



The School at Lyon after Florus' Death

Pierre Chambert-Protat

► To cite this version:

Pierre Chambert-Protat. The School at Lyon after Florus' Death: Investigating a poorly documented milieu. Warren Pezé. Wissen und Bildung in einer Zeit bedrohter Ordnung. Der Zerfall des Karolingerreiches um 900, 69, Hiersemann, pp.307-324, 2020, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 978-3-7772-2024-6. halshs-02054784

HAL Id: halshs-02054784

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02054784>

Submitted on 26 Aug 2020

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Version d'auteur destinée à la plateforme HAL-SHS <[halshs-02054784](https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-02054784)>.
Merci de citer la version publiée dans W. Pezé (dir.), *Wissen und Bildung in einer Zeit bedrohter Ordnung. Der Zerfall des Karolingerreiches um 900*, Stuttgart, 2020 (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 69), p. 307–324.

The school at Lyon after the death of Florus: investigating a poorly documented *milieu*

Pierre CHAMBERT-PROTAT
École française de Rome

Philological investigations on the Carolingian Lyons are both rewarding and frustrating*. On one hand, we can take advantage of the unusual quantity and diversity of direct and indirect material: historical *reports* on Lyonnais events and people, *works* that were written at the time by prominent figures (bishops Leidrat, Agobard, Amolo, and Remigius, and the deacon Florus), and of course *manuscripts*. Today, more than one hundred *codices* are preserved that these prominent figures would have had access to, including those offered by them, or commissioned or annotated by them personally. In addition, there are numerous manuscripts that were copied directly from now-lost Carolingian Lyonnais codices, and mainly those copied by Manno of Saint-Oyen. When cross-referencing these sources, accounting for the fact that sources document history in various specific ways, we can identify and reconstruct other facts, events, and objects that are not recorded or preserved.

These deductions, however, are more accurate when they involve prominent figures, because these individuals are more easily identified. Obviously Leidrat (798–814), Agobard (814–840), Amolo (841–852?), Remigius (852?–875), and Florus (*floruit* c. 825–855) were not alone in Lyon during their lifetimes; nor were they the only people to read or write books. There are difficulties, however, in identifying a given person without a name, work, or hand by which they can be recognised. In addition, scientific literature has a tendency to attribute works to known people, because it is more rewarding to credit someone than to accept the fact that the person who was responsible for the work is unidentified—as the French saying goes, “On ne prête qu’aux riches”.

Prominent figures may be misleading, but they still stimulate and orientate our research on a given *milieu*. However, when Florus died (February 8th, between 855 and 860), followed by Remigius (October 28th, 875) and Manno (August 16th, 893¹), no succeeding prominent figures emerged and we gradually lose our understanding of the Lyonnais *milieu*. Who was present? What did they do? Is there even anybody doing anything? How can we investigate these subjects? In this

*This paper benefited greatly from the insights provided by the other contributors of this book, in particular Annette Grabowsky and Frédéric Duplessis.

¹ A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK, “Mannon de Saint-Oyen dans l’histoire de la transmission des textes”, *Revue d’histoire des textes* 29 (1999), pp. 169–243, at p. 213.

paper, I suggest some frameworks that can carefully and reliably assess the situation in the school at Lyon after the death of Florus.

Memory and legacy

Firstly, we should investigate how the memory of prominent figures was nurtured in the periods that followed their deaths. These figures had friends and colleagues who survived them and who could have been the first advocates of their legacies. Florus himself might have played this role for Leidrat or Agobard,² and Amolo certainly did for Agobard, as he extensively used his predecessor's work.³

As we enter the “post-heroic age”,⁴ Manno is an important example. The archbishop of Lyon was the *ex officio* abbot of Saint-Oyen (later Saint-Claude, in the French Jura), and Manno was acting as his provost. In the 840s he was already copying Lyonnais manuscripts, notably Florus' works, for the abbey of Saint-Oyen.⁵ When Manno died in 893 he left a remarkable personal library of 99 to 115 manuscripts to the abbey.⁶ However, of the texts we know that Manno transferred to the abbey, none were his personal works. Instead, in what seems to have been a deliberate effort to provide the abbey with a high-quality library collection, he copied the Fathers and other books that were useful for the monastic community. Among these were a number of Carolingian Lyonnais works: Agobard's *De fidei veritate* (MS Montpellier, BU Fac. Médecine, 404), Florus' monumental augustinian *Expositio* on Paul's epistle (MS Troyes, BM, 96), Florus' *De fide* and *De pascha* collections (MSS Montpellier, BU Fac. Médecine, 308 and 157), a number of Florus' *carmina* (MS Paris, BNF, lat. 2832), and some minor patristic works of Florus (MS Troyes, BM, 2405 and Manno's lost codex XCIII). Most of these texts are only known by Manno's copies. During his time Manno endeavored to transmit the Lyonnais Carolingian scholarship to his abbey. He succeeded in doing this, and even surpassed his objective as his copies have allowed this scholarship to be preserved until the present-day.

In addition to the prominent figure Manno, we have to take into account Florus' anonymous collaborators, especially the hands *A*, *B*, and *C* who produced Lyon, BM, 484, the original MS of

² L. HOLTZ, “Leidrat, évêque de Lyon (798–814): ses livres, son écriture”, in *Amicorum societas. Mélanges offerts à François Dolbeau pour son 65^e anniversaire*, ed. by J. ELFASSI, C. LANÉRY, and A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK, Firenze, 2013 (Millenio Medievale, 96; Strumenti e Studi, 34), pp. 315–344, at pp. 328–329; see also L. HOLTZ, “La fidélité de Florus envers Agobard: témoignage de deux manuscrits”, in *Lyon carolingien: autour d'Agobard (816–840)*, ed. by F. BOUGARD *et al.* (Turnhout, 2019: HAMA 36), p. 119–130.

³ S. BOBRYCKI, “An early medieval epistolary Libellus and the question of originality: Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS. 717”, *Scriptorium* 71, 2 (2017), pp. 153–173, at pp. 160–161; C. HERBERS-RAUHUT (ed.), *Amolo von Lyon: Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum*, Wiesbaden, 2017 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, 29) (henceforth *MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch.* 29), at pp. XXI, 133.

