

The *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*: a controversy reviewed

Master Thesis

RMA Medieval Studies

Floris Kolner

6035930

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. The <i>Indiculus</i> and the ‘Bonifatian connection’	7
2.1 Boniface in review.....	15
3. The <i>Indiculus</i> and the connection with Charlemagne	19
3.1 Charlemagne and the <i>Indiculus</i> reconsidered.....	24
4. The aftermath: what remains of the <i>Indiculus</i> and what <i>can</i> we say?	28
4.1 The <i>Indiculus</i> as a capitulary?	34
5. Conclusions	40
6. Appendix: manuscript description of Cod. Pal. Lat. 577.	43
7. Bibliography	45

1. Introduction

1. *De sacrilegio ad sepulchra mortuorum.*
2. *De sacrilegio super defunctos id est dadsisas*
3. *De spurcalibus in Februario.*
4. *De casulis id est fanis.*
5. *De sacrilegiis per aecclesias .*
6. *De sacris silvarum quae nimidas vocant .*
7. *De hiis quae faciunt super petras.*
8. *De sacris Mercurii vel Iovis.*
9. *De sacrificio quod fit alicui sanctorum.*
10. *De filacteriis et ligaturis.*
11. *De fontibus sacrificiorum .*
12. *De incantationibus.*
13. *De auguriis vel avium vel equorum vel bovom stercora vel sternutationes .*
14. *De divinis vel sortilegis.*
15. *De igne fricato de ligno id est nodfyr.*
16. *De cerebro animalium.*
17. *De observatione paganorum in foco vel in incoatione rei alicuius.*
18. *De incertis locis que colunt pro sanctis.*
19. *De petendo quod boni vocant sanctae Mariae.*
20. *De feriis quae faciunt Iovi vel Mercurio.*
21. *De lunae defectione quod dicunt ' vince luna !'*
22. *De tempestatibus et cornibus et cocleis.*
23. *De sulcis circa villas.*
24. *De pagano cursu quem yrias nominant scisis pannis vel calciamentis .*
25. *De eo quod sibi sanctos fingunt quoslibet mortuos.*
26. *De simulacro de consparsa farina.*
27. *De simulacris de pannis factis.*
28. *De simulacro quod per campos portant.*
29. *De ligneis pedibus vel manibus pagano ritu.*
30. *De eo quod credunt quia femine lunam commendet , quod possint corda homi*

*num tollere iuxta paganos.*¹

The ‘list’ seen above is contained in Cod. Pal. Lat. 577,² and takes the lead in conversion studies as the most ‘controversial’ since its discovery in the seventeenth century.³ This list seems to contain descriptions of certain practices, which were deemed ‘sacreligious’ by the scribe in some instances, and follows a baptismal vow in a Germanic dialect.⁴ Since the text is written in a late eighth century insular-continental hand, most historians, as we shall see, date the manuscript and its compilation to the end of the eighth century. The origin of the list and the baptismal vow, however, were disputed ever since. Fol. 1r-73r seem to have been written by an Anglo-Saxon hand which accounts for more than three-quarter of all texts in the manuscript.⁵ The codex contains mostly church canonical material and sermons at the beginning which can be seen as pastoral literature.⁶

It remains uncertain, however, if this list was compiled at the end of the eighth century, around the same time as the compilation of this codex, or might have been transmitted from older codices from the time of Boniface. What the identity, provenance or origin of this list is has been discussed over the centuries after its discovery. By using historical, palaeographical and codicological evidence and methodology, historians since the seventeenth century have been trying to figure out the provenance, function and compilation date of the *Indiculus*.⁷ This was not an easy task, since the list was copied into Pal. Lat. 577 without a title, preface or any indication of its purpose. Because of this, historians have come up with quite daring approaches to unravel the mysteries surrounding this text. Historians have generally tried to place this list in two contexts: that of Boniface or that of Charlemagne’s early reign. This, consequently, also had its effects on what the text’s function would have been. The debate surrounding these mysteries of the *Indiculus* is largely dominated by these two ‘camps’. Why did it end up in this codex and, equally interesting, can we connect this text to Boniface, or rather to the reign of Charlemagne? As we shall see, the evidence used to answer these questions varies per historian, where one focuses on codicological evidence, the other seems more convinced of the historical or linguistic evidence.

The list was first discovered in the mid seventeenth century. Bishop Ferdinand von Fürstenberg of Paderborn, with help of a librarian, found the Cod. Pal. Lat. 577 in the Vatican library and printed a short piece of research on the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow he found with it. He stated that the list would have affinity with the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L’Estinnes, where it seemed obvious that it would have been compiled during the Bonifatian era.⁸ The argument that the *Indiculus* was a product of (or a *Vorlage* for) the *concilium Germanicum* or synod of L’Estinnes gained continued support by other researchers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,

¹ *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*, ed. Alfred Boretius in: *Capitularia regum Francorum*, Capit. 1 (Hannover, 1886), pp. 222-223.

² Located at Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 7r. The numbers are taken over from the Boretius’ edition of this text, which will be cited and discussed later on in this chapter.

³ The rest of this introduction, as well as the thesis in its entirety, will show how diverse the theories are and on which assumptions they rest.

⁴ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 6v-7r: after the *Attigny Totenbund* a renouncement of the devil in a Germanic dialect starts at the bottom of 6v, which continues in a ‘confession of faith’ on top of 7r. Most scholars, up to Gysseling and Mostert, see this baptismal vow as distinctly representative and written for the ‘Saxons’. This dispute will come up later in this chapter

⁵ Only the first and last codicological unit were written by hands from the ninth/tenth century. See note 92.

⁶ See the manuscript description in the appendix.

⁷ All these historians will be named in the coming chapters and/or in this introduction.

⁸ Fürstenberg printed his *CAROLI MAGNI CAPITVLATIO DE PARTIBUS SAXONIAE* originally in Rome (1652), where he also put texts 1-8 from Cod. Pal. Lat. 289, the *Capitulare Saxonicum* from the same codex and the baptismal vow plus *Indiculus* from Cod. Pal. Lat. 577 in this edition. He mainly argues for the relation of canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum* with the contents of the *Indiculus*. Also, the connection with the council of ‘Liftinnes’, canon VI argues for a connection with the *Indiculus*. A reprint of the text can be found in: Ferdinand von Fürstenberg ed., *Monumenta Paderbornensia* (Amsterdam, 1672), pp. 329-337.

consequently printing editions that put the synods, capitularies and the *Indiculus* together. The first centuries after its discovery, the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow were connected to the previously mentioned synods without a broader consideration of codicological evidence.⁹ The first MGH edition of the text, which was published in the 1830's by Pertz, followed its predecessors in indicating a link with the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L'Estinnes, yet implying a more direct connection with the *Concilium Germanicum*.¹⁰ Up until the nineteenth century, it was 'camp Boniface' that dominated the discussion surrounding the *Indiculus*.

After a longer period where camp Charlemagne dominated the discussion, which is between the end of the nineteenth century until the late twentieth century, Glatthaar came back with another theory to make a stand for the Bonifatian connection. Glatthaar noted that the first eleven folia of Pal. Lat. 577 could make up a text collection, which would have been compiled in a Bonifatian circle around the 740's and 50's. The parallels in the *epistolae Bonifatii*¹¹ would connect the nameless sermons¹² to Boniface's views and ideas and, therefore, their origin to a Bonifatian circle. This view was so influential that, ten years later, Marco Mostert applauded Glatthaar's thorough analysis and added more parallels with the *epistolae Bonifatii* to his thesis on the origin and aim of the *Indiculus* and, simultaneously, the baptismal vow.¹³ It seemed as if the 'Bonifatian camp' had made a strong comeback, after a long interference of 'camp Charlemagne'.

This other 'camp', as previously stated, arose in the nineteenth century as a reaction to the prevailing theories of the 'Bonifatian camp'. It was not until Massman, in the 1830's, that the origin of the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow as being composed around 742/743 was disputed. He looked at the *Attigny Totenbund* in Pal. Lat. 577. It is a text where bishops are listed, including Lullus, who attended the Attigny synod in 762. There, they promised to pray for each other after death.¹⁴ Since the period of Lullus as Bishop coincides with the first period of Charlemagne's reign, Massman saw no harm in assuming that the *Indiculus* could have been created during the Saxon wars.¹⁵ Massmann did not elaborate on this interpretation, whereas Scherer did in the 1860's. He stated that the texts, including the *Indiculus*, in the first eleven folia of the codex were organized chronologically, which would mean that the *Indiculus* is younger than the *Attigny Totenbund* and, therefore, compiled during Charlemagne's reign. The list would also depict practices that were typical for a 'recently converted people', which would mean that the list was a product of the *Nachmission* during the Saxon Wars or

⁹ Michael Glatthaar, *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg: zur politischen Dimension eines Rechtsbegriffs* (Freiburg, 2004), pp. 439-440: Glatthaar gives a summary of several historians after Von Fürstenberg who follow him in his argument that the *Indiculus* must have been created around the two previously mentioned synods. Especially Philippe Labbe (1672) notified the relation with the last chapter of the L'Estinnes synod. Jean Hardouin (1714), Joseph Hartzheim (1759 and Giovanni Mansi (1766) continued to print the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow in collections that contained the *Concilium Germanicum*, the synod of L'Estinnes and other Carolingian capitularies, following the line of reasoning initiated by Von Fürstenberg.

¹⁰ Carloman, *Forma Abrenuntiationis diaboli. Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz in: *Leges* (in folio) I: Capitularia regum Francorum (Hannover, 1835), pp. 19-20, p. 19: *Ad calcem (...) esse constitui*.

¹¹ Whenever there will be referred to *epistolae* from Boniface, the numbers as found in Reinhold Rau's edition (which will be cited later on in this thesis) will be used. In one other instance, Tangl's edition will be used.

¹² An edition of the 'nameless sermons' as contained in Pal. Lat. 577 was made by Machielsen, which Glatthaar also uses as reference in his analysis. For the edition, see: L. Machielsen, "Fragments patristiques non-identifiés du ms. Vat. Pal. 577", *Sanctis Erudiri*, 12 (1961), pp. 448-539.

¹³ The first chapter will elaborate on Mostert's analysis in more detail, for now, see: Marco Mostert, "Communicating the faith. The circle of Boniface, Germanic vernaculars, and Frisian and Saxon converts", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 70 (2013), pp. 87-130.

¹⁴ For more information on the text, see the manuscript description in the appendix.

¹⁵ Massman, *Die deutschen Abschörungs-, Glaubens-, Beicht- und Betformeln* (Berlin, 1839), p. 22: he also mainly criticizes the 'not well evidenced editions' printed by historians from the seventeenth- and eighteenth centuries who just follow the assumption that the *Indiculus* must be from the Bonifatian era.

shortly thereafter.¹⁶ These theories also resonated in later research, where Leitzmann added linguistical insights which would prove that the *Indiculus*'s vernacular words would resemble the vocal forms in the *Freckenhorster Heberregister*, a list of inventories from the monastery of Freckenhorst near Münster.¹⁷ Hauck used this argument to indicate a connection between the missionary Liudger, who was later bishop of Münster, and the compilation of the *Indiculus*.¹⁸ Furthermore, Holger Homann used the list to reconstruct superstitious practices in certain regions in early medieval Germany, where most practices would originate from Westphalia in Saxony. This would, consequently, mean that the list was compiled during the reign of Charlemagne and the mission to the Saxons at the end of the eight century.¹⁹ These arguments had great influence in the debate up until the publication of Glatthaar's thesis in 2004.²⁰

For now, it seems that the 'Bonifatian camp' is the strongest in the debate surrounding the *Indiculus*. After the publications from Glatthaar and Mostert, no voices have come from 'camp Charlemagne' to strengthen their own interpretations. It seems as if 'camp Boniface', especially after Glatthaar's thesis, was the definite victor of the debate, meaning that the *Indiculus* was a product from the Bonifatian circle. Yet how solid is his theory? And is it possible to still say something for the *Indiculus* as being produced during Charlemagne's early reign? Is the debate really finished and have the answers been revealed by Glatthaar?

Because of this, the purpose of the thesis will be to re-open this debate by, first of all, looking at these theories from both 'camps'. As we will see in the coming chapters, the theories from both camps are supported by assumptions on textual and codicological evidence that seem either vague or misguided. Consequently, the theories themselves seem tricky and not well evidenced. It will be shown how diverse and indirect these theories get, especially since we are left with practically no title, preface or function for the text in its manuscript context. As a result, as we have already seen, the historical context, along with codicological and linguistic arguments, functions as the foundation for many of these theories on the provenance, identity and function of the *Indiculus*. Where did these theories come from and why were they so influential? What kind of sources were used and which assumptions supported the credibility of these theories?

The theories will be re-evaluated with the help of theories on text transmission and authorship. Furthermore, a re-evaluation of conversion studies will also aim to look at Scherer's thesis regarding the *Indiculus* in particular. Criticism regarding linguistic evidence, especially constructed by German philologists and historians, will also be re-evaluated. The final chapter will deal with the outcome of this criticism: in which ways can we interpret the *Indiculus*? Here, it will be the aim to stay as close as possible to the source material and the manuscript context and to avoid theories that are built on mostly indirect evidence. In the end, when one stays close to the source material, there is no way of saying whether the *Indiculus* would perfectly fit a Bonifatian circle or the early reign of Charlemagne. Furthermore, attention will also be drawn to the possibilities to interpret the *Indiculus* as a capitulary or a table of contents, since we encounter similar 'short lists' in other manuscripts.²¹ The results will be based on the text critical theories will also be used to re-evaluate the previous theories. In this way, this thesis will guide the way for future research.

¹⁶ Karl Müllenhof and Wilhelm Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher poesie und prosa aus dem VIII- XII Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1864), p. 496.

¹⁷ This argument will be elaborated upon later in chapter two, for now see: Leitzmann, "Saxonica I", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 25 (1900), pp. 567-591.

¹⁸ This argument will be elaborated upon later in chapter two. For now, see: Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, bd. 2 (1958).

¹⁹ This argument will be elaborated upon later in chapter two. For now, see: Holger Homann, *Der Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum und verwandte Denkmäler* (Göttingen, 1965).

²⁰ Some of these historians will be named in the first and second chapters. For now, it suffices to state that these arguments were influential up until the end of the twentieth century.

²¹ In the third chapter, examples of these other lists will be given and evaluated. As will be seen, the lack of any preface or title in the *Indiculus* makes it hard to find a solid parallel in any of these other lists we know of.

2. The *Indiculus* and the ‘Bonifatian connection’

As we have seen in the summary of the debate, there seem to be two ‘camps’ that dominate the field, when one looks for an answer to the origin, provenance and identity of the *Indiculus*: the camp that argues for a ‘Bonifatian connection’ and another camp that argues for its compilation during the early reign of Charlemagne. This chapter will highlight the evidence that historians have put forward to connect the *Indiculus* to a Bonifatian circle during the first half of the eighth century. These historians favourably interpret the *Indiculus* as *Vorlage* (template) for the *Concilium Germanicum*, or as a capitulary that would be issued by either Pippin or Carloman. Furthermore, the *Indiculus*, as part of a ‘Bonifatian text collection’, as proposed by Scherer (and later elaborated upon by Glatthaar and Mostert), would support these previously mentioned interpretations of the *Indiculus*.²²

This chapter aims to closely examine the theories and assumptions that underlay these concepts and interpretations. The connection with the *Concilium Germanicum* and/or the synod of L’Estinnes, which proved to be influential in the debate on the origin and identity of the *Indiculus*, will be re-evaluated by use of a text-critical and comparative approach. Whether the *Indiculus* can be seen as a capitulary is a matter which will not be elaborated upon in this chapter, since the *Indiculus* as a capitulary will receive more attention later on in this thesis. This interpretation affects another debate on the nature and origin of capitularies and under which circumstances they were compiled. The notion of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, however, will be re-evaluated thoroughly. The concept of a ‘Bonifatian text collection (as contained in Pal. Lat. 577, presumably) had a great impact on the discussion, favouring the Bonifatian connection over a connection with Charlemagne. Glatthaar’s concept relies heavily on evidence taken from the *epistolae Bonifatii*, which would allow a connection between the nameless sermons in the text collection and Boniface’s views and ideas. The codicological parallels found in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, another Bonifatian text collection in a Würzburg codex, also support his theory.²³ Mostert supports this notion with even more indirect written evidence from the letter collection, while not looking more critically at the evidence used to support this claim.²⁴ Both authors see the *Indiculus* as being part of this *Sententiae Bonifatianae*, mostly because of its relation to the other texts in the collection and its supposed direct connection with the baptismal vow, which is located directly above our text on folio 7v.²⁵ This chapter will test the assumptions, which underlay this connection with Boniface and, consequently, the supposed place of the *Indiculus* in this connection with Boniface. The concept of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* itself will also be tested accordingly with the aid of new research on the transmission of texts in the Early Middle Ages and the concept of authorship, which opened up new perspectives on how texts were subject to change and why they were copied into other manuscripts. At the end, the re-evaluation will conclude with a new overview of evidence, which could be useful for an interpretation that favours a connection between the *Indiculus* and Boniface.

²² Müllenhof and Wilhelm Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher poesie*, p. 496: *Da die (...) sammlung vorliege.*

²³ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 455-493: For each text he encounters on the first eleven folia, Glatthaar sums up the parallels in the *epistolae Bonifatii* and eventual other transmissions in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*.

²⁴ Mostert, “Communicating the Faith”, pp. 117-118: While praising Glatthaar for his thorough analysis, Mostert spends two pages on adding more parallels from the *epistolae* and the *vita Bonifatii*. For more information on these parallels, see note 132.

²⁵ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 439-455; Mostert, “Communicating the Faith”, pp. 120-123: Whether the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* once belonged together or not is another debate filled with linguistic and historical arguments, neither of them being more of influence than the other. Here, a similar division in camps can be noted, where several historians attribute the baptismal vow to a Bonifatian circle and others see it as a formula used by the Carolingians to baptize the Saxon rebels. Some historians even proposed that the *Indiculus* would be an index for an interrogation after the baptism (hence its place just after the baptismal vow).

First of all, it is important to start at the discovery of the *Indiculus*, where the Bonifatian connection was almost ‘intuitively’ assumed by the discoverer of our list. Between 1651 and 1661, the bishop of Paderborn, Von Fürstenberg, with help of a librarian, studied the Cod. Pal. Lat. 577 in the Vatican library and edited the manuscript, along with the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow he found with it. He stated, while looking at similarities with canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum* (743) and the last canon of the L’Estinnes synod (744), that the list must have been created around the dates of both synods. The list would elaborate on canon V²⁶ of the *Concilium Germanicum* and would also be applied for the punishment of ‘pagan practices’ we encounter in the council of L’Estinnes. In this way, Von Fürstenberg assumed that the presence of the *Concilium Germanicum* and the Synod of L’Estinnes (next to the *Indiculus*) in Pal. Lat. 577 indicated that the list must somehow be related thematically to canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum* and to canon IV of L’Estinnes. Why this, in his eyes, allowed an interpretation of the list as being an elaborate version of canon V and used to compile canon IV of L’Estinnes is unclear.²⁷ He gave no further interpretation of the exact identity and function of the list. The presence of the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L’Estinnes in Pal. Lat. 577 also argued for their relation and *zeitgenössische Entstehung* in his opinion, where the *Indiculus* was a product of the *Concilium Germanicum* and a *Vorlage* for the synod of L’Estinnes.²⁸ The argument that the *Indiculus* was a list intended for the *Concilium Germanicum* or synod of L’Estinnes gained continued support by other researchers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, consequently printing editions that put the synods, capitularies, the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* together. The first centuries after its discovery, the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow were connected to the previously mentioned synods without a broader consideration of codicological evidence.²⁹

In 1962, to take a great leap forward in time, Lambertus Machielsen argued for the compilation of the *Indiculus* around 745, yet saw no direct evidence for a connection with Boniface. According to Machielsen, we might state that the *Indiculus* was a capitulary issued by either Carloman or Pippin. While firstly disproving the connection with Charlemagne, since Machielsen sees no direct evidence in the *Indiculus* which would imply the use of the list for the Saxon conversion,³⁰ he mainly notes the parallels with ‘list capitularies’. Even though most of these compact lists have been transmitted from Charlemagne’s reign, Machielsen notes that Carloman and Pippin must have issued similar compact capitularies and that we simply have the disadvantage of not knowing them.³¹

²⁶ *Concilium Germanicum*, ed. Reinhold Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius; Willibalds Leben des Bonifatius* (Darmstadt, 1968), p. 380: The following canon elaborates on ‘pagan practices’ which were deemed wrong and punishable by the participants of the synod: *Decrevimus, ut (...) diligentes prohibeant.*

²⁷ Ferdinand von Fürstenberg, *Monumenta Paderbornensia* (Amsterdam, 1672), p. 308: He explains the connection with the *concilio Liftinnas* and how the list elaborated on the punishment for ‘practicing pagan rituals’, yet gives no solid arguments for his interpretation: *In alio vetusto MS. Palat. subiungitur concilio Liftinensi anni DCCXLIII. Abrenuntiatio diaboli operumque eius, et brevis professio fidei, veteri lingua Theotisca, cum indiculo superstitionum, a quibus populum eipsoporom sollicitudine revocandum synodus illa statuit, parte 1. can. 5. quo vix ullum antiquitatis Germanicae monumentum vetustius extat: annos enim superat DCCCC*

²⁸ Fürstenberg printed his *CAROLI MAGNI CAPITVLATIO DE PARTIBUS SAXONIAE* originally in Rome (1652), where he also inserted texts 1-8 from Cod. Pal. Lat. 289, the *Capitulare Saxonicum* from the same codex and the baptismal vow plus *Indiculus* from Cod. Pal. Lat. 577. He mainly argues for the relation of canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum* with the contents of the *Indiculus*. Also, the connection with the council of ‘Liftinnes’, canon VI argues for a connection with the *Indiculus*. A reprint of the text can be found in: Ferdinand von Fürstenberg, *Monumenta Paderbornensia* (Amsterdam, 1672), pp. 329-337.

²⁹ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 439-440: Glatthaar gives a summary of several historians after Von Fürstenberg who follow him in his argument that the *Indiculus* must have been created around the two previously mentioned synods. Especially Philippe Labbe (1672) notified the relation with the last chapter of the L’Estinnes synod. Jean Hardouin (1714), Joseph Hartzheim (1759) and Giovanni Mansi (1766) continued to print the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow in collections that contained the *Concilium Germanicum*, the synod of L’Estinnes and other Carolingian capitularies, following the line of reasoning initiated by Von Fürstenberg.

³⁰ Lambert Machielsen, “De Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum (742-754). Een capitulare van Karloman of Pepijn de Korte”, *Leuvense bijdragen*, 51 (1962), pp. 129-149, p. 146: *Het voorgaande (...) de opsteller.*

³¹ Machielsen, “De Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum”, pp. 144-145.

