
Review by Matthias M. Tischler, ICREA/Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

This is a publication of the papers of an international congress held in Lyon on 15-17 September 2016. The congress explored the impact of the important cultural center that Lyon was, not only in times of antiquity, but also in the Carolingian ninth century under its highly-learned archbishops Leidrat, Agobard, and Amulo. The volume’s focus is mainly on Agobard’s time. It is a collaborative work of mostly French researchers. I counted only three scholars of the Anglo-American world (Cullen J. Chandler, David Ganz, and Susan Rankin), and curiously none from equally important German-speaking Early Medieval Studies. This scholarly format is perhaps the only feasible way in times of extreme specialization to approximate a comprehensive and consistent monographic study on a specific locale, while still recognizing the rich and complex manuscript and text transmission occurring from the early Middle Ages onwards.

Lyon is a well-studied locus for manuscript research. It was a privileged object of early efforts to reconstruct its late antique and early medieval *scriptorium*, demonstrating a rare continuity comparable only to the renowned center of uninterrupted learning of Verona. German scholarship has played and still plays a prominent role in the study of Lyon as a writing, learning, and political center. Two disciples of Ludwig Traube (the Munich-based founder of Medieval Latin as an academic discipline) laid the foundation with solid palaeographical research on manuscripts. Sigmund Tafel was the true discoverer of the early medieval manuscript collections in Lyon and the one who identified the hand of the famous deacon Florus of Lyon. His work was published posthumously and in English by Wallace Martin Lindsay after his early death in World War I.[1] Elias Avery Lowe, the other Traube pupil, analyzed the oldest Lyon manuscripts in preparation of his *Codices Latini Antiquiores* project, focusing on the codices written in half uncial.[2] This research allowed the reconstruction of the Carolingian book collection of Lyon using Florus’s marginal annotations. This explains, to a certain degree, the rich inventory of Lyon manuscripts compiled by Bernhard Bischoff in his catalogue of ninth-century continental manuscripts.[3] More recently, Tino Licht revisited the question of half-uncial handwriting in Lyon in a chapter of his *Habilitation*, observations that have not yet been tested.[4] To sum up, palaeographical scholarship on Lyon was dominated in the twentieth century by the German Traube-Lowe-Bischoff school, and it has only been in the later twentieth century that French scholars have begun to come into their own.
But German scholarship on Lyon did not stop with manuscript studies. A less well-known monographic study on Lyon in the early Middle Ages was published in 1968 by Hubert Gerner.[5] At the same time, Agobard himself became subject of a 1969 monograph on his life and work, by Egon Boshof.[6] Between the 1960s and 1980s, further German studies of Lyon as an early medieval center for the production of church law collections and of Lyon’s bishop list in the eighth and ninth centuries were released.[7] More recently, prominent members of the Carolingian school of Lyon have been the subject of attention: Ado of Vienne and his highly influential martyrology; Amalar (once called ‘of Metz’) and his liturgical work; and, last but not least, Florus of Lyon.[8] Most recently, Cornelia Herbers-Rauhut has released a critical edition of the anti-Jewish Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum of Amulo, Agobard’s successor.[9]

In comparison to this massive and substantial research, what do the volume’s contributions offer new? As already mentioned above, the chapters mainly provide detailed research on thematically-limited topics and thus round out the broad picture of Lyon we already have at our disposal. My brief summary of the contributions thus focuses primarily on the key new aspects and then proposes a way to open the field for an innovative research perspective that moves beyond Lyon.

Between a short introduction by Michel Rubellin[10] and a brief conclusion by François Bougard, as well as general indices of persons, archivia and manuscripts, and places, rivers, regions, and countries, the volume offers twenty-one chapters which mostly deal with individual manuscripts, works, and persons either around Agobard, or commissioned or written by himself. Several deal with more general topics concerning the place of Lyon in the network of Carolingian culture and politics. The organization of the book does not lend itself well to easy summary, so I will instead focus on specific themes, especially those contributions which deal more with the Carolingian text culture of Lyon.