⁴ I will define the Lyonnais “heroic age”, by lack of a better qualification, as the period from the beginning of Leidrat's episcopacy (798) to the end of Remigius's episcopacy (875).

⁵ A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK, “Florus de Lyon et le manuscrit Roma Bibl. Vallicelliana, E 26. Notes marginales...”, in *La Tradition vive. Mélanges d'histoire des textes en l'honneur de Louis Holtz*, ed. by P. LARDET (Paris, 2003: Bibliologia, 20), pp. 307–316, at pp. 309–316; Pierre CHAMBERT-PROTAT, “Le manuscrit Montpellier 157 de Mannon de Saint-Oyen et la collection *De pascha* de Florus de Lyon”, *Revue bénédictine* 128, 1 (2018), pp. 95–141, at pp. 96–99, 117.

⁶ TURCAN-VERKERK, “Mannon de Saint-Oyen”, at pp. 169–203, esp. pp. 176–178.

Florus' augustinian *Expositio*, with Florus himself and under his general supervision.⁷ *B* in particular seems to have been a close companion of Florus in his last years. He worked with Florus to copy Paris, BNF, lat. 2859, the original MS or the author's copy of Florus' treatises on predestination (all written between 850 and 855). Evidence suggests that Florus died leaving unfinished projects and a vast treasure of *schedulae*. His collaborators seem to have felt unworthy or unable to pursue his work, and these documents were secured and stored to ensure their survival.⁸

Evidence also suggests that Florus' augustinian *Expositio* spread rapidly and widely in the last decades of the 9th century, but it is unclear whether he conducted this "publishing process" himself. Even if he started this process shortly before he died, the responsibility would have fallen to his collaborators after his death: people who knew him, his methods and intentions, and how to work from the overly complicated original MS, Lyon 484.

In the few decades following Florus' death his work was copied and disseminated, and this is how his name survived. Florus did not sign his work; he did not write prefaces or dedicatory letters,⁹ nor insert his name in the titles of his works. This discretion partly explains why he was quickly forgotten, even though some of his works became sought after in the Middle Ages. His name only appears in a few MSS indirectly connected to him: in the title of his *Adversus Iohannem* in a s. IX^{med} copy¹⁰ from Northern France, Paris, BNF, lat. 12292, f. 3r, in some titles of his augustinian *Expositio* in a copy commissioned by Hartmut of Saint-Gall (872–883), Sankt-Gallen, SB, 279, p. 2; 281, p. 4, and 280, p. 61, and in Manno's description of his codex LXXXVIII, our Paris lat. 2832.

The name of Florus also seems to have had some value in Reims and Auxerre. A short *quaestio*, written after 882 and recently edited by Pezé from a Reims MS, reports what seems to be an oral teaching of Florus on a verse from the Epistle to the Hebrews, next to Hincmar's and two anonymous opinions.¹¹ Duplessis also drew my attention to an interesting addition in the MS Bern, BB, 357, f. 13v.¹² In this glossary, produced in Auxerre or Ferrières, s. IX^{3/4}, a short text explaining the difference between *seraphim*, *cherubim* and *seraphin*, *cherubin* was added by a contemporary hand at the end of the letter F and before the letter G, under an uncommon *·FL^s·* abbreviation.¹³ The text appears to be drawn from Florus' *De actione missarum*: Florus took it from a previous *expositio*

7 L. HOLTZ, "Le manuscrit Lyon, B.M. 484 (414) et la méthode de travail de Florus", *Revue bénédictine* 119, 2 "Florus de Lyon" (2009), pp. 270–315, at pp. 292–301.

8 P.-I. FRANSEN, "Description de la collection grégorienne de Florus de Lyon sur l'Apôtre", *Revue bénédictine* 98 (1988), pp. 278–317, at pp. 278–279; L. HOLTZ, "La tradition lyonnaise d'Eucher de Lyon et le manuscrit Paris, BNF, lat. 9550", *Revue d'histoire des textes*, N.S. 3 (2008), pp. 135–200, at pp. 178–179.

9 A remarkable exception is Florus's letter and poem to Eldradus of Novalesa, ed. separately in E. DUMMLER, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, t. 3, Berlin, 1899 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae, 5), p. 340–343 and E. DUMMLER, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, t. 2, Berlin, 1884 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Poetae, 2), pp. 549–550.

10 I abbreviate "beginning, middle, end of the IXth century" as "s. IX^{in, med, ex}" and, e.g., "first third" or "second quarter of the IXth century" as "s. IX^{1/3}" and "s. IX^{2/4}".

11 W. PEZÉ, "Une *quaestio* carolingienne sur la pénitence citant Hincmar de Reims et Florus de Lyon", in *La fabrique des sociétés médiévales méditerranéennes. Les Moyen Âge de François Menant*, ed. by D. CHAMBODUC DE SAINT PULGENT and M. DEJOUX, Paris, 2018 (Histoire ancienne et médiévale), pp. 341–350.

12 <https://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/de/bbb/0357/13v>

13 "Sciendum quoque quod cherubim et seraphim... neutrali genere et plurali numero accipiamus." Paul DUC, *Étude sur l'Expositio Missæ de Florus de Lyon, suivie d'une édition critique du texte* (Belley, 1937), p. 113. I have benefited from the unpublished edition and study recently provided by D. VANIER, "*Sequitur in mysterio*". *L'opusculum de actione missarum de Florus de Lyon*, Mémoire de licence canonique présenté au *Theologicum* de l'Institut catholique de Paris, 2017, t. 1, p. 34.

missae that Remigius of Auxerre also used for his own work,¹⁴ but the abbreviation under which the text is written here, and one variant reading, both indicate that the passage was taken from Florus' work rather than another source.¹⁵

Our knowledge of Agobard is mainly based on one single codex, Paris, BNF, lat. 2853; of his 26 known works, only six were transmitted by other witnesses.¹⁶ Although the activity of this vigorous Lyonnais bishop overlaps with the imperial reign of Louis the Pious (814–840), this collection of his works was not copied in Lyon before the end of the 9th, more likely in the 10th century.¹⁷ Amolo's *Liber de perfidia Iudaeorum* is also preserved in a codex dated from the same period, Montpellier, BU Fac. Médecine, 237.¹⁸

Thus, although modern research on the Carolingian Lyon, following Charlier's invention of Florus's "personal manuscripts",¹⁹ understandably focuses on these direct witnesses, the vast majority of Carolingian Lyonnais productions known today are s. IX^{ex} or s. X copies, not manuscripts contemporary to their authors.

