All in the family: creating a Carolingian genealogy in the eleventh century*

Sarah Greer

The genre of genealogical texts experienced a transformation across the tenth century. Genealogical writing had always been a part of the Judeo-Christian tradition, but the vast majority of extant genealogies from the continent before the year 1000 are preserved in narrative form, a literary account of the progression from one generation to another. There were plenty of biblical models for this kind of genealogy; the book of Genesis is explicitly structured as a genealogy tracing the generations that descended from Adam and Eve down to Joseph.[1] Early medieval authors could directly imitate this biblical structure: the opening sections of Thegan's *Deeds of Louis the Pious*, for example, traced the begetting of Charlemagne from St Arnulf; in England, Asser provided a similarly shaped presentation of the *genealogia* of King Alfred.[2] In the late tenth/early eleventh century, however, secular genealogical texts witnessed an explosion of interest. Genealogies of kings began to make their way into narrative historiographical texts with much greater regularity, shaping the way that those histories themselves were structured.[3] The number of textual genealogies that were written down increased exponentially and began to move outside of the royal family to include genealogies of noble families in the West Frankish kingdoms and Lotharingia.[4] Perhaps most remarkable though, is that these narrative genealogies began – for the first time – to be supplemented by new diagrammatic forms. The first extant genealogical tables of royal and noble families that we possess date from exactly this period, the late tenth and eleventh centuries.[5]

The earliest forms of these diagrams were relatively plain. Names of individuals in the table, often enclosed in roundels and occasionally embellished by sketches of the person in question, were connected vertically by lines indicating descent or inheritance of royal title. Chronological time was usually represented vertically, moving from the oldest ancestor at the top of the diagram to their most recent descendant at the bottom. Though the early examples are plainly decorated, the genre became more embellished through the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.[6] These later tables were heavily decorated with figurative medallions that depicted each individual, sometimes with the entire diagram situated in architectural settings of towers and windows. At the same time that these tables were becoming more elaborate, another genre of genealogical diagram emerged: the family tree, which placed the ancestor at the bottom of the diagram and the most recent descendant at the top, imitating the growth of a tree from its trunk to its branches. The most famous of these, the tree of Jesse, which depicted the genealogy of Christ, first emerged in its diagrammatic form in the eleventh century.[7]

* The research for this article was funded by the 'After Empire: Using and Not Using the Past in the Crisis of the Carolingian World, c.900–1050' HERA project, receiving funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 649307. I would like to thank Robert Bartlett, Stefan Esders, Alice Hicklin, Simon MacLean, Erik Niblaeus and the audience at the Edinburgh CMRS seminar series for their helpful feedback.

Clearly, there was a considerable shift of interest in the tenth/eleventh century towards genealogical texts, which sparked the creation of new diagrammatic versions. It should not be underestimated how innovative this development was. In Ancient Rome, genealogical diagrams were described as *stemmata* by Pliny the Elder: these, he says, are *imagines pictae* of ancestors connected by *lineis* painted onto the atrium walls of patrician houses. However, even Pliny indicated that this practice had already fallen out of favour by the time he was writing in the reign of Vespasian, and no Roman *stemmata* survive.[8] In the millennium that stretched between Pliny and the tenth century, extant examples of genealogical diagrams are vanishingly rare.[9] The decision to turn genealogies into diagram form in the tenth/eleventh century was a striking change after a thousand years of focus on the narrative form.

There have been several different explanations put forward for the growth of the genealogical genre in this period in general. One focuses on the concern shown by the Church in defining legitimate marriage, associating the boom in genealogical diagrams with a newly enforced prohibition against marriage to the seventh degree. Roman civil law had only prohibited marriage within four degrees (that is, four steps of descent) and the Roman method of counting these went both upwards to a common ancestor and then down to your potential spouse. For example, the relationship between parent and child was one degree; between siblings or grandparents and grandchildren was two degrees; between aunts/uncles and nieces/nephews was three degrees; and between first cousins was four degrees. A schematic form of these degrees of consanguinity was commonly shown in illustrations of Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies*, often in a crucifix form.[10] Until recently it was commonly thought that a new way of defining legitimate marriage emerged in the ninth century and became more strictly enforced in the tenth and eleventh centuries, which prohibited marriage within seven degrees and changed the method of counting, drawing on the so-called Germanic practice which only counted degrees back to the common ancestor.[11]

However, this view of the emergence of the new prohibition against marriage within seven degrees, counted in the Germanic method, has been comprehensively rewritten by Karl Ubl. Ubl convincingly argues that before the eleventh century, the medieval Church had a fairly stable definition of consanguineous marriage as any union within three degrees of separation counted by the Germanic method back to the common ancestor. However, as papal decrees switched back and forward between the Roman and Germanic methods of counting, it appeared to modern (and some contemporary) observers that there were earlier attempts to introduce a much stricter definition of prohibition within seven degrees.[12] Instead, it was only in the eleventh century that incestuous marriage began to be defined in this much stricter sense at the court of Emperor Henry II, partially in an attempt to cast Henry as a devout enforcer of canonical law in opposition to his rival, King Robert the Pious of West Francia; Robert's decidedly incestuous marriage to his second wife, Bertha, had recently shocked contemporaries.[13] As such, while the increasing interest in genealogical texts in the earlier tenth century was very possibly a response to the growing desire for secular men and women to more easily identify their more distant ancestors, it is no coincidence that we see the boom of genealogical diagrams corresponding to exactly the same period that the definition of consanguinous marriage was rewritten.

Alternatively, we could see the growth of genealogical texts from the tenth century onwards linked to the development of noble familial identity and interest in succession rights as part of the feudal revolution. Georges Duby explicitly connected the rush of new textual genealogies for comital and ducal families in West Francia with the increased prestige and authority of local elite families, such as the counts of Flanders and Anjou.[14] By writing down their ancestors,

tracing lines of descent back to legendary or heroic founding figures, noble families had a powerful tool to shape their identity as a group. The creation of a genealogy thus helped to legitimise the authority of that family's current representatives as rulers, which in turn led to a greater interest among contemporaries in the history of that family, and thus led to even more genealogical texts. Duby also situated the development of genealogies within his view of the changing nature of family structures around the year 1000, which proposed that there was a shift from cognatic, more expansive conceptions of family and kin groups to a more narrow, agnatic and patrilineal definition.[15] The increasing push towards primogeniture and stricter definition of inheritance rights within these families are thus seen as prompting more interest in accurate genealogical records within that family.[16] The identity of a family was shaped and reinforced as a consequence of defining who was considered to be one of its legitimate heirs.

Duby explicitly characterised this rise in ducal and comital genealogies as a response to the perceived breakdown of royal power in the tenth-century West Frankish kingdom. The Carolingian family continued to rule on-and-off across the tenth century over a much smaller area than their imperial predecessors, whilst facing serious competition for royal and imperial authority from the new Robertian/Capetian dynasty in West Francia and the Ottonian dynasty to the east. The idea of this erosion of contemporary Carolingian authority in the tenth century led Duby to argue that local noble families were able to lay claim to some of the former Carolingian glory, by creating their own genealogies in imitation of the royal versions of the past. Thus, the creation of genealogies from the tenth to twelfth centuries is characterised as a predominantly noble pre-occupation.[17]

However, this focus on the impetus for genealogical texts coming from noble families plays down the surge of royal genealogies being created in this same period. Noble genealogies themselves were often based on royal prototypes, with the recent generations of comital families often bolted on to a Carolingian genealogy to lend a regal lustre to their ancestry.[18] For example, one of the earliest sets of extant comital genealogical diagrams from France – those of the Counts of Anjou, created between 1066 and 1080 by the monks of Saint-Aubin in Angers – were joined by a manuscript from the monastery containing much more carefully drawn diagrams of the Merovingian, Carolingian and the Capetian dynasties.[19] In fact, the bulk of the new secular genealogies created in the tenth and eleventh centuries were focused on royal dynasties and, in particular, on the Carolingians. The genre of genealogy may well have appealed to noble concerns in this period, but it was clearly responding to concerns about royal authority and legitimacy in this period as well. There was an increasing focus on the legacy of the Carolingian dynasty after its last representative, Louis V, was replaced in 987 by Hugh Capet. Both the Capetians in the west and the Ottonians and Salians in the east attempted to latch onto the Carolingian aura as new royal dynasties, either by claiming that their line contained the real heirs of the Carolingian emperors and kings, or directly declaring their own Carolingian descent. There appears to have been an inverse relationship between the actual power of the Carolingian dynasty and its genealogy in the tenth century; as the political dominance of the Carolingian family contracted, the power and malleability of its genealogy increased as a source of authority for other dynasties.

