

## Pilgrims on earth: Some rethinking of the *Itinerarium Einsidlense* (Codex Einsidlensis 326)

... me manus una capit.

— Martial, *Epigrams*, 1.2, 3

*Introite, nam et heic Dii sunt. Apud Gellium.*

— An inscribed cornerstone after  
Lessing, seen on the way to chez Bepler  
(in Wolfenbüttel)

The manuscript usually known as the *Itinerarium Einsidlense* is a small book with a large reach. Jochen Bepler was likewise a learned friend whose kindness, probing questions, and public and professional achievements left a wide trace. I fondly remember walking from my lodging near the Herzog-August-Bibliothek to his beguiling house, there entering, and “recognizing the kindred spirit (*philos*)” which Euripides once equated (in his *Helen*, v. 560) with the divine. It seems fitting to find in a medieval booklet of traced pathways and inscriptions some intersections to honour the departed *custos librorum* who took delight in making his treasures known.

It is not my purpose here to discuss equally all the texts in, and stories one could tell about, Codex Einsiedeln 326 (hereafter *IE*). The medieval *recueil factice*, with above all its mid-ninth-century section (fols. 67r–86r) of texts concerning sites in Rome (and Pavia) ranks as one of the most famous and prized holdings of the Abbey Library. On account of the noted section, the *IE* figured in the 2014 exhibition at Aachen devoted to Charlemagne and “places of power,” and was itself in 2015–2016 the cornerstone of an itinerant exhibition in Switzerland about medieval and early-modern monastic forms of the *Grand Tour* to Italy, with an accompanying volume of scholarly papers published as a beautiful and useful catalogue.<sup>1</sup> It is the credit of Peter Erhart, the Stiftsarchivar in Saint-Gall, to have brought that exhibition and catalogue to being.

I have known and followed *IE* since living in the mid-1980s with the Benedictines at Einsiedeln, when I was allowed on several occasions to study the original. Since then a spate

<sup>1</sup> Frank POHLE (ed.): *Karl der Große: Orte der Macht*, exh. cat. Dresden, 2014; Peter ERHART and Jakob Kuratli

HUEBLIN (eds.): *Vedi Napoli e poi muori – Grand Tour der Mönche*. Sankt Gallen, 2014.



of important and lesser publications concerning *IE* have appeared. In 1987, Gerold Walser surely gave the impetus to this fresh work with his important black-and-white commentated facsimile, which covered: (1) the Carolingian sylloge of inscriptions (fols. 67r–79v), with three integrated Roman “visitors’ routes” (my expression) *extra muros* (fols. 77r, 77v–78r); (2) the ensuing, unique facing-page “spreads” (fols. 79r–85r) that represent eleven visitors’ routes (of which the first ten are strictly *intra muros*), set out on a path “marked” by the binding fold, with select sites noted in progressive order (moving downward) to the left and right; and finally, (3) the conventionally arranged tailpiece of description on Rome’s Late Antique walls (fols. 85r–86r).<sup>2</sup> The remarkable facing-page layout resulted in trouble for Jean Mabillon’s first publication in 1685 of the visitors’ routes, which were perplexingly given with the individual pages transcribed in sequence but not as pages.<sup>3</sup> It scarcely needs telling, however, that the Rome-related material has long attracted attention as important. The *IE* was used and cared for at late medieval Einsiedeln, where it may have arrived, from the Abbey of Pfäfers, only in the fourteenth century (perhaps as security against other borrowed materials). From his base at the Council of Constance (1414–1417), Poggio Bracciolini acquired *IE*’s inscriptions, probably in Einsiedeln from this manuscript, which is our only known source for certain texts. The inscriptions and the unique visitors’ routes have been published repeatedly, and have prompted diverse commentary as to the origin, nature, purpose, and “use” of the collection.<sup>4</sup> The manuscript itself earned an early place among the Einsiedeln book treasures available on the internet in excellent colour facsimile thanks to the *e-codices* project based at the University of Fribourg (CH).<sup>5</sup> As a Classicist at Bern, Walser’s initial interest in making his facsimile edition was prompted in part by a concern to document early Swiss, or at least Alemannic, interest in Rome, since the relevant texts in *IE* were for a while believed to stem from scribes at Reichenau Abbey in Lake Constance. Before Walser’s key publication, Bernhard Bischoff (d. 1991) shared with him his own judgement (known at Einsiedeln since his visit there in 1983) that the pertinent Carolingian section of *IE* was the work of a scribe “schoolled in Fulda,” which became in Walser’s telling a “Schöpfung der Klosterschule von

