. Henschenius and D. Papenbroch, AASS March 3 [Paris, 1865], 482).

and eventually martyrdom in Egypt.[119] So frequently did Julian resort to exile that when Terentianus the Campidoctor secretly beheaded and buried saints John and Paul in Rome, he circulated the plausible story that Julian had banished the two.[120] Even the suspension of exile imposed on orthodox bishops by a heterodox emperor such as Constantius furnished Julian with an instrument to antagonize the church. Ado repeated Florus's notice for Eusebius of Vercelli who was martyred by Arian persecutors when Julian ended the Scythian exile imposed upon him by Constantius.[121]

Julian sought to alter the spiritual environment by moving the dead as well as living holy persons. Ado incorporated the story of Christians at the Castalian Spring of Daphne near Antioch derisively chanting Psalm 96:7 within earshot of the emperor: "May all worshipers of images be put to shame, who make their boast in worthless idols" ("Confundantur omnes qui adorant sculptilia et gloriantur in simulacris suis"). Because priests of the nearby shrine of Apollo had reported to him that the presence of the body of the martyr Babylas had silenced the god's oracle, Julian demanded that the Christians remove Babylas's sepulcher.[122] Again, according to Ado the city of Nisibis fell under Persian control only after Julian, in his anti-Christian zeal, had deprived the city of the presence of its patron by moving Bishop Jacob's tomb outside the city

[119] Ado, *Martyrologium* VII KL. IUL. 2 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 202–4), which depends upon *Passio Gallicani* (BHL 3236–37; ed. B. Mombritius, *Sanctuarium seu vitae sanctorum* 1 [Paris, 1910], 571).

[120] Ado, *Martyrologium* IV KL. IUL. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 205), which depends upon *Passio Iohannis et Pauli* (BHL 3236; ed. D. Papebroch, AASS Iunii 7 [Paris, 1867], 140).

[121] Ado, *Martyrologium* KL. AUG. 3 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 242).

[122] Ado, *Martyrologium* VIIII KL. FEBR. 2 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 69), repeating Florus's version, which was itself explicitly based upon Rufinus, *He* 10.36 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 996). Another story of those who provoked Julian by aggressive chanting Ado did not include. Cassiodorus had repeated the anecdote of Theodoret, *He* 3.19–20.1 (ed. Parmentier and Hansen, 152–56) concerning Publia of Antioch, who was proud of the slapping she received as punishment after her choir of nuns enraged Julian (*vehementer accensus, saeviens*) by repeatedly singing within his hearing Psalm 113 attacking idolatry and idolaters; Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.36 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 358–59); Christine Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Oakland, 2014), 58–91.

walls.[123] In a third case, Ado wrote that Julian's hostility to Christians had emboldened pagans to enter the sepulcher of John the Baptist in Sebasten, Palestine (Samaria), to remove and burn his bones, and to scatter the ashes. But monks of Jerusalem who happened to be present recovered the ashes and took them to their abbot who handed them over to Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria. Motivated by the "spirit of prophecy," Athanasius saved the treasure for a future generation by depositing the relics in a chamber beneath the sacristy wall. Later, during the reign of Theodosius, Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria confirmed the presentiment of Athanasius when, after destroying the "sepulcher of Serapis," on the same spot he consecrated the Church of St. John.[124]

[123] Ado, *Martyrologium* ID. IUL. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 226), repeating Florus's version and drawing upon Gennadius, *Liber de viris inlustribus* 1 (ed. Ernst Cushing Richardson, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 14.1 [Leipzig, 1896], 61–62).

