

WANDERERS IN WANDERING SOCIETIES: EARLY MEDIEVAL MONASTICISM AND THE BEGINNINGS OF SYSTEMATIC PROSELYTISM

David Golding

MONKS AND MONK-BISHOPS of the early medieval period sustained the north European church by their communal practice of asceticism. The Western Church sent monks into Europe to expand Christianity, starting with Gregory the Great, himself having come out of the monastery when elected pope. He dispatched Augustine and a party of monks to Canterbury in 596 C.E., having seen the vital part the monk could play in missionizing the new nations taking shape in England and Northumbria. Further north, Colum Cille founded a monastery at Iona which soon served as the hub of Irish Christianity and the central foundation of several other monasteries throughout Ireland and England. Monk-bishops like Wilfrid of the late seventh century occupied most of the dioceses in Britain, and Wilfrid's own protege Willibrord later took the religion into what is today Belgium and the Netherlands, himself founding four monasteries there before his death in 739. In all these monasteries, monks adhered to a regimen of strict observances of material labor and personal righteousness as an ascetic community.¹

These cloisters appeared among societies with less institutional presence and governmental structure than the urban centers of the Roman Empire. After Rome's wide imperial reach diminished in the fifth century, loosely knit Germanic peoples characterized the main social environment

of northern Europe. Greeks and Romans had always noticed peoples beyond their borders whom they called “barbarians,” but generally failed to notice the diversity of such “uncivilized farmers.” An author of the eighth century distinguished between groups of Gepids, Bulgars, Sarmatians, Pannonians, Saxons, and Noricans, all of which had grown rapidly after Vandals and Visigoths sacked Rome centuries earlier. These peoples usually governed themselves with military personnel and warrior chieftains who cared little for upholding an elite society and more for seizing land and loot.² Missionaries felt particular interest in converting these pagans who lived so barbarously and left their monasteries in bands of several monks to minister throughout the European countryside.³

A systematic mode of proselytism developed among the Western Church during the early medieval period throughout networks of monasteries. As north European monks influenced loosely cohered Germanic peoples through their active practice of asceticism, they were perceived as spiritual authorities who maintained the church within an unpredictable environment. By extending the church to pagans, these missionaries provided security and stability in ways that satisfied their ascetic values, turned their asceticism outward, and contributed to the formation of a system for proselytism that would endure into the later Middle Ages.

Monasticism Spreads Across Northern Europe

The first Christian monks journeyed into the fierce north African deserts to practice an intensely individual mode of converting oneself into a holy person. These ascetics deliberately embraced poverty and physical suffering in an effort to internalize the teachings of Jesus and subdue the body to the will of God. Desert wanderers like Paul the Hermit and Anthony were known for their prolonged bouts with Satan which demonstrated an enormous level of holiness to resist such temptation for so long.⁴ The monastic tradition took on various forms depending on the geographic location. Lower Egypt was characterized by individual hermits like Paul and Anthony. Syrian monasticism included some of the harshest forms of self-discipline, with monks like Simeon the Stylite inflicting terrible physical toll on themselves to gain mastery over their bodies and spirit. In Palestine, Barsanuphius and Euthymius attracted small gatherings of pupils who had voluntarily embraced the desert life to learn directly from these paragons of Christian holiness. These monastic orders all celebrated the individual’s struggle against sin and the flesh and emphasized the internal striving for holiness and communion with the Holy Spirit.⁵

What began as an asceticism practiced in solitude and in the wilderness became a communal lifestyle adaptable to city and village spaces. Pachomius gained notoriety for assembling the ascetic practices of the hermits into a cenobitic order in which groups of monks came together in a communal observance of asceticism. They continued to endure hardship but of a less extreme flavor. Farming and industry described their usual chores, not carving out caves or sitting atop pillars for years at a time. Pachomius designed for a monk to oversee the monastery, and eventually the position of abbot would assume the responsibility. Abbots not only demonstrated strict observance of holy living but had gained civic skills in managing a congregation of monks. The cenobitic monks built their communities near the edges of towns and sometimes their monasteries would draw enough industry that villagers would gather nearby.⁶

Monasticism moved north with Patrick in the fourth century once he established a permanent outpost for the Roman church in Ireland. Not long after his arrival, converted monks took to the Skelligs off the coasts of Ireland and braved harsh conditions like their distant fellows in the Egyptian deserts. Patrick, though, sought to insulate Christianity by forming enclosures in which Christians ministered to each other in a tribal city. His project, most effectively realized in Armagh, encouraged the communal forms of asceticism to spread across northern Ireland.⁷