Furthermore, Machielsen does not see evidence for assuming an early compilation of the *Indiculus*, on grounds that the practices would be ‘too heathen’. Penitentials in centuries after would still deal with the same kinds of superstition, which does not make the case of the *Indiculus* more special.³² The hand that wrote the *Indiculus* in Pal. Lat. 577 would not resemble a hand from the late eight century, but rather a hand from the 740’s, thus arguing for a date of the manuscript itself before 762.³³ The *Indiculus* would, in this case, fit in the Bonifatian reform period, which he dates between 741-754.

The parallel with *niedfyr*, according to Machielsen, would prove that the *Indiculus* was influenced by the earlier issued canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*. The only other attested version of *nodfyr* can be found in this canon, where it is written as *niedfyr*. Strikingly, this canon also focuses on some other superstitious practices that can also be found in the *Indiculus*.³⁴ We know of no other text from the Early Middle Ages that attests this word in another form. A connection with the *Concilium Germanicum*, therefore, seemed obvious in Machielsen’s opinion.

Furthermore, Machielsen notes that the list could be connected with the synod of L’Estinnes. It could elaborate on the pagan rites in the last canon, yet there is no hard evidence to support such a connection, so he states.³⁵ A connection with Boniface himself seems more unsure, since Machielsen states that the usage of *sacrilegio* and *paganiae* in the letter collection and his sermons is not always constant and varies in several instances. The usage of such terms, therefore, would not allow a direct connection with a typical Bonifatian terminology, which means that Boniface as author of this list seems unlikely.³⁶ Machielsen leaves the Bonifatian connection unanswered, yet sees certainty in the *Indiculus* as a capitulary issued by either Pippin or Carloman, which would fit the Bonifatian reform period.³⁷ It seems that Machielsen does not put more evidence forward for the *Indiculus* as a capitulary other than its similarity in form to other ‘list’ capitularies.

Finally, while referring to his own research, Machielsen states that Pal. Lat. 577 itself can be interpreted as a *Visitationsbuch* owned by Lullus after 762, during his time as bishop of Mainz. The texts inside the codex deal with similar themes (often stressing the responsibilities of the bishop in caring for his ‘flock’) that fit the church reform period. As previously stated, the text can be directly linked to Lullus’ episcopacy and also seems out of place in the codex, since it does not deal with church reform or the correction of superstitious practices. In turn, this means that the Attigny *Totenbund* was inserted for some other reason in the codex, which might mean that the codex can be connected to Lullus’ personally.³⁸ The connection between the fact that Pal. Lat. 577 would have been

³² Ibidem, p. 143: *Bijgeloof bestaat er altijd en overal*. Next to this, it is interesting to look at Dieter Harmening’s publication on good or bad belief in the Middle Ages and how these texts were being reinterpreted and adapted throughout their transmissions: Dieter Harmening, *Superstitio: Überlieferungs- und theoriegeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur kirchlich-theologischen Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979).

³³ Ibidem, p. 142 and 149; *Concilium Germanicum*, ed. Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius*, p. 380: The practice described involves ‘a blasphemous fire’ called *niedfyr*, which is similar to the description of *nodfyr* in the *Indiculus*. In the *Concilium Germanicum*, it says: *Deum et suos sanctos ad iracundiam provocantes, sive illos sacrilegos ignes, quos niedfyr vocant (...)*.

³⁴ Ibidem, p. 149. Also see the scheme at p. 15 of this thesis.

³⁵ Ibidem, p. 145; *Synode von L’Estinnes*, ed. Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius*, p. 384: The last canon of this synod states that ‘every person, who practices pagan rites, will pay fifteen *solidis* as punishment’: *Decrivimus quoque, quod et pater meus ante praecipiebat: ut, qui paganus observationes in aliqua re fecerit, multetur et damnetur quindecim solidis*.

³⁶ Ibidem, pp. 147-148: Machielsen shows examples from the *epistolae Bonifatii* (while referring to the edition by Tangl) and the sermons that would be attributed to Boniface (a claim he does not seem to criticize himself) and concludes that the terminology around belief and superstition in the *Indiculus* and the *epistolae Bonifatii* and the sermons do not always correlate with each other. Some excerpts from such a Bonifatian sermon: Sermo VI (H. Löwe and W. Levison eds., *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen in Mittelalter*, part II (Weimar, 1953), p. 175) would argue for a connection in terminology: *Haec enim (...) esse dignoscuntur*.

³⁷ Machielsen, “*De Indiulus*”, p. 148: *Door wie (...) te houden*.

³⁸ Ibidem, pp. 146-149: he states that all components of the codex have a canonical- or missionary theme. This codex, consequently, seems to have been in possession of bishop Lullus of Mainz, the bishop after Boniface, since his name is present in the *Totenbund of Attigny* (bishops who would pray for each other after their death).

compiled and written before 762 and its consequent use as a *Visitationsbuch* after 762 is a causality upon which Machielsen does not elaborate further.

Glatthaar and Mostert also follow the interpretation, where the *Indiculus* can be seen as a product from the Bonifatian era, especially noting that there is enough evidence to assume that the *Indiculus* can be seen as a *Vorlage* for the *Concilium Germanicum* through historical evidence, as presented in the *epistolae Bonifatii*.³⁹ The base for this interpretation rests on a theory that interprets the first eleven folia of Cod. Pal. Lat. 577 as a collection of texts that would have been put together in a Bonifatian circle during Boniface's life. Glatthaar analyzes Cod. Pal. Lat 577 by taking a closer look at the texts contained inside this first part of the codex (which he calls the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*), which also contains the *Indiculus* (this part ranges from fols. 1r-11v).

Most texts in this collection (as one can see in the manuscript description) are either nameless sermons, or canons from synods (apart from our list and the baptismal vow). The presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* in this set of texts, however, seems misplaced. Nevertheless, the sermons and canons seem to be instructing bishops and clerics on how to care for their flock the 'correct way'. Glatthaar believes that each of these texts in the first eleven folia can be connected to a Bonifatian circle, since they would represent Bonifatian views and ideas. These would be expressed in his sources, such as the *epistolae Bonifatii*, which, consequently, function as the main source to prove the existence of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*. The idea had already been put forward by Scherer in the 1870's, yet remained an ill evidenced assumption.⁴⁰ Glatthaar, however, dedicates a third of his publication *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg* to this matter, mostly pinpointing the excerpts in Pal. Lat. 577 which would offer parallels for excerpts of the *epistolae Bonifatii*. Furthermore, the same texts, in some instances, are found in other manuscripts written and compiled around the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth. Most notably the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, a similar collection of 'Bonifatian texts', which are located in a codex from Würzburg, functions as a parallel for some texts that are also transmitted in Pal. Lat. 577. This would argue that the Bonifatian collection also had several other transmissions, perhaps in more fragmented or altered forms.

For instance, the *DE DIVERSIS CAUSIS DE LAPSU EPISCOPI VEL PRAESBYTERI* (2r) as a rubric is partially found in a list in a Würzburg codex from the middle of the 9th century (Cod. Würzburg, M. p. th. O. 4, fol. 98v), where it reads *de diversis causis* without the rest as contained in Pal Lat 577, fol. 2r. The last folio of this codex contains a small summation of titles, among them *de diversis causis* and the *epistolas pauli*. Whether this list represents books possessed by the Würzburg scriptorium or some sort of sketch is not clear. Another Würzburg codex contains a large excerpt from the *diversis causis*. The *Sententiae Wirceburgensis*, found in M.p.th.q.31, also contains this text, starting at fol. 56r with *de lapsu episcopi vel praesbiteri*. This transmission contains the same eight *capita* we find on fol. 2r in Pal. Lat. 577, yet the heading title misses *de diversis causis*.

The former information, however, might lead us away from Würzburg. The presence of *de diversis causis* in a Würzburg list next to the *Sententiae Wirceburgensis* might indicate the existence of more 'text collections' which contained this text (especially the *Collectio Hibernensis* is seen as a candidate, since we know of a Cologne codex which also contains the same text that starts with *de diversis causis*).⁴¹ The excerpts from Gregory and Hieronymus' letters, as located on fol. 6r, also have

Secondly, canon 9 of the Council of Verneuil (fol. 71v-73r) are also explicitly called in the letters of Lullus (see note 140 in this thesis). Thirdly, the interest of Lullus in the Gallic territories could explain the presence of *nomina episcoporum qui missi sunt a Romana urbe ad praedicandam in Gallia* in this codex. The *Indiculus*, however, had a much older origin and, though its transmission since 742/743, got a place in this codex.

³⁹ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, p. 596; Mostert, "Communicating the Faith", p. 96: Mostert does not criticize the idea that the *Indiculus* would be a *Vorlage* of the *Concilium Germanicum*. After all, the occurrence of *niedfyr*, an Old-English word, in the canons of the C.G., which was headed by Boniface, seems hardly striking.

⁴⁰ Müllenhof and Scherer, *Denkmäler Deutscher Poesie*, pp. 496.

⁴¹ Nevertheless, the Palatinus codex only accounts for eight canons of these *causis*, whereas the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* contains many more. Several canons from transmission of the *Collectio*

a parallel in the Würzburg manuscript. The first is an excerpt from the *Libellus responsionum*, which mostly deals with Gregory explaining to Augustine of Canterbury how a Bishop should regulate his tithes under the cleric, the poor, church building projects and the bishop himself.⁴² The second excerpt, from the letters of Hieronymus, is a commentary on Math. 28, 12-14f., where the focus is on the ‘misappropriation of church property’ and the severity of it. This is followed by a commentary of Hieronymus on Math 28, 19f., where Hieronymus notes that it is important to be well educated in order to baptize correctly. These parallels in another supposedly Bonifatian text collection would argue that Bonifatian texts were transmitted in collections throughout the eighth and ninth centuries. Both transmissions of these excerpts would be different from the other transmissions, which are mostly contained inside transmissions of the *Collectio Hibernensis*.⁴³

Other texts in Pal. Lat. 577 that are not encountered in this *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* would still be connected to a Bonifatian circle through their content and terminology. Where Machielsen mostly denotes such connections based on content and terminology, Glatthaar seems sure about the parallels in content and terminology he encounters in the *epistolae Bonifatii*. For instance, a small excerpt of Gregory of Tours’s *Historiae*, as found on fol. 6r, would stand out from its other transmissions, since the terminology applied in this excerpt would resemble concepts and ideas we encounter in the *epistolae Bonifatii*.⁴⁴ The same goes for a sermon that opposes followers of a ‘doctrine for salvation’, inspired by pope Clemens, which is located at fol. 9r in our manuscript. The sermon opposes a doctrine supposedly spread by pope Clemens, which implied that ‘those who died before the coming of Christ and, thus, lived as pagans, can still be saved, since Christ also prayed for the salvation of those ‘damned souls’.⁴⁵ This unknown sermon would also fit in with the views of Boniface, who was a firm believer in eternal damnation, so states Glatthaar.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the last codicological unit (fol. 9v- 11v) of the Bonifatian text collection, a letter from pseudo-Clemens to Jacob on the purity and sanctity of the altar, can also be connected to Boniface’s views, especially since it seems to stand out from other transmissions of this letter.⁴⁷ All in all, many texts in these first

Hibernensis also argue for a connection with the canons of the *de diversis causis de lapsu episcopi vel praesbiteri* as contained in Pal. Lat. 577 and codex M.p.th.q.31. For a more elaborate description of these parallels: Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 460-462.

⁴² See the manuscript description.

⁴³ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, p. 472: Glatthaar seems sure (just like A. Nürnberger, “Über die Würzburger Handschrift der irischen Canonensammlung”, *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, 60 (1888), pp. 3-84, p. 68) that this commentary does not originate from the *Collectio Hibernensis* or the *Sententiae Hibernensis*, where they are also encountered. Especially the absence of the words *stipe templi et* and *et sacerdotum*. Next to this, the text after this (as we also encounter this text in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*) in both collections is different than in both Cod Pal Lat 577 (*Palatinae*) and codex M.p.th.q.31 (*Wirceburgensis*).

⁴⁴ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, p. 474: Especially the words *a romana urbe* do not seem to fit Gregory of Tours’ text, yet rather, so Glatthaar assumes, Boniface’s mission. He notes the parallels with ep. 33 from 735 (*praedicatorum primi missi a sancto Gregorio*) and to the *Concilium Germanicum* list (*missus sancti Petri*). Also, the letter from 748 (ep. 82), where Zacharias partly writes about Bonifatius, where he states (...) *Bonifatium fratrem nostrum archiepiscopum apostolicae sedis legatum et nostrum presentantem vicem*. Next to this, Glatthaar seems sure that the seven bishops listed here were also present at the *Concilium Germanicum*.

⁴⁵ Boniface, *epistolae Bonifatii*, ep. 59, ed. Reinhold Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius und Willibalds Leben des Bonifatius nebst einigen zeitgenössischen Dokumenten* (Darmstadt, 1968): *Qui contra (...) cultores idulorum*.

⁴⁶ Boniface played a large role in ‘reforming the church’ in the late Merovingian kingdom: which means ‘correcting bishops and appointing them’. Glatthaar seems to be fairly sure that Boniface himself could have compiled this sermon to push back Clemens’ influence: *Ibidem*, pp. 489-490.

⁴⁷ Several versions of this letter are known, where historians often argued for a connection with the version of the *Patrologia Graeca*, yet for a far more direct connection can be argued for with the versions as contained in the old roman *Collectio Vaticana* and *Dionysiana adaucta*. But, even then, lots of differences are present, especially the beginning: *Clemens Jacobo charissimo. Quoniam, sicut a beato Petro accepimus, omnium apostolorum Patre (...)* (as contained in the *Collectio Vaticana*). The version in Pal. Lat. 577 even seems to have some additions in several instances. If one looks at the part where the conditions for ‘altar service’ are listed, one comes to the observation that our version is more elaborate (by: *qui ante ordinationem suum coniugia iam cognoscere desierunt et omni continentia ac castitate ueridica fuerint comprobati*). Also: *his qui praeesse uidentur aeclesiis* was added: *et hoc in peccatum decidat per negligentiam clericorum* (instead of the other versions: *et in*

eleven folia contain many additions from Julianus Pomerius' *de vita contemplativa*. The *epistolae Bonifatii* show us that Boniface's also had a specific interest in this text, which would explain the presence of many excerpts from this Pomerius' text inside the presumably Bonifatian sermons in fol. 1r-11v.⁴⁸

These examples, to name a few, would strengthen the existence of a unique *Sententiae Bonifatianae*, especially because of the parallels in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* (whether we can consider this text collection as Bonifatian is another debate I will not elaborate upon) and the parallels in content and terminology in the *epistolae Bonifatii*. The first eleven folia, therefore, would contain texts, which can be connected to a Bonifatian circle, implying a common heritage for the sermons as being products of Bonifatian views and concepts. This means that the *Indiculus*, being present in these first eleven folia, belongs to this text collection and, more precisely, can be seen as belonging to the *Concilium Germanicum*. In this way, the interpretation of the *Indiculus*, as a draft for canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*, is strengthened by its parallel transmission in the supposed *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, making both texts products of Bonifatian thinking.

The connection with Boniface does not end here for Glatthaar. He also argues that the largest text in the codex, a complete transmission of the first part of the *Collectio Dionysiana*, would be connected to Boniface. Originally written and compiled by *Dionysius Exiguus* around 500, it consists of a large collection of five books, containing ancient canonical law and papal decrees. Glatthaar states that Boniface would have had a personal interest in the *Collectio conciliorum Dionysianae* I and II, the first two books, which focus on Greek synodal canons from Serdika, Chalcedon and Carthage.⁴⁹ Here, he uses a similar methodology, where parallel transmissions and excerpts from the *epistolae Bonifatii* are the main sources for this interpretation.⁵⁰

Lastly, Glatthaar mentions the codicological 'break' between the last text of the text collection and the beginning of the *collectio conciliorum Dionysianae* I on fol. 11v. This break is indicated by an initialled *EXPLICIT DEO GRATIAS*, which would mean that the previous texts on fol. 1r-11v would have been copied altogether from one exemplar with the same collection of texts. This notion seemed to have encountered little critique by historians⁵¹ and would thus also be a valid codicological argument for the existence of a Bonifatian text collection.

Mostert, a decade later, also seemed convinced of the existence of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, praising the 'valuable work Glatthaar had done for the discussion on the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow'.⁵² In his paper, he mostly aims to look at the provenance of the *Indiculus*. If one reads his paper, it seems clear that the evidence surrounding the origin of the *Indiculus* is so indirect that it allows him to assign Utrecht as the provenance for the text. Mostert himself, while looking at the indirect and vague arguments used for several interpretations of the provenance, sees no evidence that

peccatum magis decidant per negligentiam clericorum). Boniface had active involvement in appointing bishops and getting privileges for 'supervisions for reforms' (*propter pallia credita et recepta*), as he addresses himself in his correspondence with other ecclesiastical figures. His involvement in the *C.G.* canons might also indicate that this commentary on the pseudo-Clemens letter could have been influenced by the policies as instigated by Boniface, so states Glatthaar.

⁴⁸ See the manuscript description: especially the excerpts from *Ezechiel* (7v) and the *DE DIVERSIS CAUSIS* (2r) contain remarkable influences from Julianus Pomerius' *De vita contemplativa*.

⁴⁹ See the manuscript description.

⁵⁰ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 493-502: Here, Glatthaar joins a large debate on the transmissions of the *Collectio Dionysiana* in the eighth and ninth centuries. The comparisons with other transmissions in Cologne and the cloister of Corbie, to name a few, are few and far between and allow him to state that these transmissions could go back to versions of the *Collectio Dionysiana* Boniface might have owned. For a more elaborate account of the transmission history of this collection, see: A. Strewé, *Die Canonensammlung des Dionysius Exiguus in der ersten Redaktion*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, bd. 16 (Berlin, 1931).

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 493: Especially Steinmeyer, Leitzmann and Haubrichs seem to have thought that the break indicated that the previous codicological units were all copied from one text collection from the exemplar the scribe was using. This is also explained further on in the text. See note 65.

⁵² Mostert, "Communicating the Faith", p. 118: *We are indebted to Michael Glatthaar for the detailed analysis (...)*.

would argue against Utrecht as the provenance for the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow.⁵³ Utrecht, during Boniface's time on the continent, was an important missionary centre, where many texts were imported from Anglo-Saxon England.⁵⁴ Consequently, he follows Glatthaar in assuming a Bonifatian origin for the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow, adding more indirect evidence from the *epistolae Bonifatii*.⁵⁵ In this way, the link between the texts in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* and the residue of Boniface's views and thoughts (as reflected in his letter and hagiography) is enlarged by adding more of the same. Based on Glatthaar's and Mostert's interpretations, one could state that the 'Bonifatian camp' had made a strong comeback after many historians in the decades before argued for the connection of the *Indiculus* with the reign of Charlemagne.

If we look back at the arguments that have been used in favour of a Bonifatian origin, the link with the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L'Estinnes were very influential. Especially Glatthaar's argument for the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* strengthened the assumption that a Bonifatian origin for our text seems plausible. Especially if it is contained in the supposed text collection and shows a direct connection to canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*, through its transmission of *niedfyr* (strikingly resembling *nodfyr*). The main sources for evidence are the *epistolae Bonifatii*, where the letter collection would give us a picture of Boniface's ideas and views. These would consequently be reflected in the texts we encounter in the first eleven folia, next to the direct connection with canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*. Now, it is important to look at the deeper notions and assumptions concerning the value of the evidence used, as well as their effect on the interpretations. Do parallels with the *epistolae Bonifatii* and the *Concilium Germanicum* really justify the connection of these texts with Boniface, as well as the existence of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*?

An influential underlying principle, regarding the attribution of these texts to Boniface, is that he alone would have had these views and ideas, as they are reflected in his letter collection. Furthermore, the assumption also implies, if Boniface did compile such sermons, that their content would not be altered through their numerous transmissions. Recent research, however, has shown us how often content of sermons changed through their transmissions, which is evidenced by the sheer number of 'nameless sermons' we possess.⁵⁶ This is intertwined with the idea of authorship in the Early Middle Ages, which did not function like the concept of authorship we know today. Mostert mentions that texts, especially sermons, were subject to constant change through their transmissions.⁵⁷ This means that the ideas and notions inside these sermons could be altered and adapted to the preference of the scribe. These are but the starting remarks on the underlying assumptions, since far more needs to be elaborated regarding the use of the *epistolae Bonifatii* and the parallels with the *Concilium Germanicum*.

First of all, it is interesting to look at the first assumption that existed: the connection with the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L'Estinnes. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, most have assumed the connection of the *Indiculus* with the canons of these two synods. Most arguably, the comparison with *niedfeor* (as found in the *Concilium Germanicum*, canon V) and *nodfyr* (as contained in our *Indiculus*) has often been noted, next to five lines from the *Indiculus* which seem to find a parallel in some canons from the *Concilium Germanicum*. The problem remains, however, that, from the thirty lines that form the *Indiculus*, only seven seem to find a parallel in the *Concilium Germanicum* (of which one is *niedfyr* and *nodfyr*). The most recent research, especially from Glatthaar

⁵³ Mostert, "Communicating the Faith", p. 123.

⁵⁴ Ibidem, p. 122: *The Utrecht school had its own library, to which Boniface donated a Bible of Italian origin (...)*.

⁵⁵ See note 131.

⁵⁶ The discussion on medieval sermons in general is relatively large. The problem of identifying authors for sermons is a broader phenomenon in codicological and textual research. For a good overview on this theme, see: Beverly M. Kienzle, ed., *The Sermon. (Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age Occidental, 81–83.)* (Turnhout, 2000).

⁵⁷ Mostert, "Communicating the Faith", p. 113: *To understand (...) single author.*

and Mostert, sees this as credible evidence to assign the *Indiculus* to the ‘Bonifatian circle’. They even, more specifically, state that the list can be seen as a *Vorlage* for the *Concilium Germanicum*, which means that the list was used at the creation of the canons of the same synod in 742. The link with the synod of L’Estinnes, which Glatthaar does not seem to consider anymore, seems more farfetched. Next to the fact that the canons of L’Estinnes have a more ‘summarizing character’, they are not specific at all about ‘practices performed by pagans’ and only offer a punishment in the form of a paid sum of *solidi*. There is no reason to assume a direct connection between the *Indiculus* and the synod of L’Estinnes. That the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L’Estinnes are connected seems credible, but implying that the *Indiculus* would be an elaboration on the ‘fined *paganas observationes*’ we encounter in canon IV of L’Estinnes cannot rely on solid proof, even though historians, especially Machielsen, have noted that the *Indiculus* could have been a list that ‘specified’ these unspecified ‘pagan practices’ in canon IV of the synod of L’Estinnes.⁵⁸ All in all, the only credible connection can be made with the *Concilium Germanicum*, even though only seven parallels can be accounted for.