[124] Ado, *Martyrologium* Libellus 51 (III KAL. SEPT.; ed. Dubois and Renaud, 28–29). To craft this story Ado relied not only on the *Martyrology* of Florus but also on elements from the Gospels and especially on Bede's *Chronica maiora* and Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. In turn, Bede's account was based on a slightly rearranged version of Rufinus's description of the same event in which the destruction of the "sepulcher of Serapis" by Theophilus and the construction of a *martyrium,* on one side, and a church, on the other, prompted Rufinus to explain in an analeptic passage how the relics of John the Baptist had reached Alexandria in the time of Athanasius, and how Athanasius, animated by a prophetic spirit, had concealed them for the good of the next generation. See Bede, *Chronica maiora* 436 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH Auctores Antiquissimi 13 [Berlin, 1898], 297); Rufinus, *He* 11.27 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 1033–34); and Bede, *In Marci evangelium expositio* 6.29 (ed. D. Hurst, CCL 120 [Turnhout, 1960], 509–10); see also Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Matthaeum* 5.14.12 (ed. B. Löfstedt, CCCM 174A [Turnhout, 2000], 413); Christian of Stavelot, *Expositio super librum generationis* 14 (ed. R. B. C. Huygens, CCCM 224 [Turnhout, 2008], 286); and Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen-Âge*, 631. Judith McKenzie, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt 300 B.C.–A.D. 700* [New Haven, 2011], 246, provides references to the extensive literature on Theophilus and the Serapeum; Johannes Hahn, "The Conversion of the Cult Statues: The Destruction of the Serapaeum 392 A.D. and the Transformation of Alexandria into the 'Christ-loving' City," in *From Temple to Church: Destruction and Renewal of Local Cultic Topography in Late Antiquity,* ed. Stephen Emmel, Johannes Hahn, and Ulrich Gotter (Leiden, 2008), 335–65. As Jitse H. F. Dijkistra points out, "Religious Violence in Late Antique Egypt Reconsidered: The Cases of Alexandria, Panopolis, and Philae," in *Recon-*

Ado's own conviction of the spiritual importance of space, especially the places of Vienne and Lyon, is apparent in the *Martyrology* and in Ado's other writings. He took an interest in the burial places of saints, and especially those who rested in Vienne, nearby Lyon, and Rome. In some cases he supplemented entries in the martyrology of Florus with information about the burial church and special public observances held by the church of Lyon on the feast day of the saints.[125] In his *Life* of the sixth-century monk Theudarius (BHL 8130), Ado included an important description of the topography of Vienne, *metropolis illustrissima et inter Galliarum urbes insignissima,* and mentioned the several monastic cellae and basilicas dedicated to the saints which Theudarius superimposed upon the five Roman castra and their "hundred gods once renowned among the worshipers of demons."[126] The retrieval of the body of Bishop

ceiving Religious Conflict: New Views from the Formative Centuries of Christianity, ed. Wendy Mayer and Chris L. De Wet (London and New York, 2018), 211–33, at 214–16, each of the five literary sources chronologically closest to the events in Alexandria at the time of the destruction of the Serapeum is tendentious, with the result that we have only a general idea of the timing, causes, and course of events of the rioting that took place there in 391/392.

[125] Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence,* 162–65; Ado, *Martyrologium* IIII NON. IUN. 2 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 182) for the feast of Blandina and the forty-eight martyrs of Lyon, Ado expanded the entry of Florus with material he took from Eusebius-Rufinus, and also included a description of the joyful public procession along the river, the name of the church where the saints are buried, the fact that the day of their feast has a special name, and name of the place of their martyrdom. Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen-Âge,* 609, suggests that these additions reflect Ado's own experience in Lyon. Ado, *Martyrologium* IIII NON. SEPT. 1 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 296) expanded Florus's entry commemorating the installation in a basilica of Lyon of the relics of Bishop Iustus and his assistant Viator, by explaining that Iustus had given up his episcopal office and left Lyon for Egypt where he passed the rest of his life in monastic contemplation, and by stipulating that the relics were installed in the basilica of the seven holy Maccabean brothers and martyrs. Ado himself apparently supplied the name of the basilica in Lyon; Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen-Âge,* 553.