2 Gerold WALSER: *Die Einsiedler Inschriftensammlung und der Pilgerführer durch Rom. Codex Einsidlensis 326: Facsimile, Umschrift, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Stuttgart, 1987. Because I mean to focus on the manuscript, I cite the *IE* according to its own foliation. The points made by Walser evoked below are taken from his “Introduction” (pp. 9–11). The entire codex may be consulted directly in the facsimile at *e-codices*, as below. The Swiss exhibition catalogue provides an excellent opening-based colour facsimile of fols. 76v–86r (thus including all the visitors’ routes), with a German translation in the outer margins: Peter ERHART and Alfons ZETTLER: *Das ‘Itinerarium Einsidlense’ oder der Falz als Weg*. In: Peter ERHART and Jakob Kuratli HÜEBLIN (eds.): *Vedi Napoli e poi muori – Grand Tour der Mönche. Sankt Gallen, 2014*, pp. 38–59, here 40–59.

3 The result is all but unusable. Mabillon numbered and summarized the sylloge (with much complete transcription), where he understood the left-versus-right cues in

the embedded consecutive routes (nos. 69, 70, 72 [= now route 12]). He certainly grasped the ensuing facing-page layout, but entrusted the actual transcription to someone who blindly copied out the text. Jean MABILLON and Michel GERMAIN: *Veterum Analectorum Tomus IV, complectens Iter Germanicum*. Paris, 1685, pp. 481–520.

4 It is often said, generally, that sylloges at least guided the elaboration of new Carolingian inscriptions, but that is more easily asserted than proved, pace, for one, Florian HARTMANN: *Karolingische Gelehrte als Dichter und der Wissenstransfer am Beispiel der Epigraphik*. In: Julia BECKER, Tino LICHT and Stefan WEINFURTER (eds.): *Karolingische Klöster: Wissenstransfer und kulturelle Innovation (Materiale Textkulturen, 4)*. Berlin, 2015, pp. 255–276.

5 The facsimile at *e-codices* includes a summary description with bibliography on the codex by P. Odo Lang (2010), which I hope to update in the near future in light of some findings presented here.



Fulda." Bischoff's posthumous *Katalog* and *Nachlaß* at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (Munich) speak for a scribe "schooled in Fulda", which is not the same thing.<sup>6</sup> Be that as it may, his informed judgement, even as approximately knowable, has not been uniformly received in recent scholarship.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, many speculations about the visitors' routes have been mooted, sometimes in consonance and repetition, sometimes with unanchored precision as to historical circumstances (e.g., imagined imperial visits) or supposed "models" (engraved tables or maps), and sometimes with nuances imported from anthropological reflection on the nature of space and mapping. Much of that harvest and the most pertinent bibliography is deftly presented and assessed in the judicious survey by Riccardo Santangeli Valenzani, a specialist on the *IE*, in his account for the recent Swiss exhibition catalogue under the specific angle of "problems and new approaches for research."<sup>8</sup> Without meaning to polemicize, I would like to take up a "problem", based on my general experience with manuscripts, that Santangeli Valenzani explicitly skipped, presumably as tedious and solved, in his useful essay.

From the start with Mabillon to the edition by Walser and even the recent *e-codices* description, the task of adequately and coherently representing the content of *IE* has remained unfulfilled. It does not entail, for one, rationalizing the extramural visitors' routes embedded in the sylloge merely to serve as an unharmonized mistake, to be tacked on, for modern convenience, to the mostly intramural opening-sized paths,<sup>9</sup> but rather attempting to explain what is actually there and where it is, once both points are fully considered. Scholars, of course, often approach "texts" and manuscripts with a particular focus and interest, and even cataloguers may want simply to have done with an entry, since so many others beckon. Bernhard Bischoff himself did not aspire to document all aspects of even the ninth-century codices that concerned him; he needed to focus on completing his *Katalog* and death cut him short with still much to do. To judge from Santangeli Valenzani's survey and perceptions, the remaining "problems and new approaches for research" would consist now in conceptualizing how the evidence of the visitors' routes (again, my term) is to be fitted into the mental "space" and categories of non-visitors attempting to translate the information of a partly inscrutable model into something they copied out to be meaningful and usable for themselves.<sup>10</sup> I cannot disagree with that, but I would like to share some missed details that I see and know, and to suggest how they may bear on working behind the written evidence that we possess, by some analogy, probabilities, and

6 Bernhard BISCHOFF: *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, edited from the *Nachlaß* by Birgit Ebersperger. Wiesbaden, 1998–2014, vol. I, p. 242 (no. 1133). In the *Nachlaß* I have studied all the slips on *IE* (under Ana 553, A, I, Einsiedeln).