A century after Patrick arrived, an Irishman named Colum Cille crossed into Scotland with twelve companions and erected a monastery at Iona, bringing his Irish monasticism with him. Missionaries branched out from Iona, perhaps the most successful being Aidan who occupied the monastery of Lindisfarne in Northumbria by 635.⁸ Aidan embraced the manner of the peregrini, the wanderers for the sake of Christ, to accomplish his missionary work. Taking journeys on foot, he reached craggy hills and preached in hamlets lying afar off, calling on the poor folk of the countryside to the heavenly life.⁹ Several foundations stretched out from the Lindisfarne monastery. There was the monastery of Gateshead, across the Tyne from Newcastle, where Utta was abbot; Paegnalaech, where Tuda, the fourth bishop of Lindisfarne was buried; Melrose, on the Tweed some forty miles west of Lindisfarne; and the old cathedral of Wilfrid at Ripon, which was in its earliest form a foundation out of Melrose. Aidan contributed to establishing monasteries for women as well, founding cloisters in Coldingham in Berwickshire where Aebba was abbess, and Hartlepool in Northumbria where Heiu was abbess. Hilda succeeded Heiu as abbess of Hartlepool and then built a monastery at Whitby where the most celebrated synod in English history was held.¹⁰

Others like Aidan covered the European mainland on foot, reaching the Franks and Burgundians within the century. One who considered himself directly trained by Iona's founder, Columbanus left Bangor in about 590 to deliver Christianity to a lapsed nation of Merovingians, landing in Mont Saint Michel, if the commemorative stone there is to be trusted. The petty kingdoms of Austrasia, Neustria, and Burgundy were mainly battlefields. Columbanus penetrated this hostile world by setting up a monastery at an abandoned fort in Annegray near the border of Austrasia and Burgundy. His work of reconverting the Franks, Burgundians, and Suevians with his small band of twelve companions brought a swell of recommitted followers, and soon a better foundation than Annegray was needed. Columbanus found in Luxeuil the most important monastery of his career, a site shrewdly chosen but with soil more tractable than Annegray and a location somewhat distant from the purview of other bishops. Free from episcopal supervision and with boldness that would challenge the pope in Rome, he reinvested himself in the work of converting the Franks and instituted an ascetic order that rivaled the Rule of Benedict in strictness and complexity. Though the monastery at Bobbio, Columbanus's final project, eventually became Benedictine, it held to the Rule of Columbanus until the tenth century. From Luxeuil and Bobbio, monasteries percolated throughout Gaul and modern-day Germany and Switzerland.¹¹

A distinctly Frankish monasticism developed out of its Irish foundations. Philibert's primary monastery at Jumièges in Normandy prepared monks for expansion into Belgium, and later abbeys crept up out of Péronne into Nivelles, Fosse, and Mechelen. Later peregrini monks would travel from these Frankish monasteries far south into the Rhine not far from Basel. By 720, Fridolin had reached Strasbourg and before 739, Willibrord had gathered monks to Utrecht, Antwerp, Echternach, and Susteren where he built monastic communities of discipline and prayer.¹² His monasteries endured through the vicissitudes of political change that plagued the continent, and by the ministry of Boniface in the 740s, much of the Irish, English, and Frankish peasantry had some reach to a monastery. At the close of the century, northern monasteries dotted the landscape and served as the primary locations of the church in Europe.¹³

Church institutions came to exercise significant pull in the politics of the high Middle Ages after authority was consolidated in the papal office at Rome, but such a consolidation took centuries to tighten thanks to the parallel initiative of monks throughout northern Europe to proselytize. Gregory the Great delivered to Augustine in 590 the first papal assignment to directly call monks into missionary work—almost two hundred

years after Patrick had already built Christian communities among the Celts over 1500 miles away. No other pope until Urban II in 1095 dispatched and corresponded with so many missionaries, yet Gregory kept a fraction of the pace voluntarily met by Irish monks. His involvement with the expansion of the church had been a step forward from past tensions between monks and clergy, but the relationship between the two had still a fair amount to traverse before the papacy assumed direct contact with the monastic community and, by extension, the unevangelized throughout the continent.¹⁴