[126] *Vita sancti Theuderii* 5–6 (ed. Jean Mabillon, AASS October 12 [Brussels, 1884], 840–41). Ado, *Martyrologium* IV KL. NOV. 3 (ed. Dubois and Renaud, 369) records the transferal of the saint's body "in loco ubi dicitur Vallis Ruspiana," which was the monastic basilica of St. Mary Mother of God which the bishop of Vienne had allowed Theudarius to construct there; Ian Wood, "Topographies of

Desiderius of Vienne from the place of his martyrdom on the River Chalaronne outside of Lyon and its repatriation to Vienne was a central dramatic episode in Ado's *Passio Desiderii* (BHL 2150). The *pia altercatio* between the people of Vienne, who claimed the relics of their shepherd, and those of Lyon, who wished the martyr to stay with them, ended only when the former confirmed the superiority of their claim by furtively removing the treasure. Ado's account of the arrival of the relics in Vienne, the ceremonial occursus of Bishop Aetherius and the populace who had waited there with him, and the installation of the relics in the Church of the Apostles Peter and Paul, burial place of other bishops of the city, suggest that Ado considered this to be an identity-constituting event for the city.[127]

Ado's preoccupation with Vienne is also apparent in his *Chronicle* of the six ages of world history.[128] He cared enough about the foundation of Vienne and its role in the great events of Roman history to invent information about it or to repeat as true information that others had invented.[129] He also creatively merged Vienne and its bishops with Scriptural history, for instance, writing that Herod and Herodias had passed through the city on their way to Spain, and that Pontius Pilate had been exiled there.[130] As Sukanya Raisharma puts it, "Ado sought to universal-

Holy Power in Sixth-Century Gaul," in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages,* ed. Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuws (Leiden, 2001), 137–54.

[127] Ado, *Passio sancti Desiderii* (PL 123:440C–441D) includes "pia altercatio" as well as "felix furtum." A comparable "grandis altercatio" over Martin's body appeared in Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum x* 1.48 (ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum 1.1 [Hannover, 1951], 32).

[128] Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence,* 159–60. Ado drew on the six-ages schema of Bede, Isidore, and Augustine, and he also employed allegory and typology; Mégier, "Karolingische Weltchronistik zwischen Historiographie und Exegese. Frechulf von Lisieux und Ado von Vienne" (n. 32 above).

[129] Sukanya Raisharma, "Much Ado about Vienne? A Localizing Universal *Chronicon*," in *Historiography and Identity III: Carolingian Approaches* (n. 1 above), 271–90, at 279–80; Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence,* 81–84, on the apostolic succession of the bishops of Vienne.

[130] Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence,* 157–60. In general in the sixth age, which proceeds ruler to ruler from Augustus to the reign of Lothair II, the account features a local or regional emphasis, with frequent notices of the

ize the city of Vienne, thereby localizing universal history, and monumentalizing the places of Francia (at least those locales to which he was connected)."[131]

The image of Julian contained in the *Martyrology* influenced Ado's presentation of Emperor Julian's reign as a moment in the sixth age of world history, the period from the Incarnation of Jesus Christ to the end of the world, in the *Chronicle*.[132] From the *Martyrology* Ado gathered information about Julian's alteration of sacred topography to contextualize the account of Julian's project for the Temple he included in the *Chronicle*. This latter episode Ado related as follows:

> Because of his hatred of Christ Julian permitted the Jews to restore the Temple in Jerusalem. When they had been gathered from all the provinces and were laying the new foundation of the Temple, suddenly in the night, because of an earthquake, rocks knocked out from under the foundation were scattered far and wide. Also a ball of fire came out of the precinct of the Temple and burned many of them to death. Terrified by this, the others confessed [belief in] Christ even against their will, and, to prevent them from thinking that this had happened by chance, the next night the sign of the cross appeared on the clothing of all of them.[133]

Here Ado closely paraphrased of his proximate source, Isidore's *Chronica,* which had itself been modeled on the account of Rufinus in his

identity, deeds, and writings of the bishops of Vienne and nearby Lyon. Ado drew attention to the apostolic succession of the earliest bishops, and when it was possible he associated the bishops of Vienne with more famous figures of the early church such as Irenaeus of Lyon; *Chronicon* (PL 123:77CD).