Carolingian genealogical tables

In the spirit of this volume, then, Carolingian schematic genealogies serve as an interesting test-case for how and why the Carolingian past was used after the Carolingian Empire and dynasty had come to an end. We can now turn to look at these genealogies more closely. It appears that the first extant version we possess of a Carolingian genealogical diagram – and

thus the earliest one known in the medieval west – is the sketch created at Saint-Gallen which has been dated to the late tenth century.[20] The diagram traces the rise of the Carolingian rulers in a single line, recording Pippin III; his sons, Carloman and Charlemagne; Charlemagne's wife, Hildegard; their son, Louis the Pious; Louis' son, Charles the Bald; and a King Pippin, wrongly described as a son of Charles the Bald. Two emperors, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, receive small figurative sketches in roundels within the diagram as well. Each of the individuals depicted is surrounded by brief biographical notes, primarily focused on their relationship with the monastery of Saint-Gall and their burial places; evidently creating the diagram was an attempt to keep track of the different Carolingian donors that had featured in the monastery's history.

Shortly after the monks of Saint-Gall, another diagram of the Carolingian dynasty was created in the German Empire; this version, however, provided a much greater amount of detail. The so-called Bamberg Table, on a sheet now in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, has been dated to the reign of Emperor Henry II (1002-1024).[21] It features a single line of male descendants in roundels stretching from Bishop Arnulf of Metz, who is represented by a small figurative sketch, down to Louis the Pious. From there, the diagram breaks into three branches with Louis's three sons, Lothar, Charles the Bald and Louis the German; the West Frankish line of Charles the Bald continues directly under his father down through Louis the Stammerer, Charles the Simple, Louis IV and Lothar, while Lothar and Louis's lines are pushed up and off to the sides of the page. Those men in the central vertical line who had been crowned as king from Pippin III down to Louis the Stammerer also received small figural representations of their faces within their roundels. While the diagram overwhelmingly focuses on male descent, with no wives mentioned, some lines of descent traced through Carolingian daughters are represented: including, famously, a line that led to Cunigund, the wife of Henry II. The page also includes another smaller family diagram representing the Ottonian descendants of King Henry I, though this is much less detailed than the Carolingian diagram that dominates the page.

This genealogy, with its inclusion of Cunigund and an Ottonian family diagram, has drawn considerable attention. Karl Schmid, in particular, has compared the Bamberg Table's Carolingian genealogy with a similar version contained in the later twelfth-century *Liber Aureus* of Prüm, to argue that both of these diagrams were based on an earlier, now-lost, Carolingian genealogical table which he describes as a *Stemma regum Franciae*. On the basis of the centrality of the West Frankish line of Charles the Bald in the diagram and the lack of imperial title given to Carolingian emperors from the Lotharingian/Italian or German lines, Schmid suggested it was likely that this stemma originated in West Francia. As the table includes Louis IV's son, Charles of Lower Lotharingia, and Charles's like-named son as the last two figures in the West Frankish line, Schmid dates the creation of the table to the 990s, just after the elder Charles had failed to claim the West Frankish throne and had rebelled against the new Capetian king, Hugh Capet.[22] This linear version of the Carolingian family tree, splitting into a tripartite division in the lower half to show the rulers of Lotharingia/Italy, East Francia and West Francia, continued to influence later versions of this genealogy, showing a remarkable stability of visual form; it was adopted for the eleventh-century Carolingian table in the original manuscript of Frutolf of Michelsberg's *Chronicle* as well as for the tables that were included in the various continuations of this text, including Ekkehard of Aura's *Chronicle*.[23]

We also have another different extant Carolingian stemma, which is found in the twelfth-century Steinfeld Codex as part of a compilation of different genealogical texts and diagrams.[24]

On the basis of the diagram emphasising a direct vertical line of descent from Pippin I down to Louis the Child, Nora Gädeke has persuasively argued that the Carolingian table in this manuscript is a copy of a now-lost, early tenth-century version, created at the court of Louis the Child. By some considerable rearranging of the Carolingian genealogical tree – including liberal mixing of lines of genealogical descent with lines of inheritance which results in Charles the Fat sitting directly below Charles the Bald – Louis the Child is cast as the direct, unquestioned heir in an unbroken line of Carolingian rulers.[25] This was clearly an argument rather than a reflection of reality; Louis was only six years old when he succeeded his father Arnulf of Carinthia in 900, and the young king faced serious opposition from his adult half-brother, the already-crowned Zwentibald of Lotharingia.[26] Gädeke suggests this document was created at the point that Louis's court was trying to secure his power as a Carolingian ruler and potentially claim the imperial title for him as well; there is little reason to have the short-lived Louis, who died in 911 when he was only seventeen, placed at the end point of this Carolingian genealogical table if it was not created at his court.[27]

The way that each of these diagrams represented the Carolingian family communicated different arguments about the nature of Carolingian legitimacy; as a result, historians have attempted to decipher what these arguments were. Those who have examined these tables have focused on the now-lost exemplars of these genealogies, trying to contextualise and thus decode the purpose of these diagrams. As such, there has been considerable attention paid to the careful structuring of these genealogies, including who is and who is not included, what connections between individuals and branches of the family are underlined, and what kinds of visual organisation and emphasis are used. All of these elements are seen as tools used to construct the overall claim that the genealogy is making, and to give us insight into how the Carolingian family was seen in the tenth century and beyond.

A New Carolingian Table: British Library Arundel MS 390, f.133r

Yet, for the attention that has been given to the Bamberg Table, the Carolingian table in the Steinfeld Codex and their other eleventh- and twelfth-century adaptations, there is one genealogical diagram from the eleventh century which has thus far not received the same level of attention. At the back of one of the earliest extant manuscripts of Regino of Prüm's *Chronicle*, British Library Arundel MS 390, we find a rather peculiar version of a Carolingian stemma (Fig. 1).[28] While the manuscript itself was most likely written in the early eleventh century, the family tree has been added in later on a flyleaf at the back, written in a hand that appears to date from the mid- to late-eleventh century. The same hand has also gone through the rest of the manuscript of Regino and annotated the text, namely giving very brief summaries of the lives of Carolingian rulers on the top of the manuscript pages where their death is recorded in the text. A few other texts are also written on the other leaves at the back of the manuscript, including: an *Epitaphium Heinrici* for the *dux* Henry who Regino reports died fighting against the Vikings in the Siege of Paris in 887;[29] the *Iudicium de Regno et Sacerdotio*, which describes how an ordeal by water was used by a group of Italian churchmen to decide between the claims of Gregory VII and Henry IV, as well as the subsequent oath made to Henry IV;[30] and a list of popes.[31] However, these are in a different hand and ink and seem to be written after the genealogical diagram as they are placed on the folios immediately before and after it.

