



HAL
open science

Tradition and Revision. The Textual Tradition of Hincmar of Reims' Visio Bernoldi. With a Critical Edition

Maaïke van der Lugt

► **To cite this version:**

Maaïke van der Lugt. Tradition and Revision. The Textual Tradition of Hincmar of Reims' Visio Bernoldi. With a Critical Edition. *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi*, 1994, 52, pp.109-149. halshs-00175522

HAL Id: halshs-00175522

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00175522>

Submitted on 14 Jul 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

TRADITION AND REVISION.
THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF HINC MAR,
OF REIMS' *VISIO BERNOLDI*
WITH A NEW CRITICAL EDITION ¹

Not long after the death of king Charles the Bald, archbishop Hincmar of Reims (845-882) sent a letter to all clerics and laymen of the diocese of Reims. This letter, known by historians as the *Visio Bernoldi*,² reports the journey to the other world of a certain Bernold, a layman³ from Voncq, a

1. This article is based on my master's dissertation *Hincmar van Reims, Visio Bernoldi. Tekst, vertaling en commentaar*, submitted to the Universiteit van Amsterdam in 1992. I wish to thank Peter van der Eerden and Marco Mostert, who supervised my master's thesis and François Dolbeau, whose suggestions were invaluable for the completion of this article. I am indebted to Laura Weigert for the correction of my English.

2. Edition PL 125, col. 1115-1120. On the *Visio Bernoldi*, W. LEVISON's classic article 'Die Politik in den Jenseitsvisionen des frühen Mittelalters' in: *Aus Rheinischer und Fränkischer Frühzeit. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Düsseldorf 1948), p. 229-246; first published in *Festgabe Friedrich von Bezold* (Bonn 1921), p. 81-100. See also: H. RALL, 'Zeitgeschichtliche Züge im Vergangenheitsbild mittelalterlicher, namentlich mittellateinischer Schriftsteller', *Historische Studien* 322 (1937), p. 110-115; E. DÜNNINGER, *Politische und geschichtliche Elemente in mittelalterlichen Jenseitsvisionen bis zum Ende des 13. Jahrhunderts* (doct. diss. Würzburg 1962), p. 31-32; J. DEVISSE, *Hincmar archevêque de Reims 845-882, I-III* (Geneva 1975-1976), p. 821-824; M. P. CICCARESE, 'Le più antiche rappresentazioni del purgatorio, dalla Passio Perpetuae alla fine del IX sec.', *Romanobarbarica* 7 (1983), p. 33-76, *ibidem* p. 67-72; latest update C. CAROZZI, *Le voyage de l'âme dans l'Au-delà d'après la littérature latine (V-XIII^e siècles)*, Rome, École Française de Rome, 1994, p. 346-359. *Ibidem*, 'Les Carolingiens dans l'Au-delà', in: *Haut Moyen Age. Culture, éducation et société*, ed. M. SOT (Paris 1990), p. 367-376, especially p. 372-373.

3. Jacques Sirmond (1559-1651) who published the first edition of the *Visio Bernoldi* (*Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis opera duos in tomos digesta cura et studio Jacobi Sirmondi societatis Iesu presbyteri* (Parisii 1645), II, p. 805-809) confused Bernold and his confessor and erroneously stated Bernold was a priest (*De visione Bernoldi presbyteri*). The error has been repeated by Migne, who copied Sirmond's edition in the *Patrologia Latina* (PL 125,

village close to the royal palace of Attigny. It describes how, during a near fatal illness, Bernold, whom Hincmar claims to know personally,⁴ is taken to the other world, where he meets various people who are all suffering terrible punishment for their sins. They plead Bernold to go to their dependents and friends and ask them to offer prayers, alms and masses to relieve their agony.

First Bernold encounters a group of forty-one bishops, suffering alternately from heat and cold, among whom he recognizes Ebo (Hincmar's predecessor), Aeneas (of Paris) and a certain Leopardellus or Leopardus who must probably be identified as Pardulus of Laon.⁵ The bishops implore Bernold to go to their vassals. Then he meets Charles the Bald, wallowing in his own filth and eaten by worms, who confides that he is punished for having disregarded the advice of Hincmar, "who had always been loyal". Charles pleads Bernold to go to Hincmar and ask him for help and tell him that he has in reality always trusted him. The third person Bernold encounters is a certain Jesse,⁶ caught in a huge stone up to his armpits, who wants Bernold to go to his friends. Finally the visionary meets a count, called Otharius, apparently an acquaintance of Bernold and probably a local lord, who after having tried to hide himself in vain, asks Bernold to go to his wife, friends and vassals. In fact Otharius had given silver to one of his vassals, to be offered for his soul, but the faithless man had not carried out the task.

Unique in early medieval vision literature, in between these encounters with the dead, Bernold visits the living: taking leave of the bishops Bernold finds their vassals in a big palace (Attigny?); he meets Hincmar in a church where the

col. 1115-1120) and by numerous historians since. Michel Sot has turned Bernold into a monk ('L'expérience visionnaire et sa fonction dans l'Histoire de l'Eglise de Reims de Flodoard', in: SOT ed. (1990), p. 479-491, especially p. 480).

4. "Nuper in paroecia nostra quidam mihi notus homo, nomine Bernoldus" (par. 1). In the ninth century *paroecia* could still signify diocese.

5. For the identification of Ebo (died 851) and Aeneas (died 870) see CAROZZI (1994), p. 350 and CAROZZI (1990), p. 372. For Pardulus (died 857), see note 11.

6. CAROZZI (1994), p. 357 has identified Jesse as bishop Jesse of Amiens (died 836). This seems rather unlikely, see note 11.

archbishop is just preparing mass, Jesse's friends "on the way" and Otharius' wife, vassals and friends on the "mallus" in Voncq, a place Bernold is clearly familiar with. Bernold thus executes the missions bestowed on him on the visionary level, and not after waking up; in his vision this world and the other world are strangely intermingled. Interestingly, Bernold's visionary missions take immediate effect; when he returns to the supplicants, their situation has much improved, they are healthy and dressed in white, even if no works have been done for them yet in the waking world.

Apart from the encounters with the supplicants and their dependents Bernold also gets to see the so-called "rest of the saints" (*requies sanctorum*), a beautiful place reminiscent of the early christian *refrigerium interim*,⁷ not far from Charles's whereabouts, and a hellish pit full of fire and smoke next to Jesse's stone, where the souls who have no one "working for them" suffer terrible torments. The vision ends rather abruptly with a quarrel over Bernold's soul between a *homo honestus* and a *homo rusticus*. The man of distinction, defending Bernold, takes the upper hand and affirms that the visionary will return to his body and live for another fourteen years. Then Bernold awakens and immediately sends for his confessor, from whom Hincmar claims to have heard the story.

Hincmar concludes his letter with a commentary in which he explains the meaning of Bernold's vision, defends the orthodoxy of the text, among other things by referring to similar stories in Bede, Boniface and Gregory the Great and exhorts his addressees to pray for Charles and to spread the message of the vision to all those in their care.

The *Visio Bernoldi* is one of the so-called "Carolingian political visions", a group of ninth century vision texts in all of which a member of the Carolingian family plays a part. The political and propagandistic purport of these texts have caused many to doubt their authenticity. If some visions, such as the *Visio Wettini* (822), are generally supposed to be based on a

7. The *refrigerium interim*, a sort of 'positive proto-purgatory', is the place where the just after death await the Last Judgment. See J. LE GOFF, *La naissance du purgatoire* (Paris 1981), p. 70-74.

genuine experience, or at least on a popular story, others like the *Visio Caroli Grossi* (888) are obvious forgeries. The authenticity of the *Visio Bernoldi* is highly contested, because the text conspicuously defends Hincmar's own interests.⁸

During the last decade of Charles' reign relations between the king and his once most important and trusted advisor Hincmar had become strained. Hincmar, supporter of the division of the Carolingian realm of 843 opposed Charles' Italian politics and his attempts to obtain the imperial crown. Charles seriously slighted Hincmar by taking on a younger advisor, who was more sympathetic to his ambitions and by asking Hincmar for a new and humiliating vow of loyalty. The *Visio Bernoldi*, written shortly after Charles's death in 877,⁹ seems to be meant to warn Charles' son Louis the Stammerer, whose advisor Hincmar had made himself, to refrain from any such mistakes.

If there is little doubt that Hincmar circulated the *Visio Bernoldi* to press a political point, upon careful analysis of the whole text it seems improbable that Hincmar has actually forged the text. Certain differences between the vision and Hincmar's commentary render more plausible an argument that the text is grounded in fact, but has been tampered with by Hincmar to serve his needs.¹⁰

8. According to LEVISON (1948), p. 242-243, RALL (1937), p. 115, DÜNINGER (1962), p. 32 and H. FUHRMANN ('Fälscher unter sich: zum Streit zwischen Hinkmar von Reims und Hincmar von Laon', in: *Charles the Bald: court and kingdom*. Papers based on a colloquium held in London in April 1979, M. GIBSON and J. NELSON ed., BAR International series 101 [Oxford 1981], p. 237-254, especially, p. 244) the *Visio Bernoldi* is a forgery by Hincmar. C. VON NOORDEN (Hinkmar von Reims [Bonn 1863], p. 353) leaves the question open; CAROZZI (1994) avoids the problem; H. SCHRÖRS (*Hinkmar Erzbischof von Reims, sein Leben und seine Schriften* [Freiburg i.B. 1885], p. 379, and DEVISSE (1975-76), p. 822 claim the text is authentic.

9. See note 35.

10. Firstly, most vision stories only describe a visit to the other world; the works for the supplicants are supposed to be carried out after the awakening of the visionary. Structurally the *Visio Bernoldi* breaks with this literary tradition, which creates a theological and exegetical problem: how can it be that the supplicants are saved before works have been done for them? Hincmar feels obliged to discuss this problem in his commentary and affirms that the salvation is only shown *specietenus*, in images foreshadowing the future as in biblical prophecies. It is unlikely that Hincmar would have invented a story contrary to tradition and orthodoxy, the truth of which he would have to justify

Most historians have focused on the role of the kings in the Carolingian visions, but Cl. Carozzi has pointed out that they are not the only ones who meet disapproval. The visions contain more general criticism on society at large, or on specific social groups, especially the secular clergy. The *Visio Bernoldi* condemns the bishops for meddling too much in politics and for neglecting their spiritual duties, a reproach symbolized by the big palace where Bernold finds their vassals.¹¹ It is not clear what wrong Jesse has committed, but count Otharius seems to be punished for faults relating to his jurisdiction.¹²

Apart from its political content the *Visio Bernoldi* is also of interest for its vivid and colourful depiction of the other world. An important document for the history of the development of purgatory, the text reflects the way people of the Carolingian age thought about the afterlife. The *Visio* indirectly sheds light on the social realities associated with this *imaginaire* of death: the system of *cura pro mortuis* in the form of prayers, alms and masses, which developed in Western Europe from the middle of

later. Secondly, the singular force attributed to the *cura pro mortuis* (see under, p. 113-114) in the vision, for better *and for worse* is less than orthodox. Since Augustine theology taught that only those who deserved it during life, may be helped by works, and only to shorten punishment, not to change fate. However, in the *Visio Bernoldi* fate seems to depend principally on the works, not on personal merit. Theoretically the souls in the pit could still be saved and Jesse can still fall into the pit if no one comes to his aid. However, in the commentary, Hincmar hardly touches on the *cura pro mortuis*, rather he emphasizes man's personal responsibility during life for one's fate after death. Moreover, Hincmar's only work on moral theology (*De cavendis vitiis et virtutibus exercendis* written in 869) is fully orthodox, stresses personal responsibility and does not devote much attention to the *cura pro mortuis*. This is not the place to go into this matter further.