Three chapters focus on Lyon as a city and its individual monasteries. Jean-François Reynaud describes ninth-century Lyon from the archaeological point of view and underscores especially the massive work of architectural renovation and transformation under Archbishop Leidrat, Agobard’s predecessor.[11] Charlotte Gaillard studies the monastic, architectural, and liturgical development of the fifth-century foundation of Saint-Martin de l’Île-Barbe after its double reformation by Leidrat of Lyon and Benedict of Aniane, while Olivia Puel outlines the still under-studied religious, architectural, and liturgical fate of the younger ninth-century abbey of Saint-Martin de Savigny, the result of the introduction of Carolingian monastic reform in and around Lyon.

These contributions bring us to Lyon as a crossroad of knowledge interchange and as a space and place of learning and writing. David Ganz gives a dense overview of the contemporaneous and later Carolingian use of the rich old pre-Carolingian manuscript collection of Lyon which is based on Lowe’s and Bischoff’s palaeographical work (although not Licht’s). This essay focuses on the many annotations before Florus and thus reopens the question of which items were Lyonnais publications and which, imported books. Claire Tignolet describes the community of the “Hispani” in Lyon as an outstanding network of learning in the Carolingian Empire. She makes clear their impact on ninth-century cultural production and politics, especially in the southwestern parts of the Empire, although without mentioning the material reflex of this impact—the still existing manuscripts (on that see below). This Frankish-Hispanic relationship is later explored by Fernand Peloux, who shows traces of the use of a Visigothic hagiographic
text collection and of the Hispanic annotated manuscript Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, E 26 in the martyrology redacted by an anonymous Lyon compiler.

As explained, the majority of the essays deal with Agobard as an author and as a thinker in the Carolingian theological and political quarrels. Caroline Chevalier-Royet and Michel Jean-Louis Perrin focus on Agobard’s biblical erudition from different standpoints. Chevalier-Royet works out a general panorama of his favorite biblical books, then makes suggestions as to which Bible edition(s) of the Vulgate he may have used, finally retracing their critical use in his various argumentations regarding contemporaneous church policy.\[^{[12]}\] Perrin focuses on two individual works dedicated to Emperor Louis the Pious and compares the use of the Bible in both of them: Agobard’s *De divisione imperii* and Hrabanus Maurus’s *De honore parentum et subiectione filiorum*. This would have been an even more effective test if Perrin would have also taken into consideration Agobard’s *Liber apologeticus*, since both Carolingian authors were perhaps the most prominent opponents in the qualification of the emperor’s process (justified or not) and deposition in 833. Claire Dantin describes the restoration of a new ninth-century Lyon copy of the *Collectio Dacheriana*, discovered only in 2013 (Lyon, Archives diocésaines, Ms. 1), which strengthens our impression of Agobard’s responsibility for the redaction and dissemination of this early Carolingian Church law collection.\[^{[13]}\] Paul Mattei analyzes the way in which Agobard used Latin quotes from some Greek Church Fathers in his *Adversus dogma Felicis* from both a material and intellectual standpoint. Cullen J. Chandler sets the same work (the *Adversus dogma Felicis*) in the wider context of the Carolingian struggle against adoptionism and theological debates regarding the correct understanding of the Holy Trinity. Kristina Mitalaité uses Agobard’s *De picturis et imaginibus* to explore his role as a dissident in the question of the veneration of images. This work was in response to the decisions made by the bishops’ council which had met in Paris in 825 and that followed the traditional opinion of Pope Gregory the Great on this topic.\[^{[14]}\] Philippe Depreux explains how much Agobard’s awareness of dissent in this and many other questions, while a character trait, was also linked to his general view of cohesion and unity of the Empire. Susan Rankin shows the slow, but enduring impact of Agobard’s *De antiphonario*, written in response to the new Antiphoner introduced in Lyon by Amalar, Agobard’s most important rival and temporary substitute (a personage otherwise mentioned in only a few contributions). Pierre Chambert-Protat analyzes chronological-historical activities under Agobard, using the computistic text material of the above-mentioned manuscript at the Biblioteca Vallicelliana in Rome. It, combined with the manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 8680, formed a working copy at the Lyon Cathedral library which had been produced at the moment of transition from Leidrat to Agobard in 814.