Copying texts implies selectivity; a given *milieu* copied what it judged of interest, and tended to neglect what it deemed as useless. Although the names of the people who commissioned or copied these s. IX^{ex} and s. X exemplars are unknown, the existence of the copies suggests a general interest in the memory and legacy of the prominent forebears in this Carolingian Lyonnais post-heroic age. In this context, it should be highlighted that some of Florus' canonical works were not only *copied* in s. IX^{ex}–X manuscripts, but they were actually *reused* in s. IX^{ex}–X canonical collections. For example, his *De electionibus episcoporum*²⁰ (MSS Albi, BM, 41; Paris, BNF, lat. 2449; Troyes, BM, 1064; Troyes, BM, 1406), and both his antijudaic collections *De fugiendis contagiis Iudaeorum* and *De coercitione Iudaeorum*²¹ (Troyes, BM, 1406).

14 J.-P. BOUHOT, "Fragments attribués à Vigile de Thapse dans l'*Expositio missae* de Florus de Lyon", *Revue des Études augustiniennes* 21 (1975), pp. 302–316, at pp. 305–310.

15 Remigius has, after the ancient *expositio missae*, "sciendum autem": Florus changed "autem" for "quoque" with regards to the way he integrated this passage amongst other explanations of the same words. The passage also has parallels in Bede and Jerome, but phrasings differ completely: see BOUHOT, "Fragments attribués à Vigile de Thapse", p. 312.

16 A summary can be found in *Agobard de Lyon: Sur les Juifs; Sur les superstitions*, M. RUBELLIN (intr. and annot.), N. BÉRIOU *et al.* (trans.) (Paris, 2016: Sources chrétiennes, 583), at pp. 71–72.

17 See Lieven VAN ACKER (ed.), *Agobardi Lugdunensis Opera omnia*, Turnhout, 1981 (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 52), at p. LI; the MS doesn't show in B. BISCHOFF[†], *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, ed. by B. EBERSPERGER, t. III "Padua – Zwickau", Wiesbaden, 2014 (henceforth *KFH* III), expected between Nos. 4254 and 4255.

18 Ed. in *MGH QQ zur Geistesgesch.* 29.

19 C. CHARLIER, "Les manuscrits personnels de Florus de Lyon et son activité littéraire", in *Mélanges Emmanuel Podechard* (Lyon, 1945), pp. 71–84 (reprint in *Revue bénédictine* 119, 2 "Florus de Lyon" [2009], pp. 252–269); C. CHARLIER, "La Compilation augustinienne de Florus sur l'Apôtre: sources et authenticité", *Revue bénédictine* 57 (1947), pp. 132–186.

20 On Florus's text, see K. ZECHIEL-ECKES, "Florus von Lyon, Amalarius von Metz und der Traktat über die Bischofswahl. Mit einer kritischen Edition des sog. *liber de electionibus episcoporum*", *Revue bénédictine* 106 (1996), pp. 109–133. On its re-use in s. Xⁱⁿ, in the Lyonnais region and a context focusing on pontifical law, see R.E. REYNOLDS, "A Ninth-Century Treatise on the Origins, Office, and Ordination of the Bishop", *Revue bénédictine* 85 (1975), pp. 321–332, and A. FIREY, "The Canon Law Book of Jerome, Bishop of Belley, A.D. 933", *Revue bénédictine* 107 (1997), pp. 88–129. The latter, in particular, shows how it was reused, along with (among others) early Clunisian material, for a Belley bishop ordained in 933.

Although remaining anonymous, these scholars of the s. IX^{ex} and s. X were interested in the same topics as their predecessors, suggesting they were also highly educated. Although they arguably did not compose as many “original” texts as their predecessors, they certainly did not stop producing books. Thus Bischoff considered a number of preserved codices as “late” Lyonnais productions, such as:

<i>IX. Jh., ca. 3. Viertel</i>	Lyon, BM, 605 (Augustine) Lyon, BM, 628 (homilies)
<i>IX. Jh., ca. 4. Viertel</i>	Lyon, BM, 447 f. 106–152 (Isidore)
<i>IX. Jh., ca. 3. Drittel</i>	Lyon, BM, 448 f. 150–178 + Lyon, BM, 447 f. 1–105 (Isidore) Lyon, BM, 473 (homilies)
<i>IX./X. Jh.</i>	Lyon, BM, 1502 (Murethach)
<i>X. Jh., 1. Hälfte</i>	Lyon, BM, 472 (Augustine) Lyon, BM, 481 (Smaragdus)

Books of the bishops

While book production persisted, book ownership evolved towards the end of the century. Lyon is fortunate to have preserved several books bearing the name of their Carolingian owner or sponsor. Four manuscripts still bear Leidrat’s autographed *ex-dono*: Città del Vaticano, BAV, Pagès 1, f. 1v; Lyon, BM, 466 + Paris, BNF, lat. 152 f. 21–25, on the Paris MS f. 25v; Lyon, BM, 599, f. 1r; and Lyon, BM, 608, f. 1r. One book shows a s. IX^{med} librarian entry stating that Leidrat’s *ex-dono* was erased by a thief (Lyon, BM, 610, f. 1r). Judging by some annotations, two others almost certainly belonged to Leidrat (Paris, BNF, lat. 11709; Lyon, BM, 402). Other preserved codices, which have lost the front or back leaves bearing their ownership marks, might have also been part of Leidrat’s collection.²²

As Holtz explained, Leidrat’s *ex-dono* formula only seems generic:

Leidrat licet indignus tamen episcopus istum librum tradidi ad altare sancti Stephani.

“I, Leidrat, although unworthy yet a bishop, carried this book to St Stephen’s altar.”