Tensions between monks and bishops highlight the dynamic nature of a developing episcopacy and reveal how spiritually authoritative monks had been perceived by their surrounding communities. Earlier in the fifth century, tensions between monks and bishops came under consideration at the Council of Chalcedon where the clergy granted direct oversight of the monasteries to the bishops. Hoping to bring religious unity to the empire, Emperor Marcian called in 451 the Fourth Ecumenical Council. A controversy surrounding Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius involved the monastic movement to a degree, and in connection with subversive behavior by Eutyches, tensions between monks and church hierarchy in Constantinople escalated.¹⁵ The main product of the council was its management of the Nestorian controversy. Given the nature of this controversy, the council necessarily and officially legislated the mode of monastic society within the church in several canons.¹⁶ Canon 4 declared that no monastery could be established without the consent of the bishop and reiterated the hierarchy between bishops and monks. Monks could not be involved in ecclesiastical or temporal affairs nor could a monastery admit a slave without the permission of his master. The canon censured monks who wandered indiscriminately from one city or monastery to the next, and stipulated that monks could not leave the monastery without the express permission of the bishop, and then only in case of necessity. Behind these mandates lay the council's reactions to Eutyches, who had not only personally opposed a synod of bishops but had also incited a group of monks against the hierarchy in Constantinople. Canon 4 proved to regulate and influence successive civil and canonical legislation regarding monasticism. The Council of Chalcedon also brought the ordination of monks into canon law. Canon 6 stipulated that monks could not receive an ordination outside of their monastery and bounded their authority to their particular church, martyrion, or monastery.

Several other canons addressed misbehaving or conspiratorial monks. Canon 8 condemned monks or clerics who dared to rebel against their bishops; canon 18 forbade them from forming secret societies; canon 23

prohibited the organizing of lawless or heretical monks into groups. Monasteries received attention as well; canon 24 not only reinforced the role of the bishop as overseer of the monastery but also prohibited lay persons from establishing their habitations there. At first glance, these canons of Chalcedon portray monks as nuisances to both the civic government and the church, but in each of them remains the tacit assumption that monks were recognized as a respected part of the church. The Council succeeded at legislating a more disciplined and stable monastic institution which would remain under the purview and control of the episcopacy and which the imperial authorities found acceptable. Monasteries, as now the main centers of approved ascetic schooling, became a vast and legitimate pool from which to fill clerical vacancies and recruit ecclesiastical leaders.¹⁷

As monasteries flourished throughout northern Europe between the fifth and eighth centuries, converted civic leaders observed the connection between the episcopacy and monasticism by appealing to monasteries for bishops and sanctioning monks to engage their subjects in ecclesiastical affairs. Ethelbert, king of Kent, received Augustine's cadre of missionaries sent from Rome with courtesy, provided them with living quarters, and gave them permission to preach and make converts. He himself converted in less than a year and his people became nominally Christian within a decade.¹⁸ Augustine remained his principal connection to the clergy and through whom he shared a loose connection to Rome, as Gregory maintained a thorough correspondence with his small missionary force. Similar relationships between kings and missionaries materialized all throughout northern Europe for the next few centuries. Oswald, the undisputed monarch of Northumbria by 634, appealed to Iona for missionaries that might restore his wasted church there to active Christianity and granted an episcopal see to the church in Bamburgh and the Farne Islands independently of any Roman or church involvement.¹⁹ Pepin, duke of the Franks in the eighth century, granted princely authority to Willibrord to preach in a half-Christian territory and later petitioned Rome to consecrate the missionary a bishop.²⁰ Charles Martel in 723 expressed his patronage of Boniface in a letter to "the holy lords and apostolic Fathers in Christ." The letter served to alert the papacy that Charles had justified Boniface in his bishopric and guaranteed protection as Boniface ministered to his kingdom.²¹ Monastic and civic involvement continued with each monastery that responded to converting the Germanic kingdoms and tribes well into the eleventh century. These relationships moved increasingly into papal and imperial conflict, beginning most dramatically with Charlemagne in the late eighth century and turning to

blows with the Capetian kings by the tenth and eleventh centuries.²²

Ascetic Values and Non-Christian Societies

Western culture shifted away from empire and toward tribes and minor kingdoms in the fifth century once the Roman Empire disintegrated under the force of Germanic invaders. What had once been a thriving empire with urban commerce and high philosophy fell under invasion by backwoods marauders. In late antiquity, long traditions of local autonomy exercised through town councils that had selected magistrates and overseen the collection of taxes were being eroded by various social forces. As time passed, different parts of the empire were becoming less like each other, and the names of towns founded by the Romans in Gaul could be seen to yield to names based on the names of local Celtic tribes. By the start of the fourth century, some people identified the town later to become the capital of France the “town of the Parisii,” rather than “Lutetia,” the name the Romans had given it. A process of regionalization followed for the next century, and much of what came after would be the product of accommodations between the newcomer Germanic tribespeople and the local landed aristocracies, usually in favor of military bands that could lay siege to a former Roman villa or threaten the stability of previous commercial and political enterprises.²³