7 Cf. Stefano DEL LUNGO: *Roma in età carolingia e gli scritti dell'Anonimo Augiense* (Miscellanea della Società Romana di Storia Patria, 48). Roma, 2004.

8 Riccardo Santangeli VALENZANI: "Itinerarium Einsidlense": Probleme und neue Ansätze der Forschung". In: ERHART and HÜEBLIN 2014 (see note 2), pp. 33–37, with bibliography on 37. One might easily cite a host of incidental literature: e.g., Kai BRODERSEN: Ein karolingischer Stadtplan von Rom? In: *Cartographica Helvetica* 14 (1996), pp. 35–41.

9 Cf. WALSER 1987 (see note 2), p. 127 (nos. 69–70), 129 (no. 72), 204–II. The convention predates him.

10 For the conceptual framework, one thinks, of course, of the important work of Patrick Gautier-Dalché. See, for one, his *Considérations intempêtes sur l'objet "espace médiéval" et sur sa construction*. In: Stéphane BOISSELLIER (ed.): *De l'espace aux territoires: La territorialité des processus sociaux et culturels au Moyen Âge*, Actes de la table ronde des 8–9 juin 2006, CESCUM (Poitiers) (Culture et Société Médiévales, 19). Turnhout, 2010, pp. 133–44.



exclusions, to arrive at fresh plausible speculations about original forms and intentions and maybe personnel. I base my comments on having reinspected the manuscript I knew in the 1980s on two further occasions in 2015: one whole day in June to prepare, and a further whole day in September to conduct a seminar at Einsiedeln on *IE* with Professor Carmen Cardelle de Hartmann and her students in Medieval Latin at Zurich.<sup>11</sup>

I focus here on mostly telling what seems to me specifically “new”. Many basic material details, namely measurements and contents, can be gleaned from standard resources, starting with Bischoff’s *Katalog* and the *e-codices* facsimile and description/bibliography. Some, however, are readily visible, but inexplicably lack or want for comment, while certain details have been subject to misstatement. A first internal matter to settle is that I follow the accepted framework for dating the visitors’ routes – as grounds for these copies, and by extension for the associated sylloge – to between AD 751 and AD 855 based on certain mentions or omissions of datably changing fixtures within Rome (known especially from the *Liber pontificalis*). The absence of St. Peter’s and the *Civitas Leonina* (ca. 847) affords no purchase, since one expects them first of all, precisely where a leaf has been excised. Conversely, I would not question, as some have, the *bona fides* of certain pointers to sites that seem inaptly far off a given path, any more than I would suspect the other plainly missing sites adjacent to some routes. Omissions and choices happen in texts, and no one can account for lines of sight on foot versus horseback, or conceivably a mix of both at different times.

A first point to restate is that the small codex (180 × 125 mm) is a medieval *recueil factice* that includes elements of an early anthology, which was itself built up over time. The codicological break-down given in the *e-codices* description (of 2010) does not serviceably mark changes in textual content as distinct from the separate and coherent physical segments that properly define a “codicological unit”.<sup>12</sup> For the record, I must clarify the physical collation of the quires (Q = quire), and I use Roman numerals (after Anton Chroust) to identify, e.g., binions (II) versus quaternions/quinions (IV/V), then standard Arabic numerals for added or removed leaves, Arabic/alphabetic superscripts to note the current foliation at breaks, and double bars || to delimit physically coherent segments. When the manuscript was “conserved” in ca. 1990, the highly paid artist disturbed both the page-order and quiring. Here, I give first what I knew in the 1980s, and then as supplement what we now see in *e-codices* and *in situ*. The physical collation should be as follows:

- QI = (V+I)<sup>A to 10</sup>, stubb opposite flyleaf A around the fold;
- || Q2 = V<sup>20</sup>, Q3 = IV<sup>28</sup>, Q4 = (IV–2)<sup>34</sup>, leaves 7 and 8 excised  
[ex-fol. 30, marked and set as 34bis];
- || Q5 = IV<sup>42</sup>, Q6 = IV<sup>50</sup>, Q7 = IV<sup>58</sup>, Q8 = IV<sup>66</sup>;
- || Q9 = (IV–I)<sup>73</sup>, leaf I excised; Q10 = IV<sup>81</sup>, Q11 = V<sup>91</sup>, Q12 = (IV–2)<sup>97</sup>,  
leaves 7 and 8 excised;
- || Q13 = (IV–I)<sup>104+Z</sup>, leaf I excised, stubb opposite flyleaf Z around the fold.

11 I am grateful to P. Justinus Pagnamenta (Stiftsbibliothek) and P. Martin Werlen (my sometime frater senior) for helping to make those visits possible.

