Gustavo Montagna von Zeschau

INVINCIBLE BISHOPS: REPRESENTATIONS OF EPISCOPAL MILITARY ACTIONS IN MEDIEVAL LOTHARINGIA

MA Thesis in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2019

INVINCIBLE BISHOPS: REPRESENTATIONS OF EPISCOPAL MILITARY ACTIONS IN MEDIEVAL LOTHARINGIA

by

Gustavo Montagna von Zeschau

(Argentina)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
Chair, Examination Committee

_____
Thesis Supervisor

_____
Examiner

_____
Examiner

Budapest
May 2019

INVINCIBLE BISHOPS: REPRESENTATIONS OF EPISCOPAL MILITARY ACTIONS IN MEDIEVAL LOTHARINGIA

by

Gustavo Montagna von Zeschau

(Argentina)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
External Reader

Budapest
May 2019

INVINCIBLE BISHOPS: REPRESENTATIONS OF EPISCOPAL MILITARY ACTIONS IN MEDIEVAL LOTHARINGIA

by

Gustavo Montagna von Zeschau

(Argentina)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,
Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____
External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2019

I, the undersigned, **Gustavo Montagna von Zeschau**, candidate for the MA degree in Late Antique, Medieval and Early Modern Studies, declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, 17 May 2019

_____
_____
Signature

Abstract

This thesis analyzes the narrative representation of Lotharingian bishops' military actions in the eleventh and the twelfth centuries. The study examines both the narrative recreation of battles—and the role of bishops in them—and the relationship between these military episodes and the process of identity-building in the bishoprics of Liège and Utrecht, and the archbishopric of Trier. The bishops' invincibility, as is demonstrated in the present study, should be understood as a narrative feature.

The analysis is based on a survey of historiographical narratives and *gesta* in which battle episodes are examined together with their narrative association to episcopal identities. The methodology of analysis entails a narratological analysis of specific passages in relation to their strategy of shaping the spatiality of combat within the text. Regarding the link between war scenes and identity, the study examines diverse strategies of identification in the texts and the "grammar of identity" that supports these.

These two approaches combined show that the narrative-trope of episcopal invincibility of bishops was built on a pattern that was shared by diverse Lotharingian written sources in the analyzed period. This pattern consists of separating the combat scenes into spaces of positive singularity and negative plurality. From a narratological point of view, the bishops of these texts are presented to avoid military defeat by improving the positive singularity among their own troops. Furthermore, this narrative "invincibility" of Lotharingian bishops helped the chroniclers project onto the past an episcopal identity which was protected by the figure of those unbeatable prelates.

Acknowledgements

After all this work done, it only rests to me to say thank you to you all. Without the support of my relatives, my friends, my supervisors and the staff from CEU, I could never reach this point. My greetings go to the both sides of the Atlantic, and there are so many persons I wish I could hang and say thank you that it is better to do not individualize. However, I must mention the plural figure that gave me the strongest support in these last months, when I really needed it. That plural figure is the 8th floor. My fellows, you all are amazing, and I have no words to express how much you helped me.

There is not too much to add. Just, and more honestly than never, thank you.

Table of contents

Introduction

A. The Invincible Bishops

The Lotharingian bishops lost many battles, however, they were invincible. This sentence appears to be contradictory, but it is not, because the invincibility of the Lotharingian bishops that I will analyze here was, in fact, a narrative characteristic of those episcopal authorities. This narrative characteristic appeared in written sources and was related to specific narrative patterns of re-creating warfare, patterns which the authors of the sources followed. In other words, the invincible bishops were real, but they existed as narrative figures.

Henceforth, I will analyze the narrative representation of the Lotharingian bishops' military actions in historiographical narratives and episcopal deeds (*gesta*) from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries.[1] The study examines both the proper narrative recreations of battles – and the role that bishops played on them– as well as the relation that those war episodes had to the process of identity-building of the bishoprics of Liège, Utrecht and the archbishopric of Trier.

To guide this research, one main question and two related secondary questions will be posed. Were the Lotharingian bishops narratively represented in a different way than secular lords when they participated in warfare? How were these differences expressed and how did they influence the narrative reconstruction of warfare events? How did the narrative description of bishops' military actions contribute to the process of identity-shaping of the different bishoprics?

---

[1] In this thesis I will examine two historiographical narratives, one *gesta* and one narrative that can occupy an intermediate position between historiographical texts and episcopal deeds. The historiographical sources are: *De diversitate temporum* by Alpert of Metz and *Triumphale Bullonicum* by Renier of St. Laurent. The *gesta* is: *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodensium* by Anselm of Liège. The intermediate source is: *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi treverensis* by Balderich of Florennes. Given the lack of space for a proper introductory chapter, I will introduce the details of each source when I start examining them.

My decision to center the analysis on bishops from Lotharingia is explained by two reasons. First, and concerning the involvement of bishops in war during the High Middle Ages, the Lotharingian prelates were especially active on that secular facet of their power.[2] Second, and concerning the relation between war and identity, Lotharingia constitutes an exemplary case of study, mainly because it was a disputed region between the French and the German Kingdoms, a factor which explains the numerous rebellions occurred there and the existence of an unclear and discussed notion of self-awareness.[3]

Considering this disputed regional identity, scholars like Michel Parisse argued that Lotharingian bishops, thanks to their close connections with the German Kings, played an important role in defining a political identity for the region. This was made mainly by supporting the German monarchs in their intentions to place Lotharingia under their sphere of political influence. To do that, they often engaged in military conflicts and, while doing this, they acted both as representatives of their own bishoprics and as representatives of the German royal power.[4] Therefore, the military engagement of Lotharingian bishops was an important factor concerning the shaping of regional and episcopal identities, and this makes Lotharingia an appropriate region on which I can base this study.

---

[2] Leopold Auer, "Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern." In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 79 (1971), 353-356.

[3] For a general overview about the region of Lotharingia, which was formed from the earlier reign of *Francia Media*, see Michel Parisse "Lotharingia." In *New Cambridge Medieval History* 3 (1999) 310-327. Parisse considers this region not as a political entity but as a "political space", shaped by the cultural and social interaction of its secular and ecclesiastical aristocracy. For the development of this concept, see Michel Parisse, "La Lotharingie: naissance d'un espace politique." In *Lotharingia, eine europäische Kernlandschaft um das Jahr 1000 / Une région au centre de l'Europe autour de l'an Mil* (1995) 31-48. About the discussion concerning if Lotharingia was or was not an historical-existent region, see Jens Schneider, "La Lotharingie était-elle une région historique?." In *Construction de l'espace au Moyen Age : pratiques et représentations. Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public, 37e congrès*, Mulhouse, 2006, 425-433. Concerning the diffuse self-identity of the region, Simon McLean relates this problem to the heterogeneous economic, social and cultural landscape of Lotharingia, as well as to the brief existence of *Francia Media*, a reign that he describes as a "shadow kingdom". For this perspective, see Simon McLean "Shadow Kingdom: Lotharingia and the Frankish World, c. 850-c. 1050" In *History Compass* 11/6 (2013), 443-457.

[4] Michel Parisse, "L'évêque d'Empire au XIe siècle. L'exemple lorrain", In *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 105-106 (1984) 99-104.

Regarding the period examined, I decided to work with sources from the eleventh to the twelfth centuries because, during that period, the episcopal functions and their representations were transformed by the Reform Movement and the Investiture Controversy.[5] Concerning the transformations, which were numerous, I will focus only on how they affected the representation of Lotharingian bishops when they participated in war. Therefore, I will introduce them gradually in the following chapters.

B. The Lotharingian Bishops, the Imperial Church System and the Problem of the Episcopal Involvement in War: A Brief History

The historiography about Lotharingian bishops and the exercise of their secular power during the High Middle Ages was to a large extent focused on the debate regarding the influence the German Kings had on the construction of that power. In this sense, many of the discussions about the political authority of Lotharingian prelates were concerned with the examination of the grade of dependence that they had in their relationship with the kings, which also constituted a way to analyze the grade of influence that the German rulers used to have in the

---

[5] The bibliography concerning the topics of the Reform Movement and the Investiture Controversy is enormous, therefore I will present here some introductory works. As a general overview of the Investiture Controversy, see Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.) Concerning the debate about the concept of "Reform Movement", see Nicolangelo D'Acunto, "La riforma ecclesiastica del secolo XI: rinnovamento o restaurazione?," in *Riforma o restaurazione? La cristianità nel passaggio dal primo al secondo millennio; persistenze e novità (Atti del XXVI Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 29-30 agosto 2004)*, Verone: Il Segno dei Gabrielli editori, 2006, 13-26. About the perspective of the Papacy on the same process, see Glauco. M. Cantarella, "Il papato e la riforma ecclesiastica del secolo X I", in *Riforma o restaurazione? La cristianità nel passaggio dal primo al secondo millennio; persistenze e novità (Atti del XXVI Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 29-30 agosto 2004)*, Verona: Il Segno dei Gabrielli editori, 2006, 27-50. Regarding the perspective of the Papacy about the Investiture Controversy, see Ian S. ROBINSON, "The Papacy (1122-1198)," in *New Cambridge Medieval History* 4 (2004) 8-37. A work that analyzes the perspective of the German Kings about the Investiture Controversy and how it influenced the representation of the past can be seen in Jacques van Wijnendaele, "Un exemple d'utilisation de l'histoire: Les empereurs ottoniens (962-1002) dans la polémique des Investitures," in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 79 (2001) 1095-1132.

3

region.[6] This relationship between episcopal and royal power, that the scholars systematized in the concept of the *Reichskirchensystem* (or Imperial Church System), was considered as a key factor to understand the way the Lotharingian –and German– prelates exercised their power and has had a strong influence on the academic debate in the following decades.[7]

Nevertheless, it is important to note that the systematization of the Imperial Church System was criticized by important scholars like Timothy Reuter, who dismantled its specificity and particularity by comparing the German and Lothringian episcopacies with their western counterparts, showing more coincidences than differences.[8] Because of this, the discussion about the Imperial Church System is considered nowadays as an already ended debate, although its impact was notorious both in the German and non-German academic approaches to the episcopal authorities.[9]

Concerning the impact that the debate about the Imperial Church System had in the historiography about the bishop's figure, it influenced the discussion in two different ways. First, it placed the focus of the analysis of episcopal power more on the relationship between

---

[6] Michel Parisse, "L'évêque d'Empire au XIe siècle", 95-99. For an older example of the discussion about the same topic, see François-Louis Ganshof, "L'Église en Belgique au Haut Moyen-Âge, " in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 20 (1941) 719-742.

[7] The focus on the link between royal and episcopal power emerged in the late fifties when German scholars analyzed the close relation that existed between the Ottonian and Salian rulers and the bishops under their sphere of influence. This close link included not only the appointment of individuals (which were close-positioned to the royal political interests) as bishops, but also the formation of future episcopal candidates in the environment of the royal chapel, as well as the political and military alliance that the royal and the episcopal authorities established against the rebellious local aristocracies. The reference work on this topic is Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige. II. Teil, Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche*, (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1966). About the figure of the courtier bishop and the imperial chapel, see also Stephen Jaeger, "The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century," in *Speculum* 58 (1983) 291-325.

[8] Timothy Reuter, "The 'Imperial Church System' of the Ottonian and Salian Rulers. A Reconsideration," In *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982) 347–374.

[9] About the discussion of the Imperial Church System as an already ended debate, see Rudolf Grosse, "L'évêque d'Utrecht autour de l'an Mil : le modèle d'un prélat ottonien?". In Alexis Wilkin and Jean-Louis Kupper (eds.). *Notger et la Basse-Lotharingie aux alentours de l'an Mil*. (Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège, 2013), 207-209. However, Jean-Louis Kupper supports the idea of the existence of imperial bishops who worked together with the German kings and collaborated to increasing their influence within the regional Churches, like in the case of Notger of Liège. About his position, that considers also the existence of an Imperial Church System both in narrow and wide senses, see Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger de Liège (972-1008)*, (Brussels: Academie Royale de Belgique, 2015,) 133-143. About the impact that the concept of Imperial Church System had in German scholarship, see Stephen Patzold "L'épiscopat du haut Moyen Âge du point de vue de la médiévistique allemande," In *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 192 (2005) 341-358.

bishops and kings than on the figure of bishops themselves.[10] Second, it helped to increase the number of works that deal only with the secular aspect of episcopal power, while relegating other important features, like the cultural, spiritual and liturgical ones.[11]

A clear example of this major concentration on the secular aspects of episcopal power –and related to the topic of bishops' military involvement– appears in the works of Friedrich Prinz and Leopold Auer. These scholars outlined the numerous military functions and obligations that the prelates of Lotharingia and Germany used to have during the High Middle Ages and associated this particularity with the diverse links that connected them with the royal power –in the context of the Imperial Church System– and with the local aristocracies.[12] The problem with their perspective was not only that the military exceptionality of Lotharingian (and German) prelates was remarkably criticized by different scholars, like Timothy Reuter, but also that Prinz and Auer's focus disregarded the spiritual components of episcopal power.[13]

The secular-centered perspective started to change in the year 2000, with the publication of the article "Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms" by Timothy Reuter. In this article, the author emphasized the spiritual and cultural importance that medieval bishops had in the Middle Ages. Moreover, he considered them as the leading figures

---

[10] Ludwig Körntgen, "Introduction," in Ludwig Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power. Bishops in Tenth and Elevsenth Century Western Europe*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011, 11-14.

[11] John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones "Introduction: The Bishop Reformed," in John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (eds.). *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge, 2016 (2007), 1-12.

[12] Friedrich Prinz, *Klerus und Krieg im früheren Mittelalter. Untersuchungen zur Rolle der Kirche beim Aufbau der Königsherrschaft*, (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1971). Leopold Auer underlines the strong military activity especially of the Lotharingian bishops. See Leopold Auer, "Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus," 316-407.

[13] Concerning the critic of Reuter, he states that there were not so many differences between German and Western prelates regarding their engagement in war. The only exception consisted on the number of troops that the German bishops could bring, which was slightly superior than their western counter-part, as well as on some specific military services to the royal power, like the obligation to support the Imperial Italian campaigns. For the general critic, see Timothy Reuter (ed.), *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Karl Leyser*, Hambledon Press, London, 1992. About the omission of the spiritual facets of episcopal military power, one example is the military use of the excommunication, which was scarcely analyzed by the specialists. A notorious exception to this omission can be seen in the work of Brian Pavlac, who shows how the archbishops of Trier used the excommunication in warfare contexts, taking advantages of it. See Brian A. Pavlac, "Excommunication and Territorial Politics in High Medieval Trier," In *Church History* 60 (1991) 20-36.

of the "imagined communities" that the episcopacies used to be in that period.[14] In this sense, he suggested that forthcoming academic works should be more focused on the episcopal authorities themselves than on their relationship either with popes, kings, or other secular lords.

The impact that this article has had in the academic field was significant, mainly because it influenced many works which left behind the previous perspective centered only on the relationship between royal and episcopal authorities, or on the secular aspect of bishops' power.[15] In other words, it appears clearly that after Reuter's article the scholars left behind the previous academic approaches to concentrate more on the bishops themselves and on the diverse facets of their figures

Concerning the topic of bishops' participation in war, this turning-point has promoted also several collective works which dealt with this problem. However, most of these contributions presented a wider perspective, both methodologically –although mainly based on a cultural approach to war– and regionally and are focused mostly on specific episodes.[16] The

---

[14] Timothy Reuter, "A Europe of Bishops. The Age of Wulfstan of York and Burchard of Worms," In Ludwig Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power*, 29. Reuter took the concept of "imaginary community" from the work of Benedict Anderson. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Revised edition* (London: Verso, 1991 (1983)).

[15] The newest works concerning the secular exercise of episcopal power can be seen in this already mentioned compilation: Ludwig Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power*. Regarding the newest perspectives about the spiritual facets of the episcopal authorities after the Reform Movement, they can be seen in this already mentioned compilation John Ott and AnnaTrumbore Jones (eds.), *The Bishop Reformed*.

[16] A clear example of this new cultural approach to the topic of episcopal authorities and war can be seen in Radoslaw Kotecki, Jacek Maciejewsk and John S. Ott (eds.), *Between Sword and Prayer: Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective.* Leiden: Brill, 2018. This book is a compilation of articles which analyze the relation between clerics and warfare from a cultural perspective and focusing on diverse problematics. Concerning the topis of the representations of clerics during war, the article of Radoslaw Kotecki about the representation of twelfth century Polish bishops when engaged in war must be underlined. See Radoslaw Kotecki, "Lions and Lambs, Wolves and Pastors of the Flock: Portraying Military Activity of Bishops in Twelfth-Century Poland," in Radoslaw Kotecki, Jacek Maciejewsk and John S. Ott (eds.), *Between Sword and Prayer*, 303-340. Another compilation with a similar approach, although more focused on England, can be seen in Radosław Kotecki and Jacek Maciejewski (eds.), *Ecclesia et Violentia. Violence against the Church and Violence within the Church in the Middle Ages*, (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014). As in the case of the previous book, it does not contain any work analyzing the Lotharingian Church. The same topic of clergy and war was wide analyzed for England, and the region count with one detailed study specifically centered on it. See Craig M. Nakashian, *Warrior Churchmen of Medieval England, 1000-1250*, (Woodbridge: Bodywell, 2016). Beyond these works, most of them compilations, it is important to mention the contributions of David S. Bachrach, who analyzed the liturgical role that the imperial clergy (both secular and regular) played in warfare during the Ottonian period in Medieval Germany, see David S. Bachrach, "Military chaplains and the religion of war in Ottonian Germany, 919-1024," In *Religion, state and society* 39 (2011), 13-31. He also published a very interesting and complete work about the religious conduct during warfare, which include some passages analyzing military actions (mainly discourses) of Lotharingian bishops from Liège and Trier. He examines these events in the contexts of what he

narrowness of these new approaches, then, makes difficult to establish a general overview of the topic or even to search for regional patterns of the phenomenon.

Among the recent scholarship on the topic, the work of Jeffrey R. Webb should be highlighted because it focuses on the narrative representation of Lotharingian bishops' military actions in the eleventh century. In this sense, he describes how the episcopal local narratives changed during that period from avoiding mentioning the bishops' military involvement to justify their actions by different rhetorical strategies. This change was related, Webb states, to the transformations of the episcopal figures and their representation during the Reform period.[17]

Regarding the Lotharingian space, the work of Jeffrey Webb represents an advance in the sense of offering a regional and diachronic perspective of the bishops' military actions focused on the analysis of written sources. However, even if important, Webb's article is based mostly on narratives from the bishopric of Liège, and his statements concerning other regional bishoprics are not long-developed.[18] Moreover, and as far as I concern, his work is the only attempt to analyze the representation of episcopal military actions in episcopal deeds or *gestae episcoporum*.[19] Therefore, the connection established between the *gesta* and the episcopal identities through the representation of military events can be further developed.

---

calls secular wars, which refers mostly to regional and local wars which were perceived as different than the Crusades. See David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300–1215*, New York: Boydell, 2003, 151-189.

[17] Jeffrey R. Webb, "Representations of the Warrior-bishop in Eleventh-century Lotharingia". In *Early Medieval Europe* 24 (2016), pp. 103-130. Concerning the Reform Period and the Investiture Controversy, the transformations that both processes promoted in the figure of the bishops in relation to war will be introduced in the following chapters.

