King's Research Portal

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Chosen Peoples and New Israels in the Early Medieval West

Conor O'Brien
King's College, London
conor.1.o'brien@kcl.ac.uk

Towards the end of the eighth century, as the Frankish Empire under Charlemagne spread eastwards, Alcuin wrote an account of the Anglo-Saxon missionary Willibrord that celebrated God's support for both Frankish expansion and Carolingian rule. When Willibrord failed to make headway against the inveterate paganism of the Frisians and Danes, Alcuin declared that he returned "to the chosen people of the Franks" in the words of C.H. Talbot's standard and widely used English translation of the *Life of Willibrord*.[1] But Alcuin actually wrote *ad electos a Deo populos regni Francorum*: Willibrord went "to the peoples of the Frankish kingdom, chosen by God".[2] Talbot's translation reflects the assumption, common in scholarship from the first half of the twentieth century onwards, that the Carolingian Franks considered themselves to be the New Israel, God's own chosen people.[3] Such claims to ethnic election came to be seen as nigh universal amongst the barbarians of the post-Roman West, references to the New Israel becoming a *topos* in the historiography of the Anglo-Saxons, Visigoths, and Irish, amongst others, as well as that of the Franks.[4] "The political education of European peoples recommenced in the aftermath of Rome's fall with the simple but explosive idea that God might single out a distinct culture for His special favour … ."[5]

This article challenges the use of the New Israel *topos*. It argues not only that the texts, like Alcuin's *Life of Willibrord*, which utilise language of "chosenness" and references to Old Testament Israel to describe contemporary peoples were not trumpeting the exclusive divine favour of one ethnic group, but that, in fact, they were asserting participation in the universal Church. The plural "chosen peoples" reminds us that Alcuin did not limit God's election to any one ethnic group. Even eastern pagans were not excluded from God's grace: in Alcuin's verse *Life*, God gave Willibrord some souls from these peoples as proof that his mission was

not pointless;[6] very soon in the story Willibrord returned east to make the Frisians, now conquered by Charles Martel, "sons of the living God", having previously not been God's people.[7] This obviously justified Carolingian expansion and linked ideas of divine election with participation in the *regnum Francorum*, but in a manner which emphasised the spread of election, not its exclusive possession.[8] Through Willibrord's preaching heathens within the Frankish kingdom became "God's new people", that is, Christians.[9] Alcuin incorporated the history of Old Testament Israel into his account, quoting Hosea 1.10, but applied its Israelite reference to the Frisians, not the Franks. A traditional reading of Alcuin's language in terms of the Franks as the chosen people effaces the significance of Christian universalism in the text.

My argument builds on the scholarship of the past generation which has increasingly questioned the validity of the New Israel *topos*. In the 1990s a special issue of *Early Medieval Europe* revealed the complexity of early medieval engagement with the Old Testament.[10] Mary Garrison argued in 2000 that the Frankish identification with the New Israel happened later, more slowly, and less completely than usually assumed;[11] she followed this up in 2006 with an article which questioned the entire validity of applying to the early Middle Ages the idea of ethnic election, a post-Reformation development in Christian political thinking.[12] Very recently, Gerda Heydemann and Walter Pohl concluded that "no consistent ideology of divine election of the Franks emerged in the Carolingian period".[13] Re-assessment of non-Frankish sources lags behind, but in 2014 George Molyneaux argued strongly against the assumption that the Anglo-Saxons had a widespread idea of themselves as God's elect.[14]

Notwithstanding this surge in critical attention, the New Israel *topos* remains common in literature on the early Middle Ages. Carolingian Frankish self-identification with the New Israel, with Alcuin's *Life of Willibrord* occasionally cited as evidence, continued to appear in

important scholarship after Garrison's 2000 article, which has indeed been cited to support the argument it aimed to critique.[15] A recent important study of Old English verse translations of the Old Testament accepts that the Anglo-Saxon poets sought "to claim the status of 'chosenness' for their own *gens Anglorum* as God's newly appointed Israel", despite presenting plenty of evidence showing the prevalence of New Testament ideas of universal election in the poetry.[16] The weight of scholarly tradition has clearly not been overturned by the recent critiques. Historians of the early medieval West still use the term "New Israel" to describe an ideology of exclusive ethnic election, even though it does not appear in sources from the early medieval west.[17] It seems worthwhile, consequently, to return to the issue of what writers in the early Middle Ages intended when they used the frequently misunderstood language of chosenness and Israel.

While this article focuses on texts with close connections to lay elites from the Carolingian period, it is intended as an example of how we can question the applicability of the New Israel *topos* in general. The idea that early medieval peoples believed themselves to be the chosen people seems to have emerged in Carolingian scholarship before being exported into the literature on other groups.[18] Obviously, every text from the early medieval west which used the language of chosenness or Israel did so in a unique context, deserving of individual attention to be fully understood – nonetheless, a survey of the key Carolingian material provides a useful way to critique the New Israel *topos* as a whole. Historians have not always been clear or consistent by what they mean by the terminology of chosen peoples and New Israels, fuelling some of the recent debates about its validity.[19] I try to capture a wide variety of possible meanings in this article by exploring three in turn: God's election of a single ethnic group as the recipients of his grace*;* divine favour for one ethnic group to conquer and subjugate others; the replacement of Old Testament Israel by an early medieval people. I argue, in all these cases, that Carolingian texts used the language of chosenness and Israel

within a cultural framework which linked it to ideas of the universal Church and supra-ethnic Christianity. That framework had more influence on the imagination of the early medieval west than scholarly references to chosen peoples and New Israels suggest.

This article builds, of course, on many years of scholarly debate on ethnicity in the early medieval west.[20] When I speak of ethnic identities in this article, I refer to identities defined by an ethnonym, such as "Frank" or "Goth". Such identities were fluid. Not everyone in the early Middle Ages meant the same thing when they called someone a Frank; they might be stressing (imagined) biological descent or political loyalty to the Frankish king. Religion, of course, might be one basis by which ethnic identities were defined (which does not mean that there was no difference between religious and ethnic identities):[21] to be perceived as a Goth it might have been necessary to follow catholic Christianity, for instance. Regardless of the shifting realities described by ethnonyms, the contemporary perception would have been that these were "distinctive groups … constituted by an ingrained common nature".[22] The New Israel *topos* tends to assume that early medieval language of election and Israel formed an ethnic discourse, celebrating one such "distinctive group" as chosen by God; this article argues that that was very frequently not the case. New Israel language was an ecclesiological discourse emphasising participation in the universal Church – not a rejection of ethnicity, but an alternative means of identification which sometimes proved more advantageous.

Ethnic Election

Alcuin certainly spoke of peoples, ethnic groups, being chosen by God in the *Life of Willibrord*; but the very fact that he used the plural implies that he meant something different to the ethnocentric connotations of an exclusive link to the divine that the idea of a chosen people has for the modern reader. Alcuin simply used the common early medieval language which spoke of salvation coming to nations rather than individuals, reflective of the patristic

claim that the universal spread of Christianity was fulfilled by the faith reaching all peoples collectively, rather than every single person individually.[23] Exegetes interpreted Christ's order in Matthew 28.19 to preach the Gospel to every creature as a command to spread the faith to every "nation of the gentiles".[24] The fact that Christianity preached that God's election had been extended from the single people of Israel to all the nations of the earth, the *gentes*, did give an eschatological significance to ethnic identities and Walter Pohl has convincingly argued that the increasing popularity of ethnic terminology in defining and legitimising political communities in the post-Roman world may in part be explained by the power of the biblically inspired idea of the calling of the gentiles.[25] Ethnic identities were not incompatible with Christian universalism.

Nor however did they trump it. It is not to appeal to any ahistorical "true Christianity" to point out that, throughout early medieval theology, the catholicity, that is the universality, of the Church established it as the true vehicle of the elect.[26] Only heretics would claim that salvation was limited to members of their own ethnically limited community and such claims to exclusive chosenness were foisted on doctrinal opponents as a smear in the case of the Donatists in North Africa, Homoians/Arians in Iberia, and those clinging to traditional Easter dating systems in the Insular world.[27] While traditional historiography described the Homoian communities of Visigothic Spain and Ostrogothic Italy as self-consciously, and narrowly ethnic, Gothic churches, Robin Whelan has shown them to have held a "catholic" worldview which asserted the universality of the true Church.[28] Hence, while biblical language might have helped justify ethnic identities, when encased in the patristic interpretation with which it reached medieval readers it grounded the salvation of an ethnic group in its Christian and ecclesiastical identities. Franks might be saved *as* Franks, converted and baptised collectively, but they were a "holy nation" *because* Christian.[29]

Having appreciated this, we can profitably re-read sources from the Carolingian era which have been thought to express ideas about Frankish ethnic election. The papal letters to the Carolingian rulers gathered in the *Codex Carolinus*, for instance, occasionally apply the language of Old Testament Israel to the Frankish elite, who are also associated with the "holy nation" of Exodus 19.6 and 1 Peter 2.9 (in the latter the terminology applied to all gentile Christians); this has been seen as a deliberate appeal by the popes to the contemporary Frankish self-identification as the New Israel.[30] When Stephen III wrote (in 770) to Charlemagne and Carloman to warn them off entering a marriage alliance with the Lombards, he reminded them that they were "a holy nation, a kingly priesthood" – the ethnic superiority of the Franks over the Lombards was seemingly grounded in their election as a New Israel. Close examination of the letter suggests something rather more complicated. Certainly, Stephen deployed a virulent ethnic discourse, praising the Franks, dehumanizing the Lombards, and alluding to the Old Testament in his warning of the dangers of miscegenation:

