Introduction:
Factors Shaping Carolingian Studies

Richard E. Sullivan

This volume has a relatively straightforward objective. It seeks to describe what happened in certain interrelated realms of intellectual and artistic life during a period commonly called the Carolingian age, an era conventionally described as spanning roughly the eighth and ninth centuries. Whether for good or bad, historians seeking to discover and account for what occurred at any particular moment in the past are never entirely free to sail their own sea. They must navigate a space where powerful direction is given to their course by prevailing winds and relentless currents set in motion by the efforts of some of their scholarly predecessors to give shape and meaning to the past. At the same time their landfall is rendered unpredictable by flotsam and jetsam cast adrift when the efforts of other precursors seeking to make sense out of the same historical problems ran aground on uncharted shoals created by changing views concerning how the past should be addressed and what was important about it. This nautical metaphor is particularly applicable to historians who concern themselves with the realm of intellectual and artistic history, an arena of historical investigation that has encountered conspicuously stormy waters during recent times. In commenting on the cliché that "history has many mansions," Dominick LaCapra, one of the more perspicacious commentators on the current state of intellectual history, observed in 1985 that "today social history tends to occupy many of the mansions and intellectual history a number of shacks."
Unfortunately, the history of the historiography of Carolingian cultural life still remains unwritten, a lacuna that makes it difficult for contemporary Carolingian scholars to know and understand their roots. No claim is made to fill that lacuna in this introductory essay. However, a few reflections formulated in broad terms touching on some of the major ideological and methodological factors that have decisively conditioned the approach to study of Carolingian cultural history in the past might provide a useful backdrop for the essays that will follow. Moreover, a look backward can perhaps provide some sense of the direction that investigation of Carolingian cultural history might or should take in the future. More important still, such an overview may compel Carolingianists to ask whether they need to reassess their conceptual and methodological posture in the light of current intellectual and ideological trends in order to sustain the vigor of their enterprise and to retain the interest of the considerable segment of contemporary society drawn toward the past that has meaning for them.

First of all, it is important to remind readers having some familiarity with Carolingian cultural history and to alert those who are venturing into that realm for the first time that the historians who have been there before them fashioned a scholarly terrain with a particular configuration. It was shaped by scholars whose inquiries were given a special conceptual orientation by their focus on the phenomenon of cultural renewal. That phenomenon can be defined broadly as quickened and redirected activity in thought and expression that derives its prime impetus and fundamental shape from a conscious turning to an earlier cultural tradition in search of models that will allow the creation of cultural artifacts capable of animating the minds and spirits of a particular collectivity, the members—or at least some members—of which perceive themselves to be restrained and confined by a deficient cultural milieu. The processes involved in the appropriation of tradition; its transformation into new patterns of thought, expression, feeling, and behavior; and the propagation of those new patterns through the fabric of society have provided historians with organizing and explanatory tools through which they have sought to frame the total history of selected cultural communities. Indicative of the seductiveness of that concept is the fact that a code word has come into use as a standard term in the conceptual vocabulary of historians to designate that cultural phenomenon that involves shaping something new out of what is ancient: renaissance. Although distressingly imprecise in its meaning and
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sometimes used in such an indiscriminate fashion as to cause genuine anguish among those who cherish preciseness in the language of historical discourse, the term "renaissance" has been attached to various moments and diverse situations in the past as a cue for all concerned to take special notice. 4

Perhaps to a greater extent than has been the case for any other historical era, the cultural revival that occurred during the Carolingian period has served for a very long time as a prime focal point around which the study of that age has been given shape. As David Ganz astutely observes in his concluding chapter in this volume, "the medieval legend of Charlemagne... had little to say about education and learning until that legend became the property of historians." 5 It may be that that particular perspective on Carolingian history began to take on substance in a world being shaped by another renaissance, that of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Although many who lived during the eighth and ninth centuries were keenly aware that cultural "renovatio" constituted a central element of their effort to renew society as a whole, their sense of their own unique intellectual and artistic accomplishments had a relatively short-lived impact on the historical consciousness of western European society. With the benefit of hindsight it is not difficult for today's historian to demonstrate that during the period extending from the tenth to the fourteenth century a wide assortment of cultural leaders depended on the cultural capital accumulated during the Carolingian age as the basis for a variety of intellectual, literary, and artistic endeavors. However, those who lived during those centuries perceived the Carolingian era from perspectives that had little apparent relationship to intellectual and artistic activity. They remembered the Carolingian age in terms of the "translatio imperii" or the articulation of the basic concepts of papal monism or the point of origin (real or fictive) of noble lineages or the delineation of the prototype Christian prince or the definition of the consummate holy warrior or the formation of the chivalric ideal or the shaping of a unique art style. 6

Eventually, as institutional and mental patterns changed in the later Middle Ages, these once fruitful images of the Carolingian accomplishments were eroded, and for the most part that era lost its relevance to the central concerns of the later medieval world. As a result and with hardly a demur, the Carolingian era was folded into what by the sixteenth century came to be called the "middle age" located between the "ancient age" and the "modern age." As interpreted and judged by a succession of humanists, religious protest, minions of the Enlightenment, and disciples of the cult of progress, that "middle age" was transformed into a "dark
age” serving as a foil against which to measure not only the glories of antiquity but also the liberating enlightenment of the “new” and “modern” epoch. In the eyes of many caught up in the dreams of emergent modernism the entire Middle Ages, including the Carolingian period, needed to be studied because “it is necessary to know the history of that age only to scorn it,” as Voltaire wrote in his Essay on the Manners and the Spirit of Nations.7

However, in an intellectual environment that in general looked darkly on the Middle Ages, there emerged a tradition that viewed Carolingian cultural activity, especially education, in a positive light. Numerous intellectual luminaries of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries attested to this positive evaluation, as Ganz shows in the study already cited. What inspired this particular interest among a variety of cultural leaders who otherwise shared a negative view toward medieval civilization is not entirely clear.8 Perhaps various activities central to Carolingian cultural history struck a resonant chord in the minds of postmedieval intellectuals deeply engaged in comparable endeavors: appropriating the Greco-Roman classics, purifying Christianity, cultivating the powers of reason, and improving the human lot. Whatever the explanation, there can be no question that well before the emergence of modern historiography in the nineteenth century the idea that Carolingian history was essentially about educational reform and cultural renewal became firmly entrenched in the historical consciousness of western Europe’s intelligentsia.

That emphasis in reading the Carolingian record received powerful reinforcement from the revolutionary changes that affected historical studies in the nineteenth century. Among other things those new approaches to the reconstruction of the past began to deliver medieval civilization from its long entombment in the limbo defined by the dark age concept and to provide a more objective and positive recognition of its major accomplishments. While the rediscovery—or as some would have it, the “invention”9—of the Middle Ages was nourished by a variety of impulses, the prime force generating a fundamental reassessment of the Middle Ages was the growing conviction shaped during the nineteenth century that nothing in the present could be understood without knowing how it came to be, that the true nature of current institutions, ideas, techniques, and values could only be comprehended by reconstructing their history. This historicizing of thought, powerfully reinforced by concurrent evolutionist trends in the concepts governing the biological and physical sciences, initiated a passionate search among those concerned with the “human” sciences for the origins of all aspects of human existence. From that starting point could be
reconstructed a history of every facet of human endeavor, which alone could reveal how things came to be what they now were and, in so doing, provide a valid, true understanding of present reality.

More often than not the quest for the roots of nineteenth-century western European civilization led back to the Middle Ages. As a consequence, that epoch grew to seem less distant and less dark; indeed, it became the fertile seedbed from which had emerged most of what really counted on the nineteenth-century scale of values—nation states, representative government, legal systems, the bourgeoisie, European expansion, commerce, capitalism, vernacular languages and literatures, universities, and technology. In general terms, historians argued that those facets of western European civilization had their origins in the period between about 1000 and 1350—the High Middle Ages. Such a definition of the medieval past that counted left the Carolingian era still entrapped in a truncated “dark age” whose history held only a modest interest.

Although the main thrust of nineteenth-century investigations of the Middle Ages tended to slight the Carolingian age, there was one dimension of that period that nineteenth-century practitioners of the genetic approach to the past were no more able to disregard than were earlier historians. That had to do with the cultural revival of the Carolingian period. Increasing familiarity with the sources treating Carolingian history that resulted from the intensified emphasis on source collection and from evolving techniques of source criticism provided a prime stimulant to inquiry oriented in that direction. Looming large in the vocabulary employed by Carolingian writers to describe their own world were certain key terms: *renovatio, reformatio,* and *regeneratio.* While not necessarily equivalent in meaning and while often employed in a context bespeaking aspiration rather than achievement, these terms left the indelible impression that Carolingian history was about cultural revival. As the activities associated with these terms became better known and understood, historians were increasingly persuaded that Carolingian cultural achievements had something fundamental to do with both the Carolingian world itself and the future course of European cultural life. That realization led to what may be called, without undue flippancy, the act of establishment of modern Carolingian studies.

In 1839 a French literary historian, J.-J. Ampère, was emboldened to characterize the Carolingian cultural achievement as a “renaissance.” Ampère justified such nomenclature not only on the basis of his assessment of the quantity and quality of the literary output of Carolingian writers but also on his detection in Carolingian cultural activity of certain generic
features that struck him as comparable to the fundamental characteristics of other more famous renaissances, especially the "great" one of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. That the cultural revival of the Carolingian age was of sufficient importance to be called a renaissance served as an open invitation to a variety of scholars to investigate the era in search of whatever else from its history might have been as creative and significant in the total record of human achievement as were the fruits of the Carolingian cultural renovatio. In a general sense the tremendous outpouring of scholarship during the last century and a half treating all aspects of Carolingian civilization has never strayed far from its fundamental mooring—cultural revival in all its aspects as pivotal to an understanding of Carolingian history.

Although the concept of a renaissance, formulated on the basis of what happened in the realm of cultural activity, has enjoyed a long reign in shaping the approach of Carolingianists to their era, modern scholars have increasingly come to realize that its usefulness as a conceptual tool is surrounded by formidable problems. As a consequence of what has sometimes been called the renaissance debate, few scholars would now employ the term as did Ampère or, somewhat later, Jacob Burckhardt to provide a conceptual frame within which the entire history of a particular era could be fitted in a meaningful fashion. The declining faith in the heuristic value of the renaissance concept has stemmed in part from the obvious fact that it rests on assumptions about the roles of thought and expression as indicators of dynamism in a society or as determinants shaping collective human behavior that find little support in the historical record. More significantly, it has been argued persuasively that history based on such dubious assumptions is bound to be bad history, faulted in many ways—by its too great concern with superstructure at the expense of deep-seated, enduring structures that give basic shape to life; by its undue preoccupation with elites and their "high" culture to the neglect of "little people" and the realms where they lived their silent, unlettered, culturally unadorned lives; by its esoteric focus on abstractions that are difficult to define in objective terms and to relate to the social fabric generally; by its unconscionable neglect of the extent to which cultural artifacts serve as tools of oppression.

For a variety of reasons, then, the venerable renaissance concept has gradually lost much of its potency as an intellectual construct around which all the elements required to formulate an interpretation of the Carolingian age can be arranged and made to cohere. And yet the idea lingers as a dimension of Carolingian historiography. Almost without exception
books surveying the history of world civilizations, the history of western civilization, the history of the Middle Ages, the history of the early Middle Ages, and even the history of the Carolingian age feature a section specifically designated "the Carolingian renaissance." Perhaps all of this could be dismissed as lip service to tradition. But one cannot be certain. A very recent and highly sophisticated book bears a title that certainly evokes the renaissance specter: *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*. With such a title it is not surprising that the volume's first chapter is entitled "Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance." And Carolingianists should be mindful that not too long ago an often-cited article argued that "the Carolingian period is, from the cultural point of view, a potential hotbed of controversy" because "no one . . . has presented an adequate analysis of the relationship between Carolingian culture and the Renaissance problem in general, nor of the methodological problems associated with this relationship." After "some exploratory suggestions about the Carolingian 'renaissance' as an historical conception," the author found reason to affirm that "the Carolingian was possibly the most significant, because the most pioneering 'renaissance' of all." Obviously, the renaissance concept has not gone away completely as a factor in Carolingian historiography.