The European social environment suffered a significant loss in Roman systems and infrastructure. From the late third century, Gaul became a hotbed of military unrest. Several military commanders contended over the title of emperor, involving Franks, Saxons, and other German groups in terrible conflict, bouncing back and forth between one official recognition here and another there. After the ascendancy of Constantine, some areas within Roman borders enjoyed stability, but great raids nevertheless continued to threaten the roads and the north experienced a massive depopulation, towns becoming smaller and many rural sites being deserted. Groups of Franks moved in to occupy settlements east of the Rhine, and other Germanic peoples began to move in as well, particularly Visigoths, Burgundians, Alamanni, and Suevi. Though they each established local codes of law that at best hearkened to Roman judicial models but probably only loosely incorporated old social values, these clans never established a significant aristocracy until Clovis rose to power the late fifth century.²⁴

Pagan and militaristic social values became the norm throughout the European mainland, especially where security remained weak. Even during Clovis’s reign, violence ravaged northern Europe. Gregory of Tours

spoke with disgust of the civil wars that plagued the Frankish realm, which seemed to him absolute madness. After the death of Chilperic, courts fell to schemes and plots to succeed the old king, which Gregory nonchalantly describes as a regular affair to be expected of the depraved human condition.²⁵ Households in the northern kingdoms began to integrate into the larger kindred group, or clan. A charismatic leader, by his display of military values, could found a new people and claim a new identity for the group. Barbarian kings relied on the effective military policies that had made Rome a formidable enemy and frequently directed their raids at other tribes. Only a few claimed right over a sizable kingdom; mostly families remained the fundamental social unit that governed the daily experiences of barbarian peoples.²⁶

No standing army or judicial system maintained the social order for these medieval Europeans, only one's clan could provide stability and security. The armies that succeeded at conquering lands and other peoples seemed to fluctuate between one territory and another. Borders between clans were blurry and fraught with peril. One could not safely cross into another territory without an armed guard which was usually a small contingent of soldiers or warriors that could protect the clan as it moved or migrated to new locations. Should another clan descend upon one's lands, the only options were fight or flight, and many tribes were not afraid to slash and burn in order to extend their own borders.²⁷ The only industry was the rural cultivation of land and territorial expansion revolved around acquiring more of it, not necessarily building large estates or commanding a larger share of commercial resources. The economy of the time predisposed the clans to subsist in villages, not busy metropolises. Thus, these small villagers depended greatly on their connections to other families and clans for networked security; if one bridged new loyalties to a different clan, or worse, fell under the attacks of a conquering one, other families would be forced to abdicate their old alliances or risk attacks on their own land.²⁸

The strongest clans valued the warrior chieftain who led with valor and cunning. Clovis, whom Gregory of Tours likened to Constantine, was a vigorous war-leader. His subjects admired him as having descended from the half-divine Merovech, and therefore had the noble descent of the Germanic kings. Archaeologists describe burial grounds of Merovingian leaders as ornate with jewelry and weaponry, including a golden battle-axe, the leader's spear and the "head of his horse with all its harness, numerous gold buckles, gold mounts from a belt." Not unlike Constantine, Clovis saw in Catholic Christianity a way to oppose and perhaps subjugate Arian Christians within his influence, and in 496

pointed to a historic victory in battle as the site of his conversion. "I have called upon my own gods," Clovis says in Gregory's history, "but, as I see only too clearly, they have no intention of helping me. I therefore cannot believe that they possess any power, for they do not come to the assistance of those who trust in them. I now call upon you[Jesus Christ]. I want to believe in you, but I must first be saved from my enemies."²⁹ After winning the military campaign, Clovis likely demanded that his armies convert to Catholic Christianity, though one account mentions that three thousand soldiers conveniently receive baptism along with Clovis and his two sisters, Alboflod and Lenteildis. The example of Clovis deviates in one crucial aspect from Constantine's similar conversion. The Merovingian monarch did not stall on making good on his vow to be baptized, unlike Constantine who observed the rite shortly before his death. This conforms Clovis to the classic model of the sacral king, imbued with power and religious significance, yet still dependent on the oaths of his supporters who elect to change beliefs with him.³⁰