The volume offers two chapters on Florus, Agobard’s most important collaborator. Warren Pezé deals with the relationship between Florus und Amalar through the lens of Florus’s contribution to the council of Quierzy in 838. This contribution turns out to be not only a criticism of Amalar himself, but of bishops-counselor in general who formed the entourage of the old emperor, Louis the Pious.\[^{[15]}\] As well as offering a new meticulous palaeographical analysis of the entries of the so-called *Annales Lugdunenses* in the aforementioned copy of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Louis Holtz studies Florus’s annotations in this manuscript, as well as in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 2853. Whereas the former copy was one of Florus’s original working manuscripts, the latter is, at least in its first part, an exact later copy of Florus’s lost original ninth-century collection of most of Agobard’s authentic works, which shows the deacon’s global fidelity and loyalty to his bishop.
The volume offers only one contribution dealing with Amulo, Agobard’s successor, that by Jean-Paul Bouhot. Bouhot investigates Amulo’s letter on the problematic pastoral issue of false relics which were being transferred from Italy to Dijon (addressed to Bishop Theutbald I of Langres), as well as that dealing with the question of predestination (written to Gottschalk of Orbais). In particular, Bouhot explores Amulo’s anti-Jewish polemical Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum (although does not make use of the new critical edition by Herbers-Rauhut mentioned above) which continued his predecessor’s religious convictions to some degree, but not without new emphases. Amulo does not appeal the emperor’s intervention in the regulation of the relationship between Jews and Christians, but urges the churchmen of his own metropole to apply the appropriate rules and standards of the Church.

A final section deals with Agobard’s early and later afterlife. Marie-Céline Isaïa focuses on the use of Agobard’s work in the above-mentioned copy (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 2853), which was annotated by a later reader from juridical, fundamental-theological, and exegetical standpoints. In doing so, that reader showed a certain predilection for adages in order to create a kind of paranetical guide for priests from this carefully selected material. The last two chapters continue the story of the reception of Agobard’s work through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Jean-Benoît Krumenacker describes the reasons for the lack of interest in Agobard’s works and the failed first attempt to publish them in the early sixteenth century. Jean-Louis Quantin shows how Papire Masson finally succeeded in introducing Agobard’s work to the political culture of early seventeenth-century France, where it was picked up by both Protestants and members of the parliament after it was put on the Roman and Spanish Indices librorum prohibitorum.