The chapters that constitute this book are rooted in the fundamental insight that generated the renaissance approach to the Carolingian world, namely, the idea that the Carolingian cultural revival was a phenomenon of central importance not only to the Carolingian era but also to the total stream of western European history. However, this statement should not be taken to mean that their authors are fixed in a traditionalist, conservative posture. Their researches and interpretations have been enriched and reshaped by various intellectual developments that moved beyond the conceptual boundaries defined by the renaissance approach to Carolingian cultural history.

Contemporary treatments of Carolingian cultural history have been indelibly marked by scholarly endeavors shaped by the fundamental canons defined during the nineteenth century to guide the exploration of the past. Although that approach, sometimes called "scientific" historianship, has been seriously challenged during the twentieth century on a variety of fronts, its powerful impact on the methods employed to discover the past, on the intellectual processes utilized to discern meaning from the historical record, and on the techniques employed to produce a comprehensible reconstruction of the past are still discernible in the historical enterprise.
Awareness of that heritage from the nineteenth century is essential to understanding the current state of Carolingian studies.

A central tenet of scientific history was the need to go to the historical record left behind by past human activity in search of the essential evidence for reconstructing the past; "no documents, no history" was its motto. As self-evident as this point appears, it posed a problem: that of gaining access to authentic versions of the sources in which traces of what happened in the past were recorded. The response to this challenge was provided by a number of scholars who worked in a variety of ways to make available in usable form the primary sources relevant to Carolingian history. Preeminent in the ranks of those engaged in this undertaking were those who sought to recover the written texts relating to the Carolingian era. That enterprise began to gather momentum as early as the seventeenth century and eventually took on an existence of its own, involving a highly specialized, complex, and arduous procedure carried out by specialists trained in institutions established specifically to develop skills appropriate to the collection and editing of texts. The process required a search in diverse repositories for manuscripts surviving from the Carolingian age or containing copies of texts that had originated in that age; the determination of the provenance and history of each manuscript; the collation of several versions of the same text; the application of philological, paleographical, and codicological criteria to establish an authentic, original version of each text; and the publication in printed form of the edited product.

Modern scholars encounter the most visible memorials celebrating the individual labors of hundreds of manuscript collectors and text editors in the form of multivolume printed collections of texts that constitute what is probably the most prized bequest of the nineteenth-century scholarly establishment to posterity. Especially precious to those studying the Carolingian cultural revival are the documents that found their way into such exemplary collections as the Acta Sanctorum, the Monumenta Germaniae Historica, and J. P. Migne's Patrologia Latina. No less important than the editing and publishing of written texts has been the effort to collect other kinds of primary source material mirroring Carolingian cultural activity: seals, coins, inscriptions, liturgical objects, jewelry, manuscript illuminations, sculptures, paintings, tools, household furnishings, and so forth. Most of these physical objects ended up in museums where they were displayed in settings that allowed easy access by researchers and where descriptive catalogues were prepared to facilitate their use.

The same development in historical inquiry that since the beginning of
the nineteenth century has focused the attention of historians on the collection, editing, and publication of the sources gave powerful impetus to a second fundamental intellectual activity that has occupied a central place in historical inquiry over much of the last two centuries and has left an indelible mark on how all aspects of the past, including Carolingian cultural history, have been viewed. That activity involved what in old-fashioned parlance was called source criticism. In simplest terms, source criticism involved making the mute records surviving from the past yield concrete data that would permit the historian to reconstruct what actually happened in the past.

The critical approach that evolved during the nineteenth century rested on certain basic points that still command the respect of most scholars involved in decoding the sources of Carolingian cultural activity as a crucial aspect of reconstructing what happened in that realm of Carolingian society. Cultural artifacts produced by men and women living in the Carolingian age were approached as creations consciously constructed with the intent of saying something comprehensible to someone about the external realities that constituted the Carolingian world. The historian's task was to extract from the source what that message was. This required that the historian determine the literal meaning of the words set down in written texts and of the images created by artists, an endeavor that required that the critic be cognizant of and true to the linguistic and visual idiom prevailing in the world in which the source was created. Beyond that the historian qua critic sought to determine to what extent the formal literary or artistic genre utilized by the creator of the cultural artifact was instrumental in giving shape to the message contained therein.

Given the role played in the study of Carolingian culture by the renaissance concept, it has been especially important for Carolingianists to ascertain the extent to which the artifacts created by their Carolingian informants were influenced by pre-Carolingian models, from which they derived the words, images, ideas, and techniques of expression utilized to convey their message. An effective critic of Carolingian sources needed to use whatever means were at his or her disposal to discover to what extent the witness being tested was able and willing to report accurately what was happening. To a considerable degree this aspect of source evaluation depended on the critic's ability to locate the witness precisely in a specific political, social, economic, religious, and cultural context. And it behooved the critic who wanted to extract the truth from a Carolingian source to inquire about what its creator intended in fabricating the artifact under scrutiny. This critical posture presumed that a detached, objective
“cross examination” of cultural artifacts from these perspectives would allow the historian to accumulate factual data that at some point would reach a critical mass sufficient to allow the historian to put together a narrative account that would make clear what happened in the Carolingian world and explain why things occurred as they did.\(^\text{18}\)

The sustained application of these critical principles to a wide range of sources surviving from the Carolingian world produced a huge corpus of critical commentary on the nature and meaning of literary and nonliterary sources surviving from the Carolingian era. Whatever one judges the value of this body of critical comment to be, it remains a factor in determining how the Carolingian past is approached and understood. Serious students of Carolingian culture can disregard it only at their peril.

Hand in hand with the recovery of source materials and the increasingly refined and sophisticated critical assessment of their meaning went a third major activity that was given its basic configuration by concepts of historianship defined in the nineteenth century. Using the data provided by a critical decoding of the primary sources scholars undertook to reconstruct what happened on the cultural scene during the Carolingian age, to write the history of cultural life in an idiom that would permit someone from the present to relive vicariously what took place in another segment of time. As defined by the canons of scientific history, effective reconstruction of the past involved arranging verifiable evidence in a sequential order in a fashion that would simultaneously portray the progress of events that marked the changes that occurred within a chronological framework and explain why and how these changes occurred. Sound historianship enjoined that the historian allow nothing to enter into the reconstructed past that was not rooted in the historical record; especially anathematized was the presence of the historian in the past. In re-creating a meaningful account of what happened in the past, historians had to make choices about the relative significance of the many pieces of data wrested from the sources. Within the frame of reference prevailing in the nineteenth century, it was generally accepted that political actions shaped by the decisions of highly visible political leaders entrusted with the direction of the affairs of nations constituted the basic framework within which the historical process worked.

While the ideal toward which the historian aspired was a universal narrative that would embrace all human activity as it actually was and explain all change as it flowed from the actions and decisions of human agents, the practicalities surrounding the discovery of the past required more limited spheres of research and reconstruction. As the nineteenth century pro-
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gressed, the sweeping narratives of earlier times gave way to more modest endeavors to reconstruct small pieces of the past: the monograph made its appearance. The efforts of those preparing studies narrow in chronological and subject-matter scope were nourished by a faith that each limited bit of research and reconstruction would constitute a contribution to the eventual creation of the universal history. As a consequence, investigation of Carolingian cultural history came to be marked by a division of labor to produce diverse forms of inquiry that still continue to frame the efforts of scholars. The lives and creative activities of individual Carolingian writers and artists were reconstructed in detail. Particular cultural events, such as the composition of a particular book, the construction of a building, the founding and evolution of a school, the collection of a library, or the activities of a scriptorium or atelier, were described and analyzed. Efforts were made to discern the contextual setting within which cultural development occurred. This concern worked in two complementary directions: the search for factors in the larger historical setting that influenced cultural development and the assessment of the impact of intellectual and artistic activities on society in general.

With the passage of time the effort to reconstruct the history of Carolingian cultural life increasingly assumed a configuration that responded to the specialized disciplinary concerns that were evolving to give structure to modern historianship as its practice became increasingly carried on by professionals working in academic settings. Separate cadres of scholars concentrated their attention ever more narrowly and sharply on specific facets of Carolingian culture: education, literature, art, architecture, theology, philosophy, law, political theory, music, and so forth. The fragmentation of Carolingian cultural history proceeded even further: for example, the history of education produced specialized studies of each of the seven liberal arts; the history of law was reconstructed in terms of Roman, Germanic, canon, and customary law; and the history of literature led to separate treatments of poetry, letters, histories, and biographies. While sometimes resulting in distortions arising from the imposition on Carolingian cultural artifacts of disciplinary categories that represent modern intellectual constructs foreign to the Carolingian mental world, the disciplinary compartmentalization of Carolingian cultural history has generally been salutary. It allowed scholars to bring discipline-specific methodological techniques, explanatory models, and accumulations of knowledge to bear on source materials in a way that gave new depth and increased comprehensibility to the reconstruction of Carolingian thought and expression. It permitted the fashioning of manageable narrative accounts and
analytical treatments devoted to specific areas of cultural activity that with some degree of certainty provided a measure of what the Carolingians accomplished.

However, the balkanization of Carolingian cultural history raised formidable challenges that still face Carolingianists. It has tended to mute scholarly discourse across the almost impermeable barriers that stake out modern disciplinary domains in a way that has veiled the interconnections and commonalities at work in Carolingian cultural activity. And it has constantly reminded Carolingianists of the vision rooted not only in their nineteenth-century background but also in the entire Western historiographical tradition: the need to formulate syntheses seeking to describe and explicate in a holistic fashion the entire range of phenomena associated with the Carolingian cultural achievement. To date the realization of that vision has proved elusive.19

The massive effort on the part of past historians whose methodology and objectives were shaped by concepts developed during the nineteenth century to collect the sources, submit them to rigid critical scrutiny defined in a particular way, and utilize the data extracted from them to write the history of Carolingian culture has provided contemporary historians with a huge storehouse of information and interpretive insights about Carolingian intellectual and artistic history. As the twentieth century progressed, opinion gradually began to divide on whether the fruits of historical investigation shaped by nineteenth-century concepts of reconstructing the past provide a crucial nutrient for the history that is currently being and in the future will be written or constitute an obfuscating screen that blocks meaningful access to the “real” Carolingian past. Perhaps it is safe to say that the majority of contemporary Carolingianists place a high value on what their scholarly forebears passed on to them and turn to that inheritance as an indispensable foundation upon which further inquiries into Carolingian cultural history must be based. But even those who see this scholarly heritage in a less-favorable light must still take it into account, if only, as a contemporary Voltaire might put it, to scorn it.

While the central thrust of the scholarship devoted to Carolingian cultural activity has been shaped primarily by the interactive play of knowledge and understanding produced by source collection and editing, source criticism, and historical reconstruction, the rather dispassionate, almost scientific environment defined by these pursuits has been subject to other forces that have had a significant bearing on the shaping of Carolingian cultural
history. Conditioned by a variety of factors at work in the larger social setting with which historians worked, these forces have created powerful intellectual currents that have blown across the scholarly world from different directions and at varying velocities to assert a decisive influence on the reconstruction of the history of the Carolingian era. Since echoes of earlier ideological and methodological concerns still resonate in Carolingian scholarship and since intellectual developments of more recent vintage play a decisive role in defining what presently is and in the future will be central to the study of Carolingian cultural life, these issues deserve at least brief attention in our effort to provide an introduction to the historiography of Carolingian cultural history.

Perhaps the simplest way to alert readers to the ideological and intellectual forces presently affecting historical inquiry is to consider briefly the impact on the study of Carolingian culture resulting from the massive changes that have occurred in recent times with respect to how history is conceived and how the past is reconstructed. In a very real sense those new approaches have emerged from a wide range of political, economic, social, intellectual and psychological forces that have played on and reshaped the modern mentality in general.20

Amid the ferment surrounding contemporary approaches to the exploration of the past one point has remained constant: "no documents, no history." However, that anchor point of traditional historiography has taken on new dimensions in recent times. While the heroic age of the collection, editing, and publication of primary sources for the Carolingian period undoubtedly lies in the past, the work is not yet complete. As will be evident in the notes appended to the chapters in this volume, the search for still-undiscovered written documents and the editing and reediting of texts remain the concern of many Carolingianists.21 So also does the effort to discover and describe all manner of Carolingian objets d'art.22 The adaptation of modern technology to serve scholarly ends has yielded a rich harvest in terms of the accessibility and management of Carolingian source materials. Through the wonders of modern photography and printing techniques, accurate representations of most material objects of Carolingian provenance have been made conveniently accessible to all Carolingianists in their local libraries or even their private studies. Electronic data retrieval systems are in the course of development that allow rapid searches of the corpus of Carolingian written and visual sources that would formerly have required years of effort on the part of the individual scholar. These developments will serve as a reminder to those exploring Carolingian cultural activity that they must always be on the alert for
newly discovered sources of information as well as improved versions of those already known.