<i>Canon V (nº).</i>	<i>Indiculus (nº).</i>
<p><i>...Ut populus Dei paganas non faciat sed omnes spurcitas gentilitatis abiciat et respuat sive profana sacrificia mortuorum sive sortilegos vel divinos sive phylacteria et auguria sive incantationes sive hostias immolatitias quas stulti homines iuxta ecclesias ritu pagano faciunt sub nomine sanctorum martyrum vel confessorum Deum et sanctos suos ad iracundiam provocantes sive illos sacrilegos ignes quod nied-fyr vocant sive omnes quaecumque sunt paganorum observationes.</i></p>	<p><i>De sacrilegio ad sepulchra mortuorum (nº 1)</i></p> <p><i>De divinis vel sortilegis (nº 14)</i></p> <p><i>De filacteriis et ligaturis (nº 10)</i></p> <p><i>De auguriis vel avium (nº 13)</i></p> <p><i>De incantationibus (nº 12)</i></p> <p><i>De sacrificio quod alicii sanctorum (nº 9).</i></p> <p><i>De igne fricato de ligno, id est nod-fyr (nº 15).</i></p>

*An overview of Machielsen’s scheme of canon V of the Concilium Germanicum in comparison to the Indiculus.*⁵⁹

As can be concluded, the similarities with the *C.G.* allow no definite connection with the *Indiculus*, because the parallels are too few. Next to this, if we assume this text was connected to these two synods, why don’t we find it somewhere near the location of these texts in Cod Pal Lat 577? After all, we do see them appear after the *Attigny Totenbund*, written at least after 762, which has often been interpreted as an ‘interpolation’ in the so-called *Sententiae Bonifatianae* and also seems to be a *Fremdkörper* in the first part of Pal Lat 577, thematically speaking. As a result, its position in the middle of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* seems out of place and cannot be easily interpreted as an interpolation in the supposed text collection, like Glatthaar does.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 450-451: Glatthaar notes that there is no evidence that would lead us to assume that the *Indiculus* as a list would be an elaboration on the punishment in *solidii* for *paganas observationes*. The closest connection remains with canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*.

⁵⁹ Machielsen, *De Indiculus*, p. 140: an overview of Machielsen’s parallel list of canon V of the *C.G.* and the *Indiculus*. Glatthaar later made a similar comparison, also noting maximum seven parallels. That only seven out of thirty can be seen as parallels to the aforementioned canon V forms a weak argument for seeing the *Indiculus* as being somehow connected to the *C.G.*

⁶⁰ A text with no canonical- or pastoral care theme and compiled after 762 which is present in the middle of the twenty-five texts Glatthaar distinguishes in his *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* cannot be a mere interpolation.

However, there also seems more to say for the interpretation, where the *Indiculus* could be seen as a ‘nameless capitulary’. We know similar nameless capitularies in the form of ‘lists’ (as they appear to us).⁶¹ Whether the *Indiculus* can be interpreted as a capitulary is a matter, which will be discussed in the last chapter of this paper. This matter takes on the details of another debate that centres around the identity and function of capitularies. It is important here, however, to take into consideration that the canons of the *Concilium Germanicum* could have been re-used in the compilation of this list, however one interprets the function of this list. This would account for the use of *nodfyr* (the main argument for historians arguing for a connection with the *Concilium Germanicum*) in a list like the *Indiculus*, looking back at the synods from the Bonifatian era. Since we know the codex is written and compiled at least after the date of the Attigny *Totenbund* (762), such a possibility does not seem unrealistic. But what about Glatthaar’s *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*? If we look at the texts in these first eleven folia in combination with the theories on text transmissions: what remains of the connections of these texts with Boniface?

2.1 Boniface in review

Firstly, the first text deserves some attention, especially since it is the only text that has another transmission with a heading, where its author is named.⁶² The folio is badly damaged and inserted in the codex around the turn of the 9th/10th century. This contains an excerpt from the *Capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiarum* (about the usurpation of churches by lay people or ‘sinning clerics’). Glatthaar notes, according to similarities in these *capitula* and the canons of the *Concilium Germanicum*, that it must have been written before the synod of L’Estinnes. The first folio contains a hand, most probably from Mainz, so stated Bisschof. In any case, it is clear that we deal with a later addition to the codex. Whether this folio was a replacement of an older page, which was ‘at risk of being damaged’, or a page that was found elsewhere and inserted, because it fitted, is difficult to determine. Sven Meeder notes, after a closer look at the organization of the quires, that this damaged folio might have been a replacement of a folio that might have contained a Bonifatian fragment.⁶³ These interpretations are still far from clear and there is no hard evidence to support a ‘replacement theory’ of fol. 1r-v. We only know that a text on church law was inserted on a later date in a codex that contains numerous other texts dealing with similar themes. Whether the *capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiarum* is actually connected to Boniface could be evidenced by the parallel transmission of the text in Cod. Vat. Lat. 4160, with the heading *EX DICITIS S. BONIFACII* (fol. 55r). Nevertheless, we also know of many texts that have been falsely attributed to saints throughout the Middle Ages.⁶⁴ The fact that this folio was inserted at a later stage does suggest that the (Mainz) scribe knew he was dealing with a ‘canonical collection with pastoral care’. The content of the *capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiarum* elaborates on similar themes (usurpation of church property and sinning clerics) as the

Especially its central position in this text collection argues for a more complex transmission history of the codicological units inside these first eleven folia.

⁶¹ A list with similar lists will be presented in the last chapter of this thesis, where more attention will be given to the functions and origins of capitularies and, consequently, if the *Indiculus* could be one.

⁶² Another transmission of this text in Cod. Vat. Lat. 4160, fol. 55r-66r, compiled around the same time as Vat. Lat. 577, contains the following rubric above the *Capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiarum*: *EX DICITIS S. BONIFACII*.

⁶³ Sven Meeder, “Pal. Lat. 577: A codicological observation”, [https://www.svenmeeder.nl/2013/03/07/pal-lat-577-a-codicological-observation] (7th march, 2013): (...) “folio 8r-v is no longer part of a bifolium, and, were it the last folium of the first quire, would have been attached to the very first page. The original arrangement also had a first folio preceding the rest of the *Sententiae Bonifatiae*. Whether or not that was the Bonifatian fragment presently on fol. 1r-v must remain uncertain.

⁶⁴ Most of those texts are indicated with a ‘pseudo-’ before the official name. Penitentials (the pseudo-Theodori, for instance), sermons and other texts are wrongly associated with Augustine or other Church Fathers in numerous instances.

other texts in Cod. Pal. Lat. 577. The theme fits with the other ‘Church reform themes’ we encounter in the other texts in fol. 1r-11v. Even though the parallel transmission argues for a connection with Boniface, its later insertion does not aid the notion of the Bonifatian text collection. The scribe might just as well have added the text because of its relevance for the other canonical themed texts in the codex and not, as Glatthaar assumes, because it was considered a Bonifatian text as well.

If we look at the thematic content of the other texts in the first eleven folia, they mostly seem to prescribe rules and habits for priests and bishops and how they have to ‘tend to their flock’. The texts are comprised of excerpts from the Church fathers (letter collections from Augustine and Hieronymus), synods (*Concilium Germanicum* and L’Estinnes), unknown capitularies (*capitula de invasoribus aecclesiarum*) and ‘un-named’ sermons (which also contain excerpts from Julianus Pomerius and excerpts from the book of *Ezechiel*). All texts contained in the first part (1r-11v) do definitely seem to share common themes: how to ‘care for your flock’ as a bishop, instructions for bishops and priests as to how to live a ‘decent and good live’, church canons and some general theological remarks; i.e. texts that aided church reform and pastoral care. Yet the other texts after fol. 11v also deal with those topics. The *collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I deals with church law as well, just like the excerpts of the council of Verneuil (fol. 71v) and the council of Carthage (fol. 73v) that deal with matters like ‘incorrect practice’ and ‘sinning bishops and clergy’.⁶⁵ In this way, the entire codex can be interpreted as a canonical collection with elements of pastoral care.

However, Glatthaar sees the texts in the first eleven folia as distinctly Bonifatian. Glatthaar tries to argue for their Bonifatian connection (and origin, in some instances) through mostly historical evidence, while referring to the *epistolae Bonifatii*. Through comparing Latin terminology, as found in these sources with the Latin terminology we find in Pal Lat 577, Glatthaar tries to make a case for the ‘Bonifatian identity’ of these texts. However convincing this may sound, we must not forget the remarks made by Mostert, where he states that such texts were without authorship and subject to change through their receptions. Just because parallels exist with the *epistolae Bonifatii* does not mean that the texts formed a collection on their own. We have no clear indication of the way these texts came into being, or how often they had already been copied in the eight or earlier centuries. Consequently, this might mean that the texts, even though their Bonifatian connection might be strengthened by parallels in the *epistolae Bonifatii*, might just as well have been adapted at a later time (around the compilation of Pal. Lat. 577). It is also not clear if the *EXPLICIT DEO GRATIAS* on fol. 11v suggests that the texts on the previous folia were taken from another exemplar altogether. There is no hard evidence to claim this, especially since we also encounter a similar ending after the *Collectio conciliorum Dionysiana* I: *DEO GRATIAS FIAT FIAT* (fol. 69v). Such endings only tell us that the scribe thanked God, but not that he/she finished copying a collection of texts from the exemplar.

The fact that these texts have ‘siblings’ in other codices, yet are not similar in many instances, is striking. Especially the extra quotes from Ezechiel and Julianus Pomerius found in the texts in Pal. Lat. 577 set these texts aside from their siblings, as Glatthaar notes. The changes would be ‘distinctly Bonifatian’, mostly based on parallels in the *Epistolae Bonifatii* and the synods associated with Boniface. This, however, does not mean that Boniface would have been the only one interested in the book of *Ezechiel* and *De vita contemplativa* by Julianus Pomerius. Any scribe could just as well have made changes to these texts at any transmission stage. Especially the research by Josh Timmerman has shown that Julianus Pomerius’ *De vita contemplativa*, was well copied, especially next to works of Gregory the Great in the Carolingian era. Pomerius’ text allowed ‘earthly perfection’ for the episcopacy in the Carolingian empire as ‘watchmen’, which seemed to have allowed for more authority in the field of ‘episcopal authority’ in the circle of Carolingian bishops. The popularity of

⁶⁵ See the manuscript description: The *Canones consiliorum Dionysiana* I, the council of Verneuil and the council of Carthage deal with responsibilities for Bishops and the ‘flock’ they have to care for. In essence the whole codex could be seen as a canonical collection with elements of pastoral care. In this way, the first eleven folia cannot be discerned on thematical grounds.

this text boomed around 790-810.⁶⁶ What this means is that the additions of Julianus Pomerius in Pal. Lat. 577, especially with regard to the texts that deal with the responsibilities for bishops, fit a trend of copying, which was present at the end of the eighth century. This is the same time when our codex was written and compiled. Because of this, these sermons could have also been compiled around the time Pal. Lat. 577 was put together.

The *Totenbund* text also seems a bit off in this thematic bundle of texts. The text mentions bishops, one of which was Lullus, who would pray for each other after death. It also mentions the place and time when this was decided: 762 in Attigny. It is striking that the Attigny *Totenbund* is situated in the middle of these eleven folia (7r). Henceforth, an interpolation of the ‘Bonifatian collection’ during the compilation of Pal. Lat. 577 seems illogical. The problem, then, is if we must interpret the transmission of the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow as being interpolated *with* the *Totenbund* in this Bonifatian collection, or as having been part of this ‘Bonifatian text collection’ already. While looking at the theories of text transmission and, most notably, the concept of authorship in the Early Middle Ages, neither of these two options seems credible. Instead, the texts could have been copied from multiple exemplars, which would indicate that the texts would all have different transmission backgrounds. This is strengthened by the fact that the closest parallel, the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* only accounts for a few texts that are present in Pal. Lat. 577.⁶⁷ The texts and theories have shown us that there is enough reason to assume that these texts might have a much earlier origin than previously thought and, if we assume that they are Bonifatian, that they could have been changed even further through their various transmissions (as the ample parallels in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* show). The *EXPLICIT DEO GRATIAS*, in the middle of fol. 11v, on its own does not seem to indicate the existence of a Bonifatian text collection. Historians have interpreted this line as a break in the copying process, stating that the first eleven folia might have formed a collection of texts on their own, which were copied into Pal. Lat. 577 in its entirety.⁶⁸ Even then, however, this collection might just as well have been a ‘canonical collection with texts on pastoral care’, its texts and sermons having been edited through previous transmissions. After all, a similar ending is at the end of the *collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I, where it says: *DEO GRATIAS FIAT FIAT* (fol. 69v). Does this mean that this was also taken out of another codex in its entirety, where the scribe thanks God for finishing the text? This remains uncertain.

Looking at the overview of the contents, there is no definite proof for the existence of this Bonifatian text collection. The Bonifatian text collection theory mainly bases itself on finding parallels or reflections of ideas and thoughts in the *epistolae Bonifatii*. After all, we only know of five ‘texts’ that are also represented in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, a collection of texts also considered Bonifatian, yet differing in several aspects from the texts in Pal. Lat. 577.⁶⁹ That the

⁶⁶ Josh Timmermann, “Sharers in the contemplative virtue: Julianus Pomerius’ Carolingian audience”, *Comitatus*, 45 (2014), pp. 1-14, pp. 11-14: “The *De vita contemplativa* was also often paired closely with the work of Gregory the Great, which served to further enhance the importance of the text for Carolingian bishops. As this article argues, Pomerius’s contention, that not only monks, but also worldly bishops could achieve an earthly form of perfection through a rigorous adherence to their duties as “watchmen,” proved remarkably appealing, and useful, to the Carolingian episcopate” and noting a sharp decline after the reign of Louis the Pious.

⁶⁷ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 458-493: From the texts he distinguishes in his *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, only the *DE LAPSEU EPISCOPI VEL PRAESBITERI* (fol. 2r), some excerpts of Julianus Pomerius *De vita contemplativa* (fol. 3v-4r) and excerpts from Hieronymus’ commentary on Matth. 28, 12-14 (fol. 6r) are also found in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, which is maybe a fourth of the textual content of the first eleven folia.

⁶⁸ Elias von Steinmeyer, *Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler*, p. 20; E. Wadstein, *Kleinere altsächsische sprachdenkmäler: mit Anmerkungen und Glossar* (Soltau, 1899), p. 296; W. Haubrichs, “Die Angelsachsen und die germanischen Stämme des Kontinents im frühen Mittelalter: sprachliche und literarische Beziehungen”, in: *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, eds. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 387-412, p. 393.

⁶⁹ The excerpts from the *Capitula de invasoribus ecclesiarum* (fol. 1r-v), the few *capitula* under the rubric *DE DIVERSIS CAUSIS DE LAPSU EPISCOPI VEL PRAESBITERI* (which occur under a slightly different rubric in

presence of excerpts from *De vita contemplativa* by Julianus Pomerius would argue for a Bonifatian influence also seems out of place. Especially since the *vita contemplativa* already knew a large circulation in the sixth and seventh centuries, next to the fact that the text's circulation received an impetus around the end of the eighth century. A specific interest in *de vita contemplativa* was not Bonifatian, but already existed for centuries. Most notably, the power and authority of bishops in the early Carolingian empire instigated an increase in the transmission of *De vita contemplativa* by Julianus Pomerius. Even when we assume that such a Bonifatian collection did exist, it might have been that, through its wide transmission, several new collections had already formed in the thirty years after Boniface's death. As the description of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* contents (1r-11v) in the appendix shows; many examples (especially the excerpts from *De invasoribus* and the authorless-sermons, which can mostly be connected to *de vita contemplativa*, written by Julianus Pomerius, but with more excerpts from the book of Ezechiel from the bible) argue for the continuing changes a text could be subject to through its transmission. The popularity of *De vita contemplativa* was widespread and even increased after the death of Boniface.

What does this all mean for the *Indiculus*, however? What follows from the previous is that Glatthaar's *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* does not rest on solid evidence. The *epistolae Bonifatii* and the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* offer parallels, which would allow a connection with a Bonifatian circle, yet these arguments could also be used to prove the opposite. The concept underestimates the rate at which texts change through their transmissions and how few hard parallels actually exist. The approach also supposes that Boniface was the only church authority, who had such views and ideas, even though we have no idea how many of these ideas were strictly 'Bonifatian' or not. A parallel with the *epistolae Bonifatii* does not conclusively mean that we are dealing with a Bonifatian parallel. Next to this, the abundance of *De vita contemplativa* excerpts is not caused by Bonifatian ideas and views, but by a longer tradition of transmission and perhaps by the explosion of transmissions of *de vita contemplativa* at the end of the eighth century. In that case, Boniface was just a follower of an older trend, where Julianus Pomerius' work was already enjoying wide circulation.

Now that we had a closer look at the concept of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, what remains to be said about the connection with Boniface? The *Concilium Germanicum* offers the only direct parallel to a sentence from the *Indiculus* through its attestation of *niedfyr*. Next to this, Machielsen en Glatthaar noted that the fifth canon of this council only accounts for seven out of the thirty lines we encounter in the *Indiculus*. When we look at the previous theories, such a parallel does not mean that we have to interpret the *Indiculus* as a product from (or *Vorlage* for) this council. On the contrary, Mostert stated that texts could be altered throughout their numerous transmissions. This interplays with the fact that authorship did not exist in the Early Middle Ages as we know it today. Texts kept being reinterpreted by their copyists and their backgrounds. Consequently, if a text is attributed to an authority, it remains to be seen if it was a valid attribution. Next to this, the position of the *Attigny Totenbund*, from 762, in the middle of these eleven folia, is proof in itself for a more complex transmission of the other texts inside these folia. The text also does not seem to fit in the codex thematically, since it does not have a canonical theme or deals with pastoral care. This means that, if we would follow the assumption that the first eleven folia once formed a collection in another manuscript, it also indicates a complex transmission history for the separate texts inside these first eleven folia we find in Pal. Lat. 577. More evidence would be needed to explain how the *Totenbund* ended up in the middle of a 'Bonifatian text collection' in Pal. Lat. 577. The *Indiculus*, therefore, cannot be fully attributed to a Bonifatian collection and, thus, a Bonifatian circle, when we re-evaluate the evidence. The evidence might suggest a vague connection with Boniface, but the lack of hard evidence does not fully allow the attribution of the *Indiculus* to Boniface. What can be said about the connection with Charlemagne and the end of the eighth century, however?

the Würzburg collection) (fol. 2r), the excerpts from *De vita contemplativa* from Julianus Pomerius (fols. 3v-4r) and the two excerpts of Hieronymus' commentary on Matth. 28, 12-14;19f., with some adaptations.

3. The *Indiculus* and the connection with Charlemagne

As we have now looked at the arguments that suggest a Bonifatian connection, it is also worthwhile to look at the other camp. Several scholars, as we will see in this chapter, have assumed the compilation of our list to have taken place at the end of the eighth century, during the reign of Charlemagne. Where the Bonifatian camp mostly argues for the parallels with the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L'Estinnes, next to the indirect historical evidence as extracted from the Bonifatian *epistolae*, the other camp uses conversion arguments and historio-linguistic arguments to make a case for 'camp Charlemagne'. Also, from a codicological perspective, the presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* and the canons of the Verneuil synod (755) allow for the use of indirect historical evidence for a connection of Pal. Lat. 577 with Lullus and, therefore, the *Indiculus*. In this chapter, the aim will be to look at the interpretations of the *Indiculus* and why the end of the eighth century seems so obvious a time for the compilation of the *Indiculus*, according to 'camp Charlemagne'. As we will see, the connection with the reign of Charlemagne was firstly mentioned by nineteenth century German historians, who gained continuous support throughout a large part of the twentieth century. The mostly historical, yet also codicological evidence which allows these historians to connect the *Indiculus* to Charlemagne and with Lullus' episcopacy, also shelters assumptions on the nature of conversion and the identity of the *Indiculus*. Like the previous chapter, it is important to summarize these interpretations and, consequently, to look at the assumptions that underlie these interpretations. Where 'camp Boniface' mostly used the *Concilium Germanicum* and the *Sententiae Bonifatianae*, strengthened by Glatthaar, the other camp uses the Attigny *Totenbund*, the council of Verneuil (755) and the Saxon conversion as evidence. The aid of historio-linguistic evidence often forms the backbone of these interpretations, as we shall see. Afterwards, the evidence will be re-evaluated in light of the new theories and views that have been shared by historical research from the last decade.

As we have seen, during the middle of the nineteenth century, Massmann was the first to propose a later date for the compilation of the *Indiculus* on grounds of the presence of later texts in Pal. Lat. 577 (*Totenbund* and the synod of Verneuil), most notably stating that the presence of the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* after these texts might just as well indicate that the baptismal vow and *Indiculus* could have been compiled around the end of the eighth century.⁷⁰

The first who firmly supported a compilation during the reign of Charlemagne was Wilhelm Scherer, who, in his *Denkmäler deutscher Poesie und Prosa*, came with a more elaborate argument. What he mostly highlighted was the fact that the text would be a list of practices which would indicate 'syncretic Christianity'. Therefore, we would deal with a list that was compiled during a later stage of the conversion in Saxony during or shortly after the Saxon wars.⁷¹ For him, the *Indiculus* and the baptismal vow belong together in their transmission in Pal. Lat. 577, especially since the vernacular word forms in both texts would be Old-Saxon. This functioned as an argument to state that the list must have been compiled in the context of the *Nachmission*, where Grimm's work on *Deutsche Mythologie* functions as main source for indicating a connection with Old-Saxon.⁷² Next to this, the argument supposes that an initial conversion had already taken place earlier in the eighth century, which on its own means that Boniface, for instance, would have dealt with a 'non-Christian' society which he tried to convert. The 'Saxons' Charlemagne encountered would have already been Christian to some degree, in this case. This interpretation of the Saxon conversion supports the interpretation of the *Indiculus* as a

⁷⁰ Massman, *Die deutschen Abschörungs-, Glaubens-, Beicht- und Betformeln* (Berlin, 1839), p. 22: he also mainly criticizes the 'not well evidenced editions' printed by historians from the seventeenth- and eighteenth centuries.

