

**THE MAKING OF MEN, NOT MASTERS: RIGHT ORDER
AND LAY MASCULINITY ACCORDING TO
DHUODA AND NITHARD**

by Meg Leja*

Abstract: Examining two texts composed by members of the western Frankish lay nobility over the period 841–843, this article addresses how contemporary conflicts within the Carolingian realm prompted the authors of these texts to reevaluate ideals of lay masculinity. A comparison of how Nithard and Dhuoda privileged certain obligations within a man’s life, articulated distinct models of knighthood, and referenced the type of relationship men ought to have with women, and with their bodies, elucidates the ways in which they sought to reform noblemen’s problematic conduct by putting forward their own models of manly behavior. The study ultimately suggests that Dhuoda and Nithard were reacting against a hegemonic masculinity that defined men in terms of their ability to dominate. In response, both authors formulated ideals of masculinity that positioned men within subservient and dependent relationships and that emphasized the need for men to establish harmonious relations with other men, with women and with their bodies.

INTRODUCTION

The scarcity of extant early medieval texts written by members of the laity makes it difficult to access lay views without the distorting lens of ecclesiastical authorship. It is particularly rare to be able to compare the views of laypeople writing at the same time for similar audiences—a fact that highlights the rare opportunity afforded by two Carolingian texts composed by members of the western Frankish lay nobility over the period 841 to 843.¹ The first of these texts is the *Histories*, a detailed chronological account of the civil war among Louis the Pious’s sons, written by Nithard, a nobleman in the service of Charles the Bald.² The second text in question is Dhuoda’s *Manual*, the only surviving text written by a Carolingian laywoman.³ All that is known

*History Program, University of British Columbia, megleja@gmail.com.

¹ Yet, surprisingly, these texts have never been the subject of a comparative study in English-language scholarship.

² Nithard, *Historiarum Libri IIII*, ed. Philippe H. Lauer, *Histoire des Fils de Louis le Pieux* (Paris 1926) (henceforth *Historiae*). Charles originally commissioned the writing of the *Histories*. However, Janet Nelson argues that, while the first three books of the *Histories* were written as political propaganda for Charles, the last book was primarily a means for Nithard to divulge his own personal history and constructively criticize Charles. See Janet Nelson, “Public *Histories* and Private History in the Work of Nithard,” *Speculum* 60 (1985) 251–293; Janet Nelson, “History-Writing at the Courts of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald,” *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Anton Scharer, Georg Scheibelreiter (Vienna 1994) 438–440.

³ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, ed. Pierre Riché, *Manual pour Mon Fils*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1991).

about Dhuoda's life is that she was the wife of Bernard of Septimania, one of Louis the Pious's high counselors, and bore two sons by him. Given that Nithard was writing his *Histories* for fellow nobles in Charles's service, one member of his audience would likely have been Dhuoda's eldest son, William, who was present at Charles's court as a hostage for his father's good faith. Isolated on her husband's estates in southern France, Dhuoda composed for the fourteen year-old William a handbook⁴ that was intended to guide him in his spiritual and earthly duties, and thereby act as a replacement for her physical presence.

The years 841 to 843 were an especially turbulent period in Carolingian history. The conflicts of that time can be traced back to 817, when, in order to secure the dynastic succession, Louis the Pious established the *Ordinatio imperii*. This pronouncement divided the realm among his three existing sons, Lothar, Pepin and Louis the German, but decreed that Lothar would be emperor over the other two sub-kings. In 823, however, Louis had a fourth son, Charles (the Bald), by his second wife, Judith—an event that led to Louis breaking the *Ordinatio* in 829 to provide an inheritance for this new son. The year 829 also marked Louis's appointment of Bernard of Septimania, Dhuoda's husband, as his chamberlain and Charles's tutor. Accusations that Bernard was involved in adultery with Judith, as well as anger at the breaking of the *Ordinatio*, seem to have been the primary reasons that Louis's first three sons, a number of magnates, and certain bishops rebelled against Louis in 830. Bernard was removed from power and nearly killed. Although Louis was soon restored to the throne, there was a second rebellion in 833, after which Louis again regained the throne in 834. His death in 840 sparked a civil war among those sons still living (namely, Lothar, Louis the German, and Charles the Bald) to determine the balance of land and power within the empire. The year 841 witnessed the Battle of Fontenoy, in which Louis and Charles joined forces against Lothar, and much of the Frankish nobility was killed in an encounter from which Louis and Charles emerged as victors. Louis and Charles then formalized their alliance with the Oaths of Strasbourg in 842; yet, the fighting continued until 843 when all three brothers signed the Treaty of Verdun, an agreement that divided the empire into three sepa-

⁴ There are two genres that the *Manual* relies upon: the handbook and *speculum principis*. Several of Dhuoda's contemporaries also adapted the *speculum principis* to write mirrors for the laity. Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis* and Jonas of Orléans's *De institutione laicali* are two such examples.

rate kingdoms, with the middle kingdom (stretching from the North Sea down through Italy to the Mediterranean) going to Lothar, the eastern kingdom (Germany) to Louis the German, and the western kingdom (France) to Charles the Bald.

Setting Nithard's and Dhuoda's works in dialogue with one another, this study seeks to explore how the conflicts of the early 840s may have triggered reevaluations of contemporary ideals regarding lay masculinity. At the core of both authors' works is the understanding that the problems the realm was facing at that time were primarily due to noblemen's expression of unmanly modes of conduct.⁵ In response, these authors attempted to construct their own ideals of masculinity, which they hoped could counter men's problematic behavior and restore the realm to its right state. The *Life of the Emperor Louis*, an anonymous biography contemporary with Dhuoda's and Nithard's works, states that men are inspired by the examples of illustrious individuals about whom they read.⁶ Such a pronouncement speaks to the importance that textual models possessed in noblemen's fashioning of a masculine identity in the ninth century. This paper will explore how Dhuoda and Nithard, by espousing particular models in their texts, and thereby privileging certain behavior as masculine, sought to influence ninth-century discourse on lay masculinity. Not only has masculinity remained a relatively unexplored topic in regards to these two texts, but it also offers a means by which to compare how two lay authors, writing in the same kingdom at the same time, assessed and responded to the political and social dilemmas of their day.

There are still relatively few studies concerning masculinity in the Middle Ages, and the majority of these have concentrated either on late antiquity or the period after the eleventh century. Janet Nelson is virtu-

⁵ John Tosh warns historians to be cautious about referring to a "crisis of masculinity," since such a phrase implies that masculine identity is generally stable. Yet, he also distinguishes between an individual man's insecurity concerning his identity and widespread social unease with the dominant constructions of masculinity, acknowledging that this latter phenomenon might be termed a "crisis of masculinity." John Tosh, "What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain," *Gender and History in Western Europe*, ed. Robert Shoemaker, Mary Vincent (London 1998) 76. Following Tosh's theory, I think that it is possible to view Dhuoda's and Nithard's texts as expressions of contemporary beliefs in a crisis of masculinity.

⁶ This anonymous biography of Louis was written shortly after Louis's death in 840. Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, Prologus, ed. Ernst Tremp, *Thegan: Die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs: Astronomus: Das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs*, MGH, SRG, separatim editi 64 (Hanover 1995) 280.

ally the only Anglophone scholar to have written on Carolingian lay masculinity, and her primary article on the subject examines only the later ninth century and only texts composed by ecclesiastics.⁷ Nelson's many probing articles about violence, nobility, warfare, and knighthood in Nithard's *Histories* are essential to contextualizing the subject of masculinity, but do not deal specifically with that topic. The scholarship on Dhuoda has, for the most part, used the *Manual* as a window into women's history and lay spirituality, touching on masculinity only incidentally. This study utilizes existing work on the *Histories* and the *Manual* to address the gap in scholarship concerning Carolingian lay masculinity. From modern gender theories, it takes into account the idea of a hegemonic construction of masculinity, as first articulated by Carrigan, Connell, and Lee in 1985. Their pivotal article argued that, within each historical situation, there is a process of negotiation by which a particular form of masculinity is established as hegemonic over other subordinated masculinities.⁸ This dominant or hegemonic masculinity is continuously contested, particularly in times of political upheaval.⁹ While, given the lack of extant sources, it is impossible to label either Dhuoda's or Nithard's ideal of masculinity hegemonic, it is in looking at the model of masculinity *against* which both authors react that the theory of a hegemonic masculinity is of particular use.

MANLY RELATIONS WITHIN THE EMPIRE

An underlying theme in both Dhuoda's and Nithard's texts is the recognition that contemporary noblemen's lives are disordered, and that this disorder is both a reflection and cause of the problems affecting the realm. Nithard presents the realm in an inverted state and implies that its return to right order is predicated upon laymen's and kings' adoption

⁷ Janet Nelson, "Monks, Secular Men and Masculinity, c. 900," *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (London 1999) 121–142.

⁸ Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell, John Lee, "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity," *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*, ed. Harry Brod (1985; Boston 1987) 63–100.

⁹ Mathew Kuefler demonstrates how political and social changes in the 3rd c. threatened the hegemonic masculinity of elite Roman males. This classical Roman ideal was replaced over the course of the 4th c. with the previously-subordinate Christian ideal, which proved able to secure men's sense of manliness in the political climate of late antiquity. See Mathew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago 2001).

of an appropriate model of masculinity.¹⁰ Dhuoda, rather than vividly describing the problems with men's behavior and with the realm, implicitly acknowledges such issues in her concern with laying out a definitive hierarchy of obligations to which all men, including her son, ought to adhere.

Nithard's conception of right order, or the golden age of the empire, is embodied by the figure of Charlemagne, who is repeatedly held up as the protector of the common good (*utilitas publica*). At both the beginning and the end of his text, Nithard recounts a "venerable memory [*venerandam memoriam*]" of Charlemagne—a memory that, Nithard implies, *ought* to be revered by those nobles for whom the *Histories* was intended.¹¹ Nithard's decision to include such a laudatory portrait of the great king clearly discloses his belief that Charlemagne's memory, and the behavior espoused by it, has been shamefully neglected by his fellow nobles. As he began his text, Nithard seems, in particular, to have offered Charlemagne as a model to which he hoped and expected his lord, Charles the Bald, could adhere. Given Nithard's negative treatment of Louis the Pious, Bernard of Septimania, and Lothar—Charles's father, counselor, and eldest brother, respectively, and the three men who played the greatest role in Charles's youth—Nithard likely believed that Charles was lacking appropriate models for kingship and for masculinity more generally.

Unlike Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*, a biography of the great king written some twenty years earlier, which attributes the emperor's greatness to his kindness, gentleness and mercy, the *Histories*' depiction of Charlemagne is characterized by his "terrible" nature.¹² To Nithard, it was the fact that Charlemagne was *terribilis*, a word not used to describe any other figure in the *Histories*, that allowed him to maintain the right order of the empire.¹³

¹⁰ For the medieval *topos* of the world upside-down, see Ernst R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard Trask (London 1953) 94–98.

¹¹ Nithard, *Historiae*, Prologus, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 2.

¹² Gerd Althoff argues that royal anger, which he links with the ability to exert terror, had no place in Carolingian biographies of Charlemagne or Louis the Pious. While the angry king was a common image in late antiquity and the earliest Middle Ages, for the Carolingians royal anger became a sign of the king's injustice. Althoff does not discuss Nithard, who stands in contrast to this tradition. See Gerd Althoff, "Ira Regis: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger," *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Barbara Rosenwein (Ithaca 1998) 61–67.

¹³ Nithard, *Historiae*, lib. 1, cap. 1, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 4.