However, it is no longer so certain that Carolingian cultural history can continue to view sources from the traditional perspective that survives as a heritage from the nineteenth century. The potential of computer technology in the management of data opens up possibilities of grouping written and visual texts for a synchronic treatment and quantifying data included in them; both approaches may produce new insights about Carolingian history. Concepts have emerged in the realm of modern textual criticism that have compelled historians of medieval cultural history to wonder about their long-standing trust in the primacy of modern edited texts. Indeed, there are reasons to consider that the heroic, much-applauded efforts of a long succession of text editors—typified by the Bollandists or the editors of texts published in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica—who have carried out an elaborate process of conflation of many manuscripts to produce what were claimed to be authentic *Urtexte* have in fact resulted in artificial versions of the essential written witnesses to what happened in the cultural realm. Perhaps it is the unique surviving manuscript that deserves the historian's prime attention as he or she searches for evidence of what actually happened. In their anxiety to produce an *Urtext* of a particular work of a single author, earlier editors of Carolingian texts were not always attentive to the codices, the florilegia, in which many individual texts of different provenances were consciously combined by someone for some purpose. From the perspective of what constitutes a valid source, these composite cultural artifacts may have something unique to say that goes beyond the message of any of the discrete pieces included in them: that matter has only begun to be addressed in Carolingian scholarship.

To such concerns must be added the issue of what constitutes legitimate sources relative to Carolingian cultural history. For a long time Carolingianists have depended on a selected corpus of written texts to provide the data that reveal the nature of the Carolingian revival of learning and its influence on society in general. Without questioning the value of that corpus of material as a window into the Carolingian cultural world defined in a certain way, Carolingianists familiar with recent developments in historical thinking relative to how culture is conceptualized are compelled to ask whether other kinds of sources have something to say about Carolingian thought and expression. It has become increasingly obvious that visual "texts" tell much about Carolingian cultural life that not only complements literary sources but also provides different insights into what that
life was really about. There are reasons to suspect that the same could be said of "audio" texts from the Carolingian age; that is, music texts. Historians are now compelled to accept that ritual actions surrounding Carolingian political and religious life are redolent with signifiers that give access to the Carolingian mentality. Perhaps they must go even further. Modern anthropological and psychological studies have suggested that almost any social act—for example, a coronation ceremony, a marriage celebration, the drawing up of legal documents, a burial rite, treating the ill, stealing relics—can serve as a "text" that tells the investigator of the past how people thought and felt, thereby serving as a useful source relative to the cultural life of any period in the past. What all of this means is that now and in the future investigators of Carolingian cultural life must once again ask themselves what their predecessors asked: what are the sources available that will allow the reconstruction of Carolingian cultural history, and how can access be gained to this material? The response will be much more complex than has been true traditionally.

If defining what constitutes a legitimate source for Carolingian cultural history has become increasingly problematic, even more unsettled are issues related to the evaluation of sources and the extraction of information about the past from them; that is, the problem of source criticism. The mere evocation of certain names will almost certainly raise concerns—perhaps even panic—among Carolingianists accustomed to relying on the vast body of traditional source criticism as a guide to the reading and interpretation of Carolingian sources. Among those individuals are Ferdinand de Saussure, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Roland Barthes, Paul de Man, Northrup Frye, and Michel Foucault. Out of their diverse concerns with the functioning of the human mind, the nature and function of language, and the complexities surrounding human discourse these seminal figures have opened vast new vistas on the treatment of texts and have posed numerous unresolved challenges in terms of discerning their meaning. Their collective efforts have raised disturbing questions for Carolingian historians concerning the sufficiency of their traditional critical approach and the relevance of new schools of criticism to their explorations of Carolingian cultural life.

There can be little doubt that Carolingian cultural historians have been less dramatically affected by evolving theories of criticism than have scholars concerned with other segments of medieval cultural development. For instance, one will not find in Carolingian scholarship the equivalent of the conscious efforts to apply the critical canons propounded by New
Criticism, structuralism, semiotics, deconstruction, psychoanalytical criticism, feminist criticism, reader reception theory, and the "new historicism" featured so prominently in the works of scholars concerned with the writings of Chrétien de Troyes, Chaucer, William Langland, Dante, or William de Lorris and Jean de Meun, or with the creations of late-medieval and Renaissance artists.

While this comment may suggest that Carolingianists are incurably traditionalist and old-fashioned in their critical stance toward their sources, it does not reflect the whole truth. A close scrutiny of the critical approach currently taken toward literary and nonliterary sources would reveal that Carolingianists have felt and reacted to various influences emanating from the roiling currents that have shaped postmodernist theories and practices relating to the nature, reading, and interpretation of texts. Perhaps they were forced to take note of the voices that have dominated modern critical theory because of the ominous threat implicit in the central message of that body of theory: in its major thrust modern critical theory has pushed relentlessly toward the dehistoricizing of texts; toward detaching them from any specific historical context and authorial intention; and toward making them objects of scrutiny independent of time, place, or circumstance of creation. The ultimate consequence of this development is, of course, the effacement of the past.

Carolingian scholars have reflected the impact of modern critical theory by their expanded awareness that texts must be seen as self-contained entities to be understood on their own terms rather than as treasure troves of data to be plundered for discrete "facts" about what happened in the past. Greater attention has been paid to the internal forms, structures, and strategies that are involved in the production of meaning in a text, an angle of attack that adds new dimensions to understanding texts beyond what was previously possible when attention focused primarily on the text's "factual" content. This sensitivity to the text as a unique, self-defining entity has made contemporary Carolingianists somewhat more hesitant than were their predecessors in treating the language of texts as a simple reflection of external reality.

As a consequence of structuralist views of texts, it has become more difficult to explicate a source in terms of the context that presumably produced it. Obversely, a critic is compelled to exercise greater caution in assuming that a text can tell its reader what that context was. Critical acumen among Carolingianists has been sharpened by what modern literary and artistic criticism has to say about how a text is brought into existence.
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That lesson suggests caution in being satisfied with the traditional view that a cultural artifact is the product of an agent consciously moved by an intention to combine form and language to formulate a message the essence of which is the replication of some external reality.

Aside from providing new insights into the nature and structure of texts, modern critical theories have had much to say about the interpretation of texts: how meaning is extracted from texts, what that meaning consists of, and its relationship to some external order of reality. Carolingianists have shown that they have learned from this facet of modern criticism that decoding texts calls for an advance beyond a methodology defined essentially in philological terms to an interdisciplinary approach involving insights drawn from linguistics, psychology, philosophy, anthropology, and semiotics.

The emphasis on textuality inherent in modern critical theory has raised the intriguing possibility that texts create their own meaning that has no relevance to anything beyond the text. Contemporary Carolingian source criticism certainly reflects the expanded awareness of the nature of language as a system of codes whose meaning derives from the relation of one code to another that has flowed from modern structural linguistics and semiotics. In their approach to texts, contemporary Carolingian critics have been influenced by what modern reception theory says is involved in reading or viewing a text and about the relationship between text and audience as a dimension of ascertaining meaning. And finally, from the chaos wrought by deconstructionist views on the interpretation of texts, historians dealing with Carolingian texts have become more cautious in laying claim that some order of incontestable, timeless, universally intelligible meaning can be drawn from a text. The complexities that surround the discernment of the meaning of a text have raised questions about traditional concepts of causality, change, human agency, and social determinism as comprehensible dimensions of the historical process.

All of these developments in Carolingian source criticism flowing from the impact of recent trends in critical theory and practice have at once enriched and made more problematic the efforts of Carolingianists to pursue the critical function required to get to a particular past through the traces it deposited in the form of various kinds of texts. Perhaps the time has come for a collective effort among all concerned with Carolingian cultural history to take stock of where they stand in terms of their critical posture toward their sources. Such a stocktaking might involve a more rigorous evaluation of the limitations implicit in their traditional critical
methodology and an objective assessment of the possibilities offered by contemporary critical theory and practice to enlarge what the texts can be made to say.

No less formidable than the issues concerning what constitutes a valid historical source and how the historian goes about decoding sources are highly charged questions about what is the meaningful past, how one best proceeds to reconstruct it, and why anyone should make the effort. The vast upheavals that have altered the mental landscape of most of the world as the twentieth century has progressed have radically reshaped views on these matters fundamental to historiography and substantially redefined the agenda of historians. The impact of these developments, which are inextricably related to changing ideological concerns, is of crucial importance in defining where the focus of Carolingian cultural history is located and assessing the results of inquiry into that realm of the past.

It would not, of course, be difficult to demonstrate that previous scholars studying Carolingian cultural history were affected by values and beliefs prevailing in the world in which they worked. The scholarly record is replete with examples illustrating the link between ideology and historical inquiry. The rationalism of the Enlightenment cast a negative coloration on Carolingian cultural activity because of the religious framework within which it found expression. The early Romanticists and a long succession of their ideological heirs, who persisted in seeking Camelot, found relief from the horrors of capitalism, industrialism, technology, materialism, and individualism in what they discerned as the organic, collective, emotional, and populist aspects of medieval society. Positivism rooted in experimental science exercised a powerful influence on how Carolingian historical sources were read, on what could be extracted from those sources as legitimate historical “facts,” and on what governed an objective reconstruction of the past as it actually was. Philosophical idealism oriented scholarly inquiry toward a search for a zeitgeist that would provide the center of gravity around which Carolingian thought and expression revolved and toward dialectical imperatives that shaped the ideational underpinnings of cultural communities.

Such prominent features of nineteenth-century thought as the idea of progress, historicism, and deterministic materialism provided different and often conflicting modes of explanation to account for change in the Carolingian cultural scene and contrasting norms to measure the advance—if any—that stemmed from Carolingian cultural renewal. The epistemological tenets undergirding nineteenth-century natural science emboldened some historians to approach any segment of the past in search of empirical
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Evidence that would form the basis of general laws governing human activity. Bourgeois cultural values played a decisive role in defining what constituted high culture in past societies. Confessional positions and concerns dividing Protestants and Roman Catholics put significant twists on defining the all-important nexus between Carolingian religious life and its intellectual and artistic life; the progressive secularization and demythologizing of thought added new complexities to that issue. Various political movements, such as liberalism, socialism, communism, nazism, and fascism, acted as prisms through which the Carolingian world was variously viewed. Nationalist sentiments influenced the tone and content of the scholarly treatment of Carolingian culture. Lurking not far below the surface of nationalist ideology were racist ideas from whose baleful influence not even Carolingianists were immune.

While remnants of older ideological positions are still embedded in the scholarly discourse on all aspects of Carolingian history, their importance has been muted by more recent intellectual trends that have posed a new range of issues concerning what constitutes history and how the historian should address the past. Although the differences between the "old" and the "new" history may not be as radical as some of the proponents of either faction have claimed, and although some of what not so long ago was trumpeted as new history has begun to show signs of aging, it is important for anyone interested in the past to have some sense of the prime ideological and methodological forces currently giving shape to the investigation and understanding of the past, including Carolingian cultural history.

Contemporary historical consciousness has been radically reshaped by what might be called a major intellectual revolution that had its roots in the nineteenth century but that has impacted upon the Western world with special force since World War I in redefining how human nature and human behavior are understood. This transformation is perhaps best mirrored in the works of a series of seminal thinkers, including especially Friedrich Nietzsche, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, Albert Einstein, Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Émile Durkheim, Lévi-Strauss, Foucault, and Derrida, and of a legion of natural scientists who have rewritten contemporary understanding of the ways in which physical and biological factors condition human behavior. Collectively these figures have added the decisive pieces needed to complete the process of dethroning human beings from their long-standing central place in the universe, a decentering process that perhaps began with Galileo and extended through Newton to Darwin, Freud, and Einstein but
whose full implications were veiled until fairly recently by such landmarks of modernism as Cartesian rationalism and empirical science.