That this table has not received a great deal of attention is perhaps not surprising: the diagram is a mess. It is a far cry from the neat, linear diagrams that we see in the Bamberg Table or the table in the Steinfeld Codex. Instead, this one seems to begin with an attempt at a structure, placing the spaced-out name of Pippin centrally at the top of the manuscript, with

Charlemagne's name almost (but not quite) directly underneath him further down the page. However, from Charlemagne onwards, it begins to break down; as some branches of the family begin to multiply and others sputter out, the diagram skews more and more to the left, forcing the author to begin to abbreviate names. The messiness of the table belies that this in fact might be a second attempt; there are remnants of erasures under the top half of the table. It also seems that once the names and links between individuals had been charted, the author added in further information, including titles of rulers, the names of their wives, and other pieces of information, such as the tonsuring of Charles Martel's son Carloman and the exile of Theodoald, the son of Grimoald II. The lack of space at the bottom of the table meant that some of these titles were heavily abbreviated as well. Some names also have single letters placed immediately above them.

The messiness and cramped presentation of the table does not, however, obscure the careful interest and attention paid by the author to certain elements of organisation. It is immediately evident that the individuals in the diagram are methodically placed on horizontal levels indicating different generations of the Carolingian family, with connecting lines (both straight and wavy) showing either marriages or lines of descent. The cramped lower half of the table is a direct result of this; rather than shift certain branches up or down, or move siblings vertically to make it clearer, the author has relentlessly kept them on the same horizontal plane. The overall effect suggests less an attempt to shape the Carolingian family stemma into an argument, as we saw with the other diagrams we have encountered, and more an effort to make sense of all of the different parts of the complicated Carolingian family.

This sense of interest in the wider Carolingian family may also explain why we see so many Carolingian wives and daughters included in this diagram. The table includes seventeen named women and one unnamed woman, a striking increase compared to the four named women in the Bamberg Table and the two in the Steinfeld Codex.[32] These women are included all the way through the tree, beginning with the two wives of Pippin II at the top of the page and ending with Hildegard, the daughter attributed to Louis III at the bottom. The majority of the women are wives of Carolingian kings; at the top of the table, where space is plentiful, they are added alongside their husbands, while the cramped bottom half of the table sees these women sometimes tacked in over the top of the line of descent between their husband and son. Care is taken to distinguish which woman produced which son with separate lines: a clear example is the separation of Pippin II's sons Drogo and Grimoald by his wife Plectrude and his son Charles Martel by an *alia uxor*, but even at the bottom we can see cramped additions of 'Ansg.' and 'Addh.' on the lines leading to Louis the Stammerer's sons by his two wives, Ansgard and Adelheid. Almost all of these wives share something in common: all but one are mothers of Carolingian children.[33]

Sources

So, what then, are the sources for this new genealogical diagram of the Carolingians? The most notable source has already been identified by Gädeke: it is clear that this diagram has notable similarities with the version offered by the twelfth-century table in the Steinfeld Codex. The choice of Pippin II as the first individual rather than the more common decision to opt for St Arnulf of Metz, Pippin I, or Pippin III; the almost complete agreement on the male members of the family (including the unusual choice to include not just Charlemagne and Carloman, but also Pippin as the sons of Pippin III); the repetition of similar titles across the tables, and the conclusion with the generation including Zwentibald and Louis the Child all led Gädeke to suggest that both the Arundel and Steinfeld Carolingian tables may have drawn on a now-lost

earlier diagram; perhaps the tenth-century version that had been drawn up at Louis the Child's court.[34] However, if this earlier diagram had the same linear, extremely dynastically-minded structure that the Steinfeld Codex table did, then it is clear that the author of the Arundel 390 table chose to radically reimagine the visual layout of the genealogy.

The other main source for table in Arundel 390 is unsurprisingly the chronicle of Carolingian history written by Regino of Prüm which dominated this manuscript. Almost all of the new information included on the tree that is not seen in the Steinfeld Codex – that is, the vast majority of the Carolingian women included – is found in Regino's text. The wives of both Pippin III and Charlemagne, and Charlemagne's two daughters, Gisela and Rotrude, are named in the section of the *Royal Frankish Annals* which Regino quoted.[35] Ermengard, the wife of Lothar I features in the entry for 851; Emma, the wife of Louis the German is mentioned in 876; and Ermentrude, the wife of Charles the Bald appears in 870. The entry for 878 explains how Louis the Stammerer had two sons with his first wife, Ansgard, before being forced to repudiate her and marry Adelheid, with whom he had Charles the Simple. Gisela, the daughter of Lothar II, is discussed at length by Regino due to her marriage to the Viking King Godafrid and her brother Hugh's rebellion in alliance with her husband.[36] This use of Regino fits with the author of this table annotating the rest of the manuscript in the way that we would expect if someone was using the Chronicle as a source to create a genealogy. The summaries noted at the tops of manuscript pages feature exactly the kind of short-form genealogical data that would help in creating a stemma.[37]

There are, however, a few additions which are not seen in either the Steinfeld Codex table or Regino's *Chronicle*. These are the two wives of Pippin II; the attribution of a son, Bernhard, and grandson, Wallo, to Carloman II; the inclusion of an Ermengard as the mother of Louis the Child; and the attribution of a daughter, Hildegard, to Louis III. We can deal with each of these in turn:

1) The inclusion of Pippin II's two wives as Plectrude and an *alia uxor*. This information matches up with the narrative Carolingian genealogy created at Compiègne in the tenth century which refers to both a 'Piletrudem' as the mother of Drogo and Grimoald and an un-named other wife as the mother of Charles Martel.[38] It seems that the author did not have access to the chronicle of Fredegar where this *alia uxor* is named as Alpaida.[39]

2) The attribution of a son, Bernhard, and grandson, Wallo, to Carloman II. In his diagram of this table for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Georg Henrich Pertz suggested that this may be a misplacing of the Carolingian ancestry of Wala, Abbot of Corbie and Corvey.[40] Wala first appears in Regino's description of Charlemagne's delegation to King Hemming in 811.[41] The ancestry of Wala was then further explained in the following year's entry, where he is described as the son of Bernhard, making him the *patruelis* (paternal cousin) of Charlemagne.[42] Yet, in the table the author bumps Bernhard and Wala down two generations from their position as Charlemagne's uncle and cousin, instead making them Charlemagne's nephew and great-nephew respectively. Perhaps there was some confusion over exactly what the label of *patruelis* indicated, possibly being read more broadly as a description of a male relative descending from a fraternal line. If so, the author may have tried to find a sensible place to put him, and opted to make him a son of Charlemagne's brother Carloman.

3) The inclusion of Irmingard as the mother of Louis the Child. Pertz described Irmingard, who is placed on a line between Arnulf and his son Louis the Child, as either the wife of Louis or possibly of his half-brother Zwentibald.[43] However, this overlooks the close positioning of

Irmingard to Arnulf, as her name is written immediately underneath his name, with some distance between her and Louis. As such, it seems more likely that Irmingard is being positioned here as the wife of Arnulf and mother of Louis the Child. This contradicts the various sources that describe Uota as Arnulf's wife and Louis's mother. However, while Regino is at pains to emphasise the legitimacy of Louis the Child's parentage, compared to the illegitimacy of his half-brother Zwentibald, Louis's mother's name is not mentioned.[44] The sources which describe her at length and name her (the Regensburg Continuator of the *Annals of Fulda* and Hermann of Reichenau's *Chronicle*) evidently were not available to the author of this table.[45] However, where the name of 'Irmingard' as Louis's mother has come from is puzzling. If the author was not sure about the name of Arnulf's wife, or the mothers of his children, they could have omitted it; instead, Irmingard has been carefully added in over the line of descent leading to Louis alone. One outside possibility is that they have confused Louis the Child with Louis the Blind, whose mother was Irmingard, the daughter of Emperor Louis II. This seems unlikely for two reasons: firstly, Regino very clearly distinguishes between Louis the Child as the son of Arnulf and Louis the Blind as the son of Boso and Irmingard.[46] Anyone who was carefully reading the final sections of Regino's text would know to separate the two. Secondly, Irmingard is already present on the table in the correct place as Louis II's daughter. Either the author has made an unexplainable mistake, or was referring to some other source or tradition about Louis the Child's parents which has now been lost to us.[47]