[131] Raisharma, "Much Ado about Vienne? A Localizing Universal *Chronicon,*" 279.

[132] Ado did not link Julian with Vienne, though this would have been possible for ninth-century authors. The *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus (15.8.21–2) had described Julian's *adventus* in Vienne in terms reminiscent of the late antique panegyrics; Sabine G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1981), 46.

[133] Ado, *Chronicon* (PL 123:93D–94A): "Julianus odio Christi templum in Hierosolymis Judaeis reparare permittit. Qui cum ex omnibus provinciis collecti, nova templi fundamenta jacerent, subito nocte oborto, terraemotu saxa ab imo fundamentorum excussa, longe lateque sparsa sunt; igneus quoque globus ab interiore aede templi egressus, plurimos eorum suo prostravit incendio. Quo terrore reliqui pavefacti, Christum confitebantur inviti. Et ne hoc casu crederent factum, sequenti nocte in vestimentis cunctorum crucis apparuit signum."

continuation of Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical history*.[134] The story of the Temple had not appeared in Ado's *Maryrology,* presumably because no saints or martyrs were involved in the episode. But in the *Chronicle,* Ado framed his presentation of the Temple episode between two stories taken from the *Martyrology*. Immediately before his repetition of the anecdote of Julian and the Temple, Ado placed the story of the desecration of the tomb of John the Baptist during the reign of Julian; the retrieval of the relics; the foresight of Athanasius; and Theophilus's later installation of the relics in the church dedicated on the site of the Serapeum which he had destroyed.[135] Immediately after the story of Julian's project to restore the Temple, Ado placed the anecdote of the fall of Nisibis to the Persians after Julian ordered that the bones of James be taken outside the city. The story is a condensed version of that included in the *Martyrology,* but with the addition in the *Chronicle* that Julian's motivation was envy of the miracles of James, a detail that Ado took from Gennadius's *De viris inlustribus*.[136] Apparently Ado recognized a thematic similarity between Julian's effort to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem and his interference with the tombs of Christian saints. Gathering these two stories from the

[134] Isidore of Seville, *Chronica* 2.345 (ed. Martin, 163 and 165): "Qui cum in odio Xristi templum in Hierusolimis Iudaeis reparare permisisset atque ex omnibus prouinciis Iudaeis collectis noua templi fundamenta iacerent, subito nocte oborto terrae motu saxa ab imo fundamentorum longe lateque excussa sunt. Igneus quoque globus ab interior aede templi egressus plurimos eorum suo prostrauit incendio. Quo terrore reliqui Iudaei pauefacti Xristum confitebantur inuiti, et ne hoc casu crederent factum, sequenti nocte in uestimentis cunctorum crucis apparuit signum."

[135] Ado, *Chronicon* (PL 123: 93D); Ado, *Martyrologium* Libellus 51 (III Kal. Septembris; ed. Dubois and Renaud, 28–29).

[136] Ado, *Chronicon* (PL 123:94A) where the phrase "invidens ipsius miraculis" goes beyond the entry for James in the *Martyrology* and may be indebted to Gennadius, *Liber de viris inlustribus* 1 (ed. Richardson, 62): "Nam post multos annos ingressus Iulianus Nisiben et, vel gloriae sepulti invidens vel fidei Constantini cuius ob id domum persequebatur, iussit efferri de civitate sancti corporis reliquias." Ado, *Chronicon* (PL 123: 94BC) drew upon Jerome, *De viris inlustribus* 95, 96, 97, and 98 (ed. Richardson, 46–47) for the end of his account of Julian's reign. Jerome devoted these chapters to Lucifer of Cagliari, Eusebius of Vercelli, Fornacius (=Fortunatianus) of Aquileia, and Acacius of Caesaria, the first and second of whom were exiled under Constantius and invidiously returned by Julian; and the third and fourth were instrumental in the exile and corruption of Pope Liberius.