12 The mixed result perhaps arose from the conversion of a sequential analysis of content to the template of “codicological units” standard in *e-codices* descriptions.



There are 104 folios (plus two medieval flyleaves), but now with a disturbance of the early quiring and numbering at:

Q3 = (IV<sup>28</sup>+I)<sup>29</sup>, the stubb opposite fol. 29 now around the fold (from Q4);

Q4 = (II<sup>34</sup>+I)<sup>34bis</sup>, the stubb opposite ex-fol. 30, alias 34<sup>bis</sup>, now reversed to set the renumbered leaf last.

From the authentic collation, one sees immediately that removed leaves occur at shifts between organic segments, there resized to fit the needed or still wanted text. As Bischoff remarked, the two ninth-century stretches of quires used calfskin (vellum): Q2–Q4 (partly) and Q9–Q12 (completely); we may add that those sections also include both “normal” quaternions along with some quinions, where the latter type in calfskin was a regular feature of mid-century book-making at Fulda and other central German scriptoria. The first noted stretch of quires, Q2–Q4, also shows a peculiar arrangement of the membrane with the hair-side always facing out.<sup>13</sup> Fulda, of course, knew how to be consistent, but not, so far as I know, in that way. The texts that chiefly concern us about Rome (and Pavia) lie together (fols. 67r–86r) in Q9–Q12, where they are followed, directly in Q11, by an excerpt from the *Ordo Romanus XXIII* (fols. 86v–88v), concerning Holy Week in Rome, specifically the Good Friday rituals with the relic of the True Cross, and then various poems, including, as seemingly latest in date, the epitaph of Bp. Bernald of Strassburg (d. 840?), a sometime monk of Reichenau (fol. 97v). The entire section of the book devoted to “Rome” is copied, with some variation (e.g., in the use of rubrication and the style of the certain notabilior letters) by what appears to be a single Caroline hand (and Caroline is the basic script throughout *IE*), which was for Bischoff some “in Fulda geschulter Schreiber.” One can follow his thinking for the writing where it shows the Fulda-style *α*-form of minuscule *a* and an often rounded (cuspleless) *α*-ligature, yet the writer also deploys a distinctly cusped form of *α*-ligature (not Fulda) and a tall *rt*-ligature with a pronounced forward “hornlet” at the top (not Fulda). The form of the *rt*-ligature recalls, in my experience, habits from ninth-century South Germany (and later atavisms from there). “In Fulda geschult” cannot mean, I think, Fulda itself. The inconsistent mix of elements would square poorly with the Fulda scriptorium, or really any well practiced centre.<sup>14</sup> Bischoff decided in his separate *Katalog* entry for Q2–Q4 (with the *Gospel of Nicodemus*) for another “in Fulda geschulter Schreiber”, here writing to a different justification and, I think, slightly later with an altogether weaker Fulda-style *α*-form of *a* but a more consistent rounded *α*-ligature.<sup>15</sup> For our purposes, it is important to emphasize (*pace* others) that the codex *does* include quire

13 Distracted by other matters I failed to note the flesh-hair orientation elsewhere except for Q1, which is the usual hair-side out to start, then alternating with usual like against like, and for Q5–Q8, containing a Penitential (Excarpus Cummeani), which uses sheep- or goat-skin parchment so finely worked as make distinguishing hair versus flesh for me impossible.

14 See, again, BISCHOFF 1998–2014 (see note 6), vol. I, p.

242 (no. 1133), dating to saec. ix<sup>2/3</sup>. The fuller notes in the Nachlaß (Ana 553, A, I, Einsiedeln) also point to the forms I observe, and date to saec. “ix<sup>3/3</sup>.”

15 BISCHOFF 1998–2014 (see note 6), vol. I, p. 242 (no. 1132), dating to saec. ix<sup>2/3</sup>. The notes in the Nachlaß (ibid.) date to saec. “ix<sup>2</sup> (3/3?)” and remark: “Könnte auch Fulda sein”. The scribe is notable for his predilection for setting accents on monosyllables.



numbers, and at that, in the section that most interests us, where the lower margin of the final versos of Q9 and Q11 still show their original ordering as “i” and “iii”, respectively. Although it now lacks (perhaps because it named a past owner or offered a blank recto), there is every reason to suppose (also for interpreting the original) that the lost first leaf of Q9 introduced, dedicated, or explained the sylloge and visitors’ routes that now begin abruptly. Without proposing to separate the physically and graphically kindred grouping Q2–Q4 from the section that originally headed a small but coherently conceived project consisting of Q9–Q12, it seems plausible that the real codicological units shifted position as part of a gradual accretion of materials by size or “theme”.