Appropriating spiritual significance to the chieftain not only moved in the direction from God to powerful chieftain, but from the chieftain to God. In other words, the qualities men like Clovis were known and valued for came to describe how Germanic peoples valued and interpreted God. The *Heliand* revisits the narrative of the Gospels but with the lens of the warrior chieftain. Christ is the great chieftain who teaches how to combat the loathsome enemy. After his baptism, Christ the Chieftain goes into the wilderness to defeat Satan, succeeding after driving him away by force. "This is the way one should serve the God of the Clan," the Saxon gospel declares, by rendering service to the chieftain and sustaining him in battle.³¹

These social groups were somewhat pliable in the early Middle Ages, coalescing around the assertive chieftain who gained loyalty from his subjects through conquest and military success. From the Celts, Picts, and Anglo-Saxons of the north to the Franks, Burgundians, and Lombards of the south, medieval European groups carved territories through military campaigns led by local chieftains. Occasionally, a line of chieftains would maintain control over a large territory and perpetuate the reach of the clan beyond just one generation. Not until the Carolingians did such a large expanse of control become consolidated under one realm. Charlemagne had shrewdly brokered deals with dukes and princes in order to proclaim his status as Roman emperor and had secured more legitimate borders for his kingdom than anyone previously thought possible. But even then, the structure fell back into disarray when problems of succession and three of his sons vied for absolute control. On the ground level,

the peasant farmer still looked to a knight or a duke for protection and would switch loyalties in a moment if the territory fell to someone else.³²

Monks faced significant risks when proselytizing among Germanic peoples and effectively turned their asceticism outward when they embraced the suffering that attended their attempts to convert pagans. To embrace the life of the peregrini meant heading out into the rural countryside alone and unprotected. Many missionaries stopped passers by to inquire about their religious beliefs. Aidan of Lindisfarne was known for directly asking each person he encountered whether he or she was a Christian. Such a statement could endanger the wandering monk; he was alerting the individual that he had no clan to protect him. But such seemed to resonate with the unconverted peasantry. Aidan was memorialized as a humble minister that blessed many a pedestrian while canvassing the north European countryside.³³

Missionaries actively sought locations near clans and built their monasteries as military strongholds.³⁴ The general movement of where monks built their cloisters moved southeast along routes carved by dozens of proselytizing missionaries actively seeking the pagan warlords and kings. Church records were housed at the monasteries and many times did not survive attacks; several monasteries either served as a fortress for clan armies during battles or were the target of raids, not only for their wealth in some cases, but also for their ties to clans and royal courts.³⁵

Monasteries became training centers for outgoing and up-and-coming missionaries. Iona, Lindisfarne, Hinba, Luxeuil, and Cluny all developed training programs for preparing missionaries to engage pagans. To a certain extent, the monks here formed enough of a theoretical approach to their proselytism that it could be adequately called a coherent missiology. As one historian puts it, these were not the adventures of hot-headed youths but calculated efforts on the part of mature men to preach the gospel of Christ to those who from their point of view were still barbarous peoples.³⁶ Colum Cille, Aidan, Columbanus, Boniface, and Willibrord all involved younger monks in their missionary work and even bequeathed their episcopal sees to them. Monasticism itself was a mission, a piece of the overall schematic for converting pagans to Christianity. These missionaries were always thinking about where next to found a monastery, and usually found monetary support for such endeavors from military commanders, not the church in Rome.³⁷

Proselytes and new converts would request bishops based on virtuous qualities. The missionary who exhibited restraint and courage was valued in the courts of Frankish and English kings. In part because of these connections between the political structures and the monastic, monks began

to conceive of mission as an ecclesiastical mode of converting pagans. To bring about the conversion required first building diplomatic relations with the ruler and then pursuing an appointment for a bishopric from him, not from the other churches, though other bishops did involve themselves in the spread of ecclesiastical offices.³⁸