11. This interpretation allows us to identify the second bishop as Pardulus of Laon, who, like Ebo and Aeneas, played an active role in politics. (For Pardulus see DEVISSE [1975-76], p. 67-68). In all manuscripts of the abridged version of the *Visio Bernoldi* (see under), the second bishop is called Pardulus. There is no plausible candidate called Leopardus or Leopardellus. CAROZZI (1994), p. 357 identified Jesse in the stone as bishop Jesse of Amiens, another 'political' bishop, who lead the trial of Louis the Pious in 834. This identification is not very convincing. Jesse died in 836, so Bernold could not possibly have known him and if we assume the *Visio* to be a forgery by Hincmar, who probably did know Jesse, it is hard to understand why Jesse's social status is not indicated. It seems unlikely that Hincmar's audience would have identified Jesse in the stone with Jesse of Amiens so long after his death.

12. CAROZZI (1994), p. 358.

the eighth century on.¹³ The *Visio Bernoldi* shows that this care for the dead was organized along the same personal lines as early medieval society as a whole ; at the same time the vision confirms the existing social order. For medieval people the message must have been painfully clear : social outcasts who have no one to work for them fall into oblivion and end up at the bottom of the pit. On the other hand, Otharius' perfidious vassal also reveals the inherent weakness of a system based on trust and solidarity.

The political and to a lesser extent the socio-religious facets of the *Visio Bernoldi* have been studied before. In this article it is my aim to consider the rather complex textual tradition of the *Visio Bernoldi*, a hitherto neglected aspect of the text, and present a critical edition of Hincmar's letter.

The *Visio Bernoldi* is known in three medieval redactions. I shall try to establish the relations between the different versions and the context in which they were conceived and I shall pose the question which redaction resembles Hincmar's original letter (*H*) most. In the second part of the article, preceding the edition, the manuscripts of the *Visio Bernoldi* will be described.

Three versions

Three versions of the *Visio Bernoldi* exist, which I shall call *A*, *B* and *C* respectively. The non-critical edition of the *Visio* in the *Patrologia Latina*,¹⁴ is based exclusively on one manuscript of version *A*.

A and *B* are independent texts, while *C* is a part of a large historiographical work, Flodoard of Reims' *Historia Remensis*

13. For the history of the commemoration of the dead see : J.-L. LEMAÎTRE, *Mourir à Saint-Martial. La commémoration des morts et les obituaires à Saint-Martial de Limoges du XI^e au XIII^e siècles* (Paris 1989), especially chap.1-3 and M. LAUWERS, *La mémoire des ancêtres, le souci des morts. Fonction et usage du culte des morts dans l'Occident médiéval* (diocèse de Liège XI-XIII^e siècles), unpubl. doct. diss. E.H.E.S.S. (Paris 1992), preliminary chapter for the development before the XIth century.

14. *PL* 125, col. 1115-1120. Migne copies J. Sirmond's edition (see note 3).

*Ecclesiae*¹⁵ (before 953). *A* contains Hincmar's complete letter with both vision and commentary. *B* is preserved in one manuscript only, which breaks off halfway at the introduction of the Jesse figure. (It may however be reasonably assumed that it originally was complete as well.) *B* tells largely the same story as *A* but is written in a more sophisticated style. *C* is a summary of two fragments of the vision only: from the beginning of the letter up to the passage of Bernold and the bishops and the scenes in which Hincmar and Charles the Bald play a part.

None of the versions is completely identical with Hincmar's original text — all contain mistakes — but it will be argued that *A* is closest to *H*.

Version C. Flodoard of Reims

I shall begin with version *C*, most obviously a revision of the original text. *C* consists of two separate fragments in chapters three and eighteen of the third book of Flodoard of Reims'¹⁶ *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*. Flodoard (ca. 893-966), canon, priest and "archivist"¹⁷ of the cathedral of Reims wrote the *Historia* around 953. The *Historia* relates the *gesta* of the bishops of the church of Reims from its foundation up to the author's own time. The third book is wholly dedicated to Hincmar.

15. *MGH SS XIII*, p. 405-600, espec. p. 476, 509.

16. About Flodoard: M. MANITIUS, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur im Mittelalter* (Munich 1923), p. 155-166; P. Chr. JACOBSEN, *Flodoard von Reims. Sein Leben und seine Dichtung 'De Triumphis Christi'* (Leyde and Cologne 1978). For Flodoard's method as an historian: H. ZIMMERMANN, 'Zu Flodoards Historiographie und Regestentechnik' in: *Festschrift für Helmut Beumann zum 65. Geburtstag*, K.-U. JÄSCHKE and R. WENSKUS ed. (Sigmaringen 1977), p. 200-215 and now M. SOT, *Un historien et son église. Flodoard de Reims* (Paris 1993) which came out after completion of this article; on the *Visio Bernoldi*, p. 492-493, 535. On visions and apparitions in the *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*, including the *Visio Bernoldi*: SOT (1990).

17. In this period archives separated from libraries and the office of archivist did not exist yet. It is however clear that Flodoard was responsible for the documents of the cathedral chapter: JACOBSEN (1978), p. 67-68.

Flodoard was responsible for the books and documents of the cathedral and he made use of this material to write his history of the church of Reims. He cites, paraphrases and summarizes numerous charters and letters in the *Historia*, sometimes explicitly mentioning he found them "in archivo Remensis ecclesiae" or "adhuc apud nos".¹⁸ He also inserts various miracle and vision stories, twenty-nine in total, which Michel Sot has listed.¹⁹ These stories are based on oral traditions or on roughly contemporary hagiographical texts, predominantly from the second half of the ninth century.

H. Zimmermann, who has studied Flodoard's historiographical technique, has pointed out that the historian from Reims hardly ever inserts whole texts literally (whether letters, charters or narrative texts), but in most cases only records the general idea and the historical anecdote, leaving out commentaries and interpretations.²⁰

Flodoard recounts the beginning scene of the *Visio Bernoldi* in the context of Hincmar's election and the elimination of his predecessor and rival Ebo.²¹ Ebo had been ousted at the synod of Thionville in 835 because of his role in the deposition of Louis the Pious. After the death of the latter in 840 Ebo returned to Reims, only to be driven away again in 841. However, even after Hincmar's official election at the synod of Beauvais (845), Ebo kept trying to regain his lost see. The emperor Lothar sustained this effort²² to frustrate Hincmar's patron, Charles the Bald.

In 846 Ebo's attempts to decide the matter in his favour failed definitively. The general council requested by Lothar and summoned by the pope did not meet, because the papal legates failed to arrive. Instead, Charles summoned a synod at Paris. Ebo did not appear and was sentenced by default. He died in 851 as bishop of Hildesheim.

Flodoard's arrangement of the material pertaining to these

18. ZIMMERMANN (1977), p. 203.

19. SOT (1990), p. 490-491.

20. ZIMMERMANN (1977), p. 204.

21. FLODOARD, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* III, 3, p. 476. For Ebo's deposition, see DEVISSE (1975-76), p. 72-90 and p. 35-36.

22. DEVISSE (1975-76), p. 72-90 and p. 35-36.

events and the location of the *Visio Bernoldi* are highly suggestive. The opening chapter of the third book describes Hincmar's election at the synod of Beauvais; chapter two relates Ebo's final conviction at Paris and following the account of Ebo's last years and his death in 851 Flodoard inserted the opening scene of the *Visio Bernoldi* as a source for what happened to Ebo after his life on earth. Bernold's vision has a double function. On the one end the text proves the fairness of Ebo's conviction by the earthly judges: God has punished Ebo and thus agrees with their judgement.²³ There can be no doubt that Hincmar's election to Remigius' see is legitimate. On the other hand the *Visio* also serves to save Ebo in the memory of Reims, because Ebo is rescued in the end by Bernold's mission.²⁴

The second part of the *Visio Bernoldi* is inserted in chapter eighteen, which describes the relations between Charles the Bald and Hincmar in his role as political advisor. Flodoard recalls different situations in which Hincmar stood by Charles in word and deed. The excerpt from the *Visio Bernoldi* follows — again very suggestively — Flodoard's account of the insurrection of Charles's son Karloman in 870-871,²⁵ when Hincmar was still Charles's most important advisor. Flodoard informs us that the king called on Hincmar "not only in spiritual but also in worldly matters" and that Hincmar "used to assemble the people against the enemy, and to summon both bishops and counts".²⁶ Here Flodoard is referring to the fact that Charles, upon leaving for the siege of Vienne and making arrangements for the kingdom during his absence, ordered Hincmar to summon a synod to incite the laymen to armed

23. Interestingly, at the very end of the second book where Ebo's term of office is treated, Flodoard has inserted another vision about Ebo, the so-called *Visio Raduini*. This story also reproaches Ebo for spending too much time at the court. For more details, see CAROZZI (1994), p. 351-353.

24. See SOT (1993), p. 492-493.

25. For these events see DEVISSE (1975-76), p. 785-790.

26. FLODOARD, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae* III, 18, p. 509: "Domno vero Hincmaro rex idem non solum de rebus ecclesiasticis, sed et de populo in hostem convocando, ut ipse hoc ageret, mandare solebat, et ipse, accepto regis mandato, tam episcopus quam comites convocare solitus erat."

resistance against Karloman.²⁷ The passage from the *Visio Bernoldi* shows how dearly Charles had to pay for not always relying on Hincmar. The scene further demonstrates that Hincmar fully merited Charles's trust, for it is the bishop who saves the king after his death.

Flodoard and his contemporaries regarded visions as reliable historical sources. These texts elevate something already known through more mundane means to a higher level. Visions offered a divine legitimation for political events and circumstances, situating them in a God-willed order.

The example of the *Visio Bernoldi* is illustrative of the way Flodoard used visions as historical documents. We note that he paraphrased only those parts of Hincmar's letter that seemed significant for the history of the church of Reims. The chosen fragments provide a divine justification for the political fate of Ebo, Hincmar and Charles the Bald within the wider framework of the history of the diocese. Count Otharius from Vongq — if Flodoard knew him at all — must have seemed of no importance in this context. Flodoard also left out the Jesse figure and reduced Hincmar's commentary, which originally constituted almost half of the text, to three lines.

A comparison of the two passages with the long versions *A* and *B* reveals that Flodoard's first fragment follows these rather closely; as in *A* and *B* the story is told in the first person. The second fragment however is set in the third person and Flodoard has abridged the original text much more considerably. The affiliations between versions *C* and *A* on the one hand and versions *C* and *B* on the other hand will be treated in more detail on pages 126 and 127.

27. Flodoard presents this synod as an historical fact, but according to DEVISSE ([1975-76], p. 786-787) it never met. However, Hincmar did correspond with several counts of the realm about the insurrection.

Versions *A* and *B*

A comparison of the two independent versions *A* and *B* demonstrates important differences in style and minor differences in content: the story lines are basically the same. I have already mentioned that neither *A* nor *B* are identical with the archetype *H*, but that version *A* is closer to *H* than *B* is. In my view the deviations in *A* are mostly due to mistakes by the scribe. The author of *B* however seems to have consciously rewritten the original to improve the rustic and repetitious Latin of the original text. I shall illustrate the differences between *A* and *B* with several examples.

Stylistic differences

Version *A* — leaving aside Hincmar's commentary, which is only contained in this version — is written in a simple but lively Latin of limited vocabulary. *A* only uses the word "adiuuare", but *B* varies when this word recurs too often: "quomodo uos possum adiuuare", becomes "quomodo possum tibi esse adiutorio" in *B*. *A* contains several vulgar elements, which in *B* (as in *C*, for Flodoard is a good Latinist) have been changed to more classical forms. Thus *A* uses a vulgar pluperfect: "carnem... manducatam habebant", while *B* circumscribes this perfect form with an ablative absolute "carne... ab illis comesta" and *C* gives the classical pluperfect "qui carnem... absumpserant". The author of *A* uses the vulgar verb "reuenire" in stead of the classical Latin "reuertor" in *B* and *C* (*A* "reueni"; *B* "reuersus sum"; *C* "reuersus" as conjunctive participle). The word "stauus", for goblet or measure is of Frankish origin (*stauus*).²⁸

28. See W. WARTBURG, *Französisch Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bonn 1928-Basel 1966), 17 under "stauus"; W. MEYER-LÜBKE, *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg 1935), p. 680.