⁷¹ Müllenhof and Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher poesie und prosa*, p. 496: (...) *und die Beziehung auf die Sachsenbekehrung unter Karl dem Grossen, sowie die enge zusammengehörigkeit mit dem sog(enannten) indiculus scheint mir unzweifelhaft.*

⁷² Ibidem, p. 495: where he followed Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie* in stating that *Saxnôt* and the German dialect forms as contained in both the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* are distinctly Old-Saxon.

list that was compiled during the reign of Charlemagne. Scherer also noted that there were similarities between the *Indiculus* and the *Capitulare Generale* (ca. 770). The *Capitulare Generale* and the *Concilium Germanicum* were, as he stated, used to compile this list we encounter at fol. 7r in Pal. Lat. 577.⁷³ In this way, the *Indiculus* could have been compiled with the help of older sources, an idea that was already introduced in the previous chapter. The list was interpreted as ‘content’ on which a *missus dominicus* or a priest in a missionary context would have relied. This is an interpretation that is not sufficiently evidenced by Scherer, as it seems that he thought this the blatant purpose of the list, without need of further explanation or exploration.⁷⁴ According to Scherer, the provenance of the list is Fulda; a place that in itself is inherently linked to the Saxon mission.. He noted the influence of Fulda’s abbot, Sturm, on the Saxon mission in the last decades of the eighth century. This would make Fulda the most likely place for the compilation of the *Indiculus* in this context.⁷⁵ For a connection with Fulda he also stated that another codex, like Pal Lat 577, contains the same scribe signature: *herimundus*. Both of these codices were in possession of Marianus Scotus (1028-1081), an Irish monk, who brought them to Mainz during his lifetime. Scotus’ own codex also contains the same signature (*Herimundus*) from the eighth century⁷⁶ which would be ‘Fuldean’.⁷⁷ Whoever this person was, or if he was the scribe or owner of the codex, remains unknown. Bisschof stated that the name *Herimundus* might not have been the scribe himself, since it would be more logical, if this were the case, that another hand would have resumed the copying process, which is not the case.⁷⁸ *Herimundus* might just as well have been a later owner of the codex, who might not have resided in Fulda. Because of this, the argument loses a portion of its validity, since *Herimundus*, in this case, would not indicate a Fuldaen origin for Pal. Lat. 577.

Scherer also stated that the contents of 1r-11v⁷⁹ were ordered ‘chronologically’, as the datable texts in these folia can be ordered as follows: *Concilium Germanicum* (742), Synod of L’Estinnes (745)⁸⁰ and the Attigny *Totenbund* (somewhat after 762). This would allow an interpretation of the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* as both having been compiled at least after 762, therefore placing them within Charlemagne’s reign. He, therefore, sees 1r-11v as dedicated to the Saxon mission. The absence of the

⁷³ Müllenhof and Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher poesie*, p. 496: *Augenscheinlich, wie cap. Generale a. 769-771, mit benutzung des conc. Germ. A. 742 entworfen*. Scherer’ refers to Pertz’s edition of the *Capitulare Generale*: G. Pertz, MGH: LL I (Hannover, 1835), pp. 32-33.

⁷⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 496: *klürlich ein vorläufiges verzeichnis dessen worauf die königsboten oder richtiger die bekehrenden priester zu achten hatten*.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 496-497: *Man weiss, welchen anteil Fulda na dieser bekehrung hatte*, he does not elaborate what this *Anteil* specifically is, *hauptsächlich der bezirk der Diemel (...) und Sturm verdiente sich durch seine unermüdliche tätigkeit den ehrenamen einse apostels der Sachsen*.

⁷⁶ On fol. 31v of Pal. Lat. 577, a name is located in the margins, which reads: *herimundus*. Whether we have to see this as the name of the scribe, since it is the same hand who writes most codicological units in Pal. Lat. 577, is not clear. The fact that another Getica codex, owned by Marianus Scotus, would contain a similar ‘signature’, would allow the codex to be ascribed to Fulda, where he obtained all of his books. Scotus would have brought it to Mainz at a later stage. Marianus Scotus would have brought the Pal Lat 577 along with him to Mainz as he left the monastery of Fulda somewhere during the last years of his life.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 496-497: While basing this interpretation on evidence put forward by Giesebrecht: (...) *und Giesebrecht hat (...) inschrift trägt*.

⁷⁸ Bisschof, *Paläografische Fragen*, p. 110: *Nach meinem (...) Stelle statt*.

⁷⁹ The chapter on Boniface elaborates on the fact that the presence of *EXPLICIT DEO GRATIAS* on fol. 11v would indicate a ‘break’ in the copying process. This was also an argument put forward by Scherer to see fol. 1r-11v as being copied from one text collection and thus stands alone as a collection next to the other contents of Pal. Lat. 577. This notion has encountered remarkably little resistance. Glatthaar (2004) and Mostert (2015) seem to support this division of Pal. Lat. 577, where the contents of 1r-11v have been interpreted as the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*, which mostly rests on historical evidence from the Bonifatian *epistolae* and *vita*. Furthermore, some direct parallels in a Würzburg collection of texts (*Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*) and other transmissions of the other contents of 1r-11v in codices from the late eighth century allow, from a codicological standpoint, an interpretation of this ‘first part of Pal. Lat. 577’ as being transmitted from another, relatively similar, text collection.

⁸⁰ There have been thorough debates up until the twentieth century as to when the L’Estinnes synod was held. Here, Scherer held on to the interpretation that dated this synod to 745.

lex Saxonum and the *capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* was ‘obvious’, in his opinion, since they would first be issued around 777 and 778.⁸¹

Scherer is not very critical in terms of interpreting source material. What makes the signature ‘typical for Fulda’ is not noted by Scherer, and any form of palaeographical evidence that could support this statement is likewise frustratingly ignored. Also, the apparent Saxon destination of the list is taken for granted by Scherer, especially in connection with the baptismal vow. It seems as if any text that can be connected to a conversion context, during Charlemagne’s reign, must have had something to do with the Saxons. This is an interpretation which he does not explain.⁸²

Nevertheless, it is an argument which historians continued to use in the following century. The twentieth century saw many historians interpreting the *Indiculus* in a missionary context, favouring a connection with Charlemagne’s early reign. Especially Holger Homann, who, in 1965, argued that through parallels in later penitentials and hagiographies, the practices as listed in the *Indiculus* can be narrowed down to the region of Westphalia and the *Niederrhein* area (a part of early medieval Saxony). Sources on superstitions or ‘wrong practices’, which were written in the area of Saxony during the rest of the Middle Ages, function as indicators for ‘distinct regional Germanic paganisms’ in Homann’s eyes. The line saying *De spurcalibus in Februario* mostly seemed to indicate a ‘female pagan fertility rite’, which could be narrowed down to Westphalia and the *Niederrhein* area of Saxony, so stated Homann.⁸³ In the end, he stated that the ‘initial baptism of the Saxons’ ended with the baptism of Widukind in 785, since this ended the long Saxon Wars and started the integration process of Saxony into the Carolingian empire. This allowed Homann to date the *Indiculus* between 790 and 800, when remaining paganisms were being rooted out by missionaries like Lebuin, Liudger and Sturm.⁸⁴

Next to this, he also incorporated historio-linguistical evidence, which allowed him to locate the *Indiculus* within the Saxon area. He mostly followed the line of argument as instigated by Leitzmann in 1900, some sixty years earlier, who noted that the Germanic word forms would definitely connect the *Indiculus* to the bishopric of Münster during the last decades of the eighth century, on basis of linguistical parallels in the *Freckenhorster Hebereregister*, an eleventh century register of possessions from the monastery of Freckenhorst nearby Münster. The Germanic *au* vocal is portrayed in the *Indiculus* as: *â* in *dâdsisas*. The *Freckenhorster Hebereregister* attests this *â*-form in numerous instances. Furthermore, the *â*-form is also attested in some Old Frisian sources and in the *Monacensis* (Codex München Cgm 25) of the Heliand, so stated Leitzmann.⁸⁵ This, in Homann’s eyes, allows for the connection of Hauck’s thesis to these historio-linguistical arguments, namely that bishop Liudger of Münster (804-809) had a hand in the compilation of the *Indiculus*, which would allow a compilation date of the *Indiculus* even after the turn of the ninth century.⁸⁶ Helmut de Boor even suggested that the baptismal vow itself could have been the words that were uttered by Widukind as he himself was baptized in 785.⁸⁷

However daring the connection with Liudger seems, the historians of ‘camp Charlemagne’ kept maintaining the connection of the *Indiculus* with the Saxon mission during the reign of Charlemagne. Richard Fletcher, in his book on the conversion of Europe, stated that the list ‘would have been available to the missionary preacher around the year 800’ and that the baptismal vow must have been ‘created in

⁸¹ Müllenhof and Scherer, *Denkmäler deutscher poesie*, p. 497: *jene ganze (...) 779 endete*.

⁸² As read in other footnotes: Scherer, almost intuitively, assigns conversion networks and the production of texts with a missionary/conversion theme to Fulda and, as is typical for his time, the presence of Christian syncretism in Saxony during the reign of Charlemagne.

⁸³ Homann, *Der Indiculus superstitionum*, p. 144.

⁸⁴ Ibidem, pp. 143-144: *Da ferner (...) sehr fehlgehen*.

⁸⁵ Leitzmann, “Saxonica I”, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 25 (1900), pp. 567-591: The Freckenhorst monastery is some ten kilometres away removed Münster. For an edition of this text with commentary, see: Wadstein, *kleinere altsächsische Sprachdenkmäler*, pp. 24-45.

⁸⁶ Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, bd. 2, p. 404.

⁸⁷ De Boor, *Die deutsche Literatur von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Beginn der höfischen Dichtung* (München, 1957), p. 26.

the circles of Willehad and Liudger'.⁸⁸ He mostly argues for the later composition of the baptismal vow, since Old English forms are present in the Old High German, yet does not further elaborate as to why this attestation of Old English word forms allow a connection with Liudger and Willehad. Not even references to letters or some other kind of written evidence is used to support this statement.⁸⁹ Fletcher's short interpretation proves the great influence of Leitzmann's and Hauck's theses.

Ruth Mazo Karras, in 1986, stated how some of the practices listed in the *Indiculus* would be 'typical for Saxony', as she tried to draw parallels with the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae*. Especially the pagan sacrifices at trees, 'typical for Saxony', are found under c.6 of the *Indiculus* (which refers to these practices with a Celtic term: *nimidias*). Karras seemed convinced of the parallels found in Rudolf of Fulda's *Annales Fuldensis*, the *vita Bonifatii*, and the Frankish annals, where sacred trees are also mentioned in connection with the Saxons. The felling of the Geismar oak by Boniface and the *Irmingsul* by Charlemagne are used as notable examples. In this way Karras assumes that the presence of canons to punish 'rites and worship in or around groves or trees' in the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* and in one line of the *Indiculus* is enough reason to warrant a connection with Saxony and, thus, the Saxon mission during Charlemagne's reign. This partly follows the assumption held by Homann, who argued that medieval sources on superstition reported cases of 'superstition' which were typical for the region in which it was written. Such an assumption allowed Ruth Mazo Karras and Homann to take descriptions of superstitions at face value, thus allowing 'useful' comparative analyses.⁹⁰

Interestingly enough, as we have seen with the 'Bonifatian evidence', similar approaches have been used to argue for a connection bishop Lullus of Mainz and the *Indiculus*. Eckhard Freise, in 1987, seemed fairly confident in connecting the baptismal vow with Lullus' episcopacy. Lullus undertook numerous operations in expanding the bishopric of Mainz, especially by founding the monastery at Hersfeld. His efforts in the missionary area are not well known. Freise seems certain that Lullus must have been involved in the felling of the *Irmingsul* (772), the large-scale baptisms (776/7) and the compiling 'Old Saxon baptismal vow' (as contained in Pal. Lat. 577). It could even be that Lullus compiled the *Festgedicht* as known from the Paderborn synod (777): *De conversione Saxonum*, which would also show some participation of Lullus' in missionary affairs in the Saxon area.⁹¹ The historical evidence, especially in connection with Lullus' founding of Hersfeld and his episcopacy in Mainz, is strengthened by Bischoff's assumption that the single hand that wrote most contents of Pal. Lat. 577 could either have a Mainz, Hersfeld or Fuldaen provenance. Both Mainz and the Carolingian library in Hersfeld's monastery (which was founded by Lullus) can be connected explicitly with Lullus' episcopacy, which would explain the presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* as well. The first and last folia contain texts which were added from the middle of the ninth century until the tenth century, which Bischoff ascribed to

⁸⁸ R. Fletcher, *The Conversion of Europe: from paganism to Christianity 371-1386* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 235 and 277: On the baptismal vow as being created in an Anglo-Saxon circle on the continent, also containing Old High German influences. And the *Indiculus* as containing influences by Caesarius of Arles and 'being available to the missionary preacher by 800'.

⁸⁹ Both pages from Fletcher's book only refer shortly to both texts, not giving them any more needed attention. I suspect that Fletcher, looking at his historio-linguistical argument, looked at Hauck and Leitzmann's analysis and used their argument to, firstly, date its compilation to the end of the eighth century and, secondly, to connect it to Liudger during his time as bishop of Münster.

⁹⁰ R. Mazo Karras, "Pagan Survivals and Syncretism in the Conversion of Saxony", *The Catholic Historical Review*, 72 (1986), pp. 553-572, pp. 563-565: Most notably it is surprising how Karras interprets her sources as eye-witness accounts, just like Homann and his predecessors did, therefore noting parallels in tree- and grove worshipping. Especially the accounts from Charlemagne's reign, in her eyes, offer worthy parallels and therefore allow a dating of the *Indiculus* during the reign of Charlemagne.

⁹¹ E. Freise, "Lul", in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, bd. 15 (1987), p. 516: on the connection with Lullus, which he mostly bases, as seen in the text, on indirect historical evidence. His support for camp Charlemagne is also attested in other works of him: Freise, "Die Sachsenmission Karls des Grossen und die Anfänge des Bistums Minden", in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur einer Landschaft* (Minden, 1983), pp. 57-100; Freise, "Das Frühmittelalter bis zum Vertrag von Verdun (843)", in: *Westfälische Geschichte*, bd. 1 (1983), pp. 275-336.

Fulda and Mainz.⁹² It is difficult to distinguish a provenance for Pal. Lat. 577 by examining palaeographical traits only. Mainz, Hersfeld and Fulda all lie in close proximity to each other (around forty kilometres), and it would therefore be difficult to distinguish between these monasteries only on palaeographical features. It does not seem unlikely that these three places frequently exchanged books or supplied each other with written material. In addition, Bisschof himself states that all these monasteries would first develop their house styles a century later.⁹³ Machielsen and Homann, while arguing from the codex as a whole, stated that the codex could have been a *Visitationsbuch* for Lullus, which would explain the odd place of the Attigny *Totenbund* in a codex filled with canonical texts and pastoral care.⁹⁴

There are, however, still other historians that just blindly assume its compilation at the end of the eight century. The authors do not go into the mysteries surrounding the *Indiculus*, yet do interpret, in a short sentence, its date of compilation. Simek, in his book on ‘Germanic mythology’, states that the list must have been compiled at the end of the eight century, yet gives no explanation as to why he thinks that is the case.⁹⁵ Also Elmar Seebold, in his edited lexicon of Germanic words from the eight century, proposes a dating of the baptismal vow and *Indiculus* to the end of the eight century without any apparent explanation.⁹⁶

There were also historians who argued for a ‘transmission adaptation’, where the *Indiculus* and baptismal vow were both products from Charlemagne’s era. The *Indiculus*, in this case, would have been influenced by the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L’Estinnes (743). In this way, elements of the *Indiculus* would date back to the Bonifatian era, yet kept being used decades after. Boudriout, however, stated that this would not make sense for the baptismal vow, which must have been compiled during the mass baptisms during Charlemagne’s reign (an interpretation he does not sufficiently elaborate upon). Both texts would have been compiled in the last decades of the eight century, in Boudriout’s eyes.⁹⁷ Georg Baesecke added to this idea the notion that the *Indiculus* was inspired by the reform synods of 742/743, yet was compiled or eventually adapted around the first period of Charlemagne’s reign (765-800).⁹⁸ And, finally, if we assume that the baptismal vow and *Indiculus* can be connected, the mentioning of the gods *Thunaer*, *Uuoden* and *Saxnote* would allow for a definite association of these two texts with the Saxon region and, therefore, the Saxon conversion during the reign of Charlemagne according to some historians.⁹⁹ *Thunaer* and *Uuoden* would also return in the *Indiculus* under their romanized names Mercury and Jupiter. *Saxnote*, however, does not know a distinct parallel in the *interpretatio Romana*, yet is sometimes mixed with the Latin name for *Thunaer*. Assuming a connection through parallels in the *interpretatio Romana*, regarding the speculative evidence, remains risky.¹⁰⁰

⁹² Bernhard Bischoff, “Paläografische Fragen deutscher Denkmäler der Karolingerzeit“, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 5 (1971), pp. 101-134, p. 110: *Sie reduzierten (...) viel ärmer.*

⁹³ Bischoff, “Paläografische Fragen“, p. 111: *In der (...) VIII. Jahrhunderts erreicht.*

⁹⁴ Machielsen, “De indiculus”, p. 135; Homann, *Der Indiculus*, pp. 207-208.

⁹⁵ Rudolf Simek, *Religion und Mythologie der Germanen* (Stuttgart, 2003), p. 100: A short statement where the *Indiculus* is placed ‘just before 800’ and the baptismal vow is dated to the ninth century seems to suffice.

⁹⁶ E. Seebold, *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes: Der Wortschatz des 8. Jahrhunderts (und früherer Quellen)* (Berlin, 2001), p. 25, 366 and 371.

⁹⁷ W. Boudriout, *Die altgermanische Religion in der amtlichen kirchlichen Literatur des Abendlandes vom 5. Bis 11. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1928), p. 18.

⁹⁸ G. Baesecke, “Rezension: Boudriout”, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 53 (1928), pp. 385-388, p. 386.

⁹⁹ Look especially at Scherer’s referenced pages in this article. The baptismal vow is directly linked with Saxony due to this reason and, since the baptismal vow is linked with the *Indiculus*, which would be compiled during the Saxon Wars of Charlemagne, this list is also aimed at Saxony.

¹⁰⁰ G. Krutzler, *Kult und Tabu: Wahrnehmungen der Germania bei Bonifatius* (Vienna, 2011), pp. 127-131: There exists a longer tradition where scholars try to find out the ‘Germanic gods’ behind the names used in our sources which are examples of *interpretatio Romana*. Krutzler, as late as 2011, implements a similar approach, by an extensive comparative analysis of written sources. Here he attests Jupiter as a roman variant for the ‘Germanic god Tiwaz*’ (*Thunaer* in the baptismal vow) and Mercury as ‘Wodan’ (*Uuoden* in the vow). Mercury and Jove (*Iouis; ioui*) would, therefore, one the one hand, be translated to Wodan, whereas Jove’s counterpart is unknown.

As for now, the argumentation in favour of Charlemagne seems to hinge on a few aspects. Firstly, the list would aim at syncretic practices in an ‘already converted’ populace, which means that it perfectly fits the mission during the reign of Charlemagne (think of Lebuin, Willehad and Liudger). These missionaries were part of the so-called *Nachmission*, where the already largely converted population in Saxony was purged of pagan remnants. Secondly, the codicological chronology, as present in the Palatinus codex, would argue for a dating of the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* after 762, in Scherer’s eyes. In general, the presence of the Verneuil canons later on in the codex, which can be connected to Lullus through historical evidence, might argue for a connection between Lullus’ episcopacy and our codex. Thirdly, its connection to the Saxon area, whether it be through its ‘Old Saxon word forms’ (as most German historians claim) or the presence of the gods *Saxnote*, *Uuoden*, and *Thunaer* in Latinised form also allows for a specific aim at the Saxon area. Indirect evidence for Lullus’ involvement in the Saxon mission in the 770’s is also used to bolster this claim and to create a bridge between the manuscript evidence in relation to Lullus and the baptismal vow’s connection with the *Indiculus*. Fourthly, the historio-linguistical evidence, as put forward by Leitzmann, would assume that the Germanic word forms as found in the *Indiculus* would allow a connection with the bishopric of Münster and, if we follow Hauck’s argument, with Liudger’s episcopacy (804-809).

3.1 Charlemagne and the *Indiculus* reconsidered

It is now important to look more closely at these arguments and on which assumptions they rest. These conclusions rest on assumptions that are quite dubious. Firstly, the fact that the list would aim at syncretic practices, indicating that it must have been compiled during the second half of the eighth century since peoples were already Christian then, is a bold statement. Archaeology and literary studies have shown that there is no way of telling if the peoples Boniface confronted were ‘Christian or not’ or if Charlemagne converted ‘non-Christians in Saxony’. This is furthermore complicated by the underlying notion behind this dichotomy: the idea that there existed a ‘pure’ Christianity versus a ‘pure’ paganism. Recent research has shown us to what limit Christianity was ‘uniform’¹⁰¹ What was good Christian faith varied per region and per ‘saint’ or missionary. This even further blurs our understanding, and the limits of, non-Christian religion in the Early Middle Ages. If we use Brown’s theory, we could just as well interpret the unclear archaeological data as depicting varieties of ‘micro-Christendoms’. In 1996, Friedrich Laux, noted a discrepancy between the written evidence and the archaeological evidence. He stated that ‘the written sources indicate the initial colossal conversion of the Saxons during the reign of Charlemagne’, whereas the archaeological data shows a different picture. His archaeological excavations showed, so he believed, ‘graves of monks who travelled through Saxon lands, long before the Saxon Wars waged by Charlemagne, to spread the gospel’.¹⁰² Babette Ludowici, in more recent years, has shown that archaeological data does not give us a view of ‘syncretism’ as much as ‘identity marking. Especially since the excavations of barrow graves from the eighth and ninth century in the Saxon area show us a demarcation of identity instead of ‘pagan belief’.¹⁰³ Consequently, it is not possible

Geralt notes that the functions of the gods Donar (*Thunaer*) and Saxnot (*Saxnôte*) would overlap and, thus, also their name in the *interpretation Romana* could be one and the same: Jupiter. But, as we have no clue who compiled the *Indiculus*, at which area it is aimed and for what purpose it was made, such an interpretation only aids the goal to reconstruct Germanic paganism, especially for the ‘Saxon area’.

¹⁰¹ See Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (Cambridge, 2003) for a more thorough analysis of early medieval Christendom and his ideas on ‘micro-Christendoms’. Simply put: there existed no such thing as a ‘homogenous Christendom’, since our written sources more likely indicate a network of micro-Christendoms who defined religion and practice through their own social, cultural and political contexts.

¹⁰² See F. Laux, “Die Sachsen- Nachbarn und Gegenspieler der Franken”, in: *Die Franken, Wegbereiter Europas* ed. A. Wieczorek (Mainz, 1996), pp. 331-337.