[18] For example, Webb dedicates not more than one sentence to analyze the case of the diocese of Utrecht. Concerning its bishops, he states that the narrative representations of their military actions try to conceal their engagement instead of justifying or even defend them. As an example of this concealment, he mentions the figure of Bishop Ansfried of Utrecht in the source *De diversitate temporum,* during the Viking attack on Utrecht in the year 1007. However, and based on my own analysis of that episode in the same source, which I will examine bot in chapters one and two, I will argue ratter the contrary. This is that the military development of Bishop Ansfrid was praised and not concealed.

[19] Webb examines, among other sources, Anselm's *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodensium,* a source with which I also work here.

As I showed in this brief introduction, there is still a gap concerning the way Lotharingian bishops were represented in historiographical narratives when they performed military actions, as well as how these military events influenced the history of the episcopal communities. In this sense, Reuter's notion of bishops as leading figures of "imaginary communities" can be used to understand the way those communities imagined themselves and their leading bishops while being involved in war. This is the main gap that this thesis plans to cover.

C. Narrating warfare: Problems and History of the Analysis of War Narratives

Because this thesis deals with the relationship between narrative representations of war and the processes of shaping local and regional identities, I will present a brief historiographical introduction about the topic. The ideological facet of medieval battle narratives has received considerable attention from the scholarship related to the cultural history of warfare. Mostly, the analyses were based on the moral and ethical perceptions of the medieval authors who wrote about the battles, and how those insights were related to the justification of the victories and defeats described by them.[20]

Nevertheless, and beyond these new cultural perspectives, the academic approaches concerning the way in which war was narrated have been historically related to the traditional-

---

[20] Related to this notion of the justification of a military outcome, an important number of the historiographical debates focused on the analysis of the concept of "Just War" and the divine explanation of triumphs and downfalls, as well as on the ethical models of combatants' behavior – like the ideal of chivalry – and their contrast with the more complex reality of war. The classical work about the debate of the concept of "Just War" and its history – and still the better introduction for the topic– is Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975). As a general overview about the contrast between the models of ethical behavior and the reality of war-conducts, from a perspective related to the ideal of chivalry, see Richard W. Kaeuper. *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). A very interesting debate concerning the use of epic-literary-fictional sources as historical evidence for war practices of medieval knights, which Kaeuper supports, can be seen in Richard W. Kaeuper, "Literature as Essential Evidence for Understanding Chivalry,", in *Journal of Military Medieval History*, 5 (2007), pp. 1-15.

positivist military history. This positivist perspective was mainly focused on the analysis of specific pitched battles, as well as about their chronology and their hierarchization depending on the importance of their political and military consequences.[21] Although this positivist approach has enjoyed an important position both in French and Anglo-American scholarship, its development followed different paths in both countries.[22]

Beyond the different roads that the historiography of war narratives took in France and in the Anglo-American academic world, two similar turning-points appeared in both traditions in the seventies with the publication of works focused on the cultural aspects of warfare. The first turning point was the work of Georges Duby about the Battle of Bouvines (1214). In this book, Duby analyzed not only the cultural background of the combatants and the way it influenced their battle decisions but also the narrative records of the event and their re-appropriation in later periods, especially concerning its transformation into a myth by the French historiography.[23]

The second turning point was the publication of John Keegan's book "The Face of Battle", where he examined how the combatants experienced the moment of combat in three

---

[21] The consequences were usually analyzed in terms of their importance for the development of the modern national states, see Ariane Boltansky, Yann Lagadec and Franck Mercierook "Introduction," in Ariane Boltansky, Yann Lagadec and Franck Mercierook (eds.), *La bataille : Du fait d'armes au combat idéologique (XIe-XIXe siècle)*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2015, 7-13. A classical work about medieval warfare, which is also a representative of the traditional perspective of analyzing with a focus more on tactics, strategies, as well as on the armies and their equipment, can be seen in Charles Oman, *The Art of War in the Middle Ages: A.D. 378–1515*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1885).

[22] This perspective, called *histoire-bataille* in France, enjoyed a good position among French scholars until the emergence of the Annals school, whose attacks were directed precisely to the traditional positivist historiography and its exaggerated focus on military and political events like battles. Due to the fierce critics from scholars of this new leading French historiographical paradigm, the *histoire-bataille* perspective was relegated to a second plane in French academy until the last decades of the twentieth century. For this process, see Ariane Boltansky, Yann Lagadec and Franck Mercierook "Introduction," 7-8. In the case of Anglo-American military historiography, however, this traditional perspective focused on the battle-event, on its details and its consequences, was not strongly confronted as in France. Therefore, it remains nowadays as a very important approach for the analysis of war narratives and it is possible to see how recent works in medieval warfare still focus on the description of the armies and of the terrain, the characterization of the generals, the analysis of the tactics and strategies, as well as the military and political consequences of pitches battles and sieges. This can be seen for example in the guiding topic of the XV volume of the Journal of Military Medieval History, that deals mostly with the debate about medieval military strategies, see Leif Inge R. Petersen and Manuel Rojas Gabriel (eds.), *Journal of Military Medieval History*, 15 (2017).

[23] George Duby, *The Legend of Bouvines: War, Religion, and Culture in the Middle Ages*, Catherine Tihany (tr.), (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1990 (1973)).

pitched-battles from different historical periods (concerning the Middle Ages, Keegan analyzed the Battle of Agincourt in the year 1415), as well as the physical and moral limitations which real battle-situations imposed to the soldiers. Moreover, he contrasted those limitations with the relatively freer narrative re-constructions of the battles, in which the authors described the soldiers' movements and actions by following pre-existent narrative models which expressed more their own cultural background and expectations than the real possibilities of a combat situation.[24]

Both books contributed to change the perspective of the historiography about battles and their narrative reconstruction, and influenced further and more recent works which analyze –within the theoretical framework of the cultural history of war– combat-events from diverse periods, like the Classical Antiquity, the Middle Ages or the Napoleonic wars.[25] Lastly, and regarding the most-recent historiography on the topic, the book *La bataille : Du fait d'armes au combat idéologique (XIe-XIXe siècle)* –published in the year 2015 by the University of Rennes– compiles works by many specialists who analyze the way different battles were

---

[24] For example, the author contrasts the description of the French knights in Agincourt, who in the battle narratives appear charging -on their horses- against the English forces and trying to penetrate deep into the well-formed enemy lines, while he states that nowadays it is known that horses avoid physical contact and would not try to charge against a barrier of lances. However, the narrative describes the knights charging in that way because that was the cultural expectation of what a French knight was supposed to do in battle. John Keegan, *The face of Battle*, (London: Cape, 1978) 69-100.

[25] In the French scholarship this perspective is called *Nouvelle-histoire-bataille*, and one of its most important representatives –related to the analysis of medieval warfare– is Hervé Drévillon, who concentrated on diverse battle-events (considered as important for the history of modern-days France) and their cultural facets. See Hervé Drévillon, *Batailles. Scènes de guerre de la Table Ronde aux tranchées*, (Paris : Seuil, 2007). About the emergence of the *Nouvelle-histoire-bataille*, that appeared not only in France but also in the English-speaking scholarship and represented in works with a similar perspective than the French ones, see Laurent Heninger, "La nouvelle histoire-bataille," In *Espaces Temps*, 71-73 (1999) 35-46. The most important French representative of the cultural approach to war is Phillip Contamine. For his general overview about medieval warfare from a cultural perspective, see Phillip Contamine, *War in the Middle Ages*, Michael Jones (tr.), Oxford: Blackwell, 1984 (1980). Concerning the Anglo-American scholarship, it is important to mention the work of John Lynn, who analyzes –based on written sources– the way of fight of different armies from the Classic Antiquity to the Contemporary period, with a special focus on the cultural explanations for the combatants' behavior and their strategies during combat. See John Lynn, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture from Ancient Greece to Modern America*, (New York: Westview Press, 2003).

narratively re-created as well as how those narratives were re-used in later political and cultural debates.[26]

From this brief resume about the topic of the narration of warfare, it can be seen first that, even if relatively old, the work of John Keegan persists as one of the most important approaches to the reconstruction of the battle-events. Moreover, his idea about the existence of narrative patterns that the authors followed to re-create battles remains valid nowadays. Second, and concerning the link between the written recreation of battles and its influence on later political and cultural debates, the many contributions on this field did not deal enough with local medieval sources.

In this sense, there is much more to say concerning the role that the narration of war – as it was represented in ecclesiastical historiographical texts– has had, for example, in the shaping of local identities. Furthermore, and even considering the concentration on the narrative reconstruction of the combatants and their moral characteristics, the historiography avoided to make a deep analysis of how the moral representation of specific combatants or leaders had influenced the way in which their movements and their interaction with the battlefields were narratively represented. To fill these gaps, this thesis takes Keegan's perspective to analyze the pattern of the written recreation of war episodes in Lotharingian historiographical-ecclesiastical sources, as well as to link that pattern with the identity-discussions within the regional dioceses in the period analyzed.

---

[26] In the same way than the recent compilations about the topic of clerics and war, the book *La bataille* encompasses a great diversity of authors and perspectives, which makes difficult to establish a clear historiographical line. However, there is a guiding pattern which consists how the cultural and political context of the authors influenced their narrative reconstruction of battles, as well as how their historical recreations of military episodes were retaken and re-interpreted for being used in later political disputes. For example, concerning the analysis of the battle of Hastings (1066) and its first narrative reconstruction, see Florian Mazel, "Qu'est-ce qu'une bataille décisive ? Jugement de Dieu et légitimation dans les premiers récits de la bataille d'Hastings," in Ariane Boltansky, Yann Lagadec and Franck Mercierook, *La bataille*, 15-30.

D. The Methodology and the Concepts for the Analysis of War and Battle Spatiality

Since the examination of the written sources will be focused on the way they describe war and battle spaces, my analysis on this point will concentrate on the representation of the combatants, their different deployment and movement within the battlefields, as well as the communication both with their own armies and with their rivals.

To do so, I will conduct a narratological analysis of selected passages in the sources chosen for discussion. This analysis will be based on the comprehension of the figures of the narrator, as well as on the focalization, the use of time, the horizontal structure of the narrative and on how all these aspects—working together—help to constitute the narrative spatiality of war in relation to the figure of the bishops.[27]

Given the fact that I will work analyzing narrative spatial representations, it is important to clarify the meaning that I will give to the concept of "space" in relation to battle-scenes. In this work, the concept refers to a dynamic area that denotes a combat zone shaped by the actions and movements of the combatants.[28] Therefore, the narrative space of battle is built more by the combatants than by the physical places or locations of fights. This definition of battle-space is based on the work of Christina Lechtermann, who demonstrated how the soldiers, their movement and their interaction with the physical landscape are the main elements which shape

---

[27] For an introduction to narratology and its concepts, see Irene J. F. De Jong, *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide,* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014). Other features of narratology, like the analysis of the narratees or the vertical structure of the text, will not be taken in consideration here because the lack of space. In this work I will also use some concepts coming from the field of literary rhetoric, as for example the notion of *analepsys*. For a good summary of the existent concepts about literary rhetoric, see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*, in Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen and David E. Orton (trans.), David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson (eds.), Leiden: Brill, 1998 (1960).

[28] The theoretical discussion about spatiality and the spatial-turn in humanities is enormous, and a proper introduction will demand an entire chapter. A brief resume of the history of the concept and the debates around it can be read in Robert T. Tally Jr., *Spatiality*, New York: Routledge, 2013. A classical work about the space as a social production can be seen in Henry Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Donald Nicholson (tr.), Oxford: Blackwell, 1991 (1905). Another classic work concerning the theory of space is Michel De Certeau. *La invención de lo cotidiano. I artes de hacer*, Alejandro Pescador (tr.), Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1996 (1990).

the narrative space of battle in the medieval epic poem "Willehalm".[29] Even if her work is based on a fictional literary-genre and not on a historiographical one, I will take her analysis as a model. This is because, as I will explain below, the combatants and their movements play the same role concerning the representation of space in the sources analyzed here.

E. The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis is divided into two chapters. In the first chapter, I will briefly justify my decision of choosing the bishoprics of Utrecht, Liège and the archbishopric of Trier and will explain the two different kinds of written sources with which I will work. Then, in the longer and most important part of Chapter One, I will examine the way the bishops were situated within war and battle-spaces. This chapter is mostly an analytical one and the examination consists mainly on a narratological approach to the sources. Finally, in the second chapter, I will analyze how the episcopal identities were projected onto the past through the written sources and their representation of war, as well as the role that the bishops played in that projection.

This study concludes that there exists a common pattern of narrating warfare in the diverse Lotharingian written sources analyzed here. This pattern is expressed by separating the combat scenes into spaces of positive singularity and negative plurality. Because the bishops improved the positive singularity among their own troops, they always overcome, narratively speaking, the military defeats. This narrative 'Invincibility' of Lotharingian bishops helped the chroniclers to project onto the past an episcopal identity, which continuity to the present time of the authors was guaranteed by those unbeatable prelates.

---

[29] Christina Lechtermann, "Topography, Tide and the (Re-)Turn of the Hero: Battleground and Combat Movement in Wolfram's Willehalm,", in Markus Stock and Nicola Vöhringer (eds.), *Spatial Practices: Medieval, Modern*, (Göttingen: V&R unpress, 2014), 89-91. Lechtermann bases her own definitions of space and spatiality on the work of Michele de Certeau. See Michel De Certeau. *La invención de lo cotidiano.*

Chapter 1: Situating the Bishops Within the Battlefield

In this chapter, I will analyze the narrative representation of the spaces of war and battles and how the bishops, when situated within, transform those spaces in a positive way which helps them to obtain victories in the narratives. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section will be a descriptive one. It is a short section in which I will justify my selection of bishoprics and will introduce the two kinds of written sources analyzed here. In the second section, I will focus on the way in which the narrators represented the combatants and shaped the spaces of battles and war in the military episodes. As a general pattern, I will show that the episcopal narratives analyzed here represented the battle-space, the combatants and their discourses either with positive singular or negative plural characteristics. It is important to note that in this first section no bishops will appear since the examples analyzed will be used to present an overview of the way in which the combat was represented in general, and not only when the prelates got involved.

In the second section, the bishops appear, and I will show how their narrative figures enhance the positive singularity and unified the discursive aptitudes of their own armies. In the third section, I will analyze the movement of bishops within the spaces of war, as well as their movements from the spaces of war to the spaces of peace, which in other words means to obtain the victory in a definitive way. Lastly, the final section will offer the example of the Battle of Vlaardingen (1018), in which all the elements mentioned before work together to conceal the defeat of Bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht.

The Bishoprics and the Sources

To give a regional and comparative perspective to my analysis, I decided to work with three

Lotharingian dioceses which will cover the region from the north to the south: the bishopric of

Utrecht[30], the bishopric of Liège[31] and the archbishopric of Trier[32]. This survey will allow me

---

[30] Thanks to its important position as a missionary center, as well as to its situation as a linking point of the commercial routes which connected the northwestern part of the German Kingdom with Flanders and England, the diocese of Utrecht growth quickly during the eighth century. In the tenth century, it appears as a consolidated bishopric, depending on the archbishopric of Cologne. However, even considering this growth, in the period analyzed here the diocese remained as border political and ecclesiastical entity, far from the most important imperial affairs. Moreover, it suffered a lot because of the Viking invasions of the ninth, tenth and the early eleventh centuries. As a general introduction to the history of the diocese, see Rolf Grosse, *Das Bistum Utrecht und seine Bischöfe im 10. und frühen 11. Jahrhundert*. (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987). Another brief but concise history of the bishopric and its integration into the Lotharingian space can be seen in Herman J. Selderhuis (ed.), *Handbook of Dutch Church History*, (Amsterdam: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015). There is also another general work, although in this case consists on a compilation of different articles. See C. A. Rutgers (ed.), *De utrechtse bisschop in de middeleeuuwen*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978). For a detailed description of the Viking invasions on the area of Utrecht during the eighth and ninth centuries, see Vliet van Kaj, "Traiecti muros eu! The Bishop of Utrecht during and after the Viking Invasion of Frisia (834-925)," in *Vikings on the Rhine. Recent Research on Early Medieval Relations between the Rhinelands and Scandinavia*, Rudolf Simek and Ulrike Engel (eds.), Vienna: Fassbaender, 2004, 133-154. Traditionally, scholars characterized the diocese of Utrecht as a clear example of a bishopric integrated into the "Imperial Church System". However, modern scholars like Rudolf Grosse polemize with this perspective. See for example Grosse, "L'évêque," 207-209.

[31] During the tenth century, the diocese of Liège became a prestigious center of political and cultural influence in the region. However, the city still suffered at the hands of the rebellious local aristocrats, who were fighting against the growing influence of the German Kings in the region. If the diocese of Liège was in need to defend itself from the local nobles, it was because it established a close relationship with the German monarchs during that period. In this sense, the diocese of Liège played a clear role of supporter of the German royal power in Lower Lotharingia. Furthermore, due to the support that the bishops of Liège offered to the imperial ambitions, the diocese received numerous royal grants and benefits, which transformed it during the eleventh century in one of the most powerful political entities in the region. The most important bibliography for Liège in the period, which is not only general but also deals with the influence of the German Kings, is Jean-Louis Kupper, *Liège et l'Église impériale aux XIe-XIIe siècles*, Liége: Presses universitaires de Liège, 1981 available online, acceded 5-14-19 http://books.openedition.org/pulg/1442. Also see Jean-Louis Kupper (ed.). *Notger et la Basse-Lotharingie aux alentours de l'an Mil*. Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège, 2013. About the cultural prestige of Liège as a center of literary production, which was based mostly on the production of hagiographical texts, see Jeffrey R. Webb, "Hagiography in the diocese of Liège (950-1130)," in Philippart, Guy (ed.) *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550. Vol 6* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 809-904.

[32] The archbishopric of Trier was one of the most important dioceses both of Lotharingia and of the German kingdom. The story of Trier as city and as bishopric can be traced as far as the Late Antiquity, when the city called *Augusta treverorum* was one of the most important cities of the Late Roman Empire. Trier was transformed into archbishopric at the end of the eighth century. Once the region of Lotharingia became definitely part of the East Frankish kingdom in the ninth century, the prestige of Trier increased since it became the oldest city in that political entity. However, this prestige was not necessarily converted into political power, and during most part of the High Middle Ages Trier competed for the primacy in Germany against the archbishoprics of Mainz and Cologne without success. In fact, the archdiocese of Trier was, during the twelfth century, a problematic see. It found many problems in the ambitious local nobles, especially the count of Luxembourg and Namur and the Palatine Count of the Rhine. A general introduction concerning its competition with Mainz and Cologne, can be seen in Egon Boshof, "Köln, Mainz, Trier. Die Auseinandersetzung um die Spitzenstellung im deutschen Episkopat in ottonisch-salischer Zeit," in *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins* 49 (1978), 19-48. For another major study, although concentrated on the relation established between the archbishopric with the kings

15

not only to analyze the differences and similarities between the entities of two bishoprics and one archbishopric but also to cover the two major Lotharingian regional divisions since the region was politically divided from the tenth century in the dukedoms of Lower (north) and Upper (south) Lotharingia.[33] Moreover, this selection will also allow me to cover the second major regional division, namely the French-speaking region (by analyzing Liège) and the German-speaking region (by analyzing Trier and Utrecht).[34]

Concerning the selection of the narratives, this study analyses written historiographical sources produced under the sphere of influence of the episcopal authorities.[35] Mainly, I will work with historiographical narratives and episcopal deeds.[36] Both types of narratives present a perspective relatively focalized on the local regions. Moreover, the episcopal historiographical narratives and the *gesta* expressed a close connection between the past and

---

and the Popes, see Egon Boshof, *Das Erzstift Trier und seine Stellung zu Königtum und Papsttum im ausgehenden zehnten Jahrhundert. Der Pontifikat des Theoderich*, (Cologne: Verlag, 1972).