In more specific terms, these shapers of the postmodern intellectual environment and designers of the postmodern man/woman have cast serious—if not fatal—doubts on the efficacy of reason as a uniquely human power capable of discerning an order of objective truth by which the universe operates and of making choices within that framework that would permit human affairs to unfold in a pattern beneficial to the human lot. They have, as some postmodern thinkers might put it, made suspect all forms of logocentrism and cast doubt on almost everything that such systems claimed were human capacities.

In a universe where the power of human reason and the boundaries of human freedom were being progressively pruned back it became increasingly imperative for those concerned with human affairs to find alternative ways of accounting for human behavior. Those who honestly faced the implications of the dethronement of reason had to give serious thought to the need for abandoning any idea that human destiny was shaped by conscious choices formulated on the basis of knowledge and applied by human will acting through institutional processes—primarily political—specifically shaped to determine collective well-being. Explanations of human conduct had to be sought in terms of impersonal forces not immediately amenable to rational human control—modes of economic production; deep-seated social structures; enduring mind-sets; unconscious instincts embedded in the human psyche; immobile systems of discourse through which the meaning of human existence and action is shaped and shared; even pure chance.

The central place given to such forces in determining human destiny brought to the fore new ways of grouping human beings into meaningful communities—groupings based on class, wealth, ethnicity, gender, family, marginality, ideology, and so on—that took precedence over the traditional political definitions of communities. This reconfiguration of social groupings gave new importance to various types of behavior that left hardly recognizable the traditional human being defined as a rational political animal. The redefinition of social structures and behavioral patterns brought into prominence new power relationships whose essence was shaped by control of material resources or by modes of discourse from which emerged ideologies capable of controlling human activity by manipulating conscious desires and subconscious urges. The potency of various structurally defined determinants of human relationships was such that it reduced to insignificance mere "events," interpreted as products of hu-
man choices, that once seemed so decisive in charting the course of human affairs; equally fruitless was any effort to explain human affairs by stringing together in sequential order these meaningless events. Thinkers of all kinds found it increasingly difficult to define any grounds for establishing a basis of truth that could be verified by criteria external to the minds that thought it and the language codes that expressed it; relativism in various forms began to permeate the realms of knowledge, morals, and values.

These new readings on the human condition were accompanied by a steady erosion of confidence that the human species was moving in any discernible direction. In a real sense, the emergence of postmodernism has been accompanied by the end of the long-standing faith that humanity was advancing toward a more perfect state. Perhaps the nineteenth-century idea of progress, increasingly discredited on philosophical grounds and by the multiple horrors that scarred the twentieth-century landscape, and "vulgar" Marxism, increasingly revealed to be a manifesto guaranteeing economic regression and political oppression, represented the last manifestations of a teleological view of the human condition.

As new and different definitions of the nature and behavior of contemporary human beings were forged, it was only natural that these new perceptions were projected onto efforts to understand human activities in the past. The result has been a proliferation of schools of historical inquiry, each representing an effort to extract from the changing concepts of basic human nature and the social order a new response to how the past should be addressed and a revision of how to interpret the meaning and significance of past human activities. A brief comment on some of those schools that have asserted a particularly seminal influence on contemporary historiography will help to highlight some of the major intellectual trends affecting Carolingian historiography.

A long succession of revisionists have given a significant role to material forces, chiefly economic and climatic, as decisive determinants of human destiny. Perhaps Marxist historians have systematized this approach most cogently in their effort to explain the past in terms of a struggle between classes forged by the system of economic production prevailing at a particular moment. That approach gave a central place in historical inquiry to material conditions, to social groups either dominant or oppressed by virtue of their location in the prevailing system of production, to cultural and religious superstructures through which those in power maintained their mastery, and to an inexorable dialectic rooted in these conditions, which provided the dynamic in historical development. In due course
the characterization of the human mind and its working articulated by Freud and his followers was applied to the past. Psychohistory opened challenging new possibilities for discerning the motives for human actions, for explaining individual and collective behavior, and especially for assessing the impact, often unperceived, of various impersonal phenomena on the human psyche. Drawing on models provided by key social scientists who played major roles in the above-noted redefinition of human nature, another group of historians devised a structuralist approach that attempted to analyze and explain the past in terms of the influence exercised on human activity by deep-seated, long-lasting structures defined by social organization, economic activity, biological factors, behavioral patterns, and systems of belief.

Although in some forms structuralism tended to impose a mechanistic pattern on human life so powerful as to make moot attempts at the explanation of human affairs, past or present, structuralism's value to historians was given credibility, a particular focus, and widespread publicity by the Annales school, which since World War II has exercised a decisive influence on historiography, especially in France. Although far from constituting a cohesive scholarly community, a long succession of annalistes produced a rich body of research that placed special emphasis on utilizing various forms of quantification in describing and analyzing structures and articulated a conceptual framework through which the working of structures in the human setting could be described and analyzed. That paradigm involved structures of the longue durée viewed as virtually immobile (e.g., climate, geological features, and forms of agricultural exploitation); cyclical forces of middle duration bringing changes (conjunctures) in the economic and social structures controlling the human condition—changes that the historian can measure by systematic quantitative soundings of economic and social structures at regular intervals (e.g., measuring such factors as prices, birth and death rates, and levels of economic productivity); and short term events marking the day-by-day unfolding of life, usually political events. Since Annales historians felt that event history had no significant bearing on human affairs, they argued that traditional narrative history—characterized by reconstructing history in terms of a sequence of events, each of which served to explain what came next—was useless in terms of determining what really happened.

Currents of thought and fields of interest emanating chiefly from the Annales school—but supported by concepts held by Marxists and psychohistorians and constantly reinforced by ideas and methodologies derived
from the social sciences and philosophy—resulted in what has often been called the “new history” or the “new social history,” a kind of history that since World War II has commanded the central attention of professional historians and has been on the cutting edge of new approaches to the past. While the full range of this kind of history is too complex to capture in a brief statement, its essential features are fairly clear. It postulates the centrality of deeply rooted economic, social, and mental structures emerging from the material base of society as determining forces in shaping the past. The prime task of the historian is to describe and analyze these structures. Access to them depends upon asking a new range of hypothetical questions about the past, questions which for the most part are derived from theories postulated by social scientists concerning contemporary society.

To answer those questions relating to the structural features of past societies and their affect on human activity, social historians have sought to exploit a variety of new sources of information about the past and have deployed an armory of new techniques for decoding these sources in quest for new data about the past. This “opening” of the past has revealed a greatly enlarged cadre of people and a vastly expanded range of human activities that have played roles in history that have heretofore been neglected. The resultant history “from the bottom up”—focusing on how “little people” operated within the basic structures in which their lives were encased—has cast serious doubt on the veracity of the “old” history, with its emphasis on the activities of political elites and their “high civilization,” narrow conceptual approach, and constrained methodology.

Although sometimes given a combative edge by the political commitments and egalitarian values of its advocates, the new social history has certainly given the past a new look. Especially important have been the new social groupings brought into view as important contributors to the human endeavor and the new range of activities thought worthy of the attention of historians and their audiences. In some cases these new social groupings have become major foci of inquiry in their own rights; women’s history, family history, and the history of ethnic groups come to mind. The broadened range of subjects that contemporary social historians have deemed worthy of attention—illustrated by such matters as the history of sexuality, insanity, play, criminality, childhood, the imagination, dreams, melancholy, monastic maledictions, pornography, death, sodomitories, and even rhubarb—has provided an immensely expanded sense of what has counted in shaping human destiny. It is indeed to their credit that
social historians consider no group and no form of human activity from
the past too insignificant or too inconsequential to deserve the historian's
attention.

This modest survey of prominent schools of thought in contemporary
historiography certainly runs the risk of oversimplifying what drives the
contemporary approach to the past. It mutes the infinite nuances of
thought that have existed among the members associated with each school
and obscures the points of intersection in the approaches advocated by
each school. Most important of all, it fails to call attention to the wide­
spread reservations held by practicing historians to the claims of any and
all of the schools just noted. In fact, at this point in time, one could argue
that a reaction has set in against the central conceptual positions shared by
all these schools of thought.

Materialistic and psychological determinants seem less decisive than
"vulgar" Marxists and avant garde psychohistorians would have it. "Im­
mobile" structures appear more malleable than ardent structuralists once
claimed. "Events" and their perpetrators attract more attention than some
would have once allowed. Political history may have almost as good a fu­
ture as its past. Elites of all kinds may have at least a modestly respectable
place in history's many mansions; all things in Clio's realm may not be
ipso facto equal. There may be a reality beyond whatever it is that exists in
the human mind, and individuals may have something to say that does tell
the attentive ear what that reality is. Yet despite the complexities that it
veils, our brief summary of the state of historical studies at the present
does make a point: the past looks different today than it did not too long
ago, and the future of the past appears to be something other than what
historians two generations ago would have surmised. Historians of the
Carolingian era must be aware of these currents of thought if they are to
reconstitute a past that has any meaning to their audience.

While the various efforts to view the past from fresh perspectives defined
by recent interpretations of human nature and the human condition speak
in one way or another to all ages and all aspects of the past, certain de­
velopments in recent historical thought and practice relate more directly to
the history of cultural activity and thus to our concern with Carolingian
cultural history.

Some historians continue to have an interest in what has been called
"the history of ideas," a venerable enterprise defined roughly as the study
of the content, impact, and transmission of certain major intellectual con­
cepts that have repeatedly engaged the minds and stimulated the creative
efforts of those recognized by their contemporaries as “thinkers” (philoso­
phers, theologians, bellettrists, even historians). These historians have not
had an easy road in recent times; their efforts have been criticized for being elitist, detached from the reality created by economic and social structures, irrelevant in a world where rationalistic inquiry is viewed with suspicion.

However, perhaps this kind of cultural history is not completely obso­
lete; perhaps “big” ideas, somewhat removed from the street, and the cul­
tural artifacts in which they find expression are still important. For example, it seems fairly clear that certain “major” literary, philosophical, and religious texts have played a decisive role in the past as vehicles through which the members of particular groups in particular societies have gained access to a coherent ensemble of aspirations, sentiments, and values that have united them, set them apart from other groups in the same society, and moved them to actions that changed the course of events.

Although the psychoanalytic procedures pioneered by Freud have not
been as fruitful as some once claimed in penetrating the thought world of cultural figures from the past, insights derived from psychology are useful to cultural historians in their efforts to reconstruct collective mentalities and measure how shared beliefs and values influence behavior. Marxist historians have constantly compelled cultural historians to be mindful of the processes through which the material conditions in any past society influence cultural activity and have forced historians at least to consider how cultural “superstructures” can serve as factors in shaping the power structure in a society.

Recently, several more sharply focused approaches to cultural history have emerged to enliven and enrich the field. Particularly fertile and chal­
lenging has been what is called the history of mentalities (L'histoire des men­
talités), defined initially by historians associated with the Annales school and inspired by their passion for social history. Generally eschewing the thought patterns and cultural forms associated with “high” culture, historians of mentalities have sought to reconstruct the systems of thought shared by collectivities and serving as prime forces shaping the mental and psychological environments within which the lives of ordinary people unfolded. Often unarticulated and operating below the level of conscious­ness within the collectivity affected by them, these thought patterns have tended to be long-lasting and repetitive in their impact on behavior. For historians of mentalities, access to the ingredients that constituted collective mentalities depends less on interpreting literary texts and formal
works of art than on decoding rituals, gestures, symbols, myths, superstitions, taboos, oral language usages, folklore, games, and informal educational practices associated with the socialization process.

As befits the _Annales_ approach in general, historians of mentalities often seek to quantify the evidence contained in such sources and arrange it serially, so as to chart the changing patterns—the _conjonctures_—affecting collective mentalities. They also seek to locate the collective mental patterns existing at any particular moment in history on the contemporary socioeconomic grid in a fashion that will illuminate interactions between social, economic, and mental structures. Such concerns have prompted historians of mentalities to explore the creation, implantation, and circulation of elements that constituted collective mentalities. And such inquiries have constantly expanded the realm that could properly be embraced by _l’histoire des mentalités_; perhaps the term "history of popular culture" more accurately defines the field as it has evolved. This expansion has led to efforts to establish the boundaries between “high” and “popular” culture and to assess the interactions between the two realms—or, in some cases, to inquire whether there is any distinction. In all its manifestations, the history of mentalities has greatly expanded contemporary understanding of what constitutes culture and how cultural factors affect the working of any human society in all its diverse components.