The author of *B* frequently varies, rewrites cumbersome constructions and corrects grammatical mistakes :

[A] ...ut quantocius current et confessorem suum uelociter ad se uenire rogarent, quia nisi cito ueniret, ille uiuere non posset. (par. 1)

Accito autem presbytero, antequam in mansionem ubi ille iacebat presbyter ueniret... (par. 1)

...et ambasciaui ex illorum parte quod mihi iussum fuerat. (par. 2)

Et uidi ibi iacere domnum nostrum Karolum regem in luto ex sanie ipsius putredinis. Et manducabant eum uermibus... (par. 3)

Prende illam petram, quae iuxta te est, et eleuato capite, pone illam sub capite meo... (par. 3)

[B] ...ut quantotius current et confessorem suum ad se adcersirent, quia nisi cito adesset ipse morti sine mora concederet. (par. 1)

Accitus itaque presbiter antequam domum infirmi intraret... (par. 1)

...et facta eorum legatione et impetrato pro illis suffragio. (par. 2)

...uidi iacere dumnum Karolum regem nostrum uolutantem se in luto et sanie putredinis suae. Deuorabatur enim a uermibus. (par. 3)

Subpone capiti meo petram que iusta [sic] te est. (par. 3)

Unfortunately the author of *B* doesn't always live up to his own ambitions.²⁹ His efforts to embellish the simple Latin often led to contrived and artificial constructions :

[A] ...quasi a nouo rasi et balneati... (par. 1)

...non... aliud nisi nerui et ossa. (par. 3)

[B] ...quasi rasura et balneis renouati. (par. 1)

...nichil... preter neruos et coxas [coxa = hip bone] (par. 3)

The aforementioned differences between *A* and *B* remain on a purely stylistic level. Occasionally however, the revision produced small differences in meaning as well. We note that *C* at certain points resembles *B* in style and wording, but always remains faithful to *A* in meaning.

29. The ability of the author of *B* must be deduced from his vocabulary and the constructions he uses. The spelling errors and uncertainties in the only manuscript we possess are obviously due to mistakes of the scribe, they are not mistakes in the *B* archetype.

Differences in meaning

The greeting scene at the beginning of the text, which describes the arrival of Bernold's confessor, is one of the most revised parts of the *Visio Bernoldi*. To elucidate the differences between *A* and *B* I shall cite the whole scene in both versions. (*C* shortens the scene considerably, but follows *A* in meaning.)

[*A*]

Accito autem presbytero, antequam in mansionem ubi ille iacuit presbyter ueniret, cum in exteriorem domum intrauit, dixit ille qui iacebat infirmus: "Ponite hic sellam, quia presbyter iam domum istam intrabit." Isdem autem presbyter, mox ut ostium est ingressus ubi ille iacebat, incipiens pro eo orationes dixit: "Dominus uobiscum." Et ille clara uoce respondit: "Et cum spiritu tuo." Dictis autem orationibus dixit presbytero ut sederet secus eum et ait illi: "Attente intellege quae tibi diciturus sum, ut, si ego in corpore manens illa nuntiare non potero quae mihi iussa sunt, tu illa adnunties." (par. 1)

[*B*]

Accitus itaque presbiter, antequam domum infirmi intraret, dixit ille qui infirmabatur: "Mox mihi consessuro presbitero ponite sellam." Qui presbiter ingressus inhabitantes domum salutauit, sed a nullo alio resalutatus quasi non audiretur a solo infirmo est respondendo reueritus. Dictis uero a presbitero orationibus assidenti sibi infirmus ait: "Attende et intellige quae diciturus sum tibi, ut me recedente te superstitute innotescant [*sic*]." (par. 1)

Although these differences are not dramatic, they are not wholly devoid of interest. *A* gives more detail and reports the liturgical formula *in extenso* and in the direct sense, while *B* only refers to these prayers.³⁰ On the contrary, the following phrase in *B*, "sed a nullo... reueritus", lacks a parallel in *A*. *A* and *B* both agree that the confessor is noticed by Bernold before he has entered the house and before the people in the house (the *inhabitantes*) have heard anything. This does not strike the modern reader as necessarily strange or marvellous. Under-

30. "Dominus uobiscum" is the standard greeting formula; "et cum spiritu tuo", the prescribed answer. In *B* "qui presbiter ingressus inhabitantes domum salutauit" may refer to another liturgical greeting that has to be uttered by a priest when entering the house of a sick man to administer the last onctions: "pax huic domui". See A. BLAISE, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout 1966), p. 206-207.

standably Bernold is very keen on the arrival of the priest; he is literally more perspicacious than ordinary people. It seems as if the writer of *B* has tried to exploit Bernold's extraordinary powers of perception to enhance the miraculous character of the story. Unfortunately he has chosen a rather awkward example. According to *A* the priest, when entering the room where Bernold is lying, and uttering the standard liturgical greeting formula ("may the Lord be with you") is answered by Bernold — for whom the priest has come — in the prescribed way ("and with your spirit"). In *B* the priest also receives a response from the sick man only, but "as if the others had not heard him". This seems most curious. A visionary may be more receptive to supernatural messages than ordinary people, but it seems rather absurd that the bystanders in Bernold's house would not notice a priest of flesh and blood. Inversely the fact that Bernold does notice this perfectly common priest hardly contributes to his aura of clairvoyance. *B*'s addition makes the situation improbable and falsely miraculous, whereas *A*'s account strikes us as more true to life.

The scene in which Bernold implores his confessor to listen carefully supplies another change in meaning. We shall cite the corresponding passage in *C* as well, because it clearly illustrates that *C*, while using some typical "*B* words", resembles *A* in meaning.

[*A*] Attente intellege
quae tibi dicturus sum,
ut, si ego in corpore
manens illa nuntiare
non potero quae mihi
iussa sunt, tu illa
adnunties. (par. 1)

[*B*] Attende et intellige
que dicturus sum tibi,
ut me recedente te
superstite innotescant.
(par. 1)

[*C*] [Bernoldus]
...dixit... ut... attenderet
quae dicturus erat, ut, si
ipse superstes illa non
potuisset adnuntiare,
saltem presbiter ea nuntia-
ret.

According to *B* the priest must listen carefully, so that he will be able to retell the story in case Bernold dies. In *A* and *C* Bernold speaks of a situation in which he will stay alive, but will be unable to tell his story. If *B*'s variant seems more likely given Bernold's physical condition, the variant in *A* and *C* is concordant with the content of the story (Bernold recovers and according to the *homo honestus* will live for another fourteen

years) and with Hincmar's commentary: "...ille rediuius ad me uenire non potuit". Did *B* in his urge to render the account more appealing to its audience and to augment its truth value attempt to make the story more logical, just as he tried to emphasize its miraculous quality earlier?

In his description of Bernold's return to the place where he has left Charles, text *A* continues without further explanation: "I went back to the place where lord Charles had been lying, and I met him in a wonderful place" ("Et statim reueni ad locum ubi domnus Karolus iacuerat, et inueni illum in loco lucido"). *B* however corrects the logical inconsistency in text *A*, namely that one place cannot be simultaneously ugly and beautiful:

[*B*] ...statim redii ad locum ubi idem [Ka]rolus sus [*sic*] uermibus iacuerat. Vbi non inuento eo reperi eum in loquo [*sic*] lu[ci]do... (par. 3).

The addition "ubi non inuento" has resolved the lack of specificity of the time and location in which the events take place, so characteristic of dream-like experience.³¹

In the description of the salvation of the bishops *B* seems on the contrary to have neglected certain elements:

[<i>A</i>] Erant iocunda facie, quasi a nouo rasi et balneati, et habebant albas uestitas et stolas et sandalia in pedibus; planetas autem non habebant. Et dixit mihi... (par. 2)	[<i>B</i>] ...erant iocunda [<i>sic</i>] facie, quasi rasura et balneis renouati. Et dixit mihi... (par. 2)	[<i>C</i>] ...inueni eos facie iocundos, acsi a nouo rasos et balneatos, albis vestitos et stolis amicitos atque sandaliis calciatos. Et dixit mihi...
---	--	--

From *A* to *B* via *C* the bishops' attributes diminish. The rather curious phrase "planetas autem non habebant" ("but they did not have chasubles") in *A* lacks a parallel in *C*. In *B* the sandals, cloaks and white clothes have disappeared as well.³²

31. It is unfortunate that we only have half of *B*; it would have been interesting to see whether the writer of *B* has changed the Jesse scene as well. In fact *B*'s logic is limited, for he has not changed the bishops' scene.

32. The fact that *A* explicitly says that the bishops do not wear chasubles might imply that they have been restored to health and well-being but not to their office. The omissions in *B* and *C* may be significant in this respect.

Direction of revision

As stated above, my argument is that *B* is a revision of the original, while *A* is close to the autograph *H*. I contend that *B* made a conscious effort to embellish the original Latin; he attempted to purify the text of some illogical or obscure elements and tried to enhance the miraculous character of the vision. His motive to do so may have been that he considered the language of the original too barbarous for young monks to learn their Latin from, while at the same time appreciating the moral and didactic message of the text.

This status of *A* and *B* respectively may seem probable, but it remains of course to be shown that the converse situation is not the case. Why is it not plausible that *B* is the original and *A* the revision? If this were the case, we should imagine a situation in which the author of *A* *simplified* the language of *B* to make the text more accessible. In fact, a stemma can be drawn for both situations, but there are strong textual and contextual arguments against such an inverse direction of revision.

The *Visio Bernoldi* consists of two main parts: a) the actual story of the vision and b) the introduction and the commentary by Hincmar. We notice that in version *A* the vision story is written in a simple Latin with some vulgar elements, whereas Hincmar's commentary is much more complex. Within these two parts the style is constant, but between the story and commentary there is a change in style.

Unfortunately *B* has only been partly preserved and we do not have the transition from vision to commentary. However, a careful study of the available *B* text reveals sudden changes of style *within* the vision. Sometimes the Latin is more compact and more elegant, other passages, however, turn out to be identical to version *A*. The part from "Ductus de isto saeculo..." up to "...sacras oblationes" (par. 2) for instance, is almost verbatim identical to *A* and follows the very condensed and extensively rewritten "greeting scene" (par. 1). In the following passage, after "sacras oblationes", we find again some variations in wording. In the "Charles' scene" (par. 3) after the

more elegant “subpone capiti” *B* continues with the same cumbersome description as in *A* :

“Subpone capiti meo petram que iusta [*sic*] te est” [grammatically more correct as well as more compact]. Et sic feci. Et addidit [variation of “et dixit”] : “Vade ad Hincmarum episcopum et dic ei, quia ipsius et aliorum fidelium meorum consilio non obaudiui, ideo ista que uides pro culpis meis sustineo [*sic*].” [awkward construction adopted from *H*]. (par. 3)

Obviously some passages have been taken over integrally, while others have been altered and “embellished”. The sudden changes in style within the vision are traces of this revision.

On the other hand, if we assume *A* to be a simplification of the original it seems unlikely that *A* would not have borrowed those constructions in *B* that are simpler and grammatically more correct, rather than turning them into more awkward constructions. An example : the phrase “Subpone capiti meo petram que iusta te est” is not only grammatically more correct but also more straightforward than the alternative in *A*. A second example : in the Carolingian period the term “absolutio” was standard enough to be adopted by *A*. However, *A* does not use the term “absolutio” and it is thus more likely to be an addition by *B*.

Moreover, to suppose an inverse direction of revision makes it difficult to explain why *A* would have left out the forementioned “logical solutions” and the “miracle” in *B*. Someone who is rewriting a text will generally add rather than omit. The *Visio Tnugdali*, for instance, was translated and rewritten several times in the course of the twelfth century, during each stage of revision new social categories were added to those punished in the other world.³³ Hagiographical texts also provide a good example : the number of miracles ascribed to a saint usually do not diminish but increase during the transmission of his or her *vita*.