[33] About the division of Lotharingia in two dukedoms, which was promoted by Archbishop Brun of Cologne, the brother of the Ottonian emperor Otto I, see Michel Parisse, "Lotharingia," 310-327

[34] Concerning the linguistic division in Lotharingia See Michel Parisse, "La Lotharingie: naissance d'un espace politique." 31-48.

[35] The notion of "under the sphere of influence of the bishops" include both the political or institutional influence, namely a bishop ordering a text or the production of a text which is expected to be produced for the bishopric (like the *gesta*) and the cultural influence, namely a work which tried to please a specific bishop.

[36] As can be seen, the perspective of this study is based on written historiographical local sources. In this sense, the selection of *gesta* instead of chronicles or annals is explained by their stronger ties with the local episcopal environment and identity. Concerning the difference between these genres, see Steven Vanderputten, "Typology of Medieval Historiography Reconsidered: a Social Reinterpretation of Monastic Annals, Chronicles and *Gesta*," *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 26 (2001) 141-178. This selection implies that hagiographical sources, like bishops' lives, or other historiographical sources like monastic chronicles will not be considered. The existence or not of medieval-literary-genres which explain the differences between texts is an open debate. Steven Vanderputten clearly supports their existence, arguing that they expressed both a different way to represent the past and different types of historical representations. Ibidem, 142. A different position, although not directly discussing with Vanderputten neither referred to the medieval genres, but to the ancient ones, is expressed by Thomas Rosenmeyer, who argues that the theory of ancient literary-genres was a creation mainly of the nineteenth century. See Thomas Rosenmeyer, "Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?," in Andrew Laird (ed.), *Ancient Literary Criticism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, 421-439. The debate concerning this topic is broad, and I will not enter into it. However, even if my survey of sources is based on historiographical texts which –I consider– share common characteristics, my narratological approach in this chapter in which I examine the battle scenes is based on previous scholars' analysis of medieval literary-fictional genres. Therefore, from the perspective of this study I consider that the medieval literary-historiographical genres (like the *gesta*) existed and should be differentiated (as for example in the notion that episcopal deeds were concentrated more on local than in world affairs), but also that they can be analyzed by following patterns and methodologies used for fictional-literary genre, since they shared characteristics (like the narrative representation of war and battle spatiality, as I will show in this chapter). Concerning the use of the same methodology to analyze historiographical and fictional texts, Irene De Jong emphasized the possibility of make a narratological analysis of both kinds of narratives, since they have similar structures and make use of similar rhetorical strategies. Because of this, the difference is minimal. De Jong, *Narratology*, 167-190

16

present of the Lotharingian dioceses. In the case of the historiographical narratives, and as it was also a general pattern for medieval historiography, they presented positive and negative examples of behavior from the past to moralize the contemporary audience.[37] Concerning the *gesta*, Michele Sot states that they had as their main objective the narrative construction of an episcopal community and the projection of its history and identity onto a sacred past.[38] Once the general explanation for the choice of the bishoprics and of the sources is done, it is time to start analyzing the narratives.

The Combatants and the Space of Battle: Positive Singularity and Negative Plurality as Narrative Characteristics

An Example of the Shaping of the Battle-Space: The Viking Invasions of the Years 1006 and 1007 on the Region of Merweede/Wal and Lek Rivers

As John Keegan argued, battle-events are narratively recreated by following specific patterns. This statement was used as his starting point to understand the difference between the narrated

---

[37] In the case of the episcopal historiographical narratives, the audience was composed mainly by the young clergy from the cathedral schools. About the moralizing objective of medieval historiography, see Matthew Kempshall, *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400–1500*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

[38] The *gestae episcoporum* were episcopal historiographical narratives characterized by a deep attachment to their political environment of production. The attachment is explained by the fact that they were produced under the sphere of the cultural influence of the episcopal authorities, regardless if they were written in cathedral schools or in monasteries and by monks under the bishops' command. Moreover, the main objective of the deeds was to reminisce and legitimize bishops' actions in front of the clergy by connecting their figures with those of the sacred ancestors of the diocese, which usually were saintly bishops. Because of this link that the authors of the episcopal deeds established between the contemporary episcopal authorities and the actions made by their sacred ancestors, important scholars like Michele Sot argued that those texts were not only produced to build the history of the dioceses, but also to build a sacred history of the episcopal communities. The best introductory work concerning episcopal and monastic deeds, which deals mainly with the concept of "sacred history", is Michele Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981). Steven Vanderputten includes also the episcopal deeds in his typology, see Steven Vanderputten, "Typology of Medieval Historiography Reconsidered," 152-153. There are two articles from Theo Riches who suggest two different but somehow complementary approaches. For the deeds and their function as archive, see Theo M. Riches, "The Function of the *Gesta Episcoporum* as Archive," in *Jaarboek voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis* 10 (2007), 7-46. For their dynamic and changing political intentions, see Theo M. Riches, "The Changing Political Horizons of *gesta episcoporum* from the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries," in Ludwig Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (eds.), *Patterns of Episcopal Power*, 51-62.

events and the real experiences of the soldiers during battles, which was another way to discuss the relationship between "real" events and their narrative reconstruction in historiographical texts, as well as between history as a discipline and its sources.[39] From the perspective of this chapter, the argument of Keegan is important since I will search for a specific pattern of narrating warfare in different written-sources. However, the debate it is not, since my examination of the pattern lies mostly on the narrative side of history and, because of this position, the military events which I will analyze will be only shortly described.

Concerning the pattern for the narration of warfare, the main characteristic of the sources analyzed here is that they shape the battle spatiality through the figure of the combatants.[40] Moreover, because the narratives characterize the combatants as singular or plural figures, they create consequently spaces of plurality or singularity. An example of this mode to create the narrative spatiality can be seen in the following passages of Alpert of Metz' *De diversitate temporum*[41], which describe the Viking invasions of the years 1006 and 1007 on

---

[39] I mentioned before that Irene De Jong underlined the possibility of analyzing historiographical texts with the same parameters from narratology which are usually applied to fiction. The statement implies that not only historiographical texts (or other kinds of written-sources that historians use for their work) can be analyzed first in their narratives characteristics, but also that, above all, they are texts and they are not so different from fiction. As can be seen, this discussion is partially related to the discussion about the way historians write history, which were under debate when the scholars close to the "linguistic-turn" began to question the existence of a historical "reality" beyond the written-sources and suggested that history should avoid going beyond texts. For a detailed description about the linguistic-turn and the debates that it promoted, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text. Historians and the Linguistic Turn*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004). Again, this is an enormous and still opened debate, and I will not enter into it. However, and concerning the warfare narratives, this notion implies that those who narrated battles created coherent narratives, from their own perspective and cultural parameters, to give coherence to the chaotic events of a battle, and to explain their concatenation. Before the Linguistic-turn, and like the historians who avoided to analyze the structure of concatenation of events and the narrative aspects of the written-sources, the military historians followed the same perspective, focusing on search for the "reality" of events, tactics, strategies, weapons and armors beyond the texts, and as I mentioned in the introduction concerning the traditional and positivist way to historically analyze battles.

[40] In other words, the combatants are the ones who, by their movement and by their interaction both with the place and with their rivals, shape the dynamics of the battle space. This was observed by Christina Lechtermann for the poem "Willehalm" and was quoted on the introduction. Concerning the difference between spaces of battle and spaces of war, the frontier between them is diffuse. However, scholarship tends to differentiate them by characterizing the battles as events in which the action, the place and the time are unified. For this description see Ariane Boltanski, Yann Lagadec and Franck Mercierook, (eds.), *La bataille,*, 7. In the case of this analysis, this difference is not relevant, because, as I will explain, the most relevant difference is not between spaces of battle and spaces of war, but between spaces of war and spaces of peace.

[41] The main written source for the diocese of Utrecht is *De diversitate temporum* by Alpert of Metz (d. 1024), which is also one of the most important written sources for the history of Lower Lotharingia in the early 11th century. Alpert was a Benedictine monk and chronicler born in the surroundings of the merchant city of Tiel, in the last decades of the tenth century. Although he growth in the diocese of Utrecht, he was formed as monk in the

18

the area near to the diocese of Utrecht. In these raids, the invaders decided to follow the

Merwede/Waal and Lek Rivers, attacking and looting the city of Tiel in 1006, fighting against

a local force near the union of Rhine and Lek Rivers in 1007, and finally attempting to plunder

without success the city of Utrecht in the same year.[42] The first passage presents the combat

between the northern invaders and the defenders of Tiel in 1006, and describes the gathering

of a defensive army which was numerous enough to scare the invaders and to momently stop

their plundering:

> "statimque nunciis a praefecto in omnes partes dimissis, postero die summon mane maxima multitudo convenit. […] Nostris visis et celeri eorum adventu hostes perterriti, naves quam citius solventes recedebant, adeo ut similis fugae recessus videretur. Nostri insequentes, et ex utraque parte fluminis levibus praeliis factis, et utrimque paucis aut vulneratis aut occisis, ne cupiditate praedae a ripa longius hostes vagarentur, prohibebant.".[43]

Nevertheless, this victory was only partial, since when the Vikings formed their troops for fight

on the next day, the defenders were unable to attend to the combat for different reasons.

Therefore, the invaders decide to victoriously leave the scene and the battle sequence finishes:

---

monastery of St. Simphorian in Metz, were he received not only education in biblical texts but also a strong classical formation. After finishing his preparation in Metz, Alpert came back to Utrecht and started writing *De diversitate temporum*, finishing it *circa* 1025. This work, divided in two books, is a historiographical narrative in which the author tried to present what he considered the most important political, military and social events occurred in the diocese of Utrecht in the last thirty years. Even if the subject matter seems to be general, the intention of the author appears clarified in the prologue dedicated to Bishop Burchard of Worms (1000–1025), where he states that the work should be used for teaching purposes. Since the work is dedicated to an important bishop, as well as relates episodes mostly occurred in the territory of the diocese of Utrecht and exalts the figure of all the episcopal authorities who appear in the narration, the work of Alpert can be situated within the sphere of influence of the episcopal –in this case more moral than political– authority. The Latin edition of *De diversitate* used in this chapter is: Alpert, *Alpertus De diversitate temporum*. Edited by Georg H. Pertz. MGH SS. 4, 1841, 700-723. Other two important Latin editions can be found in: Jacques-Paul Migne, PL, coll, 140, 451-490, and Hans van Rij and Anna Sapir Abulafia, *De diversitate temporum et Fragmentum de Deoderico primo episcopo Mettensi*, (Amsterdam 1980), 2-105, which includes also a Dutch translation. The English translation used here is: David S. Bachrach, *Warfare and Politics in Medieval Germany, ca. 1000: On the Variety of Our Times by Alpert of Metz*, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012. There exists also a Latin edition with German translation: Andreas Dederich, *Des Alpertus von Metz zwei Bücher über verschiedene Zeitereignisse, nebst zwei Bruchstücken über Bischöfe von Metz*, Münster 1859, 73-130.
[42] Bachrach, *Warfare and Politics,* 17-18.
[43] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 704. "Immediately, messengers were dispatched by the count to all districts. The next day, a great crowd gathered at first light. […] When they caught sight of our men, the enemy grew terrified at their rapid approach. They retreated, unmooring their ships so quickly that their withdrawal had the appearance of a rout. Our men followed them and there was some skirmishing on both banks of the river, although few were wounded or killed on either side. However, our men kept the enemy from moving far beyond the river in search for booty.", Bachrach, *Warfare*, 18-19.

"Vicis vero iuxta littus quos adire poterant exustis, nona hora diei omnes de navibus desilierunt, aciem confertissimam instruxerunt, nostris potestatem pugnandi praebuerunt. At nostri loco se continuerunt, et quia plurimi ex agris coacti convenerant, cum his ad usum belli imperatis et superioris anni propter sterilitatem inopia familiaris rei vexatis, praelium committere non audebant. Ubi barbari neminem ad pugnam procedere conspicerent, satis ad ostentationem suae audatiae factum existimantes, ad naves se recipiunt, et nullo prohibente regressi sunt."[44]

In these passages one can see the different meanings that the narrator gives to the singular and plural characterization of the combatants and their movements.[45] On the one hand, when the fighters are described by using plural subjects like *hostes* or *barbari* for the enemy and *nostri* for the defenders (although occasionally appear internal plural or collective nouns), the space shaped by them appears as a space of plurality, often represented by unordered troops or unordered movements, and described as troops either fleeing, pursuing or attacking the enemy without any kind of formation. Thus, the plurality is not used to express battle-winning scenes, because the plural spaces of fight represent only fleeing scenes or failed attempts to attack.

On the other hand, the narrator might describe the troops as forming a singular figure, like in the case of the Vikings' "phalanx" (*aciem confertissimam*). This way of describing the combatants, which emphasizes their unity, contributes to shape spaces of singularity which contrast with the plurality of the spaces of routing or unorganized attacks. The main difference can be seen in the fact that, after the narrator describes the homogeneous phalanx formed by the Viking invaders, he explains why the defenders could not fight and then he describes the victorious departure of the Vikings. Therefore, it exists a contrast in the appreciation of the

---

[44] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 704-705. "Then, at noon, they all disembarked from their ships and formed a phalanx, offering our men an opportunity to fight. Our men then gathered at this place. However, because many of them had come together after being summoned from the fields, they were less experienced than the enemy in the conduct of battle. Moreover, because of the famine the previous year, they were afflicted by a lack of staple goods. Consequently, they did not dare to commit themselves to a battle. When the barbarians saw that no one was advancing to fight, they decided that they had made a sufficient demonstration of their own bravery and returned to their ships. They then withdrew without any opposition.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 19.

[45] It is important not to associate automatically the figure of the real author with the figure of the narrator, because there are many kinds of narrator figures that can be used by an author in his text. However, some scholars consider—although it is still an open debate—that the assimilation of the narrator with the real author of a text is a common characteristic in historiographical narratives, like the ones analyzed in this thesis. About the assimilation between author and narrator, see De Jong, *Narratology*, 17-18.

singularity, related to scenes that describe military victories, and of the plurality, related to scenes that describe defeats or doubtful results.[46]

Furthermore, the different meaning is reinforced by the specific way in which the focalization works in the text, especially when it is embedded on the perspective of diverse combatants.[47] This is explained because the embedded focalization does not only describe what the characters see but also their feelings and expectations, and these emotional perceptions define or explain their actions. From the perspective of the story, what the characters see and their emotional reaction because of it crate a complication which forms part of the horizontal structure of the narrative, and that needs to be resolved for the story to advance.[48]

As the passages analyzed above show, the negative grammatical-plurality appears in the spatial description of the combatants because the problems brought to them by embedded focalization would not be solved. For example, the Vikings during the attack on Tiel are represented as plural figures who become scared when contemplate the great force gathered by

---

[46] This distinction –which implies that one group of soldiers could be described either as a homogeneous unit in a phalanx formation or as a chaotic agglomeration of frightened individuals fleeing onto different directions– is supported by the wide-extended idea in medieval warfare tactics that both mounted and foot troops should be organized in close formations. The uniformity of formation was also considered important during withdrawals, since a general rout or an unorganized flee were perfect scenarios for the enemy's mounted troops to charge and to conclude the battle. About the importance of tight formations in medieval warfare, see Jans F.Verbruggen, *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe During the Middle Ages From the Eighth Century to 1340*, (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1997). However, not so many medieval chroniclers were well formed in military affairs, and even if some authors like Alpert of Metz appeared to have a good knowledge concerning warfare, others like Balderich of Florennes scarcely witnessed more than one battle, while Anselm of Liège might never had been in one. In this sense, the fact that the importance of the homogeneous formations was a wide extended principle in the mind of medieval tacticians does not imply that what the medieval chroniclers wrote about unity in battles were an accurate representation of the behavior of the regular combatant, or even a description of a well-informed observer.

[47] The embedded focalization is a rhetorical tool that consists of changing the points to which and from which the narrator focalizes his narration in the story. While the narrator remains the same, the focus is embedded on specific characters or places, modifying the perspective presented to the readers. The focalization is also one of the narratological elements that better expresses the ideological intentions behind the text, since through its use, for example, the author can concentrate the perspective on what he wants to show to the reader, emphasizing it while hiding things that he does not want to show. About the embedded focalization in general, see De Jong, *Narratology*, 50. About its ideological facet, see page 69.

[48] This particularity appears not only in Alpert's *De diversitate temporum* but also in the other written-sources analyzed here, yet with less intensity. Concerning the horizontal structure of the narration, it is one of the ways in which the story develops, and consists on many stages like summary, orientation, complication, peak or resolution. About this category, see De Jong, *Narratology*, 40. The important aspect here is how the embedded focalization makes this horizontal narrative to advance. In fact, the complications—either a great number of enemies approaching, or the fear to fight against an opponent awaiting in a firm stance, or even the spread of false rumors inside the army, as will be shown below—and their resolution are what make the story to progress.

the defenders and waiting for them. This visual perception of the defenders' force is the complication that the embedded focalization brings to the plot and that the negative-plural figure of the invaders cannot resolve, therefore the narrative starts shaping a plural space of a chaotic retreat, namely a rout. However, when the Vikings form the phalanx and build a space of singularity, the defenders are the ones afraid to fight, and the invaders then pick-up their booty and leave the battle scene without any problem.[49]

The Positive Singularity and the Negative Plurality in the Analysis of Battle-Discourses

The same analysis of singularity and plurality can be applied to the discursive aptitudes of the combatants. For example, in the second invasion in 1007, a regional force of the defenders waited for the raiders on both banks of the River Lek. They are described to have presented a solid barrier that scared the Vikings at the beginning, so the problem with this army was not its organization.[50] Then, the invaders ask the defenders to allow them pass on peace, and to continue their travel in direction to the Rhine River. At the beginning, the defenders accept this offer and allow them pass. Yet, after the arriving of some reinforcements during the night, it

---

[49] In the case of the local defenders of Tiel, when they gather their big army that the narrator describes as a *maxima multitudo*, which is a plural figure but grammatically expressed in singular, they make the invaders flee. However, when the Vikings form the phalanx, the defenders are the ones who started to be described as a plural figure, as can be seen in phrases which emphasize the diversity of their rural origin like "plurimi ex agris coacti convenerant". This diversity that affects their military aptitudes, together with the effects of the famine of the previous year, represents the plural figure of the defenders' army as a chaotic group of combatants who cannot attack the enemy's phalanx.

[50] "Nostri, extimplo coacta magna multitudine equitum et peditum et paucarum navium, per ripam instructi armis adventum hostium expectabant. At primi barbarorum visa tanta multitudine perturbantur, et in medio fluminis alveo anchoris naves statuentes, reliquos expectare disponunt." Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 705. "Immediately, a great force of men on horseback and on foot was mobilized, along with a few ships. Our men, equipped with arms waited along the banks of the river for the arrival of the enemy. The first of the barbarians were concerned when they saw this great multitude, and anchored their ships in the deep middle part of the river to await the arrival of the rest of their force.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 19-20. Alpert uses again the phrase "magna multitudine" to describe the defenders, which expresses some traces of positive singularity which provoke doubts on the plural figure of the Vikings, plurally characterized as "barbarorum".