The text found in Q1, here called the *Notae Iulii Caesaris* (fol. 1r), provides a tenth-century supplement for reading abbreviations that seems purpose-built, and carefully sized, as a help to understanding the sylloge of inscriptions. It is conceivable, moreover, to judge from the titling, mistaken but firmly linkable to an analogue at Reichenau, that some early, but not original, interest in Roman things here actually points, as Walser and others hoped, to that abbey.<sup>16</sup> The wavering palaeographical attribution of Q1, Q5–Q8 (*Poenitientiale Cummeani*), and Q13 (*De inuentione s. Crucis*) to Germany or Italy may in part turn on the final *Epitaphium Xanthippae*, whose model stone still survives at Parma, in Italy, and whose text in the tenth-century copy that closes Q13 (fol. 104v) seems to follow the accents and decorative interpuncts of the original as if copied in front of it.<sup>17</sup> Q1 and Q5–Q8 strike me as tenth-century German. Might that be a sign that the “engineered” *recueil factice*, with its early core of material about Rome and Pavia and the True Cross, then crossed together with new, carefully sized and mated accretions into Italy, and then back? Perhaps on the sort of pilgrimage for which some “conceptualizing” scholars have deemed the *IE* too removed from realities to be useful or suitable? It is at least certain that the tenth-century scribe of the *Poenitientiale Cummeani* (Q5–Q8) added a rubricated heading (fol. 10r, upper margin) to highlight the original writer’s tailpiece on the alphabet as a form of numerical notation (fol. 10r–v in Q1). The distinct hand as rubricator follows up on the other scribe’s outline of an alphabetic “code”, which itself could relate to the (erstwhile ciphered) *litterae formatae* still needed, in theory, to cross into Italy as a pilgrim in the earlier Middle Ages. His added penitential as part of a pilgrim’s *vade mecum* may be, in turn, a natural functional complement, and it here doubtless postdates the other quires it joined, except perhaps for Q13, with its palaeographically cohesive tenth-century writing

16 The source is, in fact, Marcus Valerius Probus (saec. i p. Chr.). *Notae*. As my teacher, Virginia Brown, wrote in a discussion of Julius Caesar’s legacy: “Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek ms. 326 (s. IX/X) contains, on ff. 1–10, ‘Notae Iulii Caesaris’ which consist of a collection of ‘notae iuris.’ Theodor Mommsen, their editor (in Heinrich KEIL: *Grammatici latini* IV 317–330), believed them to be copied from an older manuscript, probably that listed in the 846 [Reichenau] catalogue of Reginbert (‘Notae Iulii Caesaris et liber Plinii Secundi de natura rerum’), and attributed the misleading title to a scribal confusion of ‘Notae I(uris) C(ivilis)’”.

Virginia BROWN: Caesar, Gaius Julius. In: F. Edward CRANZ (ed.): *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*, 3. Washington, 1976, p. 90.

17 There is also, as Virginia Brown often said to me, a certain habit of looking to Italy for anything one does not quite see how to place palaeographically. For the charming *Epitaphium Xanthippae*, Franz BÜCHELER: *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*. Leipzig, 1895–1897, pp. 53–54, no. 98 (= E. Bormann, ed., *CIL* XI [1888], no. 1118, from Parma; inc. *Seu mortis miseret seu te uitae, perlige*).



about Helena's discovery of the True Cross and closing epitaph copied somehow from Parma. The last quire in position and, I think, date thus picked up on the Cross-centered and epigraphic emphases of the earliest ones. The choice for the first core of material, the numbered "opening" quires with the sylloge, visitors' routes, and Liturgy of the Cross, seems to have informed and guided the taste for the rest, with the possible exception of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, the earliest accretion, whose Harrowing of Hell (on Good Friday) was still not irrelevant and generally a "best-seller." Plotting the whole content of the *IE* suggests how a perplexing congeries actually could work in concert to serve a tenth-century pilgrim to Rome, and perhaps did.

But what, then, of an original hypothetical pilgrim behind the earliest elements of *IE* as they were elaborated between AD 751 and AD 855? For I take the early core of materials preserved in *IE* as the work of a travelling individual with curiosity, skill, and sharply trained religious and antiquarian sensibilities. That is the most ready hypothesis, and any real evidence for some Frankish or papal "committee effort" to market or document Rome (at that, with many non-Christian inscriptions) simply lacks for this material as it survives. The "anonymous" here in question, that is, since the loss of the first leaf of Q9, must also have been at least somewhat capable at reading and transcribing Greek, both in Rome, where there was help, and in Pavia (then the "other" political capital in Italy), where he might find none. He may have been a northern visitor in Lombard times or a Carolingian subject on his own or in his ruler's service after AD 774. A further small but important set of details – Tironian Notes – suggest a possible quarter in which to look for this anonymous. I mean here to plot a least complex and workable hypothesis.