33. DINZELBACHER (1991), p. 65 n. 129.

Versions *A*, *B* and *C*

On the ground of these arguments it can be reasonably maintained that *A* is indeed closer to *H* than *B* is. The question then remains how *C* is related to *A* and *B*. In other words, of which textual family is *C* a paraphrase? Because Flodoard summarizes and paraphrases version *C* contains of course formulations and words absent in both *A* and *B*. Apart from these original elements, *C* follows *A* in content and in style in most cases. Therefore *C* must have used a text in the *A* branch, probably even *H* itself.³⁴ On the other hand *C* also contains several "typical *B* words" (such as: *supersistere*, *celebrare*, *absolutio*) in the corresponding places in the text. If we do not want to ascribe these similarities to chance, we must assume a certain dependency between *B* and *C*, unless these "*B* words" go back to the original *H* and have disappeared in *A* (which would somewhat weaken the argument for *A* as more original).

If we suppose a more or less direct relation between *B* and *C* it becomes impossible to draw a stemma without assuming that either

- 1) *C* has two sources: a manuscript from the *A* (*H*) branch and a manuscript from the *B* branch

or

- 2) *B* has two sources: *C* and a manuscript from the *A* (*H*) family.

H was written by Hincmar at the end of the year 877.³⁵ Flodoard wrote version *C* around the year 953. The only manuscript of *B* has been dated to the end of the twelfth century. This means that the revision *B* was executed in case 1)

34. In all manuscripts of *C* the second bishop is correctly called Pardulus and not Leopardellus.

35. *Terminus post quem* is mid October 877, when the news of Charles's death reached Francia. *Terminus ante quem* is Hincmar's death, December 21, 882, and supposing the *Visio Bernoldi* was indeed written for Louis the Stammer 879. If Levison (1948), p. 242 was right that the *Visio Bernoldi* is referred to in a letter by Hincmar to Louis of November 877 (SCHRÖRS [1885]), p. 549; 417ng) the *terminus ante quem* can be specified accordingly.

between 877 and 953 ; in case 2) between 953 and the end of the twelfth century.

Both situations are possible. On the one hand, it is likely that in the tenth century the cathedral of Reims owned both versions *A* (*H*) and *B* of Hincmar's text and that Flodoard, who used the material of the cathedral archive for his *Historia*, could have compared both versions. On the other hand, it is also possible, although perhaps less likely, that the author of *B* knew both *A* and *C*. Manuscripts of the *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* began to circulate extensively at the end of the twelfth century, although different authors in the North of Francia already used the work in the late tenth and eleventh century. Moreover, several miracle stories taken from the *Historia* were transmitted separately.³⁶ In case 2) the author of *B* would have known version *C* either from the *Historia* itself or from an excerpt.

Manuscripts of the Visio Bernoldi

1. Manuscripts

Manuscripts of the *Visio Bernoldi* are extremely rare. We only know one complete medieval copy of the text (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 5327, fol. 186v-188v = *p*). This is also the oldest manuscript, dating from the tenth century. A second medieval copy (s. XIII) is incomplete ; it breaks off at the introduction of the Jesse character (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 4087-4100 [= Van den Gheyn 1400], fol. 125r-125v = *b*). We have information about three more medieval manuscripts that are now lost. The first is a manuscript from Lobbes (= *l*), the other two are the *Vorlagen* of two seventeenth century copies made by J. Sirmond and J. Mabillon. Sirmond (Paris, BN nouv. acq. lat. 469, fol. 123r-125v = *s*) copied a manuscript from Hérivaux (= *h*). Mabillon (Paris, BN fr. 17698,

36. JACOBSEN (1978), p. 85-86.

fol. 404v = *m*³⁷) transcribed a text from Saint-Bénigne of Dijon (= *d*).

The extracts from the *Visio Bernoldi* in Flodoard's History of the Church of Reims can of course be found in manuscripts containing this text.³⁸

The different versions of the *Visio Bernoldi* are represented in the following manuscripts.

version *A* : *p*, *s* (*h*).

version *B* : *b*.

version *C* : manuscripts of Flodoard's *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*.

It cannot be established which version manuscripts *l* and *m* (*d*) contained.

2. Description of manuscripts *p*, *b*, *s* and *m*

p = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 5327³⁹

Composite manuscript of saints' lives. Northern France? s. IX-X. Parchment, 205 leaves, 258 × 180 mm (fol. 181r-187v, 236 × 180 mm). Three self-contained units: I fol. 1-24; II fol. 25-170; III fol. 171-205. IIIa fol. 171-180 (quinio),

37. I wish to thank François Dolbeau for pointing out manuscripts *p* and *m* to me.

38. Montpellier, Bibl. de la faculté de médecine 186; Reims, Bibl. Mun. 1606 (= n. 842); Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana C 14; Vaticano, Vat. lat. 5267; Troyes, bibl. mun. 620; Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5209; Vaticano, Reg. lat. 510; Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana E.43. These manuscripts are mentioned by the editors of the *Historia*, partly under old signatures. To this list should be added Epemay, Bibl. mun. 52.

39. Literature concerning fol. 181r-188v: L. DELISLE, *Le cabinet des manuscrits* (Paris 1868-1881) I, p. 315; III, p. 368; B. KRUSCH and W. LEVISON, *MGH script. rer. mer.* VII, I, p. 641 and II, p. 428; *Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste* I-VII, Ch. SAMARAN and R. MARICHAL (Paris 1959-1985) (hence referred to as MSS Datés, France), II, p. 536. BN lat. 5327 is used in the edition of the *Vita Arnulfi* (*MGH Script. rer., mer.* II, p. 426-446). Literature about BN lat. 5327 in general: *Catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques latins conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale de Paris* (Brussels-Paris 1890), II, p. 241-243; L. DELISLE, *Le cabinet des manuscrits* II, p. 448; a very detailed description in: J. GISEL, *Die unmittelbare Textüberlieferung des sog. Pseudo-Matthäus* (Brussels 1981), p. 47-48. This edition of the Pseudo-Matthew makes use of BN lat. 5327.

IIIb fol. 181-205, no regular repartition in quires, fol. 188 is a loose leaf). Part III, which contains the *Visio Bernoldi*, has traces of burning which have made the margins illegible in places. Many different hands. The *Visio Bernoldi* (fol. 186v-188v) is written in the inverse order, from bottom to top and from back to front (starting on fol. 188v, ending on fol. 186v).

Fol. 181r-186r: *Vita sancti Arnulfi* (BHL 689) and a short poem.⁴⁰ Fol. 186v-188v: *Visio Bernoldi*. The *Visio Bernoldi* begins without title on fol. 188v, directly underneath the *De palatio de quo narratur in passione Thomae* (BHL 8139). The *Visio Bernoldi* continues on fol. 187v and fol. 187r and ends on the bottom of fol. 186v. (In this description "top" and "bottom" are meant according to the writing direction maintained in the fragment concerned).

The copy of the *Vita Arnulfi* has been dated s. IX-ex or s. X-in (MSS Datés [France], II, p. 536). The *De palatio* and the *Visio Bernoldi* have been added in a very irregular later hand, which does not recur elsewhere in the manuscript. The text begins on fol. 188, a loose leaf. The dating s. X is sustained by comparisons with the MSS Datés. A dating s. XI seems possible as well.⁴¹

Fol. 203v contains a 8 line long prayer to the archangel Michael and a 10 line long prayer to the apostle Peter, neither of which is mentioned in the existing descriptions. Inc: "Sanctae (*sic*) Michael archangele domini nostri Iesu Christi subueni mihi apud altissimum iudicem, ut mihi peccatori donet remissionem ...", expl: "per eum uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum." Inc: "Sanctae Petrae apostolae (*sic*) electe Dei, tu es confessus Christum filium Dei...", expl: "regnat cum patre et spiritu sancto in secula seculorum amen." (Both prayers are

40. "Ter ternos habuit annos qui scripserat istud obsequium fidei iuuenis Hieronimus infans / Nobilis antiqua procerum de stirpe creatus / Filius hic genitus fulgens ab origine Karoli..." printed by Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits* (Paris 1868 — 1881), I, p. 315; see also III, p. 368. Evidence against his opinion that the copy of the *Vita Arnulfi* and the poem were written by a son of Charlemagne provided in: MSS Datés (France) II, p. 536.

41. See MSS Datés (France), V n° CCXVIII (Saint-Thierry near Reims, s. X); n° CCV (Saint-Arnoul of Metz, s. X-XI); G. I. LIEFTINCK, *Manuscrits datés conservés aux Pays Bas I* (Amsterdam 1964), planche n° 37 (Saint-Martial at Limoges 1023-1025).

written in another hand than the preceding text). Fol. 203v-205r: *Passio sancti Andree* (BHL 428). In yet another hand the text is written upside down and from back to front. It begins on top of fol. 205r (according to the direction of writing in the fragment) and ends at two thirds of fol. 203v. Fol. 205v contains a fragment from the Acts of the Apostles (Act 8, Simon the Magus) and is not mentioned in the existing descriptions. This text has also been written in the inverse order, in yet another hand and is probably a part of a longer text. It is scarcely readable and starts somewhere in the middle of the story: "... issionae ab ecclesiae a deum pro aeo. Cum autem producturus...", expl: "Simonem in medio eorum uel ut signiferum statim hoc modo caepit".

In a first phase units two and three were joined, later unit one was joined to this complex.⁴² Ex libris ("Bibliothecae sancti Amandi in pabula") at the beginning and the end of unit II: fol. 25r (s. XVII) and fol. 170v (s. XIII).

According to L. Delisle the manuscript corresponds with the sixth volume from a series of eight volumes of *vitae*, classed together as no.146 in a twelfth century catalogue of the Benedictine abbey of Saint-Amand-en-Pévèle. This observation is based on the fact that the sixth volume of the series from the catalogue and BN lat 5327 start with the same text (a part from the *Vita Martini*).⁴³ We don't know exactly when units I, II and III were bound together. This information therefore provides an indication only for the provenance of the second unit, which contains the Saint-Amand-en-Pévèle ex libris.

Old signatures: Regius c 4179-3; Library of Le Tellier, archbishop of Reims (died 1710) n° 269.

42. This happened in "an early stage": J. GIJSEL, *Die unmittelbare Textüberlieferung des sog. Pseudo-Matthäus* (Brussels 1981), p. 48.

43. Delisle published the catalogue in *Le cabinet des manuscrits*, II, p. 453, *ibidem* n° 146: "passiones et vitae multorum sanctorum in octo voluminibus", in quibus primae istae sunt: [the sixth volume] "pars aliqua de vita Martini."

b = Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 4087-4100 (Van den Gheyn 1400)⁴⁴

Collection of mainly theological tracts and sermons of Ivo of Chartres and Anselm of Canterbury. Northern France? (Compare MSS Datés [France], t. I, n° CLXXII, Stavelot and especially t. II, n° CCV, Tournai.) S. XII-2.⁴⁵ Parchment, 125 leaves, 245 x 155 mm. The *Visio Bernardi*, incomplete, on fol. 125r-125v. On fol. 1r an index, dated s. XII-ex. This index is a palimpsest. The texts until fol. 124r appear for the most part in this index. The codex may originally have consisted of several self-contained units, which, as appears from the index, have been joined in an early stage. Those texts not found in the index were probably added at a somewhat later date in a manuscript then containing (at least) 125 leaves. The additions can be dated s. XII-ex. The following texts are not mentioned in the index:

- fol. 32v: Litany of the virgin Mary. Inc: "Letania de sancta Maria incipit. Ave per quam orbis lapsi facta est ereptio. Ave per quam..."⁴⁶ The text begins halfway fol. 32v and suddenly breaks off at the end of the page. Fol. 32 is the last leaf of the quire; it seems possible that the scribe continued the text on a leaf of a different quire, which was however not included in the codex.
- fol. 64rv: Letter of Bernard of Clairvaux (*PL* 182, col. 427 n° 238).
- fol. 64v: *Ordo monasticus*, verse. Inc: "Ordo monasticus ecclesiasticus esse solebat", expl: "Spiritualia querere pascua ne moriantur".

44. J. VAN DEN GHEYN, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique* (Brussels 1902), II, p. 327-328; J. GESSLER, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Laurent à Liège au XII^e et au XIII^e siècle* (Tongerlen 1927), p. 39; J. DEVISSE, *Hincmar archevêque de Reims 845-882* (Genève 1975-1976) III, p. 1154; H. SILVESTRE, *Scriptorium* 13 (1959), p. 305.