The choice of words, “*istum librum tradidi ad altare*”, may refer to a liturgical ceremony in which the offered book or books may have been physically carried and presented on the cathedral’s altar. What is certain is that, after Leidrat’s example, it became a tradition for the bishops of Lyon to refer to the altar when offering books. Agobard’s known codices were “*oblatis ad altare sancti Stephani*” (Lyon, BM, 471, f. 1r; Paris, BNF, lat. 1622, f. IIIr; and a Book of Gospels which disappeared in Modern Times²³); and the same wording is carried on by Amolo (Lyon, BM, 462, f. 1v) and Remigius (Lyon, BM, 463, f. 1r; and Lyon, BM, 609, f. 1r).

²¹ B. BLUMENKRANZ, “Deux compilations canoniques de Florus de Lyon et l’action antijuive d’Agobard”, *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, 4^e série, 33 (1955), pp. 227–254 and 560–582; K. ZECHIEL-ECKES, “Sur la tradition manuscrite des *Capitula... de coertione iudeorum*: ou Florus de Lyon au travail”, *Revue bénédictine* 107 (1997), pp. 77–87.

²² L. HOLTZ, “Leidrat, évêque de Lyon”, at pp. 320–321.

²³ D. DE COLONIA, *Histoire littéraire de la ville de Lyon*, t. 2 (Lyon, 1730), p. 126.

At some point during the same period, the Lyonnais scholar *milieu* started using an original heptasyllabic tercet referring to books:

Sit utenti gratia, / Largitori venia, / Fraudanti anathema.

“Grace be with whom uses it; mercy for whom offered it; and curse on whom defrauds it.”

The tercet follows Remy’s *ex-dono*, by the same hand, in Lyon, BM, 463, f. 1r; but it also followed Agobard’s *ex-dono* in his now lost Book of Gospels. In addition, Paris lat. 11709 shows, f. 225v, a *probatio penna* “sit utenti / sit utenti gracia lar” written by a similar hand to that who repeated Leidrat’s personal signature on f. 1r, “Leydrat licet indignus tamen episcopus”. These elements, the “oblatus ad altare” mention referring to the gift of a book, and the heptasyllabic tercet, are thus distinctive of the Lyonnais Carolingian *milieu*.

The book offerings of these four consecutive bishops, covering a period of about 75 years, represent the spine of Lyon’s Carolingian library: they materialise and document the Lyonnais scholarship that was continuously sponsored and sustained by the bishops through its “heroic age”. But after 875 this trail suddenly vanishes: there is not a single MS bearing an *ex-dono* of Remy’s successor Aurelian, although his bishopric lasted twenty years, or any of his successors for a long time.

It is feasible that books bearing their *ex-dono* may have existed but have been lost; only one MS with Amolo’s (\approx 10 years as bishop) *ex-dono* and only two with Remy’s (\approx 25 years) have been preserved. However, it is strange that so many MSS produced in the Lyonnais *milieu* in the s. IX^{3/4} or s. X have been preserved, without showing a single trace of the bishops’ largesse towards the Cathedral’s library. At this stage, the hypothesis that such MSS existed and were lost cannot be accepted, *a priori*, over the hypothesis that these bishops continued to offer books but no longer sought recognition for their actions the way their forebears did.

The Lyonnais book culture

Although the “Lyonnaise *ex-dono*” stops documenting the bishops of Lyon after Remy, lower-positioned clerics took over and expanded, both in time and space, this trail of Lyonnais legacy. During the “heroic age”, the personal copy of deacon Florus’s treatises on predestination shows an anonymous entry, “Ad altare sancti...”, in which “Stephani” has been later erased and replaced by “Martini” when the MS was transferred to the abbey of Île-Barbe (Paris, BNF, lat. 2859, f. 2r). Although this *ex-dono* does not seem to have been written by Florus himself, its atypical anonymity may be linked to Florus’s, a man who steadfastly did not sign his productions and strived to withdraw from his own productions.

The Lyonnais *ex-dono* also documents the offerings of two Lyonnais clerics that, in spite of the cultural significance of their gift, left no other trace in history.

Paris, BNF, NAL 1740 is part of a s. VIII^m Old Testament, in which five folia (ff. 193–197) were replaced by the same copyist who wrote Leidrat’s Lyon, BM, 599.²⁴ On an originally blank page between Judges and Ruth (f. 225v), one or several hands have repeated:

²⁴ E.A. LOWE, *Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts prior to the Ninth Century*, t. V “France: Paris” (Oxford, 1950), No. 691; *KFH* III, No. 5113a.

- *in clumsy uncial*: AD ALTARE SCI
- *in diplomatic minuscule*: <a>d altare st
- *in a very clumsy minuscule*: Ad al|tare sci Ste|fani ut sit in | munus²⁵

In the lower inner corner there is a more specific entry, in clumsy capitals:

ISTE LIBER ES DANIELE CERICE SCI |

ISTE LIBER EST DANIELE CLERICE SCI | STEFANI EPISCOPATÚ BONUM ||²⁶

It is surprising to observe the owner of such a manuscript having so little proficiency in writing or in the Latin language; but the abilities to read and write are not necessarily connected. His clumsiness also makes it difficult to date his hand, which could be from the s. IX or the s. X. Our unknown Daniel could have inherited the book, before he decided to offer it to the Cathedral: thus, some time could have passed between the copying of the s. IXⁱⁿ ff. 193–197 and the codex being offered to the Cathedral. It should also be noted that the name Daniel does not appear in the list of Lyon’s cathedral clerics, in Reichenau’s *Liber Confraternitatum*,²⁷ which dates back to Agobard’s bishopric. This absence, although it does not provide proof, may indicate that this cleric belonged to this institution at a later date.

A clearer case is that of Paris, BNF, lat. 1546, the only witness of an invaluable Late Antique document, the lengthy Acts of the AD 411 Council of Carthage where Catholics and Donatists confronted each other. Copied in the s. IX^{2/4} Lorsch,²⁸ this codex later made its way to Lyon, judging by the *ex-dono* (f. 1r):

*Liber oblatas ad altare sci Stephani,
Voto Fulcherii canonici.*

Although he was much more experienced than Daniel in the art of writing, the canon Fulcherius is not better known, but his hand definitely belongs to the s. X.