22

appears a discursive misunderstanding in the defenders' army which provokes an unorganized attack:

> "Sequenti die cum classem movissent, iamque primi Hrenum essent ingressi, [...] Intermisso noctis spacio et omnibus nostris flumen transportatis, et diliculo ad nostros qui in navibus erant falsa fama pervenisset, equites cum hostibus magno certamine conflixisse iamque quasdam naves direptas essa, nihil reliqui ad celeritatem sibi fecerunt. Tumultu et clamore omnia complentes, nullo duce, nullo certo ordine, ut quique sibi celeriores videbantur, hostibus appropinquabant. Quibus visis, in unum hostes conglobati occurrerunt. At nostri qui in navibus erant, ut viderunt Nordmannos integris viribus occurrisse, relictis navibus praecipites se fugae dederunt."[51]

As can be seen in this passage, the narrator explains that suddenly a false rumor ("falsa fama") spread in the army announcing—incorrectly—that the combat began. This rumor caused the loss of the positive singularity of the defenders' great crowd, and from that moment they are always presented in a chaotic way, either charging against the enemy in disarray or fleeing in panic after finding that the Vikings were standing in a close formation ("in unum hostes conglobati occurrerunt"). Moreover, the narrator clearly states that the troops acted as if they had no leader and with no fixed order, which reinforces their plural characterization. Before the rumor spread, the defenders' army showed a coherent discourse that allowed them to negotiate an advantageous position in relation to the enemy. Once that unified discourse was broken, a space of chaotic plurality emerged, and the result was a defeat for the local defenders.

In other words, the discursive aptitudes of the combatants influenced on their characterization as positive singular figures or negative plural figures, since a coherent and unified discourse was a crucial element keep the positive singularity on their own side. As I

CEU eTD Collection

---

[51] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 705. "The following day, the enemy advanced with their fleet, and the first of them entered the Rhine. [...] Over the course of that night, all of our men were transported to the river. However, at dawn, a false report reached our men who were in the ships, namely that our mounted forces had fought a great battle with the enemy and had captured some of their ships. So, leaving nothing behind, the men in the ships acted with all possible speed. The air was filled with clamor and tumult. There was no leader and no fixed battle order. Everyone approached the enemy as if he wished to appear faster than his fellows. When they saw what was happening, the enemy gathered into a single force. When our men in the ships saw that the Northmen were advancing in a unified group, they abandoned their ships and turned in headlong flight.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 20-21.

will explain below, the keeping of the spatial and discursive singularity on their own side was the main attribution attached to the bishops when they got involved in war.

The Bishops and their Narrative Unification of the Battle-Space and the Battle-Discourse

The pattern of representing the combatants either in a positive singular way or in a negative plural way, as well as to shape the battle spatiality by describing singular or plural spaces of combat or flights, is strongly related to the narrative representation of the Lotharingian bishops when they were involved in war episodes. The relation is explained mainly by the fact that bishops, when described in battle, appear improving the positive singularity of their own forces. This enhancement occurs either in the actions and the spaces that the bishops shape with their troops, or in the unification of their own soldiers' discourse during battles.

For example, and after obtaining the triumph, the Vikings attacked the episcopal city of Utrecht, which was led by Bishop Ansfrid (995–1010) by that time. The story starts with the description of the people of Utrecht who, after realizing that the Vikings were coming, decided to burn the port to stop them from using it to besiege the place. Then, the invaders tried to convince the defenders to allow them to enter the city, claiming that they did not want to loot the place but to praise the church with offerings. But the defenders stood firmly and refused the offer, afterwards the Vikings left:

> "Traiectenses de adventu barbarorum cerciores facti, ne hostibus commodi aut usui ad obsidionem castelli foet, portum omnen ipsi incenderunt. Portu exusto, conquesti sunt barbari, cur tantum incommodum esset admissum, se nullum malum adversus locum moliri, praesertim cum Ansfridus tantae sanctitatis vir eidem praeesset episcopus. Religionis tamen causa ut in castellum intromitterentur, orabant; ecclesias oblationibus suis venerari se velle, dicebant. Quibus oppidani, assumpto vultu et constantia, respondent, se aditum armatis praebere non posse."[52]

---

[52] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 705. "The people of Utrecht, when they were certain that the barbarians were coming, burned their entire port so that it would not be of any value to the enemy and could not be used to besiege the fortress. After the port had been burned, the barbarians complained that they had been badly treated and stated that they planned no evil against this place, especially since Ansfrid, the very holy man, was their bishop. They

It is possible to see in this passage how the defenders, namely the people of Utrecht ("Traiectenses"), solved the first narrative complication of the incoming invasion thanks to their quick and well-organized action of burning the port. Then, they solved the second complication of the Vikings asking permission to enter the city thanks to their unified discursive rejection. Therefore, and especially concerning their discursive aptitude, the people of Utrecht present some traits of positive singularity, as can be seen in the fact that the narrator describes their rejection to the Vikings demands as a singular firm stance ("assumpto vultu et constantia"). To the description of this strong and unified discursive position, it follows the retreat of the invaders who, as Alpert mentions, considered that the city would resist their attack mainly because of the good fortune of its bishop:

> "Et quamvis facillima expugnatio esset, tamen cognoscentes, sanctum locum et tantum sacerdotem suis fortunis alias obsistere posse, nullam laesionem civitati inferentes abierunt."[53]

This passage reveals that Bishop Ansfrid was present in the city during the attack and that his presence is the main narrative explanation for the victory over the invaders.[54] Ansfrid's presence on the battle was, in fact, the narrative factor that unified the people of Utrecht both

---

begged to be permitted to enter the fortress in order to show their piety. They said that they wished to venerate the churches with their offerings. But the defenders, taking a firm stance, responded that they could not permit armed men to enter.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21.

[53] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 705. "So, although the battle had been very easy, the enemy realized that this holy place, and particularly its priest, would be able to resist outsiders through the strength of his own fortune. So they departed, inflicting no damage to the city.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21.

[54] Regarding the presence of the bishop in the battle, Rolf Grosse considers that his participation was minimal and that it was intentionally concealed by Alpert. This goes in coincidence with the representation Alpert's representation of Bishop Ansfrid as an exemplary prelate who never, from the time he assumed the ecclesiastical office, wielded weapons again. See Grosse, "L'eveque," 207-2015. From my perspective, the presence of the bishop is clear, and Alpert states that clearly in later passages, as I will show below. Concerning the concealed way of representing Bishop Ansfrid, in the battle, Stephanie Haarlander already noted that biographers had the costume to avoid including directly bishops into battles scenes while writing their *vitae*. Therefore, the position of the bishop "covered behind" the people of Utrecht, but actually being there into battle and, thus, acting narratively to win it, fits with the argument of Haarlander. About bishops representation while fighting in *vitae*, see Stephanie Haarlander, *Vitae episcoporum. Eine Quellengattung zwischen Hagiographie und Historiographie, untersucht an Lebensbeschreibungen von Bischöfen des Regnum Teutonicum im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier*, (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2000), 365-374.

in action and in discourse, and because of that they solved the complications of the Viking invasion and obtained the victory. In contrast with the previous battle scene near the Lek River, where the spread of false rumors broke the discursive coherence of the local defenders and provoked their defeat, the defenders of the episcopal city relied on their bishop to convert them into a single force. Moreover, Bishops Adalbold's victory was definitive inside the story, since after the Vikings left the description of their invasion stops and never restarts.[55]

A comparable example regarding the shaping of a positive singular space of battle can be seen in Balderich of Florennes description of Archbishop Albero of Trier (1132-1152) besieging the castles of Arras and Nantersburg, *circa* 1137. This conflict appears in Balderich's *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi treverensis*[56], and started when two local nobles, the brothers John and Werner from Nantersburg, took by "treachery" Castle Arras from the archbishop while he was following the emperor Lothar III into his campaign onto Italy. After describing Albero's rage because of this treachery, Balderich explains how he gathered a great army

---

[55] Concerning the ascription of this definitive victory, Alpert of Metz ascribes it to the holy bishop Ansfrid in the last sentences of the scene. I will analyze those sentences on Chapter Two, as well as the same episode but from the perspective of identity-building and the discourses of victory.

[56] The main source that I will use to analyze the military involvement of the archbishops of Trier is the *Gesta Alberonis archiepiscopi treverensis*, written by Balderich of Florennes between the years 1152 and 1157. Balderich (d. *circa* 1162) born in Florennes, in the diocese of Liège, and traveled to Paris to receive formation as cleric. While he was still a scholar, he called the attention of Arhcbishop Albero of Trier (1132–1152), who decided to offer him the charge of master of the cathedral school. Once Albero died in the year 1152, Balderich started his only known work, namely the *Gesta Alberonis*, which was dedicated to the archbishop. The work is difficult to be defined into the medieval-literary-genres. Brian A. Pavlac, for example, defines it as a biography, although he notes that it has many similarities with the genre of episcopal deeds. Stephanie Haarlander, on the other hand, considers it as a hagiographical text, this is a *vita*. Principally, Balderich narrates on it the life of Albero, praising his figure to present him as an example of good behavior to the young scholars from Trier. When he needs to describe episodes previous to his arrival to Trier, he based his work on testimonies and on a previous hagiographical text about Albero by an anonymous author, the *Gesta Alberonis metrica*, which was integrated into the *Gesta treverorum*. In this sense, the *Gesta Alberonis* brings representations similar both to those of the historiographical narratives and of the *gesta*. The Latin edition that will be used here is Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis auctore Balderico*, Georg Waitz (ed.), MGH SS 8 Hannover, Hahn, 243-260. There is another edition: *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Latina*, Jacques P. Migne (ed.), 154, Paris, 1307c-1338b. I used the following English translation for this thesis: Brian A. Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop of the Twelfth Century: The Deeds of Albero of Trier, by Balderich* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008). There are also two German translations: Emil Zenz (ed.), "Von Erzbischof Gottfried (1124) bis zum Tode Alberos (1152)", in *Die Taten der Trierer / Gesta Treverorum 2* (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 1958) and Hatto Kallfelz, "Taten Erzbischof Alberos von Trier, verfaßt von Balderich", en *Lebensbeschreibungen einiger Bischöfe des 10.-12. Jahrhunderts. Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters. Freiherr vom Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe*, (Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973) 543-617.

formed by contingents from Toul, Metz and Trier, and recovered his castle while also attacked and destroyed the perfidious brothers' Nantersburg:

> "Colligens quoque omnes Tullensis et Metensis terrae principes, cum magna militia Treverim pervenit, et utrumque castrum, Arraz scilicet et Nantersburch, simul obsidione cinxit, et Nantersburch destructo atque Arraz recuperate, cum triumpho magno Treveris reversus est."[57]

In this passage Balderich uses the image of the military contingents to create a space of positive singularity that allows the archbishop not only to recover Arras but also to destroy Nantersburg. The positive singular space is shaped by the great army gathered by Albero, which Balderich calls *magna militia*, emphasizing its singularity even if it was formed by troops from three different regions. The positive meaning of this singular figure is given by the phrase "simul obsidione cinxit", in which the adverb *simul* denotes a simultaneity not only of time but also of space in the action of besieging. Therefore, the great force unified by the archbishop was the crucial factor to enlarge the space of war and to allow him to attack both castles and to solve the problem of the treacherous brothers from Nantersburg.

The characterization of Albero's forces as a singular figure appears repeated in other passages of the *Gesta Alberonis*, for example when he arrives to the city of Trier after being elected as archbishop in the year 1131. In this case, the local burgrave opposed Albero's election and conspired against him.[58] The archbishop, however, discovered the threaten and gathered a great army described by Balderich as a *multo milite,* this means characterized as a singular figure. This great army –and hence this singular figure– was powerful enough to

---

[57] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 252. "Assembling all the princes of the land of Toul and Metz, he came to Trier with a great army and simultaneously besieged both castles, namely Arras and Nantersburg. And having destroyed Nantersburg and regained Arras, he returned to Trier in great triumph.". Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop,* 54.

[58] The local burgrave, namely the military commander of the city forces, was a *ministerial* called Ludwig de Ponte. The *ministeriales* were unfree servants of the German and Lotharingian bishops who usually fulfilled military duties, although occasionally they occupied offices like the one of burgrave of the episcopal city. As Benjamin Arnold noted, the *ministeriales* had their own ambitions and acted often against their episcopal lords. As a general introduction concerning their figure, see Benjamin Arnold, *German Knighthood, 1050 – 1300*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985) 53-75. For their use by the German and Lotharingian bishops, see Timothy Reuter (ed.), *Warriors and Churchmen*, 86.

freight his plural enemies (the burgrave and "sui coniurati") and make them cancel the conspiracy.[59] Again, the positive singularity shaped by bishops actions during war works by defeating the negative plurality of their enemies.[60] In relation to this event, Balderich directly attached the creation of this great force to Archbishop Albero and, due to this action, praises his figure by describing him as an invincible man ("vir inexpugnabilis").[61]

The Narrative Function of Bishops' Battle Discourses as Explanation of Victories

The discursive ability of the Lotharingian bishops does not only include the unification of the discourse of their own troops, which as I showed above enhanced their positive singularity and helped them to deal with the narrative complications of the battle, but also the possibility to create a narrative complication to their enemies. In other words, and narratively speaking, the bishops could use their discourse not only to defend themselves but also to attack their enemies.

A clear example of this appears in the *Gesta Alberonis*, when the texts describes a conflict that took place in the year 1148 between the Archbishop Albero of Trier and Count Palatine of the Rhine, Hermann von Stahleck (1142–1156), concerning the possession of the castle Treis, in 1148. While the prelate was besieging the fortress, the count palatine came with a reinforcement army and both forces were deployed to fight.

> "[…] castrum predictum obsedit. Palatinus autem collectis omnibus viribus suis ad liberandum castrum venit : ad introitum silvae, quae castro adiacet, castra metatus est. Archiepiscopus vero ex opposita parte, acie instructa equitum peditumque, […]"[62]

---

[59] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 250.

[60] The enemies of Albero are often described as plural figures. For example, in a later episode in which the count of Luxembourg and Namur attacked the city of Trier by surprise, his troops are described as a plural force of 1500 knights ("mille quingentis militibus"). Ibidem, 253. The result of this scene is a partial triumph for the defenders, since the count Frederick of Vianden convinced the count of Luxembourg to do not attack the city. Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 59. However, the victory was not definitive, and the war continued until Albero defeated the Count in a pitched battle, as I will show below. Therefore, the only one who could defeat the count of Luxembourg and obtain a definitive victory that finishes the war scene was Archbishop Albero.

[61] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 250.

[62] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 255-256. "[…] Albero besieged castle Treis. The Count Palatine, however, gathering all his troops, came to liberate the castle; and he pitched a camp the entrance to the woods where the

28

Here it is possible to see again the contrast between the singularity in the prelate's contingent, described as an ordered single line ("acie instructa"), and the plurality of the count's forces, described as "viribus suis". Then, both armies await at their positions for three days. In the meantime, the narrator describes the military practices made by the troops of Albero. From this moment the narrative starts adjusting the focalization, first to the archiepiscopal troops. Then, when the battle was close to start the narrative adjusted the focalization extremely close to the figure of the archbishop, at the point where the space of war presented to the narratees is delimited by his figure and the soldiers which whom he interacts.[63] This extreme focalization is followed by the quoting of the archbishop's speech before battle:

> "Tunc videres senem illum, iam toto defectum corpore, acies peditum ordinare, equites militare arte disponere, notos ex nomine singillatin apellare, […] Tunc exhortatoriam orationem, tenens crucem archiepiscopalem in manibus, cepit ad armatas acies tali modo facere: O vos amici beati Petri! O sanctae defensores ecclesiae! [...] nunc veniat vobis in mentem beatus Petrus, cuius milites hodie existitis; credatis eum cum magna sanctorum caterva invisibilibus clipeis hodie vos protegere; certi estote de victoria. Respicite hoc signum crucis, hoc, inquam, signum terribile, adversariis Ihesu Crhisti. Hec est crux, in qua Herimannus comes palatii mihi iuravit fidelitatem, […] Ipse vero palatinus tenens, manum super hanc sanctam imaginem iuratus est michi in hace verba: "Hunc Dominum, hunc pro nobis crucifixum, do vobis, domine arhiepiscope, fideiussorem, et iuro vobis per eius virtutem, quod nunquam aliquid contra vos faciam, […]"[64]

castle lay. On the opposite side, the archbishop drew a battle line of soldiers on horse and foot […]" Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 66.

[63] An example for this is the very detailed portrayal of the military exercises that the archbishop's knights undertake before the battle, in which Balderich not only describes how they practice changing their formation during a charge, but also explains the traditional tactic of feigned flight. In addition, the narrative use of the rhythm of time supports this detailed and focalized scene, since the narrator mentions, right before the detailed description, that the battle line formed by the prelate waited for the count's advance for three days. In other words, as three days pass in the story, the narrative time moves slowly to help the narratees to concentrate on the detailed scene. Concerning this augmented and very detailed description, and as Brian A. Pavlac notes, this close perspective could be an attempt to show that the author was an eye-witness of the event. This is not at all impossible, since by this time (1148) Balderich was already in Trier, working as the master of the cathedral school. Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 1-3.

[64] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 256. The scene and the speech are, in fact, longer. But because the lack of space I decided to quote only specific passages which are useful to my point. "Then you would have seen old Albero himself, although enfeebled in body, personally draw up the battle line of foot soldiers and position his horsemen with military art. Those he knew he addressed one by one by name, […] Then, holding the archiepiscopal cross in his hands, he began to make an exhortatory oration to the ranks of his soldiers in such a manner: "Oh you friends of the blessed Peter! Oh defenders of the Holy Church, […] Now may the blessed Peter come to you in spirit, for you are his knights today. Believe that he with a great heavenly hosts protects you today by their invisible shields. Be certain of victory. Behold this sign of the cross, this sign, I say, terrible for the adversaries of Jesus Christ. This is the cross upon which Hermann, Count Palatine, swore fidelity to me […] Inded, the same Count Palatine, holding his hand upon this holy image, swore to me with these words: 'I give to you, lord archbishop,

To reinforce the focalization on this event, which was currently in progress, the fragment starts with the narrator calling the attention of the narrates using the word *videres*. After calling the narratees' attention, the narrator merges the embedded focalization —quoting the speech of the archbishop from a very close proximity— with embedding the narration in the figure of Albero too.[65] In other words, in this scene the prelate is not only the focus of the perspective, but he also becomes the narrator of a secondary story.

This occurs because Albero does not only describe the event in front of the cross but also quotes his own version of the phrase that the count palatine told to him during the oath. Hermann, the archbishop says, swore in front of the archiepiscopal cross that he would never attack the prelate, therefore the fact that he was there with his army, opposing Albero, converts him into a traitor. Because the count's treason constitutes the main explanation of why both armies ended fighting on that day, I consider Albero's story as an *analepsis*, a rhetorical-literary tool used to describe events of the past of the main story, with the objective to explain how the situation progressed to that point.[66] In this case, the *analepsis* works bringing from the past the discursive and moral justification which supports the Albero's blame of the wrong behavior of the count, namely the treason. Finally, after the speech, the archbishop offered a general confession to all his men, forgiving their sins and notoriously inspiring them:

> "Tunc cum accepisset omnium communem confessionem, indulgentia facta et absolutione, benedictionem super eos faciem, ita omnes animavit, quod nec in uno signum timiditatis apparuit."[67]

---

this Lord, He who was crucified for us, as my guarantor, and I swear to you by His virtue that I shall never do anything against you […]". Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 67.

[65] Regarding the tool of embedded narrative, see De Jong, *Narratology*, 34-37.

[66] About the concept of *analepsys* as a rhetorical tool, see Ibidem, 78-86.