Above all ... [Charlemagne] will be admired for the tempered severity with which he subdued the fierce and iron hearts of Franks and barbarians. Not even Roman might had been able to tame these people, but they dared do nothing in Charles's empire except what was in harmony with the public welfare.¹⁴

Charlemagne's terror checked the unruly and rash strength not only of the barbarians but also of the Franks themselves, of warriors like Nithard. Fearing the emperor's anger and his justice, the men of the realm did not dare to act against the common good. Thus, with all individual interests supporting the one common good, the empire flourished.¹⁵ This golden age of Charlemagne, nostalgically recalled by Nithard in 843, stands in bleak contrast to the present situation, when, "since each goes his separate way, dissension and struggle abound."¹⁶

In the *Histories*, it is Charlemagne's ability to inspire terror that emerges as the basis for his masculinity and qualities of kingship. Yet, Nithard implies that it was not only Charlemagne's masculinity that was secured by his terror but the masculinity of the lay noblemen as well. A layman's masculinity is, consequently, presented as distinctly different from that of the king: the king dominates; the noblemen are suppressed. Nithard is clear that right order can only be maintained if hierarchical, rather than lateral, power relations structure the realm. Thus, his representation of Charlemagne's relationship with his men differs significantly from Einhard's in the *Life of Charlemagne*, which, as Matthew Innes has persuasively argued, "stressed the horizontal bonds uniting the ruler and the Franks."¹⁷ In Nithard's view, laymen are

¹⁴ "Nam super omne quod ammirabile fateor fore, Francorum barbarorumque ferocia ac ferrea corda, que nec Romana potentia domare valuit, hic solus moderato terrore ita repressit ut nihil in imperio moliri praeter quod publice utilitati congruebat manifeste audent," Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.1, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 4; trans. Bernhard W. Scholz with Barbara Rogers, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor 1970) 130.

¹⁵ Emphasis on the need to rule with terror is also found in Isidore of Seville's *Sententiae*. Isidore claims that "both princes and kings have been elected over the people so that by their terror they might check the people from evil, and subdue them by means of laws to a right way of living" ("Inde et in gentibus principes, regesque electi sunt, ut terrore suo populos a malo coercerent, atque ad recte vivendum legibus subderent"). Isidore, *Sententiae*, lib. 3, cap. 47, PL 38.717. I thank Courtney Booker for bringing this reference to my attention.

¹⁶ "at nunc econtra, quoniam quique semitam quam cupit incedit, ubique dissensiones et rixae sunt manifestae," Nithard, *Historiae*, 4.7, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 144; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 174.

¹⁷ Matthew Innes, "'He never even allowed his white teeth to be bared in laughter': The Politics of Humour in the Carolingian Renaissance," *Humour, History and Politics in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Guy Halsall (Cambridge 2002) 140.

incapable of controlling their selfish and violent desires of their own accord, and so require the restraint imposed by a dominating king. Nithard does not imply that it is unmanly to be suppressed by such a king; rather, it is suppression that makes a layman masculine, since it is that which distinguishes him from an unruly or uncultivated being.¹⁸

In keeping with the ideal of kingship embodied by Charlemagne, Nithard attributes the problems arising during Louis the Pious's reign to the king's weakness.¹⁹ He traces the roots of the conflicts in the early 840s to Louis's anxiety and indecisiveness upon the birth of his youngest son Charles in 823. "After Charles's birth, Louis did not know what to do for him since he had already divided the whole empire among his other sons ... The distressed father begged [the sons'] help on Charles's behalf."²⁰ According to Nithard, distress compelled Louis first to seek help from Lothar, and then, when Lothar began scheming against Charles, to appoint Bernard of Septimania second in the empire in an attempt to counter Lothar's schemes. As a result of these actions, Louis inverted the hierarchical relations that ought to exist between a king and his noblemen. It was not, as Philippe Depreux claims, Louis's decision to grant Charles the territory of Alemannia in 829 that, in

¹⁸ Although it will not be discussed in this study, Nithard's conception of the "uncontrolled man" seems to touch on medieval notions of the Wild Man, an almost mythological being who was closer to beast than human. While he focuses on the later Middle Ages, Richard Bernheimer notes that the wild man was thought to live a life of "bestial self-fulfillment." His state of wildness "implied everything that eluded Christian norms," although it was "amenable to change through acculturation." The idea that Nithard saw Charlemagne's terrifying lordship as the force that held the wild Frankish men in a civilized state is supported by Paul Dutton's argument that Charlemagne was imagined as "a symbol of the domestication of the wild world." Dutton refers primarily to how Charlemagne collected and tamed exotic beasts, but he also mentions that the Saxons were seen as "savage beasts," whom Charlemagne transformed into "gentle lambs." Richard Bernheimer, *Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology* (Cambridge 1952) 4, 8, 20; Paul E. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Mustache: And Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York 2004) 67–68.

¹⁹ Nithard's narrative thus stands in contrast to other contemporary reports, which criticize Louis not for his weakness but for his overly harsh treatment of his nephew, Bernard of Italy. Bernard was blinded and subsequently died when he rebelled against Louis in 817 in response to the *Ordinatio imperii*, which granted Bernard's kingdom of Italy to Lothar. Texts that have been interpreted as critical of Louis's treatment of Bernard include the *Vision of the Poor Woman of Laon*, the rebel bishops' summary *Relatio* from 833 and Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*.

²⁰ "Karolo quidem nato, quoniam omne imperium inter reliquos filios pater diviserat, quid huic faceret ignorabat; cumque anxius pater pro filio filios rogaret," Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.3, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 8; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 131.

Nithard's view, first upset the right order of the empire.²¹ Although this act, which broke the *Ordinatio imperii*, angered many of Nithard's contemporaries, it is understood by Nithard *not* as a legitimate reason for Lothar to seize power in the interest of the common good, but as a pretext used by Lothar in the service of his greed: "Then, at last, Lothar, *as if* [*quasi*] he had discovered a just complaint, roused his brothers and, similarly, the whole people to restore the state of the empire."²² The reason that Charles's birth is associated with the decline of the empire is not because it provoked a redistribution of land, but because it provoked Louis's distress, which led to his inability to restrain the greed of men such as Lothar and Bernard, and thus opened the way for personal ambition and neglect of the common good.

Nithard's primary objection with the men of his age is that they act only in accordance with their greed and personal welfare, even going so far as to destroy the foundations of society by disrespecting their oaths.²³ Frequently, Nithard expresses his disgust at the weakness of his contemporaries, their tendency to follow the common way rather than the way of the common good. He describes how one man's decision to break his fealty resulted in many others "like slaves [*more servorum*]" following his example.²⁴ In a right-ordered empire, the king would have controlled the individual desires of these men, strengthening all oaths by enforcing the idea of the common good; however, in the early 840s there was no "terrible" king to make men act in a manly way.

In contrast to the example of Charlemagne, Nithard emphasizes that horizontal bonds unite the kings and their men in the early 840s. Charles the Bald and his brother Louis do not govern by asserting their

²¹ Philippe Depreux, "Nithard et la *Res Publica*: Un regard critique sur le règne de Louis le Pieux," *Médiévales* 22–23 (1992) 153–161.

²² Translation and italics mine. "Tum tandem Lodharius, quasi iusta querimonia repta, tam fratres quam et universam plebem veluti ad restaurandum rei publicae statum animabat," Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.3, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 10.

²³ To a certain extent, the *Histories* presents a world in which the oath has become useless; at one point, Nithard clearly implies that Charles's men swore an oath as a strategy, knowing that they would not be obliged to keep it long given Lothar's propensity for breaking his promises. Yet, at the same time, the oath remains, for Nithard, the only means these men have for establishing relationships and carrying out concerted action.

²⁴ Nithard's use of the term "slaves" indicates that he conceived of slaves as people who typically act in a shameful fashion. Nithard, *Historiae*, 2.3, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 44. For a similar conception of slaves, see the *Deeds of Louis* by Nithard's contemporary Thegan. Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, cap. 20, ed. Ernst Tremp, *Thegan: Die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs; Astronomus: Das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs*, MGH, SRG, separatim editi 64 (Hanover 1995) 204–208.

royal superiority, but by holding councils with their followers and reaching consensual decisions. The primary example of these new relations among the Franks is the Strasbourg Oaths in 842.²⁵ Both Charles's and Louis's followers, by swearing to restrain their respective lord or else fail to give him aid should he break his oath to his brother, act as a surety against their lord doing anything contrary to the common good.²⁶ In place of an authoritative figure such as Charlemagne controlling the Frankish men, the men are seen to control their lords, but only by exerting group pressure on them. In addition to establishing a relationship between the lords and their men, the Strasbourg Oaths function as a means to bind the men to one another.²⁷ That is, the men of both camps swear the oath collectively, each group in its own language, and part of their oath includes the stipulation that each man will prevent anyone whom he can from giving aid to a brother who has broken his oath. Thus, within the group each man functions as a control on the selfish desires of the others. For Nithard, the Strasburg Oaths represent an attempt to control men as they would be controlled under a terrifying ruler; however, his despair at the end of the work indicates his belief that this noble attempt to reorder the realm has failed.

Although the new relationship between the king and the Frankish noblemen may be, for Nithard, the factor that triggered the inversion of proper order within the realm, this inversion is also evidenced in the other networks in which a layman is situated. The fact that kin relationships have been corrupted to the point where brothers are fighting one another on a battlefield is, to Nithard, unmistakable evidence that men are expressing an improper form of masculinity and have overturned the right order of society.²⁸ Throughout the *Histories*, Nithard constantly reminds his noble audience how a brother *ought* to behave toward his sibling—that is, loyally, generously, respectfully, and as a

²⁵ Nithard recorded these oaths in the French and German vernacular, making the *Histories* the first record of the French language.

²⁶ Nithard, *Historiae*, 3.5, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 102–106.

²⁷ For a discussion of peer relationships in the early Middle Ages, which briefly touches on Nithard's and Dhuoda's work, see Janet Nelson, "Peers in the Early Middle Ages," *Law, Laity and Solidarities: Essays in Honour of Susan Reynolds*, ed. Pauline Stafford, Janet Nelson, Jane Martindale (Manchester 2001) 27–46.

²⁸ Horror at brothers, uncles, nephews, father, and sons fighting one another at the Battle of Fontenoy is also prominent in the layman Angelbert's poem. Angelbert, "The Battle of Fontenoy," trans. Peter Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London 1985) 262–265.

friend.²⁹ While the relationship between Louis the German and Charles the Bald is held up by Nithard as the “proper” or “masculine” form of the fraternal bond, he provides few, if any, representations of an ideal father-son relationship. Indeed, Louis the Pious’s proper paternal authority is inverted when he seeks help from his older sons, and, in turn, the sons consistently neglect the respect and obedience owed to a father.

Nithard’s insistence that men respect their familial duties is, however, tempered by an acknowledgement that simply honoring kinship obligations will not right the order of the empire. Nithard’s image of Louis as the “pious and gentle father [*pius ac clemens pater*],” who, like the father of the prodigal son, forgives his erring son and welcomes him back with gifts, seems to be a positive model of clement fatherhood;³⁰ yet, this ideal of fatherhood undermines Louis’s position as the terrifying emperor and potentially contributes to the realm’s troubles, since Louis fails to sufficiently control or chastise Lothar.³¹ The conflict between Louis’s two roles speaks to larger underlying tensions that Nithard sees between kinship bonds and men’s other obligations. While Nithard recognizes that kinship bonds constitute an integral network within Frankish society, he also wishes to emphasize that men’s primary duty ought to be to the common good and not to their kin.³²

An analysis of Nithard’s conception of masculinity must take into account not only men’s duties to king and kin, but also to God, especially since such an approach will illuminate the distinctions between Nithard’s and Dhuoda’s worldviews. Nithard explicitly states that the “way of the common good” is the “way of God,” and thus the way to salvation,³³ yet, the emphasis within the text is certainly more on the conditions of earthly life than the pursuit of heavenly rewards. When

²⁹ These reminders are generally aimed at Lothar, whom, Nithard stresses repeatedly, represents all that is unmanly among Frankish men.

³⁰ Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.7, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 30.

³¹ Nelson notes that people during the 9th c. began rethinking “the way kingship had hitherto been gendered. Alongside, but sometimes obscuring ‘masculine’ justice were ‘feminine’ mercy and gentleness.” See Nelson, “Monks, Secular Men and Masculinity” (n. 7 above) 141. Nithard seems to be reacting against just such an ideal with his implicit criticism of Louis’s mildness.

³² Such tension is also evident in the brothers’ conflicts, most particularly in Charles’s recognition that he owes Lothar loyalty as his elder brother, but that Lothar is unfit to receive such loyalty because of his disregard for the common good.