45. Van den Gheyn erroneously dated the text s. XIII; SILVESTRE (1959), p. 305; K. HAMPE, 'Reise nach Frankreich und Belgien im Frühjahr 1897', *Neues Archiv* 23 (1898), p. 661.

46. This text is not mentioned in Van den Gheyn's catalogue either.

- fol. 97rv : *Cives celestis patriae (de lapidibus)* (RH 3271 ⁴⁷).
- fol. 124v : “ Moyses assumptus ex aqua signum israelitas de mari rubro christianos de babtisma assumptos, debemus intelligere ut cantemus humana ratione non auium uoce, qui docentur sonare quod nesciunt. Non desperemus si uidemus ciues celi agere aliqua negotia Babyloniae ut Ioseph in Egypto Hester uxor regiiis nec continuo gratulemur his quos uidemus agere celestia negotia ”. ⁴⁸
- fol. 124v : a miracle of the virgin Mary (BHL 5357, c.2 ; A. PONCELET, ‘Miraculorum B.V. Mariae’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 21 [1902], p. 299, n° 850).
- fol. 125rv : *Visio Bernoldi*, fragment. The text ends in the middle of the story, just after the introduction of the Jesse character on the bottom of fol. 125v, which is the last leaf of the manuscript. In order to complete the story the scribe would have needed two more leaves.

The miracle of Mary on fol. 124v is written in the same hand as the *Visio Bernoldi* on fol. 125rv. This indicates that both texts were added at the same moment. The short addition at the top of fol. 124v is executed in a different hand.

Up until fol. 64v the manuscript is clearly dividable in quires. A long text of Anselm ends halfway down fol. 97r, followed by the aforementioned *Cives celesti patriae*, which ends in the middle of fol. 97v. Thereafter we find several pen trials. Fol. 97 thus seems to be the last leaf of a quire, or a loose leaf added to this quire, which could not accommodate all of Anselm’s text (fol. 65-97 add up to 8 quires plus one loose leaf).

Fol. 98-125 add up to 7 quires. Fol. 98r-124r contain Anselm’s *Cur Deus homo*. On the three remaining pages of the last quire the short prayer, the miracle of Mary and the *Visio Bernoldi* were added.

According to J. Gessler this manuscript may correspond to

47. RH = U. CHEVALIER, *Repertorium hymnologicum : Catalogue des chants, hymnes, proses, séquences, tropes en usage dans l’Eglise latine depuis les origines jusqu’à nos jours* (Louvain 1892-1921).

48. This text does not appear in Van den Gheyn’s catalogue.

number 97 in the thirteenth century catalogue of the library of Saint-Laurent of Liège.⁴⁹ Gessler bases this assertion on the fact that *b* and the manuscript in the catalogue begin with the same text by Ivo of Chartres. This correspondance is an indication, but does not provide a strong proof.

Old signatures : Societatis Iesu Lovanii, n. 267 Y1.

s = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 469⁵⁰

Collection of transcriptions by Jacques Sirmond. Paper, 158 foliated leaves, 210 x 155 mm. The quires are numbered as well. Both numberings are in Sirmond's own hand. The *Visio Bernoldi* is found on fol. 123r-125v (quire 28), copied from a manuscript from Hérivaux ("ex codice Herivallis").⁵¹ The *Visio Bernoldi* contains some marginal corrections in Sirmond's hand. It is not possible to decide whether these are Sirmond's own corrections or corrections from the *Vorlage*. The same is true for the headings ("incipit uisio Bernoldi de Attiniaco").

Quires 27 and 28 are closely related. They contain texts about Reims, concerning Ebo and Hincmar, all (and as far as indicated the only ones in the collection) copied from a manuscript from Hérivaux. Quires 29 and 30 also contain texts about Reims, copied from a manuscript from Saint-Remi of Reims, now lost.⁵²

49. GESSLER (1927), p. 39.

50. L. DELISLE, *Manuscrits latins et français ajoutés... 1875-1891* (Paris 1891) II, p. 621; A. DE VIJVER, 'Les œuvres inédites d'Abbon de Fleury', *Revue Bénédictine* 47 (1936), p. 125-169; éditions of the *Visio Bernoldi* based directly or indirectly on this manuscript: *Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis opera duos in tomos digesta cura et studio Jacobi Sirmondi societatis Iesu presbyteri* (Parisii 1645); PL 125 (See note 3).

51. Victorins monastery, founded 1130. T. DE MOREMBERT art. in: *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* 137, col. 1466-1467. CAROZZI (1994), p. 346 n. 215 incorrectly identifies *Herivallis* as the monastery of Orval, in present Luxembourg, 125 km north east of Reims. However, the latin name of Orval is not *Herivallis* but *Aurea vallis*; L.-H. COTTINEAU, *Répertoire Topo-Bibliographique des Abbayes et Prieurés I-IV* (Mâcon 1936); lemmata "Hérivaux" and "Orval".

52. P. DESPORTES and F. DOLBEAU, 'Découvertes de nouveaux documents relatifs au polyptique de St-Remi de Reims', *Revue du Nord* 68 (1986), p. 575-604, espec., p. 579-580.

27. fol. 117-122

— fol. 117r-121v: *Appendices ad concilium Ingelheimense anni 840. Apologetici Ebonis forma posterior*. Appendixes to the acts of the council of Ingelheim (840), concerning the reinstatement of archbishop Ebo of Reims (A. WERMINGHOFF ed., *MGH conc 2-2* [Hannover 1908], pp. 799-806. This edition is based on J. Sirmond's transcription).

(fol. 122rv blank).

28. fol. 123-126

— fol. 123r-125v: *Visio Bernoldi*.

(fol. 126rv blank).

29. fol. 127-130

— fol. 127r-129v: "Missorum Hincmari placitum de iuribus sancti Remigii Remensis", inc: "Ordinante Hincmaro archiepiscopo venerunt eius missi...", expl: "... turibulum de auricalco 1 lampadam staguram 1."

(fol. 130rv blank).

30. fol. 131-134

— fol. 131r-134v: Extracts from the polyptic of Saint-Remi of Reims.⁵³

***m* = Paris, BN fr. 17698⁵⁴**

Collection of papers of Dom Jean Mabillon. 482 leaves, paper, various formats. Fol. 403r-404v contain J. Mabillon's notes taken at the monastery of Saint-Bénigne of Dijon (fol. 403r. "Ex Bibl. Benign. "). On fol. 404v Mabillon has copied a fragment of the beginning of the *Visio Bernoldi* from a "codex 8" of Saint-Bénigne (= *d*). This codex 8 must have been incomplete or badly damaged, because the fragment is very short and full of blank spaces. Mabillon has not been able to read the name Bernold and failed to identify the text.

53. See DESPORTES and DOLBEAU (1986), p. 580, 586.

54. H. OMONT, *Catalogue général des manuscrits français*, II (Paris 1898), p. 149-150.

3. Manuscripts of the *Visio Bernoldi* now lost

We have information about three manuscripts that are now lost.

The first is the *Vorlage* from Hérivaux of J. Sirmond's transcription (= *h*), of which Sirmond gives no further description. Given the quire signatures and the content it seems probable that the texts from the quires 27 and 28 in *s* have been copied from the same Hérivaux manuscript. This manuscript almost certainly was lost on October 18, 1632 when fire destroyed the monastery of Hérivaux and in particular its library.⁵⁵

A second manuscript is the *Vorlage* of J. Mabillon's transcription (= *d*). Mabillon refers to this manuscript as "codex 8" of Saint-Bénigne of Dijon. According to the index of the library of Saint-Bénigne compiled in 1653 by Dom Maur Benetot,⁵⁶ the numbering of which Mabillon adopted, this codex contained parts of the Bible ("n° 1-2-3 et seq. Biblici libri; n° 9-10 Bibliorum concordantia"). We have not been able to find out more details about the content and composition of codex 8 in other catalogues of Saint-Bénigne, nor do we know whether it has been preserved.⁵⁷ In any case it must already have been badly damaged or contained a damaged fragment of the *Visio Bernoldi* when J. Mabillon

55. Paris, BN lat. 17020, fol. 167v, 176r, cited in J. DEPOIN, *Hérivaux (canton de Luzarches), notes historiques et archéologiques* (Versailles 1894), p. 23 [= Extrait du *Bulletin de la commission des antiquités et des arts de Seine-et-Oise* (1894)].

56. Catalogue of the library of Saint-Bénigne: Paris, BN lat 13074, fol. 97-98, 99-107, edited by B. MONTFAUCON, *Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova*, II (Paris 1739), p. 1284-1287. Benetot also made more specific observations about several manuscripts, albeit not of codex 8: Paris, BN lat 10395, fol. 55-58 and 13069, fol. 1-3; Dijon, Arch. dép. Côte d'Or 1 H 141.

57. Paris, BN lat. 10395 and 13069 contain no further observations about codex 8. Codex 8 does not appear in other catalogues or descriptions of manuscripts of Saint-Bénigne, mentioned in M.-L. AUGER's article on the library of Saint-Bénigne ('La bibliothèque de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon au XVII^e siècle: le témoignage de dom Hugues Lanthenas', *Scriptorium* XXXIX [1985], p. 234-264). We find nothing in the list of liturgical documents in A.-G. MARTIMORT, *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène. Etude codicologique*, (Città del Vaticano 1978) Studi e testi 279, nor in Chifflet's personal copy with additions of Benetot's catalogue (Ms Berlin Staatsbibl. Philipps 1866 [rec 17], fol. 37-38).

consulted it. The fragment is too short to identify as either version *A* or *B* or as yet another version, because it breaks off before *A* and *B* go different ways.

The third manuscript that we can consider lost is a manuscript that appears as n° 249 in a catalogue of Lobbes from the middle of the twelfth century (= *l*) and which according to the catalogue contained the *Visio Bernoldi* ("Hincmarus scriptum de visione cuiusdam"). We cannot of course discern which version of the text is meant here. Three big fires have destroyed almost the whole library of Lobbes and n° 249 does not appear among the few surviving manuscripts.⁵⁸ According to the catalogue n° 249 referred to one or perhaps several volumes of *miscellanea*.⁵⁹

In the tenth century the library of the church of Reims very likely contained one or more copies of the *Visio Bernoldi*, on which Flodoard based his paraphrase of the text in the *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae*.

4. The place of the *Visio Bernoldi* in medieval manuscripts

We have information about at least five medieval manuscripts containing the *Visio Bernoldi*, of which only two have been preserved. This scant information allows us to make the following observations about the context in which the text was transmitted.

In three out of five cases the *Visio* is found in direct contact with other visions or with texts of a related genre. In *p* the *Visio* is included in a collection of saints' lives; in *b* it has been added together with a miracle of the Virgin Mary. In *l* the *Visio Bernoldi* is found in the company of several poems, religious texts (on fasting: *Questio quare ieiunium*; on the Last Judge-

58. F. DOLBEAU, 'Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XI^e et XII^e siècles', *Recherches Augustiniennes* 13 (1978), p. 3-36 and 14 (1979), p. 191-248. *Ibidem* p. 5 n. 15. The catalogue was written between 1049 and 1158-1160 (*ibidem*, p. 10).

59. F. Dolbeau has published the catalogue and identified the titles as far as possible. For n° 249: DOLBEAU (1979), p. 221-222.

ment : *Signa finis saeculi*) and two other visions : the *Visio Caroli Grossi* and the *Visio Pauli*. The *Visio Bernoldi* follows immediately after the *Visio Pauli*.

In fact, visions are often transmitted with other visions,⁶⁰ which indicates that these texts were considered as an independent genre. We often find visions in the company of miracle stories and saints' lives as well. This is not surprising given the fact that visionaries were often saints, *vitae* frequently contain short visions and visions were generally considered as miraculous or marvellous events. *Visiones*, *miracula* and *vitae* are related genres. In the later middle ages there seems to be a further connection with texts about death and the four last things.⁶¹

In the fourth manuscript of the *Visio Bernoldi h* (Sirmond's *Vorlage* from Hérivaux) the ordering principle seems to have been geographical : the *Visio* is found among texts concerning Reims and the archbishops Hincmar and Ebo.