Martyrology as a frame for the story of the Temple fiasco presented in the *Chronicle* suggests that in Ado's eyes one of Julian's objectionable attributes was his desire to alter sacred topography, whether by rebuilding on the most holy site of ancient Judaism or by removing the relics of saints from their tombs. That Ado should present the Temple story as an instance of Julian's perverse determination to contest the Christian pattern of sacral topography makes sense in light of Ado's own manifest attention to the churches and saints' tombs of Vienne, Lyon, and Rome. The growth of the Church in the sixth age he presented as the progressive expansion of holy places. The fourth- and fifth-century observers had noted and reported Julian's use of exile and the movement of saints' tombs to advance his anti-Christian agenda by controlling local topography.[137] Indeed, their reports were Ado's sources of information on this topic. But Ado's intention and purpose in recounting these anecdotes was different from those of the sources whose reports he depended upon. Their contexts, aims, and anticipated audiences, which had in the intervening centuries been lost, were superseded with concerns that were of

[137] Nathaniel Morehouse, "Begrudging the Honor: Julian and Christian Martyrdom," in *Heirs of Roman Persecution. Studies on a Christian and Para-Christian Discourse in Late Antiquity,* ed. É. Fournier and W. Mayer (New York, 2020), 44–60; Jennifer Barry, *Bishops in Flight: Exile and Displacement in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2019), 157–65; Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*; Juana Torres, "Emperor Julian and the Veneration of Relics," *Antiquité tardive* 17 (2010): 205–14; eadem, "El poder de los idolos y de las reliquias: un conflicto de competencias," in *Homo religiosus. Mediadores con lo divino en el mundo mediterráneo antiguo,* Actas del Congreso internacional de Historia de las Religiones, Palma de Mallorca, 2005, and "La ocupación de espacios sagrados como fuente de conflicto entre paganos y cristianos," in *Libertad e intolerancia religiosa en el Imperio romano,* ed. J. Fernàndez Ubiña and M. Marcos (Madrid, 2007), 83–96. Another Carolingian who was aware of Julian's use of banishment was Paulinus of Aquileia, *Epistola* 18b (ed. E. Dümmler, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 2, MGH Epistolae 4 [Berlin, 1895], 526): "Legitur etiam in ecclesiastica historia, quod cum Iulianus destitutionem religionis Christi vellet inferred in ecclesia, festinabat presules ecclesiarum a civitatibus distrahendo suspendere, ut eorum absentia solveretur ecclesia, et dum qui docerent non essent, per hoc longo tempore paterentur populi propriae religionis oblivionem." This paraphrases a passage from Sozomon *He* 5.15.9 (ed. Hansen, 622), which had been included in Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.27.5 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 343).

Ado's own time and place, and that illustrate the porous boundary between chronicle and hagiography within Ado's sphere.

Ado himself apparently did not dedicate the work, and the *Chronicle* contains few hints as to its intended audience. External evidence is limited too. Raisharma lists sixteen manuscripts containing the entire work or fragments of it, six of them produced in the eleventh century, several of them in Benedictine houses in northern France. The oldest (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Reg. lat. 556) is said to date from the ninth or tenth century and includes both the *Chronicle* and the *Histories* of Gregory of Tours. On the basis of the strong element of local history and legend present in the *Chronicle,* Raisharma speculates that the work may have been intended as a "memento of local pride" for the enjoyment of members of the aristocratic elite of Provence.[138] When Ado wrote the *Chronicle* in the 860s, the duke of Vienne was Gerard who held the position from Emperor Lothar I (r. 817–55). In 860 Lupus of Ferrières had written to Gerard urging him to confirm Ado's election to the see of Vienne. Gerard later served as regent for Lothar's son Charles of Provence in the period 855–63, and then supported King Lothar II in the period 863–69. After the death of Lothar II Charles the Bald forced Gerard to give up the duchy and in 870 replaced him with Boso of Provence.[139] Gerard and his entourage may have been among the intended readers of the *Chronicle*.