> … we learn that many (as we are taught by the history of divine scripture) deviated from the mandates of God through an unjust bond with a foreign nation and sank into great sin. For it is great stupidity (as is utterly right to say), most excellent sons, great kings, that your illustrious people of the Franks, which shines forth above all peoples, and the so splendid and most noble offspring of your royal power should be polluted (which God forbid) by the faithless and most foul people of the Lombards, which is by no means counted in the number of the peoples/gentiles, and from whose nation the stock of lepers is certainly born.[31]

The pope certainly gestured to the disastrous effects of foreign marriages in the Old Testament and Israelite horror at alien women;[32] he also hinted that the Lombards might be so foul as to be denied the possibility of salvation – but he could only do this by excluding them from the number of the gentiles, not from Israel. The Christian theological framework

in which he wrote limited the extent to which Stephen could push the link between Israel and the Franks in terms of election. As the letter continued, Stephen introduced the argument that Charlemagne and Carloman could not abandon their existing wives, interweaving the horror of miscegenation with that of polygamy, before turning to concentrate on Christian marriage ethics:

> For it is wicked … to take wives other than those who originally it was determined you would take. It is not appropriate that so great a sin be done by you, who possess the law of God and censure others not to do such things. Pagan peoples do these kinds of things; God forbid that you do it, you, who are perfectly Christian and a "holy nation and royal priesthood". Recall and reflect that you have been sanctified with a heavenly blessing by the holy oil of anointing through the hands of St Peter's representative; you ought to beware that you are not implicated in such great guilt.[33]

Charlemagne and Carloman's divine election has nothing to do with their being Franks (foreign women are unmentioned on either side of the key scriptural quotation) but has everything to do with their being good Christians. Raising the issue of Christian identity allowed Stephen to slide neatly, via the implicit importance of baptism, to the Carolingians' anointing at papal hands, derived from baptismal anointing.[34] This was key to the overall argument of the letter as it pointed out the insecurity of the Frankish rulers' election, dependant on ongoing subjection to Christian moral norms as policed by the pope; Stephen ended the letter with a warning that Charlemagne and Carloman could find themselves denied the kingdom of God, and membership of "God's elect", unless they followed the pope's advice.[35] Recent scholarship on the *Codex Carolinus* has shown that popes were rather more limited in their celebration of the Franks in the mid-eighth century than was once assumed.[36] As a pope trying to keep the Carolingians on a tight leash, Stephen utilized both an ethnic

discourse of Frankish excellence and Lombard filth and a separate ecclesiological discourse, where Frankish election was insecure and dependent on membership of a papally controlled Christian community.

One might suppose that sources produced with close connections to the Carolingian court would give a different perspective, but although Gerd Tellenbach identified just such a text, the Gellone Sacramentary's mass for an army marching to war, as the clearest expression of the Franks' chosen status, he recognised that the Frankish identification as the New Israel could never be exclusive.[37] The Sacramentary probably became the property of Charlemagne's kinsman Count William of Toulouse, having been made for Bishop Hildoard of Cambrai, himself closely associated with Carolingian liturgical reforms.[38] The mass parallels the army going to war with the Israelites and speaks of it as both elect and Frankish, but does so with an awareness that it speaks on behalf of the universal Church; it is the Christian identity of the Franks that justifies their divine aid:

> Grant, O Lord, light to your army going into darkness; may you strengthen the will of [the army] advancing, and just as you granted the defence of security to Israel hastening out of Egypt, so give an angel, creator of light, to your predestined people going into battle … The holy Church, spread everywhere by the majesty of the Father, is always ruled and governed by the undivided Trinity, true God of one power, and now oppressed by the torments of the barbarian peoples it groans in the valley of tears on behalf of its members … But may the triumphant, strengthened by the company of your like powers, assign glory to you, Lord, when you protect the Frankish people, most faithful of the Christian faith, when you lay low the army of infidel peoples by your power …[39]

A repeated stress on the infidel nature of the army's enemies probably reflects the context of the Sacramentary's creation, when Charlemagne fought against Iberian Muslims.[40] The major stress of the mass, consequently, falls on the protagonists' Christian, rather than ethnic, identity; it requests the divine aid that was given to the Israelites, to David and to Gideon, for the king and army of the Franks because they are predestined as excellent Christians fighting back against the forces of the unbelievers that threaten the universal Church. This is not to set Frankish and Christian identities against each other. If the Gellone Sacramentary reflects the ideas of the Carolingian elite,[41] then it shows their pride in being both Frankish and Christian – indeed their Frankish pride derives from the Christian faith of the Franks. Consequently, the mass does not conflate election with Frankishness: the 'predestined people' and the *Francorum gens* are one, but they are not actually the same. The Carolingian owners of the Sacramentary knew that they belonged to a Church spread throughout the world – indeed, they may very well have grounded their claims to Frankish dignity on the leadership rule their military activities accorded them within that Church.

Empire and Church

The Sacramentary utilised the biblical image of Israel and the idea of the universal Church to promote a political end in support of Carolingian expansion, just as Alcuin did in the *Life of Willibrord*. Both texts clearly associated Frankish political power with Christianity and divine favour – even if neither ever stated that Franks had any exclusive claim to that favour. In that respect, the Gellone Sacramentary and the *Life of Willibrord* fit into a wide pool of texts, presenting eighth-century Carolingian propaganda, which have often been seen in terms of the New Israel *topos*. Recent research has emphasised the extent to which the ideology underlying this propaganda changed over time, in response to changes in Carolingian power that led to the increased salience of traditional ideas associated with the late antique Roman Empire. Kantorowicz's memorable claim that the Franks saw themselves "as the continuators

of Israel's exploits" rather than "as the heirs of pagan Rome" ignored the fact that the Carolingian regime increasingly defined itself in terms borrowed from Christian Rome.[42]

Certainly, around the middle of the eighth century, religion and ethnicity were being combined in materials aimed at an elite audience in a manner suggestive of a concerted effort to proclaim that the supporters of the Carolingian family ("the Franks") enjoyed divine support in their wars of conquest. The most obvious example of this remains the infamous bombast of the mid-eighth-century prologue to *Lex Salica* with its strong suggestion that the Franks had always enjoyed God's special favour, even before formal conversion. Joining the Christian community had not dramatically changed the fact that piety and might were ingrained in the nature of the Franks. The prologue unambiguously suggests an exceptional "chosen" status for an ethnically defined community, although any use of the Old Testament to do so remains faint.[43]

> The glorious people of the Franks, founded by the authority of God, in war strong, in peace firm in alliance, in council profound, in body noble, in purity untainted, in beauty outstanding, brave, swift and fierce, immune from all heresy – having been [recently] converted to the Catholic faith; seeking, while they as yet held to barbarian rites, the key of wisdom by God's inspiration, according to the nature of their custom, desiring justice, preserving piety. … Long live he who loves the Franks – may Christ guard their kingdom, may the light of his grace fill their rulers, may he protect the army, give them the protection of faith. … For this is the people who has been strong while mighty in force.[44]

The prologue mentions conversion to Christianity only in order to show how the Franks honoured the martyrs whom their enemies the Romans had brutally killed.[45] The prologue was added to *Lex Salica* under King Pippin, probably around 764, against a background of

recent Carolingian expansion into regions (Aquitaine in particular) where local elites still emphasised their Roman identities;[46] Pippin appealed here to a Frankish identity shared with those who had backed him, grounded in martial values and Christian devotion. The *Lex Salica* prologue presents an ethnic discourse related to that Stephen III utilized when he later wrote to Pippin's children, but far more unusual in the way it makes religious identity subservient to ethnic identity. Similar links between the Franks and God appear around the same time (and emerging from similarly Pippinid circles) in the so-called continuation of Fredegar and may lie behind the vogue for introducing prayers for the "Empire of the Franks" in eighth-century liturgical manuscripts.[47]

There was then an early Carolingian vogue for the kind of concept of chosenness which historians have often presented as central to the New Israel *topos*. In the long-term, however, this reading of Carolingian expansion rather fizzled out in Frankish sources: Charlemagne's post-800 re-issue of *Lex Salica* dropped Pippin's long prologue; from the late eighth century, Carolingian-connected annalists avoided emphasising the exclusive importance of the Franks, suggesting new attitudes in court circles; from the early ninth century, liturgical manuscripts included prayers for a general "Christian Empire" rather than the "Empire of the Franks".[48] Exclusionary uses of the idea of chosenness "had no place in a political system whose logic was inclusive, not divisive";[49] as Mayke de Jong has pointed out, by the end of the eighth century the language of universal Christianity proved more appropriate than that of a chosen people for the multi-ethnic polity which Charlemagne ruled.[50] Certainly by the 790s, much Carolingian propaganda sought to celebrate God's support for the dynasty as the upholders of catholic Christian orthodoxy, rather than as the leaders of one innately pious people.