[67] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 256. "Then when he had accepted the public confession of everyone and granted forgiveness and absolution by making a blessing upon them, he so inspired them all that no sign of fearfulness appeared in anyone." Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 68.

This passage is closely related to the *analepsis*, because if the count broke a promise made to an archbishop and in front of the archiepiscopal cross, this also transforms him into a traitor to the Church. Therefore, this justifies also the transformation of Albero's soldiers into defenders of the Holy Church ("sanctae defensores ecclesiae") and works as a narrative support of the strong effect that the general confession had on motivating his army.[68]

To the explanation of past events evoked by the main character, it follows a change on the focalization, which is embedded in the enemy. The narrator describes, then, that after realizing that Albero's soldiers were so motivated by the speech, the count palatine Hermann decided that he could not win that battle and asked for peace.[69] In this sense, the complexity of this passage is explained because the archiepiscopal discourse generates a narrative complication in the battle-story that the enemy cannot resolve, namely the extremely motivated archiepiscopal soldiers. Therefore, the speech, the remembrance of a broken oath and the general confession offered to the archiepiscopal soldiers, are the elements which win the battle in the narrative.[70]

Time and Movement Within and Across the Spaces of War

Apart from improving the positive singularity of their troops, enhance the unity of their discourse and generate narrative battle-complications through their discourse (which the enemies cannot resolve), the Lothairngian bishops were also able to move quick and softly

---

[68] The transformation also reinforces the positive singularity of the ecclesiastical contingent, since from that moment they would be protected by the shields of a great heavenly host of St. Peter ("magna sanctorum caterva"). Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 256

[69] Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 68.

[70] Concerning this scene of Albero making a general confession to his soldiers and calling them as "knights of St Peter", David S. Bachrach argues that it shows how far the discourse of Crusade and Just War spread around Western Christendom by the mid-twelfth century. This spreading, Bachrach says, resulted useful for the episcopal lords, since it boosted their spiritual abilities during battles. For this analysis, see David S. Bachrach, *Religion and the Conduct of War*, 151-189. Despite if the Crusade discourse gave more or less abilities to Albero during battle, what it is evident is that the new discourse indeed gave new narrative meanings and rhetorical tools to Balderich, which he used to potentiate the discursive abilities of his invincible bishop.

31

within and across the spaces of war. In the first case, they moved to obtain the victory within the space. In the second case, they moved –without any problem, hence my characterization of this movement as "softly"– from an adverse space of war to a quiet space of peace.

Surprising the Enemy: Bishops' Movement Within the Spaces of War

It is possible to see in different passages a pattern of describing bishops' movements within war spaces as a quick displacement to surprise the enemy and obtain the victory. For example, it happens when Alpert of Metz describes the combat between a local noble, called Godizo, and Bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht. The conflict started when Godizo and his men captured some horses from the ecclesiastical lord, while he was returning from a meeting with Emperor Henry II (r. 1014-1024) at Mainz. The attack took place *circa* 1017, close to the Rhine River and near Aspel castle, where Godizo had his power base.[71] After underlining the anger of the bishop because of this unexpected attack, the narrator describes the counter-attack on Godizo's Aspel castle:

> "Qua de re episcopus necessario commotus, et his iniuriis quam citius mederi cupiens, omnibus suis copiis Baldrico adscitis, de improviso veniens, Aspolam ex una parte obsedit."[72]

The description of the counter-attack as launched by surprise ("de improviso veniens") suggests that the narrator intended to hasten the narrative time. In other words, the alteration of the rhythm—literary device works in this passage to underline the quick and effective reaction of the clerical leader.[73] Furthermore, it works together with an augmented description

---

[71] The attack was motivated by local political struggles, mainly the fight between two counts who enjoyed—in different moments—the support of the bishops of Utrecht. These counts were Balderich of Drenthe and Wichmann of Vreden. As the narrator clearly suggests, Godizo was a supporter of the latter, while at that moment the bishop was an ally of the former. For the explanation of the conflict see Bachrach, *Warfare*, 39.

[72] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 711. "Inevitably, the bishop was disturbed by this action. Wishing to avenge this injury immediately, Adalbold joined his forces with those of Balderich and, coming by surprise, organized a siege of Aspel that focused on one side.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 39.

[73] About the concept of rhythm, see De Jong, *Narratology*, 92-93.

of the siege, mentioning that it was focused on one side of the castle ("ex una parte obsedit") to show to the reader that the quick movement fulfilled its objective to besiege the fortress. Thus, it shows that the surprise move was not just an attempt, but a military action with narrative consequences on the story of the combat.

Another example appears when Balderich describes the long war between Archbishop Albero of Trier and Count Henry IV of Luxembourg and Namur. About this episode, he narrates how the prelate made a forced march during the whole night to surprise his enemy and make him flee:

> "[…] tota nocte properavit cum milicia sua, ut inproviso hosti superveniens, inopinato terrore concusso suas vires ostenderet. Comes vero per exploratores eius presentiens adventum archiepiscopi, in fugam conversus, [...]".[74]

Afterwards, the narrator describes how the fleeing count and his exhausted troops searched for refuge, provisions and rest both on the village of Wittlich and on the abbey of Himmerod, but they could not find anything there. Moreover, Balderich emphasizes that the enemies were tired and hungry by quoting a message that Count Henry sent to Albero asking him for mercy, as well as explaining the penuries that they suffered in the last days while running away.[75] Yet, the archbishop attacked them and made the count flight while killed many of his men. Importantly, even if the archbishop's troops were also pursuing them without resting, there is no mention about their tiredness, giving the impression that they marched, fought and won without any problem.

---

[74] Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis*, 254. "[...] he [the archibishop] abandoned the siege and hastened with his army through an entire night so that he might make a show of his strength by attacking the enemy unprepared and striking with an unexpected terror." Pavlac, *A Warrior Bishop*, 60.

[75] Balderich places his focus not only on the tiredness but also in the lack of provisions of count's forces. He describes how Henry "wished to pause and break bread, for he was famished, but it was announced that the army of the archbishop was already almost upon him.". In one fragment of the message in which he asks for peace, the count says: "For two days I have had nothing to eat, and on the third I was not even allowed to take a little bread.". Ibidem.

The same laity lord of Luxembourg suffered another defeat at the hands of a bishop, when in the year 1153 Bishop Henry of Liège (1145–1164) destroyed his army in a surprise attack at Andenne.[76] Concerning this episode, which appears briefly described in Renier of St. Laurent's *Triumphale Bullonicum*[77], the narrator explains how the bishop decided to separate from his army, with a small number of mounted troops, to attack the count in his camp at Andenne:

> "Ad postremum decernere bello comes non est veritus, equitumque collecta peditumque manu Andetennam accessit, villam penes Mosam fluvium sitam. Contra quem processit episcopus, licet equitum minore numero. […] Leodienses enim Hoiensesque cives dum classe precessissent, metuens episcopus, ne adversariorum illos equitatus incursaret, sequi non distulit. Ea preventus necessitate equestres aggregare copias mirus occurrerat. Sed procul dubio Christus martyrem suum hoc etiam destinarat triumpho glorificare."[78]

The specificity of this war scene is not the quick march made by the bishop, neither the attempt of a surprise attack with a small number of mounted warriors, which is justified in the weakness of the foot combatants of Liège against the many cavalrymen that Count Henry had.[79] What makes this description different is the fact that the divine intervention of the relics of St.

---

[76] The defeat at Andenne abruptly ended the territorial ambitions of the count of Luxembourg and Namur in the region of Liège, as Claude Gaier noted. For the description of this episode, see Claude Gaier, *Grandes batailles de l'histoire liégeoise au Moyen Age* (Liège: Wahle, 1980) 48-54. Gaier also analyzed the battle of Andenne from a perspective focused on the role of the relics of St. Lambert in the battle, see Claude Gaier, "Le rôle militaire des reliques et de l'étendard de saint Lambert dans la principauté de Liège," in *Le Moyen Age* 72 (1966), 235-249.

[77] The first source of Liège analyzed here is a historiographical work, *Triumphale Bullonicum* by Renier of St. Laurent (d. 1188). Renier was a Benedictine monk born in Liège and formed in the local abbey of St. Laurent. He was a prolific author who wrote many different works from hagiographies, exegeses, and even some polemical works in relation to the dispute within Liège because of the Investiture Controversy. In other words, Renier was a very well-educated monk (like Alpert, he had a strong classical formation) who actively participated in the religious, social and cultural life of Liège in the twelfth century. The main objective of *Triumphale Bullonicum*, written between the years 1153 and 1182, was to contextualize, describe and justify the conquest of Bouillon castle in the year 1141 by the bishop of Liège. The work is based on a previous text, called *Triumphus Sancti Lamberti de Castro Bullonio* by an anonymous author, as well as on witnesses' testimonies. Concerning the description of war, its most important characteristic is that it associates the military triumphs of the bishops to the divine intervention of the relics of St. Lambert, the protector-saint of the Church of Liège, whose rests were translated into the battlefield to help the combatants. Because a matter of space, I will analyze a brief passage about the second episode described, the Battle of Andenne in the year 1153, to comprehend the links established between the bishops and the sacred power of the relics during war episodes. The Latin edition used here is Renierus, *Triumphale Bullonicum*, W. Arndt, MGH SS. 20, (Hannover: Hahn, 1868), 583-592. There is another Latin edition, see Jacques P. Migne (ed.), 204, 96-116.

[78] Renierus, *Triumphale*, 592.

[79] This disadvantage of the foot-based Liège militia compared with the Luxembourger knights is remarked by Claude Gaier. See Claude Gaier, *Grandes batailles,* 48-54.

Lambert assured the effectiveness of the ambush attempt, as the narrator states in the passage "Sed procul dubio Christus martyrem suum hoc etiam destinarat triumpho glorificare.".

Moreover, this brief sentence is placed after the decision of the bishop to move but before the description of the forces clashing, which from my perspective, when related to the determined and secure meaning of the verb *destino*, reinforces the idea of a pre-determined divine triumph concealed behind the fast movement of the bishop.[80] In fact, the narrator reinforces this perspective when in the last sentence, after the triumph, he associates it with a miracle: "Efferimur ergo ecclesiae glorioso successu, neque dubitamus accidisse quasi miraculum a Deo."[81]

Wining from the Defeats: The Soft Movement of Bishop Adalbold of Utrecht from the Space of War to the Space of Peace

Concerning the movement of the Lothatingian bishops across the space of war, there is a clear example in *De diversitate temporum* of how Bishop Adalbold of Utrecht moved, in a very quick and un-problematic way, from a hostile space of war to a calm space of peace. The military event is the same mentioned above concerning the siege of Aspel castle, *circa* 1017, which the ecclesiastical lord besieges after a quick movement.

Once the siege started, the narrator presents –from his external point of view– a detailed description of the fortress and its surroundings. It can be seen here how the narrator explains – from a distant and reflexive position– that the strength of the place and its tall towers are the reason why the bishop's men were not able to conquer the castle:

---

[80] Concerning the ambushes, it is well-known that the tactics of deception, ambushes and surprise attacks were common among the medieval military leaders, and that they were useful. See an entire work dedicated to the topic on surprise and deception in medieval warfare, David Whetham, *Just Wars and Moral Victories. Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages*, (Leiden: Brill, 2009). However, what makes the prelates' surprise attacks different is how the narrators established a contrast between the figure of the bishops and their rivals, since the fast movements of the former are surrounded by positive moral and religious characterizations which their enemies lack.

[81] Renierus, *Triumphale*, 592.

"Nam ex altera palude et stagno interiecto inaccessibilis erat. Cumque aliquot diebus acriter ab utrisque pugnaretur, et omnia studio obpugnandi experirentur, propter firmitatem loci et altitudinem turrium nihil proficere poterant. Set cum frustra laborem se sumere videret, et spes pociundi opidi a se discederet, simul etiam quia dicebatur, hostes cum exercitu adventasse, obpugnatione destiterunt, et in suas sedes se receperunt."[82]

The importance of this description is also supported by the fact that the embedded focalization appears only once, when Adalbold's men realized that they would not be able to take the castle. Furthermore, they discovered that a defenders' reinforcement army was on their way to break the siege. Therefore, the bishop withdrew with his army. This is the narrative complication brought by the embedded focalization. However, since in this case the army was under the leadership of a bishop, the complication of the failed siege and the forced flee is solved in a more organized way. Here, instead of describing a chaotic rout, or I will add, instead of creating a negative space of plurality, the narrator simply says that Adalbold's men withdrew from the combat and returned home ("obpugnatione destiterunt, et in suas sedes se receperunt").

One thing that emerges here clearly is that the retreat took place in an orderly manner, since no adjectives of quickness or associations with a general flee appear. Moreover, the narrator clearly states that the men returned home, without mentioning a counter attack or being pursued by the enemy. Therefore, by using the same narrative strategy of describing the actions of the combatants to shape the war space, the narrator breaks this space when he describes how they safely reached their home, that is, a space of peace. At this point, he also extends the time of the narrative, summarizing in one sentence the period between the time of the siege and the time of the combatant's arrival home, which is another clear instance of accelerating the rhythm.

---

[82] Alpertus, *De diversitate*, 711. "The other side was inaccessible due to a swamp and bog that stood in the way. However, after several days of bitter fighting by both parties, during which they tried every means of attack, Adalbold's men were not able to achieve anything because of the strength of the place and the height of its towers. As they realized that they had taken up this task in vain, it also was reported that the enemy was approaching with an army. So, Adalbold's men withdrew from the fight and returned home.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 39.

If the narrative eschews using adjectives to describe the quickness of the retreat, it is because it is demonstrating that the withdrawal of the episcopal troops was a soft and quiet movement, through which the episcopal forces changed a space of war for a space of peace. In addition, the capacity of the bishop's army to move softly between both spaces is confirmed in the last paragraph of the scene, when the narrator explains why the bishop decided to retreat from the war. After giving the reasons, he underlines the good finale that the withdrawal had for him:

> "Episcopus vero his de causis, quod ante obsidionen Castelli Godizo ad se in petenda pace legatos miserat, et de iniuriis a suis sibi inlatis omnibus rationibus satisfacturum promiserat, quamvis illum dolo loqui suspicaretur, et ideo nullam conditionem pacis dare voluisset, et suum dolorem iam satis expiatum esse population agrorum et vicorum, et hostes iam ad sanitatem reverti arbitraretur, ab hac procella seditionis se subtraxit, et quem exitum res esset habitura, interim quietus expectare coepit."[83]

Concerning this passage, it can be noted first that the bishop appears as the subject –in nominative case ("Episcopus")– of a very long sentence in the active voice, in which the narrator gives the reasons why the prelate decided to abandon the fight. Therefore, it can be seen how all the morphological aspects works together to give him the authority and the power of decision to withdraw. Moreover, David S. Bachrach pointed-out that this sentence is a periodic one, constructed in a Ciceronian style, whereby the subject and the predicate ("se subtraxit") are very far apart.[84] It is not a coincidence that Alpert decided to imitate the style of Cicero's art of rhetoric in a sentence in which he describes soft movement between two contexts or spaces. This choice of a high style here works as a legitimation tool for a very

CEU eTD Collection

---

[83] Alpertus, D*e Diversitate*, 711. "The bishop then withdrew from this storm of sedition for the following reasons: Even before the siege of the stronghold, Godizo had sent messages to Adalbold to seek peace and had promised to make good all of the damages that the bishop had suffered at the hadns of Godizo's men. The bishop suspected that Godizo's offer was a ruse and, for this reason, did not wish to grant him terms of peace. Nevertheless, Adalbold's own suffering had now been sufficiently expiated by the people of the fields and settlements, and he judged that his enemies had returned to sanity. So the matter came to an end, and the bishop began to look forward to quiet.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, p. 40.
[84] Ibidem., p. 40. Concerning the importance of emulate or imitate classic authors to increase own prestige, see D. A. Russell, "De imitatione," in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literatur*e, David West and Tony Woodman (eds.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

difficult passage in which the author tries to present a failed attempt to conquer a castle as a victory of the bishop. The break of the space and time of war by a quiet movement and a safe arrival home is crowned by this sentence supported by the authority of Cicero.

In addition, the embedded focalization brings again a complication from the perspective of the bishop, namely the suspicious peace-offer from Godizo. The prelate, the narrator says, thought that the offer was a subterfuge and decided to reject it. Furthermore, he considered that he himself acquired enough booty from the ravaging of the fields near the castle, hence the debt of the stolen horses was compensated. Therefore, in this case the narrative complication is immediately solved when Adalbold decided to abandon the siege without facing the reinforcements and the risk of a defeat.

Furthermore, the narrator mentions that the prelate considered that his enemies were appeased, which contributes to present the failed siege of the stronghold as if it was a military victory. Going beyond its brevity and simplicity, the passages concerning the siege of Aspel castle presents a very deep and complex use of different narrative tools to present to the audience the idea of a bishop who could not be defeated by a failed siege.

When a Bishop Loses: The Battle of Vlaardingen and the Concealment of a Failed Episcopal Military Command

The Shared Command of the Imperial Army at Vlaardingen

Finally, I will analyze the most important military episode in Lower Lotharingia of the first half of the eleventh century, the Battle of Vlaardingen (1018). As I will show, in this battle scene all the rhetorical elements mentioned above work to conceal the leading role of the bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht, who was one of the commanders of the imperial army which was defeated at the hands of Frisians rebels.

Alpert of Metz describes this episode in the Book Two of *De diversitate temporum*. He starts the narrative time of the war by describing Emperor Henry II summoning Bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht and Duke Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia (1012-1023) and ordering them to march against Count Dirk III of Holland (993-1039). This count, a former leader of the Frisians, was taking advantage of his coastal fort in Vlaardingen, where he was extorting illegal tolls from the merchants. Therefore, the emperor asked the two lords to defeat Count Dirk and to secure the commercial routes. On July 1018, the army embarked at Tiel and sailed to the west, following the Waal/Merwede River to Vlaardingen.[85]

> "Imperator vias mercatorum patefieri volens, Adelbaldum episcopum et ducem Godefridum ad se vocans, mandat, ut Frisios adeant, eosque ab his sedibus quas iniuste occuparant propellant et praedones submoveant. His mandatis acceptis, immensam multitudinem cogunt, clarissimos quoque viros et adprime in re militari instructos, […] Cumque in unum convenissent, omnen exercitum in navibus collocant, […]".[86]

In this introductory passage and in subsequent sentences, the narrator describes the marching forces by using plural pronouns and verbs, since the army was composed of combatants of both the duke and the bishop. In this sense, he does not only mention the Bishop Adalbold and the Duke Godfrey receiving the order from the emperor, but also states clearly that they both mobilized (*cogunt*) the *immensam multitudinem*. In a latter sentence, it appears the phrase *in navibus collocant*, to indicate that both leaders participated in the embarkment of the troops. Hence, these passages present a war scene in which the responsibility to gather an army to punish the Frisians, as well as the commandment of that army, were assigned both to the bishop and to the duke.

---

[85] For a detailed description of this tragic battle for the imperial authority, which includes both its causes and consequences, as well as a description of the counts of Holland and their county at the beginning of the eleventh century, see Kees Nieuwenhuijsen (ed.), *De Slag bij Vlaardingen 1018. Strijd om het Graafschap Holland* (Utrecht: Uitgeverij Omniboek, 2018).

[86] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 719. "The emperor wished to open up the routes used by the merchants and so he summoned Bishop Adalbold and Duke Godfrey into his presence and ordered them to march against the Frisians, remove them from the lands that they had occupied unjustly, and drive off the pirates. After they had received the emperor's orders, they mobilized an immense force. They gathered the most honorable men, who were particularly well versed in military affairs. […] When they had all gathered into a single force, they loaded the entire army onto ships […]". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 68.