Perhaps even more challenging to contemporary historians of culture are the complex ramifications surrounding what has come to be called the linguistic turn in the broad field of sociocultural history. In what amounted to a revolution in the approach to social and cultural history, a revolution rooted in the seminal work of Saussure, _Cours de linguistique générale_ (1916), this movement brought language and discourse to center stage as prime factors in shaping the fabric of the social order and determining human behavior. In fact, among the most ardent champions of this new approach to language, defined as a system of codes through which meaning is created and transferred, came to be viewed as the prime constitutive force in shaping all levels of human consciousness, all forms of human bonding, and all types of human action. Across a kaleidoscopic trajectory highlighted by endeavors now labeled semiotics, structuralism, poststructuralism, and deconstruction—a course that in some sense has culminated in the works of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault—the "linguistic turn" has posed a wide range of problems for historians of culture.

Beyond identifying the linguistic structures that make possible all forms of human discourse upon which social interaction depends, cultural historians marching to the beat of modern linguistic and communication the-
ory have been compelled to reexamine how cultural artifacts come into being, a task that involves not only the activity of the ostensible creator but also the audience, who in the act of receiving the text play a role in creating it. Given the way language is understood in modern linguistic theory, the role of texts in representing some external reality has become problematic to the point where some theorists of language would deny any connection between the message of a text and external reality. Such concerns raise serious problems concerning the relationship between context and text; especially problematic for cultural historians is the long-standing assumption that the context within which a text originated serves as a prime factor in constructing its meaning. Equally problematic has become the matter of ascertaining the intentions of the creators of a cultural artifact and assessing the importance of such intentionality in the message a text conveys. Vexing issues involving the relationship between orality and literacy have had to be addressed. As noted earlier in this chapter, modern critical theory has surrounded the quest for meaning in cultural artifacts with obstacles that have made some cultural historians doubt whether any fixed meaning can be attached to texts, a conclusion that raises questions about the ultimate validity of cultural history.

There are indications that many aspects of the history of mentalities, popular culture, and language and communication theory in particular, and of Marxist and Annales history in general, are converging to create still another approach to cultural history, one that has been called the new cultural history. While still a field of investigation that remains fluid in terms of its objectives and methodology, most practitioners of the new cultural history would probably agree that it seeks to avoid the reductionism implicit in treatments of cultural life by Marxists and annalistes, who generally have tended to make cultural phenomena derivative from and dependent on economic or social factors operating in a society, and to transcend the essential lack of coherence and the randomness that characterizes the seemingly endless range of topics that, under the rubric “cultural history,” comes under scrutiny by historians of mentalities and popular culture.

The new cultural history seeks to establish the determinative role of cultural factors in shaping human affairs, especially in terms of defining the power relationships that prevail in a society. Relying heavily on concepts drawn from cultural anthropology, the new cultural historians view culture in terms much broader than has been traditional for cultural historians. They see culture as embracing a wide range of actions, which express in allegorical or symbolic form some order of meaningful message with which members of society can collectively identify. Culture defined in this
way might include social acts (e.g., riots, parades, or marriage ceremonies), written texts (e.g., saints' lives, political tracts, novels dealing with gender issues, or popular songs), visual representations (e.g., public building programs, styles in clothing, or material objects related to religious worship), or mechanisms involved in the circulation of cultural artifacts (e.g., educational practices, book production, and literacy). Obviously the context that produces cultural artifacts of this kind embraces the entire spectrum of collective life—political, economic, social, and religious. The task of the cultural historian is to read the meaning inscribed in these kinds of cultural texts for those who encountered them in a particular historical setting and to discern the impact of that message in determining social consciousness and behavior.

The new cultural historians draw heavily on techniques provided by contemporary literary criticism to guide their efforts to decode what such cultural texts mean to those "reading" them and to determine what the text does to its recipients. In general their efforts aim less at defining structures undergirding cultural communities than at understanding how cultural artifacts emerge out of a particular ambience and influence the way people act in a particular historical setting. In this sense, the cultural dimension of a society's existence takes on central importance in explaining what holds the society together and in accounting for what initiates the numerous events marking its movement through time. Within the conceptual framework posited by the new cultural history, the traditional dichotomy between elite and popular culture tends to lose its relevance; all cultural artifacts and activities potentially become a part of a network of symbolic expressions of how a society conceives itself and its activities. The approach expands without trivializing what is embraced by the concept of culture and elevates cultural activity conceived in this broader sense to the level of active agent in any human setting in a way that promises to put cultural historians near the center of the scene in accounting for what happened in the past and how it happened. To some Carolingianists that may not seem to be a revolutionary insight, but in many respects the new cultural history offers a salvific antidote from the nihilistic approach to cultural artifacts implicit in some contemporary schools of thought.

Anyone looking to Carolingian history in search of an arena that could serve as a model in which these developments—shaping recent historical thought generally and affecting the treatment of cultural history in particular—were applied to produce radical changes in approaches or in-
interpretation will likely be disappointed. Practitioners of cultural history defined in these terms have found more hospitable arenas in the late-medieval world of Montaillou; in early modern times when witchcraft had its best days; in the eighteenth-century world that discovered madness; in fin de siècle Vienna, where the road to the postmodern world was charted, and in the media industry in America, where that same road ended. But even though new approaches to cultural history have not found a prime focal point in the Carolingian age, the total weight of ideological developments over the last half century has brought subtle changes to the study of Carolingian culture.

The revisionist mentality that has characterized modern historical thought and practice—in part a consequence of an effort to purge mind-sets rooted in earlier ideological positions—has had its impact on Carolingian cultural history primarily in terms of establishing how the Carolingian cultural achievement is perceived to fit into a larger historical context. The psychic shock produced by the world wars of the twentieth century—catastrophes that many came to view as the consequences of crass materialism, ideological dogmatism, hypernationalism, and blatant racism rooted in nineteenth-century ideologies—sired a countervailing wave of transnationalism and cosmopolitanism. From this revised ideological perspective it seemed more productive to abandon debates over whether one should speak of Charlemagne or Karl der Grosse in order to enshrine the great Carolingian as Europae Pater, whose role in establishing a cultural community provided benefits that might be emulated in the twentieth century. Modern scholarship has devoted a good deal of energy to demonstrating the contribution of Carolingian cultural activity to unifying Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries, thereby providing a base for European community in future centuries. The role of religion as a formative force in Carolingian cultural history has been reevaluated in light of the spirit of ecumenism that has flowed from the moral outrage stemming from the Holocaust, the agenda defined by Roman Catholic aggiornamento, growing awareness in an increasingly interdependent world of religious systems other than the Judeo-Christian, and new insights into the nature of religious experience in general provided by modern social sciences.

Recent developments in historical thought have also given scholars concerned with Carolingian history cause to reconsider their definition of the periodization framework within which they fit the Carolingian period. In line with nineteenth-century concepts of what was central in reconstructing the past, the Carolingian age has long been defined in political terms:
it was a discrete, self-standing temporal entity given its own identity by the activities of the rulers of a single dynasty, which ascended to power in the early eighth century and fell from grace at the beginning of the tenth. From the perspective of cultural history, this periodization scheme never provided an entirely comfortable fit as a consequence of the association of Carolingian cultural history with a renaissance concept. The very idea of a Carolingian renaissance made no sense unless Carolingian cultural activity was connected with some prior cultural system that could be “reborn”; likewise, if the renaissance typology meant anything, then a Carolingian renaissance must have shared something with subsequent renaissances—Ottoman, twelfth-century, Italian, Northern European.

The famous Pirenne thesis, which since World War II has loomed large in Carolingian historiography, ostensibly buttressed the traditional politically defined periodization scheme by positing a decisive break in the historical continuum in the middle of the eighth century at the very moment that marked the accession of the Carolingian dynasty to power. However, it is well to recall that Pirenne’s argument was based on evidence derived primarily from economic history, which, when Pirenne’s seminal book was published in 1937, was a relatively new arena of historical inquiry in which developments proceeded at a pace and for reasons quite independent of political affairs. In positing a disjunction in history in the eighth century resulting from the rupture of Mediterranean unity by the Muslim intrusion, the Pirenne thesis oriented Carolingian cultural historians toward a search for the new, unique, and formative aspects in Carolingian intellectual and artistic life that would mark the “birth of Europe” and throw light on what the product of that blessed event would grow up to become.

The appearance of Pirenne’s seminal book in a sense marked the rising impact exercised by the Annales school and the new social history on the study of late antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Concerned chiefly with deep-rooted, slowly changing structures, historians working within the conceptual framework staked out by these approaches began to lay the foundations for a periodization scheme that folded Carolingian history into an expanding temporal framework stretching roughly from the end of the fourth to the end of the tenth century. Such an approach focused on identifying and describing common structures that defined the human scene across the entire period. The same approach provided grounds for arguing that there occurred a radical transformation of the basic structures affecting society beginning around 1000, which in effect marked the beginning of a new epoch in European history that had little to do with the Carolingian age except to end it.
Some schools of historical thought have argued the need to go even further in extending the time frame within which meaningful Carolingian history should be embraced. Their adherents have read the central features of Carolingian history in terms that make that age part of a vast, unchanging epoch given its common configuration by "feudal modes of production" or "preindustrial social structures" or "primitive (or at best archaic) mentalities."

The end result of these adjustments in temporal sight lines, shaped by changing ideological perspectives affecting historical studies, has been to mute the uniqueness of the cultural activity traditionally associated with a particular royal dynasty. As one especially vocal advocate of repositioning the Carolingian age in the historical continuum put it, the Carolingian revival was an episode without consequence, a feeble stirring of a society still locked in a position of "fetal dependence," awaiting the beginning of "le 'vrai' Moyen âge" about A.D. 1000. One can hardly mistake the thinly veiled invitation embedded in this formulation to partake in the dismantling of at least one renaissance, which heretofore had enjoyed a long career! In any case, these shifting views on where the Carolingian age fits into the historical continuum demonstrate anew that attempts to divide the past into temporal segments as a heuristic tactic essential in making sense out of historical inquiry assert a powerful influence on what is discovered.

Changing concepts of historical inquiry have certainly played a significant role in expanding the present view of what constituted the essential elements of Carolingian cultural life. For a long time the investigation of Carolingian cultural activity tended to be defined within parameters established by political and ecclesiastical history. Meaningful cultural life involved whatever developed as a response to the official program set forth by Carolingian rulers, especially Charlemagne, and the Church to bring about a *renovatio* of society. Carolingian culture defined in these terms focused attention on royal, episcopal, and monastic legislation; schools and their curricula; libraries; scriptoria; artistic ateliers attached to or patronized by the royal court; and the production and explication of standardized texts. Key cultural figures involved an elite who were ostensibly identified with the royal court and its cultural policy.

While few contemporary Carolingianists would diminish the importance of the royal and ecclesiastical policies and the particular cultural activities they engendered in shaping the Carolingian cultural environment, all would insist that the definition of culture must be extended beyond what was sanctioned by royal policy. In response to the philosophical premises that undergird the history of mentalities, the history of popular
culture, and the new cultural history, Carolingianists today have posited a whole new range of activities as subjects appropriately subsumed under the mantle of Carolingian culture. In seeking to decode the meaning of cultural monuments traditionally viewed as instrumentalities explicable in terms of official cultural policy, Carolingian cultural historians have discerned levels of meaning and modes of expression having little if any relevance to official culture; the result has been an enriched understanding of the sophistication and originality of what in contemporary parlance would be called Carolingian high culture. Cultural artifacts that marked departures from “official” Carolingian ideological positions have been given closer scrutiny as integral parts of the entire cultural setting, and the creators of such aberrant cultural expression have earned new honor in the galaxy of significant cultural leaders. The result has been a heightened sense of the complexity and diversity of Carolingian culture.