Charlemagne's own voice (ventriloquised by Theodulf of Orleans) declared that "we … are the spiritual Israel" in the *Opus Caroli*, written at court before 794 to attack the Byzantine Empire over the iconodule Second Council of Nicaea.[51] The *Opus* clearly contested

Byzantine claims to enjoy God's political favour, but it never relied on ethnic language when doing so – indeed the Franks are never mentioned in the body of the treatise. "Spiritual Israel" meant the universal Church of the gentiles, as its long tradition of patristic use reveals: "the spiritual Israel consists, not of one, but of all the peoples which were promised to the fathers in their seed, which is Christ. This spiritual Israel, therefore, is distinguished from the carnal Israel which is of one people, by novelty of grace, not by nobility of homeland, and by mind, not by people."[52] Theodulf here presented Charlemagne as speaking on behalf of the universal Church, as Alcuin also did around the same time in a letter from the king to the Iberian bishops involved in the adoptionist dispute: "Christian piety rejoices to extend the dual wings of divine and fraternal love over the wide expanse of the earth, so that it may cherish with maternal affection those it gave birth to by sacred baptism. And great is the joy of holy mother Church in the union of her children, that they might be reckoned as one who were redeemed by one … We declare that we guard and proclaim everywhere and in all things this orthodox faith, both handed down by the apostolic teachers and preserved by the universal Church."[53]

Both Spanish adoptionism and Byzantine iconodulism were condemned at Charlemagne's 794 Council of Frankfurt. The *Opus Caroli* went to some effort to denigrate the Second Council of Nicaea's "universal" status and the Frankfurt Council was memorialized as a direct challenge to that.[54] The organisation and supervision of an ecumenical council was, of course, a defining mark of late Roman imperial authority and Charlemagne's religious propaganda in the early 790s seems to have been closely tied up with the suggestion that he had replaced the Christian emperors of late antiquity, whose sway was necessarily universal: Paulinus of Aquileia, in his account of 794, attributed the Roman imperial title "lord of the earth" to Charlemagne.[55] The *Opus Caroli* presented, therefore, not a battle between Franks and Greeks for access to God's special favour, nor a claim that the Franks have succeeded

Israel as the new chosen people, but rather suggested that the Carolingian monarchy defended "the churches of the whole world" against the arrogant "church of one region".[56]

This Carolingian imperial turn had deep roots in western Europe. Tellenbach showed many decades ago that prayers for the Roman Empire entered into the liturgy through a conflation of the universalism of the empire and the universalism of Christianity – if the Franks were later to take the place of the Romans in the liturgy it was because they too took their place at the head of a multi-ethnic community of the faithful.[57] The significance of such universalist ideas was often downplayed in twentieth-century historiography which saw ideals of empire as too abstract and clerical to have had much real impact; ideas of ethnic superiority, *gentilismus*, were deemed so innate in pre-modern societies that the post-Roman world must have seen the emergence of closed-minded political communities, defining themselves ethnically and claiming God's favour for themselves.[58] More recent work has shown that the ideal of a Christian empire did motivate Carolingian lay elites, lying, for instance, behind the grandiose claims for Charlemagne's universal reach which a lay courtier like Einhard could make in the early ninth century.[59]

The Carolingians and their courtiers were not resurrecting such ideas from the dead; the ideal of a universal Christian empire had not disappeared from the Latin west between the fifth and eighth centuries. Frankish elites in the early seventh century felt the tug of an ongoing loyalty to this supranational body, still headed by an emperor in distant Constantinople: Stefan Esders has shown that around 630 the Merovingian Dagobert made a far-reaching treaty with the emperor Heraclius aimed at the military defeat of the Avars and the forced conversion of Jews that rested on an ideal of "the unity of a Christian world dominated by the Roman Empire."[60] This was one variant on a common theme: in the mid-sixth century, Theudebert I could claim a divinely favoured authority for himself by listing all the peoples God subjected to him "all the way to the ocean's shores."[61] The imagery is Roman and imperial, here used

to assert status before the emperor Justinian, foreshadowing the *Opus Caroli*'s similar emphasis on the multi-ethnic and geographically wide nature of Charlemagne's rule by listing people and places.[62] This imperial rhetoric had been taken over by the Acts of the Apostles to represent the universality of the Church, and consequently by the early Middle Ages such lists signalled catholicity, as the lists of the origins of the bishops at Frankfurt in 794 undoubtedly did.[63] Such rhetoric provided, therefore, a view of Carolingian society as grounded in ethnic diversity and ecclesial uniformity – both important in the contemporary political imagination.[64]

The imperial turn in Carolingian ambitions did not require the complete abandonment of the *Lex Salica*'s ethnic discourse but did require its severe limitation. Writing for Louis the Pious in the late 820s, Ermoldus Nigellus echoed the statements of Pippin's prologue when he declared that the Franks "conquer through God's love, and they prevail through faith", but his poem consistently praises Louis for his *pietas*, his devotion to a Christianity which is neither exclusively Frankish nor just an excuse for Carolingian expansion.[65] Faced with the Moors of Barcelona, Louis declared: "If this people loved God and pleased Christ with the anointing of holy baptism, there would have to have been peace between us, and peace would have persisted, for we would have been united in the worship of God."[66] The emperor hesitated over attacking the faithless Breton ruler because "his people and ours share one faith. It can stop right here … let him bind himself to the Christian community in peace and faith."[67] Louis assured the Danes, to whom he sent missionaries, "that they do not have to yield their realms to me, for I seek only to enlighten one of God's creatures."[68] Of course, Ermoldus's portrayal of Louis is disingenuous, as the poem in fact details constant Frankish expansion under Carolingian rule; but the ideological grounding of that expansion has shifted significantly towards a commitment to Christian universalism. Flirtation with an image of the

Franks as an exclusive new Israel in Pippin's reign gave way to celebration of their role in leading the Christian Empire: they enjoyed God's favour, so that others could also.[69]

This change over time in how Carolingian political propaganda utilized the idea of chosenness was possible because old Roman ideas about universal empire continued to matter throughout the early middle ages – undoubtedly because they chimed with ecclesiological assumptions. But new ideas of political legitimacy came to join them, as from about the year 600 the use of the Old Testament in political rhetoric surged, with references to Israel increasingly common in western texts and rituals.[70] By the eighth century Frankish elites well knew that the title of "holy nation, kingly priesthood, chosen people" had been that of Israel, long before it was applied to gentile peoples within the Church.[71]

The New Israel

Thanks to Willibrord's preaching, Alcuin declared, those he converted became "God's new people". New, clearly, in contrast to God's previous people, the *prior populus* of pre-incarnation Jews. Alcuin's words remind us that Old Testament Israel was a constant presence when early medieval Christian thinkers talked about believers in their present day and that, as already pointed out, they did not use the phrase "New Israel", so beloved of modern historians, when they did so. Most equivalent phrases (such as "true Israel") simply meant the Church, as part of a general claim to Israelite status by Christians since the New Testament period that was increasingly disconnected from any actual Jewish reality.[72] Nonetheless, the claim that some early medieval thinkers believed their ethnic community to be Israel's replacement, its successor in the new dispensation, deserves consideration since so many sources do draw parallels between contemporary groups and the Old Testament chosen people.[73]

The question is what the use of such parallels means. One may doubt whether simply describing Franks in Old Testament terms implied that they "are not *like* the biblical Israel. They *are* the chosen people."[74] Carolingian writers displayed far too keen a sense of distance from biblical Israel for such straightforward acts of identification to take place. For instance, the much-cited reference to the Old Testament king Josiah in the *Admonitio generalis* of 789 explicitly emphasised distance: Charlemagne modelled himself on Josiah, "not that I hold myself equal to his holiness, but because the examples of the saints are always to be followed by us". A Carolingian could imitate a Jewish king, as Garrison noted, without ever being equivalent to him.[75] Nothing in the *Admonitio generalis* suggests that the idea of Israel as a chosen people was uppermost in court minds at the time it was written; as in the *Opus Caroli*, the Franks are never mentioned in the text, which is framed in entirely ecclesiological terms.[76] Josiah was held up as a model in this case, not because of any elaborate underlying parallel between the *regnum Francorum* and the kingdom of Judah, but because of a specific point of resemblance between the Jewish king and Charlemagne: both rulers' legislation on matters of cult. Whether Alcuin or Theodulf was responsible for the reference, the example followed is probably Bede, who had declared King Osred of Northumbria a "New Josiah" purely because of the monarchs' similar ages.[77] The image of Charlemagne as Josiah rested on fairly shallow foundations. The *Admonitio* expressed a pious sense of distance between the Old Testament model and the Frankish king and framed the comparison in Christian terms of saintly exemplarity; Israel, Jews, and chosen peoples went entirely unmentioned.