¹⁰³ Babette Ludowici, “Gedanken zu Phänomenen des Religiösen”, p. 387 and 391: Even when grave goods were found they indicated Christian belief of some kind: (...) *aber die meisten der beigabenarmen oder beigabenlosen Beisetzungen waren sicher zu Recht als gräber von Christen angesprochen. Einige Grabfunde liefern auch tatsächlich einen sicheren Beleg dafür, nämlich kleine kreuzförmige Fibeln, die Bestandteil der Totentracht*

to identify markers of ‘paganism’ or ‘Christianity’, which leaves us with more questions. As a result, analyses made by Homann and Karass, who tried to prove that the *Indiculus* was aimed at Saxony, can be dismissed following research by Dieter Harmening and later historians.¹⁰⁴ When we look at Latin terms such as *divinatio*, *sortilegis*, *auguria* and *simulacrum* (which all occur in the *Indiculus* in more or less the same form),¹⁰⁵ they are words that know a transmission history through their ‘literary importance’ in our sources. Often, which is also the case for the *Indiculus*, our sources on superstition betray huge influences of Caesarius of Arles and Isidore of Seville: church authorities who wrote and preached in the sixth- and seventh centuries on matters like superstition and ‘wrong belief’.¹⁰⁶ In this way, a comparative analysis of penitentials or hagiographies from saints that missioned in Saxony is more a comparative analysis of literary tropes than contemporary accounts of cases that show superstitious or non-Christian practices.

The ‘chronological ordering’ of the Palatinus texts has also been contested by various scholars. First of all, the student of Scherer, Elias von Steinmeyer, argued against the chronological ordering of the texts. He stated that, firstly, the excerpt from Gregory of Tours’s *Historiae* seems out of place and that the same counts for the excerpts of the Clementine letter. Overall, only the canons of the *Concilium Germanicum*, and the synod of L’Estinnes (742 and 743) and the Attigny *Totenbund* (after 762) could argue for some sense of ‘chronological ordering’, yet this is a weak argument. In connection to the other texts and sermons that are contained, the first eleven folia could just as well have been randomly copied together in this codex, so stated Steinmeyer.¹⁰⁷ This notion of Scherer implies that a scribe would ‘chronologically order’ these texts as if he would know their ‘original compilation date’ and would, consequently, copy them in this sequence in Pal. Lat. 577. There are, as Steinmeyer mentioned as early as the 1900’s, enough reasons against this claim, especially since the evidence for such a chronological ordering is so scarce. Later, Bischoff argued that there existed many reasons for copying texts in a certain collection or sequence, which, to our modern minds, could be perceived as ‘illogical’. Historical or antiquarian motives, for instance, could just as well have been arguments to copy and sequence texts in a codex;¹⁰⁸ motives that elude us and are an easy prey for anachronistic interpretation.

Also, the fact that *Saxnote* can be identified as a ‘Saxon diety’, if we can call it one in that sense, seems not at all that obvious. It is true that we do know of an attestation of Saxnot and Woden in some Anglo-Saxon written sources, where families trace their lineage back to a ‘Saxnot’ or in the other case ‘Woden’.¹⁰⁹ Whether this means that Anglo-Saxon missionaries picked up these names and inserted them in a baptismal vow at the end of the eight century is another point of discussion I will not deal with here. It is more pressing to look at its importance for the connection between the baptismal vow and *Indiculus* and the Saxon mission. Firstly, it is necessary to note that these ‘entities or beings’ could have

waren. Solche konkreten Belege für ein christliches Glaubensbekenntnis sind aber selten. And further on: Für die Zeit vor den Sachsenkriegen sind derartige Sachzeugnisse noch sehr viel rarer, aber es gibt sie (...) Chorschrankenplatte des 7. Jahrhunderts interpretierte “Reiterheilige”(…) aus der Zeit um 600, die ein mit einem Christogramm verziertes Stück Geweihknochen enthielt (...) eine fränkische scheibenfibel des 7. Jahrhunderts aus Goldblech mit kruzförmig angeordneten Zierelementen aus der Wüstung Gross-Orden bei Quedlinburg (Harz).

¹⁰⁴ See, for instance: Dieter Harmening, *Superstitio: Überlieferungs- und theoriegeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur kirchlich-theologischen Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979) and James Palmer, ‘Defining paganism in the Carolingian world’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 15/4 (2007), pp. 402-425.

¹⁰⁵ Fol. 7r-v: *De divinis vel sortilegis; De auguriis vel avium vel equorum vel bovum stercora vel sternutationes; De simulacro de consparsa farina; De simulacris de pannis factis; De simulacro quod per campos portant*

¹⁰⁶ Again, see: Dieter Harmening, *Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters*, pp. 204-250.

¹⁰⁷ Elias von Steinmeyer, *Die kleineren althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler* (Berlin, 1916), pp. 21-22.

¹⁰⁸ Bischoff, ‘Paläografische Fragen’, p. 110.

¹⁰⁹ Genealogies are known from several Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Several kingdoms trace their lineage back to a *Uuoden* or *Woden*, whereas the East-Anglian lineage notes *Seaxneat*, similar to *Saxnote* in the baptismal vow. There are however extant manuscript traditions on these lineages and how they influenced each other through their centuries of transmission. See: Kenneth Sisam, ‘Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 39 (1953), pp. 287-348.

also been known by the inhabitants of Frisia or the Carolingian empire. In other words: names of these deities do not allow a connection of the baptismal vow to a Saxon area.¹¹⁰ This, in turn, if one assumes that the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* are connected to each other, also means that the names of Jupiter, Jove and Mercury cannot be directly connected to ‘unknown deities’, like *Thunaer*, *Uuoden* or *Saxnote*. Leitzmann, as early as 1900, had already assumed on historio-linguistical grounds that the baptismal vow would have a different heritage than the *Indiculus*. Next to linguistic evidence, there is no direct evidence in the manuscript which would allow us to connect the baptismal vow with the *Indiculus*. Summarizing, we can state, firstly, that there is not enough reason to assume on historio-linguistical grounds that the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* are related to each other and, secondly, that there is reason to assume that *Saxnote*, if we perceive it as a name for a deity, was not only a deity for the Saxons.

Next is the connection with Münster and Liudger. This interpretation has been put forward by Hauck and Leitzmann, who looked more closely at the attested word *dadsisas* in the *Indiculus*. Here, he draws a parallel with the *â*-forms he encounters in the *Freckenhorster Heberregister*, a register of possessions from a monastery that was located in the vicinity of Münster. Here, Hauck sees a parallel with *dadsisas* and words from this register that contain the same *a*’s (as in *geldad*). He goes even further to assume that, on these grounds, it is even possible to appoint the *Indiculus* to Liudger, who was the first bishop of Münster. In this way, the *Indiculus* would have been compiled under influence of the missionary Liudger. Leitzmann noted the specific *â*-form which is attested in *dadsisas* and, therefore, would stem from a different dialect than the baptismal vow. He stated that the Germanic *au* is not written as an *â* here but an *ô* as in *Saxnote* and *gelôbistu*. This would mean that the vernacular words represent different Germanic dialects and, thus, have different origins, so stated Leitzmann. Here, the attestation of *â* in the *Freckenhorster Heberregister* allows for a parallel with the area of Münster and, consequently, the compiling of the *Indiculus*, as a list connected with the conversion, in the bishopric of Münster. This evidence, however, seems quite far-fetched, especially since it assumes that the *â*-forms in the Germanic words as contained in the *Indiculus* immediately tell us something about a Germanic dialect that would be spoken in Münster. To rest an interpretation on a few written attestations of a Germanic *a* seems to be overstretching this evidence. This word form could just as well have been part of local dialects in many other places where a Germanic dialect was spoken and does not suffice as evidence for ascribing the *Indiculus* to Liudger.¹¹¹ The little attestations of Germanic dialects that we have do not allow a reconstruction of specific Germanic dialects in North-Western Europe at the end of the eighth century. Just because the *Freckenhorster Heberregister*, attests such a form does not mean that we can tie this word form specifically to the Münster area. Especially given the fact that the *Heberregister* was written around 1100. This information supposes that the language in that area would have evolved minimally since the eighth century, which is a rather daring and unfounded assumption looking at the scarcity of vernacular sources we have from this area between 800 and 1100. The word form could just as well have existed in Old-Dutch, as Marco Mostert mentions, and, especially because of our vague knowledge of Germanic dialects from this period, ‘there exists just as much evidence to tie the language in the *Indiculus* to Old-Dutch as to, for example, Old-Saxon or Old-Frisians’.¹¹² This argument mostly builds on the attestation of *dadsisas*, whereas we also have *nodfyr*, which seems to be some mixture of Old-Saxon, Old-English and Old-Dutch.¹¹³ The other words *yrias* and *nimidias* do not seem to have a Germanic origin. On the contrary, *nimidias* is related to *nemeton*, a Celtic word for a ‘cultic place in the

¹¹⁰ Mostert, “Communicating the Faith”, p. 105-109.

¹¹¹ It is risky to assign a ‘Germanic word form’ to a specific region without means to clearly ‘define’ a Münster dialect of Old-Saxon or, if one prefers, Old High or Low Germanic. Next to this, the absence of a sufficient number of written sources to define such dialects more clearly also makes such arguments vague. Mostert makes a similar case for his interpretation and criticizes the labels historians have put on early medieval Germanic dialects: Mostert, “Communicating the faith”, pp. 105-109.

¹¹² Ibidem, pp. 122-123.

¹¹³ Ibidem, pp. 102-105 for a short overview on the language debate which does not seem to give way for assigning the word forms to one Germanic dialect in particular.

woods' whereas the origin of *yrias* remains disputed.¹¹⁴ This does allow a connection with the notion that many descriptions of superstitious practices from the end of the eighth century contain influences from Gallic penitentials, as mentioned by Homann.¹¹⁵ It also ties in with the concept that texts were constantly adapted through their transmissions and were compiled with the help of other codices that the scribe possessed. Next to this, the *Hebereregister* does not contain a single reference to something resembling a 'list of superstitions', which, directly speaking, also does not allow a connection with the *Indiculus*.

As we have seen, the previous argumentation has been re-evaluated with more recent research and insights and, thus, has been proven unreliable. The link with Lullus', out of all arguments, however, seems the most valid one. The presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* and the council of Verneuil, which can be connected to Lullus' through historical sources, do indicate the influence of Lullus' legacy on Pal. Lat. 577. So, for a start, the presence of these texts in Pal. Lat. 577 allows for a subtle connection with Lullus. There is still no reason, however, to connect the *Indiculus* to him without any substantial written evidence. According to Bischoff we may assume that the Palatinus texts must have been written in either Mainz, Fulda or Hersfeld, yet the palaeographical evidence is not sufficing. Bischoff stated that the Anglo-Franconian hand would not evolve into its definitive regional forms until after 800.¹¹⁶ Consequently, this means that palaeographical evidence alone cannot determine the provenance of our codex. Trying to determine the provenance of the codex (and, thus, the *Indiculus*) by utilising arguments regarding the Saxon mission allowed Scherer to bluntly state that it was 'obvious that the codex would have been compiled in Fulda, which was the main missionary centre for mission in Saxony at the end of the eighth century'. To our modern standards, this seems quite an overzealous statement. It does not say anything about where the *Indiculus* comes from or what its function was. It only allows a small connection between Fulda as a centre for the Anglo-Saxon mission and the 'good versus bad belief' subject-matter of the *Indiculus*. Consequently, a connection with Fulda is not clear at all if based on this assumption. As we have seen, the historical evidence can be interpreted in so many ways that it allowed Mostert to conclude that the collection of Bonifatian texts (the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*) could have been compiled at Utrecht.¹¹⁷ The destination of the *Indiculus* or the baptismal vow cannot be determined as there is too little evidence historio-linguistically and codicologically speaking. It is safe to state, however, that camp Charlemagne's only substantial evidence lies in its connection to Lullus' (indirect) influence on the mission in Saxony, a portion of the palaeographical evidence (which allows a provenance of Mainz, Hersfeld or Fulda, of which the first two were under control of Lullus (753-786)), the presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* and the canons of the synod of Verneuil (where letters show us that he was present at that synod).¹¹⁸

All in all, it seems that most arguments for assigning the *Indiculus* to Charlemagne's early reign stem from books and papers published by German historians from the early twentieth century. It is remarkable how long Scherer's thesis on the 'chronological composition of Pal. Lat. 577, fols. 1r-11v' remained influential on later interpretations. Also, the linguistic evidence has been taken for granted for

¹¹⁴ Homann, *Der Indiculus Superstitionum et paganiarum*, pp. 123-126: Homann sketches the debate surrounding *yrias*, where multiple linguists and historians come to quite different conclusions. These pages sketch a debate which rests on complicated historio-linguistic theories, where *yrias* could either have a Germanic or Celtic origin.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 143: He notes the parallels with Gallic *vita*'s and penitentials but then argues that this is no coincidence since 'the Celtic and Germanic pre-Christian religions were quite similar'. These parallels, most likely, if we look at Harmening and Palmer, lie in the transmission of the *interpretatio Romana* through the literary genre in which they are embedded: that of 'the pagan versus the Christian'.

¹¹⁶ Bischoff, "Paläografische Fragen", p. 111.

¹¹⁷ Mostert, "Communicating the faith", p. 123: As he draws his conclusion, it seems as if Mostert is well aware of how indirect the evidence in the debate surrounding the baptismal vow and the *Indiculus* is and, consequently, does not see a problem with assigning both texts to Utrecht, which had a missionary school that was well active during the mission in the first- and second half of the eighth century.

¹¹⁸ See note 140.

quite some time, especially when one looks at how Homann, in 1965, borrows Leitzmann's and Hauck's theses to assign the *Indiculus* to the end of the eighth century and to Münster. Even more convincing was the notion that the list would deal with 'already converted Saxons' and, therefore, could never be placed in Boniface's time. Boniface was confronted with a more imbedded paganism, so it was stated, whereas the Saxons during the Saxon Wars were already partly Christian. The last argument has been proven unstable, especially since the archaeology shows us quite a different picture on the conversion of Saxony, showing a more 'gradual Christianisation' since, at least, the seventh century. The chronological interpretation of the contents of Pal. Lat. 577 also underwent a wave of criticism from Steinmeyer and, most notably, Bischoff. Even the historio-linguistical arguments seem too optimistic in assigning certain word forms to a specific region of Westphalia, thus assigning the *Indiculus* to the bishopric of Münster. The only evidence that would allow a connection of the *Indiculus* with Charlemagne's reign is the mere fact that two texts (Attigny *Totenbund* and the council of Verneuil) can be connected with Lullus and that the palaeographical evidence allows a connection with Mainz and/or Hersfeld, which can definitely be connected with Lullus. What still remains a mystery, however, is how the *Indiculus*, then, can be connected to Lullus. The indirect historical evidence suggests Lullus' involvement in the conversion of Saxony during his episcopacy, yet these indications remain uncertain. The presence of these texts in a corpus of other texts which fit a missionary or pastoral context also seems odd, yet could indicate some connection between Lullus' episcopacy and church reforms on the side of the compiler of Pal. Lat. 577. What the motives were for placing the Attigny *Totenbund* among these pastoral care texts remains difficult to interpret. To interpret the entire codex as a *Visitationsbuch* owned by Lullus as bishop, like Machielsen and Homann did, also seems farfetched, especially since there is no direct codicological evidence to support this.

Nevertheless, if a strong argument is to be made for the compilation of the *Indiculus* during Charlemagne's reign, it has to be found in Lullus' context as bishop of Mainz between 753 and 786. The other evidence rests on assumptions that date back to the end of the nineteenth century, which can be placed in the *Zeitgeist* of the German unification of 1871. Glatthaar assumes that German historians in the nineteenth century lived in an academic climate where Charlemagne was seen as the founder of the German state. The *Indiculus* as a part of Charlemagne's influence and reforms seemed obvious for many historians, as we have seen. This seems to be a typical development in historical science for the 'early Bismarck period'. A certain 'political and confessional mindset' (*konfessionell-politischer Besinnung*) seemed to have been present at that time among medieval historians who wanted to reconstruct 'German history'.¹¹⁹ This also affected the assumptions and, consequently, the interpretations that shaped a large part of the foundation for 'camp Charlemagne', which remained influential for almost a century.

4. The aftermath: what remains of the *Indiculus* and what *can* we say?

In the previous chapters we have evaluated the evidence which puts the *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* in different contexts: the mission of Boniface on the Continent or the reign of Charlemagne and the Saxon wars. The evidence used is few and far between, since the list itself does not provide us with clear, direct evidence for its compilation, its "author" or its provenance. Even historical linguists and palaeographers were not able to determine the precise provenance of the hand or the Germanic dialect which is represented in the few words that are contained in the *Indiculus* (even though German scholars were quite sure to determine the Germanic dialect and, therefore, assumed

¹¹⁹ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, p. 443: (...) *Aber es passt doch zur Stimmung der frühen Bismarckzeit, wenn Scherer Taufgelöbnis wie Indiculus nicht der Ära des papsttreuen Bonifatius, sondern Karls des Grossen zuwies.*

that the provenance of the *Indiculus* would be the bishopric of Münster or Fulda's monastery). Thus, as we have seen, both camps build their theories on indirect written evidence from letter collections, hagiographies and capitularies in combination with palaeographical- and historio-linguistic evidence. The previous two chapters have shown how unstable some of these theories are as a result of the underlying assumptions. This last chapter will try to uncover what remains of the evidence put forward by scholars from the last centuries, i.e.: what can be said with certainty about the origin, identity and compilation of the text and, if we might go further in uncovering its secrets, which direction might seem the most plausible? It starts with staying as close to the *Indiculus* as possible, which means that we will focus mostly on the direct evidence that we have.

Therefore, it is necessary to go back to the text in its manuscript setting. Since we do not know of any other transmissions of the *Indiculus*, we have to stay near our sole transmission to build a solid foundation on which we can rest a solid approach. After all, it will be the aim of this chapter to apply the most direct approach in uncovering the secrets of this text, instead of searching for indirect evidence in the sources which have been used by so many scholars in the last centuries. Of course, to uncover more details about the text's origin, context and provenance, one cannot ignore indirect approaches altogether. The 'two camps', however, have shown us what can happen with theories and interpretations if one heavily relies on indirect evidence (and extrapolates this evidence to create a 'Bonifatian text collection', for example). This is why in this chapter the *Indiculus* as a text itself will be the starting point. After this, we will evaluate which indirect approaches might be reliable, reflecting on the last two chapters, and which ones do not. By looking at the structure and appearance of the *Indiculus* in contrast to the other texts in Pal. Lat. 577, a foundation should be laid for a strong approach of the origin, identity and provenance of the *Indiculus*.

First of all, it is important to list the codicological data we have on the codex which contains our text: Cod. Pal. Lat. 577. The palaeographical evidence gives us a *terminus post quem* as to when our codex has been written, namely around the end of the eighth century (more precisely after 762, since that is the year when the Attigny *Totenbund* took place).¹²⁰ The continental Anglo-Saxon hand, which wrote all texts (with exception of *De capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiae* (fol. 1r-v) and the excerpts from the *Concilium Carthaginensis*) seems difficult to trace. Bisschof already noted that, according to his research, the main hand of the codex must have written in either Fulda, Hersfeld or Mainz around the end of the eighth century.¹²¹ The continental Anglo-Saxon hand writes most of the texts in this manuscript, ranging from fol. 2r up to 73v. The hand, which wrote the first text, would resemble hands from a scriptorium in Mainz, probably written around the ninth or tenth century. The hand that wrote 73v-74r was most probably a scribe from the scriptorium of Fulda, writing around the second half of the ninth century.¹²² What this all means, is that our codex, containing pieces on canonical law and pastoral care, was probably written in centres which were closely tied to the conversion of Saxony and Hesse in the eighth century and, in some sense, the Bonifatian reforms. The

¹²⁰ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 478-479: There has been some uncertainty as to the date of the Attigny *Totenbund*, yet recent research has stated with certainty that it occurred on 762. The itself does not indicate the date on which the assembly was held, yet does note the present abbots and bishops in detail. Glatthaar himself states that the interpolation of the text collection must have taken place after Lullus' death (789) and, most probably, in his own 'Fulda': Hersfeld. The absence of Sturmi's name in the *Totenbund* list argues that it was most probably not written in Fulda, but in Hersfeld, since Sturmi was abbot of the monastery of Fulda during Lullus' episcopacy. This would mean that our codex was compiled after 789, where Lullus' successor, Balthart, was most probably responsible for the insertion of this text in Pal. Lat. 577. To base Sturmi's absence on the list on a fight between the same person and Lullus', however, seems unlikely, just as assigning the provenance of this text to Hersfeld on the same grounds.

¹²¹ Bisschof, *Paläographische Fragen*, pp. 110-111: the main hand of the codex does not know a close relative in another manuscript, although Bischoff did find a hand which showed some similarities in another codex from Fulda or Hersfeld (Wolfenbüttel, Helmst. 496a), written in the same time period.

¹²² *Ibidem*, p. 111: He does not go into more elaborate detail as to why he thinks the hands resemble a 'Fuldean' or 'Mainz' hand or what this meant for the life of the codex and in how it would have arrived at Fulda and later Mainz. His main aim seems to have been to list palaeographica options for optional provenances of Pal. Lat. 577.

presence of the *Concilium Germanicum* and the canons of L'Estinnes, which mainly focus on 'false religion and superstition' and guidelines for bishops, argue for a connection between the thematic input of the codex and the relevance of Mainz, Hersfeld and Fulda for missionary activity and church reform. After all, we do know that Mainz had a large collection of books in its library, which must have also influenced the collections at Fulda and Hersfeld.¹²³ The fact that later hands added the *capitula de invasoribus* and an excerpt from the canons of the *Concilio Carthaginense* to the other texts in Pal. Lat. 577 suggests that the codex, whether it was present in Fulda, Mainz or Hersfeld in the later centuries, was probably perceived as a collection of canonical and pastoral material.

It is remarkable, however, that one hand, datable to the end of the eight century, writes more than three-quarter of the entire codex. This allows us to analyse why the scribe put these texts together and how they might be related to one another. The scribe must have had access to previous transmissions of these texts all at once over a longer period as he wrote this sequence of texts. How he selected and sequenced these texts was interpreted by Glatthaar with help of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae* idea and Scherer's notion of 'chronological ordering'. The previous chapters have shown how unstable these theories are from a codicological and textual point of view. It is, therefore, difficult to determine intertextual relationships and how they ended up in the codex if we look at how texts could change over time and through their transmissions, just like the ideas and views they carry. Just because Boniface held certain views and preferred certain Latin terminology does not mean that he was the only one, or his circle, who held these views.¹²⁴ For now, it is only clear that Pal. Lat. 577 itself can be identified as a canonical collection with elements of pastoral care. Thematically speaking, this means that the *Indiculus* was seen by the compiler as a text that expressed views on good and 'sacrilegious' practices, just like the other texts in the codex do on a more general scale.¹²⁵ Such issues were also of importance for a bishop or priest, who were responsible for 'correctly' preaching the gospel and correcting 'superstitious belief'. Therefore, the *Indiculus* seems to be in a right spot in this codex.