Leidrat was a close friend of Alcuin and Charlemagne. His c. 810 report to the Emperor shows us the concrete actions he undertook in Lyon after he was appointed bishop. In particular, he mentions two schools—a *schola cantorum* and a *schola lectorum*—, describes the skills of his students, and adds that he promoted the copying of books.²⁹ Even if his work was not a foundation but rather a *reformatio*, third-party evidence documents his personal significance, both actual and symbolic, in Carolingian Lyon’s culture. The persisting *motif* of the “*liber oblatas ad altare*” shows how familiar the Lyonnais educated clerics were with Leidrat’s personal books, and how strongly they related to this founding figure. This familiarity is witnessed by the *probationes penna* that echo Leidrat’s *ex-dono* in Lyon 599 f. 1r or Paris lat. 11709 f. 1r, and by the care with which a s. IX^{med} librarian tried to repair the loss of the authentic *ex-dono* in Lyon 610. After they were educated with these books in this particular *milieu*, people in turn tended to donate their own books using the

²⁵ Wrongly in L. DELISLE, “Notes sur quelques manuscrits du baron Dauphin de Verna”, *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes* 56 (1895), pp. 645–690, at p. 654: “Rudoltus sancti Stefani. ut sit in motus”.

²⁶ Wrongly in DELISLE, “Notes sur quelques manuscrits”, at p. 654: sancti¹] sancto || daniel²] danyele || stefani] stephani || episcopatus] episcopatus.

²⁷ MS Zürich, Zentralb., Rh. hist. 27, f. 60v (p. XCIV); ed. P. PIPER, *Libri confraternitatum Sancti Galli, Augiensis, Fabariensis*, Berlin, 1884 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Necrologia Germaniae, supplementum), at p. 257.

²⁸ KFH III, No. 4026, after B. BISCHOFF, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften* (Lorsch, 1989²), pp. 112–113.

²⁹ Leidrat, *epist. ad Carolum regem*, ed. E. DUMMLER, *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, t. 2, Berlin, 1895 (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae, 4), p. 543, l. 3–10.

same formula. This was a reflection of their education and probably, at least for some, a deliberate sign of recognition and a tribute to their mother library.

Another result of this familiarity with the Lyonnais Cathedral books lies in the *probationes penna* repeating (part of) the heptasyllabic tercet, as in Paris lat. 11709, f. 225v (see above). A late s. IX hand also wrote the words “Fraudanti anathema” as a *probatio penna* on MS Vaticano, BAV, Reg. lat. 632, f. 107r: Bignami-Odier’s statement that this copy of Orosius’ history “has been written by Florus for a great part” cannot be agreed with,³⁰ but the copyist was educated in a Lyonnais milieu,³¹ and a late Middle Ages *ex-libris* on f. iv shows that the MS belonged, at least at that time, to the Lyonnais abbey of Saint-Martin d’Ainay.

The verses that a certain Richirannus added on MS Lyon 463, under Remigius’ *ex-dono* and the heptasyllabic tercet (see above), and at the end of the same codex, should also be taken into account. In his first nine verses (f. 11r,a) devoted to his reading of this very codex, Richirannus calls it a “Christi et Stephani protove testis ipse libellus”, echoing Leidrat’s conception that the book belongs to the church’s dedicatee.³² Richirannus prides himself on using Greek words and *scinderatio phonorum*, and the poem consisting of nearly a hundred verses that follows (f. 11r,b and 170v–171r) plays with Virgilian reminiscences.³³ This is a testimony to Lyonnais culture towards or after the end of the “heroic age”. Unfortunately the hand is difficult to date because of its clumsiness (s. IX^{2/3}? s.X?) and several verses are now difficult to decipher because they have been erased by rubbing of the parchment.

Florus, Daniel and Fulcherius perpetuated the ritual formula within the library at Lyon’s cathedral, and it is interesting to observe the diffusion of this particular trait of Lyonnais education to other regions. Thus Manno, after having copied a number of Lyon’s MSS for the abbey at Saint-Oyen, adapted the Lyonnais *ex-dono* formula to his new position: his books are offered “ad sepulchrum sancti Augendi” (Montpellier, BU Fac. Médecine, 157, f. 11r; Paris, BNF, lat. 2832, f. 11r; Troyes, BM, 96, f. 11r; Troyes, BM, 2405, f. 2v; Lons-le-Saunier, AD Jura, 12/F/2, f. 11r).

At the turn of the tenth century, Paris, BNF, lat. 1452 also illustrates the same phenomenon. This very neat s. Xⁱⁿ codex contains: a) ff. 1–152, a copy of the (now lost) *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* that Florus of Lyon had annotated;³⁴ and b) ff. 153–202, a copy of the so-called “*Collectio Lugdunensis*”: MS Saint-Petersbourg, BNR, F. v. II. 3 + Berlin, SBB, Phill. 1745, a unique juridical collection from s. VII^{ex} Burgundy that was notoriously annotated by the same Florus.³⁵ This codex

30 J. BIGNAMI-ODIER, “Encore la main de Florus de Lyon dans un manuscrit de la reine Christine à la Bibliothèque du Vatican ?”, *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire* 63, 1 (1951), pp. 191–194, at p. 193.

31 For Bischoff (*KFH* III, No. 6725) the MS was produced in “(Südliches?) Frankreich, IX. Jh., Ende”. It would be interesting to collate Orosius’ text in this witness and in Florus’s personal selection, in MS Vaticano, BAV, Vat. lat. 3852, f. 31r–50v.

32 Ed. K. STRECKER, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini*, t. 4, fasc. 2–3 Berlin, 1923 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Antiquitates*, 4, 2–3), at p. 1065–1066, No. XXII.

33 I have to thank Fr. Duplessis again for highlighting the importance of this piece. Richirannus’ longer poem remains unpublished, I believe; this is an excellent case study for somebody with more expertise in Carolingian poetry than I am able to provide.

34 P. CHAMBERT-PROTAT, “Un thésor abrégé de tout ce que les Saints Peres ont écrit sur les Epistres de S. Paul ? Quelques faits, réflexions et questions sur le grand œuvre de Florus”, in *Les Douze compilations pauliniennes de Florus de Lyon. Un carrefour des traditions patristiques au IX^e siècle*, ed. P. CHAMBERT-PROTAT, F. DOLVECK and C. GERZAGUET (Rome, 2016: Collection de l’École française de Rome, 524), pp. 13–57, at pp. 43–44, 54–55.