³³ “populus unam eandemque rectam ac per hoc viam Domini publicam incedebat,” Nithard, *Historiae*, 4.7, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 144.

men's lives are rightly ordered, then God's will is assumed to be manifested through that of the king. However, when the common good is neglected, God is required to intervene directly in the affairs of the realm. For Nithard, the Battle of Fontenoy is a judgment of God, necessitated because discord among men has increased to the point that God's is the only authority that can settle issues of legitimate power and enforce the right order of society. When describing the events of 830, Nithard notes that Louis the Pious was ordered to "promote religious worship, by which all order is protected and preserved."³⁴ Rather than suggest that Nithard is referring here to an increased religiosity inspiring men toward better ideals, I would argue that Nithard is reflecting the belief that imperial concern for the well-being of the church and monasteries will encourage God to look after the empire. This belief is prominent in much of the legislation from Charlemagne's and Louis's reigns. Although Nithard's understanding of religion is not exceptional, it does stand in sharp contrast to Dhuoda's worldview, in which men ought to establish a personal relationship with God.

Unlike Nithard, who, for the most part, describes the empire in its inverted state, Dhuoda is primarily concerned with setting out a prescriptive schema for ordering men's relations within the empire. In one of her few references to current affairs, she recalls that "the wretchedness of this world grew, and worsened, in the midst of the many struggles and disruptions of the kingdom," vividly revealing her opinion that relations among the Franks are not right.³⁵ The fact that Dhuoda believed it necessary to provide her son with a guide to the obligations that would structure his life indicates that she saw her son's need for such information—a need that was not going to be fulfilled except by her work. Even though William was now situated at court, a place that Dhuoda frequently refers to as the centre of wisdom and learning, and even though Dhuoda urges him to seek conversation with the scholars of the realm, she still seems to have acted out of a conviction that William would not secure the knowledge he needed from these sources

³⁴ "fovere vellet maximeque cultum divinum, quo omnis ordo tuetur ac regitur," Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.3, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 12; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 131.

³⁵ "Volente et crescente calamitate huius saeculi miseria, inter multas fluctuationes et discordias regni," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, Praefatio, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 84; trans. Carol Neel, *Handbook for William: A Carolingian Woman's Counsel for Her Son* (Washington, DC 1999) 6.

alone.³⁶ In part, Dhuoda thought that her work was special because it contained personal details about William's family and was meant to reflect her motherly presence.³⁷ Yet, Dhuoda considered her work integral to William's well-being not only because of these qualities, but also because it would ensure that her son behaved properly in the face of improper masculinities.

William, however, was not the only male in need of guidance in such difficult times. If only William were aware of the proper hierarchy of obligations within a man's life, then his salvation, which is one of Dhuoda's concerns, might be assured; yet, Dhuoda's other concern is William's earthly security and happiness, and that, surely, could only be maintained if all noblemen recognized the correct order of relations within the realm. There are clear indications within the *Manual* that Dhuoda expected it to be read by people other than her son.³⁸ In the first book, she directs a humility *topos* to William as well as to "those to whom you may offer this little book for perusal."³⁹ Dhuoda was writing at the same time as Nithard, and her family was directly involved in the power struggles of the day. She, like Nithard, saw the need for a work that would outline proper "manly" obligations, both to William

³⁶ Rosamond McKitterick notes that Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis* is known to have been present in the libraries of at least two laymen in addition to Count Wido to whom the work was addressed, and she surmises that it was a text considered of general use to the laity. Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge 1989) 266–267. It is possible that Dhuoda knew the whole of Alcuin's text, given that she borrows from it twice. Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.6, 7.6, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 226–227, 304–305. The fact that the Barcelona manuscript of the *Manual* also contains Alcuin's *De virtutibus* could further support the idea that Dhuoda had access to Alcuin's complete text. See André Vernet, "Un nouveau manuscrit du 'Manuel' de Dhuoda," *Revue d'Érudition* 114 (1957) 22–23. Yet, despite her awareness of Alcuin's text, she apparently did not believe that it could fulfill William's need for guidance with respect to his proper obligations.

³⁷ She enjoins him that "as you pray to God you may be able to look upon *me* as if in a mirror" (italics mine) ("quasi in picturam speculi, me ... intueri possis"). Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 114; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 13.

³⁸ Margaret Trenchard-Smith is the only scholar to address this aspect of the work, arguing that Dhuoda anticipated that members of Charles's court (including Charles and Bernard) would read her text. Trenchard-Smith points out that this knowledge of a wider audience both constrained Dhuoda's message and was integral to her purpose. Primarily, her purpose was to present William as Charles's loyal *fidelis* and thereby evoke Charles's sympathy and protection toward her son. Margaret Trenchard-Smith, "Furibunda silentia: The 'Raging Silences' of the Testimony of Dhuoda, Countess of Septimania," (Unpublished manuscript, UCLA 1997) 5, 7, 15, 19.

³⁹ "illos ad quos hunc libellum ad relegendum ostenderis," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.1, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 96; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 7.

and to the general public, obligations that evidently had been forgotten or neglected.

According to the hierarchy of obligations that Dhuoda lays out, a man must give his complete loyalty first to God, second to his father, and third to his lord. In keeping with such an arrangement, Dhuoda begins her text with a discussion of God and the Trinity. Unlike Nithard, whose God is somewhat distant from everyday affairs, Dhuoda emphasizes that William must constantly bear in mind that he owes everything to God, and that he must “unceasingly call upon His aid.”⁴⁰ William must treat God as he would a great lord; so long as William approaches God as he would his lord, that is, respectfully and humbly, God should be prepared to answer William’s prayers.⁴¹ Dhuoda is adamant that, while men must place their hopes in eternal (not transient) pleasures, God will not ignore the earthly needs of those who seek his spiritual help. For the most part, Dhuoda’s God exerts a type of justice recognizable to human beings: he rewards those who act according to his laws, and punishes those who sin and do not repent.⁴²

After God, who is at all times the ruler of any earthly kingdom and the first lord to whom any man owes loyalty, Dhuoda instructs William to obey his father. In many ways, the relationship between a son and his father is depicted as one of exchange. William owes his father loyalty in return for the rank and property that his father will pass on to him and that will allow William to participate in the power structures of the realm. “For it is a fixed and unchangeable truth,” explains Dhuoda, “that no one, unless his rank comes to him from his father, can have access to another person at the height of power.”⁴³ Given the importance of land in establishing William’s position at court, Dhuoda instructs William to pray for his kin in proportion to the amount of land

⁴⁰ “eius adiutorium ... indesinenter peto,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.2, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 98; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 8.

⁴¹ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 2.3, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 126.

⁴² For Dhuoda, the relationship between humanity and God is not nearly as mysterious or unknowable as Augustine suggested in the *City of God*. As Theodor Mommsen has demonstrated, in the *City of God* Augustine firmly denies that humanity has a *do ut des* (I give so that you may give) relationship with God. Theodor E. Mommsen, “St. Augustine and the Christian Idea of Progress: The Background of the *City of God*,” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Eugene Rice (Ithaca 1959) 265–298.

⁴³ “Certa quidem et fixa manet conditio, quod nullus nisi ex genitore procedat, non potest ad aliam et summam personam culmine pervenire senioratus,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.2, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 140; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 23.

they have bequeathed to him.⁴⁴ Although her “pragmatic” attitude toward kinship relations (in terms of land and the loyalty it obliges) seems somewhat at odds with her spiritually-centered worldview, Dhuoda’s understanding of the kinship exchange system in many ways parallels her perception of divine justice, in which proper reverence toward God is repaid by temporal and eternal benefits.

Dhuoda is insistent that inheritance is not simply a right; a son must prove himself worthy of his inheritance in the eyes of his father and God. Proving oneself worthy of inheritance is presented as a masculine endeavor and is one of the ways in which Dhuoda tries to stabilize relations between two generations of men. She was not alone in recognizing that contemporary problems within the realm necessitated an emphasis on filial loyalty as an integral aspect of proper masculinity.⁴⁵ In his discussion of the relations between William the Conqueror and his eldest son in eleventh-century England, William M. Aird touches on issues of masculinity that also affected the Frankish realm in the ninth century. Aird highlights how royal sons were prevented from assuming the status of fully gendered men due to their dependence on their father’s power and their inability to act independently. Sons wished to embody the model set for them by their fathers, but could only do so by rebelling against their fathers and casting off their subordinate masculinities.⁴⁶ Such actions seem consonant with how affairs developed between Louis and his sons. In response to such issues, Dhuoda underscores the manliness of subservience. A true man is naturally subservient both to God and to his father, just as, for Nithard, a layman ought to be subservient to a king terrifying enough to protect the interests of the common good.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Patrick Geary argues that, in the rules of gift-exchange, the gifts that dead ancestors bequeathed to the living (namely, life, family identity, and land) could only be repaid by the gift of prayers for eternal salvation. Geary maintains that the list of William’s ancestors in the *Manual* is not a genealogy but a list of the dead whose property will pass to William. See Patrick Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca 1994) 78–90.

⁴⁵ For example, the subject of filial obedience surfaces in Jonas of Orléans’s mirror for the laity, and is the subject of a treatise written by Hrabanus Maurus in 834 and dedicated to Louis the Pious. See Paul E. Dutton, “Awareness of Historical Decline in the Carolingian Empire, 800–887” (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto 1981) 182, 185.

⁴⁶ William M. Aird, “Frustrated Masculinity: The Relationship between William the Conqueror and His Eldest Son,” *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (London 1999) 39–55.

⁴⁷ The fact that such subservience could be variously interpreted, however, is evidenced by the rebels’ claims that the sons of Louis had no choice but to take action

Following her discussion of paternal relations, Dhuoda proceeds to describe the loyalty that William must show his lord—the lord and *fi-delis* relationship being the third most important in a man’s hierarchy of obligations. She firmly states that this hierarchy is God’s will, although she acknowledges that to many, overwhelmed by the pomp of royal power, it seems right that obligations to one’s lord precede paternal obligations.⁴⁸ Certainly, Nithard and other of Dhuoda’s contemporaries would have been uneasy with the primacy she affords kinship bonds.⁴⁹ Dhuoda instructs William to be faithful to his lord, “whatever sort of lord he may be.”⁵⁰ This statement seems to imply that she considered it William’s duty to obey even an incompetent or unjust ruler, since God still had his reasons for instituting such a sovereign. Her *Manual* was not promoting any right to resistance, whether it be against one’s father or king.⁵¹

Dhuoda’s instructions to William are built upon an ideal of manly subservience to God and father and, to a lesser degree, one’s lord. Yet, she tempers the idea of such hierarchical power relations with her notion of a fraternal brotherhood in which all men are bound together by common love and the need for mutual support. This brotherhood is integral to her worldview and reflects a model of friendship that espouses the strength of emotional ties. A similar conception of friendship emerges from the works of Alcuin, the leading Carolingian scholar

against Louis, since such action was, in truth, the only way to restore their father’s dignity. For example, Bishop Agobard of Lyons, vividly describing how Judith’s affair with Bernard shamed Louis and upset the order of his mind, emphasized that it was the sons’ duty to “rebel,” in order to protect the honour and reputation of their father. Agobard of Lyons, *Liber apologeticus I*, ed. Lieven Van Acker, CCCM (Turnhout 1981) 52.309–312.

⁴⁸ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.2, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 140.

⁴⁹ Archbishop Hincmar, in his didactic work, *On the Governance of the Palace*, asserts that the election of a bishop must not be influenced by kinship or friendship, and that blood ties should not interfere with the rendering of just punishments. Hincmar of Rheims, *De ordine palatii*, cap. 3, ed. Thomas Gross, Rudolf Schieffer, MGH, *Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum, separatim editi 3* (Hanover 1980) 49–50.

⁵⁰ “quisquis ille est,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 106; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 32.