Before we go into the content of the texts and their thematic overlap, it is important to note the peculiarities of the main scribe's behaviour. Especially in the first eleven folia, the scribe seems to avoid titles of texts in several instances¹²⁶ or does not write the title before the text but at the end of the text, consequently ignoring the title of the following text.¹²⁷ It seems as if the scribe was mainly focussed on copying as much material as possible, as if he just continued copying texts and did not care for the titles in some occasions. The reason why the scribe did not bother to put titles above the texts will remain a mystery. It could have been, for instance, that the scribe saw titles as unnecessary in some instances for the text bundle he was compiling.

The *Indiculus*, as we know, is also such a text that was copied without a title. If we extend this assumption, we might state that the *Indiculus* as a text might have also existed in other manuscripts with a title, which we do not yet know or are already lost to us. Of course, Pal. Lat. 577 is most

¹²³ For more information on Fulda's and Hersfeld's libraries, see: Bernhard Bisschof, *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 42-44.

¹²⁴ As has been stated in the first chapter; excerpts from Gregory the Great or Julianus Pomerius were also interpolated in texts at the end of the eight century. Especially Timmermanns has shown how important these authorities were for establishing and consolidating episcopal authority in the early Carolingian empire.

¹²⁵ If one looks through the manuscript description, the excerpts from Gregory the Great on how to refurbish 'pagan temples' to function as churches or the pseudo-Clemens sermon on the 'purity of the altar', for instance, seem to fit the same theme of 'good practise versus bad practice' as the *Indiculus* does. Also here a line states: *De sacrilegiis per aecclesias* (fol. 7r).

¹²⁶ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577: the Atigny *Totenbund*, the sermon against Clemens, the excerpts from *Ezechiel* about the bishop's responsibilities, a pseudo-Clemens letter to Jacob on the purity of the altar, the council of Verneuil and, the largest body of text in this codex: the *Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I, have been transmitted into this codex without a title.

¹²⁷ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 7v-8v: The part beginning with *Fili homini speculaetorem posuite* (...) has its title at the end of the text: *ALLOQUUTIO SACERDOTUM DE CONIUGUS IN LICITIS AD PLEBEM* and consequently ignores an initialled title for the next sermon (*Rogamus vos*(...)).

probably not the only manuscript that encounters such copyist behaviour. Why scribes might have chosen to skip titles (or place them at the end of the text) might be explained by the specific reasons why scribes copied certain texts in a certain sequence. The problem is, however, that we do not know these specific reasons and why skipping titles, consequently, seemed a logical step to take by a scribe.¹²⁸ For now, it is important to note that *Indiculus* can be interpreted as a text which might deal with prescriptions or views centred around good or bad practices, connecting to the themes of the other texts in Pal. Lat. 577. The main scribe, an Anglo-Saxon hand, who copied and sequenced all texts in this codex (with the exception of the first and last text), probably focussed on compiling a collection of texts which dealt with pastoral care and canonical law. The scribe saw the *Indiculus* as fitting for this collection, which might allow us to place the *Indiculus*, as a start, in a church reform setting. This context is not only applicable to the Bonifatian era but also to the Carolingian era and, therefore, for almost the entire eighth and ninth century.¹²⁹ What is important is that we do not want to directly associate the *Indiculus* with a Bonifatian circle or Charlemagne's reign through indirect evidence, like Glatthaar and Scherer did, but to take a step back and look at what Pal. Lat. 577 and the *Indiculus* can tell us directly.

Therefore, we want a more direct approach of the manuscript, which means that the notion of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* must be ignored for now. The evidence used by Glatthaar, as we now know, is indirect at best and does not allow a definite connection with the sermons as contained in the first eleven folia. Only the *Concilium Germanicum* and the *capitula de inuasoribus* can be distinctly connected to Boniface, especially since the synod text itself implies that Boniface was the presiding bishop.¹³⁰ The latter text knows another transmission in a late eight/ early ninth century codex, where the title mentions Boniface as the compiler of the sermon (if we believe the scribe's ascription to Boniface in the other transmission of this text).¹³¹ The other texts would be connected to Boniface through their content, which would reflect Boniface's opinions and reflections on theological issues. These parallels can be found in his letter collection, therefore ascribing their compilation to a Bonifatian circle. Also Marco Mostert aids Glatthaar's analysis, as we have seen, with more indirect evidence from the letter collection, extending the Bonifatian approach, which Glatthaar already propagated so vividly in the discussion of the *Indiculus* and its place in Pal. Lat. 577.¹³²

It is with a commentary on this approach that a start shall be made with discussing the overlapping themes that cover most of the content of the texts in Pal. Lat. 577. If we look at the texts in the first eleven folia, they mostly seem to deal with pastoral care, church reform matters and canonical material.¹³³ We also encounter several 'authorless sermons', as we have seen. After the supposed end of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae*, however, this theme does not stop appearing. The largest

¹²⁸ Bisschof, *Paläografische fragen*, p. 110: this ties in with the problems Bisschof pointed out. Precisely why scribes copied certain texts in the sequences we encounter them in will stay elusive as long as we do not have direct evidence that explains these choices.

¹²⁹ Even though Boniface, as is evidenced through his letters and his presence at the *Concilium Germanicum*, played a central role in the reform of the church and its episcopacy during the reign of Carloman and Pippin, the same can be said for Charlemagne's reign. The *Admonitio Generalis*, for example, also deals with episcopal responsibilities and authority, next to the purging of superstitious practices (which was also Boniface's goal). How far and wide this 'Carolingian Renaissance' stretched is another debate. See: Julia Barrow, 'Ideas and Applications of Reform', in *The Cambridge History of Christianity III* eds. T.F.X. Noble en J.M.H. Smith (Cambridge 2008), pp. 345-362.

¹³⁰ For an excerpt from this transmission of the *Concilium Germanicum*, see note 155.

¹³¹ See note 64.

¹³² Mostert, "Communicating the Faith", pp. 117-118: as seen in chapter one, the excerpt of the *Responsiones* of Gregory the Great would be explained by Boniface asking Nothelm for a copy of this text in 735 (ep. 33). In 745, he makes a similar request to Rome, also asking for Gregory's letters (ep. 54). The presence of papal and church father canons would be connected to Boniface's interest in canon law, which can be deduced from the letters he wrote to Ecgbert in 742 (ep. 75) (to help him with church legislation) and to Cuthbert of Canterbury in 747 (ep. 78) (asking for conciliar decisions).

¹³³ See the manuscript description.

text contained in this codex, a complete transmission of the first chapter of *Dionysius Exiguus*'s canonical collection (*Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I) of church canons, stretches from fol. 11v to 69v and also fits the themes that cover the texts in the first eleven folia.¹³⁴ Even after this text, the council of Verneuil and Carthage appear and fit the church reform theme, where a set of canons from the council of Carthage was added by a later hand.¹³⁵ The pastoral care theme also fits the texts betitled *De Sabbato*, about the sabbath, and *Incipit de evangelio tractatus Ambrosius episcopus gratiano augusto*.¹³⁶ Consequently, it is fair to state that not only the eleven folia share a common set of themes, but the whole codex does. The only exception to this rule, more or less, is the Attigny *Totenbund*, which is located in the middle of the supposed *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae*. Otherwise, the codex seems to have been carefully put together by the first hand who wrote all the texts down, with exception of the first and last text. Yet the themes of the texts, that were written by later hands in this codex, allow the assumption that all scribes who worked on the codex knew that they were dealing with a collection that dealt with themes like the ones described earlier. Frankly, the later insertion of the *capitula de inuasoribus* on the first folio and the added canons of the *Concilium Carthaginense* on the last folia suggest that the codex was perceived as a collection dealing with pastoral care and church reform by the scribes who added to it and it remained useful for its users centuries after. Directly assuming, we might state that Pal. Lat. 577 is a codex with texts, that cover themes in connection with pastoral care and church reform. In this way, the entire codex itself could be seen as a collection instead of just the first eleven folia. We might assume, consequently, that the main scribe collected pieces he found in either Mainz, Fulda or Hersfeld and copied them together in Pal. Lat. 577. It is interesting how Glatthaar ignores the other texts that follow the *Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I in his argument for the Bonifatian text collection.¹³⁷

As has been stated in chapter one: the texts in the first eleven folia have few close relatives in other manuscripts and the parallels with the Würzburg collection are also not convincing enough. After all, the largest text in the codex (the only full transmission of the *Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I) makes up more than half of the texts in Pal. Lat. 577, which is a large collection of antique church and papal canons. This first part, containing synod canons and papal canons, knows many other incomplete transmissions, yet the closest one would be contained in a Corbie manuscript compiled around the same time as Pal. Lat. 577.¹³⁸ The late eight century Anglo-Saxon hand, that wrote most texts of the codex, clearly had a goal in writing these texts down, where the texts together would form a collection of texts, which informed the reader on theological issues in church reform, pastoral care and older traditions of canon law. Besides, the historical- and palaeographical evidence does seem to intertwine regarding the themes covered by the texts in this codex. Especially the consolidation of Carolingian control over the border regions of Hestia and Saxony has to be taken into

¹³⁴ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 11v-69v: The whole *Collectio conciliorum Dionysianae* I includes the *canones apostolorum* and the councils of Nicaea, Ancyra, Antioch, Constantinople and Chalcedon, next to numerous other ancient church councils. It fits the other themes we encounter in Pal. Lat. 577, where problems regarding good/bad faith play an important role next to the responsibilities of bishops and clergy as 'herders of the flock'.

¹³⁵ See Bisschof, *Paläografische Fragen*, p. 111 and the manuscript description.

¹³⁶ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 69v-70v: Where *De Sabbato* informs its reader on how to 'correctly' do the sabbath. The other text is a letter from bishop Ambrose to emperor Gratian, originally from the fourth century. It notes the importance of purging Arianistic thought and the consolidation of Catholicism.

¹³⁷ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, p. 502: Only the Attigny *Totenbund* would be the exception on the theme, where the rest could be connected to Boniface, including the first chapter of *Dionysius Exiguus*'s canon collection. Where *De Sabbato* and the *Incipit de evangelio tractatus Ambrosius episcopus gratiano augusto* fit in this analysis, or if they would be connected to Boniface, is left out of the question. Especially since they also concern themselves with pastoral care (*De Sabbato*) or episcopal matters (Bishop Ambrosius of Milan to emperor Gratian).

¹³⁸ Glatthaar, *Bonifatius*, pp. 493-501: Next to the various transmissions of this first chapter of *Dionysius Exiguus*' canon collection, the transmission in the *Collectio Corbeiensis* (Cod. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 12097). The manuscript contains texts ranging from the sixth to the first half of the eighth century. It still remains a debate if this Parasinus codex is related to Pal. Lat. 577 or not. Glatthaar himself notes that there are many problems with assigning both transmissions of the *Collectio consiliorum Dionysiae* I (or the *Collectio Dionysia Prima*, as Glatthaar prefers to call it). See also note 47.

account, as well as the missionary activity of *Sturmius* and the episcopal legacy of Boniface with regard to Mainz and Hersfeld: Lullus.¹³⁹

Henceforth, the direct evidence lets us assume that the texts share common themes and that their possible provenances, palaeographically and historically speaking, allow for a connection with these themes and the compilation of such a thematical codex. Nevertheless, we are still dealing with the mysteries surrounding the *Indiculus*: where does this text fit in a collection of texts on pastoral care and church reform? As the Bonifatian camp, with help of the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* thesis and the *Concilium Germanicum*, draws the text to the 740's, the Carolingian camp, on basis of Lullus' texts and historio-linguistic evidence, sees the text as distinctly Carolingian. Because this chapter wants to stay as close to the direct evidence as possible, the presence of the Attigny *Totenbund* does not seem 'logical' if one looks at the overarching themes the other texts deal with. Since it is the only text in the whole codex that does not concern itself with matters of church law, pastoral care or any opinion on good or bad religion, its presence should be taken into account. Another text, the council of Verneuil, fitting the overarching themes, also allows a connection with Lullus, especially since he refers to being present at that council himself in his letters.¹⁴⁰ For Boniface, only the presence of the *Concilium Germanicum* seems to be a binding factor, especially since the introduction of the canons factually states that Boniface was the overseeing archbishop.¹⁴¹ The later inserted text, the *capitula de invasoribus*, allows a (careful) connection with Boniface regarding the inclusion of an introduction stating Boniface as the author in another transmission, like earlier stated in this chapter. Nevertheless, this says nothing about the origin, identity or provenance of the *Indiculus* or how it might have come to be in this manuscript. Therefore, it might be practical, for the sake of using a direct approach, to look at the text structure itself.

The *Indiculus* is not the only list we know. Many other similar lists (where every line also starts with *De*) can be found in numerous other manuscript from roughly the same time period. Some appear nameless, just as our *Indiculus*, whereas the identity of others can be deduced from their preface or manuscript context. We know of similar collections of sentences, which portray a table of contents for a penitential, for example.¹⁴² Furthermore, others appear as short capitularies for the *missi dominici*, since the preface of these lists clearly explain the aim and use of the lists they introduce.¹⁴³ Summarizing, a short list of sentences could have different identities in the Early Middle Ages, like the various prefaces we encounter show. These texts have a similar structure, as for instance, a list of sentences which seem to shortly introduce matters of some kind. The same lists can consist of shorter

¹³⁹ The role Boniface played in reforming the episcopal sees and the founding of Fulda's monastery cannot be overlooked. Especially their role in the conversion of these regions. Lullus' episcopacy in Mainz and him founding the Hersfeld monastery around 775 (starting a new library there as well) argue for a huge influence of the Anglo-Saxon mission on the establishment and development of church authority in these regions. The copying of canonical collections (with specific stress on episcopal responsibilities and authority occasionally) and pastoral care, by an Anglo-Saxon hand, in one of these three provenances allows a connection of the codex thematical input with the historical context of Fulda, Mainz and Hersfeld. See: Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the written word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 166-204.

¹⁴⁰ Lullus, *Bischof Lul von Mainz beschwert sich (bei dem Erzbischof Chrodegang von Metz) über Verfehlungen zweier Priester Willfrid und Enraed, besonders über Benachteiligung des Kirchenguts (nach 755 juli)*, ed. M. Tangl in: *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, MGH Epistolae selectae 1 (Berlin, 1916), pp. 236-237: Lullus' critique of how church property was handled by two priests reflects the issues presented in canon 9 of the Verneuil synod.

¹⁴¹ *Concilium Germanicum* ed. Reinhold Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius; Willibalds Leben des Bonifatius* (Darmstadt, 1968), p. 378: (...) *et synodum pro timore Christi congregavi, id est Bonifatium archi-episcopum* (...).

¹⁴² The 'Roman Penitential', compiled by Halitgar of Cambrai (817-831), has several transmissions with a similar short list of sentences which form a table of contents for the penitential. For more information, see: Raymond Kottje, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus* (Berlin, 1980).

¹⁴³ A few of such capitularies have been edited by Alfred Boretius, including the prefaces. The following text and notes will give detailed descriptions of these prefaces.

and much longer sentences (or paragraphs, if one would prefer to interpret them as such) as we encounter them in the *Indiculus*. Directly put, we are not left with an isolated case.

4.1 The *Indiculus* as a capitulary?

Consequently, we must start looking at the text as it appears on fol. 7r-v, it appears as a sum of sentences that describe practices of all sorts. Every sentence on this starts with *De* (about) as if, to our modern mind, we would be dealing with a table of contents. Such an interpretation has been put forward by German scholars at the end of the nineteenth century, also calling it ‘a list possessed by a noble man who lived in Saxony.’¹⁴⁴ For now, it might be worthwhile to look up possibilities to interpret the *Indiculus* as some kind of capitulary. After all, many historians (especially German editors from the late 1800’s) have tried to interpret the *Indiculus* as a capitulary, but to what extent can we interpret our list as a piece of early medieval law? The following will look at a few capitularies, which seem to have striking similarities in structure with the *Indiculus*. It is another question, however, if that allows us to interpret the *Indiculus* as a similar text. The following lists, indicated by the names they have received by Alfred Boretius, seem to consist of the same short sentences, mostly starting with *De*:

Capitulare missorum in Theodonis villa datum primum, mere ecclesiasticum (805)

Capitulare missorum in Theodonis villa datum secundum, generale (805)

Duplex legationis Edictum (789)

Breviarium missorum Aquitanicum (789)¹⁴⁵

These ‘lists’, which Boretius tends to interpret as lists that were spread by the *missi dominici*, are all of similar length and seem to shortly introduce broad or specific themes. These themes, however, range from church reform matters to economic and political matters. Next to this, it is only Boretius’ interpretation to think of all these lists as *capitulare missorum*, since their structures would be the same and most lists in his edition contain a preface, which informs us of the list’s uses and aims, as we have seen. All four of these texts would be compiled for use by the *missi*. The *Breviarium missorum Aquitanicum* is transmitted with an introduction, which explicitly states to be used by the *missis*.¹⁴⁶ Another of the four texts listed, the *Duplex legationis Edictum*, issued in 789, also emphasizes its destination for the ‘public’.¹⁴⁷ The *capitulare missorum in Theodonis villa datum primum* and *secundum*, both issued around 805, also refer to the *missi* as being the audience of these texts in several transmissions.¹⁴⁸ All texts contain sentences of the same length as we encounter them in the *Indiculus*, albeit a longer list of them or the occurrence of some rather large sentences here and there. Both *capitulare missorum in Theodonis villa primum* and *secundum* resemble the sentence length and the unclear descriptions, which we similarly encounter in the *Indiculus*. Is it fair to state that the *Indiculus* is such a list of themes that were compiled for the *missi dominici*? It is another problem, of course, how we interpret such interfaces and what that says about the text and its function.

¹⁴⁴ *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*, ed. Alfred Boretius, p. 222: *Legitur in (...) esse videtur*.

¹⁴⁵ Boretius (ed.), *Capitularia regum Francorum*, MGH Capit. 1, pp. 115-117; 121-122: Here I use the titles as Alfred Boretius used them in his MGH edition.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 65: *Incipit breviarium de illa capitula quae domnus rex in Equitania Mancione et Eugerio missis suis explore [iussit et] sacramentum fidelitatis iurare (...) genitor noster Pipinus instituit et nos in postmodum pro nostros missos conservare et implere iussimus vel de nostros edictos (...)*.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 62: *Anno dominicae incarnationis DCCLXXXVIII. Indictione XII. Anno XXI. Regni nostril actum es huius legationis edictum in Aquis palatio publico. Data es haec carta die X. Kalendas Aprilis.*

¹⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 120-124: The introduction to both capitularies vary in several transmissions: in Cod. Paris. 9654, fol. 17r-v (and Cod. Pal. Lat. 582, fol. 19v): *Ad Teutonem villam fuit datum in anno V. imperii ante natale Domini*; in codex Guelferb. Blankenb. 130.52. fol. 78r-v: *Capitulare dominicum datum anno Domini DCCCVI. Ad Theodonis villam anno imperii domni Karoli VI. Titulum II. Item Karoli de causis ecclesiasticis*; Codex Parisiensis 4262, fol. 43: *excarpsu capitula domno imperatoris Karoli (...)*.

Such an interpretation requires in depth knowledge of why capitularies were written down in the ways we encounter them. Earlier on in this thesis, we already read about Scherer, who interpreted the *Indiculus* as such a list for *missi dominici* (he does not elaborate thoroughly as to why such an interpretation would be valid). Also Machielsen went so far as to interpret the *Indiculus* as a capitulary in itself, most probably issued by Carloman or Pippin, as we also read. The problem with these interpretations, however, lies in the anachronistic view of, in our case, the Frankish empire as a proto-state and law issuer. Ganshof created an influential view on capitularies as fitting an anachronistic notion of the Carolingian empire as a ‘modern state’. He notes a structure, where a central power delegates his power through institutionalised hierarchies of officials, as we see in the nation states of today.¹⁴⁹ Later historians, however, criticized this anachronistic notion on a fundamental level by using anthropological evidence, which undermined the presence of a proto-nation state in the Middle Ages.¹⁵⁰ With thanks to research done by Christina Pössel in the last decade, a more ‘spontaneous’ view arises on why and when capitularies were issued. Where our modern mind tends to interpret capitularies as being issued in a strict pattern after deliberations have been held by officials, the medieval reality was quite the opposite. In fact, capitularies could be: residue of an already held assembly, a list of points or issues that still needed to be addressed on a ‘coming’ assembly or, in a single case, some capitulary clauses, where matters are explicitly described as being postponed until the *fideles* could be consulted.¹⁵¹

Furthermore, Pössel notes, after looking at several Carolingian capitularies, that it is not always the case that the subject matter of capitularies was determined by what issues had been raised or decided at a specific assembly. Chapters on a certain theme could have also been collected over a period of time and perhaps from a larger number of assembly debates and other discussions. Or a decree could have been made to send out as a text with only one theme due to immediate need.¹⁵² Consequently, this would mean, from Pössels point of view, that the results of assembly debates underwent processes of selection and redaction before some of them ended up in capitularies.¹⁵³ This leads Pössel to conclude that we ought to take into account the different ways these texts came into being and that, if we look at the legislative-anachronism and their supposed dependence on assemblies, it is not at all true for most of the capitularies. Because of this, it is unnecessary to attribute significance exclusively to promulgation processes.¹⁵⁴ Thus, if we look at Pössels research, any form of capitulary could be written down or issued in spontaneous instances when there was need for clarification or law enforcement. This did not follow the standard legal procedures which we see today. This reality of early medieval law only exists in the modern mind, unfortunately. What this all means, is that capitularies drew on a form of authority that was being exercised by a social group of high status.

Where do we find a form of such authority in the *Indiculus*, however? In Pal. Lat. 577, the list appears without a title or preface, whereas the other texts, which do carry ‘social authority’, have titles and, in some instances, a preface. The *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L’Estinnes contain prefaces where persons of high authority are named,¹⁵⁵ next to the great preface of the *Collectio*

¹⁴⁹ For an elaborate version of Ganshof’s thesis: F.L. Ganshof, *Contribution à l’étude de l’application du droit romain et des capitulaires dans la monarchie franque sous les Carolingues* (Milan, 1969).

¹⁵⁰ Very influential were the following historians: Matthew Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages. The Middle Rhine Valley, 400-1000* (Cambridge, 2000); Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law. King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, Part 1: Legislation and its Limits (Oxford, 1999).

¹⁵¹ Christina Pössel, “Authors and recipients of Carolingian capitularies 779-829”, in: *Texts & identities in the early middle ages*, eds. Richard Corradini, Rob Meens (Vienna, 2006), pp. 253-274, pp. 255-258.

¹⁵² Pössel, “Authors and recipients of Carolingian capitularies”, p. 259.

¹⁵³ Ibidem, pp. 257-258.

¹⁵⁴ Ibidem, pp. 270-274.