A "place" where we might plausibly find our early scribes "schooled" at Fulda includes a whole circle of immediate dependencies and also other communities in whose educational and cultural life the great abbey was implicated through teaching, training, and writing for export (i. e., models). Einhard (d. 840), Charlemagne's well-connected biographer, was an alumnus of Fulda, and from the late 820s, in busy retirement at Seligenstadt (no more than two days' ride to the south), he wielded moral influence, gave advice, and lent books.<sup>18</sup> He did so specifically, we know, under prodding from Fulda by the visiting western student, Lupus of Ferrières (833–836), who scoured an outposted copy of Einhard's library catalogue to make requests and plied the elder statesman by letter and in person with questions about metrical theory, mathematics, Greek, and the practice of "Adoring the Cross." A multiple talent, Einhard had even made or guided the making of intricate reliquaries to honour the relics of the True Cross which he had received as an imperial gift. Early modern isometric sketches of one such creation show his mastery of Classical form, figural decoration, and the intricacies of exquisitely lettered inscriptions whose exceptional beauty is still evident in the extant pen-and-ink facsimile.<sup>19</sup> Though not unique in his preoccupation with the Cross as relic, its suitable display, and appropriate "worship", Ein-

18 See now, to start, Steffen PATZOLD: *Ich und Karl der Große: Das Leben des Höflings Einhard*, 2d ed. Stuttgart, 2014.

19 Karl HAUCK (ed.): *Das Einhardkreuz: Vorträge und*

*Studien der Münsteraner Diskussion zum arcus Einhardi* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Folge, 87). Göttingen, 1974.



hard was an expert; he even dedicated to Lupus a bespoke theological essay “On Adoring the Cross” (836).<sup>20</sup> As a layman, or rather the lay abbot at Seligenstadt, he was engaged by the then deacon Lupus as a multivalent authority, though Fulda had architects (for maths), Hrabanus (as poet and theologian of the Cross), but admittedly scant knowledge of Greek.<sup>21</sup> Einhard used this language, albeit sparsely, to explain “adoring” the Cross to Lupus and as proof, if not advertisement of his skill, in his earlier *Life of Charlemagne* (ca. 828). In his useful importunity about those matters, Lupus was even abetted by Abbot Hrabanus, who allowed his junior guest the use of his messenger to send to Seligenstadt. The resources and experience of Einhard were considerable. He could and did provide Lupus with a superb and justly famous model of inscriptional capitals as used by a certain royal scribe, which still survives in ms. Bern, Burgerbibl. 250 (Seligenstadt, AD 836).<sup>22</sup> Einhard also possessed a trusted agent and delegate in his notary, Ratleik (originally from Cologne), who mastered the contemporary Latin shorthand (Tironian Notes). This was a rare skill and probably scarcer than even a smattering of Greek letters in Central Germany. As Einhard’s abbatial successor at Seligenstadt from 840, Ratleik also appears that year in December as archchancellor at the royal court of Louis the German (d. 876), where until his death in June 854 the immemorial practice of corroborating royal charters with notes in Tironian shorthand continued and then abruptly stopped. It is highly significant, though it has gone unnoticed, that the margins of *IE* include two instances of sophisticated Tironian annotation in the sylloge.<sup>23</sup> One resolves, if a reader knows to understand the rare sign, an inscription’s technical turn, *pater patriae* (fol. 67v), while the other proposes (fol. 69r, to no good effect) an alternate reading, *uel nec*, for the unfamiliar truncation of the term *nummi* (to its initial *N*). Ratleik presents an instance of advanced Tironian ability, such as briefly but deftly witnessed by *IE*, in the relevant Central German landscape which was otherwise devoid of it.<sup>24</sup> Both Ratleik and Einhard also went to Italy and Rome on various business: the statesman multiple times and via Pavia, and Ratleik famously to Rome in 827 with orders to obtain (that is, to steal) relics, when he brought back the Martyrs SS. Marcellinus and Peter, who soon became the patrons of Seligenstadt. Ratleik had a strictly focused purpose, but one for which the visitors’ routes in *IE* might have been useful. The collection’s (internally exceptional) extramural visitors’ routes, whose descriptive informa-

20 Michael I. ALLEN: The Letter as Mirror and Prism: Lupus of Ferrières and Einhard. In: Christiane Veyrard COSME, Dominique DEMARTINI, and Sumi SHIMAHARA (eds.): *La Lettre-Miroir dans l’Occident latin et vernaculaire du Ve au XVe siècle* (Études Augustiniennes). Paris (in press). An appendix there gives an improved text (based on all three extant mss.) of the *De adoranda cruce*, with commentary and translation.