What constitutes Carolingian culture has been given new dimensions by a willingness among scholars to acknowledge a new array of actors as culture creators and bearers: holy men, preachers, noble warriors, women, seekers of patronage, ecclesiastical power brokers, polemicists, members of “textual communities.” Activities involving rituals, displays of symbols, and veneration of material objects have been given a significant place in the delineation of meaningful cultural activity. The important place accorded language and discourse in cultural life by modern linguists and anthropologists is reflected in Carolingian cultural history by the effort to assess the impact of illiteracy, orality, and bilingualism on Carolingian culture and society. The possibilities of quantifying some aspects of Carolingian life as a guide to fuller understanding of the implantation and impact of ideas have been explored; examples include the accumulation and circulation of books, frequency of the occurrence of iconographic motifs, traffic in relics, common themes utilized in the definition of saintliness, and recurrent patterns in language usage.

Prompted by the critical importance accorded to material conditions in life by modern historiography, especially by Marxist and structuralist historians, Carolingian cultural historians have given greater attention to the interrelationships between material conditions and cultural activity. Yet to be measured is the potential impact on the exploration of Carolingian culture that might emerge from the agenda of current advocates of multiculturalism and cultural diversity engendered by ethnicity, religion, race, and gender.

As the array of activities and actors deserving of attention by Carolingian cultural historians has expanded, so also have the range of evidence
they put into play in reconstructing Carolingian cultural history and the techniques they employ to decode that evidence. Note has been made earlier of the impact felt in the criticism of Carolingian sources resulting from recent approaches to literary criticism. What is equally noteworthy are the new kinds of evidence upon which Carolingianists rely in their explorations of cultural life. This development is in part a response to the general thrust in twentieth-century historiography to expand what counted as legitimate witnesses to past human activity; but it is also a by-product of the resourcefulness of Carolingian historians seeking answers to new questions posed by ideological developments affecting the general field of cultural history.

While never losing sight of what traditional sources such as official documents (e.g., capitularies, diplomas, or royal instructions) and literary texts (representing intellectual artifacts consciously crafted to serve cultural purposes, e.g., theological tracts, scriptural exegeses, educational manuals, histories, letters, liturgical books, or collections of laws) tell about their age, Carolingian historians have grown increasingly adept at extracting information from a more diverse body of sources. They have probed the meaning of art works of all kinds to produce fresh insights into the content of Carolingian culture and how its meaning was transmitted. Symbolic acts associated with public ceremonies and religious rituals have yielded expanded perceptions of how Carolingians thought and what they thought about. Poetry, saints’ lives, and moral tracts, instead of serving as texts to be culled for “facts” relative to Carolingian political, economic, social, or ecclesiastical history, have become mirrors reflecting the emotional dimensions of Carolingian society and revealing the value system that gave direction to the lives of an entire society. Material objects originally fabricated to support daily life and its routine round of activities have yielded insights into such important ingredients of cultural life as tastes, relations between human beings and nature, attitudes toward death, and concepts of pleasure and pain. In short it no longer suffices to depend on a relatively narrow body of written texts to reconstruct cultural history. A much more diverse body of evidence must be brought into play in order to see Carolingian culture for what it was.

When added together, these diverse trends perhaps justify concluding that a new Carolingian cultural history is in the making, a history crafted in large part in response to powerful ideological forces that have combined during the last half century to redefine how the past is approached. Awareness of what is involved in this development will serve as a reminder that the reconstruction of the cultural history of the Carolingian era has always
been something more than a dispassionate, objective pursuit of the “noble dream” of scientific history aimed at delineating, in the Rankean sense, the past as it actually was. In important ways the cultural history of that distant age has been contemporary history, seeking to employ knowledge of what happened in the past as a medium through which to speak intelligibly to issues that living historians and their living audiences have thought significant in a context defined by their current intellectual vision, their societal concerns, and their system of values. It has been that quest for meaning within the context of the present that has given vitality, excitement, and even passion to what might otherwise be sterile discourse on a dead past. By the same token it has been that search for the relevance of Carolingian cultural life to an ever changing present that has generated new issues and new challenges of sufficient magnitude to require the constant rewriting of Carolingian cultural history.

The exploration of Carolingian cultural life has been affected by another set of factors. Appearances to the contrary, historians do not operate exclusively in the realm defined by ideas and their interplay; they also live and work—along with almost everyone else—in a social milieu shaped by institutional patterns, material resources, professional practices, group mores, and personal concerns. This volatile realm generates its own subtle forces determining the way historians work and shaping the products of their investigation. What transpires in that space, which probably deserves to be called the sociology of historical scholarship, needs greater attention than it is given by those seeking to understand the dynamics of historical inquiry.

In the context of the historiography of Carolingian cultural life, only one small but highly significant aspect of that larger subject warrants comment. That has to do with the composition of the scholarly community concerned with Carolingian cultural history. Until well into the twentieth century that community was dominated by continental Europeans, particularly by French-, German-, and Italian-speaking scholars, predominantly male, whose national identities, education, social status, institutional attachments, cultural values, and gender provided a distinctive perspective from which to view the past. Then within a brief span of time, especially the decade or two after World War II, the community of Carolingianists began to expand numerically and reflect a changing ethnic and gender mix, a process that has continued unabated. That trend has manifested itself in the increasingly transnational composition of congresses devoted to Caro-
lingian history and in the authorship of the contributions made to multi-authored syntheses treating Carolingian culture noted above. Even more noteworthy is the fact that the annual bibliographies chronicling the progress of Carolingian studies have increasingly recorded significant studies by Spanish, Scandinavian, Polish, Russian, Japanese, and above all English and North American scholars. Most important of all is the increasing number of women who have assumed a significant role in the study of the Carolingian age. Given the temporal, spatial, and cultural remoteness of the Carolingian world from many of the new participants in Carolingian studies, why this universalizing of Carolingian studies has occurred raises intriguing questions. It goes without saying that the increasing presence of women in the community of Carolingianists is in large part a salutary consequence of the struggle defined by the feminist movement in general and of the demonstrated capability of female scholars to perform in an exemplary fashion once given a chance to do so. Certainly the quest of many Europeans to find their common roots after the trauma resulting from political, economic, and ideological divisiveness of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries encouraged scholars from European nations to seek out each other and listen to one another.

The restricted boundaries of the Eurocentered scholarly world were increasingly erased by the intensification of scholarly exchange made possible by technological advances permitting speedy, affordable travel, the subsidization of research by public agencies and private foundations, and the rapid transfer of information made possible by a variety of technological advances. The scholarly diaspora that occurred just before, during, and immediately after World War II had an especially significant impact on Carolingian studies, particularly in the Anglo-American world. But perhaps above all else the universalizing of Carolingian studies owed most to the maturation of historical consciousness on a global scale and the onset of some remarkable scholarly entrepreneurship in support of Carolingian studies exercised in settings other than a continental European space bounded in rough terms by interlocking spheres of influence emanating from Paris, Berlin, and Rome.

The universalizing of the scholarly community concerned with Carolingian studies poses an intriguing issue: what has been the effect of this development on that enterprise? While that question has not been addressed in a systematic way, one suspects that closer inquiry would unearth some notable points that would tell a great deal about the recent course of Carolingian historiography. The expanding cadre of Carolingian
scholars includes individuals whose education and professional training differ in marked ways from that of the scholarly circle that traditionally dominated Carolingian studies. Many of those who have joined the ranks of Carolingianists during the last two generations have emerged from a social milieu that has endowed them with concerns, values, and perspectives contrasting sharply with those of earlier generations of Carolingianists. Their scholarly and teaching functions have been situated in institutional settings that have demanded that they speak to audiences whose interests in the past and levels of susceptibility to historical insights have been quite different from those audiences to whom earlier Carolingianists spoke. Their spatial, cultural, and emotional distance from a scholarly community that formerly carried the torch for old Francia allowed some salutary head clearing.

All of these sociological factors surrounding the changing composition of the community of Carolingian scholars have combined to create a yeasty brew that has broadened, deepened, redirected, and—perhaps most important—enlivened inquiry into the nature and significance of Carolingian cultural life. The future of Carolingian studies will undoubtedly depend in crucial ways on how the bonds uniting that diverse community are cultivated and expanded and in what ways the unique insights rooted in diverse economic, social, ethnic, gender, and educational backgrounds that characterize the modern scholarly community and its audiences are brought to bear on a particular segment of the past.

The studies that follow seek to treat selected aspects of Carolingian cultural history in a way that will simultaneously utilize the rich scholarly tradition just described and respond to new conceptual and methodological challenges as the point of departure for an attempt to rewrite that history. Each chapter seeks consciously to make its readers aware of the état de question on the matter it treats; each can be read by those beginning their venture into Carolingian history as a convenient summation of the prevailing scholarly consensus on what is known and understood about that subject. No less consciously each study attempts to move current knowledge and understanding of Carolingian cultural activity onto a new plane; already established specialists in Carolingian cultural history may find reasons in these essays to reevaluate and perhaps even readjust their current views.

Those reading these chapters should be alert for the devices employed by their authors to achieve the dual end of summarizing existing scholarly
positions and advancing to new levels of understanding. These strategies include the following: approaching established scholarly positions with respectful skepticism; rereading the historical sources in search of historical data heretofore undetected in them; reformulating the questions to which the sources are asked to speak; rearranging and recombining the factual data revealed by the sources into new narrative and analytical patterns; reinterpreting the signification of the surviving historical record in the light of new analytical and conceptual tools that expand the comprehension of the processes affecting human societies; rearranging surviving data into narrative and analytical treatments that provide new levels of comprehension and explanation of what happened in the past. The judicious pursuit of such scholarly operations is not apt to produce quantum leaps into new terrain; the chapters that follow are not fundamentally revisionist in intent or result. Rather they seek to expand incrementally upon what is known and understood about a segment of the past. To the extent that each study achieves this objective it contributes an ingredient that is absolutely essential to the sustenance of vitality in historical scholarship: the constant establishment of new vantage points from which the process of reconstructing the past can proceed.

While each chapter has its own unique contribution to make to the rewriting of the history of different aspects of Carolingian cultural activity, collectively these studies are linked by central concerns that give them cohesion. Without consciously seeking to do so, each author has brought to the fore certain points that are echoed by the other authors. These shared views come into focus in a way that reveals where the cutting edge of scholarly endeavor relative to Carolingian culture is now located and that provides indications of the direction in which inquiry about Carolingian thought and expression is currently moving. The common grounds undergirding the collaborative enterprise represented by this volume are well worth noting at this point as a means of focusing attention on what is most essential in the studies taken collectively.

First, all of the chapters point up the crucial importance of approaching Carolingian cultural activity in terms of the specific historical context in which any particular activity occurred. The repeated sounding of this note in matters pertaining to education, artistic expression, scriptural exegesis, musical practice, and theological discourse strongly suggests that future scholars treating Carolingian cultural activities will pay greater attention to Carolingian history in the broadest sense than was the case with their predecessors. Such a shifting of perspective may counteract the recent vogue of detaching all matters that have anything to do with thought,
expression, and communication in any form from any context beyond lan­
guage itself. And it may mute the prevailing tendency to treat cultural phe­
nomena within a framework defined primarily by the abstract, detached,
universalized concepts and categories that surround contemporary disci­
plinary thought and practice.

To respond to this evolving perception of what constitutes the appro­
priate contextual framework for describing and explaining intellectual and
artistic life, Carolingian cultural historians will perforce need to immerse
themselves more deeply in the general history of the Carolingian age. No
less significantly, historians of all facets of the Carolingian world will need
to be sensitive to the relevance of their investigations to Carolingian cul­
tural life. In brief, these chapters collectively suggest that when the Caro­
ingian age is discussed in the future, its cultural history will increasingly
constitute an integral part of the total picture rather than an appendage to
the larger historical setting, sometimes tacked on as an afterthought little
related to the main scene.

Second, the essays in this collection highlight the fruitfulness of an inter­
disciplinary approach to Carolingian cultural activity, thereby suggesting
that future research should and most likely will give greater importance to
that approach. As is implicit in the points made in my comments on the
context of Carolingian cultural activity, the new level of understanding of
cultural life that can flow from interrelating cultural history with political,
economic, social, and religious history will by definition depend upon inter­
disciplinary inquiry. Even more important are the insight and the under­
standing that can result from expanded dialogue among the practitioners of
the scholarly disciplines whose focus is primarily on cultural activity: litera­
ture, art, music, theology, philosophy, linguistics, education.