Conclusion

All three Carolingian references to Julian's unbuilt Temple were written in the West Frankish realm during the lifetime of Charles the Bald (823–77). Frechulf dedicated his work to Empress Judith with the explicit intention that she would use it in the education of her son Charles. Whether Amulo intended Charles to read *Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum* is not clear, but the work did influence two sections of the *acta* of the coun-

[138] Raisharma, "Much Ado About Vienne? A Localizing Universal *Chronicon,*" 284, with list of manuscripts at 273–74.

[139] Lupus, *Epistola* 122 (ed. E. Dümmler, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi* 4, MGH Epistolae 6 [Berlin, 1925], 102–3); Nimmegeers, *Évêques entre Bourgogne et Provence,* 69–70, 164–66, and 191–93; René Louis, *Girart, Comte de Vienne (819–877), et ses fondations monastiques: de l'histoire a la légende* (Auxerre, 1946).

cil at Meaux/Paris in 845/846, and Charles reportedly reviewed these. It is unclear who the intended readers of Ado's *Chronicle* might have been, but the most likely possible addressee, Gerard *dux,* served Lothar I and Lothar II and was finally ousted by Charles the Bald. It is also unclear why the subject of Julian's project should arise several times in those decades in this region. Certainly elite court and ecclesiastical circles in this period are known for their interest in the achievements of the recent and more distant past.[140]

It is also worth noting that while travel to the Holy Land from Francia was rare, it was not unknown, and both oral and written accounts of those who had visited Jerusalem circulated in the ninth-century West.[141] The Jerusalem Temple was often on the minds of at least some authors working in the West Frankish realm during the lifetime of Charles the Bald. In 824 the young Walahfrid Strabo referred to the Temple several times in a homily he wrote on the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem and based on Luke 19:41–47.[142] In 829 Walahfrid compared Louis the Pious to a second Moses who constructs not tabernacle and bronze serpents in the desert but new temples of morals.[143] Walahfrid mentioned the Temple repeatedly in the work on liturgical history, *Liber de exordiis et*

[140] Rosamond McKitterick, "Charles the Bald (823–877) and his Library: The Patronage of Learning" (n. 54 above), *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (n. 116 above), and *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, 2006), 35–61, has argued that interest in Roman history was conspicuous in *scriptoria* connected with the royal and imperial court, that of Charles the Bald as well as his predecessors; see also William J. Diebold, "'Nos quoque morem illius imitari cupientes': Charles the Bald's Evocation and Imitation of Charlemagne," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 75 (1993): 271–300.

[141] Yitzhak Hen, "Holy Land Pilgrims from Frankish Gaul," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 76 (1998): 291–306; Nestor Kavvadas, *Jerusalem zwischen Aachen und Bagdad: Zur Existenzkrise des byzantinischen Christentums im Abbasidenreich* (Stuttgart, 2017); Michael McCormick, *Charlemagne's Survey of the Holy Land: Wealth, Personnel, and Buildings of a Mediterranean Church between Antiquity and the Middle Age* (Washington, D.C., 2011); Maraval, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient,* 261; Aryeh Grabois, "Charlemagne, Rome and Jerusalem," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 59 (1981): 792–809.

[142] Hermann Knittel, "Ein Frühwerk Walahfrid Strabo: *De subversione Hierusalem*," *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 41 (2006): 357–400.