21 Michael I. ALLEN: Aus Einhards Lebensabend und Consolatio Philosophiae III: Ein Seligenstadter Boethius-Fragment mit lateinischen und althochdeutschen Glossen. In: *Archiv für mittelhochdeutsche Kirchengeschichte* 66 (2014), pp. 343–377.

22 See the facsimile and description at e-codices. A further textual commonality between Bern 250 (fol. 11vb) and

*IE* (fol. 98r-v) is the presence in both of the twelve-line (Ps.-Ausonius) mnemonic poem *De aerumnis Herculis* (= Alexander RIESE: *Anthologia Latina*, 2d ed. Leipzig, 1906, vol. 1/2, pp. 107–108, no. 641).

23 There are other text-critical marks that show that the sylloge was carefully proofread and checked.

24 Tironian Notes were an important but strictly limited phenomenon (found only west of the Rhine outside royal chanceries), and geography matters. In a fine article that culminates with the recovery and publication of a major poem from shorthand, Martin Hellmann also resolves the Tironian mysteries of ms. Saint Gall, Stiftsbibl. 171, but has taken the codex as a local creation, whereas the early Caroline writing and shorthand originated, in an enriching twist, at Saint-Denis, near



tion is arguably the most immediate, point at least to catacombs with the required type of holy booty.<sup>25</sup> Einhard himself was an antiquarian, interested in past models and types for comparison, a product and paragon of the Carolingian *renovatio*. His interests coincide with the noted linguistic skills and preoccupations implicated in the early core of the *IE* (the Tironian signs are, of course, early but separate dressing). He had scribes at Seligenstadt, doubtless cosmopolitan in training but situated in the ambit of Fulda's powerful material (e.g., quinions of calfskin) and graphical examples. His personnel included individuals who knew Tironian notes, certainly Ratleik. Layered presences at Seligenstadt converge with the content, material form, and copywork in the original *IE*. We know from Lupus at Fulda, in Seligenstadt, and even back home in Ferrières (cf. his *epp.* 1–5 and 60), that Seligenstadt under Einhard and Ratleik owned and disseminated special texts. Reasonable plausibility suffices for a hypothesis, and there remain some comparanda and opportunities for further work.

Here I would like to remain within the *IE* to compare and assess some “imagined features” of – that is, speculations about – the early texts there, which relate to perplexities and attendant musings over what precisely we see. To start, as I touched on above, some analogues to Route II — itself the last of the facing-page “spreads” — and then the entirety of Route 12, figure inside the sylloge.<sup>26</sup> This counts almost perennially as a flaw, oversight, or indigestion, easily extended to impinge on further notions about the perception, mastery, and reworking of space. But I must admit that the immediate evidence of the codex has never struck me as a real problem, because the “misplaced” topographical elements directly adjoin inscriptions taken from the places that they list (and the near vicinity). The effect, when one reads the elements in context, is *immediacy*, not mistake. Only attempting to rationalize the material into some sort of “expected” coherence, printed layout (“fraught” with analogy or the lack thereof), or putative uncertainties about space produces a “flaw”, and at that, one that touches on visiting, in part but especially, extramural places that clearly stand outside the usual fare of the visitors' routes, or to embrace my first hypothesis, of *the* visitor's routes. It may well be that going explicitly beyond the walls elicited, invited, or somehow required a different treatment, which attached to an individual subjective experience, and the shift of circumstances and results may be as simple and complex as dealing with a different oversight (or accompaniment), conveyance, or kit of tools for those outings. Altogether, we could be dealing, at various moments and here indirectly, with the notoriously diminutive Einhard as he padded through and around Rome on foot, with some sites a bit or much harder to see and reach with his short stature

Paris. Cf. Martin HELLMANN: Stenographische Technik in der karolingischen Patrologie. In: BECKER, LICHT and WEINFURTER 2015 (see note 4), pp. 177–179.

25 See, to begin, routes II and 12 in WALSER 1987 (see note 2), pp. 203–211, comparing 54–59 (nos. 66 [at the end] and 67–72, where the limitations of the presentation and transcription are obvious). Ratleik secured hired guidance to the booty he took from the Roman deacon Deusdona; see EINHARD: Translation

und Wunder der heiligen Marcellinus und Petrus (Lateinisch-Deutsch), ed. Dorothea KIES and others (Acta Einhardi, 2). Seligenstadt, 2015. Eighth- and ninth-century popes tried to forbid exports and removed most “relics” from the vulnerable suburban catacombs to inside the walled City's relative safety and order.