4) The attribution of a daughter, Hildegard, to Louis III of West Francia. This seems to be an error, as it is clear from both Regino himself and other sources that Louis died in 883 without children.[48] There are several possibilities for where this error came from, as there are a number of Carolingian daughters named Hildegard at this point in the family tree, including the daughter of Louis II and the daughter of Charles the Simple.[49] However, I believe the most likely source for this error is the report in Regino's entry for 894, where he describes how a certain Hildegard, daughter of the King Louis who was the brother of Carloman and Charles, was deprived of her possessions and exiled to the monastery of Chiemsee.[50] This Hildegard was the daughter of Louis the Younger, and Louis's brothers were Emperor Carloman and Charles the Fat.[51] It would be an easy enough mistake to confuse that trio of brothers with the like-named trio of Louis III, Carloman II and Charles the Simple, especially as they are not far from each other on the bottom of the tree.

Alongside the additions to the table, we can also see which Carolingians have been removed or omitted from the author's two sources. There are a number of omissions from the earlier generations of the family which are recorded in Regino's *Chronicle*, including some which also appear in the Steinfeld Codex table. These include Charles Martel's daughter Hiltrude and her son, Tassilo of Bavaria; Charles Martel's son, Grifo; Charlemagne's sons, Pippin the Hunchback, Hugh, and Theoderic; and Ermengard's son, Louis the Blind. Others who were not on the Steinfeld Codex table but were present in Regino's text include Lothar's two wives, Theutberga and Waldrada; Charles the Bald's wife, Richildis; Louis the Younger's wife, Liutgard; Hugh of Lotharingia's wife, Friderada; Charles the Fat's wife, Richgard; and Zwentibald's wife, Oda.[52] The underlying theme for these omissions seems to be related to a lack of descendants from these figures, or questions surrounding their legitimacy.[53] Tassilo, of course, was forced to give up his and his family's claim to Bavaria and entered a monastery and his uncle Grifo faced accusations of illegitimacy, was imprisoned in a monastery and then was killed in a rebellion against Pippin III.[54] The three sons of Charlemagne who were omitted included the famously illegitimate Pippin the Hunchback and two clerics who had no children.[55] Theutberga and Waldrada were the quintessential examples of problematic Carolingian marriages and questions around legitimacy. Richildis had no surviving male

children.[56] Liutgard only produced one son for Louis the Younger, who died in childhood.[57] Hugh of Lotharingia's wife Friderada only had children from her previous marriage, and she remarried following the imprisonment and tonsuring of Hugh for his rebellion against Charles the Fat.[58] The scandal around Empress Richgard's sexual conduct and accusations of adultery were discussed at length by Regino, as well as her assertion of virginity and divorce from Charles the Fat.[59] Despite Zwentibald's marriage to Duke Otto of Saxony's daughter, Oda, the couple had no sons before Zwentibald's death in 900.[60] Although Regino and the exemplar of the Steinfeld Codex table serve as the sources for this table, it is evident that the information from them has not been copied over indiscriminately. Instead, members of the Carolingian family have been carefully weighed and decisions made about whether they are fit to include in this stemma on the basis of their production of legitimate heirs.

Consequently, this genealogical table is considerably different in purpose to the others that we have encountered of the Carolingian family. The Arundel 390 table is not, like the Bamberg Table, the Steinfeld Codex table and its lost exemplar, or the lost *Stemma regum Franciae*, focused on tracing the progression of dynastic power through the Carolingian family. Its focus is not to show which branch of Louis the Pious's sons dominated over the others, or to cast anyone as the main heir of Charlemagne or of Pippin III. Instead, the Arundel 390 table is intensely concerned with trying to map out the Carolingian family as opposed to the Carolingian dynasty. The genealogy, as noted above, is structured with horizontal layers corresponding to generations of the family contrasts with the vertical emphasis on the dynastic stemma, which instead prioritises lines of inheritance. This allows a more comprehensive and more workable vision of the Carolingian family to appear. It is much easier to use the table in Arundel 390 to discover the relationships between siblings, cousins, nieces and nephews or more removed family relationships than to use the other convoluted dynastic diagrams that we have encountered. The information presented in Regino's *Chronicle* about the different members of the Carolingian family is here laid out for a reader to access easily, even if the format is cramped and messy. Much like modern editions and translations of Regino and other Carolingian chronicles include a genealogical diagram, the table in Arundel 390 offers a helpful visual guide for a reader who wants to make sense of who is who in this extensive, complicated family.

Provenance

Where did this rather different Carolingian stemma come from? Unfortunately, the provenance of Arundel 390 is somewhat opaque. Hartmut Hoffmann argued that the scribe of the main Regino text was from Reichenau, suggesting that the manuscript was written in the first third of the eleventh century.[61] However, the only certain information about its provenance after this comes from a stamp at the front of the manuscript which records that it was given to the Royal Society of London from the donation of Henry Howard, the sixth Duke of Norfolk (1628-1684). Howard donated the manuscripts collected by his grandfather, Thomas Arundel, the second Earl of Arundel, to the Royal Society in 1667, which were then later passed on to the British Library in 1831. No other definite information about the manuscript exists, though the donation from Arundel's collection suggests that it might have come into his ownership as part of his 1636 purchase of the library of Willibald Pirckheimer, the German humanist and intellectual.[62] Wolf-Rüdiger Schleidgen, who reassessed the various manuscripts of Regino's *Chronicle* in 1977, has suggested that this manuscript may have either originated in or was held in Soissons, mainly on the basis that the manuscript also contains a copy of the epitaph of Count Henry, who died fighting the Vikings in the ninth century and was buried at Soissons. To support this, he notes that there is a later, fifteenth-century copy of this manuscript and of

the table it contains as well, which is now held in the Universitätsbibliothek at Gießen.[63] This manuscript was either copied by or for a certain Eustachius, who was a canon of St Germanus at Speyer before later becoming a cantor at Worms. Eustachius studied canon law at Sens for two years, which Schleidgen notes is not far from Soissons, and so he could have made his copy of the manuscript while he was studying in the region.[64]

However, Schleidgen himself notes that there is another possibility: the manuscript may have come from the Middle Rhine area. Eustachius was, after all, based in this area for most of his career. Placing the manuscript in this region would then make more sense of its presence in the collection of Pirckheimer, who was based in Nuremburg.[65] This would also agree with one other element which Schleidgen did not note: the strong similarities between the tables in Arundel 390 and the Steinfeld Codex. Both the authors of the twelfth-century Steinfeld Codex table and the eleventh-century Arundel 390 table appear to be drawing on copy of a now-lost stemma. The monastery of Steinfeld lies just north of Würzburg, about 100 kilometres to the north-east of Worms. A Middle Rhine provenance for the Arundel manuscript would thus make sense of how the author was able to access the same exemplar. It would also explain why the twelfth-century *Codex Laureshamensis* from Lorsch appears to be based on the Arundel 390 version of Regino's *Chronicle*. It may also explain why a new Carolingian genealogical diagram appears in Lorsch at the same time that the Codex was being created which, like the Arundel 390 table, begins with Pippin II before tracing down to Louis the German and Louis the Younger, both of whom were buried in the monastery and are labelled as such on the table.[66] The majority of evidence that we have thus supports Arundel 390 being in the Middle Rhine region in the mid-to-late eleventh century, when this stemma was composed. It would have been relatively easy for someone to copy out the epitaph of Count Henry at Soissons, then travel back to the Rhine and later enter it into the manuscript.