⁵¹ Of course, underlying her system of obligations is the specter of conflicting loyalties. Given Bernard’s fickle and deceitful ways, there was a very real chance that William would have to decide between duty to his father and to his lord, Charles. While Dhuoda makes it clear that William is expected to obey his father before his lord, she never directly raises the issue of obeying his father *instead* of his lord. Presumably, Dhuoda hoped that if all men were giving their primary allegiance to God, then such conflicts of interest would simply not arise. Trenchard-Smith points out that Dhuoda’s instructions regarding this topic were necessarily circumscribed given the possibility of Charles reading her work. Trenchard-Smith, “*Furibunda silentia*” (n. 38 above) 16.

in the 780s and 790s. For Alcuin, the type of love expressed in personal friendship is intimately associated with universal *caritas* or friendship; friendship is a mystical gift from the Holy Spirit, which both reflects the unity of God and is the means by which humans draw closer to God.⁵² Nithard, in contrast to Alcuin and Dhuoda, never suggests that emotional ties ought to be a powerful force within a man's life. He uses the word *amicitia* only once, in reference to a contractual bond rather than an emotional one; and while he stresses the *unanimitas* existing among men pursuing the common good, there is no indication that love binds, or should bind, the men.⁵³

Dhuoda speaks of a "brotherly fellowship of love for greater and lesser men alike," examples of which are found in nature and in traditions of the past, but which examples the Franks are apparently ignoring.⁵⁴ As Glenn Olsen has shown, whereas Acts 4.32 had traditionally been interpreted as referring to the first monastic community,⁵⁵ Dhuoda applies the idea of "one heart and one soul" not to those sharing goods in common, but to all peoples.⁵⁶ She links this common love among all men both to a shared love in Christ, and to humanity's common origin of flesh made from dust. Within the fraternal brotherhood, Dhuoda's ideal of subservience finds its place in the belief that those who serve their brothers, who make themselves the lesser and humbler of the lot,

⁵² Adele Fiske and Brian McGuire argue that Alcuin's idea of friendship stands in contrast to that of his contemporaries, who primarily discuss friendship as a practical, useful bond, rather than a mystical one. See Adele Fiske, "Alcuin and Mystical Friendship," *Studi Medievali* 3rd ser. 2 (1961) 751–775; Brian McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo 1988) 116–133.

⁵³ Nithard uses the word *amicitia* to refer to Charles receiving Bernard of Septimania's promise of loyalty and bestowing gifts on Bernard in return. Nithard, *Historiae*, 2.5, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 50–52. For a discussion this type of friendship bond, see Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Early Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge 2004) 73–74, 84–86. The one time that Nithard does refer to love between the men, it is in reference to how Louis the Pious "loved Adalhard so much [*Dilixerat ... Adelardum adeo*]" that he allowed Adalhard to usurp powers that were not his and ruin the kingdom. Nithard, *Historiae*, 4.6, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 142.

⁵⁴ "dilectionem tam in maioribus quam in minoribus per compassionis fraternitatem omnimodis per cuncta in generi humano ostendit esse tenendam," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.10, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 178; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 36.

⁵⁵ "And the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul: neither did any one say that aught of the things which he possessed was his own, but all things were common unto them" (Acts 4.32).

⁵⁶ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.10, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 178–180; Glenn Olsen, "One Heart and One Soul (Acts 4.32 and 34) in Dhuoda's 'Manual,'" *Church History* 61 (1992) 28–33.

are closer to God than those who simply hold earthly power. At the same time, she indicates that even those who are powerful and lead the brotherhood require the support of their fellows—thus, in a right-ordered world, all men are bound by dependence and need.

Although for Nithard it is primarily fear that structures men's civil relations, for Dhuoda it is mutual compassion that ought to govern men and maintain order among them.⁵⁷ These bonds of compassion are also what structure the relationship between mother and son. Unlike a son's duty to his father, which is due on account of the land and position he will receive from him, Dhuoda indicates that a son owes his mother service in return for the loving care she directs toward him.⁵⁸ Thus, while she emphasizes the special love that gives her authority over William, Dhuoda sees this "feminine" ability to command through love as an effective means of governance that applies to all human relationships, not only maternal ones.⁵⁹

TWO IDEALS OF CAROLINGIAN KNIGHTHOOD

In his discussion of Carolingian knighthood, Karl Leyser repeatedly draws attention to the central role of the *cingulum militare* (sword-belt) in distinguishing the status of a lay nobleman—a fact that attests to the importance of martial activity in the formation of a nobleman's identity.⁶⁰ The potential for warriors' involvement in violence to bar them from leading the type of Christian life espoused by the church had been

⁵⁷ In many ways, Dhuoda's and Nithard's distinct understandings of human relations are comparable to the differences that Michael Clanchy notes between medieval dispute settlement by law or by love. In reference to the 12th c. he argues that people generally considered settlement by love to be more effective than settlement by law. It was a commonly held belief that "agreement prevails over law and love over judgment." Michael Clanchy, "Law and Love in the Middle Ages," *Disputes and Settlements: Law and Human Relations in the West*, ed. John Bossy (Cambridge 1983) 47–67.

⁵⁸ Felice Lifshitz, examining the type of authority female abbots possessed, demonstrates that, in early monastic rules that recognized a difference between female and male abbatial authority, the *mater* could only be obeyed out of love, not, like the abbot, out of fear of her ability to discipline the flock. Felice Lifshitz, "Is Mother Superior? Towards a History of Feminine *Amtscharisma*," *Medieval Mothering*, ed. John Parsons, Bonnie Wheeler (New York 1996) 117–138.

⁵⁹ Dhuoda's suggestion that men must adopt feminine qualities in order to be masculine is a theme that will be touched on later in the paper.

⁶⁰ It was the *cingulum* with which laymen were girded upon reaching the age of manhood, and, according to council decrees from the second half of the 9th c., it was this same symbolic item that laymen were forced to remove when they committed a crime and underwent public penance. Karl Leyser, "Early Medieval Canon Law and the Beginning of Knighthood," *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Carolingian and Ottonian Centuries*, ed. Timothy Reuter (London 1994) 55–66.

a problem since antiquity; nevertheless, as Carl Erdmann argues, the Carolingians' alliance with the papacy encouraged ecclesiastics to promote the idea that *Godly* rulers could use their martial skills for the defense and extension of Christendom.⁶¹ It was, however, much harder to justify warriors' participation in the violence of civil war in the 840s. The two ideals of knighthood that Dhuoda and Nithard sketch can be seen as attempts, by the laity itself, to address and define the role that fighting should occupy in a layman's life.

Throughout the *Manual*, Dhuoda devotes almost no attention to William's duties as a warrior. She encourages him to take pleasure in fighting for his lord,⁶² but never makes reference to the training he will undergo or to contemporary conflicts such as Fontenoy—an event that shapes Nithard's understanding of a warrior's identity.⁶³ On the surface, she remains silent with respect to the pertinent question of how William can engage in legitimate acts of violence.⁶⁴

Dhuoda's understanding of William's masculine duties is defined by her belief that there are "two lives, the active and contemplative," and that these two lives ought to be performed in tandem, just as love of God and neighbor are to her naturally codependent.⁶⁵ She never exclusively links the active life to the laity and the contemplative life to monasticism, refusing to establish firm distinctions between the duties of each order. Dhuoda's conception of William's contemplative life is

⁶¹ Ecclesiastics drew on Augustine's theory of the just war in their attempts to legitimize violence. Augustine allowed warriors to be God's servants only when fighting against heretics or on missionary campaigns. Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. Marshall Baldwin, Walter Goffart (Princeton 1977) 8–25. Nelson notes that several texts from the 9th c., including Alcuin's mirror for the laity, espoused Augustinian beliefs that fighting to defend the church or the kingdom was a legitimate activity. Janet Nelson, "Violence in the Carolingian World and the Ritualization of Ninth-Century Warfare," *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Guy Halsall (Woodbridge 1998) 91.

⁶² Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 162.

⁶³ While one might argue that Dhuoda does not discuss William's military duties because she has no experience in that field, she also declines to mention anything about estate management, an activity about which she knows a great deal, since, as she states, she has been caring for her husband's estates in Uzès.

⁶⁴ Erdmann notes that, similarly, in Jonas of Orléans's mirror for the laity, "one looks in vain for a word about the practical morality of the warrior." Erdmann, *Origin of the Idea of Crusade* (n. 61 above) 17.

⁶⁵ "duae intelligunt vitae; hoc est activa et contemplativa," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.5, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 106; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 10.

exceedingly similar to the life of a monk.⁶⁶ She implies that he ought to follow the seven liturgical hours that structured the monastic day, and her description of the manner in which he ought to offer his prayer mirrors sections in the Benedictine Rule. Anne McGuire points out that Dhuoda's understanding of prayer differs from the type of prayer her contemporary Jonas of Orléans sets out in his own mirror for the laity. Whereas Jonas emphasizes that the laity's prayer should take place in church, communally, under the supervision of the clergy, Dhuoda depicts a more personalized form of prayer that occurs, primarily, outside the church's services.⁶⁷ William is to pray constantly to God, "not only in church but wherever the circumstances take [him]."⁶⁸ While Dhuoda accords the clergy a closer relationship with God, and thus a special authority, she does not suggest that William needs priests or monks to mediate between himself and God; rather, she instructs William on how to establish his own personal relationship with God, and aspire to the example of Moses, who "spoke with God as a man with his friend."⁶⁹

The high priority that Dhuoda affords laymen's contemplative duties is not a viewpoint her contemporaries necessarily deemed appropriate. For example, the records of the reform synod of Aachen in 816 note that "certain simple people are generally accustomed to assert that only monks ought to observe the precepts of the holy scriptures."⁷⁰ Such a statement implies that Carolingian lay people were not particularly interested in Christian ideals, and saw themselves as living distinctly dif-

⁶⁶ Valerie Garver argues that evidence of certain Carolingian lay nobles possessing psalters "reveals the desire among individual aristocrats to take up some aspects of monastic life." See Valerie Garver, "The Influence of Monastic Ideals upon Carolingian Conceptions of Childhood," *Childhood in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: The Results of a Paradigm Shift in the History of Mentality*, ed. Albrecht Classen (Berlin 2005) 77. For a discussion of Dhuoda's use of the psalms and her theological beliefs in general, see Marie Ann Mayeski, *Dhuoda: Ninth Century Mother and Theologian* (Scranton 1995).

⁶⁷ Anne McGuire, "Liturgy and Laity in the Ninth Century," *Ecclesia Orans* 13 (1996) 469–471, 480–482.

⁶⁸ "non solum in ecclesia, sed ubicunque tibi provenerit eventus," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 2.3, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 126; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 18.

⁶⁹ "loquebaturque cum Deo, quasi homo cum amico suo," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 232; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 54. Dhuoda also references her own personal relationship with God, asserting that she has the ability to receive wisdom directly from God, just like the clergy.

⁷⁰ "Propter quorundam simplicium verba, qui religiosi et eruditus viris se admonentibus ac redarguentibus plerumque obicere solent solos monachos scripturarum sanctarum praecepta observare debere, opere pretium duximus," Concilium Aquisgranense (816), cap. 114, ed. Albert Werminghoff, MGH, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, 2.1 (Hanover 1906) 394.

ferently from monks.⁷¹ If one assumes that the king functioned as a model for his noblemen, then the two ninth-century texts that criticized Louis the Pious's over-involvement in religious affairs surely influenced laymen's beliefs about their proper contemplative duties. Thegan's *Deeds of Louis* observes that Louis spent too much time reading scripture, and so left the affairs of the empire in the hands of lowborn advisors—an action that ultimately led to the rebellions against Louis.⁷² Paschasius Radbertus's *Epitaphium Arsenii* demonstrates how the king's abandonment of his "proper duties [*propriis officiis*]" for "divine matters [*divina*]" forced others to take up inappropriate duties and upset the correct order of the realm.⁷³

Although Dhuoda's blurring of the distinctions between lay and monastic duties diverges from the views voiced in the above sources, her beliefs are in accordance with the monastic reforms carried out by Louis the Pious in 816 and 817. These reforms sought to standardize monastic practice by making the Benedictine Rule the one rule to which all monasteries in the realm would adhere. The increasing popularization of Benedictine monasticism may help explain why Dhuoda quotes extensively from the Rule, but, more importantly, may have been a key factor in shaping Dhuoda's worldview.⁷⁴ It seems likely that Dhuoda was somehow influenced by these monastic reform ideals, and that this, for the most part, accounts for her insistence that William adopt a "monkish" way of life.⁷⁵

⁷¹ That the synod's observations contradict n. 66 above about the laity's interest in the psalter both points to the lack of information concerning the Carolingian laity's beliefs and supports the idea that there were conflicting beliefs about appropriate lay duties in the 9th c.

⁷² Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, cap. 20, ed. Tremp (n. 24 above) 204–206.