26 See again, to begin, WALSER 1987 (see note 2), pp. 203–211, comparing 54–59 (nos. 66 [at the end] and 67–72).



and strides, until he took to horse, when he saw farther, or at least differently. And then he noted it down.

How exactly should we imagine that the key visitor, or at least someone, did that? The answer concerns what originally happened, what it included, and the mode and shape of the transmission that underlies what we now have. Not just any, in fact probably no secretary could be entrusted with deciphering or taking dictation in Latin (with abbreviations) and also in Greek (just outside Rome and in Pavia), where we even find in the latter the differential treatment of majuscule Greek Sigma in the “usual” forms versus the normal – “lunate” *C* of medieval bookhands and epigraphy.<sup>27</sup> That so much is so accurate about the inscriptions speaks for immediacy, all of which we might suppose, heuristically at least, for the airy facing-page spreads. How then, concretely, might we imagine that thinly packed immediacy in its first incarnation? Do we really need to posit in every case a troubled, fraught, or at least troublesome “translation” from the tightly packed, “raw” or “unprocessed” evidence of Route 12 (among the inscriptions) to the ample and tidied two-page format? From working with medieval books and their users, I imagine, I think, what lies behind the facing-page spreads. It is not likely that blank books (which were not available for purchase) were schlepped from home, and simply impossible that the wax-tablets of daily notes were filled up and brought back. In all likelihood, the antiquarian visitor to Rome and Pavia worked in margins, on interlinear space, and over end-leaves or blanks in some *vade mecum*, or at least in some owned and “sulliable” book(s) that could be appropriated, and later disentangled through recopying, for the noble purpose of creating a record, a memento, of a rich and complex encounter with Rome. It is not in the nature of such, so to say, *Sudelbücher* to survive as such, yet I suggest as a first good analogue the diminutive, originally airy pages of ms. Paris, BnF, lat. 6256 (saec. ix<sup>2/4</sup>, W. France, with excerpts from the complete *Corpus Caesarianum*, Sallust, and others), whose margins were later invaded with other text.<sup>28</sup> The same sort of process is at work in the early-ninth-century glossary (from Orléans, but much traveled), whose margins and interlinear spaces were subsequently populated, *inter alia*, with the famous “Paris Old German Phrase Book.”<sup>29</sup> One might test this second hypothesis, at least partially, by assessing the paths (with detour *de uia*) behind the differently presented left-side versus right-side pointers to noted sites in the “packed-format” trajectories found within the sylloge as against the distinction by left/right page in the two-page format. The roving “anonymous” visitor inscribed all his intramural routes and further forays venturing outside (especially in no. 11) with sites marked to the left and right of the binding fold in some book, probably with scratched notes (dry-point) or in red-point (Rötel). Inscriptions (sometimes long and complex)

27 For the Greek, see in WALSER 1987 (see note 2), pp. 129–30, 141 (nos. 73 and 80, respectively), which appear on fols. 78r–v and 79r in IE. The Greek would reward more commentary.

28 BISCHOFF 1998–2014 (see note 6), vol. 3 (2014), p. 116 (no. 4399). The manuscript can be inspected through the BnF’s Gallica web-site.

29 Ms. Paris, BnF, lat. 7641. See Wolfgang HAUBRICHS

and Max PFISTER: “In Francia fui”: Studien zu den romanisch-germanischen Interferenzen und zur Grundsprache der althochdeutschen “Pariser (Altdeutschen) Gespräche” nebst einer Edition des Textes (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse 1989/6). Wiesbaden, 1989. Also BISCHOFF 1998–2014 (see note 6), p. 133 (no. 4489).



and certain extramural movements entwined with them elicited a different, better suited method and cleaner space to ink. Visits to the suburbs with their precious catacombs were perhaps scouted twice. Or so, altogether, the evidence strikes me.

That will not eliminate the odd omissions, inclusions, and other challenges that remain about the visitor's paths in *Itinerarium Einsidlense*. But reflecting more, and nearer to the parchment, on the content, inner workings, and plausible hidden workings of this unique and valuable source does bring us closer to some real contours of friendship and duty toward the past, and as pilgrim in the present. That is all something Jochen Bepler understood and exemplified as lover and sharer of books and as a good pilgrim on earth.

Währendem Exkurs zur Einführung der Psalmen-  
vorlesung an Hildesheimer Michaeliskloster  
im 12. Jahrhundert