In the fifth manuscript *d* the *Visio Bernoldi* is found in a Bible.

In two, perhaps even three cases the *Visio Bernoldi* has been added on empty leaves. In *p*, a composite manuscript of saints' lives, the *Visio* will not have stood out ; in *b*, which contains mostly theological tracts and sermons, the text is more conspicuous. About manuscript *d* (the "codex 8" of Saint-Bénigne of Dijon) we only know that it was a Bible, but it seems likely that the *Visio Bernoldi* was added on an empty page here as well.

There are some indications that short religious texts (miracles, *exempla*, visions etc.) could be included in all sorts of manuscripts, also in the absence of content or genre resemblances. The manuscript of the *Annals of Egmond* provides a good example. On empty pages a saints' life, the *Visio Baronti*, the *Visio Lietberti* and visions of the nuns of Oostbroek were

60. DINZELBACHER, *Revelationes*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidentale fasc. 57 (Turnhout 1991), p. 59 ; HOUBEN (1976), p. 36 demonstrates this for the *Visio pauperulae mulieris*.

61. See DINZELBACHER (1991), p. 58-61.

added.⁶² It would be interesting to examine systematically in which kinds of manuscripts visions were most commonly added.

Maaïke van der Lugt
Universiteit Utrecht

62. J. P. GUMBERT, 'Een en ander over het handschrift van de Egmondse Annalen' in: *Heiligenlevens, annalen en kronieken. Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond* G.N.M. VIS, M. MOSTERT and P. J. MARGRY ed. (Hilversum 1990), p. 55-69, espec. p. 58, 62, 65.

EDITION

Sigla

- p* = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 5327, fol. 186v-188v
(s. IX-ex, X-in)
- b* = Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 4087-4100 (Van den Gheyn
1400), fol. 125rv (s. XII-ex)
- s* = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. lat. 469,
fol. 123r-125v (s. XVII)
- m* = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, fr. 17698, fol. 404v
(s. XVII)

The edition contains version *A*, *B* and *C*. Version *C*, edited in the *MGH*, is only incorporated to facilitate comparison. For this version no variants are given.

The edition of version *A* is based on manuscript *s*, with variants in *p*. Deviations from *s* in Sirmond's edition are indicated as well.

Square brackets [] designate omissions in *p*; half brackets [] designate text that has been lost by damage in *p* for version *A* and in *b* for version *B*. It could not be established with which version manuscript *m* corresponded. The fragment is very short and is printed in italics in column *A*. Omissions in *m* apparently not due to text loss are indicated in the notes.

I am responsible for the division in sections.

[A]

[Incipit uisio Bernoldi de Attiniaco]. ^a *Hincmarus episcopus ac* ^b *plebis Dei famulus dilectis fratribus et religiosis* ^c uiris ad quorum *notitiam* ^d haec quae ^e sequuntur peruenerint.

1. *Nuper* ^a *in paroecia* ^b *mea* ^c *quidam* ^d *mihi notus homo, Bernoldus* ^e *nomine, infirmatus, et post confessionem et reconciliationem atque* ^f *sancti olei unctionem* ^h *et corporis Christi ac* ⁱ *sanguinis communionem*, ^l *ingrauescente ualitudine,* ^j *pene* ^k *usque ad mortem peruenit,* ^m *ita ut per quatuor dies nec cibum uel potum capere* ⁿ *uel loqui posset,* ^p *nisi raro signum facere, ut ei aqua daretur.*

Quarto ^q *autem die, hora nona,* ^r *uelut exanimis iacuit, adeo ut non posset in eo sentiri halitus,* ^s *nisi per uices. Qui manum suam mittebat* ^t *ad os illius uel super pectus eius, uix sentiebat in eo adhuc spiritum esse. Rubor*

[B]

Hincmarus episcopus ac plebis dei famulus dilectis fratribus et religiosis uiris ad quorum notitiam haec quae sequuntur peruenerint.

1. *Nuper* in parrochia ^{aa} *mea quidam mihi notus homo, Bernoldus nomine, infirmatus, post confessionem et reconciliationem atque* ^{bb} *sancti olei unctionem et corporis ac sanguinis Christi communionem, ingrauescente ualitudine,* ^{cc} *pene usque ad mortem peruenit, ita ut per quatuor dies nec cibum nec potum capere uel loqui posset, nisi raro significare, ut ei aqua daretur.*

Quarta autem die, hora nona, uelut exanimis iacuit, adeo ut non posset in eo alitus sentiri, nisi per uices. Quicumque manum suam mittebat ad os eius uel super pectus illius, uix sentiebat in eo adhuc spiritum esse. Rubor autem in

[C]

De uisione cuiusdam Bernoldi

De quo postmodum talis ostensa est reuelatio cuidam homini Remensis parrochiae, nomine Bernoldo, qui depressus infirmitate

pene usque ad mortem peruenit, ita ut per quatuor dies nec cibum nec potum capere nec loqui ualeret.

Quarto uero die, hora nona, uelut exanimis iacuit, adeo ut non posset in eo sentiri halitus remansisse, nisi per uices, dum, quis manum mississet ad os eius uel super pectus illius, uix sentiebat in eo adhuc spiritum esse. Rubor illi

A. (Titulus) **a** De uisione Bernoldi presbyteri *ed.* **b** hac *p* **c** religiosi *p,* **d** notiam *s,* *sed habet* notitiam *ed.*

A. 1. **a** ra *Nuper* **m** **b** parthia *p,* **parochia** *m,* *ed.* **c** nostra *s*
d quadam *p* **e** nomine Bernoldus *s* **f** adque *p,* **ac** *m* **g** ci *m*
h iunctionem *p* **i** et *m* **j** ualitudine *s* **k** poene *p* **l** usque *om.*
m *m* peruenerit *s,* *sed habet* peruenit *ed.* **n** acipere *p* **o** nec *ed.*
p possit *m* **q** Quarta *s* **r** hora nona *om. m* **s** alitus *p*

B. 1. **aa** lege *parochia* **bb** lege *atque* **cc** lege *ualitudine*

tamen in facie magnus erat. Et sic iacuit usque ad¹ mediam noctem. Circa uero mediam noctem, apertis oculis, uiriliter¹ uxori^u suae ac circumstantibus dixit, ut quantocius current et confessorem suum uelociter¹ ad se uenire rogarent, quia nisi cito ueniret, ille uiuere non posset. Accito autem presbytero, antequam¹ in mansionem ubi ille iacebat presbyter ueniret, cum in exteriorem domum intrauit, dixit ille qui¹ iacebat infirmus: 'Ponite hic sellam, quia presbyter [iam] domum istam intrabit.' Isdem autem presbyter, mox¹ ut ostium est ingressus ubi ille iacebat, incipiens pro eo orationes,^v dixit: 'Dominus uobiscum'. Et ille cl¹ara uoce¹ respondit: 'Et cum spiritu tuo.' Dictis autem orationibus, dixit presbytero, ut sederet secus eum et ait illi: 'Attente¹ intellege^w quae [tibi] dicturus sum, ut, si ego in corpore manens illa nuntiare non potero quae mihi iussa sunt¹, tu illa adnunties.' Et coepit uehementissime flere, et cum singultibus dixit:

facie eius magnus erat. Et sic iacuit usque ad mediam noctem. Circa uero mediam noctem, apertis uiriliter oculis, dixit uxori suae et circumstantibus^{dd} ut quantocius current et confessorem suum ad se adcersirent, quia nisi cito adesset, ipse morti sine mora concederet. Accitus itaque presbyter, antequam domum infirmi intraret,

dixit ille qui infirmabatur: 'Mox mihi consensuro presbytero ponite sellam.' Qui presbyter ingressus inhabitantes domum salutauit, sed a nullo alio resalutatus, quasi non audiretur, a solo infirmo est respondendo reueritus. Dictis uero a presbytero orationibus, assidenti sibi infirmus ait: 'Attende et intellige quae dicturus sum tibi, ut me recedente te superstite innotescant.'^{ee} Et flens uehementissime^{ff} cum singultu ait:

tamen in facie magnus videbatur. Et sic iacuit usque ad mediam noctem. Tunc uiriliter oculos aperiens et affatus uxorem suam atque circumstantes, iussit, ut quantocius current et presbyterum suum uelociter ad se uenire rogarent.

Accito autem presbytero, antequam intraret ille domum,

dixit infirmus, ut apponerent sellam, quia presbyter iam domum intraturus esset.

Illo uero ingresso, postquam orationem pro eo fudit, dixit, ut sederet iuxta eum et attenderet quae dicturus erat, ut, si ipse superstes illa non potuisset adnuntiare, saltem presbyter ea nuntiaret.

Tunc ergo coepit uehementer flere et cum singultibus dixit:

A. 1. t ante p u uxoris p
B. 1. dd lege circumstantibus
mentissime

v orationes pro eo p
ee lege innotescant

w intellegere p
ff lege uehementissime

2. 'Ductus de isto saeculo¹ ad aliud^a saeculum, ueni in quendam locum, et inueni episcopos XL et unum^{b 2} inter quos cognoui Ebonem, Leopar^rdellum^{1 c} et Aeneam³, pannosos et denigratos, uelut si ustulati fuissent, et squalentes, sicut et alios, ¹et per uices nimio frigore horribiliter cum fletu ac stridore dentium tremulantes,⁴ et per uices calore n¹imio^d aestuantes.

Et Ebo episcopus me uocauit ex^e nomine dicens: "Quia tibi dabitur licentia redeundi ad corpus, precamur te ego et isti confratres nostri, ut adiuues nos." Et ego respondi: "Quomodo uo^fs possum adiuuare?" Qui respondit: "Vade ad homines nostros clericos et laicos, ¹quibus benefecimus, et dic illis, ut p^ro nobis¹ faciant eleemosynas^g et orationes et impetrent pro nobis offerri sacras oblationes." Et ego respondi, quia¹ nescio ubi illorum homines essent. Et ille respondit: "Nos dabimus tibi ductorem qui te ad illos duc¹at." Et dederunt mihi unum

2. 'Ductus de isto seculo ad aliud seculum, ueni ad quemdam locum^m, et inueni episcopos quadraginta unum, inter quos cognoui Ebonem, Leopardum et Aeneam, pannosos et denigratos, uelut si ustulati fuissent^{bb} et spalentes^{cc} et per uices nimio frigore horribiliter cum fletu et stridore dentium tremulantes, et per uices nimio calore ¹es^tuantes.

Et Ebo episcopus uocauit me ex nomine dicens: "Quia tibi ¹d¹abitur licentia redeundi ad corpus, precamur¹ te ego et isti con¹frat¹res nostri, ut adiuues nos." Et ego respondi: "Quomodo posum^{dd} ¹u¹os adiuuare?" Qui respondit: "Vade ad clericos nostros et laicos, ¹q¹uibus benefecimus, et dic illis, ut pro nobis faciant elemosinas et orationes et impetrent pro nobis offerri sacras oblationes." Et respondente me ignorare quo loquor^{ee} quesiti inuenirentur isti suffragatores. "Nos", inquit, "dabimus tibi ductorem qui te ad illos ducat." Et dederunt mi-

'Ductus de isto seculo ad aliud, ueni ad quendam locum et inueni episcopos 41, inter quos cognoui Ebonem, Pardulum et Aeneam, pannosos et denigratos squalentesque, sicut et alios, acsi ustulati fuissent, et per uices nimio frigore horribiliter cum fletu ac stridore dentium tremulantes, per uices autem calore nimio aestuantes.