⁷³ Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, lib. 2, cap. 2, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *Philologische und historische Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 2 (1900) 63. This is not to say that these writers thought a king should entirely neglect spiritual duties. They do seem to suggest, however, that the type of constant prayer and devotion Dhuoda proposes is dangerous for the order of the realm.

⁷⁴ Thomas Noble has argued that the Benedictine Rule was one of the "guiding principles" in Louis' understanding of the empire; Louis equated his position as emperor to that of abbot, believing that he possessed similar duties to those outlined for the abbot in the Rule. Thomas Noble, "The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious," *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976) 235–250. Matthew Innes similarly asserts that Thegan's portrait of Louis in his biography is particularly monastic. Innes, "He never even allowed his white teeth to be bared in laughter" (n. 17 above) 142–147.

⁷⁵ Innes asserts that the morality inculcated at Carolingian courts by the end of the 8th c. reflected monastic ideals of self-control: "The Carolingians chose to construct their court society around an image of the courtier that drew on monastic ideals, but was dis-

It is William's contemplative duties—his constant prayer and his personal relationship with God—that inform the role that combat plays in William's life. Dhuoda may say little about warfare in the *Manual*, but her instructions are filled with descriptions of the internal struggle William must wage against the vices.⁷⁶ This struggle requires him to examine the “inner chamber of [his] spirit” for signs of pride, anger, or envy, to restrain his thoughts from such sins, and instead to foster humility and patience in his heart.⁷⁷ Again, Dhuoda is here comparing William to a Benedictine monk, who was instructed to be a soldier for Christ and battle the devil.⁷⁸ She adheres to the idea that martial prowess defines a layman's reputation, but privileges a spiritual form of conflict. Moreover, while she never states so directly, she implies that only by winning this internal conflict can a nobleman then engage in legitimate, and thus, “manly” acts of violence.

Similarly, the primary reason that William will be able to provide sound counsel is because he has engaged in internal reflection and struggle and has acquired a “secure mind [*secura mens*].”⁷⁹ When describing William's active duties, Dhuoda repeatedly focuses on the provision of counsel, not military aid, as the most important duty William must fulfill. As a noble of the realm, William not only owes counsel to his lord, but to any whom he is able to help; he ought to use his spiritual knowledge to guide others toward God. A key component of providing counsel is to “correct those who err” by reproving, entreating, and rebuking them.⁸⁰ This three-part formula of reproving, entreating, and rebuking is from Paul's second epistle to Timothy,⁸¹ but is also

tinct from them.” See Matthew Innes, “‘A Place of Discipline’: Carolingian Courts and Aristocratic Youth,” *Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The Proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference*, ed. Catherine Cubitt (Turnhout 2003) 60, 75. Dhuoda's image of the courtier seems less “distinct” than Innes's article suggests.

⁷⁶ The idea of an internal war against the vices was not unique to Dhuoda. One of the foundational texts for such a theme was Prudentius's early 5th-c. work, the *Psychomachia*, which depicted the vices and virtues as two contending armies of female warriors.

⁷⁷ “cubiculo mentis ... tuo,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 230–232; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 54.

⁷⁸ Benedict of Nursia, *Sancti Benedicti Regula Monachorum*, Prologus, trans. Justin McCann, *The Rule of St. Benedict* (Westminster 1952) 7.

⁷⁹ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 234–236.

⁸⁰ “delinquentes ... corrige frequenter. Scriptum est: Argue, obsecra, increpa,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 254; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 61–62.

⁸¹ 2 Tim. 4.2.

found in the Benedictine Rule, where it is applied specifically to the abbot. The abbot must remain continuously aware of the danger his own soul is in should he fail to correct his monks, for on the Day of Judgment the abbot will have to render an account not only for his own soul, but for the souls of all his flock.⁸² Dhuoda indicates that William, too, endangers his own soul if he does not correct sinners when he sees them sinning, since “whatever is passed over in lesser persons is demanded of those who are greater.”⁸³ Thus, Dhuoda notes that this duty of *correctio* applies particularly to kings, dukes, bishops, and other prelates. At the same time, however, she implies that it is a duty natural to the fraternal brotherhood. Her assertion that not only the clergy, but laymen, too, are entitled to engage in this form of spiritual guidance may have been considered somewhat unorthodox. This was a duty that the clergy, particularly the bishops, saw as essential to *their* ministry.⁸⁴

Unlike Dhuoda, Nithard does not seem to have believed that it was a layman’s duty to involve himself in extensive prayer or contemplation—or at least, he rarely mentions any of the noblemen engaging in such activities in the *Histories*.⁸⁵ The only time that Nithard draws particular attention to Charles’s and Louis’s men engaging in prayer is before and after the Battle of Fontenoy. Once they realize that there is going to be a battle, they decide to beseech God’s help with fasting and prayers. Similarly, after the battle, the men take part in a three-day fast to praise and thank God for his justice, to ensure God’s continued support, and to seek “the remission of sins of their deceased brothers.”⁸⁶ These religious activities are clearly distinguished as pertinent only to

⁸² Benedict of Nursia, *Sancti Benedicti Regula Monachorum*, cap. 2, trans. McCann (n. 78 above) 17–23.

⁸³ “Quidquid enim in subditis delinquitur, a maioribus requiritur,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 246; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 58.

⁸⁴ For a discussion of the bishops’ *ministerium* in the later years of Louis’s reign, see Mayke de Jong, “Power and Humility in Carolingian Society: The Public Penance of Louis the Pious,” *Early Medieval Europe* 1 (1992) 39–43. Jonas of Orléans begins his *speculum principis* by explaining that priests must render an account to God even for the souls of kings, and so have the duty to correct and admonish kings if they sin. Jonas of Orléans, *De institutione regia*, cap. 1, ed. Alain Dubreucq, *Le métier de roi* (Paris 1995) 176–178.

⁸⁵ Over the course of the entire narrative, he only notes three times that Charles went to church to pray. Even if Charles and his men attended church more often or prayed every day, Nithard apparently did not believe that such actions were particularly relevant to a report of the men’s activities. Nithard, *Historiae*, 2.6, 3.7, 4.5, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 56, 114, 136.

⁸⁶ “pro remissione delictorum mortuorum fratrum suorum,” Nithard, *Historiae*, 3.1, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 82; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 156.

special occasions like battles; they are group efforts, concentrated on invoking God through communal actions, rather than establishing a personal relationship with God. As such, they are quite different from the continual, introspective contemplation that William is to practice.

Nithard's description of the aftermath of Fontenoy focuses on the concern that Louis's and Charles's men expressed about the morality of taking part in civil war, of killing their relatives and fellow Franks on a battlefield. To assuage these anxieties, the men asked the bishops to interpret their actions.⁸⁷ According to Nithard, the bishops came to a consensus that, because God's judgment had proven that Louis and Charles were fighting for the common good, every warrior was to consider himself an "instrument of God, free from responsibility."⁸⁸ This pronouncement of complete absolution for the entire group was tempered by a warning that any of the men who "had either counseled or committed anything on this campaign from wrath or hatred or vain-glory or any passion, was to confess secretly his secret sin and be judged according to the measure of his guilt."⁸⁹ The parameters of the penance suggest that the men were expected to engage in some form of internal reflection; they also imply that intention was understood to play a role in the determination of guilt.⁹⁰ Focusing on this section of the *Histories*, Nelson has argued that the idea of Christian knighthood ought not to be considered a "post-Carolingian phenomenon," as other scholars have argued. She notes how Nithard draws attention to the bishops' declaration that violence could be legitimized within a Christian worldview.⁹¹ Provided that noblemen were sufficiently aware of

⁸⁷ Nelson draws attention to the fact that it was the laymen who sought the bishops' help, not the bishops who imposed acts of remorse on laymen. Janet Nelson, "The Search for Peace in a Time of War: The Carolingian Brüderkrieg, 840–843," in *Träger und Instrumentarien des Friedens im Hohen und Späten Mittelalter*, ed. Johannes Fried (Sigmaringen 1996) 108.

⁸⁸ "inmunis omnis Dei minister," Nithard, *Historiae*, 3.1, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 82; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 156.

⁸⁹ "quicumque, consciens sibi, aut ira aut odio aut vana gloria aut certe quolibet vitio quiddam in hac expeditione suasit vel gessit, esset vere confessus secreta secreti delicti et secundum modum culpe diiudicaretur," Nithard, *Historiae*, 3.1, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 82; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 156.

⁹⁰ Nithard is clear that the intention of each layman is what determines guilt; Erdmann notes, on the other hand, Augustine's belief that guilt lay with the ruler, not with the soldiers who followed a ruler. Erdmann, *Origin of the Idea of Crusade* (n. 61 above) 8.

⁹¹ Furthermore, Nelson discusses Nithard's references to horses and to mock tournaments as important markers in the emergence of an ideal of medieval knighthood—that is, a class of noble warriors who fought on horseback and engaged in a form of warfare

their motivations to judge a pure intention from an impure one, they could use their status as warriors to act as God's ministers, fighting for justice, or for God's way of the common good.⁹²

Guy Halsall argues that the "right, even the ability, to participate in violence was commonly seen as an index of masculinity" in the Frankish world.⁹³ It is true that fighting structures a layman's life in the *Histories*, and, in many ways, is the central means by which a man participates in the governance of the realm; however, Nithard repeatedly emphasizes that it is not solely the ability to engage in warfare that makes a man. Rather, masculinity depends upon the *type* of fighting that a man performs. If such fighting is undertaken in the service of the common good and with sufficient scrutiny of inner intentions, only then can a layman be considered a true man. Grounded on a form of external warfare, Nithard's ideal of Christian knighthood stands in contrast to Dhuoda's "monkish" image of knighthood, yet both emphasize the importance of inner awareness in determining masculine behavior.

THE MALE BODY

Modern scholarship typically presents the Middle Ages as a period in which men were particularly uneasy with their bodies, due to fear of the male body's sexual potency. Medieval concerns about the uncontrollability of the male body are regarded, for the most part, as reflecting the beliefs of the Church Fathers,⁹⁴ for whom the body was a "problem" that needed to be mastered and contained. Examining the effects of

approved by the church. Janet Nelson, "Ninth-Century Knighthood: The Evidence of Nithard," in eadem, *The Frankish World 750–900* (1989; London 1996) 76, 80–87.

⁹² A sermon from the 9th c., while directed toward warriors fighting pagans, presents a similar legitimization of violence. If a layman "strive[s] with all forethought ... not to fight the war for earthly profit or secular glory" and if he "get[s] ready according to his conscience," confessing his sins before battle, he "can stand in battle without any hesitation" and know he is fighting for God. See Michael McCormick, "The Liturgy of War from Antiquity to the Crusades," *The Sword of the Lord: Military Chaplains from the First to the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Doris Bergen (Notre Dame 2004) 58–60.

⁹³ Guy Halsall, "Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West: An Introductory Survey," *Violence and Society in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Guy Halsall (Woodbridge 1998) 31.

⁹⁴ See Peter Brown for a discussion of the Church Fathers' attitudes toward the body. According to Brown, Augustine, whom Dhuoda references several times, believed that the corruption of the will at the time of the original sin is manifest in the resulting "disobedience" of the body; in its fallen state, the body can never achieve complete harmony with the soul, and so has to be disciplined. The body, while not evil in itself, "remained a source of disquiet" for Augustine. Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York 1988) 400–426.

these long-standing beliefs, Jacqueline Murray notes that a typical response to masturbation in the Middle Ages was to anoint the genitals, “as if both cause and effect were rooted in the man’s body.” Murray states that, although the church emphasized the dangers of sex, medieval medical theory propounded the view that sex was, in fact, necessary for good health.⁹⁵ Such attitudes toward masturbation and sex reveal an underlying conviction that the body is inherently corrupt, and that the needs of such a base body are, by nature, opposed to the pursuit of holiness. Yet, neither Dhuoda’s nor Nithard’s work appears designed to provoke such thoughts in their male audience. Dhuoda, indeed, emphasizes the “fidelity” of the male body, as opposed to its treachery, thereby defying modern consensus about the medieval masculine body.