[143] Walahfrid Strabo, "De imagine Tetrici," 100 (ed. Herren [n. 3 above], 125): "mora noua temple struis."

incrementis, he wrote in the period 840/842 and dedicated to Reginbert (†846) the librarian of Reichenau.[144]

In addition to these factors, there was a long-standing interest in dramatic episodes of destruction, both acts of God and those of God's agents. From the tower of Babel to Boniface and the oak at Giesmar in the 720s and Charlemagne and the Irminsul in 772, stories about the toppling of blasphemous edifices and offensive idols came to the attention of literate and even some illiterate Franks. Hagiographic redactors during the reign of Louis the Pious and after continued to find new meaning in reports of shrine and idol destruction.[145] One way of conveying that meaning was in the material itself, for example, when Boniface used timber hewn from the sacred oak to erect a chapel at Geismar.[146] Jaś Elsner has drawn attention to the circumstances under which defacement of images and destruction of monuments may become creative acts of forgetting, which paradoxically "preserve the memory of the eliminated as condemned even in the act of their eradication."[147] In these cases the iconoclastic performance does not altogether erase the broken image, but produces an absence so conspicuous that it brings to mind the presence in a certain negative light. This account of violence directed at an image clearly applies to the story of Julian replacing with a statue of himself the statue of Jesus and the woman cured of the flow of blood. While the statue of the emperor was smashed by a bolt of lightning, its pieces remained where they had fallen, and thus the presence of the altered image became a memory sanction insofar as it publicly memorialized the erased

[144] Walahfrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Boretius and Krause).

[145] David Appleby, "Shrine and Idol Destruction in Three Carolingian Hagiographic Texts," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 73 (2022): 1–23.

[146] Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii* 6 (ed. Wilhelm Levison, *Vitae Sancti Bonifatii,* MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum 57 [Hannover, 1905], 31–32); John-Henry Clay, *In the Shadow of Death: Saint Boniface and the Conversion of Hessia, 721–54* (Turnhout, 2010), 200–203 and 295–307; for an example from the Ottonian period, see Ittai Weinryb, "Hildesheim Avant-Garde: Bronze, Columns, and Colonialism," *Speculum* 93 (2018): 728–82.

[147] Jaś Elsner, "Iconoclasm and the Preservation of Memory," in *Monuments and Memory, Made and Unmade* (n. 9 above), 209–31, at 214 and 211.

memoria.[148] But Elsner's account of iconoclasm and the preservation of memory may also have some application to Julian's project to restore the Temple. It is not clear whether in the ninth century the scattered stones of the foundation were still visible at the Temple site, or whether the clothing scorched with the sign of the cross had been preserved somewhere. But the fifth-century ecclesiastical historians mentioned the stones, the deaths, the marked clothing, and the autopsy of the survivors as testimony to the act of God that halted construction soon after it had begun. Their words changed what might have been an act of complete elision into a gesture of erasure so conspicuous that it entered the collective memory of their time. Their accounts eventually furnished material for repurposing within the cultural semantics of later times.

The preference of Carolingian authors for the abridgment of Isidore of Seville and the epitome of ecclesiastical history assembled by Cassiodorus seems to reflect something fundamental about their approach to the past. Foreign to the predisciplinary world of the early Middle Ages was a sharp conceptual distinction between old texts as repositories of probative information about historical events, on one hand, and, on the other, old texts as assemblages of moral examples and guides for living. Certainly Carolingian readers understood that the narratives of past events offered in histories and chronicles ought to be true as well as useful. But their confidence in the veracity of the authors whose works they consulted, and by extension their confidence in the honesty of the witnesses those authors had relied upon, usually outweighed whatever skeptical doubts Carolingian readers may have entertained about the possible representational gap between the old texts they received and the reality those texts described. This basic stance did not prevent them from noticing and sharing in the irony that pervaded the sources on Julian they used. Rufinus and the ecclesiastical historians whose works Cassiodorus excerpted

[148] Jaś Elsner, "Iconoclasm as Discourse: From Antiquity to Byzantium," *The Art Bulletin* 94 (2021): 368–94, 371: "The act of iconoclasm is accompanied by the need to record its effect so that the act of forgetting will be remembered." See *Libellus synodalis Parisiensis* (ed. Werminghoff, 487 and 517) and *Epitome libelli synodalis Parisiensis* 11 (ed. Werminghoff, 538–39), which follow Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, *Het* 6.41–42 (ed. Jacob and Hanslik, 363–64), relying on Sozomen, *He* 5.21.1–4 (ed. Hansen, 654–56), who mentioned Eusebius, *He* 7.18.2 (ed. Schwartz and Mommsen, 672).