This setting of Middle Rhine region helps to contextualise the very specific interest the author of the Arundel 390 table shows in the Carolingian family. The area stretching between Worms and Speyer was the heartland of the Salian imperial dynasty, which had risen to power after the death of the childless Henry II in 1024. From the middle of the eleventh century onwards – that is, at exactly the point that this diagram was created – the Salians began to steadily intensify their attention on the region, and on Speyer in particular, placing the cathedral at the centre of their imperial identity. The cathedral served as the imperial mausoleum for the Salian dynasty, containing the tombs of Conrad II and his wife Gisela; their son Henry III; their grandson Henry IV and his wife Bertha; and their great-grandson Henry V. This striking collection of Salian royal bodies was unusual for the time. The generations of the previous Ottonian dynasty had each been buried at different sites and there were few other mausolea that had such a wealth of emperors and empresses accumulate in such a short space of time. Under the reign of Henry IV, Speyer's identity as *the* Salian burial site intensified. In 1076, Henry arranged for his young daughter, Adelheid, to be buried in the cathedral; this marked a reorientation of the burial site from one which had been purely dynastic, housing the Salian ruling couples, to one which could include non-ruling members of their broader family as well.[67] Shortly afterwards, the cathedral began a period of intensive development, with the launch of a new building scheme on an unusually monumental scale. Over twenty years of construction, Speyer cathedral was transformed into one of the most spectacular buildings in the western Christian world, a very visible symbol of the power of the dynasty entombed there.[68]

The amplification of Speyer's identity as a Salian burial site was not just physical; Henry IV also made a concerted effort to promote the memorial function of the site and to craft a new

image of his family. From the 1080s onwards, Henry gave a series of donations to Speyer in quick succession, transferring a number of properties to its bishop. These donations were made at significant points in Henry's reign; they tended to precede critical military and political events, such as on October 14, 1080, the day before Henry's battle against the anti-king, Rudolf of Rheinfelden.[69] Henry's success in quelling the threat Rudolf posed, followed by Henry's successful Italian campaign and imperial coronation in 1084 and the death of his great rival, Pope Gregory VII, in 1086 were all accompanied by another swathe of memorial grants to Speyer; perhaps also intended as a reward for the bishop's loyal support during Henry's conflict with Gregory VII. From 1086 onwards, the emperor issued diplomas to Speyer which were granted for the souls of his grandparents, Conrad II and Gisela; his parents, Henry III and Agnes; his wife, Bertha; his brother, Conrad; his daughter, Adelheid; and his son, Henry.[70] He also arranged to have the bodies of some of his family members translated to Speyer: these included Bertha, who had been interred in Mainz cathedral; and Henry's brother, Conrad, and son, Henry, who were originally buried in the Harzburg.[71] This concerted effort by Henry IV to craft a Salian memorial identity at Speyer has led Stefan Weinfurter to argue that by the early twelfth century, Speyer would have been the most Salian place in the entire kingdom.[72]

As the central memorial site for the Salian family, Speyer would have been plugged into the increasing interest of the Salians and their supporters over the eleventh century in claiming that they were descended from the Carolingians. This attempt to latch onto the Carolingians as a source of identity had begun early; Conrad II was especially interested in Charlemagne, with the churches constructed at his royal palaces of Goslar and Nijmegen imitating the structure of his famous church at Aachen.[73] By the middle of the eleventh century, claims were being made about the direct Carolingian ancestry of the Salians. In addition to reporting that people said 'the stirrups of Charlemagne hung on Conrad's saddle', Conrad II's biographer, Wipo, stated that the emperor's wife, Gisela, was descended from Charlemagne 'when the fourth line is added after the tenth'.[74] This riddle appears to refer to Gisela's descent from Charlemagne through two different branches of her family, as well as making a neat biblical allusion to the book of Matthew proclaiming that there were fourteen generations from Abraham to David, from David to the exile to Babylon, and from the exile to Christ.[75] As both Gisela and her husband Conrad shared the line of ten generations of descent from Charlemagne through Otto I, their mutual great-great-grandfather, their marriage was clearly consanguineous by the new seven-degree definition, and the couple were dogged by criticism for this throughout their reign.[76] Their son, Henry III, also faced criticism for his second marriage to Agnes of Poitou in 1043 on the basis of their consanguinity: in two letters addressed to Abbot Poppo of Stavelot which must date to immediately before the marriage, Abbot Sigefried of Gorze pointed out that Agnes and Henry had common ancestors in both the fourth and fifth degree, lines he was able to trace with precision through successive female generations. Strikingly, he added that he had attached a *figura* of this genealogy, which he hoped Poppo would be able to show the king to help him make his case against the marriage; unfortunately, this *figura* has not survived.[77]

The Middle Rhine region, and the area around Speyer in particular, makes sense both as the location for Arundel 390 and as the context for the creation of the new Carolingian genealogical diagram in the late eleventh century. A wealth of evidence ties the manuscript to this location, from its use of the same exemplar as the Steinfeld Codex, its similarities to the *Codex Laureshamensis*, the fifteenth-century copy made by a canon of Speyer (perhaps copied out so that he could take it with him after he moved to Worms) and its likely purchase as part of Pirckheimer's library. The setting of Speyer also perfectly fits with why the manuscript would be annotated and a new Carolingian genealogy created in the late eleventh century, just as

Speyer saw an intensification of interest in the commemoration of the Salian family and attempts to link them explicitly to their Carolingian ancestors.

The purpose of the Arundel 390 Table

With this in mind, we can begin to better understand why we see this particular version of a Carolingian genealogical diagram created in this manuscript. The table in Arundel 390 was created as part of an effort to map out the legitimate descendants of the Carolingian family; this must be linked to the context of Salian interests in Carolingian descent and in consanguineous marriage from the mid-eleventh century on. In Speyer, at a burial place that had been newly redefined as a familial burial place rather than simply a dynastic one, the Salians were intensely focused on concerns about consanguinity and Carolingian descent through female ancestors. In the face of serious challenges by other rival kings and by the pope, the Salian dynasty was in process of legitimising its power and rulership through claiming that they were part of an unbroken line of emperors stretching back to Charlemagne. At the same time, we find a genealogical diagram of the Carolingians which paid careful attention to the division of the family into generations and to the inclusion of wives and mothers, being as comprehensive as possible in tracing the different legitimate lines of the family which had produced children. At the very point that the Carolingian family was a powerful source of authority that the Salians and their supporters sought to utilise, we see someone turn to the earliest extant copy of Regino of Prüm, precisely the text that helps to illuminate the Carolingian family tree.

As such, this tree may well have been created as the first part of an attempt to create a new version of a Carolingian stemma to help bolster Salian claims to Carolingian descent and legitimacy. The table looks strikingly like later examples from the Renaissance, where we have the summary diagrams of entire families sketched out in this very horizontal, generational form, before the creation of a more streamlined, argumentative form.[78] As Gädeke has pointed out, Arundel 390 is unique amongst the other eleventh-century Carolingian genealogical tables in the German Empire: it appears on its own, without a table of the contemporary ruling dynasty accompanying it.[79] Was the Arundel 390 diagram the preparatory work for a new table? This diagram could have been the first step of cataloguing the entire Carolingian family by someone who had been asked to create a new stemma. If that is the case, then we can compare this to the production of the Bamberg Table in the court of Henry II, a diagram that tacked the family of Empress Cunigund onto an earlier exemplar of a Carolingian genealogy. Doing so offered a way to skim over potentially consanguineous marriages in Cunigund's family and to promote a new vision of the ancestry of Henry II and his wife.[80] Given the allegations of incest against Conrad and Gisela, and thus against all of their descendants, a new stemma that allowed a renegotiation of their family within a Carolingian framework may well have been appealing. Of course, this can only remain speculation, as no such diagram has survived today. We can only reconstruct hints of possible intention from the interests that we can see within the Arundel 390 table; whether this was acted upon cannot be proven.