Ninth-century texts contemporary with Dhuoda’s and Nithard’s suggest that laymen were expected to carefully fashion their behavior so that they both expressed their sexual potency and restrained this potency within acceptable practices. The church’s efforts under the Carolingians to establish monogamous and indissoluble marriage as the norm resulted in increasing concern with defining proper sexual relations between husband and wife; discussions of convenient periods and proper positions for sexual activity appear in both Alcuin’s and Jonas’s mirrors for the laity and various penitential books.⁹⁶ Louis the Pious was the first of the Carolingian rulers to adhere to a Christian ideal of marriage, and it was surely a reflection of this new ideology that, during his reign, texts began to circulate that criticized Charlemagne for his relatively promiscuous lifestyle. The *Vision of Wetti*, from the 820s, in which Charlemagne was said to be languishing in hell with demons gnawing at his genitals,⁹⁷ could be seen as a harsh warning directed against the improper sexual activity not only of kings but of all males.

Yet, such warnings were situated in a context where masculinity was predicated upon sexual prowess. In his *Life of the Emperor Louis*, the Astronomer takes care to emphasize that Louis, who is generally de-

⁹⁵ Jacqueline Murray, “‘The Law of Sin that is in my Members’: The Problem of Male Embodiment,” *Gender and Holiness: Men, Women and Saints in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Samantha Riches, Sarah Salih (London 2002) 13, 15–16.

⁹⁶ Katrien Heene, *The Legacy of Paradise: Marriage, Motherhood and Women in Carolingian Edifying Literature* (Frankfurt am Main 1997) 79–89; Pierre J. Payer, *Sex and the Penitentials: The Development of a Sexual Code, 550–1150* (Toronto 1984) 52–70.

⁹⁷ For an analysis of this vision, see Paul E. Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln 1994) 63–67.

picted in the work in Christo-mimetic terms, was nevertheless lustful in his youth. His advisors urged him to marry, not in order to beget children, but to avoid “the manifold toils of lust.”⁹⁸ In an apologetic work written on behalf of the sons of Louis in 833, Bishop Agobard of Lyons attributes the disruption of the entire empire to Louis’s inability to fulfill his conjugal duties to his “youthful [*iuvenem*]” wife. When Louis grew “cold [*frigescere*],” Judith grew “lascivious [*lasciviam*]” and “playful [*ludat pueriliter*].” This state of affairs brought both shame to Louis and disorder to the palace. Agobard implies that a man’s sexual prowess was integral not only to a male’s reputation, but also to the order of the family unit, and consequently, to the condition of the realm as a whole.⁹⁹ Ross Balzaretti, in reference to tenth-century Italy, asserts that authors often attributed political instability to improper or uncontrolled male sexual practices.¹⁰⁰ Balzaretti’s observation applies to Agobard’s work, and also, more particularly, to Paschasius Radbertus’s narrative of Louis’s reign, which links the confusion of the empire in the 830s to Bernard of Septimania’s bestial sexuality. “Like a wild boar ... he occupied the bedchamber; and in partisan manner penetrated everything.”¹⁰¹

Unlike the ecclesiastics Paschasius and Agobard, neither the laywoman Dhuoda nor the layman Nithard associate the realm’s problems with a dearth or an excess of male sexuality. In his narrative of the events of Louis’s reign, Nithard makes no mention of Bernard’s and Judith’s alleged affair, except to note that Judith swore an oath in 834 in order to prove her innocence and return to the royal bed (*thorum regius*).¹⁰² Given that other texts stridently proclaim that Judith committed adultery with Bernard, Nithard likely assumed that his audience had heard rumors about the alleged affair and would know what he meant by reference to the royal bed. However, the fact that he draws little attention to the rumors of sexual scandal surrounding the rebellions highlights his refusal to link the realm’s problems with issues of

⁹⁸ “ne ... in multimodos luxuria raperetur,” Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, 1.8, ed. Tremp (n. 6 above) 306; trans. Allen Cabaniss, *Son of Charlemagne: A Contemporary Life of Louis the Pious* (Syracuse 1961) 39.

⁹⁹ Agobard of Lyons, *Liber apologeticus I*, ed. Van Acker (n. 47 above) 52.309, 311.

¹⁰⁰ Ross Balzaretti, “Men and Sex in Tenth-Century Italy,” *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. Dawn M. Hadley (London 1999) 158.

¹⁰¹ “acsi ferus aper ... thorum occupavit, atque factiose...omnia pervasit,” Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, 2.7, ed. Dümmler (n. 73 above) 67; trans. Allen Cabaniss, *Charlemagne’s Cousins: Contemporary Lives of Adalard and Wala* (Syracuse 1967) 159.

¹⁰² Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.4, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 18–20.

improper sexuality. While there is little else in the *Histories* to elucidate Nithard's views of the male body, his silence on matters that led contemporaries to decry the dangers of male sexuality suggests that he did not conceive of the body as a faculty men ought to fear.

Dhuoda, similarly, never treats the male body as a threat.¹⁰³ Although, in her book's section on vices and their opposing virtues, she refers to fornication as a "persuasion of the devil [*suadente Zabulo*]" that will sensually provoke William's heart, the battle that she directs William to fight against lust is an internal one, waged more against the mind and will than the body. "For although it is in the head that the eyes of the flesh are turned to desire," she explains, "the struggle against such evils is fought within."¹⁰⁴ By keeping his body in a state of either virginity or marriage, William can avoid the sin of lust and keep his mind secure. Like Jonas and Alcuin,¹⁰⁵ Dhuoda treats marriage as a sacred condition equal to chastity, not as an inferior state for laypeople who can never attain the perfection of the chaste. Given the contemporary concern with male sexuality, it would seem natural for Dhuoda to devote significant attention to William's sexual state. However, when considered within the context of the entire work, Dhuoda's concern with William's sexual state is rather minimal. She devotes no more space to the sin of fornication than to anger, nor does she suggest, as other texts do, that youth is a particularly sexual, and hence dangerous, period.¹⁰⁶

Dhuoda's relative lack of concern with the dangers men faced concerning their sexuality is a position that must be understood within the context of her views on the male body as a whole. Nowhere in the

¹⁰³ While much of what Dhuoda reveals about the body may be applicable to all bodies, not just the male body, she was writing specifically for a male audience. Thus, the focus of this paper will be the male body and not whether Dhuoda made a binary distinction between the male and female body, or how her own female body impacted her beliefs about the male body.

¹⁰⁴ "Et licet in testa capitis carnales ad concupiscendum volvantur oculi, tamen intrinsecus militantur cuncta," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.6, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 222, 226; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 51–52.

¹⁰⁵ Dhuoda borrows from Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis* in this section. Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.6, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 226–227.

¹⁰⁶ See the Astronomer's and Agobard's texts, mentioned above. For a discussion of how Lothar II's divorce case in the 850s and 860s also associated youth with heightened sexuality, see Stuart Airlie, "Private Bodies and the Body Politic in the Divorce Case of Lothar II," *Past and Present* 161 (1998) 25. Ruth Karras also notes that medieval thought considered youth to be more lustful. Ruth Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia 2003) 14.

Manual does Dhuoda suggest that men must discipline or control an inherently corrupt or threatening body. Rather, she consistently treats the body as a key participant in men's quest for perfection: William is to "carry the yoke and burden of Christ [his] king each day, in both spirit and body."¹⁰⁷ In a discussion about numbers, Dhuoda links the number five with the five senses of the body, and the number four to the four elements of bodies (hot, cold, moist, dry), or, alternatively, to the four virtues or the four evangelists—a connection that, in itself, seems to associate the body's natural state with holiness.¹⁰⁸ The fact that, in this section, Dhuoda's discussion proceeds by an arithmetic regression from the number five, which represents the bodily senses, to the number one, which represents God, implies that the body's faculties constitute the first stage in an approach toward God.

In the views of many of Dhuoda's contemporaries, the body is treated as an obstacle to be overcome, and the more the body is ignored, the more virtue it accrues. For example, Ardo's *Life of Benedict of Aniane* praises Benedict for "endangering his own flesh as if it were a bloodthirsty beast ... His face grew gaunt with fasting; his flesh was exhausted by privation; his shriveled skin hung from his bones like the dewlaps of cows."¹⁰⁹ In this and other hagiographical works, it is the saint's ability to deprive or destroy the body that is praised; thus, the emaciated body visually represents the holy body. Dhuoda, on the other hand, depicts the holy body as one of corporeal integrity.¹¹⁰ Combining a description of Moses's appearance and his virtue, she implies that his holiness was reflected in his "invulnerable [*inviolabilem*]," "unscathed

¹⁰⁷ "disce iugum et onus cotidie in mente et corpore regis Christi portare," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.4, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 212; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 47.

¹⁰⁸ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.5, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 106.

¹⁰⁹ "Sic quippe carni suae acsi cruentae bestiae erat infestus ... Pallebant ora ieiuniis, et macie exausta carne, pellis ossibus inherebat hac in modum pallearia bovum rugata pendebat," Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Anianensis*, cap. 2, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, MGH, SS 15.1 (Hanover, 1887), 202; trans. Allen Cabaniss, *The Emperor's Monk: Contemporary Life of Benedict of Aniane by Ardo* (Ilfracombe 1979) 51–52.

¹¹⁰ Only once, in her section on illness, does she suggest that lack of bodily health can be considered a positive thing. She points out that God may send illness to the body as a way of chastising an individual, since a healthy body causes some to forget their dependence on God and to pursue earthly rewards. However, her conception of illness is not grounded upon a belief that the body itself is the source of disobedience or evil and needs to be subdued. Rather, illness either punishes the body alongside the soul, or, through the body, reminds the soul that weakness is strength, since dependence on God is a virtue. Dhuoda's treatment of illness thus relates to her conception of subservience or dependence as "manly." Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 5.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 278–284.

[*inlaesum*]” body and in the fact that he kept all his teeth.¹¹¹ When speaking, in turn, of a lack of virtue, Dhuoda links it with the body’s disintegration: “What good is there in noble blood, my son, if one’s body is corrupted by injustice, so that it grieves forever in its descent to putrefaction?”¹¹² While it is not clear exactly why Dhuoda’s ideal body differed from that of ecclesiastical contemporaries such as Ardo, her conviction in the essential goodness of the body was surely a determining factor in shaping her ideal.¹¹³

More than any specific reference in the *Manual*, Dhuoda’s faith in the goodness of the body is demonstrated by her decision to employ the phrase “soul and body” (*anima et corpus*) or “mind and body” (*mens et corpus*) over twenty-five times throughout the text.¹¹⁴ She does not set the soul and its needs in opposition to the body, but consistently refers to the two faculties in tandem, rarely mentioning them individually. She makes clear that, rather than constituting a hindrance to the soul, the body is intended to aid the soul in its quest for salvation; this process is comparable to the way that the fulfillment of one’s earthly duties is integral to the attainment of heavenly rewards.

One way in which the body can aid the soul, as Dhuoda frequently observes, is by accurately mirroring a man’s inner state of being, or his soul. While she never uses terms such as inner and outer man, nor deals directly with the issue of hypocrisy, Dhuoda does implicitly suggest that she has some understanding of a division between inner (soul) and outer (body).¹¹⁵ Her acknowledgment of the potential for such a divi-

¹¹¹ Dhuoda is borrowing from the Vulgate (Deut. 34:7) when she notes Moses’s teeth. Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 232–234.

¹¹² “Quae utilitas, fili, in sanguine nobili, si propter iniustitias corpus corrumpatur suum, descendens ad corruptionem ut luceat semper?” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 4.8, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 248; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 59.

¹¹³ The difference may be indicative of competing monastic and lay beliefs. It is also possible that Dhuoda’s specific and immediate goal—of ensuring her son’s safety—caused her to imagine an ideal body that was integral and unhurt, rather than deficient or wounded in any way.

¹¹⁴ Her tendency to interchange *mens* and *anima*, even when issuing similar instructions or describing the same phenomena, suggests that she is not drawing distinctions between the two faculties. A comparable use of either phrase is not found in Alcuin’s *De virtutibus et vitiis*, and occurs only a few times in Jonas of Orléans’s *De institutione laicali*. Jonas of Orléans, *De institutione laicali*, 1.1, 1.5, 2.27, 3.5, 3.14, PL 106.125, 141, 228, 253, 261.