The north European monks before the ninth century consistently interpreted their mission in terms of converting the pagan by teaching and exemplifying ascetic virtues. Their work endured in part due to their connections to clan societies and chieftains. Even the Roman pontificate understood the effectiveness of sending ascetic athletes into hitherto untapped wildernesses of unconverted pagans. Founding new monasteries and directly engaging hostile cultures received the encouragement and sanction of the popes, even after their own position became as nearly elevated as the emperor of Christendom. As the Western Church sent missionaries to build churches, these missionaries delivered monasteries that endured through mixed and unstable societies, and though these monks still did not escape martyrdom, their system for proselytizing survived. The loose social structure that characterized the new environment after the dissolution of the Roman Empire in the west incentivized the work of proselytism; missionaries had not only personal reasons, but could respond with their call to holiness to counteract the rampant violence and instability of the age. Networks of monasteries carried out this mode of proselytism systematically and effectively, enough so to be called by some a pivotal moment for the survival of Western Christianity.³⁹ These wanderers for Christ had reconciled the wandering social structures of their world and gave them order and stability.

¹ Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964), 67–73.

² John Moorhead, *The Roman Empire Divided, 400–700* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2001), 16.

³ Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, 7 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941), 2:4–5.

⁴ Claudia Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005), 102.

⁵ Benedicta Ward, *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, rev. ed. (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1984), xviii–xix.

⁶ Peter Brown, “The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80–101.

- ⁷ Kathleen Hughes, "The Church in Irish Society, 400–800," Chap. 4 in *A New History of Ireland: Prehistoric and Early Ireland*, edited by Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 306–10.
- ⁸ Carole M. Cusack, *The Rise of Christianity in Northern Europe, 300–1000* (London: Cassell, 1998), 96–97.
- ⁹ Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV:27.
- ¹⁰ William H. Marnell, *Light from the West: The Irish Mission and the Emergence of Modern Europe* (New York: Seabury Press, 1978), 61–62.
- ¹¹ Marnell, 79–88.
- ¹² Marnell, xiii, 164–65.
- ¹³ Neill, 75–78; Marnell, ix–xiii.
- ¹⁴ Jeffrey Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London: Routledge, 1980), 228–50.
- ¹⁵ Andrea Sterk, *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church: The Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 171.
- ¹⁶ Chalcedon, canons 2–4, 6–8, 16, 18, 23, 24.
- ¹⁷ Sterk, 172–73; John F. Matthews, *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2000), 120, 290.
- ¹⁸ James Thayer Addison, *The Medieval Missionary: A Study of the Conversion of Northern Europe, A.D. 500–1300* (New York: International Missionary Council, 1936), 22.
- ¹⁹ Addison, 28; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, III:3.
- ²⁰ Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, V:10.
- ²¹ Ephraim Emerton and Thomas F. X. Noble, *The Letters of Saint Boniface* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 25.
- ²² Paul Edward Dutton, ed. and trans., *Charlemagne's Courtier: The Complete Einard* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 1998), 16–31; Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 198, 204, 224.
- ²³ Moorhead, *Roman Empire Divided*, 25, 28–30.
- ²⁴ Moorhead, *Roman Empire Divided*, 69–71.
- ²⁵ Gregory of Tours, *History of the Franks*, VII:29; Martin Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 58–59.
- ²⁶ Patrick J. Geary, "Barbarians and Ethnicity," in *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, edited by G. W. Bowersock, Peter Brown, and Oleg Grabar (Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999), 110, 121.

- ²⁷ Edward James, "The Northern World in the Dark Ages: 400–900," in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Medieval Europe*, ed. George Holmes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 68.
- ²⁸ Georges Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, Cynthia Postan, trans. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 62–63.
- ²⁹ Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, ed. and trans. Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth, 1974), 143.
- ³⁰ Cusack, 73.
- ³¹ *The Heliand*, trans. G. Ronald Murphy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 36–39.
- ³² James, 71–72.
- ³³ Kenneth Hyslop-Smith, *Christianity in England from Roman Times to the Reformation* (London: SCM Press, 1999), 1:168–69; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, IV:27.
- ³⁴ Marnell, 30–31.
- ³⁵ Adrian Hastings, *A World History of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1999), 137–39; Neill, 78–80; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, III:16.
- ³⁶ Neill, 74.
- ³⁷ David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1991), 230–36.
- ³⁸ Bosch, 35.
- ³⁹ Kurt Aland, *A History of Christianity*, 3 vols. (Fortress Press, 1986), 1:216–18.