Concealing the Bishop, exposing the Duke: The Narrative Attribution of a Military Defeat

Once the imperial troops arrive to the destiny and the time of battle start, the description changes. On the one hand, the duke becomes the active subject in the sentence and the perspective starts being centered on him. On the other hand, the references to the figure of the bishop stop altogether. This emerges clearly when the narrator describes the landing of the troops and how the duke decides to divide the army:

> "In cuis litus cum exponerentur milites, dux ceteram omnem multitudinem egredi iussit, paucis relictis qui naves in altum reducerent, ne iterum commutato aestu in arido consisterent, ut si quid opus esset eis libere uti potuissent."[87]

This passage starts with a sentence written in the passive voice. This sentence, which mentions that the soldiers were deployed (*exponerentur*) along the coast, does not define clearly the agent of the action. Thus, it works as a transitional structure, which starts the change from the narrative description of a shared military command to a single one. The transition is completed in the next sentence, which is written in the active voice and with the figure of the duke in nominative (*dux*), where he fulfils the function of subject. This places the onus of all the initiative on him as well as the responsibility of the order to move the greater part of the troops, as it is clearly stated in the verb *iussit*.

With the use of these grammatical changes the narrator shifts from the time of war to the time of battle, while starts shaping the combat-space. But, more importantly, he removes any trace of the bishop's participation in the imminent disaster. From that moment, and until the end of the scene, the narrator will describe only the actions of the duke, the imperial

---

[87] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 719. "The soldiers were set down along the shore here. The Duke ordered the greater part of the force to move out. He left behind a small number of men who sailed the ships back out to sea so that they would not be stuck on land if the wind changed again. Thus, if there were another task for them to carry out, they would be free to act.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 68.

soldiers, or the Frisians, and the narration will embed its focalization only on them. No mention

of the bishop and his perspective of the battle would be made.

The Disaster of Vlaardingen

When the narrator describes the defeat of the imperial forces, the problems concerning the

discursive aptitude of the attacking army emerges as the main explanations of the disaster. The

first narrative complication consists on the fact that the Frisians had built ditches to hamper the

enemy's maneuvers. [88] The description of the ditches appears when the focalization is

embedded in the duke, who perceive the problem and considers that crossing that field with an

entire army would be difficult. Because of this problem, he decides to reorganize his forces in

a defensive stance:

> "Quas cum duci videretur difficile cum multitudine transeundas, iussit, ut qui signa
> ferebant redirent, et circutatis fossis in locis planis consisterent, ut si Frisii dimicare
> vellent, eos excipiendi expeditor facultas esset."[89]

The duke's attempt to reorganize the soldiers is chained in the narrative with a second

complication, related to the discursive problems of the imperial army. This complication is an

infiltrated Frisian who, from the midst of the less experienced imperial army, shouted that the

duke's maneuver was in fact a retreat, and that the vanguard was under attack. This starts a

wave of rout in the whole army, which in turn becomes the main narrative explanation for the

significant defeat of the imperial forces at Vlaardingen:

> "Et cum exercitus ducis signa referre coepissent, ortus est inter novissimos eorum clamor
> a quodam scelestissimo, propinquo praedonum, dicens, ut quisque vitae suae consuleret,
> ducem in prima acie impetu Frisiorum pressum fuga praelio cessisse. Hac falsa fama per

---

[88] "One thing was of great value to them; namely, that they had pierced the entire open area with ditches, both to
protect against major storms from the sea, which generally were even stronger during full moon, and to impede
the progress of the enemy.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 69.
[89] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 719. "When it seemed to the duke that it would be difficult to cross this area with a
large force, he ordered that the men bearing the banners turn back and halt in a flat space that was surrounded by
a ditch. Then if the Frisians wished to fight he would have a better ability to receive them.". Bachrach, *Warfare*,
69.

exercitum perlata, omnes in fugam versi sunt, et tanto timore sunt perterriti, ut nemine urguente in flumen se praecipitarent. Multi confisi viribus ad naves transnatare cupiebant. Quas cum prehendissent, et in eas summo studio ascendere conarentur, multitudine circumstipante naves dimersae sunt. Et eo modo plures perierunt, […]"[90]

Once the general flight starts, the narrator retakes its primary-external position and expresses a bird-view perspective to describe the chaotic space of the rout. This space is shaped by the negative and plural figure of the imperial soldiers, who are described in the unorganized and muddled plural form normally used in the sources analyzed here. In this sense, they appear either running away without any kind of organization or throwing themselves into the river and getting sunk while trying to reach their ships.[91] Furthermore, the negative plurality does not only characterize the regular soldiers of the imperial army but also the duke's personal guard. For example, the narrator describes how they were astonished and paralyzed when the Frisians troops attacked them. The only explanation that the narrator suggests about this coward behavior is that it was a result of a divine judgement.[92]

---

[90] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 719. "But when the banners of the duke's army began to withdraw, a most evil man, a kinsman of the pirates, shouted loudly in the midst of the least experienced men in the army, saying that each man should take care for his own life. The duke, he claimed, had withdrawn in flight from the battle after being pressed by the attack of the Frisians against the first rank. As this false rumor flew through the army, the men all turned in flight and were struck by such fear that they hurled themselves into the river, even though there really was no pressure. Many of the men, confident in their abilities, wished to swim to the ships. When, however, they reached the ships and tried with all of their will to board them, the ships were sunk by the multitude that was crowding around on all sides. In this way many died, […]". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 69-70.

[91] The narrator emphasizes this negative plurality of the fleeing soldiers also by making use of his external position to give further information of which the combatants could not have been aware. An example of this appears when he mentions that the soldiers hurled themselves into the river because they feared an attack that was not occurring ("ut nemine urguente in flumen se praecipitarent"). The key-point concerning this description is to portrait them in a ridiculous way, like soldiers who did not know what was really happening in the battlefield. Thus, giving extra information is connected to the need to present the general flight more as a mistake, as subterfuge or as the consequence of a wrong decision, than as the result of a combat proper.

[92] "The duke, seeing the flight of this great multitude, stood stupefied along with his men. The bravest of them, whose hearts were like those of lions, were so undone by fear that they could not move from the spot on which they were standing. And so it happened, by I do not know what divine judgement, almost like an unheard of miracle from God, that the Frisians came running, having been summoned by the signals of the men in the stronghold, and killed the duke's men where they stood as if immovable rocks.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 70. The Frisians, even if they won, are also represented in a negative plural form, since the narrator criticizes the aggressive, chaotic and non-human treatment that they gave to the bodies of dead imperial soldiers: "In the meantime, the pirates suddenly burst forth from the stronghold. They were filled whit joy at this victory and rode around all the corpses of the dead. […], they rushed out of the dead, and, forgetful of their humanity, they tore the clothing from all the bodies. They did not even leave a patch of cloth to cover their private parts.". Ibidem, 71. The critic to the Frisians has also the function to diminish their narrative figure and to do not praise their military triumph, since the narrator focus more on the defeat of the duke than on the victory of the count of Holland.

The duke and the bishop as generals:

Finally, in a short passage Alpert describes the individual behavior of Duke Godfrey during the battle. His figure is represented positively, since he works as a static center of order that not only remains in his place without any movement, but also continues to fight and resist:

> "Alii namque, dum ducem solum stare conspicerent, circumsistunt; set ille, consumpto spiritu, fortiter restitit, et missa pila excipit, unum tantum a tergo se inpetentem aversa hasta traicit. Quo exanimato, reliquorum impetum paululum repressit."[93]

It is clear in this passage that the narrative represents the duke as a brave warrior. Nevertheless, this positive singularity is not shared with his troops, because, as I explained in this chapter, the narrative ability to enhance the positive singularity of the combatants belonged to the bishops. Therefore, of all the combatants of his army, the duke was the only one who kept fighting. Moreover, the narrative shows also that he was unable to control the spread of false rumors in his army, which were the main explanation for the defeat, a problem that does not occur when the bishops are leading armies.

As I presented, the narrative of the Battle of Vlaardingen intentionally hides any trace of Bishop Adalbold participation in the scene just by placing the focus on the duke and stop mentioning the prelate. Once this was done, the narrative conditions were given to describe the spread of disrupting rumors and the general rout of the imperial army. However, when the battle ends, the Frisians take the duke as prisoner and the narrator describes how they asked him to intervene on their behalf in front of the emperor and the bishop:

---

[93] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 719-720. "Others, when they saw the duke was standing alone, surrounded him. But he resisted bravely despite the fact that his spirit was overwhelmed. He grabbed up a spear that had been cast at him. Then, turning it about, he stabbed a man who was attempting to attack him from the rear. In this manner the duke was able to keep the other attackers at bay for some time.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 70.

43

"[…], pedibusque eius provolvuntur, eique se dedunt, obsecrant, ut rebus suis consulat et apud imperatorem et episcopum Adelbaldum pro eis de negotio confecto interveniat."[94]

This brief scene shows clearly that, when the narrative speaks about how to finish a war and to obtain peace, the figure of the bishop appears. This can be related to the episode of the siege of Aspel castle, in which the bishop was represented as having the narrative ability to move from a space of war to a space of peace without being disturbed. Even if the defeated imperial army was composed by episcopal forces, Bishop Adalbold still appears as one of the important actors of a peace negotiation. In fact, he is not the *medium* of that negotiation, like it happens in the case of the duke because he was a prisoner, but one of the main objectives of the Frisian attempt to conciliate the parts, together with the emperor. The bishop, hence, was not narratively defeated, since the concealment of his military command in Vlaardingen allows him to victoriously appear again in a scene in which the Frisians asked for a negotiation of peace.

This chapter analyzed the problem of the narrative representation of combatants and the space in which they fought. As I pointed-out, there exists a general pattern in the way in which the narrative sources examined here reconverted military events into battle and war scenes. When comparing different Lotharingian episcopal narratives and their description of military episodes, one pattern which appears often reproduced in the sources consists on the representation of the combatants either as singular or plural figures, who also form spaces of singularity and plurality. The most important characteristic of these spaces is that they are

---

[94] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 720. "They then threw themselves down at his feet, offered themselves up to him, and begged him to think about their concerns and intervene on their behalf with the emperor and Bishop Adalbold about the business that had just taken place.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 71.

44

morally characterized as positives or negatives, and that this contrast also defines the discursive aspect of the combatants.

In this sense, the Lotharingian sources analyzed here tried to organize the chaos and the disorganization of real combat events by creating a moral space of war. Therefore, the pattern of singularity and plurality expresses more the narrators' own perceptions and expectations of the behavior and potentialities of combatants than an attempt to recreate the "real" military events, as the traditional military historiography that I mentioned in the introduction attempted.

Finally, when comparing all the examples, one can note that before the combat starts, the bishops are always on the right side of war. This mean that it does not matter if they are on attack or on defense, because they always would be defending themselves or the people from their dioceses, either from Vikings, from local counts, or even from important lords like the Count Palatine of the Rhine. From the perspective of this chapter, this explains why the bishops are always on the positive side of the moral-battle-spatiality, which is expressed in the idea of the positive singularity. Furthermore, because of this advantageous position in the narratives, on the correct side of the moral battlefields and close to the positive singularity, the bishops always win. In this relation rests the narrative kernel of the invincible bishops.

Chapter 2: An Armed Defense of the Past

In the previous chapter I analyzed how the bishops were represented in war and explained why they were narratively invincible. In this chapter I will analyze how that military invincibility strengthens the process of shaping a local episcopal identity through the discourse of the past.

Since, as pointed-out in the introduction, the narrative description of military events is important as a reinforcement of self-awareness in historical discourses, this chapter will analyze the way in which the description of past military episodes contributed to shaping the episcopal identities. As a general pattern for this second section, I will pay special attention to the role that the bishops played as successful defenders of those episcopal identities, a success that is mainly explained by their narrative attributes in war, which I described in the previous chapter.

The analysis is divided in three sections. First, I will introduce my perspective for the analysis of process of identification, mostly based on the theoretical framework elaborated by scholars from the Vienna school. Second, I will present some examples in which the episcopal identity of the three bishoprics can be observed. Lastly, I will analyze how the recreation of military events contributed to the shaping of those local identities, as well as how the bishops played the role of protectors, especially in the past.

A Brief Introduction to the Episcopal Identities

Identities, Strategies of Identification and the "Grammar of Identity"

The theoretical framework that I choose for the analysis of the episcopal identities in relation to war events is the one elaborated by scholars of the so-called Vienna school. Certainly, the main identity that they discuss is an ethnic one, that is analyzed in the form of a political discourse of ethnicity, which does not appear in the sources examined here. However, their

perspective, based on the study of diverse strategies of identification instead of searching for natural and stable identities, can be applied also for the analysis of other group identities like the political or religious ones, as is the case of the idea of belonging to a specific bishopric.[95]

The main statement elaborated by the Vienna school, of which Walter Pohl is the major representative, builds on the idea that ethnicity existed in the Early Middle Ages as a form of identification both of groups and individuals, but that it was expressed mostly as political discourse in specific contexts. He argues that, theoretically speaking, identities do not exist as natural categories in the minds of individuals but are the result of diverse processes of identification, which include the identification of individuals with a group, the identification of a group itself and the recognition of that group as such by outsiders.[96]

These strategies of identification are the ones that shape and continue nourishing group identities, not only the ethnic one but also others like belonging to Christianity or to diverse post-Roman regional identities. When analyzing the discursive facet of the strategies of identification, and especially concerning the narratives about identity, Pohl focuses on the concept of the "grammar of identity". This concept takes from the notion of "grammar" the idea of analyzing the way in which the meanings of a given language are set during the wording by different structures, either of words, of sentences or of entire texts. Once the notion of 'grammar' is merged with the one of "identity", the result is a concept which refers to the understanding of the rules and structures of the identity-discourses (instead of languages)

---

[95] For an introduction to the perspective of the school of Vienna about ethnic identity and ethnicity as a political discourse and a strategy of identification, which emerged mainly in the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, see Walter Pohl, "Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West: Introduction," in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Post-Roman transitions: Christian and Barbarian identities in the early medieval West* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013), 1-46. About the belonging to a specific bishopric as a form of political and religious identity, see Walter Pohl, "Introduction: Strategies of Identification. A Methodological Profile," in Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (eds.), *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2013), 21-22. There are other perspectives concerning the shaping of identities, also related with the topic of ethnic identity. See for example Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*, (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969).
[96] Walter Pohl, "Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West: Introduction," 4-6. As the notion of ethnicity as a political discourse in the Early Middle Ages, see page 17.

which contribute to giving meaning to their statements (instead of wordings) and make them understandable in a social group. The concept also describes the required knowledge to comprehend those rules and structures and to debate about them.[97]

As can be seen, the approach to the topic of identity-building elaborated by the Vienna school can be applied also to the analysis of written sources, since it allows to comprehend not only the different ways in which narrations can shape identities but also the etymological and grammatical structures –as well as the cultural contexts– which support their statements.

Therefore, and as I will show in the second section of this chapter, it is possible to search for different strategies of episcopal-identification appearing both in the bishopric deeds and in the episcopal historiographical narratives, which expresses identities of the bishopric communities as such, as well as of individuals belonging to them and of outsiders describing them. These strategies are supported by the specific meanings of the words and the phrases which the written discourses of episcopal identity use. The perspective of the "grammar of identity" will be useful to search for those meanings which rest on the cultural and historical background of the authors and are shaped not only their own identity but also by its projection onto the diocesan past.

Episcopal Identities in Liège, Utrecht and Trier

Once the specific theoretical approach for this chapter is determined, it is time to discuss the general matters concerning episcopal identities, as well as to present some expressions from

---

[97] The use that scholars from the Vienna school gives to this notion is mostly related with the structure and the meaning of specific words. For example, some words and terms which refer to group-identity could remain unmodified in different periods, as it occurs with the Latin word *gentes*, but the meaning that individuals and groups give to them might have changed, as well as the grammatical function that this word fulfills in different sentences during a given period. The comprehension of those changing meanings is precisely one of the objectives of the "grammar of identity". About the notion of "grammar of identity", see Walter Pohl, "Introduction: Strategies of Identification. A Methodological Profile," 31-32. Pohl also bases his development of the notion of "grammar of identity" in previous studies, although with slightly differences. As an example, that I will retake below and concerning the grammar of identity in relation to the "otherness", see Gerd Baumann and Andre Gingrich (eds.), *Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach* (New York: Bergham Books, 2004).

the dioceses chosen for discussion. In his famous article "A Europe of Bishops", Timothy Reuter described how the burial ceremonies of medieval bishops could assemble representatives from all the layers of the society. Those enormous crews, Reuter stated, demonstrated that the bishops were considered as the leading figures of one type of "imaginary communities", namely the bishoprics, which were based more on the web of personal relationships of the bishops than on a clear dominion over the episcopal territory. In other words, the bishops ruled more over the people of the diocese than over the land.[98]

Consequently, the fact that the episcopal power was more personal and exercised over people, reinforced the ties between the bishops and their flock. First, one of the clearest expressions of the bishops as leaders of the "imaginary communities" was their role as protectors of their dioceses, which mean that they should protect not only the properties of the episcopacies but also their people. In the case of the bishops of Liège, for example, Jeffrey Webb showed how the Reform movement reinforced the role of the bishops as protectors, at the point in which their function of keepers of order appeared assimilated to those of the German kings, at least within their diocese.[99]

Another example related to the notion of the bishops of Liège as keepers of order can be seen in the fact that they counted with a strong army during the High Middle Ages, of which a major part was composed by the urban militia of the episcopal city. Regarding the identity ties that this army built, Claude Gaier described the strong feeling of identification that its soldiers had with the diocese.[100] It is true that this binding was expressed, on first place, to the

---

[98] Reuter states that the notion of ruling more over the people than over a territory was common all around Western-Europe in the year 1000. In this sense, the bishoprics were not the exception, although other facets of the episcopal power differentiated them from other laity lords, like their representation as defenders of the episcopal cities, from the Early Middle Ages. About the figure of bishops as defenders of the episcopal cities, see Geneviève Bührer-Thierry, "Bishops as City Defenders in Early Medieval Gaul and Germany," in Radoslaw Kotecki, Jacek Maciejewsk and John S. Ott (eds.), *Between Sword and Prayer* 24-45.

[99] Jeffrey R. Webb, "Representations of the Warrior-bishop", 128.

[100] For example, the identity ties were expressed in the banners, the signs, and even in slightly distinctive clothes for the men on the highest ranks. See Claude Gaier, "Art et organisation militaires dans la principauté de Liège et dans le comté de Looz au Moyen Âge. 135-136", (Brussels: Academie royale de Belgique, 1968).

city and its hinterland. However, the urban militia of Liège fought many battles, in defense of Liège and its bishops, which occurred beyond those "urban" borders, like in the example of the surprise attack at Andenne that I analyzed in the previous chapter.[101] The fact that the defensive role of the episcopal urban militia included the movement over a territory which exceed that of the city (and its hinterland), but at the same time scarcely overpassed the diffuse borders of the diocese (since, for example, there are no registries of those urban troops following the emperors into their campaigns to Italy), shows that they fought for an identity bigger than the urban one (which could be the city of Liège) but at the same time smaller than a regional one (which could be a Lotharingian identity). Therefore, it might be argued that the episcopal militia of Liège fought for an identity closely associated with the entity of the diocese.