More explicit references to Israel show similar characteristics. Book 2 of Ermoldus Nigellus's poem *In Praise of Louis* moves from an individual association between Louis the Pious and Solomon to a more general discussion of Israel as a model for the Frankish elite. When Louis and Pope Stephen IV met in 816, according to Ermoldus, the pope compared himself to the Queen of Sheba journeying to meet Solomon, before swiftly emphasising the

Christian emperor's superiority to the Jewish king: Solomon "held to a shadow, whereas you [Louis] love the truth. … He governed only Israel, but you, in your piety, hold the kingdoms of Europe in your sway."[78] Next in the poem comes a long speech by Louis, which builds on the pope's imagery by sketching out a history of Israel as the chosen people (apparently as a model for the Franks), before going on to locate that story within the narrative of Christian salvation history:

> When Israel kept to the precepts of God and His teaching, it loved justice and gave just judgements, and as long as it loved God himself with a pious love and did not follow foreign customs but only the holy words of God, His power cast down foreign peoples before it; He gave it every advantage and took away all that was harmful. O happy is the people that follows the commands of God. … This people alone knew God … For the rest of the peoples kept the commands of the serpent; ignoring the creator, they followed the words of demons. Alas, Satan ruled over three-quarters of the world and subjugated the human race in his kingdom.[79]

Israel was a chosen people at a particular (pre-redemption) moment in human history. Louis next took up the two points on which Pope Stephen had contrasted him with Solomon – Christianity (truth) vs. Judaism (shadow) and universality (Europe) vs. exclusivity (Israel) – and weaved them together in an account of the change Christ's coming had wrought in the human condition that justified the existence and expansion of his (Christian) empire as the defender of the universal Church:

> Still the Holy Father took mercy and sent the world the saving Word that He might save us. In His mercy He washed the world with His own blood … and gave us the name of Christians to keep. … through God's gift, the whole world

now overflows with throngs of Christians and the faith of the church and there is

no need for the Lord's servants to be slaughtered in his name, since the name of

Christ resounds everywhere in the world and the troop of unbelievers, who reject

the teaching of the Lord, flee, driven away by the Christian spear.[80]

Obviously, Ermoldus's account reflects not the actual statements made in 816, but the ideology and use of Israel which the poet thought amenable to the imperial court in the late 820s. As an exiled suppliant, Ermoldus wished to present nothing controversial; as a one-time member of the Aquitanian court, he knew the ideas circulating in the very highest Carolingian circles.[81] In those circumstances, one is struck that *In Praise of Louis* makes such a cautious link between ninth-century Franks and Old Testament Israelites. Ermoldus stressed the distance between Christian present and Jewish past, and while he did assume that the Franks could learn from the history of Israel, he gave no hint that the Franks simply replaced Israel. Carolingian imperial ambitions were closely linked with their status as Christian, rather than Frankish, leaders: Louis ended his speech declaring, "I am the king of Christians".[82] Why, here as in the *Admonitio*, has the identification with Israel been rather more circumscribed than the scholarly New Israel *topos* would lead us to imagine?

Presumably because the context of closest identification between Israel and the present for most early medieval people was the Church and its ceremonies, like the church service where a Visigothic king preparing for battle heard the words of Deuteronomy 33.29: "Blessed Israel: Who is like you, O people, who is saved by the Lord, the shield of your help and the sword of your glory?".[83] In preaching, teaching, and the liturgy secular elites received the history of Israel only as part of the wider story of Christianity. Of course, by the ninth century Carolingian lay elites could often read the Bible for themselves,[84] but their interpretations of it were not as unusual as might be imagined. Dhuoda's fondness for the Psalms reflected her exposure to the liturgy, not any Frankish affinity with Israel, and her survey of numerological

symbolism in her *Manual* for her son reveals that she read scripture in the light of traditional

patristic exegesis, with its emphasis on the Church and Christianity's universality: Noah's ark

symbolised the Church in which the baptised are reborn; "In the number four are contained

the four parts or the four columns of the world, according to which the Gospel is to preached

throughout the entire world."[85] In such circumstances, identification with Israel came heavily

laden with ecclesiological overtones and a salvation-history perspective grounded in the New

Testament which emphasised difference from the Old Testament as well as closeness to it.

When Carolingian writers thought about Israel and election, consequently, they could not

escape the New Testament lenses through which Christianity framed these issues – even if

these problematised otherwise neat propagandistic uses of such ideas. For instance, in 871

Louis II sent a letter to the Byzantine emperor Basil, wherein Louis's amanuensis, Anastasius

Bibliothecarius, responded to Basil's denial (in a letter now lost) of the validity of the

Carolingian claim to the title "Emperor of the Romans". Anastasius drew heavily on biblical

statements concerning election to discuss whether the imperial title belonged to the ruler of

Constantinople alone; since Basil had relied heavily on Old Testament imagery to legitimate

his recent usurpation, Anastasius's decision to draw this analogy between empire and biblical

election may have been a deliberate piece of mockery.[86] In response to Basil's claim that a

Frank as one of the *gentes* could not be Roman emperor, Anastasius pointed to Psalm 2.8:

"Ask of me, and I will give thee the gentiles (*gentes*) for thy inheritance." Ethnic background

had never determined whether one could be Roman emperor and certainly did not in the eyes

of God who accepted those who fear him in every *gens* (Acts 10.35), including the Franks.[87]

Eighty years after Theodulf wrote the *Opus Caroli*, Carolingian claims to divine favour

continued to link the Franks with the gentiles, not Israel:

> Therefore, just as God could raise up sons of Abraham from the rocks [Matthew
>
> 3.9], so he could raise up successors of the Roman empire from the hardness of

the Franks. And just as if we are Christians we are the seed of Abraham according

to the Apostle [Galatians 3.29], so if we are Christians we can do through his

grace all the things which those who are seen to be Christians can do. And just as

we are the seed of Abraham through the faith of Christ, and the Jews ceased to be

the sons of Abraham because of their treachery, likewise we received the rule of

the Roman empire on account of our good belief, our orthodoxy; the Greeks

ceased to be emperors of the Romans because of their cacadoxy, that is bad

belief.[88]

While Israel itself does not provide the direct model for the Franks here, there are still

elements supportive of a traditional understanding of the New Israel *topos*: election to empire

has been transferred from the Byzantines to the Franks because of the religious superiority of

the latter. But Anastasius had to tread carefully because Louis II's aim in correspondence

with Basil was not just to rebut the Constantinopolitan emperor's claims about the Roman

imperial title, but also to keep alive the possibility of a marital and military alliance with

Byzantium against the Arab threat in southern Italy.[89] The New Testament provided a means

for Anastasius not only to proclaim the election of the Franks, but also to soften the

Byzantine loss of election. Having just condemned the Byzantines as like the Jews, he next

offered Basil an olive-branch by referring to the fact, well known to Carolingian writers, that

the status of chosen people had not been permanently lost by the Jews.[90] Anastasius deployed

a truly remarkable rewriting of Paul's discussion of the chosenness of Israel in Romans 11:

But lest sadness might fill your heart, beloved brother, hear in what follows that

God has not cast away his people which he foreknew [Romans 11.2]; I say then,

have they so stumbled, that they should fall? God forbid [Romans 11.11]. But by

their offence, our honour is made, and by their diminution, our fullness [cf.

Romans 11.12]. For when the branches were broken, we were grafted onto them,

indeed when we were wild olives, we became henceforth partakers of the root and

of the fatness of the [domesticated] olive [cf. Romans 11.17]. Therefore we say:

the branches were broken so that we might be grafted on. Well: they were broken

not for any other reason than unbelief, we however stand by faith [cf. Romans

11.19–20]. He who has ears for hearing, let him hear.[91]

Paul's argument in Romans 11 was that Israel has not been denied God's favour entirely or

irrevocably; unbelief has meant that some Israelite branches have been broken off the olive

tree of election and the gentiles grafted on in their place – but the election of the gentiles

remains insecure and therefore the new chosen people should not boast over the old one, who

will be restored to the fulness of favour at the end of time. Some of this Anastasius applied

directly to the relations between Franks and Byzantines, some he tweaked in significant

ways. On the one hand, Anastasius removed Paul's warnings to the gentiles not to boast of

their good fortune and changed the sense of *plenitudo* in Romans 11.12 from the fulness

which will be achieved when all Israel converts to the Franks' good fortune at the

Byzantines' expense.[92] But he also implied that the Greeks had not been rejected by God and

that their "cacodoxy" did not constitute an irredeemable fall; his final admonition to hear

recalls Paul's warning to the gentiles to be wary.[93] The New Testament, in other words, both

provided the basis for grounding anti-Byzantine polemic in the history of Israel, and for

preventing that polemic going so far as to exclude the possibility of co-operation between the

two emperors within the universal Church.[94]

The texts surveyed in this section all used the imagery of Israel at different moments in

Carolingian history, within very different contexts. What is striking is that none of them,

closely connected with royal courts and written to satisfy the self-image of secular elites as

they were, drew on this imagery in the way modern scholarly references to the New Israel

topos would lead us to expect. All three situated the ideas of Israel and chosenness within a

framework shaped by an ecclesiology grounded in the New Testament that clearly militated against the straightforward claim that any *gens* was the New Israel.

Conclusion

The Carolingians did not think that the Franks were the chosen people or had replaced Old Testament Israel – at least not in any straightforward sense. They were not alone in that. Although within the limits of this article I have not been able to survey all the relevant evidence, when one sets comparable material from elsewhere in the early medieval west alongside Carolingian texts similar patterns emerge. The prologue to Alfred the Great's Law Code, for example, begins with the Law of Moses but historicises it in a similar fashion to how the emperor's speech in Ermoldus's *In Praise of Louis* puts Christian distance between the Franks and Israel. For Alfred, Mosaic Law was the starting point of a tradition of legislative activity, which extended, with the coming of Christ, to the apostles providing rules for gentile converts and then to the receipt of Christianity by many peoples (the English among them) who established divinely inspired laws through the holding of synods.[95] Alfred's laws claimed authority from participation within this universal process, not from any ideology of the English as "a new Chosen People" succeeding Israel.[96]

A common framework underlay how early medieval writers utilised ideas of chosenness or identification with Israel and it was not one which supported the "idea that God might single out a distinct culture for His special favour".[97] If historians continue to use the language of chosen peoples and New Israels then they run the risk of misleading their readers about the decree to which claims to exclusive election or divine favour were made by the elite of early medieval ethnic groups. Some scholars have already begun the process of trying to nuance this problematic language, but it must be asked whether it serves any useful purpose at all?[98]

We need to speak more clearly about the function references to election and Israel served in early medieval texts.