To sum up, Lyon has been a cosmopolitan city since Antiquity, and an attractive center of learning in Carolingian times that harbored Jews, Visigoths, and Bavarians (such as Leidrat) within its city walls. When studying and describing such a center, one should not forget that the true dimension of a center’s radiating impact is recognizable only when one also takes into consideration the effects on the peripheries of that center. This tension between center and periphery is more than true in the case of Lyon, and here lies, in this reviewer’s eyes, the most innovative potential for future research: We have to study Lyon’s impact not only at the local or regional level, but in a broader, panoramic view.[16] It is about the spread of Lyon’s Carolingian text and manuscript culture, especially to Septimania and the southwestern periphery of the Carolingian Empire (the so-called “Spanish March,” which would become medieval Catalonia). This is one of the most relevant insights this reviewer and his Barcelona research team have made in the last years,[17] because it reverses and complements the classical view of Lyon as a centripetal center of culture.[18] The dissemination of literary works of the school of Lyon is certainly related to Leidrat of Lyon’s central role in the Carolingian struggle against adoptionism, especially against Bishop Felix of Urgell who was finally grounded in Lyon. But there was apparently a transmission, à la longue durée, which went far beyond the early ninth century and needs to be investigated in its entirety and on the basis of a secured stemma codicum of each work. We have found not only traces of Leidrat’s own work in copies of his tract on baptism in Girona (Barcelona, Biblioteca de la Universitat, Ms. 228, fol. 141r-158r, before 990) and Saint-André de Villeneuve-lès-Avignon (Nîmes, Archives départementales du Gard, 1 F 5, fol. 41r-51v, thirteenth century), but also a copy and traces of two lost exemplars of the Chronicon by Claudius of Turin, Felix’s disciple, again in Saint-André de Villeneuve-lès-Avignon (Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, Ms. 9605 [olim Ms. E. e. 40,], fol. 103r-115r, 1026), Santa Maria de Ripoll (library catalogue of 1047) and Saint-Pons-de-Thomières (library catalogue of 1276).
Moreover, we have determined that a trace of the rare Psalter edition of Florus of Lyon, namely his *Epistola ad Hyldradum abbatem Novaliciensem*, is transmitted in the famous early eleventh-century Bible of Ripoll, Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5729, fol. 261va-262rc.[19] As well, Florus’s *Expositio in Epistolas beati Pauli ex operibus S. Augustini* is transmitted in copies from Sainte-Marie de Lagrasse (Nîmes, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. 36, fol. 2ra-207vb, 1086/1108) and Santa Maria de Ripoll or Saint-Michel de Cuxa (Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5730, second quarter of the twelfth century). In addition, the quasi-exclusive transmission of Ado of Vienne’s Martyrology, already established for southern France by Jean-Loup Lemaitre, and now confirmed for Catalonia up to the twelfth century by this reviewer’s own research and that of Ekaterina Novokhatko, combined with the dissemination of Amalar’s *Liber officialis* in regions both north and south of the Pyrenees (more or less unknown to Jean Michel Hanssens), shows the massive impact of key works of the Carolingian school of Lyon there.[20] Another underrated phenomenon is the transmission of unknown manuscripts from the Lyon *scriptorium* in Catalonia. It is worth mentioning two spectacular, but still unknown cases. The Archive of the Cathedral Chapter of Urgell still holds a ninth-century Lyon copy of the *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* (La Seu d’Urgell, Arxiu Capitular, Ms. 2006, fol. 1ra-145ra). A detailed study of its text, as well as its numerous marginal notes, is needed. While Lyon is known to have been a center for the dissemination of law collections since late Antiquity, this manuscript, which demonstrates that Lyon’s manuscript culture extended beyond the Pyrenees, suggests that Lyon also disseminated collections more recently, i.e. in Carolingian times.[21] Secondly and very recently, Jesús Alturo i Perucho and Tània Alaix i Gimbert have discovered and published a fragment of the earliest copy of the anonymous Merovingian Passion of Bishop Desiderius of Vienne in Urgell (La Seu d’Urgell, Arxiu Capitular, s. n. [olim Caja 01926]). This fragment comes from a late ninth-century manuscript, presumably copied in Lyon.[22] In addition to Fernand Peloux’s findings on Visigothic hagiographical traces in Lyon, mentioned above, this finding makes clear that early Frankish hagiographical texts can be found in former Visigothic territory, completing our panorama of the mutual exchange of text resources between the regions of Gallia and Hispania. Yet the fragment obviously came to Urgell as reinforcement in the book-binding of a sixteenth-century print from Lyon, so that it could not have belonged to the early medieval library of the Pyrenean bishop’s see. Nevertheless, the fragment’s presence in the Pyrenees was likely not by chance, but instead suggests that relations between Lyon and Urgell were long-standing.