Nevertheless, the practical purpose of this diagram finds a useful comparison with another genealogical text from the eleventh century. At the back of a tenth-century manuscript containing the historical texts of Liudprand of Cremona, Regino's *Chronicle*, and its continuation by Adalbert of Magdeburg, we find a table of royal genealogical information arranged in columns.[81] The primary column described the various rulers from the Carolingians down to the Ottonians and Salians, with the Carolingian information drawn almost entirely from Regino's text. Another column was then added to the left that discussed the Merovingians.

Other bits of information, primarily to do with whether different individuals died with or without heirs, were added in around the table. To keep track of all the various people, the author used epithets and various scribal marks; so, for example, all references to Charles the Bald were marked by three horizontal dots.[82] Steffen Patzold has persuasively argued that this text was likely created for Bishop Abraham of Freising after Henry II died heirless in 1024, intended to help Abraham prepare for the upcoming assembly in Kamba to decide who would succeed as king. The genealogical table created was thus designed as a practical reference text, providing the bishop with information about the historical succession of kings that was easy to decipher quickly, added into the back of a manuscript containing the relevant texts. Later on, around the time of the coronation of Henry IV in 1084, the table was updated with information about the Salian rulers.[83] The similarities with Arundel 390 are striking: in these two manuscripts containing Regino's chronicle, we find a practical genealogical reference text designed to quickly summarise the information within the manuscript as a whole. It may also contextualise the apparently random letters included over the names of different figures in the table; they may have been a similar kind of device as the scribal marks in this table, or possibly refer to addenda which summarised pieces of biographical information in the way that we see on the Freising table.

It is clear that the Carolingian past lay at the heart of present concerns on the east of the Rhine in the late eleventh century. Genealogies of past dynasties were just as valuable a source as those of the present ruling dynasty. The inclusion of Carolingian genealogical diagrams in all of the copies of Ekkehard of Aura's *Chronicle* is testament to the continued interest in the Carolingians as a source of imperial legitimacy and authority when that topic was being fiercely debated.[84] Genealogies and genealogical diagrams were far from simply a noble concern; the table in Arundel 390 shows us how Carolingian sources were read, interpreted and used well after that dynasty had ended.

---

[1] T. Desmond Alexander, 'From Adam to Judah: The Significance of the Family Tree in Genesis', *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 61:1 (1989), 5-19.

[2] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici Imperatoris* 1 in *SS rer. Germ.* 64, ed. by Ernst Tremp (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1995), pp. 174-6; Asser, *Vita Alfredi* in *Asser's Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of St Neots, erroneously ascribed to Asser* ed. by William Henry Stevenson (2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 2-4. For a comprehensive discussion of early medieval textual genealogies, see Walter Pohl, 'Genealogy: A Comparative Perspective from the Early Medieval West' in *Meanings of Community across Medieval Eurasia* ed. by Eirik Hovden, Christina Lutter, Walter Pohl (Leiden: Brill, 2016), pp. 232-269.

[3] Gabrielle Spiegel, 'Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Historical Narrative', *History and Theory* 22:1 (1983), 43-53.

[4] For example, see the tenth-century genealogy created for the West Frankish Carolingians: *Genealogia regum Francorum* in *Scriptores* 13 (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1881), p. 247; the *Genealogia Witgeri* created for the Flanders ducal house in 951-9: *Witgeri Genealogia Arnulfi Comitis* in *Scriptores* 9, ed. by Georg Henrich Pertz (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1851), pp. 302-4 ; the *Genealogia de Arnulfo Comite* written in 961: in *Scriptores* 9, ed. by George Henry Pertz (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1851), p. 304; and an eleventh-century short genealogical history of the Carolingian kings: P. Bernard, 'Une courte histoire des rois de France de Charles le Chauve à Louis V', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 84 (1923), 257-264. See also Karl Ferdinand Werner, 'Il y a Mille Ans, Les Carolingiens: Fin d'une Dynastie, Début d'un Mythe', *Annuaire-Bullentin de la Société de l'histoire de France* (1991-1992), 17-89 (pp. 50-7); Georges Duby, 'French genealogical

literature: the eleventh and twelfth centuries' in *The Chivalrous Society* trans. by Cynthia Postan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), pp. 149-157 (p. 150).

[5] The genealogy of Christ also began to be depicted in graphic form in this period. The first extant examples come from illustrated manuscripts of Beatus of Liébana's commentary on the Apocalypse, which were produced in northern Spain from 940 onwards. However, the influence of these diagrams was apparently restricted to the Iberian peninsula in the tenth century. See Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *L'Ombre des Ancêtres: Essai sur l'Imaginaire Médiéval de la Parenté* (Paris: Fayard, 2000), pp. 61-75; Gert Melville, 'Geschichte in graphischer Gestalt: Beobachtungen zu einer spätmittelalterlichen Darstellungsweise' in *Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im Späten Mittelalter*, ed. by Hans Patze (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1987), pp. 57-154 (pp. 67-8).

[6] Karl Schmid, 'Geschlechterbewusstsein am Beispiel ausgewählter karolingischer (Bild-)Stemmata aus dem hohen Mittelalter' in *Georges Duby: L'écriture de l'Histoire* ed. by Claudie Duhamel-Amado and Guy Lobrichon (Brussels: De Boeck-Wesmael, 1996), pp. 141-159 (p. 143).

[7] Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, 'The Genesis of the Family Tree', *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 4 (1991), 105-129 (pp. 118-122); Marilyn Mitchell, 'Fitting issues: the visual representation of time in family tree diagrams', *Σημειωτκή - Sign Systems Studies* 2-3 (2014), 241-280 (pp. 253-6).

[8] Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 35, 2, ed. by H. Rackham (*Loeb Classical Library* 394, Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 263-267; Mirelle Corbier, 'Painting and Familial and Genealogical Memory (Pliny, Natural History *35, 1-14*)' in *Vita Vigilia Est: Essays in Honour of Barbara Levick*, ed. by Edward Bispham and Greg Rowe with Elaine Matthews (London: Institute of Classical Studies SOAS, 2007), pp. 69-81 (pp. 70-6, 83). Corbier notes that Pliny appears to be describing paintings on walls, rather than the theory put forward by Theodor Mommsen that these *imagines* were masks connected by physical ribbons (pp. 81-3).

[9] Anglo-Saxon royal pedigrees occupy the middle-ground between textual genealogies and visual stemmata: they relied on vertical organisation of text, but still lack the visual elements (such as the roundels, lines, and different forms of arrangement) that mark out the genealogical stemmata dealt with here. David N. Dumville, 'The Anglian collection of royal genealogies and regnal lists', *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976), 23-50; David N. Dumville, 'Kingship, Genealogies and Regnal Lists' in *Early Medieval Kingship* ed. by Peter Sawyer and Ian Wood, (Leeds: The School of History, 1977), pp. 72-104. Both of these essays are reprinted in David N. Dumville, *Histories and pseudo-histories of the insular Middle Ages* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1990). See also Pohl, 'Genealogies', pp. 249-255.

[10] Mary Bouquet, 'Family Trees and their Affinities: The Visual Imperative of the Genealogical Diagram', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 2:1 (1996), 43-66 (p. 47); Klapisch-Zuber, 'The Genesis of the Family Tree', pp. 113-4.

[11] See, for example, Jack Goody, *The development of the family and marriage in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 136-7; Georges Duby, *Medieval Marriage: Two Models from Twelfth-Century France*, trans. by Barbara Bray (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978); Constance B. Bouchard, 'Consanguinity and Noble Marriages in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', *Speculum* 56:2 (1981), 268-287.