The evidence put forward here suggests that that function was to assert Christian identity as much as ethnic identity, to link a specific group of Christians to the universal Church, and to draw authority and legitimation for that group (or, more usually, its rulers) from participation in the Church. This is not to say that the language of divine election and Israel did not serve political or expansionist propaganda purposes – it clearly often did in the Carolingian world, as elsewhere, because ideas of Church and empire were closely related. Nor is it to say that ethnic identity did not matter to early medieval people; the importance of ethnicity in this period is a well-attested and extensively studied historical datum. Nonetheless, ethnic identity was not the only identity which mattered at the time and it did not necessarily sit at the head of a hierarchy of identities, always defining and shaping religious ones.[99] Traditional uses of the chosen people and New Israel *topos* prioritise ethnicity and distinction whereas the evidence studied in this article suggests that the language of election and Israel was essentially ecclesiological and universalising. It had more in common with late antique ideas about Christian empire than modern notions of *gentilismus*.

Previous scholarship has already pointed towards much of this conclusion. Mayke de Jong, especially, has revealed the political importance of the multi-ethnic Church in Carolingian political thought in a series of important articles. Even she, however, rather downplays the significance of universalism to early medieval ideas, describing it as no more than a "memory" in the eighth and ninth centuries: "the lingering idea that the *ecclesia* had once transcended" the boundaries between *gentes*.[100] No Carolingian thinker believed that the universal Church, "which is spread throughout the entire globe", was just a memory; none believed that the Pauline vision of the multitude of the gentiles merging into the Church had failed to happen.[101] While modern historians emphasise fragmentation and localisation as the

distinguishing dynamics of the early Middle Ages (because we compare the early medieval west to the Roman Empire),[102] early medieval Christians saw themselves as living in the era founded in the Acts of the Apostles: the passing of the Roman Empire was irrelevant in the face of the essential continuity of the multi-ethnic, universal Church which had emerged under it. The texts I have studied in this article show that such a view reached Carolingian ruling elites via the discourse of divine election and Israel.

Historiographical interest in the unity of the early medieval world has always existed, although the romantic vision of the Christian origins of "European civilisation" associated with Christopher Dawson's *The Making of Europe* has given way to the more recent stress on the diversity of the early Middle Ages within a shared post-Roman culture.[103] While the emphasis on unity in diversity is truer to the realities of the period than a confessional belief in a cultural Christendom, we nonetheless need to acknowledge the imaginative importance of universal Christianity at the time. Peter Brown's concept of "micro-Christendoms" has been seized upon as integrating the spread of early medieval Christianity into the wider picture of diversity, but that is only half the story. "Micro-Christendom" is not just another way of saying "a local form of Christianity": it recognises that diverse, regional Christian cultures were grounded in an ideological appeal to an imaginary universal Christianity. "Each region … believed that it mirrored, with satisfactory exactitude, the wider macrocosm of worldwide Christian belief and practice. … Seldom have so many appeals been made … to membership of a universal Christian community."[104] We have seen that such appeals mattered as much to the Carolingian ruling elite as they did to the seventh-century Insular churchmen Brown described.

The New Israel *topos* accords with our understanding of a fragmented and diverse post-Roman world – but there is very little evidence that early medieval writers ever used it in the way historians assumed they did. Acknowledging the ideological power of universal

Christian identity, as I have here urged, forces us to take a more nuanced look at the early Middle Ages, the age of "micro-Christendoms". The paradox that the universal Church mattered in the political imagination of the ethnically defined polities of that age needs to be recognised; it holds the key to explaining how the Carolingians, who rose to power as champions of Frankish superiority, came to present themselves as rulers of the Christian empire. Working in a world where the reality of globalisation exists alongside the increasing power of exclusivist, nationalist politics, contemporary historians may be perfectly placed to understand how appeals to a universal and inclusive identity possessed real force in the politically fragmented early medieval west.

---

[1] C.H. Talbot, *The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany: Being the Lives of SS. Willibrord, Boniface, Sturm, Leoba, and Lebuin, Together with the* Hodoeporicon *of St. Willibald and a Selection from the Correspondence of St. Boniface* (London, 1954), 9; repr. in *Soldiers of Christ: Saints and Saints' Lives from Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Thomas F.X. Noble and Thomas Head (London, 1995), 199.

[2] Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi* 9, ed. Wilhelm Levison, MGH SS rer. Merov. 7 (Hanover, 1920), 124.

[3] E.g. Ernst Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley, 1946), 56–9; Gerd Tellenbach, "Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in der Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters," in *Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1988), 2:343–410, at 361–2 [originally published in 1934].

[4] E.g. Janet L. Nelson, "Kingship and Empire in the Carolingian World," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, UK, 1994), 52–87, esp. 55–6; Nicholas Howe, *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England* (New Haven, 1989); Sarah Foot, "The Making of *Angelcynn*: English Identity before the Conquest," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th ser., 6 (1996): 25–49, esp. 32; Mayke de Jong, "Adding Insult to Injury: Julian of Toledo and his *Historia Wambae*," in *The Visigoths from the Migration Period to the Seventh Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. Peter Heather (Woodbridge, 1999), 375; Donnchadh Ó Corráin, "The Church and Secular Society," *L'Irlanda e gli irlandesi nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 57 (Spoleto, 2010), 267.

[5] Patrick Wormald, "*Engla lond*: The Making of an Allegiance," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 7 (1994): 18.

[6] Alcuin, *Vita sancti Willibrordi* 8, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Poetae 1 (Berlin, 1881), 211: "Sed deus omnipotens animas donaverat illi / Gentibus ex ipsis aliquas …"

[7] Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi* 13, p. 127: "in eo populo subito propheticum illud impleretur testimonium: *Et erit in loco, ubi dicetur eis: Non populus meus vos; dicetur eis: Filii Dei viventis* [Hosea 1.10]."

[8] See Mary Alberi, "The Evolution of Alcuin's Concept of the *Imperium christianum*," in *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout, 1998), 3–17.

[9] Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi* 12, p. 127: "novus Dei populus."

[10] See Mayke de Jong, "Introduction – Rethinking Early Medieval Christianity: A View from the Netherlands," *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998): 261–76, esp. 273.

[11] Mary Garrison, "The Franks as the New Israel: Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne," in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge, UK, 2000), 114–61.

[12] Mary Garrison, "Divine Election for Nations – a Difficult Rhetoric for Medieval Scholars?" in *The Making of Christian Myths in the Periphery of Latin Christendom (c. 1000–1300)*, ed. Lars Boje Mortensen (Copenhagen, 2006), 275–314.

[13] Gerda Heydemann and Walter Pohl, "The Rhetoric of Election: 1 Peter 2.9 and the Franks," in *Religious Franks: Religion and Power in the Frankish Kingdoms. Studies in Honour of Mayke de Jong*, ed. Rob Meens, Dorine van Espelo, Bram van den Hoven van Genderen, Janneke Raaijmakers, Irene van Renswoude and Carine van Rhijn (Manchester, 2016), 13–31; Walter Pohl, "Ethnicity in the Carolingian Empire," in *The 'Abbasid and Carolingian Empires*, ed. D.G. Tor (Leiden, 2017), 102–22, at 104 (whence the quotation).

[14] George Molyneaux, "Did the English Really Think They Were God's Elect in the Anglo-Saxon Period?," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 65 (2014): 721–37.

[15] Frank Riess, "From Aachen to Al-Andalus: The Journey of Deacon Bodo (823–76)," *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (2005): 132; Thomas F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009), 233–4; Jinty Nelson, "Lay Readers of the Bible in the Carolingian Ninth Century," in *Reading the Bible in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jinty Nelson and Damien Kempf (London, 2015), 43–55. For citation of Garrison: John J. Contreni, "The

Patristic Legacy to *c.* 1000," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible from 600 to 1450*, ed. Richard Marsden and E. Ann Matter (Cambridge, UK, 2012), 526.

[16] Samantha Zacher, *Rewriting the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon Verse: Becoming the Chosen People* (London, 2013), quotation at 158.

[17] The phrase appears in Greek sources, but only to mean the universal Church of the gentiles: Sophronius, *Oratio III de Hypapante sive occursu Domini* 2.7, PG 87:3292–3; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Interpretatio synodi VII generalis* 6.3, PL 129:398B.

[18] See Foot, "Making of *Angelcynn*," 32; Molyneaux, "Did the English?," 723–4.

[19] Thomas F. X. Noble, "Review of *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*," *Speculum* 77 (2002): 1307–9, at 1308; George Molyneaux, "The *Old English Bede*: English Ideology or Christian Instruction?," *English Historical Review* 124 (2009): 1319.

[20] For a recent summary and state of the field: Erica Buchberger, *Shifting Identities in Spain and Gaul, 500–700: From Romans to Goths and Franks* (Amsterdam, 2017), 10–24.

[21] Walter Pohl, "Disputed Identifications: Jews and the Use of Biblical Models in the Barbarian Kingdoms," in *Barbarians and Jews: Jews and Judaism in the Early Medieval West*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Thomas F.X. Noble (Turnhout, 2018), 11–28, at 17–18.