¹¹⁵ According to Heinrich Fichtenau, those living in the early Middle Ages generally could not conceive of a distinction between inner being and outward behavior; hypocrisy was not a concern because few could understand such a concept. Mayke de Jong and Geoffrey Koziol, on the other hand, indicate that early medieval concerns about the effi-

sion can be inferred from her exhortations that it not occur—that is, from her repeated instructions to perform a deed “in soul and in body.” For example, William must “read in spirit and body” and pursue “his earthly struggle with consistent patience and gentleness of mind and body.”¹¹⁶ Whatever a man thinks or believes must be apparent in his manner and actions, his bodily form and behavior.¹¹⁷ Several times throughout the text, Dhuoda invokes both the two-fold process of thinking and acting, and the three-fold process of thinking, speaking, and acting; as she explains to William, it is the fulfillment of these processes in the proper order that will lead to perfection.¹¹⁸ Dhuoda is aware that if men think or believe something in their inner being (soul) that they do not express with their body, then other men might be led astray by their example,¹¹⁹ for “even lesser men improve themselves after the model of their betters.”¹²⁰ William must always keep in mind that he is an example for those around him, and must moderate his behavior accordingly.

It is particularly imperative that William fulfill the processes of thinking and acting in their proper order because of his relation to the *Manual*. Although Dhuoda indicates that she expects others to encoun-

er a cacy of penance raised the problem of internal motivation differing from public appearance. Philippe Buc firmly criticizes the idea that early medieval society did not operate with an understanding of hypocrisy. Heinrich Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. Patrick Geary (Chicago 1991) 4, 21, 31; Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca 1992) 318–320; Mayke de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden 1996) 262–263; Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton 2001) 242–247.

¹¹⁶ “mente et corpore legendo,” “patiens mitisque mente et corpore inter omnes militabat,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.7, 4.7, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 114, 232; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 13, 54.

¹¹⁷ While Dhuoda’s emphasis on the need to physically display or perform virtue was not unique, her persistent concern with a distinction between inner and outer being and her use of the phrase “soul and body” to demonstrate the unnaturalness of such division is unusual. Jonas, in his mirror for the laity, hints at the issue of hypocrisy when he notes that one can sin in the heart as well as in works, and states that one must free the mind from depraved thoughts in addition to acting correctly in order to be free from sin. However, he never uses a phrase similar to “soul and body” in this section. Jonas of Orléans, *De institutione laicali*, 1.17, PL 106.154–156.

¹¹⁸ Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.5, 1.7, 2.2, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 106, 116, 124. Mayeski also notes that Dhuoda thought reading was incomplete without action. Mayeski, *Dhuoda* (n. 66 above) 52–54.

¹¹⁹ Nithard hints at just this problem when he refers to Lothar’s continual deceits and his techniques of tricking otherwise good men into following him.

¹²⁰ “tamen minores ad formam praelatis erigi ne dubites culmen,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.10, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 172; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 34.

ter the text itself, she also hopes that William's body will become a means by which her work and its recommendations reach even those who never read it. At the very beginning of the *Manual*, Dhuoda vividly describes how the text becomes the medium by which her own thoughts may find their fulfillment in William's behavior: "take this work eagerly in your own hand and fulfill its precepts, after my hand has addressed it to you."¹²¹ She reinforces this command several times, instructing William to "adhere to, believe in, and fulfill in action what you find in this book."¹²²

It is harmony of thought and action, soul and body, and inner and outer man that Dhuoda continually seeks for her male contemporaries. This harmony Dhuoda depicts as both the natural state of these two faculties and one of the goals of earthly existence. As a man's commitments to God, father, and lord ought to exist in harmony, so ought a man's soul and body to work in tandem. Her belief that these natural states of being had been corrupted in the lives of her male contemporaries is evinced by her attention to the hierarchy of obligations in a man's life and her repeated emphasis on the unity of soul and body.

GENDER RELATIONS

This paper has thus far examined masculinity in terms of men's relationships with other men and their own bodies, but has yet to touch on men's relationships with women. In her article on the *Herrenfrage*, or masculine identity crisis of the mid-eleventh century, Jo Ann McNamara argues that during that period masculinity increasingly became defined according to a virulent misogynistic rhetoric that labeled women sexually dangerous, aggressive, and polluting forces that needed to be quarantined and subdued by men in order to preserve social order.¹²³ McNamara's assessment of gender relations in the later Middle Ages serves as a useful foil against which to compare how Nithard and Dhuoda understood women's natures and the form that relations between men and women should take in a properly-ordered

¹²¹ "cum ex manu mea tibi fuerit directus, in manu tua libenter facias amplecti eum opus," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, Incipit, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 68; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 2.

¹²² "Sicut in hoc opusculo parvitatis meae inveneris, tene, crede, et opera comple," Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 2.1, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 120; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 16.

¹²³ Jo Ann McNamara, "The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender System, 1050–1150," *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare Lees (Minneapolis 1994) 3–29.

realm. While both are clear that it is men's duty to govern society, neither present women as dangerous beings in need of strict governance, nor suggest that the central facet of masculinity is the domination of women.

In Dhuoda's construction of the ideal family, order is presented as originating from the father around whom the family is organized, and from whom the greatest earthly authority comes. Dhuoda portrays herself as the perfectly obedient wife, dutifully taking care of her husband's estates and honoring his wishes. Her presentation of William's family history was carefully molded, intended to counter views of Bernard's disordered family, which he incurred thanks to the allegations and rumors of sorcery and adultery with Queen Judith.¹²⁴ Yet, the inherent paradox within her idealized picture of family loyalties is that Dhuoda apparently saw herself as the only one capable of properly instructing William in the affairs of his life; Bernard was not ensuring William's earthly or spiritual well-being, so Dhuoda was forced to perform this duty. She cleverly compensates for the slip in the family image, however, by repeatedly emphasizing that writing the *Manual* was the only means of fulfilling her maternal obligations from afar. Such declarations rely upon cultural expectations, as elaborated in Haimo of Auxerre's and Jonas of Orléans's works, that the *ministerium* of a virtuous wife involved setting the moral tone of the household, including teaching and instructing within the confines of the home.¹²⁵

Martin A. Claussen argues that, at one particular point within the *Manual*, Dhuoda explicitly compares her commands to William to those of a Benedictine abbot, thereby placing herself in the role of abbot within the "monastic family"—a role that would normally be ac-

¹²⁴ Trenchard-Smith argues that one of the central functions of the *Manual* was to promote a very specific family *memoria*, one that could compete with other stories about William's family that were circulating at that time. Dhuoda recognized that William was entering a potentially hostile environment at court, where his reputation and safety might be endangered by unfavorable attitudes toward his father's family. Bernard's sister had, after all, been accused of witchcraft and drowned by Lothar's faction only seven years earlier. See Trenchard-Smith, "*Furibunda silentia*" (n. 38 above). In tending the family memory, Dhuoda was merely performing textually a duty that was traditionally ascribed to women. See Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton 1994) 49–70; Matthew Innes, "Keeping It in the Family: Women and Aristocratic Memory, 700–1200," *Medieval Memories: Men, Women and the Past, 700–1300*, ed. Elisabeth van Houts (Harlow 2001) 17–35.

¹²⁵ Julia Smith, "Gender and Ideology in the Early Middle Ages," *Gender and Christian Religion*, ed. R. N. Swanson, *Studies in Church History* 34 (1998) 64–65; Haimo of Auxerre, *In Epist. I ad Tim.* PL 117.790–791.

corded to the father.¹²⁶ With this action, Claussen asserts, Dhuoda implicitly undermines the patriarchal social order that she explicitly sets out.¹²⁷ Although Dhuoda does afford herself considerable authority in instructing both William and the wider public, I think that Claussen is mistaken in suggesting that Dhuoda sees herself taking on masculine roles and purposefully inverting the gender hierarchy.

Nowhere in the *Manual* does Dhuoda indicate that the feminine is something that naturally bars her from holiness—in other words, that her feminine identity is something she needs to shed in order to assume the role of Godly counselor. Although Dhuoda frequently refers to herself as weak, fragile, sinful, and unworthy, she certainly does not categorize such attributes as negative consequences of being female.¹²⁸ She speaks of herself in a derogatory fashion when using those attributes to describe her condition, but it is, in fact, precisely those deprecatory traits that she praises and seeks to inculcate in others. It is Dhuoda's weakness, her dependence on God, that allows her to gather the crumbs of spiritual wisdom, just like the male clerics.¹²⁹ In reference to the later Middle Ages, Caroline Bynum argues that men, when representing their progress toward greater holiness, used symbols of gender inversion, taking on feminine characteristics; they stressed the dichotomy between the genders and the “otherness” of woman, and thus saw the process of “becoming female” as an image of renunciation. Women, on the other hand, did not tend to use gendered language as much as androgynous imagery,¹³⁰ in speaking of their holiness, they either empha-

¹²⁶ Garver notes that in Paulinus of Aquileia's mirror for the laity, his “discussion of a father's responsibility for his family recalls Benedict's discussion of the abbot's responsibility for his monk.” Garver, “Influence of Monastic Ideals” (n. 66 above) 74.

¹²⁷ Martin A. Claussen, “Fathers of Power and Mothers of Authority: Dhuoda and the *Liber manualis*,” *French Historical Studies* 19 (1996) 796–807.

¹²⁸ At one point, she does refer to females as the “weaker sex [*fragilis sexus*],” but the context seems to imply that women are naturally less capable than men, rather than less holy. Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 9.4, ed. Riché, 334. Katrien Heene's examination of hagiographical texts and moral treatises from the Carolingian period similarly led her to conclude that the authors of such works treated women as “physically and psychologically ‘weaker,’ but never more sinful or more prone to evil.” This lack of misogynistic attitudes toward women accounts, says Heene, for Dhuoda's “self-respect.” Heene, *The Legacy of Paradise* (n. 96 above) 256, 266, 269.

¹²⁹ Dhuoda describes herself as a “small bitch [*catula*]” scrambling under the table with the male puppies (clerics) for the master's (God's) crumbs. Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 1.2, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 98–100. For an analysis of this passage, see Mayeski, *Dhuoda* (n. 66 above) 65–92.

¹³⁰ For example, Bynum claims that “personal and social characteristics were more often shared by the two genders in women's writings.” Caroline Bynum, “... And Woman

sized their humanity, or “reached God not by renouncing what they were but by sinking more fully into it.”¹³¹ Bynum’s observations seem applicable to Dhuoda, who does not adopt masculine qualities when instructing William, but rather privileges more feminine characteristics, such as weakness and humility, as those that all people, men and women, ought to assume.

Dhuoda presents a worldview in which laymen’s primary task is not to dominate, but to love and support one another. Since men such as her husband were not performing this task, Dhuoda was compelled to take on a role within the family that she would not normally possess. However, once men were structuring their lives properly, according to the order Dhuoda had outlined in the *Manual*, then gender roles would return to normal. While Dhuoda never suggests that women are excluded from the universal brotherhood of love,¹³² and while she extends feminine qualities of love and meekness across both genders, she firmly designates men as those who ought to structure and regulate the brotherhood of Franks.

Very few references to women occur in Nithard’s *Histories*—a fact that makes his account of an incident involving Hildegard, Charles’s sister, all the more notable.¹³³ Nithard says that in the fall of 841, she, together with the citizens of Laon, took one of Charles’s men prisoner. Charles immediately surrounded the city, and they, fearing his force, agreed to release the man and hand the city over to him: “On the next day Hildegard indeed did homage to [Charles], as she had vowed ... Charles received his sister kindly ... and graciously promised her all the kindness a brother owes his sister if in the future she would be willing to side with him.”¹³⁴ Why Hildegard decided to move against Charles in the first place is not indicated, but it may have been that she

His Humanity’: Female Imagery in the Religious Writing of the Later Middle Ages,” *Gender and Religion: On the Complexity of Symbols*, ed. Caroline Bynum, Stevan Harrell, Paula Richman (Boston 1986) 277.

¹³¹ Bynum, “... And Woman His Humanity” (n. 130 above) 261, 269–274, 277–280.

¹³² Claussen points out that part of Dhuoda’s authority stems from her ability to engage in *correctio*, which is a duty of the universal brotherhood. Claussen, “Fathers of Power” (n. 127 above) 800.