[12] There were some exceptions allowing closer marriages in more extreme circumstances, such as for missionaries in recently converted areas. Karl Ubl, *Inzestverbot und Gesetzgebung. Die Konstruktion eines Verbrechens (300-1100)* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), pp. 236-240, 374-383; David d'Avray, 'Review article: Kinship and religion in the early Middle Ages', *Early Medieval Europe* 20:2 (2012), 195-212 (pp. 199-205).

[13] Ubl, *Inzestverbot*, pp. 384-440; d'Avray, 'Kinship and religion', pp. 206-9.

[14] Duby, 'French genealogical literature', pp. 149-157.
[15] This view has since fallen out of favour. See the commentary by Pohl, 'Genealogy', pp. 256-7.
[16] Pierre Bourdieu explicitly linked the creation of genealogical texts and diagrams to interest in succession law and inheritance processes. Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. by Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1977), p. 207 n. 71.
[17] Duby, 'French Genealogical Literature', pp. 151-2.
[18] Duby, 'French Genealogical Literature', pp. 152-3.
[19] The comital genealogies are in Vatican, MS Reg.lat. 1283, fol. 65v; the royal genealogies are in Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale, 58(51), ff. 1v-3r. Klapisch-Zuber, *L'Ombre*, pp. 92-4. The royal genealogical diagrams appear to date to the reign of Philip I (r. 1060-1108), so were possibly written out at the same time as those of the Angevin counts.
[20] BAV, MS Reg. lat. 339, fol. 7 (olim fol. 32); *Genealogiae Karolorum* VII in *Scriptores* 13 ed. by Georg Waitz (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1881), pp. 244, 248. See also Klapisch-Zuber, *L'Ombre*, p. 91. A high-resolution image of the manuscript is available online: http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Reg.lat.339.
[21] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 29880 (6). A high-resolution image of the manuscript is available online: http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0005/bsb00059279/images/index.html?id=00059279&seite=2&fip=193.174.98.30&nativeno=/&groesser=200%25.
[22] Schmid, 'Ein verlorenes Stemma *Regum Franciae*. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Entstehung und Funktion karolingischer (Bild-)Genealogien in salisch-staufischer Zeit', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 28 (1994), pp. 196-225 (pp. 202-206). He argues that the inclusion of the younger Charles may suggest the table was created as an *ad hoc* response to the capture and imprisonment of the elder Charles and his older sons at Laon in 991, and was possibly written under the supervision of Archbishop Arnulf of Reims, himself the nephew of the elder Charles and cousin of the younger.
[23] Schmid, 'Geschlechterbewusstsein', pp. 143-5. On the continuations and the various manuscript recensions of these texts, see T. J. H. McCarthy, *Chronicles of the Investiture Contest: Frutolf of Michelsberg and his Continuators* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 41-4.
[24] London, British Library Additional MS 21109, f. 133v. This manuscript contains two stemmata, one of the Carolingians, one of the German emperors, and also includes a textual genealogy running from Louis the Pious through to the twelfth-century German emperors which appears to have no apparent link to the schematic trees included. Nora Gädeke, 'Eine Karolingergenealogie des Frühen 10. Jahrhunderts?', *Francia* 15 (1988), 777-792 (pp. 778-80).
[25] Gädeke, 'Eine Karolingergenealogie', pp. 785-6.
[26] Timothy Reuter, *Germany in the Middle Ages c. 800-1056* (London: Longman, 1991), pp. 125-6; Simon MacLean, 'Shadow Kingdom: Lotharingia and the Frankish World, C. 850-C.1050', *History Compass* 11:6 (2013), 443-457 (p. 447).
[27] Gädeke, 'Eine Karolingergenealogie', pp. 787-8.
[28] London, British Library, Arundel MS 390, f. 133r. An edited versions of this diagram as well as the various tables in the Steinfeld Codex can be found in 'Tabulae Karolorum et Ottonum', *Scriptores* 3 ed. by Georg Henrich Pertz (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1839), pp. 213-5.
[29] *Epitaphium Heinrici* in *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* 4.1 ed. by Paul de Winterfeld (Berlin: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1899), p. 137. Arundel MS 390 includes an annotation on

the page recording Henry's death in Regino's text directing the reader to the epitaph at the end of the manuscript.

[30] This is edited in H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Age of Abbot Desiderius: Montecassino, the Papacy, and the Normans in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 245-9.

[31] The papal list is edited with comments in Wilhelm Levison, 'Aus Englischen Bibliotheken', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 38 (1913) (643-664), pp. 662-4.

[32] The women in the Arundel 390 table are Plectrude (wife of Pippin I) and his unnamed *alia uxor*; Bertha *regina*, wife of Pippin III; Charlemagne's wives Hildegard, Fastrada and Liudgard; Charlemagne's daughters Gisela and Rotrude; Judith, wife of Louis the Pious; Ermengard, the wife of Lothar I; Emma, the wife of Louis the German; Ermentrude, wife of Charles the Bald; Ermengard, daughter of Louis II; Gisela, daughter of Lothar II; Ansgard, first wife of Louis the Stammerer; Adelheid, second wife of Louis the Stammerer. There are two new inclusions: Ermengard as the mother of Louis the Child; and Hildegard as the daughter of Louis III of West Francia.

[33] The exception is Charlemagne's wife, Liutgard. His other wife Fastrada is also included, though her two daughters with Charlemagne are not in the table.

[34] Gädeke, 'Eine Karolingergenealogie', pp. 779-780, esp. n. 13, p. 780.

[35] Regino of Prüm, *Chronicon* in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 50 ed. by Friedrich Kurze, (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1890), pp. 53, 69.

[36] Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 75, 101, 110-1, 114, 120, 123-5.

[37] For more on the annotations, see Wolf-Rüdiger Schleidgen, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Chronik des Regino von Prüm* (Mainz: Gesellschaft für Mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 1977), p. 22.

[38] 'Hic [Pippin] cum haberet uxorem Piletrudem, de qua genuit Grimoaldum, aliam superduxit uxorem, de qua genuit Karolum seniorem et ducem, et obtinuit principatum annis 27.' *Genealogia regum Francorum*, p. 247.

[39] *Chronicarum quae dicuntur Fredegarii* in Bruno Krusch (ed.), *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 2, (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1888), p. 172.

[40] Pertz, 'Tabulae Karolorum et Ottonum', p. 214.

[41] This section of Regino's *Chronicle* quoted extensively from the *Royal Frankish Annals*. *Annales Regni Francorum*, in Georg Heinrich Pertz (ed.), *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 6 (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1895), p. 134; Regino, *Chronicon,* p. 70.

[42] 'Walonem filium Bernardi patruelis sui', Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 72.

[43] Pertz, 'Tabulae Karolorum et Ottonum', p. 214, note b.

[44] Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 134, 147-8.

[45] *Annales Fuldenses*, in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi* 7 ed. by Friedrich Kurze (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1891), p. 132; Hermann of Reichenau, *Chronicon*, in *Scriptores* 5 ed. by Georg Heinrich Pertz (Berlin: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1844), p. 111. On Uota, see Timothy Reuter, 'Sex, lies and oath-helpers: the trial of Queen Uota' in *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities* ed. by Janet L. Nelson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 217-230.

[46] Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 142.

[47] This raises the tantalising opportunity to speculate about whether the source was the lost stemma of Louis the Child and the Carolingian family on which the Steinfeld Codex and Arundel 390 tables were based.