Et Ebo episcopus me uocavit ex nomine, dicens: "Quia tibi dabitur licentia redeundi ad corpus, precamur te ego et isti confratres nostri, ut adiuues nos". Et ego respondi: "Quomodo vos possum adiuuare?" Qui ait: "Vade ad homines nostros clericos et laicos, quibus benefecimus, et dic illis, ut pro nobis faciant elemosinas et orationes et impetrent pro nobis offerri sacras oblationes." Et ego dixi, quia nescirum, ubi homines illorum essent. Et ille uero ait: "Nos dabimus tibi ductorem, qui te ad illos ducat." Et dederunt mihi ductorem quendam, qui me precessit

A. 2. a aliud p b XLII p, quadraginta et unum ed. c Leoba p
d nimio calore p e per p f laicos et clericos p g eleemosynas faciant p

B. 2. aa lege locum bb lege fuissent cc lege squalentes dd lege possum
ee lege locorum uel loco

hominem, qui^h me praecessit et duxit me ad maximum palatium, ubi multitudo hominum eorumdem episcoporum eratⁱ et de illis episcopis loquebantur. Et ambasciavi ex illorum parte quod mihi iussum fuerat.^l Inde cum ductore meo rediens^j ad locum ubi ipsi erant [episcopi [reueni]]. Et quasi ea iam^k quae postulauerant pro ipsis facta fuissent, erant iocunda facie^l, quasi a nouo rasi et balneati, et habebant albas vestitas et stolas et sandalia in pedibus; planetas autem non habebant. Et dixit mihi praefatus Ebo: "Vides quantum nos adiuuauit tuus missaticus? ^m Usque modo nimis durum custodem et custodiam grauem, sicut uidisti,⁵ habuimus; modo habemus domnum Ambrosium custodem et leuem custodiam."

3. Inde ueni in quendam locum tenebrosam, ad quem^a ex alia parte lux resplendebat de^b uicino loco satis lucidissimo et pulcherrime florido et odorifero, ad

chi unum hominem, qui me praecessit et duxit me ad palatium maximum, ubi multitudo clientelae eorumdem episcoporum erat, et de ipsis episcopis colloquebantur. Et facta eorum legatione et impetrato pro illis suffragio, inde rediens cum ductore meo ad loquum^{ff} ubi episcopos reliqueram reuersus sum. Qui quasi iam ea quae postulauerant pro ipsis facta fuissent,^{gg} erant iocunda facie, quasi rasura et balneis renouati. Et dixit mihi prefato^{hh} Ebo: "Vides quantum nos adiuuit missaticus tuus? Usque modo nimis durum et grauem custodem sicut uidisti abuimus"; modo habemus dumnum Ambrosium custodem et sub eo misericordem custodiam."

3. Inde ueni in quendam locum tenebrosam, ad quem ex alia parte lux resplendebat de uicino loco satis lucido et pulcherrime florido et odorifero. In eo scilicet

et duxit ad quoddam palatium magnum, ubi multitudo erat hominum eorumdem episcoporum, qui de ipsis episcopis inter se loquebantur. Quibus suggesti, quod mihi fuerat iussum ex parte episcoporum. Inde cum ductore meo reuersus, ad locum redii, ubi erant ipsi episcopi, et quasi iam facta fuissent pro ipsis ea quae postulauerant, inueni eos facie iocundos, acsi a nouo rasos et balneatos, albis vestitos et stolis amictos atque sandaliis calciatos. Et dixit mihi prefatus Ebo presul: "Vides, quantum nos adiuuit tua legatio? Usque modo nimis durum custodem et custodiam grauem habuimus, sicut uidisti; modo uero habemus domnum Ambrosium custodem et leuem custodiam."

Venit in quendam locum tenebrosam, ad quem ex alia parte lux resplendebat de uicino loco satis lucidissimo et pulcherrime florido ac odorifero; ibique iacere

A. 2. h quam p i erant p j redientis p k iam ea p l faci p
m missaticus tuus p
A. 3. a atque p b ae p
B. 2. ff lege locum gg lege fuissent hh lege prefatus ii lege
habuimus

eundem locum tenebrosum. Et uidi ibi iacere domnum nostrum Karolum regem⁶ in luto ex sanie ipsius putredinis. Et manducabant eum uermes, et¹ iam carnem illius manducantam habebant, et non erat in corpore ipsius aliud⁵ nisi nerui¹ et ossa. Qui¹ uocans me ex nomine [meo] dixit: "Quare me non adiuuas?" Cui respondi: "Domine,^d quomodo uos possum adiuuare?" Et ait: "Prende^e illam petram, quae iuxta te est, et eleuato capite, pone illam^f sub capite meo." Sicut et feci. Et dixit mihi: "Vade ad Hincmarum episcopum,⁷ et dic ei, quia illius et aliorum fidelium meorum bona consilia non obaudiui, ideo ista quae uidis pro culpis meis sustineo. Et dic illi, quia semper in illo fiduciam habui, ut me¹ adiuuet, quatinus^f de ista [poena sim]^g liberatus, et per omnes qui mihi fuerunt fideles ex mea^h parte postulet, ut me¹ adiuuent, quia, si inde certamen habuerint, cito de ista poena ero liberatus."

loco tenebroso uidi iacere dumnium Karolum regem nostrum uolutantem se in luto et sanie putredinis suae. Deorabatur enim a uermibus. Cuius carne iam ab illis comesta, nichil corporis eius aparebat preter neruos et coxas. Qui uocans me ex nomine dixit: "Quare me non adiuuas?" Cui respondi: "Dumne, quomodo possum tibi esse adiutorio?" Et ait: "Subpone capiti meo petram quae iusta^a te est." Et sic feci. Et addidit: "Vade ad Hincmarum episcopum et dic ei, quia ipsius et aliorum fidelium meorum consilio non obaudiui, ideo ista quae uidis pro culpis meis sustineo.^{bb} Quia ergo in eo semper fiduciam abui,^{cc} adiuuet me de pena ista liberari. Et omnes qui michi fuerunt^{dd} fideles postulet,

ut me adiuuent, quia si absolutioni mee orando institerint, cito de hac pena liberabor."

uidit hunc regem Karolum in luto ex sanie ipsius putredinis et a uermibus edi, qui carnem ipsius omnem iam pene absumpserant, et non apparebat in corpore ipsius aliud nisi nerui et ossa. Qui uocans hunc ex nomine, dixit: "Quare me non adiuuas?" Cui respondit: "Domine, quomodo uos possum adiuuare?" Et ille: "Prende", ait, "illam petram quae iuxta te est, et pone illam sub capite meo." Quo facto, dixit ad eundem: "Vade ad Hincmarum episcopum et dic ei, quia illius et aliorum fidelium meorum bona consilia non obaudiui, ideo ista quae uidis pro culpis meis sustineo; et dic illi, quia semper in illo fiduciam habui, ut me adiuuet, quatinus de ista poena sim liberatus, et per omnes qui mihi fuerunt fideles ex mea parte postulet,

ut me adiuuent, quia, si inde certamen habuerint, cito de ista poena ero liberatus."

A. 3. c aliut p d Domne p e Et ille dixit mihi: Apprehende p
f quatenus p g signum additionis habet p, sed nunc additio non legitur
h me p

B. 3. aa lege iuxta bb lege sustineo cc lege habui dd lege fuerunt

Et interrog^fauⁱ illum, quisⁱ locus esset, unde illa lux resplendebat et tantus odor respirabat. ¹ Qui dixit: "Sanctorum est requies." ⁸ Ego autem¹ uolens^j propius ad illum locum accedere, uidi tantam claritatem et tantam suauitatem tantumque decorem^l, quantum humana lingua dicere non potest. Et uidi ibi multitudinem hominum diuersi^f ordinis^l in albis uestibus collaetantium, et quaedam sedilia lucida, in quibus homines adhuc non sedebant, quibus praeparat^a erant. Et in illo itinere uidi quandam ecclesiam, quam cum intraui, inueni Hincmarum episcopum praeparat^{um} ^k cum clericis reuestitis ut missam cantaret. Et dixi illi hoc quod ei^l domnus noster Karolus mandauit. ^lEt statim reueni ad locum ubi domnus Karolus ^m iacuerat, et inueni illum in loco lucido et sanum corpore^l et indutum regiis uestibus. Et dixit mihi: "Vides quomodo me adiuuauit ⁿ tuus missaticus?"

Et interrogauⁱ, qui^s locus esset locus, unde lux tanta resplendebat, et tantus odor respirabat. Qui dixit: "Sanctorum est requies." Ego autem adpropinquans loco illi, uidi tantam claritatem et tantam suauitatem tantumque decorem, quantum humana lingua dicere non potest. Et uidi ibi multitudinem hominum diuersi ordinis in albis uestibus collaetantium^l et quedam sedilia lucida, in quibus adhuc nullus sederat, sed qu^e in illis sessuris praeparata erant. Et in illo itinere uidi quandam ^{ee} ecclesiam, quam cum intrasem, ^{ff} inueni Hincmarum episcopum paratum cum clericis dealbatis [missae] celebrare misteria. Et dicta ei ^llegatione dumni nostri Karoli, statim redii ad locum ubi idem ^lKarolus ^{gg} uermibus iacuerat. Vbi non inuento eo reperi eum in loquo ^{hh} lucido, sanum corpore indutum regiis uestibus. Et uidens me dixit: "Vides quantum me adiuuit missaticus tuus?"

Cumque interrogasset eum, quis locus esset unde illa lux resplendebat, audivit, sanctorum esse requiem; conatusque propius accedere, vidit tantam claritatem sensitque suauitatem tantumque decorem, quantum humana non potest edicere lingua. Viditque inibi multitudinem hominum diuersi ordinis albis uestibus collaetantium et quaedam sedilia lucida, in quibus nemo adhuc sedebat eorum quibus preparata erant. Et in illo itinere ingressus est ecclesiam quandam, in qua reperisse visum sibi est Hincmarum episcopum, preparatum cum clericis reuestitis ut missam celebraret, dixitque illi hoc quod Karolus ei mandauerat. Statim regressus ad locum ubi eundem regem iacentem viderat, inuenit eum in loco lucido sanum corpore et indutum regiis uestibus, dixitque illi: "Vides, quomodo me adiuuit tuus missaticus?"

A. 3. i respitabat p j nolens p k para p l ei om. s m nos-
ter p n adiuuabit p
B. 3. ee lege quamdam ff lege intrasem gg lege sub hh le-
ge loco

4. In^fde ueni¹ ad quan-
dam^a petram grandem
et altam^b, [et] inueni
ibi hominem [unum] in-
plantatum in eadem
[petra] usque a^d ascell-
las. Qui uocans me
dixit: "Ego sum Ies-
se." »⁹

4. Inde ueni ad quaⁿ
dam petram grandem et
altam, ubi inueni homi-
nem insertum in ¹ea¹ us-
que ad ascellas. Et ut
uocans me dixit "Ego
sum Iesse"^{aa}...

[A]

Vade ad amicos meos et dic illis ut me adiuuent, ¹qua¹tinus de ista petra^c sim liberatus. "Et ego respondi [me] nescire ubi illi homines essent. [Et ille dixit: "Cum hinc perrexeris, inuenies eos in uia." Et uidi iuxta] illam pe¹tram¹ magnam et altam, profundam uallem et puteum teterrimum et aquam nigram quasi pix esset. Et in¹terro¹gaui illum hominem qui^d se Iesse nominauit, quid esset ille puteus. ^c Qui respondit: "Exspecta hic ¹par¹um, et tu ipse uidebis quid sit. Nam me tantum non^f grauat ista poena mea, ⁸ quam sustineo, quantum ¹timo¹r de hoc quod uidebis." Et subito flamma et fumus processit^h de ipso puteo quasi usque ad caelum. Et residente flamma in puteum, et euanescente fumo, erant quatuor daemones, qui multitud¹inem an¹imarum, per¹ quatuor partes diuisas, per ipsum puteum minabant usque ad quandam aquam ni¹mis frigidissimam, sicut animalia minari solent, ut adaquentur. Et dixit ipse Iesse: "Hoc cotidie fa¹ciu¹nt isti daemones, et sustinent istae miserae¹ animae una uice in die, pro quibus nulli am¹icorum il¹lorum laborant. Nam si aliqui laborassent pro illis^k, istam poenam non sustinerent." Inde proce¹dens, obu¹am habui homines conloquentes de praefato Iesse, et dixi illis quae ipse Iesse [eis] ma¹ndauit¹. Inde redii ad praefatam petram et inueni ipsum hominem indutum albis uestibus et sedentem in sede honesta. Qui mihi multas gratias retulit de missatico quem mihi iniunxerat.