Second, this example of the urban episcopal militia of Liège reinforce the notion that, when compared with other laity lords around the year 1000, the episcopal power had a strong territorial basement on the episcopal city. In this sense, the bishops not only protected the city but also improved them, either building walls and churches, like in the case of the bishop Notger within the city of Liège, or monasteries in the surroundings, as the bishop Ansfrid did in Utrecht.[102]

Concerning the bishops of Utrecht, their attachment to the city was specially reinforced when the Viking invasions started in the ninth century. For example, when the Vikings sacked the city in the year 857, they expelled the bishop from there and for more than twentieth years the very existence of the diocese was threatened. However, different episcopal authorities continue insisting to come back to Utrecht. In other words, instead of re-creating the bishop anywhere they continued attempting to return to the city and re-built the bishopric from there,

---

[101] Even if that surprise attack was made by the mounted troops, the written sources makes clear that, before the quick movement, the urban militia was marching together with the knights.

[102] About Bishop Notger of Liège as reformer of the city, see Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger de Liège (972-1008)*, 65-80. Concerning the Cistercian monastery built by Bishop Ansfrid of Utrecht in a near hill called Hohorst, see *Bachrach*, 26-27. Also Grosse, *Das Bistum Utrecht*, 198-201.

which they did during the last decades of the ninth century.[103] Then, the close identity link that attached the bishops to their episcopal city appears clearly.

In other cases, the bishops appear in the written sources defending their episcopal city not physically but as representatives of a previous urban identity. For example, in the *Gesta Alberonis* Balderich claims that, thanks to the many good actions of the archbishop Albero, the city of Trier recovered its prestige as the "second Rome".[104] This comparison was an old tradition, mostly based on the important role that the old Roman city, called *Augusta treverorum*, had during the Later Roman Empire as one of its capitals. The tradition, however, was reinforced in the tenth century after the city was definitely integrated, together with the Duchy of Lotharingia, into the sphere of influence of the German kings.[105] It is important to mention also that the moment in which Balderich attempts to reinforce –again– the old tradition is not aleatory, since it happened after the archbishopric of Trier obtained, from the Pope, the Primacy over the German Church.[106]

In relation with this process of local identification, one can observe that during the eleventh century, which is the main period of the Reform Movement, the bishoprics started to appear associated in the written sources with the idea of *patriae* or Fatherland. Regarding this change, both Reuter and Webb relate it with the more demanding expectations that the reformers had about the bishops' role as keepers of their flock, which exceeded their previous role as leaders of the episcopal city.

In this sense, the meaning of the Latin word *patriae*, in relation to the bishoprics, was transformed and adapted to encompass the changing attributes of the bishops, who from the

---

[103] Vliet van Kaj, "Traiecti muros eu!", 139-152.
[104] Pavlac, *A warrior Bishop*, 78
[105] This occurred because, once Trier was integrated into the dominion of the eastern Frankish kings, it became the oldest Roman city of its new political entity.
[106] Pavlac, *A warrior Bishop*, 78

eleventh century were expected to rule in a more direct way and over a wider territory.[107] The bishops, also, supported this change by acting as leading figures of those episcopal identities. This is the process that I will analyze in the second section of this chapter. I will do that from the perspective of the written reconstruction of military events and their influence on the shaping of episcopal identity.

The Bishops as Defenders of the Continuity of the Episcopal Identity

The Siege and Destruction of Chèvremont Castle by Bishop Notger of Liège

The notion of an episcopal identity which was projected onto the past and defended by a bishop, appears clearly in a brief passage of Anselm's *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodensium*[108] in which the author describes the attack on the fortress of Chèvremont in the year 987. This episode was of considerable importance for the bishopric of Liège, since from that fortress, situated near to the episcopal city, many local lords instigated rebellions against German kings, rebellions which also ravaged the territory of the diocese. In this sense, the

---

[107] Jeffrey Webb notes that this change can be appreciated in the work, for example, of Anselm of Liège. Jeffrey R. Webb, "Representations of the Warrior-bishop", 115.

[108] The *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodensium* is an episcopal deeds type of text which was mostly written by a canonic of the cathedral of Liege, named Anselm, between the years 1052 and 1056. His work is, in fact, a continuation of the previous *Gesta episcoporum* written by the monk Heribert of Lobbes in the last decades of the tenth century. The continuation of Anselm had the main objective of praise the figure of the bishop Wazo of Liege (1042-1048), who was a contemporary of the author. This fact explains that the longer and most original part of the text, which was entirely written by Anselm, is dedicated this episcopal authority. In this source, most military events are narrowly reproduced, with the partial exception of the actions of Bishop Wazo. This is explained by the particularities of the *gesta*, since these kinds of texts describe the numerous events from longer periods which need to be aligned into the local episcopal history. Therefore, the authors could not use the same space than the authors of specific historiographical narratives. The Latin edition used here is Anselmus, *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium*, Rolf Koepke (ed.), MGH SS. 7, (Hannover: Hahn,1846), 189-234. A brief entry about Anselm's work can be seen in Jean-Louis Kupper, "Remarques sur la chronique d'Anselme de Liège, " in Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire, 59 (1981), 1053.

castle played not only the role of a political and military center of revolts against the imperial power, but it also constituted a local menace for Liège.[109]

This menace can be partially explained because at the time the castle was destroyed the leading prelate was Bishop Notger of Liège (972 – 1008), a figure of notorious political importance and an ally of the German rulers.[110] Concerning the figure of Notger, scholars agree that he was a paradigmatic example of an "Imperial Bishop", namely a prelate who was close to the imperial power and who tried to organize the Lotharingian Church under the influence of German kings.[111] In fact, the closeness of Notger with the imperial power is considered the main factor which explains that the many rebellions that emerged in the fortress ravaged also the territory of Liège.

However, and despite the importance of Notger, the first record of the siege and destruction of Chèvremont does not mention him. This source, a letter by Gerbert of Aurillac of the year 987 (the year of the episode) only describes Empress Teophane leading an army that besieged and conquered the castle.[112] From the perspective of the analysis of the process of identity-building in the diocese of Liège, it is important that the only contemporary source about the siege does not mention the figure of Notger. This importance is explained because, given this omission, Notger's first appearance in on Chèvremont episode –which is also the historical creation of his participation in the event– appears in the text written by Anselm of

---

[109] For a general description of the conflict, see Claude Gaier, *Grandes batailles de l'histoire liégeoise au Moyen Age* (Liège: Wahle, 1980), 15-25. For a more detailed description of the sources and the role of Notger, which includes the mention of Chèvremont Castle as an important factor for imperial politics in Lotharingia, see Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger de Liège (972-1008),* 39-47.

[110] Notger, who was bishop of Liège between the years 972 and 1008, was one of the most important political and religious figures of Lower Lotharingia in his time. As a bishop, he did not only concentrate his effort on the improvement of his diocese, but also defended the political interest of the German kings, with whom he had a close relation, both in Lotharingia and in their Italian campaigns. For this reason, he is considered as a clear example and a paradigm of an "Imperial Bishop." About Notger of Liège, see Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger de Liège (972-1008),* and Godefroid Kurth, *Notger de Liège et la civilisation au Xe siècle* (Paris: Alphonse Picard & Fils, 1905). As a general overview of his figure, as well as of the social, political and cultural context in the region at the beginning of the eleventh century, see Alexis Winkin and Jean Luis Kupper (eds.), *Évêque et prince.*

[111] Regarding the debate about Bishop Notger as an Imperial Bishop or not, see Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger,* 133-143.

[112] Ibidem, 42.

Liège more than fifty years later. In other words, the historical fact of Notger's destruction of the fortress is mentioned first in a *Gesta episcoporum* which had as its main objective to create a sacred history of the diocese, as well as to relate the contemporary episcopal identity with that past.[113]

Anselm's description of the episode is neither extensive nor detailed. Nevertheless, he describes how the castle was full of dangerous men who ravaged the region, as well as how, after conquering the fortress, Notger destroyed it until only the ruins remained:

> "Multa auferens incommoda, plura huic nostrae aecclesiae contulit commoda, inter quae miseros Leodicenses liberare studuit a munitissimo et factiosis hominibus semper fecundo Montis Caprarum castello. Quod quam damnose vicinum fuerit ipse Leodio, haut longe hinc distantes fidelibus oculis subiectae attestari possunt eiusdem oppidi ruinae."[114]

The narrator is referring to Notger in this passage and uses the active voice to describe how the bishop did many good things for "this, our church," (*plura huic nostrae aecclesiae contulit commoda*), and among them he liberated the unfortunate people of Liège (*inter quae miseros Leodicenses liberare studuit*) from the dangers of Chèvremont fortress. Regarding these descriptions, it is first noted that the use to the active voice gives the figure of Notger the leading role in the attack on the castle since he is the subject who performs the action. Not only is this sentence the starting point of the historical narrative which situates Notger in the place of battle but does so by giving him the role of protector of the diocese.

Furthermore, not only does the description of Notger's action place him at the front of the combat but it also shows how aggressive the conflict was and how difficult the action of

---

[113] The description of Anselm was the beginning of this historical tradition, but the description of Bishop Notger in the siege was enlarged by latter chronicles, like Gilles d'Orval in his own continuation of the deeds called *Gesta episcoporum Leodensium*, which was written in the thirteenth century. Ibidem, 45-46, as well one vita from Bishop Notger also from the twelfth century. Because of a matter of space, I will not work with those sources.

[114] Anselmus, *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium*, 203 "By separating many uncomfortable things, he brought many comfortable things to this, our church. Among them he dedicated himself to free the unhappy people of Liège from Chèvremont castle most heavily fortified and always full of seditious men." (My translation). This passage was also partially translated into French by Jean-Louis Kupper. See Jean Luis Kupper, *Notger,* 42. I based my own translation on his work, although because a matter of time I only translated the first part of the passage.

besieging the castle was. This is expressed by the use of the verb "dedicate himself" (*studuit*), which is not a verb that denotes a quick action, but one that demands time from the subject who performs it. Therefore, the narrative presents the siege as a difficult task that demanded a strong effort from the bishop, which is also connected to the first sentence in which the author mentions the many uncomfortable things matters issues (*Multa auferens incommode*) which Notger kept far from the Church in order to protect it.

Second, the episcopal community of Liège appears in relation to the event in the first sentences, especially in the phrases *nostrae aecclesiae* and *miseros Leodicenses*. The first phrase is crucial since it defines a figure of "us" in relation to the Church, which is also an identity shared by the narrator. Furthermore, the phrase *miseros Leodicenses* adds two extra meanings to that identity, namely the idea of having been suffering because of the problem with Chèvremont and the notion of belonging to Liège.

It appears evident that the meaning of the phrase *nostrae aecclesia* refers to the diocese of Liège. Yet, the meaning of the phrase does not end there. By analyzing the word *nostrae* from the perspective of the "grammar of identity", it is possible to note that it describes a shared identity between a narrator who wrote in the eleventh century in the environment of the cathedral of St. Lambert and who dedicated his work to the ruling prelate of Liège, Bishop Wazo (1041–1048) and the characters of his story, which are the miserable inhabitants of Liège, victims of the violence that emerged from Chèvremont before the year 987.

Therefore, the link between the narrative representation of the past identity of the inhabitants of the diocese and the contemporary identity of Anselm is clearly expressed in the text. In other words, the analysis of the word *nostrae*, based on the cultural background of the narrator, helps to rebuild the knowledge that supports the statement of an identity of Liège that not only existed at the moment the text was written, but was also projected onto the past since the same *aeclesiae* was under menace from Chèvremont before its destruction.

55

Concerning the strategies of identification in this passage, both the identity of the group as such, i.e. the people of Liège, and of the individuals as forming part of the group, namely Anselm and Notger, appear in the sentences. Regarding the group identity, it can be seen how the people of Liège suffered together with the devastation provoked by the seditious men of the castle (*factiosis hominibus*). However, after Notger intervened they attested together with their eyes and for a long period the remaining ruins of the fortress (*haut longe distantes fidelibus oculis subiectae attestari possunt eiusdem oppidi ruinae*). The adverb *longe* in this sentence defines a long-term condition, which is related to the ruins of the castle and to the liberation of the suffering people of Liège from the terror of the seditious bandits. This long-term condition of peace is what guaranteed the continuity of the episcopal identity from the time of Notger to the time of Anselm.

Despite its brevity, this passage about the siege and destruction of Chèvremont Castle gives room for a condensed use of strategies of identification. By associating individuals like Bishop Notger, or even himself, to the identity of the diocese of Liège, and by defining the group as opposed to the seditious and aggressive bandits of the fortress, the author contributes to the shaping of the episcopal identity. Furthermore, this identity, which is the major identification that appears in the text and whose construction was one of the objectives of Anselm's *Gesta episcoporum*, was also projected into a past full of dangers. Nevertheless, the identity remained, as well as the community or social group that it represented. The main character who defended this continuity was Bishop Notger of Liège, and his tool to fulfill the difficult task was his military ability to attack a well-defended fortress and demolish it to the extent that only the ruins remained.

The Viking attack on Utrecht and the Role of Bishop Ansfrid

Concerning the diocese of Utrecht, an example of its identity under menace and saved by a bishop in the past appears in *De diversitate temporum*, specifically in the already analyzed episode of the Viking attack on the city in the year 1007. However, in this section I will analyze the same event but from a perspective which focuses on searching different strategies of identification.

At the time of the attack on Utrecht, the leading prelate was Bishop Ansfrid (995–1010), whose figure Alpert venerates by dedicating an entire chapter to his history. In this sense, he remarks how Ansfrid left a previous secular career and, thanks to his righteousness and piety, had been chosen as bishop, a position that –the author remarks– he honored by never wielding a weapon again.[115] However, and even considering Ansfrid retirement from the military affairs, he plays an important role in the narrative reconstruction of the successful defense of the city.

As we have already seen, Alpert's war episode is longer, compared to the previous example of Liège, as well as more detailed. The main characters of the story are the people of Utrecht, who acted quickly and like one unified group to stop the Vikings. I will reproduce the first sentence again which describes how, after realizing that the Vikings were coming, the people of Utrecht decided to burn the port so as to stop them from using it to besiege the place. Then, the invaders tried to convince the defenders to allow them to enter the city, claiming that they did not want to loot the place but to praise the church and their bishop. But the defenders stood firmly and refused the offer, afterwards the Vikings left:

> "Traiectenses de adventu barbarorum cerciores facti, ne hostibus commodi aut usui ad obsidionem castelli foet, portum omnen ipsi incenderunt."[116]

---

[115] Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21-25.

[116] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 705. "The people of Utrecht, when they were certain that the barbarians were coming, burned their entire port so that it would not be of any value to the enemy and could not be used to besiege the fortress.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21.

In this passage, the strategy of identification shapes the identity of the group from outside since Alpert, who was born in Tiel, does not describe himself as forming part of the community of the episcopal city.[117] Therefore, there are no expressions of an "us" appearing clearly in this combat scene, since the main characters whose identity was threatened by the Vikings were the people of Utrecht ("Traiectenses"), a social group to which Alpert did not belong. When compared with the example of Liège, in which Anselm –who was born in the diocese– identified himself as part of the local Church, the description of Alpert shows another strategy to shape a bishopric identity, in this case from outside, and which consisted in binding it to the episcopal city.

In this sense, the narrative description of a military episode in which the episcopal city was attacked constitutes a way to reinforce the binding of the bishopric identity to the urban place. This can be seen in the fact that the author gives a further characterization of Utrecht by describing it as a holy place ("sanctum locum").

> "Et quamvis facillima expugnatio esset, tamen cognoscentes, sanctum locum et tantum sacerdotem suis fortunis alias obsistere posse, nullam laesionem civitati inferentes abierunt."[118]

Moreover, the description of the sanctity of the city has a narrative function in the story, since it emerges not as a perception of the narrator but of the Viking invaders, once the narrative embeds the focalization in the Vikings' perspective. In this sense, the portrayal of the city as a holy place is one of the complications –together with the bishop– that the embedded focalization brings to the invaders, because the narrator states clearly that once they realized that that sacred place would be able to resist their attack, they decided to leave ("tamen

---

[117] This outsider position in relation with Utrecht is confirmed by the fact that, when Alpert describes the Viking invasion on Tiel, he characterizes the local defenders as "our men", attaching himself to that city. Bachrach, *Warfare*, 20

[118] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 705. "So, although the battle had been very easy, the enemy realized that this holy place, and particularly its priest, would be able to resist outsiders through the strength of his own fortune. So they departed, inflicting no damage to the city.". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21

58

cognoscentes, sanctum locum et tantum sacerdotem suis fortunis alias obsistere posse, nullam laesionem civitati inferentes abierunt").

The fact that Alpert gives a narrative function to the holiness of the city in a military episode makes the local episcopal identity more consistent. This consistence is reinforced by the opposition that he establishes between the people of Utrecht and the invaders, characterized as "barbarians" ("barbarorum" – and in the entire passage, presented in Chapter One, it also appears the word "barbari"). Concerning this point, I consider important to remark the pejorative meaning of the word *barbarus*.

While trying to understand the "grammar of identity" behind the use of that word, the classical formation that Alpert obtained at the monastery of St. Simphorian at Metz offers an explanation. As David S. Bachrach points out, the many references that Alpert made to classical authors like Cicero or the use of words like *clientela* to refer to someone's supporters, show the importance that classical works had in his education.[119] Since during the Classical Antiquity the most extended use of the word *barbarus* was to define an otherness in an inferior position to a self-identity, the characterization of the Vikings as barbarians in this episode appears to work in the same way, exalting the superiority of the inhabitants of Utrecht. The description of the enemies during a military episode, hence, constituted a good opportunity for the author of the narrative to praise the local episcopal identity.

Finally, the positive local identity is applied not only to the place, but it is extended to its leading figure, Bishop Ansfrid, against whom the invaders planned no evil since they described him as a very holy man ("tantae sanctatis vir"). Furthermore, the bishop ("sacerdotem") is described together with the sacred city, as another reason which explains why the Vikings considered that the place could not be conquered. In this sense, and to

---

[119] About the classicizing tendency in Alpert's work, see Bachrach, *Warfare*, xxviii–xxxv. For the use of the word *clientela*, see page 58.

reinforce the important role that Bishop Ansfrid plays in the episode, the narrator ascribes the victory to his holy figure in the final sentence of the battle-scene:

> "Quis hoc meritis sancti episcopi non adscribat, oppidanos contra spem metu liberatos, et periculum evasisse, et locum illum inviolatum permansisse?"[120]

Alpert expresses clearly that, due to the positive influence of the holy bishop ("sancti episcopi"), the defenders acted bravely and resisted the invaders. This valiant behavior is expressed not only in their quick movement to burn the port, but also in the clear and unified discursive rejection of the Vikings' petition to enter the city, which can be related to the above-mentioned narrative characteristic of bishops to unify the discourses of their armies during battles.[121] This explanation is followed by the affirmation, written more than ten years later (when Alpert wrote his work), that the city ("locum") remained inviolate ("inviolatum permansisse") thanks to that military victory. The choice of the verb *permaneo* expresses, like the use of the adverb *longe* in the example of Liège, a long-term condition. Consequently, the narrative does not only describe an episode of military victory but also its consequences, namely the continuity of the local episcopal identity. This military triumph, described by an outsider and attached to a specific sacred place, was guaranteed by the successful military presence of the leading figure of the community, namely Bishop Ansfrid.

The objective of this chapter was to establish a link between the narrative invincibility of the Lotharingian bishops, described in the Chapter One, and the process of identity-shaping of the Lotharingian bishoprics. This link was established, I stated, through a narrative discourse about military events of the past.