¹⁵⁵ *Concilium Germanicum; Synode von L’Estinnes*, ed. Reinhold Rau in: *Briefe des Bonifatius*, pp. 381-384: For the *Concilium Germanicum: Ego Karlmannus dux et princeps Francorum (...) cum consilio servorum Dei et optimatum meorum episcopos (...) cum presebiteris (...) pro timore Chrsti congregavi, id est Bonifatium archiepiscopum et Burghardum et Regenfredum et Wintanum et Willabaldum (...)*. For the synod of L’Estinnes: *Modo*

consiliorum Dionysianae I.¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, the *Concilio Vernensis* has a preface without a title, whereas the canons are titled with red initials.¹⁵⁷ Also, the excerpt of the *Concilium Carthaginense* on the last folio includes a title which carries canonical authority.¹⁵⁸ Consequently, we can state these texts have one thing in common: they exercise a form of high social authority which is imbedded in their titles or prefaces. This authority is either religious (church fathers, biblical passages or papal decrees) or worldly (indicating the presence or admonition of a ruling figure). The *Indiculus*, from this point of view, seems to be without such authority. Consequently, the *Indiculus*' origin seems more elusive, especially if one recalls the theory on text transmission, which was used in the last two chapters.

True enough, there are many lists which, similarly, are transmitted into manuscripts without title or preface. The purpose of this analysis is to make clear that, if we want to interpret the *Indiculus* as a capitulary, we would need more indications of its social authority in the manuscript (or in other transmissions we do not yet know of). Even the 'authorless sermons' in the first eleven folia contain prefaces and titles in some instances, which concern the audience or content of the text, indicating religious authority.¹⁵⁹ In the end, the *Indiculus* carries less signs of authority than the 'authorless sermons'. Even these sermons, which build on religious authorities, have seen many adaptations and versions, which is evidenced by the various transmissions of the sermons in other manuscripts.¹⁶⁰ The first chapter, and especially the large analysis of Glatthaar, has shown how texts were manipulated through their transmissions, which is shown by the differences in terminology we encounter in similar sermons in other manuscripts.¹⁶¹ Where the sermons and the *Indiculus* have no clear social authority, the mid eight century councils and synodal excerpts in Pal. Lat. 577 do indicate their social authority through their titles or prefaces. Here, the *rex Francorum*, the *episcopi* and/or *duces* were indicated as figures of authority overseeing synods or implementing their decisions. The lack of this info in the *Indiculus* might draw us away from interpreting the *Indiculus* as a legislative document.

From a textual point of view, however, what does the content of the *Indiculus* say about its connection with legislation? With the previous paragraph in mind, and if we still assume that the *Indiculus* is a capitulary or a list for *missi dominici*, this interpretation has complications for the origin of the content of the *Indiculus*. We have seen that Glatthaar and Mostert were fairly sure that, due to the evidence in the *epistolae Bonifatii* and parallels found in the *Concilium Germanicum*, the *Indiculus* would be a *Vorlage* for the *Concilium Germanicum*. Yet, if we look at the conclusions drawn by Pössel, the presence of *Nodfyr* (a different written form of *niedfyr* which, as we know, occurs in canon V of the *Concilium Germanicum*) does not immediately support a direct chronological connection with the assembly of 742. In other words, the occurrence of *nodfyr* does not make this list inherently connected to the *Concilium Germanicum* as a result of this assembly, or as a *Vorlage* that was compiled before this council took place. If we follow Pössels line of reasoning, the concept of *nodfyr*,

autem in hoc synodali conventu (...) omnes venerabiles sacerdotes Dei et comites (...) se implere velle et observare promiserunt.

¹⁵⁶ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 11v-12r: The preface builds its validity on excerpts from the apostle Peter and decrees from popes, to honour the 'holiest laws of the pontificate' (*acramentissima iura pontificalibus*).

¹⁵⁷ Ibidem, fol. 71v-73v: the preface names king Pippin and the presence of bishops from Gallia at the *concilium Vernense*: *Ideoque gloriosissimus utque regeiosus in luster vis Francorum rex Pippinus universos paene galliarum episcopos ad gregari facit ad concilium vernus palatio publico recuperare (...)*.

¹⁵⁸ Ibidem, fol. 73v-r: the initialled title reads: *CCXLV CONCILIO CARTAGINENSE TITULUS XII*, one of the councils of Carthage which took place in 242 (now dated to 252). Here, it was debated which punishment several bishops from North-Africa should receive, since they 'lapsed from the faith'. It is the oldest piece of canon material in the entire codex.

¹⁵⁹ See the manuscript description: the attestation of excerpts from Hieronymus' letters or the *Responsiones* of Gregory the great (*Hieronymus dixit; Gregorius dixit*), for instance, argue for religious authority. The *DE CAUSIS DE LAPSU EPISCOPI VEL PRAESBITERI* (fol. 2r) also claims religious authority through citing the views and ideas from church fathers and popes (*Hieronymus dixit; Agustinus autem dixit; Leo papae (...) honore privabit*).

¹⁶⁰ See notes 45-52.

¹⁶¹ See notes 41, 43, 44, 47 and 50. Also see the manuscript description.

could have been collected from earlier discussions or synod assemblies. The parallel with *niedfyr* in the *Concilium Germanicum* is a clear example of this principle in the case of the *Indiculus*. This opens up the possibility for the *Indiculus* being a text that re-used previous written material in its compilation and would also allow a post-Bonifatian date for its compilation. This possibility was already mentioned by Basaecke, as we saw in the second chapter of this thesis.

It should also be noted that the content of the *Indiculus* allows a connection with the overarching themes we encounter in other texts in Pal. Lat. 577. As far as the aim and identity goes for the *Indiculus*, it is safe to state that its subject matter does fit the themes we encounter in texts associated with pastoral care. The short summarizing sentences tell us about several ‘sacrilegious practices’ in the vicinity of certain places in nature (woods and ‘things they do on stones’)¹⁶² and in the direct vicinity of a church.¹⁶³ Also, in one sentence, the practitioners of these practices are named as *paganum* or the practice described is referred to as a *paganus ritus*.¹⁶⁴ All of these practices, however, have not been invented by the compiler of the *Indiculus*, since we encounter similar prejudiced views on practices from Ceasarius of Arles and Isidor of Seville.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the presence of a Celtic word (*nimidus*) and a Germanic word (*nodfyr*) in the same text also argues that the *Indiculus* could have been compiled with the help of other texts with different backgrounds.¹⁶⁶ Consequently, the theme of the *Indiculus* does indicate a connection with pastoral care, which we also see in other texts in Pal. Lat. 577. When one takes a closer look at the manuscript description, one finds striking resemblances in the other texts dealing with the responsibilities of bishops, theological issues, the purity of the altar, misappropriation of church property etc. The connection between correct faith and episcopal authority seems clearly underlined, when one looks at the content of the texts in our codex. The scribe extended on this with a large collection of ancient canon law, which forms the biggest part of our codex. It is unclear, however, what this says about the identity of the *Indiculus*. Would this mean that, like Fletcher assumed, the *Indiculus* was some sort of text that aided an authoritative figure in a church context? Or perhaps a missionary in establishing church authority in newly converted lands? The textual and codicological evidence do not allow such an interpretation directly, despite the list’s affinity with the overarching canonical and pastoral care themes.

This, in turn, also has complications for the assumption that the *Indiculus* would be part of a Bonifatian text collection. When written sources on discussions in assemblies could be re-used over a longer period of time, then this would mean that a Bonifatian text collection, if it even existed, could have become unstable over time in terms of content stability.¹⁶⁷ This would also alter content inside the texts of this collection, especially if we look at Mostert’s comment on the concept of ‘authorship’ in the Early Middle Ages. Many texts, especially sermons, which are plentiful in the supposed text collection, were subject to constant change throughout their transmissions. It has been noted in the

¹⁶² Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 7r: About rites in the woods: *de sacriis silvarum* and ‘about things they do on stones’: *De his quae faciunt super petras*.

¹⁶³ Cod. Pal. Lat. 577, fol. 7r: *De sacrilegiis per aeclesias*.

¹⁶⁴ Ibidem, fol. 7v: *De eo quod credunt quia femine lunam comendet quod possint corda hominem tollere iuxta paganum*.

¹⁶⁵ On the terminology and occurrences of such descriptions in early medieval pastoral literature, see: Filotas, *Pagan Survivals*, p.8; p. 19; pp. 35-38.

¹⁶⁶ The presence of a Germanic word and a Celtic word in the *Indiculus* is most striking. So far, no other attestations of *nimidus* have been found, as well as *yrias*, which linguistic origin remains unknown until today. Only *nodfyr* knows an earlier variant in the form of *niedfeor*, as we have already deduced. This argues for the influence of other texts in the compilation of the *Indiculus*, originating from various part of the Frankish empire. Superstitious subcategories we encounter in the *Indiculus* (doing ‘sacrilegious or wrong’ things near trees, stones, graves, and partaking in pagan festivities) were also noted in texts from Ceasarius of Arles and Isidore of Seville, their texts being authorities on the area of ‘good or bad religion’ throughout the Early Middle Ages. For more information, see the publications by Harmening and Bernadette Filotas: Harmening, *Superstitio*; Bernadette Filotas, *Pagan Survivals, Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature* (Toronto, 2005).

¹⁶⁷ In terms of how drastically the text changes through its transmissions. It is not always certain how drastically transmissions affect the content and terminology of a text.

first chapter that many sermons from the first eleven folia know other transmissions which differ in terminology and content in some instances.¹⁶⁸ Even the parallels with the so-called *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* are not enough to make a strong case for a transmitted text collection.

The indirect evidence from views and ideas, as they appear in the Bonifatian letter collection, which would justify the connection of these sermons with a Bonifatian circle, is not directly implied in Cod. Pal. Lat. 577. Only the *Concilium Germanicum* clearly states Boniface as its supervisor and, thus, being influential in the canons that were compiled at this council. And if one, consequently, wants to connect the *Indiculus* with the canons of the *Concilium Germanicum*, one can only account for seven rough parallels out of the thirty sentences.¹⁶⁹ Based on this scarce direct evidence, it does not seem convincing to interpret the *Indiculus* as a *Vorlage* for this council. Whether some sort of connection between the content of the *Indiculus* and Boniface existed would need more manuscript evidence, since inserting it into a theoretical *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* would seem to exaggerate Boniface's influence on the transmissions of these sermons.

But does this mean that the *Indiculus* is thus a compilation of issues and/or discussions that was compiled during the reign of Charlemagne? The arguments that covered the *Nachmission* and the historio-linguistical field were not convincing either, just as the parallel with Lullus was quite indirect. Even though two texts in our codex (the Attigny *Totenbund* and the council of Verneuil) can be connected to Lullus with certainty, nothing can be said about his relationship to the *Indiculus*. Hauck and consequently Homann went so far as to even interpret the Cod. Pal. Lat. 577 as a *Visitationsbuch* that was in possession of Lullus, even though there is no direct evidence to support that statement.¹⁷⁰ On a more superficial level, one could state that the *Indiculus* in its compact sentences mostly resembles the compact sentences we also encounter in the *capitulare missorum in Theodonis villa datum primum* and *secundum*. The *Duplex legationis Edictum* and the *Breviarium missorum Aquitanicum* also contain a list of compact sentences, yet they do seem to elaborate more on the themes they convey in various instances than the *Indiculus*. The other two *capitulare missorum* seem to be just as compact in their structure as the *Indiculus*, regardless of the different themes they deal with. It is tempting, henceforth, to interpret the *Indiculus* as being compiled in the late 700's, in favour of camp Charlemagne, where we state, on the assumption that the *Indiculus*' structure and layout are very similar to a few lists that were compiled during the early reign of Charlemagne. A larger survey of all list-like capitularies from the eight century, however, would be needed to uncover more parallels. For now, it was the main aim to point at the possibilities for interpreting the *Indiculus* as a piece of legislation in the form of a list capitulary.

The problem is that there exists too little direct evidence for a deeper analysis. The fact remains that we have no title or introduction to our *Indiculus*, which means that it is difficult to know when it was compiled and for what purpose. Next to this, capitularies in general take on so many different forms (this too counts for the capitularies that have an introduction, which hints at its use for *missi*) that there is no way of telling if the *Indiculus* was a typical *capitulare missorum* issued by Charlemagne. Furthermore, 'list' capitularies have also been issued by Pippin and, perhaps, Carloman. These also take on different forms, yet all contain some compact formulations of issues or problems that need to be corrected.¹⁷¹ It could just as well have been the case that Pippin and Carloman issued quite similar *missi* capitularies like Charlemagne, but that they are lost to us or still unknown.

Nevertheless, the 'missing title' in the case of the *Indiculus* might be answered by the fact that the main scribe of the codex, who wrote most of the texts, more often forgot to put the title at the beginning of a text or simply forgot the title. It could also be that the text did not have a title in the

¹⁶⁸ See the manuscript description.

¹⁶⁹ See the scheme made by Machielsen on p. 14 of this thesis.

¹⁷⁰ See note 38.

¹⁷¹ *Pippini capitulare Aquitanicum*, ed. Alfred Boretius in: *Capitularia regum Francorum*, Cap. I, pp. 42-43: most notably the *Pippini capitulare Aquitanicum* (ca. 768) contains quite short sentences on issues and problems. This means that there must have been more similar capitularies, or lists of some sort, that were issued during that time. It seems improbable that Pippin would have been the first who compiled such capitularies.

exemplar the scribe was using. As we already noticed, the *Indiculus* might be one of those texts the main scribe did not bother to put a title on. After all, the main scribe even started the *Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I, the largest body of text in the codex, without an introducing title. In this way, the *Indiculus* could be a (for us unknown) compact summary of themes that was fit for use for *missi dominici*, since it does closely resemble the compact sentences (also mainly starting with *De*) we encounter in the *capitularia missorum in Theodonis villa primum* and *secundum*. If this, however, strictly means that we are dealing with a similar document for *missi* is one uncertainty and its attribution to Charlemagne, because of the dates of the two *capitularia missorum*, is another. Its concern with good or bad belief does fit the overarching themes we encounter in the sermons and synod canons in our codex, which might tempt us to interpret the list in, a broad sense, as a text that was useful during the church reforms in the eight century.

The theme of the *Indiculus*, however, does not allow a distinct connection with either Boniface or Charlemagne. In chapter two of this thesis, it was already stated that there is no way of stating where and when Saxons were converted. To depend the interpretation of the date of the *Indiculus* on whether a people was already initially ‘Christian’ or not seems unstable. Both Charlemagne as well as Boniface maintained to convert pagans and correct their superstitious behaviours. The reality behind these processes, however, are still under debate and remain unclear.¹⁷² If the *Indiculus* would deal with ‘actual pagans’ or ‘already converted superstitious pagans’ is another unnecessary dichotomy that cannot rest on solid evidence, as has already been noted in the second chapter.

The question now remains: what can we say with certainty about the *Indiculus* after this chapter? The problems surrounding the *Indiculus* were approached from the direct evidence we have. The aim was to ignore indirect evidence where this was possible, next to the theories that are supported by indirect evidence, by staying as close to the text as possible. By looking at the overarching themes that the texts in Pal. Lat. 577 deal with, next to the behaviour of the main scribe and the structure of the *Indiculus*, it is safe to say that the list’s content seems to fit the overarching themes we encounter in the codex. The lack of a title or a preface, however, as well as the numerous attestations of such lists in either a legislative (capitulary) or pastoral care context (the table of contents for a *Liber Poenitentialis* written by Halitgar of Cambrai, for instance), does not allow a proper interpretation of the text’s function or origin. There is no information in the text indicating that it was a capitulary, a ‘missionary list’ or a table of contents. The *Indiculus* certainly seems in the right position regarding the overarching themes that are dealt with in the entire codex. Its compilation in the eight century and the presence of church reform material (in the form of pastoral care and canonical collections) seem to connect the *Indiculus* with a period that saw a reorganization of episcopal authority and the consolidation of ‘correct Christian practice’. This is neither unique to the Bonifatian era nor Charlemagne’s early reign: both authorities had a profound influence on the development of church institutes and, consequently, imposing the ‘correct doctrine’. The few close parallels that the so-called *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* has in other manuscripts, as well as the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, cannot account for the existence of a Bonifatian text collection.

Apart from this, the theory on text transmission as well as the intertwining notion of early medieval authorship further complicate the search for an author and origin of this list. What can be concluded after this chapter, especially after looking at the manuscript evidence and after using new insights from Pössel, was that information in *capitularia* could be re-used and thus transformed in the transmission process. Furthermore, the *Indiculus* can be seen as playing a role in the dissemination of pastoral care and canonical material in the early Carolingian age. It can be said for certain that the *Indiculus* was not randomly copied in Pal. Lat. 577. Its content fits the other themes we encounter in the codex and, because of its aim at good/bad religion, the list might, thus, also fit the church reform and conversion context of the eight century. Whether the compiler of this text can be found in a

¹⁷² Here, it is necessary to read Babette Ludowici and Palmer on the archaeological and written evidence we have on the conversion of peoples along the Eastern-Frankish border. See notes 102 and 103.

Bonifatian circle or during the early reign of Charlemagne will remain uncertain until more parallels are found in other manuscripts.

5. Conclusions

The goal of this thesis was to look how the *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* can be interpreted from multiple perspectives. The list has been interpreted from various angles and contexts by multiple historians throughout the last four centuries. Since its discovery up until now, two camps emerged from the discussion. On the one side, the Bonifatian camp, the oldest one, argued for the connection with Boniface. The other camp argued for a connection of the list with Charlemagne, which first began to gain influence in the nineteenth century among German historians and editors. Since the list has been transmitted into Pal. Lat. 577 with no information on its compiler, provenance or identity, historians from both camps have come up with theories to uncover these secrets, by relying on mostly indirect approaches. The assumptions that supported these approaches, however, were unreliable and needed to be re-evaluated. Therefore, this thesis was structured in a way that it re-evaluated these theories from both camps and looked at which assumptions were at the base of their theories and approaches. With help of theories on textual transmission, authorship and conversion, the assumptions were reviewed and, consequently, the theories they supported undermined. The last chapter focused on the evidence that remained useful after the re-evaluations of both camps, and, consequently, what we can still say about the *Indiculus*. What has been the result of this analysis? In which ways can we still interpret the *Indiculus*? And to what extent?

The first chapter dealt with the theories that aimed at connecting the *Indiculus* with Boniface or a Bonifatian circle. The discoverer of the list stated firstly that it seemed clear that the *Indiculus* was connected to the *Concilium Germanicum*, through the parallel with *nodfyr*, and that the list was an elaboration of the punishment for pagan practices in the last canon of the L'Estinnes synod. This remained an influential interpretation of the *Indiculus* up until the nineteenth century and encountered little to no critique. Much later, in 1962, Machielsen argued that the *Indiculus* was a capitulary issued by either Pippin or Carloman, on basis of the similarities with other list-like capitularies. The connection with Boniface, which seemed so obvious to his predecessors, seemed unlikely in his eyes. There was no terminology in the list that would allow a direct connection with the terminology as found in the *epistolae Bonifatii*. Machielsen did admit that the list was most certainly a product of the Bonifatian church reforms during the reigns of Carloman and Pippin, yet would not originate from Boniface himself.

The first elaborate theory to connect the *Indiculus* to a Bonifatian circle would come from Glatthaar. In his publication in 2004, he tried to argue that the first eleven folia of Pal. Lat. 577, which also include the *Indiculus*, would form a Bonifatian text collection. The existence of such a text collection was already assumed by Scherer, who did not elaborate on it any further. Glatthaar aimed to build a large argument for this theory. The terminology as contained in the nameless sermons and the capitularies would reflect Boniface's views and ideas, which would be proven through the parallels in terminology in the *epistolae Bonifatii*. Furthermore, the parallels between some texts in his *Sententiae Bonifatianae Palatinae* and the Würzburg text collection (*Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*) would also argue for the compilation and transmission of a Bonifatian text collection around the 740's and 50's. According to Glatthaar, the *Indiculus* can be seen as a text that was used to compile the canons of the *Concilium Germanicum*. The connection with the synod of L'Estinnes seemed out of place, since there was no direct evidence to assume a relation between the list and the L'Estinnes canons of 743. Ten years later, Marco Mostert picked up the debate again. He primarily noted that the linguistic evidence concerning the origin of the vernacular words (*nodfyr*, *dadsisas*, *nimidias* and *yrias*) could not make an argument for the *Indiculus* being a Saxon, Franconian or Frisian list. He also suggested, like Glatthaar, that the *Indiculus* was a Bonifatian product. He followed Glatthaar's theory of the Bonifatian text collection and added more parallels from the *epistolae Bonifatii* to it. Mostert

went a step further in stating that Utrecht could have been a likely place where the Bonifatian collection was put together by Anglo-Saxon missionaries. The Bonifatian origin of the *Indiculus* seemed certain in his opinion as well.

Yet Mostert also noted the concept of authorship in the Early Middle Ages, which aids to criticize the existence of such a text collection. Authorship, like we know today, did not exist in the Early Middle Ages. Texts were adapted throughout their transmission, most notably sermons, where the textual content and terminology were subject to constant change. Therefore, when we assume that such a Bonifatian collection was compiled during the Bonifatian era, a lot in the compilation of the collection and the texts themselves could have been altered throughout their transmissions. Next to this, it is not at all sure whether the *epistolae Bonifatii* can account for the terminology we encounter in the texts in the first eleven folia of the manuscript. The analysis of Glatthaar showed that many texts did not have very close relatives. The texts did have transmissions in other manuscripts occasionally, yet were quite different in terminology and structure in many instances. The texts that were also present in the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis* only accounted for a third of the texts we find in Pal. Lat. 577. These parallels, as we have seen, are few and far between. Many excerpts of the church fathers, Gregory the Great and Julianus Pomerius are found in these texts; authors which were not only known by Boniface. In this way, they do not allow a sole connection with his views and ideas. These authorities were also known by his contemporaries and by ecclesial figures at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century, who also influenced text production and transmission. Such terminology, therefore, was not unique for Boniface's time or his views, but remained useful for Carolingian libraries in the centuries after Boniface's life. After all, we know that Pal. Lat. 577 was compiled during the reign of Charlemagne, where research from Timmermanns even showed that Julianus Pomerius' popularity rose at the end of the eight century. This fits the context, where Carolingian bishops were consolidating their episcopal authority during the last decade of the eight century. Summarizing, the great changes that texts can undergo through transmissions complicates the existence of such a text collection. Parallels with the *epistolae Bonifatii* or the *Sententiae Bonifatianae Wirceburgensis*, consequently, cannot directly account for the existence of a Bonifatian text collection and, thus, the connection of the *Indiculus* with a Bonifatian circle.

Does this mean that camp Charlemagne has the advantage? Not quite. The historians, who tried to assign the *Indiculus* to Charlemagne, firstly looked at the manuscript context of the *Indiculus*, where they noted the presence of the Attigny *Totenbund*. This text presents a list of bishops and abbots who promised to pray for each other after their death. It was compiled after a synod in Attigny, which took place in 762. It was first Massman, in the middle of the nineteenth century, who assumed that the *Indiculus* could also have its origin around the end of the eight century. The *Totenbund* was initiated by bishop Lullus, where Massman stated that a connection between the *Indiculus* and Lullus could have also existed. The *Concilium Vernense*, later on in the manuscript, can also be directly connected to Lullus through letter evidence. All in all, Pal. Lat. 577 would allow a connection with Lullus.