35 ZECHIEL-ECKES, “Sur la tradition manuscrite des *Capitula*...”; K. ZECHIEL-ECKES, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist. Studien zur Persönlichkeit eines karolingischen »Intellektuellen« am Beispiel der*

of indisputable Lyonnais origin was quickly taken out of the city to the Massif Central, as this *ex-dono* shows (f. 2r):

*Liber oblatuſ ad altare ſanctae Mariae Anitiensis eccleſiae,
dono Adelardi eiſdem ſedis epiſcopi.
Sit utenti gratia, largitori venia, fraudanti anathema!*

We know nothing of Adelard, who only appears as biſhop of Le Puy (Anitium) in two charters from c. 925.³⁶ His *ex-dono*, however, may be ſeen as evidence that he was of Lyonnais culture: he might have been ſchooled there in the s. IX^{ex}–Xⁱⁿ, a time when ſchools in Lyon are not documented otherwiſe. His ordination as a biſhop illuſtrates how the Lyonnais *milieu* remained a *vivier* of the eccleſiaſtical *élite*³⁷.

A Lyonnais alumnus, Maiolus of Cluny

Later in the s. X, Maiolus of Cluny provides an excellent illuſtration of the Lyonnais education. Born around 910, he became a monk at Cluny in 943–944, as well as the abbey’s *armarius*; he was elected abbot ten years later and he held his poſition for about forty years, until his death in 994.

He did not write anything himſelf, but books were an important part of his life and legacy. A number of manuſcripts were produced in Cluny under his rule,³⁸ ſome of which have been key documents in the hiſtory of texts and libraries throughout the later Middle Ages.³⁹ Maiolus’s example diſpels the general idea of a dark and illiterate s. X.

The links Maiolus had with Lyon appear to have been personal and professional. Firſtly, his only *ex-dono* that we know of repeats the Lyonnais formula inherited from Leidrat⁴⁰—in fact, it is the lateſt known occurrence of this formula:

*Liber oblatuſ ad altare ſancti Petri Cluniensis coenobii,
ex voto domni atque reverentiſſimi Maioli abbatiſ.
Si quiſ illum a iamdicto loco abſtraxerit, ſeu furtim abſtulerit, ſit anathema, maranatha.
Et dicat omniſ populuſ: Fiat, fiat, fiat! Amen, amen, amen!⁴¹*

Auseinandersetzung mit Amalarius (835–838) und deſ Prädeterminationſtreitſ (851–855), Stuttgart, 1999 (Quellen und Forſchungen zum Recht im Mittelalter, 8), pp. 167–169.

36 H. FRAISSE, “Adalard et Hector, évêques du Puy (915–926)”, *Tablettes hiſtoriques du Velay* 4 (1873–1874), pp. 411–422.

37 See alſo (*ſupra* n. 20) the way Floruſ’s ſo-called *De electionibuſ epiſcoporum* haſ been reuſed in pontifical law collections ſuch as Jerome’s of Belley.

38 M.-C. GARAND, “Copiſtes de Cluny au temps de ſaint Maieul (948–994)”, *Bibliothèque de l’école deſ chartes* 136 (1978), pp. 7–36.

39 See for example P. PETITMENGIN, “Cinq manuſcrits de Saint Cyprien et leur ancêtre”, *Revue d’hiſtoire deſ textes* 2 (1972), pp. 197–230 or V. VON BUREN, “Ambroſe de Milan dans la Bibliothèque de Cluny”, *Scriptorium* 47 (1993), pp. 127–165.

40 In 1685 Mabillon already noticed the ſimilarities between Manno’s and Maiolus’s *ex-dono* (*Itinerarium Burgundicum*, poſthumouſly publ. by V. THUILLIER, *Ouvrages poſthumes de D. Jean Mabillon et de D. Thierry Ruinart*, 3 vol. [Paris, 1724], t. 2, p. 22).

41 Paris, BNF, NAL 1438, p. 308.

This discrete use of a Lyonnais formula finds a concrete corroboration in the Clunisian book production of Maiolus's time: several manuscripts were copied from exemplars that certainly came from Lyon's cathedral library, since they showed Florus's very specific annotations. For example, Paris, BNF, NAL 1437 (Ambrose, *In psalmum 118*);⁴² NAL 1454 (Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate*).⁴³

In contrast to the case of Adelard of Le Puy, Maiolus' link with Lyon is documented. After he died in 994, his cult as a saint spread extremely quickly, which immediately triggered the writing of bio/hagiographies.

Although hagiographical, the *Vita Maioli* do nevertheless contain biographical information which can be confirmed by third-party documents.⁴⁴ Maiolus was native to Provence but his parents had to flee from the Saracens when he was still a child. They went North to Mâcon (a suffragan diocese of Lyon) and Maiolus joined the local cathedral's canonical school. Then, as Maiolus's chosen successor Odilo explained, he went to Lyon because he wanted to receive the education provided there by a certain Antonius:

Iuvenili iam imminente aetate altiora et potiora in divinis, acriora in humanis studiis et graviora non distulit attentare, et ideo per utramque exercitatus doctrinam, non timuit accedere Lugdunensem "ad aram":⁴⁵ deinde apud hanc urbem, "philosophiae nutricem et matrem"⁴⁶ et quae totius Galliae ex antiquo more et Ecclesiastico iure non immerito retineret arcem, Anthonium virum eruditum et prudentem in liberalibus studiis habere voluit praeceptorem. Postea vero multo magis exempla sequutus Anthonii illius magni et solius Christi discipuli, quam studia istius Anthonii seculari professione Philosophi.⁴⁷

Antonius is otherwise unknown to us. Did he actually exist? Many details in this short account are typical hagiographical *motifs*, and the literary echoes that are raised by the name Lyon have little to do with the realities in Lyon in the s. X^{1/2}. Nevertheless, a hagiographer does not write at random: they choose what to recount, and how they will do it—and what not to recount.⁴⁸ The anonymous author of the short *Vita Maioli* BHL 5180, for example, does not say anything specific about Maiolus's education, and quickly moves to the point where Maiolus accomplishes his first miracles and, from being a canon in Mâcon, becomes a monk in Cluny.⁴⁹ Hagiographical requirements may have led Odilo to state that Maiolus was highly educated (although hagiography can accept "holy