The studies in this volume abound in examples of such fruitful cross
fertilization. John J. Contreni’s treatment of educational practice throws
light on the content and form of literary composition and shows that an
understanding of the basic characteristics of Carolingian literature illumi­
nates what was learned and how. Bernice M. Kaczynski and Lawrence
Nees show how creations in the visual arts clarify the meaning of literary
texts and how literary texts explicate the motifs and forms given expression
in the visual arts. Richard L. Crocker demonstrates how liturgical needs,
spiritual concerns, and the organizational structures of monastic and ca­
nonical communities help to explain how and why a borrowed musical tra­
dition was adapted and reshaped. Thomas F. X. Noble shows how political
ideology takes on new meanings when concepts rooted in theology and
scriptural exegesis are brought to play and how esoteric theological precepts find fresh relevance in shaping effective political polemic and molding historical consciousness. Such examples provide persuasive evidence that any scholar investigating a particularized aspect of Carolingian cultural activity needs not only to know what colleagues concerned with other facets of cultural life are doing but also that he or she should become more familiar with how others do their work.

Third, the studies in this volume are marked in a special way by a concern on the part of their authors for how the products of the Carolingian cultural revival were actually utilized. This interest goes beyond defining how the creators of cultural artifacts or those who patronized their activities intended such creations to be used and minimizes the tendency among cultural historians to elevate the phenomena they explore into an esoteric realm beyond the mundane, often messy, and not always inspiring terrain where most human activity transpires. Instead, these chapters focus attention on the impact that specific aspects of learning and artistic expression had on the real world of the eighth and ninth centuries. How an individual master in a particular school taught and what individual students learned emerge from Contreni’s rereading of the historical record. How music was performed by real people in real churches becomes evident in Crocker’s study. How scriptural exegetes and manuscript illuminators applied interpretive techniques to specific biblical passages and with what precise results come into clear focus in Kaczynski’s essay dealing with how an unlikely figure became a cultural hero in a new age. The ways in which visual artists and theologians utilized their métiers to make statements about real political situations are set forth in concrete terms by Nees and Noble. Especially illuminating to many students of the Carolingian world will be the ways in which Crocker, Kaczynski, Nees, and Noble make music, art, and theology bear witness to the realities of the Carolingian world. Their studies suggest that a new day is at hand for a fruitful dialogue among those who have trouble dealing with a real problem, both Carolingian and modern: what is the relationship between the written word and the visual image?

In its total effect, the emphasis given in these chapters to the uses to which cultural activity were put adds a dimension of concreteness to cultural life. And it opens significant channels for integrating every facet of cultural life into the total fabric of Carolingian society in ways that make thought and expression more central and more relative to that society than has often been the case in past treatments of Carolingian intellectual and
artistic life. Without assuming a position of stridency in advocating any particular school of thought about cultural history, the authors of the chapters that follow have demonstrated that thought and expression are indeed close to the lifeblood that nourishes any community at any moment in history.

Fourth, these studies produce results that when taken together highlight the uniqueness of the Carolingian cultural accomplishment in terms that reinforce the claim that the Carolingian period deserves to be viewed as a discrete segment of the historical continuum. The basis of that claim hinges on how any society responds to what is probably the crucial factor in shaping its destiny: the reception and use of tradition. In one way or another each chapter highlights the unique and creative ways in which the entire Carolingian cultural establishment—school masters, students, writers, scriptural exegetes, artists, cantors, liturgists, theologians, political polemicists, even patrons—appropriated and adapted components of an inherited cultural tradition to serve the complex, constantly changing, and newly discovered needs of a particular society.

Like many of their predecessors, the authors of these studies are aware of the ongoing need to discover what components of that tradition were recovered during the Carolingian age, how that process proceeded, and what of the recovered treasure was transmitted to later ages. But beyond that remains a more fundamental issue: what happened to that tradition? If one can judge by what emerges from the studies in this volume, the Carolingian cultural establishment reworked, reinterpreted, and rearranged major segments of that inheritance to create a wide range of unique cultural artifacts that had a significant impact on the way life was understood and how an entire society arranged its collective existence. It is that achievement that defines the uniqueness of the Carolingian cultural renewal. In brief, it would seem that the concept of renaissance is returning to center stage to provide the interpretive model that gives focus and direction to the description, analysis, and explanation of Carolingian cultural life.

Finally, there may be discernible in these essays a glimpse of the scholarly paths that must be taken to fill a major lacuna in Carolingian studies as a whole: the absence of a synthetic treatment of Carolingian cultural life that provides a holistic picture of what happened in that spectrum of Carolingian society. To meet that need requires a kind of treatment beyond what currently passes for synthesis: manuals that patch together a panoramic picture describing what happened in different realms of cultural
activity; histories treating in relative isolation discrete aspects of Carolingian cultural activity; and collections of studies dealing with selected aspects of cultural activity at particular moments in Carolingian history. The chapters that follow suggest what needs to be done to reach a new level of synthesis.

Carolingianists must work together to fashion treatments of Carolingian cultural activity derived from a firm grasp of a myriad of discrete cultural events, each understood in terms of its unique context. Interconnections linking diverse facets of cultural activity must be established on firmer ground as a means of identifying overarching themes that give shape to proper synthesis. Specific cultural developments must be synchronized more precisely in chronological terms so as to detect development on the entire cultural scene. Activities related to learning, thought, and expression must be integrated more closely into the total pattern of Carolingian society in search of a fuller understanding of how cultural phenomena affected all aspects of Carolingian life. Conceptual paradigms that are helpful in defining the general processes involved in cultural creativity and dissemination need to be applied by design to the total array of cultural activities as a means of imposing a comprehensible order on what is otherwise inchoate.

In short, scholars interested in Carolingian cultural history need to dedicate part of their collective effort to a special kind of intellectual enterprise consciously aimed at knitting together all that they know and understand about every individual facet of cultural activity into a single picture that retains the identity of each piece while enhancing its significance by locating it in a larger setting that has its own order of meaning. That will be a formidable task, but to sense its demands may represent a significant step toward achieving a holistic reconstruction of what was really involved in the Carolingian revival of culture.

All of which brings us back to where we started. This book seeks to describe and explain what happened in selected realms of intellectual and artistic life during the eighth and ninth centuries. Need we think that what happened then—a mind-boggling twelve centuries ago—means nothing? Before anyone whose mind is open to any enterprise that might allow a better understanding of the human condition responds, he or she must read on. What follows may—indeed, will—help resolve issues that are of fundamental importance to how any intelligent person responds to the world in which we all live and how any society sustains its civility: What does the past mean? Why is that meaning of importance?
Notes


2. For some provocative reflections on this problem, see the chapter by David Ganz in this volume. Also helpful is Arnold Angenendt, Das Frühmittelalter: Die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900, pp. 24–52.

3. No attempt will be made in this essay to cite examples of scholarly studies that illustrate the general points being made concerning Carolingian historiography; such an effort would produce a scholarly apparatus that would quickly get out of hand. References will be confined to selected studies that help to elucidate the historiographical issues under discussion.

4. Suggestive on the variety of situations to which the term renaissance has been applied are Derek Baker, ed., Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History, and Warren Treadgold, ed., Renaissance before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

5. See chap. 8 in this volume.


8. This is a topic that would bear closer examination by those interested in early modern European intellectual history. Suggestive are Siegfried Epperlein, “Karl der Grosse in der deutschen bürgerlichen Geschichtsschreibung”; Arno Borst, “Das Karlsbild in der Geschichtswissenschaft vom Humanismus bis heute”; Rosamond McKitterick, “The Study of Frankish History in France and Germany in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth
Introduction

Centuries”; and Nikolaus Staubach, “‘Das grossen Kaisers kleiner Sohn’: Zum Bild Ludwigs des Frommen in der älteren deutschen Geschichtsforschung.”

9. I borrow the terminology—although not necessarily the argument—of Norman F. Cantor, Inventing the Middle Ages.

10. One suspects that an expanding awareness of this growing “isolation” of the Carolingian age in the total stream of European history was in part the explanation for a series of books appearing in the middle decades of the twentieth century that attempted to define the early Middle Ages as an epoch with its own unique character; illustrative are H. St. L. B. Moss, The Birth of the Middle Ages, 395–814; Christopher Dawson, The Making of Europe: An Introduction to the History of European Unity; C. Delisle Burns, The First Europe: A Study of the Establishment of Medieval Christendom, A.D. 400–800; J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, The Barbarian West, 400–1000; William Carroll Bark, Origins of the Medieval World, Richard E. Sullivan, Heirs of the Roman Empire; and Archibald R. Lewis, Emerging Medieval Europe, A.D. 400–1000. (A comparable list of works in German and French could be compiled.) Perhaps that concern persists; see Judith Herrin, The Formation of Christendom; Angenendt, Das Frühmittelalter; and Roger Collins, Early Medieval Europe, 300–1000.


13. Perhaps this is changing. For example, Pierre Riché, whose efforts to illuminate Carolingian cultural activity have put all Carolingianists in his debt, in his Les Carolingiens: Une famille qui fit l’Europe, pp. 310–42 (pp. 325–59 in the English trans.), acknowledges the conventionality of the term “renaissance carolingienne” but chooses to discuss Carolingian cultural activity in terms of “la premier grand épanouissement de la culture européenne” (“the first great flowering [?] of European culture” [p. 311; p. 326 in the English trans.]), a culture for which the Carolingians cannot take sole credit. Likewise, Collins, Early Medieval Europe, pp. 280–86, subsumes his discussion of Carolingian cultural activity under the rubric “the ideological programme” [of Charlemagne], a discussion prefaced by some remarks on the inadequacy of the term “Carolingian renaissance” to characterize what was essential in Carolingian cultural activity.

14. Rosamond McKitterick, ed., Carolingian Culture; the first chapter, by Giles Brown, is found at pp. 1–51.


17. Some indication of the magnitude of that task relative to Carolingian
written texts is provided by Bernhard Bischoff, “Panorama der Handschriftenüberlieferung aus der Zeit Karls des Grossen.” For the full picture, see E. A. Löwe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. The best description of the total corpus of Carolingian literary sources is Wilhelm Wattenbach, Wilhelm Levison, and Heinz Löwe, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter: Vorzeit und Karolinger*.

18. The confidence generated in the nineteenth century that source criticism in this positivist sense could be reduced to an exact science is illustrated by the handbooks on methodology produced for historical researchers. The most famous of these were Ernst Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, and Charles-Victor Langlois and Charles Seignobos, *Introduction aux études historiques*; both of these works went through many editions. In the same vein was the development of a special kind of training facility to develop the skills required to pursue effectively the challenges posed by source criticism. That instrument was the historical “seminar,” developed first in German universities and then imitated widely elsewhere. Invaluable insight into the challenges still facing source critics working in this rather traditional mode can be gleaned from the many studies published under the editorship of Léopold Genicot in an ongoing series entitled *Typologie des sources du moyen âge* (Turnhout, 1972–). Each volume in this series (more than sixty have now been published) deals with a separate genre of source materials, seeking to identify its unique features, describe the kind of information that can be gleaned from it, and highlight the methodological problems inherent in utilizing the genre. Although the series deals with types of sources drawn from the entire medieval period, many of the individual studies deal specifically with types of sources characteristic of the Carolingian period.

19. Worth noting are five efforts to provide a synthetic treatment of Carolingian cultural activity that have been made during the last four decades. Taken together they provide a fundamental point of departure for the study of Carolingian cultural history. Two of them represent efforts to see Carolingian cultural life in its entirety. In 1953 the first of the annual conferences sponsored by the Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo was devoted to Carolingian cultural life; the results were published as *I problemi della civiltà carolingia*. Most recent is the collection of essays edited by Rosamond McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*. The other three sought to provide overall characterizations of Carolingian culture at particular moments. The 1960s witnessed the appearance of the landmark collaborative work *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. Wolfgang Braunfels, et al. Volume 2, *Das geistige Leben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff, and volume 3, *Karolingische Kunst*, ed. Braunfels and Hermann Schnitzler, focused on Carolingian cultural life. On a somewhat lesser scale were two significant collections of studies attempting to provide an overview of cultural life in the times of Charles the Bald and Louis the Pious: Margaret T. Gibson and Janet L. Nelson, eds., *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, and Peter Godman and Roger Collins, eds., *Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious* (814–
Despite the many virtues of these works, most scholars would probably agree that they leave something to be desired as syntheses.