regarded the emperor with an ironic awareness that Julian's intentions and purposes failed to provide an adequate account for his actions. As far as the Carolingians were concerned, it was Rufinus and in his wake Isidore who released Julian's projected Temple from the meaning the emperor was thought to have intended it to have. They liberated the non-Temple from Julian's intention not because they hoped to render the anecdote an unwitting, objective document of historical fact, and not because they prized the epistemic value of source material that was free from aspiration, expectation, and partisan spirit. Instead they rejected Julian's authority to assign meaning to it in order to make the anti-monument available for re-interpretation in the light of what they understood to be providential intention and divine purpose. One interpretative authority replaced another.

This awareness of the ironic subversion of Julian's intended subversion became the common footing of the three Carolingian presentations of the episode of the Temple. Yet the conviction that the episode must be meaningful did not entail that its meaning was entirely evident. Along with the irony that animated it, the information about Julian inherited from the authors of the fifth century was both laconic enough and ambiguous enough to present further opportunities for interpretation. Even when providential intention and divine agency were acknowledged to be present in the story about Julian's project, the meaning of the unbuilt Temple was not self-explanatory. Thus the anecdote was repurposed in three different contexts. Julian's reign provided Sedulius Scottus with material for a lesson on a particular aspect of good and bad rule. But Frechulf's imaginative scope was much wider. He apparently recognized that the whole series of Temples erected and then toppled in Jerusalem could be viewed as monuments of Israel's repeated efforts to align human aspirations with the imperfectly grasped divine intention. The emperor's abridged expectation showed that after the Incarnation and death of Jesus Christ, the Temple's epochal significance depended not upon its presence but upon its absence. In polemical settings the figure of Julian as indecorous in appearance and even insanely angry was incorporated into *ad hominem* invectives that were meant to mark social and ideological perimeters. Carolingian polemicists also noticed ancient reports of the emperor's hostility to Christian devotional images and his desire to memorialize himself. In contrast, Amulo mentioned the unbuilt Temple

Mediaeval Studies 84 (2022)

not to arraign a tyrant before the court of history but to denounce contemporary Jews who Amulo thought exhibited the same perverse messianic expectations about the future that had animated their ancestors in Julian's day. Ordering and unifying the church also entailed purifying it through being seen to exclude those whose hopes for the future clashed with those of the archbishop's intended Christian Frankish readers. As Heil remarks in a related context, the "Jews' otherness served the aim of creating a fuller Christian identity by providing a contrast to the ideal of Christian individual and collective life."[149] Julian made many brief appearances in the martyrologies, hagiography, and commemorative verse of the Carolingian period. His name was remembered along with those who had suffered for the Christian faith during his reign. Although Ado mentioned Julian's non-Temple in a chronicle of world history, he viewed history from the archiepiscopal *cathedra* of Vienne, a city illustrious for its foundation and ancient Rome past, and even more glorious because of the achievements of its saints, martyrs, and bishops. Celebrating the places and heroes of Vienne may have been intended to enhance the prestige of members of the regional aristocracy by associating them with a city whose first bishop, Ado maintained, had been Crescens, one of St. Paul's disciples. Connecting the diachronic line of the church's progress in history with the synchronous expansion of Christian holy places, Ado was attuned to the sacred geography of Vienne and other important cities. His repurposing of the story of the unbuilt Temple emphasized not Julian's mistake about time, whether past or future, but the emperor's perverse desire to alter sacred topography by encouraging the Jews to restore the Temple in Jerusalem as a place for worshipping according to the Law.

Thomas Aquinas College.

[149] Heil, "'Nos Nescientes de Hoc Velle Manere'" (n. 45 above), 98; François Hartog, *Chronos: L'Occident aux prises avec le temps* (Paris, 2020).