¹³³ Although, surprisingly, it is a part of Nithard’s text that has received almost no attention from scholars. Nelson only briefly mentions Hildegard. See Nelson, “Public *Histories*” (n. 2 above) 270.

¹³⁴ “Crastina quoque die Hildigardis ad fidem suam, sicut sponderat, venit ... Sororem suam siquidem Karolus benigne excepit et ... omnem benignitatem quam frater sorori debet, si deinde benivola erga illum esse vellet, ei perhumane promisit,” Nithard, *Historiae*, 3.4, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 98; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 160.

wished to side with Lothar, who was her full-brother, as opposed to Charles who was only her half-brother. What is intriguing about the story is that a woman, an abbess, in fact, is described as taking a leading role in military affairs and as performing homage to Charles like one of his men might have done. Moreover, Nithard does not act as though the idea of a woman taking on such an authoritative role is monstrous in itself. His primary concern with Hildegard's actions is that they provoked discord between brother and sister that should not exist. Interestingly, whereas Nithard always mentions the aid (*auxilium*) and loyalty (*fidelitas*) that one brother ought to show another, in the case of this brother-sister relationship, he refers to kindness (*benignitas*) as the obligation owed by a brother to a sister.

Unlike the Hildegard incident, when Nithard recounts situations in which Charles's mother, Judith, demonstrated the ability to command or influence men, it is with a trace of discomfort at her actions. According to Nithard, as Louis was growing "decrepit [*decrepita*]" with old age, Judith took a more assertive role in the issue of the succession—although, says Nithard, Judith only acted as Louis wished her to.¹³⁵ While Nelson argues that there is nothing sinister or disparaging in Nithard's depiction of Judith,¹³⁶ I would suggest that Nithard draws a clear distinction between this portrait of Louis in his old age and the earlier "terrifying" portrait of Charlemagne with which he opened Book One—a distinction that is based, in large part, on the unease his readers ought to feel at the thought of a wife controlling her husband.¹³⁷ A similar unease, this time in regards to Judith's influence over her son, is evident later in Nithard's narrative. According to Nithard, in May 841 Charles was undecided about his course of action, and while a few of his men said that he should go to meet with his mother in Châlons-sur-Marne, the majority advised him against that plan, saying that Charles would appear cowardly if he changed his itinerary, and that, conse-

¹³⁵ This addendum was necessary because Judith's influence helped secure Charles's inheritance, and Nithard originally began writing the *Histories* in order to bolster the legitimacy of Charles's kingship. Nithard, *Historiae*, 1.6, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 28.

¹³⁶ Nelson attributes to 19th-c. historians the idea that, in his later reign, Louis was a pathetic man "in the hands of a scheming young woman." Janet Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London 1992) 98. However, she later modified her views, arguing that Nithard's depiction of Judith was intended to be critical. See Janet Nelson, "Early Medieval Rites of Queen-Making and the Shaping of Medieval Queenship," *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. Anne Duggan (Woodbridge 1997) 304 n. 17.

¹³⁷ Given Nithard's emphasis on the ideal king as terrifying and domineering, he was probably worried in particular about *kings* being dominated by women.

quently, Lothar's force would gain numbers and morale. "This is exactly what happened when, in spite of much objection, Charles was won over to the former view."¹³⁸ The fact that Nithard began writing the *Histories* upon Charles's request while they were in Châlons suggests that Charles wanted a favorable report of his activities to counter criticisms that were being levied against him at that time—criticisms that likely censored Charles for running after his mother and relying overly much on her advice.¹³⁹

While Nithard is critical of Judith's influence, his treatment of her is favorable in comparison to that found in the works of Agobard and Paschasius Radbertus. Both ecclesiastics present Judith as a lascivious woman in need of male governance, and Paschasius, in particular, emphasizes how her evil feminine will overturned the order of the empire.¹⁴⁰ Nithard, in contrast, never describes Judith as a manipulative or monstrous woman nor hints at the malevolence of feminine authority. He implies that Louis and Charles were emasculated by allowing a woman too great an authority in a world that ought to be ruled by men, but his purpose in doing so is to draw attention to the problems of masculine (and kingly) weakness, not feminine aggression. Although they may have divergent solutions to the problems with contemporary masculinity, both Nithard and Dhuoda suggest that such problems stem primarily from men's relations with other men, not with women. Even though ecclesiastical authors such as Agobard and Paschasius had a less positive view of women than their lay counterparts, it is significant that these clerical beliefs seem not to have strongly affected Nithard's and Dhuoda's understandings of gender relations. The Carolingian situation, then, stands in contrast to the period McNamara discusses, in which the misogynistic attitudes of the clergy permeated society.

¹³⁸ "quod et evenit. Nam, quamquam difficile, praevaluit tamen sententia priorum," Nithard, *Historiae*, 2.9, ed. Lauer (n. 2 above) 64–66; trans. Scholz (n. 14 above) 150.

¹³⁹ I owe to Courtney Booker the point that Charles's decision to commission the *Histories* was a result of events that transpired following Charles's move to Châlons-sur-Marne.

¹⁴⁰ For a discussion of Agobard's and Paschasius's treatment of Judith, see Elizabeth Ward, "Agobard of Lyons and Paschasius Radbertus as Critics of the Empress Judith," *Women in the Church*, ed. William J. Sheils, Diana Wood, *Studies in Church History* 27 (1990) 15–25.

CONCLUSION

In his discussion of gender theory, Stephen Whitehead claims that, “for the masculine subject to become a man, it must appropriate the ‘ideal’ meanings of manhood circulating within that subject’s particular cultural setting and ‘communities.’”¹⁴¹ What this paper has sought to demonstrate is how two members of the ninth-century Frankish laity attempted to shape their society’s conception of ideal manhood. Recognizing that strife and disorder within the realm were associated with men’s expression of improper masculinities, Dhuoda and Nithard sought to resolve these problems by providing clear indications of how men ought to refashion their behavior. Both authors, while anticipating that their texts would reach many Frankish noblemen, directed their words at certain individuals, believing these young men to be at a formative stage in the construction of their masculinity. Dhuoda’s statement, “maturity is rooted in the flower of youth,” implies that William’s ability to take on a manly identity is determined by how he behaves while still a boy.¹⁴² I would suggest that, as he began writing, Nithard, too, holding up Charlemagne as a model of masculinity for Charles, wished to shape the man that Charles, currently aged eighteen, would soon become.¹⁴³

When discussing medieval notions of masculinity, modern scholars typically refer to domination and self-control as the two qualifications for “manliness” in the Middle Ages. Masculine dominance could take various forms, including the sexual subjugation of women, economic domination of other males, control over one’s own household, or martial prowess in military competitions and engagements. Often, men’s ability to dominate was thought to be predicated upon their ability to exercise self-control—a man incapable of controlling himself was not

¹⁴¹ Stephen Whitehead, *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions* (Cambridge 2002) 214.

¹⁴² “in iuventa viget florentis senecta,” Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis*, 3.5, ed. Riché (n. 3 above) 156; trans. Neel (n. 35 above) 28. Garver contends that this belief is prominent in Carolingian texts. Garver, “Influence of Monastic Ideals” (n. 66 above) 72–73, 82–84. Hincmar refers to the example of Alexander the Great in order to demonstrate that the faults adopted in one’s youth cannot be mended in adulthood. Hincmar, *De ordine palatii*, Prologus, ed. Gross, Schieffer (n. 49 above) 34–36.

¹⁴³ I would suggest that Nithard’s negativity toward Charles at the end of the *Histories* indicates that he thought he had failed in this attempt. Such a suggestion complements Nelson’s argument that Nithard’s bitterness toward Charles in Book Four is due to the fact that Charles did not properly protect his vassal’s lands, which remained the possession of one of Lothar’s supporters in the settlement outlined by the Treaty of Verdun. Nelson, “Public *Histories*” (n. 2 above) 271–279.

manly enough to control others.¹⁴⁴ As both Aird and Karras demonstrate, in their respective works on William the Conqueror and masculinity in the later Middle Ages, the decisive stage in youths' assumption of a hegemonic masculinity was when they acquired the power to exert dominance over other members of society. Males had to "win" their rights to be considered true men, and thus, masculinity was grounded upon ideals of aggression and strength.¹⁴⁵

Certainly, both Nithard and Dhuoda underscored the importance of self-control and self-awareness in a man's assumption of a proper masculine identity. For Nithard, the only way in which a nobleman could be sure that he was not endangering his masculinity through engaging in inappropriate warfare was by possessing sufficient self-awareness to examine and judge his motivations. Dhuoda, to an even greater degree than Nithard, emphasized the necessity for a man to know himself—to identify and scrutinize his inner vices in order that he might fight them accordingly. While, in both these cases, the two lay authors envisioned men exercising individual self-restraint over their more animalistic or carnal urges, at the same time, the authors formulated ideals of masculinity that positioned men within networks that would assist them in governing themselves. Nithard's understanding of masculinity was centered upon the idea that men were incapable of restraining their innate cupidity and selfishness solely by their own will. For Nithard, order within the realm was seen to flow from the king, who, by his terror, held in check the personal desires of men, inspiring them with respect for the common good. Dhuoda, on the other hand, privileged the idea that men existed within a fraternal brotherhood of love, and that each man both required and contributed to the mutual support provided by this brotherhood. She conceptualized order within the realm according to every man's dependence on God and, in turn, God's constant, daily care for the spiritual and material needs of his subjects.

In marked contrast to the emphases of modern scholarship, neither Dhuoda nor Nithard maintained that laymen's masculinity was predicated upon domination. They acknowledged that men naturally ought

¹⁴⁴ Innes's article on court culture in the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious draws attention to the role that the court played in inculcating norms of monastic self-control in young Carolingian youths. Innes, "A Place of Discipline" (n. 75 above) 60, 73–75.

¹⁴⁵ Karras argues that there were three hegemonic masculinities in later medieval Europe, each corresponding to a different male profession. Karras, *From Boys to Men* (n. 106 above); Aird, "Frustrated Masculinity" (n. 46 above) 39–55.

to hold authority over women and that, if the hierarchy governing the sexes was disrupted, men's masculinity and the right order of society would be endangered. However, for both authors, the control that men should exercise was neither violent nor aggressive. Moreover, it was men's subservience—to God, to a terrifying lord, to their fathers—that ultimately concerned Dhuoda and Nithard and that structured their ideals of masculinity. They focused not on men's need to prove themselves against others, but on their duty to serve others, which included service to the common good or to the universal Christian brotherhood. For Dhuoda, the solution to the realm's problems was for men to take on more feminine qualities of weakness and humility, and for mutual bonds of love and support, traditionally more feminine virtues, to form the basis of social order. Unlike several of their ecclesiastical contemporaries, neither Dhuoda nor Nithard associated the disorder of the realm with the disordered sexuality of male bodies, and thus, they did not present the male body as a threatening force that men had to subdue. Rather, Dhuoda's interest in the body spoke to her urgent belief that the soul and body ought to interact peacefully, with the body aiding the soul in a man's quest for perfection. For both authors, self-control was necessary and important so that men might establish harmonious relations with their bodies, with other men, and with God, not so that they might dominate.

Given the small number of extant texts written by the laity, it is difficult to assess how Dhuoda's and Nithard's beliefs about lay masculinity related to the existence of a hegemonic masculinity in ninth-century Carolingian Europe. However, the fact that both Nithard and Dhuoda were determined to put forward ideals of masculinity that significantly devalued the importance of domination suggests that they were reacting against a prominent conception of men as those who dominate. Such a conception would be in accordance with modern scholars' generalizations about masculinity in the Middle Ages. The references to improper masculinities that underlie much of Dhuoda's and Nithard's work can generally be seen as reflections of their conviction that, in light of the realm's recent disasters, masculine ideals that privileged domination needed to be reconceived. Their goal was to counter the dangerously self-aggrandizing behavior of contemporary noblemen—behavior that had led to civil war—by proposing models of

masculinity in which men did not have to dominate in order to achieve manliness.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ The following article came to my attention just as I was finishing this study: Stuart Airlie, "The World, the Text, and the Carolingian: Royal, Aristocratic and Masculine Identities in Nithard's *Histories*," *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World*, ed. Patrick Wormald, Janet Nelson (Cambridge 2007) 51–76.