21. Of special interest to Carolingianists in terms of the reediting of important written texts is the ongoing project undertaken by Benedictine Abbey of Steenbrugge and Brepols Publishers of Turnhout, Belgium, to create what has been heralded as a “new Migne” containing new editions of previously edited texts that will meet modern editorial standards. The newly edited texts most relevant to Carolingian studies are appearing in two series, entitled *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, and *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* (full citation given in List of Abbreviations).

Hardly less noteworthy is the ongoing effort of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* to make available editions of key Carolingian sources; the progress of the editing activities of the MGH is chronicled in the annual volumes of *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*.

22. Much of what represents new source material in this area depends on the work of archaeologists. Unfortunately, there is no convenient study that provides a general overview of the present state of Carolingian archaeological investigations, particularly as they relate to cultural history, and that suggests what the future agenda of that enterprise might be. Although their emphasis is primarily on economic conditions, some sense of the possibilities can be gleaned from the following works: Franz Petri, ed., *Siedlung, Sprache und Bevölkerungsstruktur im Frankenreich*; Herbert Jankuhn, *Einführung in die Siedlungsarchäologie*; Jankuhn and Reinhard Wenskus, eds., *Geschichtswissenschaft und Archäologie: Untersuchungen zur Siedlungs-, Wirtschafts-, und Kirchengeschichte*; Joachim Werner and Eugen Ewig, eds., *Von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter: Aktuelle Probleme in historischer und archäologischer Sicht*; Richard Hodges and David Whitehouse, *Mohammed, Charlemagne, and the Origins of Europe: Archaeology and the Pirenne Thesis*; and Klaus Randsborg, *The First Millennium A.D. in Europe and the Mediterranean: An Archaeological Survey*. Although not everyone will agree with all its authors’ conclusions, the magnificent work of Walter Horn and Ernest Born, *The Plan of St. Gall: A Study of the Architecture and Economy of, and Life in a Paradigmatic Carolingian Monastery*, illustrates how archaeological evidence can illuminate Carolingian cultural history. Also suggestive is Carol Heitz, *La France pré-romane: Archéologie et architecture religieuse du haut moyen âge du IVe siècle à l’an mil*. 
23. Developments in this area are occurring on so many diverse fronts that it is difficult to get a firm fix on the present state of the art, especially for one whose understanding of and competence in electronic data management have progressed about as far as Charlemagne’s competence in writing. Some sense of the potential of computer technology for Carolingianists can be gained from the computerized word lists being prepared for each of the texts now published in the Corpus Christianorum series. Each of these elaborate indexes will eventually be combined to create a common thesaurus of all the Latin fathers that will open vast opportunities for comparing their ideas, tracing influences, and charting changes in thought patterns. But perhaps the impact of computer technology illustrated by this example will be dwarfed by more far-reaching consequences affecting the way people think and communicate their thoughts; on this possibility, see, e.g., Mark Poster, The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Context.

24. I have found the following useful introductions to the vast and confusing arena of modern literary criticism and linguistic theory: D. W. Fokkema and Elrud Kunne-Ibsch, Theories of Literature in the Twentieth Century: Structuralism, Marxism, Aesthetics of Reception, Semiotics; Jonathan Culler, On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism; Terry Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction; John E. Toews, “Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience”; and Lee Patterson, Negotiating the Past: The Historical Understanding of Medieval Literature. See also the essays collected in a special issue of Speculum under the general title “The New Philology,” ed. Stephen Nichols. For the visual arts, see E. H. Gombrich, Ideals and Idols: Essays on Values in History and in Art; Hans Belting, The End of the History of Art; David Freedberg, The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response; Francis Haskell, History and Its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past; and, more sharply focused on the early Middle Ages, the essays in Testo e immagine nell’alto medioevo.

25. Illustrative of issues at stake in this debate are Gertrude Himmelfarb, The New History and the Old; Peter Novick, That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession; and “AHR Forum: The Old History and the New.”

26. There is a huge literature on the Marxist interpretation of history; helpful are William H. Shaw, Marx’s Theory of History; G. A. Cohen, Karl Marx’s Theory of History: A Defence; Melvin Rader, Marx’s Interpretation of History; Paul Q. Hirst, Marxism and the Writing of History; S. H. Rigby, Marxism and History: A Critical Introduction; and Paul Wetherly, ed., Marx’s Theory of History: The Contemporary Debate.

27. Useful on this subject are Bruce Mazlish, ed., Psychoanalysis and History; Jacques Barzun, Clio and the Doctors: Psycho-History, Quanto-History, and History; D. E. Stannard, Shrinking History: On Freud and the Failure of Psychohistory; Peter Lecdenberg, Decoding the Past: The Psychohistorical Approach; Peter Gay, Freud for Historians; Geoffrey Cocks and Travis L. Crosby, eds., Psycho/History: Readings in the Method of Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and History; William McKinley Runyan, ed., Psychology and
Introduction

Historical Interpretation; and Mazlish, The Leader, the Led, and the Psyche: Essays in Psychohistory.

28. The Annales school is so called after the journal that, since its founding in 1929 under the title Annales d'histoire économique et sociale (changed after World War II to Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations), has been the showcase for Annales scholarship. For the main features of Annales history, see Le Goff and Nora, eds., Faire de l'histoire; Traian Stoianovich, French Historical Method: The Annales Paradigm; Lynn Hunt, “French History in the Last Twenty Years: The Rise and Fall of the Annales Paradigm”; François Dosse, L'histoire en miettes: Des “Annales” à la “nouvelle histoire”; and Philippe Carrard, Poetics of the New History: French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier.

29. Insightful introductions to this subject are provided by Jacques Le Goff, et al., eds., La Nouvelle histoire; and Theodore K. Rabb and Robert I. Rotberg, eds., The New History, the 1980s and Beyond: Studies in Interdisciplinary History. The works cited in n. 20, above, also provide useful information.


31. Any attempt to provide a suitable bibliography covering this development is beyond the scope of this study. Helpful are the works cited in nn. 20 and 24, above, to which should be added LaCapra and Kaplan, eds., Modern European Intellectual History.

32. It is not entirely clear to me whether historians have as yet made a sure fix on the importance of the ideas of Derrida and Foucault in shaping historical inquiry concerning culture. Anyone wishing to tackle this subject might begin with the writings of these authors, especially Derrida, Of Grammatology, and Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge. There is a massive literature that seeks to respond to this challenge; useful to me have been E. M. Henning, “Archaeology, Deconstruction, and Intellectual History”; Allan Megill, Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida; and Megill, “The Reception of Foucault by Historians.”

33. Insightful on these issues are Walter J. Ong, The Presence of the Word: Some Prolegomena for Cultural and Religious History; Eric Havelock, Origins of Western Literacy; Brian Stock, The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries; Harvey J. Graff, The Legacies of Literacy: Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society; Jack Goody, The Interface between the Written and the Oral; McKitterick, The Carolingians and the Written Word; Stock, Listening for the Past: On the Uses of the Past; and Michel Banniard, Viva Voce: Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en occident latin.

34. Insight into the relationship between currents in modern literary criticism and cultural history are explored by Hayden White, Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe; White, Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism; Frank Lentricchia, After the New Criticism; LaCapra, History and Criticism; Derek Attridge, Geoff
Bennington, and Robert Young, eds., Post-structuralism and the Question of History; Bryan D. Palmer, Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History; and Thomas Brook, The New Historicism and Other Old-Fashioned Topics.

35. The best introduction is Hunt, ed., The New Cultural History. In her introduction to this collection, Hunt suggests the convergence of various approaches in the new cultural history in these terms: “Are we headed here for . . . an ending that promises reconciliation of all contradictions and tensions in the pluralist manner most congenial to American historians?” (p. 22). A seminal figure in shaping the approach of the new cultural history has been the American anthropologist Clifford Geertz, especially in his The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays, in which he wrote a kind of manifesto for the new cultural history: “Believing with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning” (p. 5). For English speakers, perhaps the kind of history produced by Robert Darnton, Natalie Zemon Davis, Carl Schorske, and Peter Gay will serve to illustrate the new cultural history.

36. The discussion of this issue found its way into print under the title Karl der Grosse oder Charlemagne? Acht Antworten deutscher Geschichtsforscher, a work that reflects many of the worst features of Nazi German nationalism. The nomenclature used by Charlemagne’s contemporaries designating him “father of Europe” has been brought to our attention by Donald A. Bullough, “Europae Pater: Charlemagne and His Achievements in the Light of Recent Scholarship.”

37. Riche voiced this sentiment touchingly in his dedication to Les Carolingiens: “Pour mes enfants et mes petits-enfants, citoyens de l’Europe du troisième millénaire” (p. 7).

38. Pirenne’s seminal work Mohammed and Charlemagne is still worth reading, especially by those just venturing into the world of the Carolingians. The effort to evaluate Pirenne’s thesis has produced a vast literature. For recent assessments of the state of the question, see Hodges and Whitehouse, Mohammed, Charlemagne, and the Origins of Europe; La Fortune historiographique des theses d’Henri Pirenne; and Leopold Genicot, “Mahomet et Charlemagne” après 50 ans.


40. For some examples illustrating this approach, see Perry Anderson, Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism; Chris Wickham, “The Other Transition: From the Ancient World to Feudalism”; Arno Borst, Lebensform im Mittelalter; and A. J. Gurevich, Categories of Medieval Culture. Indications of new interpretive models shaped by this approach are often found in the articles dealing with the early Middle Ages published in Annales: Economies, sociétés, civilisations, Past and Present, and Frühmittelalterliche Studien.

42. The scholars who in increasing numbers feel comfortable treating Carolingian history within this expanded periodization scheme have been slow to find a captivating name for this new age. However, the direction in which their thinking is moving is suggested by the nomenclature attached to several research institutes under whose aegis some of the most significant research on the Carolingian age has been produced during the last thirty years: the Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo of Spoleto, the Institut für Frühmittelalterforschung of the University of Münster, the Centre de Recherche sur l’Antiquité Tardive et le Haut Moyen-Age of the University of Paris X-Nanterre. The impact of the Spoleto Centro in shaping this new approach can be measured not only by what has been published in its journal, Studi medievali (3rd ser., vol. 1, 1960, et seq.), but also by the volumes containing papers read at the annual Spoleto Settimane, where the international cardinalate of early medieval studies has been gathering for forty years to exchange wisdom about the early medieval world. Hardly less influential have been the studies published in Frühmittelalterliche Studien (vol. 1, 1967, et seq.), the scholarly organ of the Münster Institut für Frühmittelalterforschung. Still another journal, Early Medieval Europe (vol. 1, 1992, et seq.), devoted to the history of the period extending from the fourth to the eleventh century, promises to serve as a forum for studies that will give clearer definition to that era as a distinctive period in a larger chronological continuum.

43. For more on this point, see chap. 2 in this volume.

44. I refer to “textual communities” as defined by Brian Stock in The Implications of Literacy and Listening for the Past.

45. Suggestive of the implications for medieval studies of an interpretative approach defined in such terms are the articles collected in a special issue of Speculum under the title “Studying Medieval Women: Sex, Gender, Feminism,” ed. Nancy F. Partner. See also Hans-Werner Goetz, ed., Weibliche Lebensgestaltung im frühen Mittelalter.

46. The influx of American scholars into Carolingian studies is a little surprising in view of strictures uttered early in the twentieth century by an eminent American medievalist to the effect that the history of the early Middle Ages had been so thoroughly investigated that there remained little left to do, a sentiment repeated a half century later by another noted American medievalist; see Bark, Origins of the Medieval World, p. 5.

47. In this connection one thinks of the impact on Carolingian studies of such migrant scholars as Wilhelm Levison, Walter Ullmann, Ernst Kantorowicz, and Luitpold Wallach.

48. Some interesting comments on this matter as it pertains to the historical profession in America are provided by Novick, That Noble Dream.

49. An enduring monument in English of this kind of synthesis is M. L. W. Laistner, Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900 (orig. pub. 1931). Equally enduring is Erna Patzelt, Die karolingische Renaissance (orig. pub. 1924). Briefer attempts at synthesis are a common feature of larger studies of Carolingian history; useful recent examples include the following: Theodor Schieder, ed., Handbuch der europäischen Geschichte, 1:568–79.

50. Typical works of this nature are cited in chapter 2, n. 21.

51. See n. 19, above, for examples of such works.