---

[120] Alpertus, *De Diversitate*, 705. "Who does not ascribe this to the merits of the holy bishop? Who does not believe that, against hope, the defenders were freed from fear, and that they escaped from danger, and that this place remained inviolate because of him?". Bachrach, *Warfare*, 21.

After analyzing the written sources, it is possible to note that the connection appears clearly when referred to examples of war scenes in the past. As I showed both in the episodes of the siege of Chèvremont and the Viking attack on Utrecht, the authors expressed all the types of strategies of identification proposed by the scholars of the Vienna school, namely as an individual inside a group, as a group as such and as an outsider characterizing a group. In this sense, the narration of episodes of war appears to be, for the Lotharingian authors of the historiographical narratives and the *gesta*, an important strategy in terms of shaping identities. Moreover, the key-point concerning the shaping of identities in relation to the past consists, precisely, on the projection of those identities onto the past. Because of this, it was necessary to show a continuity of the identity that would be projected onto the past through the narrative reconstruction of war episodes. Here is where the invincible bishops appear, as they appeared in Utrecht and in Chèvremont. Their narrative function was precisely to use their invincibility to protect the continuity of the episcopal identity that the authors projected onto the past.

Conclusion

When I stated in the introduction that the invincibility of the Lotharingian bishops was a narrative feature and not an historical fact, I was suggesting two simultaneous ideas. First, that the way in which the written sources analyzed here represent the prelates' military actions has more to do with a shared pattern of narrating warfare than with describing the tactics, the troops, the strategies, and everything else that the word "warfare" encompasses in the modern sense.

Concerning the ways of narrating warfare, thus, my first research question addressed the possibility that bishops are represented in the sources in a different way than secular lords in war. The analysis of the sources demonstrated that they were. The key concept undergirding this differentiation is the notion of victory, which was shown to be attached to secular lords and ecclesiastical leaders in different ways. More specifically, the distinct notion of victory in these texts was attributed only to bishops, since they were the only ones whose victories were used to end scenes of war in these narratives.

In other words, I demonstrated that even if the sources present some cases of secular lords "obtaining triumphs," as for example the local counts of Tiel and Drenthe obtaining a one-day victory against the Viking invaders, the individual "victory" of Duke Godfrey of Lower Lotharingia fighting alone and bravely against the Frisians, or that of Count Frederick of Vianden keeping his enemies from entering Trier, these victories, however, did not bring peace to the dioceses. To attain that peace, a bishop had to be involved in these episodes.

Second, this peculiarity of the notion of victory brought about the second research question, examining how the difference between bishops and other combatants and commanders are expressed in the texts. The notion of a true victory—one that ends the battle scene and is exclusively achieved by prelates—comprises part of the difference but does not complete it. As explained in the first chapter, one way to understand the variation in the

62

representation of the combatants is to analyze how the sources shape the spatiality of the battle, which, in turn, allows an insight into how the authors situated the episcopal figures within the combat spaces.

An important starting-point for the spatial analysis is the notion of a battle-space which is dynamic and shaped by the movement and the actions of the combatants. Building on this, the narratological analysis showed the authors' understanding of the battle space in terms of a dichotomy between a positive singularity and a negative plurality, as well as between unity and discord in the battle discourses. In addition, it was also emphasized that bishops were represented as creators of spaces of positive singularity during war, as well as boosters of the discursive unity of their own troops.

The narratological analysis also showed the important role that focalization plays in linking positive singularity with the explanation of victories. Notably, it was through the changing or the embedding of the focalization in specific combatants that the narrators presented complications in the battle-story, which later the combatants attempted to solve and, which, in the end, explains either the victories or the defeats. More specifically, I established that singularity in this case is positive because it is the only feature—both in terms of space (a close formation) and in terms of discourse (a clear communication within the army)—that can solve battle complications expressed by focalization.

Given the fact that the bishops appear as creators of positive singularity, therefore the bishops can always solve combat problems. This is the first explanation for episcopal invincibility in these battle narratives. The second explanation is related to the soft movement of the bishops within the spaces of war. These include descriptions of forced marches to surprise enemies which somehow do not cause the moral or the fatigue of the episcopal forces, as well as their ability to leave the spaces of war and enter into spaces of peace seamlessly, for

example, in the account of the failed siege attempt of Castle Aspel by Bishop Adalbold II of Utrecht.

The second issue concerning episcopal invincibility is related to the cultural and political background of the authors of the sources. To state it clearly, if the representation of eleventh- and twelfth-century Lotharingian warrior bishops is proven to have been shaped by narrative pattern shared by a range of various sources, then the intellectual, cultural, social and political context must also be examined to enlighten other facets of their descriptions of invincible bishops. The notion of contextualization includes both the context of the authors and of the episcopal authorities, since they work together in the creation of the narrative figure of the invincible bishops. This immediately inflates the subject, since such an inquiry encompasses the history of the Lotharingian bishops, and of the bishoprics and their entourage in general, during the Reform Movement and the Investiture Controversy.

There are a number of possibilities of further research in this field. Not only extending the number of sources and incorporating other regions, but also assuming a diachronic perspective, especially that there appears to be a link between the Reform Movement and the way of representing the bishops in defense, as well as between the Crusader discourse and new tools used by the chroniclers to better elaborate the narrative figure of warrior bishops. At this point, it is not yet possible to firmly suggest that this narrative method of creating episcopal authority in war was a product of the Reform Movement. The hypothesis that it disappeared after the Investiture Controversy also necessitates further research. Finally, an extended survey of sources must go beyond *vitae* and chronicles, and incorporate visual representations of bishops, too.

I formulated my third and last research question in order to be able to make meaningful inquiries in this vast topic: the question was what was the relationship between descriptions of warrior bishops and the process of identity-building on the bishoprics through a discourse of

64

the past in these texts. Merging recent scholarship concerning the identity through war events—about the importance of the narrative reconstruction of warfare for later political and cultural struggles of a given social group or political entity—with the Vienna school's methodology of identity analysis of strategies of identification, I assumed a hybrid approach to the analysis of episcopal written sources.

In this vein, the third research question was investigated by looking at how the authors projected contemporary episcopal identities onto the past through diverse strategies related to diverse events of war: from self-identification, as in the case of Anselm and the episcopal identity of Liège, to identification from outside, as with Alpert and the identity of the bishopric of Utrecht. Revisiting the first premise of the study, it was demonstrated that Lotharingian warrior bishops played an important role in that projection, due to the fact that their military invincibility was the main factor which assured the narrative continuity of identities even if they were threatened in the past. As expounded in the last chapter, the idea of the continuity of diocesan identity through military triumphs in the past supports, from a new perspective, Michel Sot's astute definition of the primary aim of the episcopal *gesta*, namely the creation of an episcopal community and its sacred history. In view of this, Lotharingian bishops do appear to have been the most suitable protectors of that sacred past because, after all, they were invincible.

Primary Bibliography

Anselmus, *Gesta episcoporum Tungrensium, Traiectensium et Leodiensium*, Rolf Koepke (ed.), MGH SS. 7, (Hannover: Hahn,1846), 189-234.

Alpert, Alpertus de diversitate temporum. Edited by Georg H. Pertz. MGH SS. 4, 1841, 700-723.

Balderico, *Gesta Alberonis auctore Balderico*, Georg Waitz (ed.), MGH SS 8 Hannover, Hahn, 243-260

David S. *Bachrach,* Warfare and Politics in Medieval Germany, ca. 1000: On the Variety of Our Times by Alpert of Metz, Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2012

Pavlac, A. *A Warrior Bishop of the Twelfth Century: The Deeds of Albero of Trier, by Balderich* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 2008)

Renierus, *Triumphale Bullonicum*, W. Arndt, MGH SS. 20, (Hannover: Hahn, 1868), 583-592

Secondary Bibliography

Anderson, B. (1991) (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Revised edition.* London: Verso.

Arnold, B. (1985). *German Knighthood, 1050 – 1300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Auer, L. (1971). "Der Kriegsdienst des Klerus unter den sächsischen Kaisern." In *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 79, 316-407.

Bachrach, D S. (2003). *Religion and the Conduct of War c. 300–1215.* New York: Boydell, 151-189.

Bachrach, D. (2011). "Military chaplains and the religion of war in Ottonian Germany, 919-1024." in *Religion, state and society* 39, 13-31.

Barth, F. (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries. The social organization of culture difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Baumann G, Gingrich, A (eds.) (2004). *Grammars of Identity/Alterity: A Structural Approach*. New York: Bergham Books.

Blumenthal, U. (1988). *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boltansky A, Lagadec L Mercieroo k. (2015). *La bataille : Du fait d'armes au combat idéologique (XIe-XIXe siècle)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Boshof E, (1972). *Das Erzstift Trier und seine Stellung zu Königtum und Papsttum im ausgehenden zehnten Jahrhundert. Der Pontifikat des Theoderich*. Cologne: Verlag

Boshof, E. (1978). "Köln, Mainz, Trier. Die Auseinandersetzung um die Spitzenstellung im deutschen Episkopat in ottonisch-salischer Zeit." in *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins* 49., 19-48.

Bührer-Thierry, G. (2011). "Bishops as City Defenders in Early Medieval Gaul and Germany." in Kotecki, R. Maciejewsk J, Ott, J. (eds.), *Between Sword and Prayer: Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective*. Leiden: Brill. 24-45.

Cantarella, G. (2006). "Il papato e la riforma ecclesiastica del secolo XI." in *Riforma o restaurazione? La cristianità nel passaggio dal primo al secondo millennio; persistenze e novità (Atti del XXVI Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 29-30 agosto 2004)*. Verona: Il Segno dei Gabrielli editori, 27-50.

Clark, E. (2004). History, Theory, Text. Historians and the Linguistic Turn. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Contamine, P. (1984) (1980). *War in the Middle Ages*, Michael Jones (tr.). Oxford: Blackwell

D'Acunto, N. (2006). La riforma ecclesiastica del secolo XI: rinnovamento o restaurazione?. *Riforma o restaurazione? La cristianità nel passaggio dal primo al secondo millennio; persistenze e novità. (Atti del XXVI Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 29-30 agosto 2004).* Verona: Il Segno dei Gabrielli editori, 13-26

De Jong, I. (2014). *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)

Drévillon, *H. (2007). Batailles. Scènes de guerre de la Table Ronde aux tranchées*.

De Certeau, M. (1996) (1990). *La invención de lo cotidiano. I artes de hacer*. Pescador, A. (tr.). Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana.

Duby, G. (1990) (1973). *The Legend of Bouvines: War, Religion, and Culture in the Middle Ages*. Catherine Tihany (tr.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fleckenstein, J. (1966). *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige. II. Teil, Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1966.

Gaier, C. (1966). "Le rôle militaire des reliques et de l'étendard de saint Lambert dans la principauté de Liège." in *Moven Age* 72, 235-249.

Gaier C. (1968). *Art et organisation militaires dans la principauté de Liège et dans le comté de Looz au Moyen Âge*. Brussels: Academie royale de Belgique.

Gaier, C. (1980). *Grandes batailles de l'histoire liégeoise au Moyen Age*. Liège: Wahle,

Ganshof, F. (1941). "L'Église en Belgique au Haut Moyen-Âge." in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 20, 719-742.

Grosse, R. (1987). *Das Bistum Utrecht und seine Bischöfe im 10. und frühen 11. Jahrhundert*. Cologne: Böhlau.

Grosse, R. (2013), "L'évêque d'Utrecht autour de l'an Mil : le modèle d'un prélat ottonien?." in *Notger et la Basse-Lotharingie aux alentours de l'an Mil*. Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège, 207-209.

Haarlander, S. (2000). *Vitae episcoporum. Eine Quellengattung zwischen Hagiographie und Historiographie, untersucht an Lebensbeschreibungen von Bischöfen des Regnum Teutonicum im Zeitalter der Ottonen und Salier*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann,

Heninger, L. (1999). "La nouvelle histoire-bataille." in *Espaces Temps*, 71-73, 35-46.

Jaeger, S. (1983). "The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century." in *Speculum* 58 291-325.

Keegan, J. (1978). *The face of Battle*, London: Cape.

Lechtermann, C. (2014). "Topography, Tide and the (Re-)Turn of the Hero: Battleground and Combat Movement in Wolfram's Willehalm." in *Spatial Practices: Medieval, Modern*, Göttingen: V&R unpress, 2014, 89-91.

Lynn, L. (2003). *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture from Ancient Greece to Modern America*, New York: Westview Press.

Mazel, F. (2015). Qu'est-ce qu'une bataille décisive ? Jugement de Dieu et légitimation dans les premiers récits de la bataille d'Hastings. *La bataille : Du fait d'armes au combat idéologique (XIe-XIXe siècle)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 15-30.

Kotecki R., Maciejewski, J. (2014). *Ecclesia et Violentia. Violence against the Church and Violence within the Church in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kotecki, R. Maciejewsk and Ott, J. (eds.), (2018). *Between Sword and Prayer: Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective.* Leiden: Brill.

Kotecki, R. (2018). "Lions and Lambs, Wolves and Pastors of the Flock: Portraying Military Activity of Bishops in Twelfth-Century Poland." in Kotecki, R, Maciejewsk, J and Ott

J. (eds.), *Between Sword and Prayer*, *Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective.* Leiden: Brill. 303-340.

Kupper J. (1981). *Liège et l'Église impériale aux XIe-XIIe siècles*. Liége: Presses universitaires de Liège, acceded 5-14-19 http://books.openedition.org/pulg/1442

Kupper J. (ed.) (2013). *Notger et la Basse-Lotharingie aux alentours de l'an Mil*. Liège: Presses Universitaires de Liège.

Kupper, J. (2015). *Notger de Liège (972-1008).* Brussels: Academie Royale de Belgique, 133-143

Lausberg, H. (1998) (1960). *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study*. Matthew T., Annemiek J., David E. (trans.), David E. Orton, R. Anderson D. (eds.), Leiden: Brill

Kempshall, M. (2011). *Rhetoric and the Writing of History, 400–1500*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Kaeuper, R (1999). *Chivalry and Violence in Medieval Europe*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaeuper, R. (2007). "Literature as Essential Evidence for Understanding Chivalry." In *Journal of Military Medieval History* 5, 1-15.

Körntgen L, Wassenhoven, D. (eds.). *Patterns of Episcopal Power. Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Kurth, G. (1905). *Notger de Liège et la civilisation au Xe siècle*. Paris: Alphonse Picard & Fils.

Lefebvre, H. 1991 (1905) *The Production of Space*, Nicholson D. (tr.). Oxford: Blackwell.

McLean. S. (2013). "Shadow Kingdom: Lotharingia and the Frankish World, c. 850-c. 1050." in *History Compass* 11/6, 443-457.

Nakashian, C. (2016). *Warrior Churchmen of Medieval England, 1000-1250.* Woodbridge: Bodywell,

Nieuwenhuijsen K. (ed.), (2018). *De Slag bij Vlaardingen 1018. Strijd om het Graafschap Holland*. Utrecht: Uitgeverij Omniboek.

Oman, C. (1885). *The Art of War in the Middle Ages: A.D. 378–1515*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ott, J. and Trumbore, A. (2016) (2007) (eds.). *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge.

Patzold, S. (2005). "L'épiscopat du haut Moyen Âge du point de vue de la médiévistique allemande." in *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 192, 341-358.

Parisse, M. (1984) "L'évêque d'Empire au XIe siècle. L'exemple lorrain," In *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 105-106, 99-104

Parisse, M. (1995). "La Lotharingie: naissance d'un espace politique." in *Lotharingia, eine europäische Kernlandschaft um das Jahr 1000 / Une région au centre de l'Europe autour de l'an Mil*, 31-48.

Parisse, M. (1999), "Lotharingia." in *New Cambridge Medieval History* 3, 310-327.

Pavlac. B. (1991). "Excommunication and Territorial Politics in High Medieval Trier." in *Church History* 60, 20-36.

Petersen, L. Rojas Gabriel, M. (2017). *Journal of Military Medieval History*, 15.

Pohl, W. (2013). "Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West: Introduction." in Pohl W., Gerda H. (eds.), *Post-Roman transitions: Christian and Barbarian identities in the early medieval West.* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 1-46.

Pohl, W, (2013). "Introduction: Strategies of Identification. A Methodological Profile." In Pohl W., Gerda H. (eds.). *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe.* Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 21-22.

71

Prinz, F. (1971) *Klerus und Krieg im früheren Mittelalter. Untersuchungen zur Rolle der Kirche beim Aufbau der Königsherrschaft*, Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann

Reuter, T. (1982). "The 'Imperial Church System' of the Ottonian and Salian Rulers. A Reconsideration." in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33, 347–374.

Reuter, R. (ed.). (1992). *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Karl Leyser*. London: Habmbledon Press.

Reuter, T. (2011). "A Europe of Bishops. The Age of Wulfstan of York and Burchard of Worms." in Körntgen L, Wassenhoven, D. (eds.). *Patterns of Episcopal Power. Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

Riches, T. (2007). "The Function of the *Gesta Episcoporum* as Archive." in *Jaarboek voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis* 10, 7-46.

Riches, T. (2011). "The Changing Political Horizons of *gesta episcoporum* from the Ninth to Eleventh Centuries." in Körntgen L, Wassenhoven, D. (eds.). *Patterns of Episcopal Power. Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011, 51-62.

Robinson, I. (2004). "The Papacy (1122-1198)." in *New Cambridge Medieval History* 4, 8-37.

Rosenmeyer, T. (2006). "Ancient Literary Genres: A Mirage?." in Laird, A (ed.), *Ancient Literary Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 421-439.

Russell, A (1979). *De imitatione*, *Creative Imitation and Latin Literatur*e, West D., Woodman T. (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Russell, F. (1975). *The Just War in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Rutgers C. A. (ed.). *De utrechtse bisschop in de middeleeuuwen*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff,

Selderhuis H. (ed.).(2015)   *Handbook of Dutch Church History*. Amsterdam: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Schneider, J. (2006). "La Lotharingie était-elle une région historique?." in *Construction de l'espace au Moyen Age : pratiques et représentations. Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public, 37ᵉ congrès*. Mulhouse : 2006, 425-433.

Sot, M. (1981*). Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Tally R. (2013). *Spatiality*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

van Kaj. V. (2004). "Traiecti muros eu! The Bishop of Utrecht during and after the Viking Invasion of Frisia (834-925)." in Simek R., Engel, U.(eds.), *Vikings on the Rhine. Recent Research on Early Medieval Relations between the Rhinelands and Scandinavia*. Vienna: Fassbaender, 133-154.

van Wijnendaele, J. (2001). "Un exemple d'utilisation de l'histoire: Les empereurs ottoniens (962-1002) dans la polémique des Investitures." in *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 79, 1095-1132.

Vanderputten, S. (2001). "Typology of Medieval Historiography Reconsidered: a Social Reinterpretation of Monastic Annals, Chronicles and Gesta." in *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung*, 26, 141-178.

 Verbruggen, J. (1997). *The Art of Warfare in Western Europe During the Middle Ages From the Eighth Century to 1340*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Webb, J. (2016) "Representations of the Warrior-bishop in Eleventh-century Lotharingia". In *Early Medieval Europe* 24 (2016), pp. 103-130.

Webb, j. (2014). "Hagiography in the diocese of Liège (950-1130)." in Philippart, G. (ed.) *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*. Turnhout: Brepols, 809-904.

Whetham, D. (2009). *Just Wars and Moral Victories. Surprise, Deception and the Normative Framework of European War in the Later Middle Ages*. Leiden: Brill.