5. Inde ueni ad quandam locum et inueni Otharium^a comitem, capillos et barbam [habentem], sed¹⁰ et totum corpus miseria et squalore infectum et nigrum. Qui se abscondere uoluit, ne illum uiderem. Cui dixi: "Domne comes, quid hic facis?" Qui respondit: "Propter mea peccata hic sum et sustineo quae uides. Et iste meus^b custos, qui me hortatus est in uita [mea] illa mala facere quae feci, adhuc hortatur^c ut me absconderem, ne tu me uideres. Sed precor te in amore Dei, uade ad uxorem meam et ad homines^d et amicos meos, et

A. 4. a quendam p b allatam p c pena p d per p e puteum p f non tantum p g mea poena p h processerit p i et p j miserere p k pro illis laborassent p l iniunxerat p, mihi om. s

A. 5. a. Otharium p b mens c p hortatus est p, ortabatur ed. d omnes p

B. 4. aa hic deficit B

dic illis ut pro me eleemosynas faciant et orationes fieri obtineant, ^a ut de ista poena liberer. Et uni homini meo commendaui aurum et argentum meum, quod nemo alius sapuit nisi ego et ille, et adhuc nec ^f unum quidem denarium pro me inde donauit. ” Et uisum est mihi, ^g ut statim fuissem apud Vongum ^h ⁱ in mallo, et dixi suis hominibus et aliis qui ibi ¹ erant, quae mihi iniunxit. Et statim fui in spiritu ad illum locum ubi erat Otharius ^j, et erat quasi a nouo rasmus et balneatus et sanus corpore et albis uestibus ^k indutus, et ille suus custos durus ibi non erat. Qui dixit mihi : ^l “ Vides quantum me adiuuauit ^m tuus missatus ? Et ille meus custos iam de me potestatem non habet. ”

6. Et erat ibi unus homo ualde honestus, qui dixit mihi : “ Tu ibis ^a de isto saeculo ad corpus et stude per eleemosynas et alia bona opera et per bonam uitam, ut, quando huc reueneris, bonam mansionem ¹² habeas. ” Et dixit mihi qualiter pauperes pascerem [et uestrem] secundum [meam] possibilitatem. Et alius homo rustica facie ^b et toruo uultu erat ibi, qui dixit : “ Non hinc ibit. ” ^c Cui ille homo honestus ^d respondit : “ Sic faciet, et per quatuordecim ^e annos ¹³ adhuc ^f in corpore erit, et inde [huc] ueniet ^g. ” Cui ille rusticus respondit : “ Quos tu quatuordecim ^h annos dicis, ego quatuordecim ⁱ dies faciam, et ^j non uiuet amplius usque dum huc reueniat. ” Et ille homo honestus ^k : “ Sic erit sicut ego [dico], non sicut tu, quia ecce hic est suus aduocatus et fideiussor, et tu eris ^l ibi mecum. ” ¹⁴ Sicque petiit sacram communionem. Qua ^m accepta, bibit quasi dimidium ⁿ staupum de uino, et dixit : ‘Modo manducare possem, si haberem.’ Et datus est illi cibus, et manducauit et ab inde conualuit.

7. Ego ^a per quosdam diuulgari haec audiens, quia ille rediuius ad me uenire non potuit ^b, praefatum presbyterum bonae intelligentiae ac bonae vitae, cui ^c haec retulit, ad me accersitur quae scripta sunt mihi ex ordine feci narrare. Vera illa esse credens, quia huiusmodi, et in Libro Dialogorum sancti Gregorii ¹⁵ et in ^d Historia ^e Anglorum ¹⁶, et in scriptis sancti ^f Bonifacii ^g episcopi et martyris ¹⁷, sed et tempore domni ^h Hludouici ⁱ imperatoris ¹⁸ aetate nostra cuiusdam Witino ^j ¹⁹ uiro religioso reuelata relegi. Unde, fratres carissimi ^k, haec relegendes semper pauidi semperque suspecti, dum in hoc corpore sumus, de mansionibus ²⁰ quas exuti corporibus habituri sumus cogitantes, remedia nobis a Deo insinuata atque ^l collata non neglegamus. Et commissos nobis, ac quoscunque adire potuerimus, ^m non neglegere ⁿ commoneamus ^o, quia sic mors cum uenerit uincitur, si antequam ueniat semper timeatur. Pro dom]no quoque nos-

A. 5. e obimeant *p* f me *p*, ne *ed*. g mihi est *p* h Vengium *p*
i quibus *p* j Hotharius *p* k questibus *p* l Quid iam *p* m adiuuabit

p

A. 6. a Tu ibis modo *p* b faci *p* c ibi *p* d honestus omo *p*
e XIII *p* f ad hoc *p* g reueniet *p* h XIII *p* i XIII *p* j quia
p k honestus homo *p* l eras *p* m quae *p* n dimium *p*

A. 7. a Ego autem *p* b patuit *p* c cum *p* d in *om. s*, sed *habet*
ed. e Istoria *p* f cum *p* g Bonefacii *p* h domne *p* i Ludouici
p j VVicino *p* k karissimi *p* l adque *p* m poterimus *ed*. n ne-
legerere *p* o commoueamus *p*

tro quondam rege Karolo, ut ei Dominus bona aeterna conferat, studiosissime^p imploremus, per cuius potestatem nobis bona temporalia contulit.

In quo ex hac uisione duo iudicia Domini perpendere possumus: uidelicet ut cum poenis quas^q sustinebat, etiam ex scientia^r sanctorum requiei^s ut luce resplendente a^l longe, qui^u promereri in corpore positus^v poterat et necdum promeruit, conscientia torqueretur.^w Quemque futura spes aliquantulum refouebat, sicut et nos hortantur^x scripturae,²¹ [ut] sic peccata nostra perturbent, quatinus^y mens in desperationem non^z proruat, sic Dei misericordia^a nos refoueat, ut nullo modo negligentes reddat.

8. Sed [et] pro fratribus nostris, qui nos cum signo fidei in unitate sanctae Ecclesiae praecesserunt,²² dilectionis uisceribus Domini misericordiam^a deprecemur, ut pro solatio illis impenso fraternam nos ad^b inuicem caritate consolemur, sicut scriptum est, frater^c fratrem adiuuat²³ [et] ambo consolentur.^d Illi quidem qui nos praecesserunt, de caritatis^e solatio sibi a nobis impenso,^f et nos de fraternae dilectionis merito a Deo nobis reddendo consolemur.^h Ceterum quod rediuuius ille dixit, quosdam seⁱ prius in poenis,^j et subsequenter^k quasi liberatos^l uidisse, intellegendum aestimo, quia si ea pro illis gesta fuerint quae petierunt, liberatio subsequetur, quae^m specietenus ostendetur.ⁿ Nam et in scripturis saepe futura, quasi iam facta tempore praeterito,^o causa certitudinis dicta legimus, et uisiones prophetarum et aliorum sanctorum, per species diuersas ostensas fuisse cognoscimus. Quia nondum ad hoc peruenimus quod scriptum est, facie ad faciem Domini gloriam specularantes. Nondum enim apparet^p quid erimus. [Et licet nondum appareat quid erimus], spe tamen salui facti sumus.²⁴ Verum, quia mors certa et exitus nostri hora nobis est^q incerta,²⁵ debemus sedula mente ruminare sententiam beati Prosperi^r de uerbis sancti Augustini ex^s scripturae tramite adnotatam,^t quae ita se habet^u: 'Peccata siue parua, siue magna^v, [impunita esse non possunt], quia aut homine poenitente, aut Deo iudicante [plectuntur]. Cessat autem uindicta diuina, si conuersio praeueniat^w humana. Amat enim Deus confitentibus parcere, et eos qui semetipsos iudicant, non iudicare'.²⁶

A. 7. p studiisissime p q culpe quasi p r obientea, obiecta in mg. s, obiecta ed. s requies s, ed. requie, requiei sanctorum p t et luce resplendebat ea p u quam p v positus in corpore p w Forte leg. Videlicet ut cum poenis quas sustinebat, etiam ex scientia requiei sanctorum obiecta ut lux resplendens a longe, quam promereri in corpore positus poterat et necdum promeruit conscientia torqueretur x ortantur p y quatenus p z non in mg. s a spes Dei misericordiae p

A. 8. a misericordia p b ab p c si frater p d fraternam nos ... adiuuat in mg. s e consolabatur p f caritate p g impensa p h lege consolemur i suis p j poenis p k secundum p l illos p m quam p n ostenderet p, ostenditur ed. o praeterita p p apparuit p q ora est nobis p r Prospere p s haec p t adnotata p u habent p v magnam p w praecurrat p

1. Bernold lapses into a coma at the ninth hour. Dinzelbacher erroneously interprets this phrase as the duration of the coma: DINZELBACHER (1981), p. 140.

2. The number 41 (or 42 in *p*) does not seem to have any special significance. 41 does not occur in H. MEYER and R. SUNTRUP, *Lexikon der mittelalterlichen Zahlenbedeutungen* (Munich 1987). The meanings mentioned for 42 do not seem to apply here.

3. Archbishop Ebo of Reims (died 851), probably bishop Pardulus of Laon (died 857), bishop Aeneas of Paris (died 871). See commentary, notes 5 and 11.

4. Mt 8:12, 13:42, 13:50, Lc 23:28 etc.

5. However, this is the first time the *custos* is mentioned.

6. King Charles the Bald (died 877).

7. Archbishop Hincmar of Reims (died 882).

8. See commentary, note 7.

9. Perhaps bishop Jesse of Amiens (died 836), but see commentary, note 11.

10. The suggested antithesis seems to be a corruption.

11. Voncq, a village close to Attigny in the diocese of Reims.

12. Cf. Io 14:2.

13. Cf II Cor 12:2-4, where St Paul speaks of his own visionary experience, which took place fourteen years before.

14. Cf. Lc 23:43. The *homo honestus* seems to be associated with Christ. It is not altogether clear to which person *tu* refers in this phrase. Syntactically the word refers to the *homo rusticus*; the context, however, suggests that *tu* refers to Bernold.

15. I.e. GREGORY THE GREAT, *Dialogi* IV, 37, 5-7 (*SC* 265, pp. 128-130).

16. I.e. BEDE THE VENERABLE, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*. Ch. PLUMMER ed. (Oxford 1896). *Visio Fursei*: III, 19, pp. 164-167; *Visio Drythelmi*: V, 12, pp. 303-310.

17. I.e. BONIFACE, *Epistolae*. M. TANGL ed., *MGH* Ep. sel. (Berlin 1955). Vision of the monk of Wenlock: ep. 10, II, pp. 8-15.

18. Emperor Louis the Pious (died 840).

19. I.e. HEITO, *Visio Wettini*. E. DÜMMLER ed., *MGH* Poetae Latini II (Berlin 1884), pp. 267-275.

20. See commentary, note 13.

21. GREGORY THE GREAT, *Homiliae in evangelia* 32, 8 (*PL* 76, col. 1238).

22. Cf. the commemoration of the dead at the consecration of the host. See J.-A. JUNGSMANN, *Missarum Sollemnia. Explication génétique de la messe romaine* 3 vol. (Paris 1950-1953), vol. III, p. 158-169, especially p. 163.

23. Prv 18:19.

24. Combined citation of I Cor 13:12, II Cor 3:18 and I Io 3:2.

25. Cf Mt 25:13. See also the *Visio Fursei*: during his vision Furse received the order to dedicate his life to prayer and preaching 'eo quod certus sibi exitus sed incerta eiusdem exitus esset hora futura, dicente Domino: "Vigilate itaque, quia nescitis diem neque horam"' ; BEDE, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* III, 19 (ed. cit., p. 164).

26. PROSPER OF AQUITAIN, *Liber Sententiarum ex operibus Augustini delibatarum* CCXI (*CCSL* 68A, p. 306).