In stark contrast, the failure of any transmission of Agobard’s works in Septimania and Catalonia is striking, since Agobard continued Leidrat’s relationship with Septimian bishops and abbots. With the exception of his liturgical tract, *De antiphonario ad cantores ecclesiae Lugdunensis* and the *Collectio Dacheriana*, Agobard’s other works—which had been written in specific ecclesiastical and political circumstances—generally demonstrate a weak manuscript transmission with it mostly confined to Lyon and its region.[23] This pattern of reception underscores his minor impact as a Carolingian theologian and politician beyond his own diocese and readdresses his importance among the contemporaneous and later scholars who saw him obviously more as a man of liturgy and Church law.

My short overview of Lyon’s role between centers and peripheries underscores the importance of an in-depth study of the manuscripts and text transmission of the Carolingian epoch. This gives me the opportunity to formulate two desiderata for future research on Lyon. First, as far as I can see, the big gap that we are still missing is a comprehensive monographic study and critical edition of the rare works of Agobard’s predecessor, Archbishop Leidrat.[24] Second, we need a
general history of the Carolingian *scriptorium* and the school of Lyon in order to better understand its intermediating role between other Carolingian centers of learning and the former Visigothic world of Septimania, Catalonia and beyond, not only for the ninth century, with Leidrat, Agobard, and Florus of Lyon at the story’s center, but beyond.[25] This is a study that would be welcome for another reason. Until now, we have had comparable major repertories, studies, and monographs for only Tours (by Edward K. Rand), Würzburg (by Josef Hofmann and Bernhard Bischoff), Lorsch (by Bernhard Bischoff), St. Gallen/Reichenau (by Walter Berschin), Saint-Benoît de Fleury (by Marco Mostert), Corbie (by David Ganz) and Saint-Germain d’Auxerre (by Dominique Iogna-Prat et al.). Most of these studies have focused on abbeys rather than on episcopal cities, which are more complicated as they contain within themselves several competing religious institutions, resulting in a more complex network of rival competences in writing and learning. The core question of a study on the Carolingian Lyon *scriptoria* should be a description of their style and thus their ear marks, in order to identify further manuscripts. Since the presence of a colony of Hispani in Carolingian Lyon made the city a crossroads of various cultural influences, such a study would tell the story of an amalgamation or hybridization, transition, and transformation of scripts and their various cultural backgrounds. Who developed the typical Carolingian writing style(s) of Lyon, if it ever existed? What was its relationship with the writing style of Auxerre, another important contemporaneous and geographically close center of Carolingian manuscript culture? And how did it influence the more southwestern landscape of Carolingian Septimania and Catalonia? Had it any impact on the new Carolingian scripts used in the *ecclesia Narbonensis*? In order to answer all these and other questions, key manuscripts such as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. lat. 8093 + Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F. 111, (according to Bernhard Bischoff, a corner stone of the early, still hybrid Carolingian Lyon *scriptorium*, but in this reviewer’s eyes, a manuscript building a bridge between the still Visigothic world of the early ninth century Pyrenean region and Lyon), need to be reconsidered. Curiously, this codex is not mentioned in any essay of the volume under review.

The volume is a solid new brick in our building of Carolingian Studies of Lyon and should be included in any academic book collection of Early Medieval Studies worldwide. It is pity, therefore, to say that one must complain about two boring formatting aspects of the book series to which it belongs. First, the volume lacks a comprehensive bibliography of all used texts and studies beyond the quoted archival and manuscript materials. This would have converted the book into an even more valuable working instrument on the Carolingian school of Lyon. Second, the page design is inconsistent; the footnotes have a ragged right margin in contrast to the justified main text body. This modern page design—visible in a growing number of book series of other prestigious publishing houses—gives the impression of incompleteness which does not correspond to the perfect manuscript design of its early medieval counterparts, a small detail which nevertheless calls for typographical improvement in the future.
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NOTES


[16] Curiously, there is no discussion of the regional, often tense relationship between Lyon and Vienne in the essay collection.
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