[48] Regino records his death and that his kingdom passed to his brother Carloman (Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 120); the *Annals of St-Vaast* records the story of his death while chasing a girl into a house on a horse (*Annales Vedastini* in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum separatim editi* 12 ed. by B. de Simson (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1909), p. 52).
[49] Witger, *Genealogia Arnulfi Comitis*, p. 303.
[50] 'Hildegardis filia Ludowici regis, fratris Carlomanni et Caroli, a quibusdam ad Arnulfum accusata regiis possessionibus privatur et privata in exilium destinatur in monasterio puellarum, quod Chemissem dicitur', Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 142. See D Arn 132, in *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Karolinger, Dritter Band, Die Urkunden Arnolfs* ed. by P. Kehr (Berlin: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1940), pp. 197-9; Karl Ferdinand Werner, 'Die Nachkommen Karls des Großen 1.-8.' in *Karl der Grosse. Das Nachleben* ed. by Wolfgang Braunfels and Percy Ernst Schramm (Dusseldorf: L. Schwann, 1967), pp. 403-484 and addition (b23, p. 456 and addition); Matthias Becher, 'Zwischen König und "Herzog"' in *Kaiser Arnolf: Das ostfränkische Reich am Ende des 9. Jahrhunderts* ed. by Franz Fuchs and Peter Schmid (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2002), pp. 89-121 (pp. 102-6).
[51] Not to be confused with her eponymous aunt, Hildegard, the daughter of Louis the German.
[52] Theutberga: Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 77-8, 80-2, 84-9, 91; Waldrada: Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 80, 82, 84-5, 87-9, 97; Richildis: Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 113; Liutgard: Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 118; Friderada: Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 121; Richgard: Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 127; Oda: Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 145, 148.
[53] An omission that does not fit this pattern though is Louis the Blind; he was a legitimate son of Irmingard and Boso, was proclaimed emperor and later married and produced children. This could perhaps be taken as further evidence for confusion around Louis the Blind and Louis the Child; or, alternatively, a rejection of this Louis on the basis of his descent from a Carolingian daughter rather than father. If so, that would also apply to the rejection of Hiltrude and her son Tassilo.
[54] Regino, *Chronicon*, pp. 43-4.
[55] Though this opens questions about why his other son, Drogo, was included. It is possible that the prestige of his position as bishop of Metz outweighed his lack of legitimate children.
[56] She is also only briefly mentioned in Regino without reference to any children. Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 113. Werner, 'Die Nachkommen', b43-46, p. 454.
[57] Regino, *Chronicon*, p. 119.
[58] Ibid., p. 121.
[59] Ibid., pp. 127-8.
[60] Ibid., pp. 145, 148.
[61] Hartmut Hoffmann, *Buchkunst und Königtum im ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1986), p. 331.
[62] See Schleidgen, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte*, p. 21; Bernhard Ebneth, 'Pir(c)kheimer, Willibald' in *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, Band 20 (2001), pp. 475-6
[63] This is Gießen, Universitätsbibliothek 650, which Schleidgen dates to c. 1486-1519. Schleidgen, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte*, pp. 22-4, 139.
[64] Ibid., p. 139.
[65] Ibid.
[66] 'Genealogia Karolinorum' Straßburg, ehem. Sammlung Robert Forrer ohne Signatur. A digital reproduction of this stemma can be found online at: https://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/view/slgrf_o-sig/0001/image. Schleidgen, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte,* p. 139.
[67] Caspar Ehlers, 'Die salischen Kaisergräber im Speyerer Dom' in *Die Salier. Macht im Wandel. Essays.* (Munich: Minerva, 2011), pp. 202-9 (p. 206); Stefan Weinfurter, 'Herrschaftslegitimation und Königsautorität im Wandel: Die Salier und ihr Dom zu Speyer'

in *Die Salier und das Reich. Band 1: Salier, Adel und Reichsverfassung* ed. by Stefan Weinfurter (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1992), pp. 55-96 (p. 67).

[68] Ehlers, 'Die salischen', p. 206; Weinfurter, 'Herrschaftslegitimation' pp. 91-2; Odilo Engels, 'Die Kaiserliche Grablege im Speyerer Dom und die Staufer' in *Papstgeschichte und Landesgeschichte. Festschrift für Hermann Jakobs zum 65. Geburtstag* ed. by Joachim Dahlhaus, Armin Kohnle (Cologne: Böhlau, 1995), pp. 227-254 (p. 227).

[69] D HIV 325 in *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser, Sechster Band, Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV*, vol. 2 ed. by Dietrich von Gladiss and Alfred Gawlik (Weimar: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1952) p. 427. On the importance of this grant, see Weinfurter, 'Herrschaftslegitimation', p. 89; Karl Schmid, '"De Regia Stirpe Waiblingensium" Remarques sur la conscience de soi des Staufen' in *Famille et Parenté dans l'Occident Médiéval* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1977), pp. 49-56 (pp. 50-3).

[70] DD HIV 379-385, pp. 505-11. Ingrid Heidrich, 'Beobachtungen zur Stellung der Bischöfe von Speyer im Konflikt zwischen Heinrich IV. Und der Reformpäpsten', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 22 (1988), 266-285 (pp. 269-272).

[71] DD HIV 426, 474-5, pp. 571-2, 645-7; Heidrich, 'Beobachtungen zur Stellung', p. 272; Ehlers, p. 206; Weinfurter, 'Herrschaftslegitimation', p.90.

[72] Weinfurter, 'Herrschaftslegitimation', pp. 95-6.

[73] Ibid., p. 71.

[74] 'Quando post decimam numeratur linea quarta, De Carolo Magno procedit Gisela prudens.'; 'Unde extat proverbium: Sella Chuonradi habet ascensoria Caroli.' Wipo, *Gesta Chuonradi II Imperatoris,* 4, 6, in *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum separatim editi* 61 ed. by Harry Bresslau (Hanover: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1915), pp. 28-9, 24-5.

[75] Matt 1:17. My thanks to Chris Eddington for this observation. Donald C. Jackman has laid out the calculations of Gisela's Carolingian ancestry in detail, tracing the 'tenth' line ten generations back through her paternal ancestry to Otto I, and then through his mother Hadwig to Louis the Pious and Charlemagne and the 'fourth' line through her maternal grandfather King Conrad of Burgundy. Donald C. Jackman, Ius Hereditarium *Encountered III: Ezzo's Chess Match* (Pennsylvania: Archive for Medieval Prosopography, 2010), pp. 8-23, 67-74.

[76] Herwig Wolfram, *Conrad II 990-1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms* trans. by Denis A. Kaiser (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), pp. 46-7.

[77] For a detailed discussion of Siegfried's case with an edition of his letter, see Michel Parisse, 'Sigefroid, Abbé de Gorze, et le mariage du roi Henri III avec Agnès de Poitou (1043). Un aspect de la réform Lotharingienne', *Revue du Nord* 356-7 (2003/4), 543-566.

[78] See, for example, the diagrams of Scipione Ammirato in Klapisch-Zuber, 'The Genesis of the Family Tree', Figs. 6-8 between pp. 112-3, commentary pp. 110-1.

[79] Nora Gädeke, *Zeugnisse Bildlicher Darstellung der Nachkommenschaft Heinrichs I.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992), p. 235.

[80] Donald C. Jackman, *Studia Luxembourgensia* (Pennsylvania: Archive for Medieval Proposography, 2012), pp. 15-8.

[81] Munich Codex Latinus 6388.

[82] Steffen Patzold, 'Wie bereitet man sich auf einen Thronwechsel vor? Überlegungen zu einem wenig beachteten Text des 11. Jahrhunderts' in Matthias Becher (ed.), *Die Mittelalterliche Thronfolge im Europäischen Vergleich* (Ostfildern: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2017), pp. 127-156 (pp. 141-2).

[83] Patzold, 'Wie bereitet man sich auf einen Thronwechsel vor?' pp. 138-150.

[84] For how the anonymous *Imperial Chronicle* which followed Ekkehard played with this concept of dynastic genealogy see Johanna Dale, 'Imperial Self-Representations and the Manipulation of History in Twelfth-Century Germany: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 373', *German History* 29:4 (2011), 557-583 (p. 572).