[22] Walter Pohl, "Introduction – Strategies of Identification: A Methodological Profile," in *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (Turnhout, 2013), 1–64, at 2. Eventually Frankishness lost its ethnic overtones and incorporated the universalism of Christian identity: Matthew Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade* (Oxford, 2011).

[23] Augustine, *Epistulae* 199.48, ed. Alois Goldbacher, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum [hereafter: CSEL] 57 (Vienna, 1911), 287: "omnes enim gentes promissae sunt, non omnes homines omnium gentium"; quoted verbatim by Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositio in*

Matthaeum 7, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCCM 174A (Turnhout, 2000), 620, and Paschasius

Radbertus, *Expositio in Matheo* 11, ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 56B (Turnout, 1984), 1165.

[24] Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in evangelia* 29.2, ed. Raymond Étaix, CCSL 141 (Turnhout,

1999), 246: "Potest etiam omnis creaturae nomine omnis natio gentium designari"; quoted by

Bede, *In Marcum* 4, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnhout, 1960), 645. Also Heiric of

Auxerre, *Homiliae* 2.13, ed. Riccardo Quadri, CCCM 116B (Turnhout, 1994), 107: "omni

creaturae … hoc est per uniuersas nationes quae in ignorantia Dei eatenus fuerant."

[25] Walter Pohl, "Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West: Introduction,"

in *Post-Roman Transitions: Christian and Barbarian Identities in the Early Medieval West*,

ed. Walter Pohl and Gerda Heydemann (Turnhout, 2013), 1–46; Pohl, "Introduction –

Strategies of Identification", 33–8; and Pohl, "Disputed Identifications", 11–28.

[26] E.g., Isidore of Sevile, *Etymologiae* 8.1.1, ed. W. M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911), n. pag.:

"Non enim sicut conventicula haereticorum in aliquibus regionum partibus coartatur, sed per

totum terrarum orbem dilatata diffunditur." See Mayke de Jong, "*Ecclesia* and the Early

Medieval Polity," in *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl and Helmut

Reimitz (Vienna, 2006), 113–32, at 116–19, for an overview of the historiography on

Christianity's universalism.

[27] E.g. Augustine, *Contra litteras Petiliani* 2.70.158, ed. Michael Petschenig, CSEL 52

(Leipzig and Vienna, 1909), 101; Leander of Seville, *Homilia in laude ecclesiae*, ed. José

Vives, *Concilios Visigoticos e Hispano-Romanos* (Barcelona and Madrid, 1963), 139–44;

Cummian, *De controversia paschali*, ed. Maura Walsh and Dáibhí Ó Cróinín (Toronto,

1988), 72–4. The Donatists may have made some claims to exclusivity: Gerda Heydemann,

"People(s) of God? Biblical Exegesis and the Language of Community in Late Antique and

Early Medieval Europe," in *Meanings of Community across Medieval Eurasia: Comparative

Approaches*, ed. Eirik Hovden, Christina Lutter and Walter Pohl (Leiden, 2016), 41–2.

[28] Robin Whelan, "Ethnicity, Christianity and Groups: Rethinking Gothic Homoian Christianity in the Post-Imperial West," in *Inclusion and Exclusion in Mediterranean Christianities, 400–800*, ed. Yaniv Fox and Erica Buchberger (Turnhout, 2019), 167–98; I am grateful to Dr Whelan for sharing this work with me pre-publication.

[29] See Alcuin, *Vita Vedastis* 3, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS. rer. Merov. 3 (Hanover, 1896), 418: "[Clovis] cum fortissima gente Francorum crededit Christo, et facta est gens sancta, populus adqusitionis."

[30] Janet L. Nelson, "The Lord's Anointed and the People's Choice: Carolingian Royal Ritual," in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge, UK, 1987), 137-80, at 151–3; and Nelson, "Kingship and Empire," 55–7.

[31] *Codex Carolinus* 45, ed. Wilhelm Gundlach, MGH Epp. 3 (Berlin, 1892), 561: "… quoniam plures conperimus, sicut divinae scripturae historia instruimur, per aliene nationis iniustam copulam a mandatis Dei deviare et in magno devolutos facinore. Quae est enim, praecellentissimi filii, magni reges, talis desipientia, ut penitus vel dici liceat, quod vestra praeclara Francorum gens, quae super omnes gentes enitet, et tam splendiflua ac nobilissima regalis vestrae potentiae proles perfidae, quod absit, ac foetentissimae Langobardorum genti polluatur, quae in numero gentium nequaquam conputatur, de cuius natione et leprosorum genus oriri certum est!"

[32] Walter Pohl, "Why Not to Marry a Foreign Woman: Stephen III's Letter to Charlemagne," in *Rome and Religion in the Medieval World: Studies in Honour of Thomas F.X. Noble*, ed. Valerie L. Garver and Owen M. Phelan (Farnham, 2014), 47–63.

[33] *Codex Carolinus* 45, p. 561: "Impium enim est … alias accipere uxores super eas, quas primitus vos certum est accepisse. Non vobis convenit tale peragi nefas, qui legem Dei tenetis et alios, ne talia agant, corripitis: haec quippe paganae gentes faciunt; nam absit hoc a vobis,

qui perfecte estis christiani et 'gens sancta atque regale estis sacerdotium'. Recordamini et considerate, quia oleo sancto uncti per manus vicarii beati Petri caelesti benedictione estis sanctificati; et cavendum vobis est, ne tantis reatibus inplicemini."

[34] Arnold Angenendt, "Rex et Sacerdos: Zur Genese der Königssalbung," in *Tradition als historische Kraft: Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des früheren Mittelalters*, ed. Norbert Kamp and Joachim Wollasch (Berlin, 1982), 100–18; Nelson, "The Lord's Anointed," 151–3.

[35] *Codex Carolinus* 45, p. 563: "Et si quis, quod non optamus, contra huiusmodi nostrae adiurationis atque exhortationis seriem agere praesumserit, sciat se auctoritate domini mei, beati Petri apostolorum principis, anathematis vinculo esse innodatum et a regno Dei alienum … ad vero, qui observator et custos istius nostrae exhortationis extiterit, caelestibus benedictionibus a domino Deo nostro illustratus aeternis praemiorum gaudiis cum omnibus sanctis et electis Dei particeps effici mereatur."

[36] Clemens Gantner, *Freunde Roms und Völker der Finsternis: Die päpstliche Konstruktion von Anderen im 8. und 9. Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 2014), 218–43, esp. 238.

[37] Tellenbach, "Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke," 361–2.

[38] For the closeness of the sacramentary to the Carolingian court: Michael McCormick, *Eternal Victory: Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium, and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, UK, 1986), 347–8.

[39] *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis* 430 (*Missa in profectionem hostium eontibus in prohelium*), ed. Antoine Dumas, CCSL 159 (Turnhout, 1981), 431–2: "Prębe domine exercitui tuo ęonti in tenebris claritatem, proficiendi augeas uoluntatem, et sicut israheli properanti ex ęgypto securitatis prebuisti munimen, ita tuo predistinato eunti in prelio populo lucis auctore<m> adicias angelum … Trinitas indiuidua semper ubique patri<s> maiestati defusa, unius potentiae deum uerum, a quo[s] sancta regitur uel goberna[re]tur ęcclesia, que

nunc gentium barbararum adflictionibus pro suis menbris in ualle[m] lacrimarum gemit

angusta ... Sed similium tuarum uirtutum agmine roborata, tibi domino gloria<m> refferant

triumphantes, dum fidelissime christiane fidęi francorum gentem protegis, dum infidelium

gentium tua potentia bella prosternis …"

[40] Samuel Ottewill-Soulsby, "'Those Same Cursed Saracens': Charlemagne's Campaigns in

the Iberian Penninsula as Religious Warfare," *Journal of Medieval History* 42 (2016): 416–

19.

[41] See Ildar H. Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (c.

751–877)* (Leiden, 2008), 66–7, for the sacramentary reflecting lay expectations.

[42] Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae*, 56.

[43] Nelson, "The Lord's Anointed," 150–51; Garrison, "Franks as the New Israel," 129–31;

Karl Ubl, *Sinnstiftungen eines Rechtsbuchs: Die* Lex Salica *im Frankenreich* (Ostfildern,

2017), 155–6.

[44] *Lex Salica* (D) prologue, ed. Karl August Eckhardt, MGH LL nat. Germ. 4.2 (Hanover,

1969), 2–6: "Gens Francorum inclita, auctorem Deo condita, fortis in arma, firma pace fetera,

profunda in consilio, corporea nobilis, incolumna candore, forma egregia, audax, uelox et

aspera, [nuper] ad catholicam fidem conuersa, emunis ab heresa; dum adhuc [ritu] teneretur

barbaro, inspirante Deo, inquerens scienciae clauem, iuxta morem suorum qualitatem

desiderans iusticiam, costodiens pietatem. … Uiuat qui Francus diligit, Christus eorum

regnum custodiat, rectores eorundem lumen suae graciae repleat, exercitum protegat, fidem

munimenta tribuat … Haec est enim gens, que fortis dum esset robore ualida."

[45] *Lex Salica* (D) prologue, pp. 6–8.

[46] Matthew Innes, "'Immune from Heresy': Defining the Boundaries of Carolingian

Christianity," in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages. Essays in*

Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (Manchester, 2008), 101–25, at 101–4; Ubl, *Sinnstiftungen*, 160–63.