It was Scherer, however, who elaborately argued for a connection between the *Indiculus* and Charlemagne. The *Indiculus* would be a product of the later Saxon mission after the Saxon wars, since the practices would imply its use for an already converted population. The Saxon *Nachmission*, as he called it, aimed at thoroughly exterminating pagan leftovers in Saxony. Its main agents were missionaries like Liudger and Sturm, who can be tied to another theory. Namely, German linguists tried to tie the origin of *nodfyr* and *dadsisas* to a certain Germanic dialect. Here, Leitzmann used linguistical evidence to prove that the *â* in *dâdsisas* would represent a distinctly Westphalian dialect in the Early Middle Ages. He based this on similarities with *â*-forms he encountered in the *Freckenhorster Hebereregister*, a list of inventories from the Freckenhorst monastery (which is located in the vicinity of Münster). This means that the *Indiculus* could have been compiled in the bishopric of Münster, where Hauck stated that it is not unlikely that the *Indiculus* was connected to the missionary Liudger, who became bishop of Münster after 800. Homann searched for parallels with the *Indiculus* other texts on superstition from the Early Middle Ages. He argued that some practices as described in the *Indiculus*, through their affinity with other descriptions of superstitious practices, could be

narrowed down to a specific region. There, he claimed that the practices would mostly aim at the Westphalian/Saxon area. He does state that the *Indiculus* could have been influenced by older Gallic penitentials, which were quite influential in the compilation of later penitentials. Other historians carefully attributed the list to the early reign of Charlemagne, silently consenting to the theories of Scherer, Hauck and Homann.

The assumptions that support these theories are quite unstable, as we have seen earlier. To base a date of the *Indiculus* on the fact that it would 'portray practices of a newly converted people' is implying that Boniface would have converted 'real pagans' and that Charlemagne would have dealt with already converted Saxons that still practiced superstitions. Recent research from a historical and archaeological perspective has made clear that it is difficult to identify 'pre-Christian religion in Germania' in contrast to 'Christianity', let alone how many persons Boniface or Liudger, for instance, converted. There was no homogenous Christendom in the Frankish empire, nor a homogenous 'paganism'. Because of this, it is not possible to assume a clear dichotomy between pagan and Christian and, therefore, to assume that the *Indiculus* would deal with 'new converts to Christianity'. As for the linguistic arguments it is problematic that we have only a few vernacular documents from that region in the Early Middle Ages. Just because an inventory list of the Freckenhorst monastery, written around 1100, would account for similar written vocals to *dadsisas*, is implying that the language did not change for over two centuries and, secondly, that only the dialect spoken in the Münster area possessed such a vocal form. It does not seem convincing to support a theory on one vocal parallel in a text that was written more than two centuries later. Going further and, on basis of its affinity with the Münster area, connecting it to bishop Liudger to account for its textual content seems even more out of place. There is no manuscript or textual evidence to allow any connection with Liudger as the compiler of the *Indiculus*, as well as to imply that the vernacular words would represent a Münster dialect.

Lastly, Lullus has been appointed as compiler of the *Indiculus*. It is true that the Attigny *Totenbund* seems out of place thematically in the codex, which could mean that some connection exists between Lullus and Pal. Lat. 577. He was the instigator of the *Totenbund* and also the presiding bishop over the council of Verneuil in 755, which is also located in this codex. It is therefore fair to state that Pal. Lat. 577 as a codex can be connected with Lullus' episcopacy. To appoint Lullus as the compiler of the *Indiculus*, however, is another story. It is unclear, how big Lullus' role was in the church reforms and the discussion on 'good or bad faith'. We do know that the palaeographical data allows us to assign either Mainz, Fulda or Hersfeld as the provenance of Pal. Lat. 577. Bischoff stated that he was unable to assign a clear provenance to Pal. Lat. 577 on basis of palaeographical evidence, since the hands of all Mainz, Fulda and Hersfeld would first develop their house styles later. We do know that Lullus was influential in Mainz and Hersfeld, where he founded a monastery and library in 775. Two out of three likely places for the manuscript's compilation, strikingly, can be connected to Lullus' influence as bishop. If an argument is to be made to place the *Indiculus* in Charlemagne's context, it has to be found in Lullus' influence on Pal. Lat. 577 or his influence as church reformer.

The third chapter looked at the possibilities for interpreting the *Indiculus* in a safer way. Here, it was the aim to stay as close as possible to the text and the manuscript context. We have no other transmission of the *Indiculus* and were therefore stuck with the only manuscript that contains it: Pal. Lat. 577. It became clear very early that the entire codex shares a similar theme: canonical collections with elements of pastoral care. Each text in the manuscript concerns itself with an aspect of these overarching themes, with exception of the Attigny *Totenbund*. Therefore, we could state that it is just as fair to suggest that the entire codex is a text collection itself in contrast to the supposed Bonifatian text collection that was comprised of the first eleven folia of the codex. Furthermore, the possible provenances of Mainz, Fulda or Hersfeld for the codex allow a connection of the manuscript evidence with the historical context of these three provenances at the end of the eighth century. Mainz, Hersfeld and Fulda had been influential in church reform matters (either through Boniface or Lullus) through their activities in the context of the mission or the dissemination of written culture. The *Indiculus*, as a text that deals with 'sacrilegious or wrong' practices, fits the overarching themes in the codex.

Furthermore, the structure of the *Indiculus* was compared with other similar text that have been encountered in other manuscripts. A few capitularies for the *missi dominici* from Charlemagne's reign were surprisingly similar in structure and compactness to the *Indiculus*. On the other hand, we also know of a table of contents from a book, the *liber poenitentialis* by Halitgar of Cambrai written in the early ninth century, which also looks similar to the *Indiculus* in terms of structure and compactness. Claiming that the *Indiculus* would be a capitulary would mean that it has some form of social authority. Pössel claims that capitularies were, in a sense, texts that set and controlled social norms through their high social authority. Other texts in Pal. Lat. 577, especially the *Concilium Germanicum* and the synod of L'Estinnes, contain prefaces that state their use, origin and presiders. The same counts for the largest text in the manuscript, the *collectio consiliorum Dionysianae* I, which draws on ecclesiastical authority. The sermons and capitula also refer to religious authorities (*Hieronymus dixit* or *Agustinus autem dixit*) to validate their content.

The *Indiculus*, however, misses any form of authority from a worldly or religious aspect. The presence of a Celtic word and a Germanic word in one text indicate that more texts were used to compile the *Indiculus*, of which most probably the *Concilium Germanicum*. This does not mean, however, that the *Indiculus* is closely tied to this synod. The re-use of texts to compile other texts over a longer period of time has been noted by Pössel in particular, since it also seems to count for capitularies. The *Indiculus*, from this perspective, seems like a text that could have a range of identities: ranging from being a capitulary to being 'a list for missionaries'. Next to this, such lists could have also functioned as a table of contents, yet the *Indiculus* also gives us no indication of having this function. Consequently, we are left with ample proof for the *Indiculus* as a capitulary or a table of contents.

What remains important is that the theories from camp Boniface and Charlemagne need to be used critically, if future research will try to unravel the identity and origin of the *Indiculus*. The purpose of this thesis was to show the weaknesses of these theories and why they might lead us on a wrong path for the search of all the answers to the questions surrounding the *Indiculus*. The complex mechanics of text transmission and how their content was altered must be taken into account, when interpreting the *Indiculus* in its manuscript context. The historical context, and especially the conversion and the roles of Boniface and Lullus, must also be treated carefully when interpreting the *Indiculus*. In the end, the last chapter has shown that it is important to remain close to the manuscript evidence as found in Pal. Lat. 577 and the *Indiculus* itself. If future historians will try to uncover the mysteries surrounding the *Indiculus*, as so many have tried to do before, this thesis showed that the only certainty is to be found in Pal. Lat. 577 and the list itself. Perhaps in the future, when another codex is found with a transmission of the *Indiculus*, we will have the answers to all these mysteries.

6. Appendix: manuscript description of Cod. Pal. Lat. 577.

This manuscript description is based on the following research:

- Michael Glatthaar, *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg: zur politischen Dimension eines Rechtsbegriffs* (Freiburg, 2004), pp. 458-502.
- Hubert Mordek, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta: Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrschererlasse*, MGH Hilfsmittel, 15 (München, 1995), pp. 775-778.

1r-v	<i>De eo quod laicus vel adulter clericus aecclesiam dei inuasit (...)</i> This is an excerpt from the <i>Capitula de inuasoribus ecclesiarum</i> about the usurpation of Churches by lay people or ‘sinning clerics’. This text is believed to have been written just before the synod of L’Estinnes in 743. The folio is badly damaged.
2r- 4v	<i>DE DIUERSIS CAUSIS DE LAPSU EPISCOPI VEL PRAESBITERI</i> (red initials): canons on wrong behaviour by priests and bishops, which penance they have to do to become ‘re-instated’. Especially Hieronymus, pope Leo and Augustine are the sources for these canons. An excerpt from ep. 58 from Hieronymus’ letters to Paulinus of Nola starts, with no initial, interpunction or small space [fol. 3r (19)- 3v (2)], with the message to ‘not be too kindly to those who are not in need’. Here follows an excerpt of Iulianus Pomerius’ <i>De vita contemplativa</i> (II) (Ch. 1, 10, 11) (fol. 3v-20-4r-5), where a guide is given for priests and clerks how to live ‘without sin’.
4v- 5v	The canons of the <i>Concilium Germanicum</i> (742), as organized and condoned by Charles Martel and the synod of L’Estinnes (743) are listed on these folia (the break between the two indicated with: <i>DE AELIO SYNODAEI CONVENTU (...)</i> <i>ad kalendas martias in loco, qui dicitur liftinus</i> . Canons that specify the rules and punishments for Bishops, priests and how they should live. Also, lists of pagan practices that were deemed ‘punishable’ can be found in the <i>Concilium Germanicum</i> . The synod of L’Estinnes mostly seems to deal with the punishments for trespassing these rules.
6r (1-11)	Excerpt from Gregory the Great’s letters and Hieronymus’ letters: <i>GREGORIUS DIXIT (...)</i> <i>aecclesias reparandis</i> ; <i>HIERONYMUS DIXIT (...)</i> <i>fides ueritatem</i> . It is an excerpt from the <i>Libellus responsionum</i> , which mostly deals with Gregory explaining to Augustine of Canterbury how a Bishop should regulate his tithes under the cleric, the poor, church building projects and the bishop himself. This is followed by an excerpt from Hieronymus’ commentary on Matth. 28, 12-14f., where the focus is on the ‘misappropriation of church property’ and the severity of its case. And a commentary of Hieronymus on Math 28, 19f., where Hieronymus notes the importance that one has to learn first in order to baptize.
6r (11)-6v (21)	<i>Nomina episcoporum qui misi sunt a romana urbe ad predicandum gallia. (...)</i> <i>Nomina episcoporum seu abbatum qui apud villum publicum attiniacum pro causa religionis ac salute animarum congregatis synodali (...)</i> Where 6r (12-15) contains an excerpt of Gregory of Tours, <i>Historiae</i> (I, 30) where seven bishops are listed <i>qui misi sunt a romana urbe ad praedicandum in Gallia</i> (they preached in Gallia). The other list is known as the <i>Attigny Totenbund</i> where bishops and abbots in the Gallic area promise to pray for each other after they die. In 762, this list was made at the synod at Attigny proposed that all bishops attending should pray to each other after they died.
6v (22)- 7r (3)	<i>Forsachistu Diabolae (...)</i> <i>Halogan gast</i> . This is known as the baptismal vow written in either Old Saxon, Old Frisian, Old Dutch or Old Low Franconian.
7r (4)- 7v (11)	<i>De sacrilegio ad sepuchra mortuorum (...)</i> <i>iuxta paganum</i> . The most controversial list in early medieval studies. No title, no author and no apparant clues for its origins. Some words like <i>sacrilegio</i> , <i>paganum</i> , <i>divinatio</i> , <i>incantatio</i> , seem to indicate that we look at a list of ‘practices wich were deemed sacriligious, wrong or superstitious’.
7v (12)- 9r (15)	<i>Fili homini.s speculaetorem posuite in populo meo audiens ergo (...)</i> <i>Si eum in ipsi corporibus nostris volumus habitare</i> . These are excerpts from <i>Ezechiel</i> from the Bible, especially where he talks about the ‘obligations of Bishops (<i>Wächterpflicht</i>). We see similar excerpts of <i>Ezechiel</i> ’s book as in <i>De Vita Contemplativa</i> I, 20. Glatthaar seems to note the fact that this text is most notably influenced by Julianos Pomerius, especially since this text also adds <i>Ezech.</i> 33, 7f. and 3, 19-21, which show affinity with the <i>Ezechiel</i> excerpts as contained in <i>De vita contemplative</i> I, 20. Also, notably, the first <i>capitulario</i> (c.

	24), contains a letter as contained in Bede's <i>Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum: de gradibus consanguinitatis</i> (721/731). It is the 'red rubricant' that heads the second part of this sermon. <i>ALLOQUUTIO SACERDOTUM DE CONIUGUS IN LICITIS AD PLEBEM</i> (...), landed at the end of the sermon 'by accident' (<i>versehentlich</i>), so states Glatthaar.
9r (16)- 9v (16)	<i>Rogamus vos</i> (...) Here starts a sermon opposing the followers of a 'doctrine for salvation' inspired by pope Clemens. The doctrine that is being criticized is that 'those who died before the coming of Christ and, thus, lived as pagans, can still be saved, since Christ also prayed for the salvation of those 'damned souls'.
9v (16)- 11v (15)	<i>Clemens iacobo carissimo in domino aeternam salutem (...) te immo petrum et me et dominem loquentem pertemet ipsum damnationem sibi accipiet: EXPLICIT DEO GRATIAS</i> . The last part of this <i>Sententiae Bonifatianae</i> is a letter from Pseudo- Pope Clemens to Jacob. On the 'purity and sanctity of the rituals at the altar'.
11v (16) – 69v (1)	Excerpts of <i>Dionysius Exiguus</i> ' canon collection known as the <i>Collectio Dionysiana</i> . Here, the <i>Collectio consiliorum Dionysianae</i> I is transmitted in its entirety. It forms the largest codicological unit of the manuscript and is written by the same hand as the previous texts in its entirety. Ancient canonical material, as well as papal decrees, form the primary content of this text.
69v (2) – 70r (14)	<i>DE SABBATO</i> . This sermon goes into how the sabbath is to be correctly followed and practised.
70r (15) – 71r (7)	<i>Incipit de evangelio tractatus Ambrosius episcopus gratiano augusto</i> : This is a decree issued by bishop Ambrose of Milan in the fourth century, by order of the West-Roman Emperor Gratian. It opposes Arianistic doctrines and aims at consolidating the Roman Catholic faith.
71r (8) – 73v (7)	<i>Sufficerant quidem priscorum patrum</i> (...). This is an excerpt from the canons of Verneuil (755), which can also be connected to Lullus' influence. It deals with responsibilities for bishops and clergy alike.
73v (8) – 74r (22)	<i>CCXLV CONCILIO CARTAGINENSE TITULUS .XII.</i> (...) Here, an excerpt of one of the <i>Concilio Carthaginense</i> was copied in the last folia of the codex. It consists of the council of Carthage which took place in 245 (<i>CCXLV</i>) (now dated to 252). During this council, it was debated which punishment several bishops from North-Africa should receive, since they 'lapsed from the faith'.

7. Bibliography

Primary sources

Cod. Guelferb. Blankenb. 130.52.

Cod. M.p.th.q. 31

Cod. M.p.th.o. 4

Cod. Pal. Lat. 577

Cod. Pal. Lat. 582

Cod. Paris. 4262

Cod. Paris. 9654

Editions

Boretius, Alfred ed., *Capitularia regum Francorum*, MGH Capit. 1 (Hannover, 1886).

Fürstenberg, Ferdinand von, ed., *Monumenta Paderbornensia* (Amsterdam, 1672)

Löwe, H. and Levison, W. eds., *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen in Mittelalter*, part 2 (Weimar, 1953).

Machielsen, L. ed., “Fragments patristiques non-identifiés du ms. Vat. Pal. 577”, *Sanctis Erudiri*, 12 (1961), pp. 448-539.

Pertz, Georg Heinrich ed., *Capitularia regum Francorum*, MGH Leges I (Hannover, 1835).

Rau, Reinhold ed., *Briefe des Bonifatius und Willibalds Leben des Bonifatius nebst einigen zeitgenössischen Dokumenten* (Darmstadt, 1968).

Tangl, M. ed., *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, MGH Epistolae selectae 1 (Berlin, 1916).

Secondary sources

Baesecke, G., “Rezension: Boudriout”, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, 53 (1928), pp. 385-388.

Barrow, Julia, ‘Ideas and Applications of Reform’, in *The Cambridge History of Christianity III* eds. T.F.X. Noble en J.M.H. Smith (Cambridge 2008), pp. 345-362.

Bischoff, Bernhard, “Paläografische Fragen deutscher Denkmäler der Karolingerzeit“, *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 5 (1971), pp. 101-134.

- , *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne* (Cambridge, 2007).

Boudriout, W., *Die altgermanische Religion in der amtlichen kirchlichen Literatur des Abendlandes vom 5. Bis 11. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1928).

Brown, Peter, *The Rise of Western Christendom* (Cambridge, 2003).

Filotas, Bernadette, *Pagan Survivals, Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature* (Toronto, 2005).

Fletcher, R., *The Conversion of Europe: from paganism to Christianity 371-1386* (Cambridge, 1996).

Freise, E., “Lul”, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, bd. 15 (Münster, 1987), p. 516.

- , “Die Sachsenmission Karls des Grossen und die Anfänge des Bistums Minden”, in: *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur einer Landschaft* (Minden, 1983), pp. 57-100.

- , “Das Frühmittelalter bis zum Vertrag von Verdun (843)”, in: *Westfälische Geschichte*, bd. 1 (1983), pp. 275-336.

Ganshof, F.L., *Contribution à l'étude de l'application du droit romain et des capitulaires dans la monarchie franque sous les Carolingues* (Milan, 1969).

- Glatthaar, Michael, *Bonifatius und das Sakrileg: zur politischen Dimension eines Rechtsbegriffs* (Freiburg, 2004).
- Harmening, Dieter, *Superstitio: Überlieferungs- und theoriegeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur kirchlich-theologischen Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979).
- Haubrichs, W., “Die Angelsachsen und die germanischen Stämme des Kontinents im frühen Mittelalter: sprachliche und literarische Beziehungen”, in: *Irland und die Christenheit: Bibelstudien und Mission*, eds. Próinséas Ní Chatháin and Michael Richter (Stuttgart, 1987), pp. 387-412
- Hauck, Karl, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, bd. 2 (Berlin, 1958).
- Innes, Matthew, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages. The Middle Rhine Valley, 400-1000* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Karras, R. Mazo, “Pagan Survivals and Syncretism in the Conversion of Saxony”, *The Catholic Historical Review*, 72 (1986), pp. 553-572.
- Kienzle, Beverly M., ed., *The Sermon. (Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age Occidental, 81–83.)* (Turnhout, 2000).
- Kottje, Raymond, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus* (Berlin, 1980).
- Krutzler, Gerald, *Anthropologie des Mittelalters II: Kult und Tabu: Wahrnehmungen der Germania bei Bonifatius* (Berlijn, 2011).
- Laux, F., “Die Sachsen- Nachbarn und Gegenspieler der Franken”, in: *Die Franken, Wegbereiter Europas* ed. A. Wieczorek (Mainz, 1996), pp. 331-337.
- Leitzmann, A., “Saxonica I”, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 25 (1900), pp. 567-591.
- Ludowici, Babette, “Gedanken zu Phänomenen des Religiösen bei den kontinentalen Sachsen vom 6. bis 10. Jahrhundert im Spiegel archäologischer Quellen“, in *Glaube, Kult und Herrschaft: Phänomene des Religiösen im 1. Jahrtausend n. Chr. in Mittel- und Nordeuropa* eds. Uta von Freeden et al. (Bonn, 2009), pp. 385-394.
- Machielsen, Lambert, “De Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum (742-754). Een capitulare van Karloman of Pepijn de Korte”, *Leuvense bijdragen*, 51 (1962), pp. 129-149.
- Massman, H.F., *Die deutschen Abschörungs-, Glaubens-, Beicht- und Betformeln* (Berlin, 1839)
- Meeder, Sven, “Pal. Lat. 577: A codicological observation”, [<https://www.svenmeeder.nl/2013/03/07/pal-lat-577-a-codicological-observation>] (7th march, 2013).
- Mordek, Hubert, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta: Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrschererlasse*, MGH Hilfsmittel, 15 (München, 1995).
- Mostert, Marco, “Communicating the faith. The circle of Boniface, Germanic vernaculars, and Frisian and Saxon converts”, *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 70 (2013), pp. 87-130.

- Müllenhof, Karl and Scherer, Wilhelm *Denkmäler deutscher poesie und prosa aus dem VIII-XII Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1864).
- Nürnberger, A., “Über die Würzburger Handschrift der irischen Canonensammlung”, *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, 60 (1888), pp. 3-84.
- Palmer, James, ‘Defining paganism in the Carolingian world’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 15/4 (2007), pp. 402-425.
- Pössel, Christina, “Authors and recipients of Carolingian capitularies 779-829”, in: *Texts & identities in the early middle ages*, eds. Richard Corradini, Rob Meens (Vienna, 2006), pp. 253-274
- Schmidt-Wiegand, Ruth, “Spuren paganer Religiosität in frühmittelalterlichen Rechtsquellen“, in: *Germanische Religionsgeschichte. Quellen und Quellenprobleme* eds. Heinrich Beck et al. (New York, 1992), pp. 575-587.
- Simek, Rudolf, *Religion und Mythologie der Germanen* (Stuttgart, 2003).
- Sisam, Kenneth, “Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies”, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 39 (1953), pp. 287-348.
- Strewe, A., *Die Canonensammlung des Dionysius Exiguus in der ersten Redaktion*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, bd. 16 (Berlin, 1931).
- Timmermann, Josh, “Sharers in the contemplative virtue: Julianus Pomerius’ Carolingian audience”, *Comitatus*, 45 (2014), pp. 1-14.
- Wadstein, E., *Kleinere altsächsische sprachdenkmäler: mit Anmerkungen und Glossar* (Soltau, 1899).
- Wormald, Patrick, *The Making of English Law. King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, Part 1: Legislation and its Limits (Oxford, 1999).