42 C. CHARLIER, "Une œuvre inconnue de Florus de Lyon: la collection *De Fide* de Montpellier", *Traditio* 8 (1952), pp. 81–109, at pp. 101–102; K. ZECHIEL-ECKES, "Eine neue Arbeitshandschrift des Diakons Florus von Lyon: Der Kommentar des Ambrosius zum CXVIII. Psalm (Cod. Firenze, Bibl. Med. Laur., Plut. XIV. 21)", *Revue bénédictine* 119, 2 "Florus de Lyon" (2009), pp. 336–370; P. CHAMBERT-PROTAT, "Deux témoins d'Ambroise sur le psaume 118 et leur ancêtre", in *The Annotated Book. Early Medieval Practices of Reading and Writing*, ed. M. TEEUWEN and I. VAN RENSWOUDE, Turnhout, 2017 (Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy, 38), pp. 647–672.

43 P.-I. FRANSEN, "Notes marginales de Florus dans un manuscrit de Cluny", *Revue bénédictine* 109 (99), pp. 148–153 (although many of his observations and conclusions need to be revised).

44 D. IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati. Recherches sur les sources hagiographiques relatives à saint Maieul de Cluny (954–994)*, Paris, 1988, e.g. (on Maiolus' parents and family possessions in Provence) p. 118–120.

45 Juvenal, *Satyræ*, I, 44: "Aut Lugudunensem rhetor dicturus ad aram", that is, in the original context, one who takes a big risk: he is compared with someone who would walk barefoot on a snake.

46 Odilo draws this phrase from Isidorus' description of Athens, "mater liberalium litterarum et philosophorum nutrix" (*Etym.* 14, 4, 10).

47 Odilo of Cluny, *Vita Maioli*, BHL 5182: in *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, ed. M. MARRIER and A. DU CHESNE (Paris, 1614), col. 282C–D (= *PL* 142, col. 948–949). On this *Vita* see IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati*, pp. 34–40.

48 IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati*, pp. 311–313.

ignorance”), but nothing compelled him, however, to say that Maiolus went to Lyon: if he was making-up details as he wrote, his fictional young Maiolus could have been wholly educated in Mâcon, or he could have gone to Auxerre, a centre which strongly influenced the Clunisian *milieu*. Nothing compelled him either to be as specific as to name a master. He also uses several very laudatory expressions when referring to Lyon, which could be seen as merely a way of raising the status of Maiolus, but he also used the phrase “mother and nurse of philosophy” in another text, again as an epithet of Lyon, so it seems to be his personal feature to associate this epithet with this city in particular.⁵⁰ He also does not say “quidam Antonius”, as he could have done if he did not know this figure. Thus, the school at Lyon probably had a good reputation, and a master Antonius did teach there in the s. X^{1/2}. Further information on this figure, his works and legacy, may be found in unpublished and/or unnoticed sources.

Without third-party witnesses it is difficult to assess the accuracy of details in the hagiographical sources; but I think the anonymous author of the *Vita BHL* 5179 is mistaken when he describes Antonius as the head of the Lyonnais Benedictine abbey of Île-Barbe:

Per idem tempus Lugduni Antonius quidam bonis pollebat moribus, in philosophia satis eruditus, quem virtus et religio insule Barbarensi prefecerat cenobio. Hoc vir Dei quorundam relatu comperto, quia nimio discendi fervebat desiderio, Lugdunum perrexit eiusque magisterio se ad erudiendum commisit. Cuius multum convaluit, non modo doctrina, verum moribus et vita. Predicta quidem tunc civitas omnes excellebat sibi propinquas tam religione virtutum quam studio liberalium artium. Offensa namque sapientia que propter se ipsam tantum appetenda est, quorundam lucris turpibus, multorum indisciplina vita, omnium postremo tepide se appetentium inhonesta desidia, preceptorum inopia intercedente, priorumque studiis pene collapsis, huius nostre exitialiter perosa regionis, Lugduni sibi aliquamdiu familiare consistorium collocavit. Ibi quas dicunt disciplinarum liberalium peritia quasque ordine currere hoc tempore fabula tantum est, eo usque convaluit ut quantum ad scholas publicum appellaretur citra marini orbis gymnasium. Et ut aliquid rationis adferre videar, eo id argumento colligimus, quod quisque artium profitendarum adficeretur studio, non ante professis inscribi merebatur quam huc explorata diligentia examinatus abiret. Cui rei satyricus quoque adstipulatur qui, ut exempli circumstantia res eluceat, primo sui operis libro acriter diuque in impudicos invectus, fert eos conscientia frequentati sceleris perinde pallescere, “Ut Lugdunensem rhetor dicturus ad aram.”⁵¹ Ita claret hanc sapientibus et palmas et nomina olim fuisse largitam. In ea itaque urbe, ut iam diximus, cum philosophos virosque audiret ecclesiasticos, divina inspirante gratia, omnes suos precessit emulos sapientia. Fecunditas eloquentie gravitate tunc componebatur sapientie. Ex materia huiusce compositionis vas esse cepit electionis.”⁵²

At first sight, this account of Maiolus’s time in Lyon seems much more developed than Odilo’s. But the text does not state anything specific: the good reputation of Lyon is painted in very vague terms, which does not give us any tangible information on scholarly life in s. X Lyon. And with

49 *Vita Maioli*, BHL 5180: *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, col. 1765–1767; see IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati*, pp. 20–29 and 147–148.

50 Lyon is described as “philosophiae quondam mater et nutrix” in Odilo’s *Epitaphium Adelheidis imperatrici*, BHL 63, ed. G. H. PERTZ, *Scriptores*, t. 4, Hannover, 1841 (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, 4), at p. 640, l. 14. I could not find any other instances of this expression in sources prior to s. XII.

51 Same literary reference as in Odilo’s *Vita*, see above n. 45.

52 *Vita Maioli* BHL 5179, I, 4: ed. IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati*, pp. 185–186.

good reason, since the majority of it—the text composed in roman—is borrowed from Heiric of Auxerre’s *Miracula sancti Germani*.⁵³ This account can be seen as a s. IX^{3/4} “artist’s view” of the s. V Lyon, a view which, in turn, draws on a s. I literary reference.