[47] Garrison, "Franks as the New Israel," 131; Garipzanov, *Symbolic Language of Authority*, 58–68; Innes, "Boundaries," 103–4; Helmut Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity and the Framing of Western Ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge, UK, 2015), 295–333; Pohl, "Ethnicity," 108–10. See *Missale Francorum* 13 (*Orationes et preces pro regibus*), ed. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, Leo Eizenhöfer and Petrus Siffrin (Rome, 1957), 20–21.

[48] Garipzanov, *Symbolic Language of Authority*, 68–73; Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity*, 339–59, 407–22. See Tellenbach, "Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke," 392–405, for the popularity of the "Christian Empire" in the liturgical manuscripts in comparison to any ethnically defined kingdom.

[49] Innes, "Boundaries," 122.

[50] De Jong, "*Ecclesia* and the Early Medieval Polity"; and De Jong, "The State of the Church: *Ecclesia* and Early Medieval State Formation," in *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat – europäische Perspektiven*, ed. Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser (Vienna, 2009), 241–54. Thomas F. X. Noble, "Carolingian Religion," *Church History* 84 (2015): 292, integrates some of the recent work on the importance of Christian, rather than ethnic, identity to the Carolingian Empire into the New Israel model.

[51] *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* 1.17, 1.19, ed. Ann Freeman, MGH Conc. 2. Suppl. 1 (Hanover, 1998), 183–4, 193: "… qui non carnalis, sed spiritalis Israhel sumus …"; Noble, *Images*, chs 4–5.

[52] Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3.34.48–9, ed. Joseph Martin, CCSL 32 (Turnhout, 1962), 109: "Sic fit Israhel spiritalis non unius gentis, sed omnium, quae promissae sunt patribus in eorum semine, quod est Christus. Hic ergo Israhel spiritalis ab illo Israhele

carnali, qui est unius gentis, nouitate gratiae, non nobilitate patriae, et mente, non gente distinguitur."

53 *Epistola Karoli Magni ad Elipandum et episcopos Hispaniae*, ed. Albert Werminghoff, MGH Conc. 2.1 (Hanover/Leipzig, 1906), 158: "Gaudet pietas Christiana divinae scilicet atque fraternae per lata terrarum spatia duplices caritatis alas extendere, ut materno foveat affectu quos sacro genuerat baptismate. Et maxima est sanctae matris ecclesiae exultatio suorum adunatio filiorum, ut sint consummati in unum qui redempti sunt ab uno … Hanc igitur fidem orthodoxam et ab apostolicis traditam doctoribus et ab universali servatam ecclesia nos pro virium nostrarum portione ubique in omnibus servare et praedicare profitemur."

54 *Annales regni Francorum* s.a. 794, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS rer. Germ. 6 (Hanover, 1895), 94–5; *Opus Caroli* 3.11, 4.13, 4.28, pp. 376–8, 515–22, 557–8. Noble, *Images*, 170–72, 178–80; Florence Close, *Uniformiser la foi pour unifier l'Empire: Contribution à l'histoire de la pensée politico-théologique de Charlemagne* (Brussels, 2011), 126–9, 144–9.

55 *Libellus sacrosyllabus episcoporum Italiae*, ed. Albert Werminghoff, MGH Conc. 2.1 (Hanover and Leipzig, 1906), 130: "clementissimi et tranquillissimi gloriosique Caroli regis, domini terrae."

56 *Opus Caroli* 3.11, p. 376: "unius partis ecclesia … totius mundi ecclesias conetur anathematizare." See Conor O'Brien, "Empire, Ethnic Election, and Exegesis in the *Opus Caroli* (*Libri Carolini*)," in *The Church and Empire*, ed. Stuart J. Brown, Charlotte Methuen and Andrew Spicer, Studies in Church History 54 (Cambridge, UK, 2018), 96–108.

57 Tellenbach, "Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke," esp. 362.

58 E.g. Wolfgang H. Fritze, "Universalis gentium confessio: Formeln, Träger und Wege universalmissionarischen Denkens im 7. Jahrhundert," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 3 (1969):

124–8; Lutz E. von Padberg, "Unus populus ex diversis gentibus: Gentilismus und Einheit im früheren Mittelalter," in *Der Umgang mit dem Fremden in der Vormoderne*, ed. Christoph Lüth, Rudolf W. Keck, and Erhard Wiersing (Cologne, 1997), 155–93.

[59] Einhard, *Vita Karoli magni* 16, ed. Louis Halphen (Paris, 1938), 46–8. Anne Latowsky, "Foreign Embassies and Roman Universality in Einhard's Life of Charlemagne," *Florilegium* 22 (2005): 25–57; Jonathan P. Conant, "Louis the Pious and the Contours of Empire," *Early Medieval Europe* 22 (2014): 336–60; Mayke de Jong, "The Empire that was Always Decaying: The Carolingians (800-888)," *Medieval Worlds* 2 (2015): 6–25.

[60] Stefan Esders, "Herakleios, Dagobert und die 'beschnittenen Völker': Die Umwälzungen des Mittelmeerraums im 7. Jahrhundert in der Chronik des sog. Fredegar," in *Jenseits der Grenzen: Beiträge zur spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. Andreas Goltz, Hartmut Leppin, and Heinrich Schlange-Schöningen (Berlin, 2009), 299–308; and Esders, "*Nationes quam plures conquiri*: Amandus of Maastricht, Compulsory Baptism, and 'Christian Universal Mission' in Seventh-Century Gaul," in *Motions of Late Antiquity: Essays on Religion, Politics, and Society in Honour of Peter Brown*, ed. Jamie Kreiner and Helmut Reimitz (Turnhout, 2016), 269–307, quotation at 291.

[61] *Epistolae Austrasicae* 20, ed. Wilhelm Gundlach, MGH Epp. 3 (Berlin, 1892), 133: "Id vero, quod dignamini esse solliciti, in quibus provinciis habitemus aut quae gentes nostrae sint, Deo adiutore, dicione subiectę: Dei nostri misericordiam feliciter subactis Thoringiis et eorum provinciis adquisitis, extinctis ipsorum tunc tempore regibus, Norsavorum itaque gentem nobis placata maiestate, colla subdentibus edictis ideoque, Deo propitio, Wesigotis, incolomes Franciae, septentrionalem plagam Italiaeque Pannoniae cum Saxonibus, Euciis, qui se nobis voluntate propria tradiderunt, per Danubium et limitem Pannoniae usque in oceanis litoribus custodiente Deo dominatio nostra porrigetur."

[62] *Opus Caroli* preface, 1.6, pp. 97, 136.

[63] Gary Gilbert, "The List of Nations in Acts 2: Roman Propaganda and the Lukan Response," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 497–529. *Capitulare Francofurtense* 1, ed. Albert Werminghoff, MGH Conc. 2.1 (Hanover and Leipzig, 1906), 165; *Annales regni Francorum* s.a. 794, p. 94; *Libellus sacrosyllabus*, p. 131.

[64] Steffen Patzold, "'Einheit' versus 'Fraktionierung': Zur symbolischen und institutionellen Integration des Frankenreichs im 8./9. Jahrhundert," in *Visions of Community in the Post-Roman World: The West, Byzantium and the Islamic World, 300–1100*, ed. Walter Pohl, Clemens Gantner, and Richard Payne (Farnham, 2012), 375–90.

[65] Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludowici* 3, lines 153–4, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Poetae 2 (Berlin, 1884), 45: "Gens est Francorum nulli virtute secunda, / Vincit amore dei, exsuperatque fide"; trans. Thomas F.X. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis the Pious: The Lives by Einhard, Notker, Ermoldus, Thegan, and the Astronomer* (University Park, PA, 2009), 159. Philippe Depreux, "La *pietas* comme principe de government d'après le *Poème sur Louis le Pieux* d'Ermold le Noir," in Hill and Swan, *The Community*, 201–24, at 219–21, 222–4.

[66] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 1, lines 289–92, p. 14: "Si gens ita deum coleret, Christoque placeret, / Baptismique foret unguine tincta sacri, / Pax firmanda esset nobis, pax atque tenenda, / Coniugi ut possit relligione deo"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 135.

[67] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 3, lines 317–21, p. 50: "Praecipue sit cum una fides nostrisque suisque, / Dante deo periet, pro dolor! absque fide. / Hic finis, si praestat … Christicoloque gregi iungatur pace fideque …"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 163.

[68] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 4, lines 103–4, p. 61: "Non, sua regna mihi ut credant, hoc consulo, credat, / Sed quo plasma dei lucrificare queam"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 61.

[69] For similar ideas in Anglo-Saxon sources: Miriam Adan Jones, "A Chosen Missionary People? Willibrord, Boniface, and the Election of the *Angli*," *Medieval Worlds* 3 (2016): 98–115.

[70] Raymund Kottje, *Studien zum Einfluss des Alten Testamentes auf Recht und Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters (6.–8. Jahrhundert)* (Bonn, 1964); Johan Chydenius, *Medieval Institutions and the Old Testament* (Helsinki, 1965).

[71] *Codex Carolinus* 39, p. 552.

[72] Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (AD 135–425)*, trans. Henry McKeating (London, 1996); Philippe Bobichon, "Le theme du 'Verus Israel': Est-il constitutive de la controverse entre christianisme et judaïsme?," *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 22 (2005): 421–44; De Jong, "*Ecclesia* and the Early Medieval Polity," 119–21; and De Jong, "State of the Church," 250.