After stating that Antonius was the abbot of the Île-Barbe, the *Vita* also states that Maiolus was drawn to Lyon because “said city prevailed over all its neighbours.” This shows that the author had no direct knowledge of Lyonnais geography: the abbey of Île-Barbe is deliberately isolated, about 6 km from the early medieval city on a small island upstream on the Saône. Either the author knows that Maieul was schooled in the city and assumes that the abbey is in the city, or he simply associates the Lyonnais abbey he knows with his literary knowledge of the city’s reputation. Either way, he does not seem to realise that the two elements can not be assimilated to one another.

In this context, I believe that our author rightly *knew* about Maiolus’s Lyonnais education and his master Antonius, as Odilo did, because these were facts. But then, because Maiolus later became a monk and abbot, he wrongly *assumed* that he had been educated in an abbey, the Île-Barbe—and accordingly, Antonius had to be the abbot. But, at the time, Maiolus was a canon at the cathedral in Mâcon; after his time in Lyon, he took up a good position at the local church⁵⁴ and only later turned to monasticism.

During this period, the abbey of Île-Barbe was probably splendid; it had been restored by Benedict of Aniane, with whom Leidrat had worked and travelled. It certainly had a library, and maybe also a school, but the fact remains that we have no direct account of them during this period. In contrast, the library, schools and masters of the cathedral, in the few decades before, are widely documented. Even if we assume that the schooling activities decreased at the cathedral towards the end of the century, the library would have maintained its position. The books and teaching material were at the cathedral. This is where famous masters could have attracted promising students, such as a young canon Mâcon. Again, the MSS provide evidence that Maiolus was familiar with the cathedral’s library, “libri oblatis ad altare sancti Stephani”, and Florus’ “personal manuscripts”.

In the general framework of Carolingian Lyon’s legacy to cultural history, Maiolus holds a position somewhat similar to both Adelard of Le Puy and Manno of Saint-Oyen. Like Adelard, he had access to Lyonnais exemplars and had them copied for his own library; he was educated in Lyon and rose to a lead position in the s. X church. Like Manno, he did not occasionally choose a MS, but he orchestrated a significant *translatio textuum* from Lyon, unveiling the accumulated treasures of its Carolingian “heroic age”, making its contribution to cultural history concrete and real.

Conclusions

What did actually occur in the Lyon’s schools in the s. IX^{ex}–X? To obtain precise data for an accurate viewpoint is challenging. Numerous studies need to be conducted on the MSS of the time

⁵³ *Acta Sanctorum mensis Iulii*, t. VII (Anvers, 1731), p. 267A (=PL 124, 1209C–1210A); see IOGNA-PRAT, *Agni immaculati*, pp. 124–126.

⁵⁴ Odilo, *Vita Maioli* BHL 5182, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, col. 282D: “A quo [Matisense Episcopo] humiliter invitatus [est Maiolus], consultu clericorum et civium, ut in eadem Ecclesia non dedignaretur administrare archidiaconatus officium.”

to investigate how the interests and methods of this *milieu* evolved after Florus's death. Despite current lack of knowledge, however, two divergent patterns can be observed.

Firstly, books were being produced, texts were being copied, and people were being schooled and educated. Nothing indicates a significant decrease in the production of books at the end of the s. IX. On the contrary, the s. X was a key moment in the transmission of Ancient texts, and also (and maybe even more so) in the transmission of Carolingian scholarship. Many productions of the "heroic age" (in Lyon, roughly 798–875) would have simply been lost if there had been no interest in them during the s. IX^{ex}–X, and these productions had not been copied or diffused during the s. IX^{ex}–X. As such, this production is a testimony to the persistence of scholarship. But this production is also not plain and simple copying: these people researched texts, rearranged them, made collections of them, reworked them, and adapted them to their new needs, as Florus and his contemporaries did in their own time.

Secondly, it is striking to see how these people worked in silence. This is one of the main reasons why it is difficult to identify them, to follow and study them through time. The bishops of Lyon, Leidrat, Agobard, and Amolo, wrote treatises and letters which document their insertions into political networks and religious debate, but we do not know of any writings by Remigius and his successor Aurelian. Bishop Adelard of Le Puy might have been a fine jurist, but he is only known by three mentions of his name, so it remains impossible to determine the rough duration of his bishopric or to study his person or actions. There might have been a famous master Antonius in s. X^{1/2} Lyon, but there are no preserved works of his, so we cannot confirm he even existed.

Even prominent figures remain in the shadows. Manno of Saint-Oyen spent a large amount of time copying texts and building a personal library of a hundred codices, eventually making him a major actor in the history of texts. But he does not seem to have ever composed any new writings of his own: we have no treatises, no prefaces, no letters, nothing from which we can draw information about him, his origins, his life, his thinking, or his actions. Similarly, Maiolus of Cluny can also be called a major actor in Europe's cultural history and he never wrote anything. He ruled over an abbey for forty years which he made one of the most important abbeys in the West; Clunisian charters of his time are preserved by the hundreds; but not one sermon or short letter of his own has been preserved.

This phenomenon can be partly explained by the loss of documents, and by the fact that fewer studies were conducted on this period than for the preceding decades. But this does not explain how we have no information on the scholars, when the fruits of their scholarship—the MSS—have been preserved. I would argue that these generations really were more discreet than the few generations before them. Many elements indicate that Florus desired discretion unless he was pushed onto the scene, as in the Amalarius crisis. For his time, this behaviour stands out as a personal option, atypical and strange. But in the s. IX^{ex}–X, discretion seems to have been the typical behaviour. In fact, the very common rhetoric of humility may have concrete consequences if people do not take it as merely a *topos*, but actually believe it. Scholars with such a belief may genuinely think their work is not worth their forebears' work, and their names not worth being mentioned next to their forebears' names. If such a personal conviction happened to be shared among a scholarly *milieu*, posterity would be left with all the fruits of its scholarship, but little or no personal information on the actual scholars—and this is an accurate description of the known documentation regarding Carolingian schools in Lyon after Florus's death.