[73] Noble, "Review of *The Uses of the Past*," 1308.

[74] Reimitiz, *History, Frankish Identity*, 450, referring to the *Liber historiae Francorum*, which I address in more detail in "The New Israel Motif," in *Origin Legends in Medieval Europe*, ed. Lindy Brady and Patrick Wadden (Leiden, forthcoming).

[75] *Admonitio generalis* prologue, ed. Alfred Boretius, MGH Capit. 1 (Hanover, 1883), 54: "… non ut me eius sanctitate aequiparabilem faciam, sed quod nobis sunt ubique sanctorum semper exempla sequenda"; see similarly Pippin's 762 charter for Prüm: *Diplomata Pippini* 16, ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher, Alfons Dopsch, Johann Lechner, and Michael Tangl, MGH DD Kar. 1 (Hanover, 1906), 22. Garrison, "Franks as the New Israel," 146–7.

[76] Patzold, "'Einheit' versus 'Fraktionierung'," 376.

[77] Bede, *Vita metrica sancti Cuthberti* 21, ed. Werner Jaager (Leipzig, 1935), 100. Isabelle Rosé, "Le roi Josias dans l'écclésiologie politique du haut Moyen Âge," *Mélanges de l'école*

française de Rome: Moyen Âge 115 (2003): 683–709 argues for Theodulf as author but misunderstands Bede.

[78] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 2, lines 267–72, p. 32: "Tu tamen es potior, tu rite potentior extas, / Ille umbram retinens, tu quia vera colis. / ... Israel ille fuit regnator solius arcis; / Tu pius Europae regna potenter habes"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 148–9.

[79] Ermoldus. *In honorem Hludowici* 2, lines 327–48, p. 34: "Quo praecepta dei servavit adusque docentis, / Iustitiam coluit, iudiciumque dedit; / Dumque in amore pio dominum dilexit eundem, / Non aliena sequens, sed pia dicta dei, / Adversas illi prostravit numine gentes, / Prospera cuncta dedit, atque inimica tulit. / O felix semper domini si iussa secutus / Adforet, aeternum regnum teneret ovans ... Haec gens sola deum norat … Caetera turba quidem servabat iussa celidri, / Factorem ignorans, daemonis orsa sequens. / Hic per triquadrum regnabat, pro dolor, orbem, / Et genus humanum in sua regna dabat"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 150.

[80] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 2, lines 351–66, p. 34: "Tum pius indoluit genitor, verbumque salutis / Transmisit mundo, ut nos pius erueret. / Ille lavit proprio miserans de sanguine mundum … Christicolum nobis nomen habere dedit … Quamvis dante deo totus nunc mundus habundet / Christicolum turbis ecclesiaeque fide, / Nec sit opus domini famulos pro nomine caedi, / Cum passim Christi nomen in orbe boet, / Et male fida cohors, domini quae dogma refutat, / Cuspide christicolo iam procul acta fugit"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 150.

[81] Hans Hubert Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit* (Bonn, 1968), 197–8; Depreux, "La *pietas*," 203–4.

[82] Ermoldus, *In honorem Hludowici* 2, line 379, p. 35: "ego rex sum christicolarum"; trans. Noble, *Charlemagne and Louis*, 151.

---

[83] *Ordo quando rex cum exercitu ad prelium egreditur*, ed. Marius Férotin, *Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église wisigothique et mozarabe d'Espagne* (Paris, 1904), 152: "Benedictus Israel: quis similis tibi, popule, qui saluaris a Domino? scutum auxilia tui et gladius glorie tue."

[84] Nelson, "Lay Readers."

[85] Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis* 9.3, ed. Pierre Riché, *Manuel pour mon fils*, Sources Chrétiennes 225 (Paris, 1975), 330: "In quo quaternario, quatuor mundi continentur partes uel quatuor columnae, secundum <quas> per orbem in uniuersum praedicatum euangelium." Mayke de Jong, "Carolingian Political Discourse and the Biblical Past: Hraban, Dhuoda, Radbert," in *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (Cambridge, UK, 2015), 94–8.

[86] Chris Wickham, 'Ninth-century Byzantium through Western Eyes,' in *Byzantium in the Ninth Century: Dead or Alive?*, ed. Leslie Brubaker (Aldershot, 1999), 253–4; Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson, "Introduction," in *The Old Testament in Byzantium*, ed. Paul Magdalino and Robert S. Nelson (Cambridge, MA, 2010), 22. I am grateful to Dr Mike Humphries for his observations on this point.

[87] *Ludovici II imperatoris epistola ad Basilium I imperatorem Constantinopolitanum missa*, ed. Walter Henze, MGH Epp. 7 (Berlin, 1928), 389.

[88] *Ludovici epistola*, p. 390: "Sicut ergo potuit Deus de lapidibus suscitare filios Abrahae, ita potuit de Francorum duritia Romani suscitare successores imperii; et sicut si Christi sumus, secundum apostolum Abrahae semen existimus, ita si sumus Christi, omnia possumus per gratiam ipsius, quae possunt illi, qui videntur existere Christi; et sicut nos per fidem Christi Habrahae semen existimus Iudaeique propter perfidiam Abrahae filii esse desierunt, ita quoque nobis propter bonam opinionem, orthodosiam, regimen imperii Romani suscepimus;

Graeci propter kacodosiam, id est malam opinionem, Romanorum imperatores existere cessaverunt."

89 Steven Fanning, "Imperial Diplomacy between Francia and Byzantium: The Letter of Louis II to Basil I in 871," *Cithara* 34 (1994): 3–17; Giulia Cò, "Vescovi, re, imperatori: Anastasio Bibliotecario tra Occidente e Oriente" (PhD thesis, Università di Trento, 2015), 173–214.

90 See e.g., Dhuoda, *Liber Manualis* 9.4, p. 332.

91 *Ludovici epistola*, p. 390: "Set ne, frater desiderabilis, tristitia cor tuum repleat, audi sequentia qui 'non repulit Deus plebem suam quam praescivit'. Dico ergo: numquid sic offenderunt, ut caderent. Absit.' Set illorum delicto honor noster et diminutione ipsorum plenitudo nostra effecta est. Cum enim fracti sunt rami, nos inserti sumus in illis, cum oleastri quidem ammodo fuissemus, et socii radicorum et pinguedinum olivae sumus effecti. Dicimus ergo: fracti sunt rami, ut nos insereremur; bene; non enim nisi propter credulitatem non rectam fracti sunt, nos autem fide stamus. Qui habet aures audiendi, audiat." For the argument that Bede used Romans 11.2 in a comparable way in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, emphasising that God had not permanently rejected the Britons in favour of the Anglo-Saxons: W. Trent Foley and Nicholas J. Higham, "Bede on the Britons," *Early Medieval Europe* 17 (2009): 154–185.

92 Romans 11.12: "Quod si delictum illorum divitiae sunt mundi, et diminutio eorum divitiae gentium: quanto magis plenitudo eorum?"

93 Romans 11.20: "Tu autem fide stas: noli altum sapere, sed time."

94 See *Ludovici epistola*, p. 387.

95 Alfred, *Law Code* pro.49, ed. Friedrich Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols. (Halle, 1898), 1:42–6.

[96] Patrick Wormald, *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century*, vol. 1, *Legislation and its Limits* (Oxford, 1999), 426; Molyneaux, "Did the English?," 735.

[97] See n. 5 above.

[98] Jamie Wood, "*Religiones* and *Gentes* in Isidore of Seville's *Chronica Maiora*," in Pohl and Heydemann, *Post-Roman Transitions*, 125–68, uses "favoured people" to describe Isidore's presentation of the Visigoths; the "chosen people" are Christians. Adan Jones, "Chosen Missionary People?" argues that the Anglo-Saxon missionaries to the continent never articulated an idea of being the chosen people; they saw themselves as enjoying God's "special" (but not "exclusive") favour.

[99] On the need to avoid granting religion just such a place in a hierarchy of identity in an earlier period: Éric Rebillard, *Christians and Their Many Identities in Late Antiquity: North Africa, 200–450CE* (Ithaca, NY, 2012).

[100] De Jong, "*Ecclesia* and the Early Medieval Polity," 118; and De Jong, "State of the Church," 247.

[101] Citing only Carolingian authors: Florus of Lyons (quoting Fulgentius of Ruspe), *Collectio ex dictis XII patrum* Fulg.40, ed. Paul-Irénée Fransen, Bertrand Coppieters 't Wallant, and Roland Demeulenaere, CCCM 193B (Turnhout, 2007), 250: "ecclesiam, quae per totum est orbem diffusa terrarum"; Heiric of Auxerre, *Homiliae* 2.40, p. 386: "Christi ecclesia quae per totum orbem diffusa est"; Hincmar of Rheims, *De divortio Lotharii regis et Theutbergae reginae* resp.5, ed. Letha Böhringer, MGH Conc. 4 Suppl. 1 (Hanover, 1992), 139: "cotidie in omni catholica ecclesia longe lateque per orbem diffusa"; Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in librum judicum* 1.13, PL 108:1150C: "in Ecclesia catholica, quae est per universum orbem diffusa." Cf. Pohl, "Disputed Identifications," 25.

[102] E.g. the brief overview in Ian Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2013), 2–4.

[103] Ibid., 270–4, 315–21.

[104] Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2013), 13–17, 359 (whence the quotation). The importance of universality to Brown's concept is noted by Pohl, "Disputed Identifications," 12.