<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Paying Attention to Dreams in Early Medieval Normative Sources (400 900) : Countering Non-Christian Practices or Negotiating Christian Dreaming?

Keskiaho, Jesse

2020-02

Keskiaho, J 2020, 'Paying Attention to Dreams in Early Medieval Normative Sources
(400 900) : Countering Non-Christian Practices or Negotiating Christian
Medieval Europe', vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emed.12391>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/338646>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/emed.12391>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

This is the accepted version of the following article: *Paying attention to dreams in early medieval normative sources (400–900): countering non-Christian practices or negotiating Christian dreaming?*, which has been published in final form at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/emed.12391>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Wiley Self-Archiving Policy [<http://www.wileyauthors.com/self-archiving>]

Paying Attention to Dreams in Early Medieval Normative Sources (400–900). Countering Non-Christian Practices or Negotiating Christian Dreaming?*

Abstract: Early medieval Christian cultures found accepted and important roles for dreams and visions, while at the same time perpetuating learned traditions commending suspicion of dreams and warning of the dangers of the wrong kinds of dreams. This article examines prohibitions of the heeding or interpretation of dreams and their transmission in early medieval normative sources (canonical collections, penitentials and royal and episcopal capitularies). It argues that such prohibitions were less likely related to any non-Christian practices involving dreams than they were motivated by a need to define conceptual places for Christian dreaming between concerns about dreams arising from patristic writings, chiefly those of Gregory the Great, and the importance of dreams in Christian cult and thought.

Stories of dreams and visions had important functions in early medieval cultures. Saints were said to communicate with the faithful in dreams and were told to have received guidance and reassurance through them. Narratives of the dreams and visions of even ordinary men and

* I am grateful to Rosamond McKitterick, Yitzhak Hen, Matthew Hoskin and Jaakko

Tahkokallio for their comments on various versions of this article, to the anonymous readers for their constructive criticism, and to Marios Costambeys for his perceptive remarks on the final version. All remaining failings or omissions are naturally my responsibility.

women were used in arguing religious or political points.¹ On the other hand, the religious importance of visions, as well as biblical and patristic warnings about the potential of demonic influence behind them, provided ecclesiastical leaders with reasons to be wary of dreaming. The possibilities of divine revelation and the threat of demonic illusion were assessed differently in different contexts.² Indeed, early medieval ideas for and against following dreams are perhaps most fruitfully seen in terms of the spread and use of authoritative ideas in ongoing negotiations of the nature of Christian dreaming.³

In their search for evidence of early medieval dreaming scholars have often investigated normative (or prescriptive) sources - canons, penitentials and capitularies – but the intentions and meaning of their prohibitions of following dreams have not been sufficiently explored. These texts have been investigated as indicators of the occurrence of (non-Christian) divination from dreams.⁴ Based on such prescriptive sources, ecclesiastical views have often

¹ See esp. P.E. Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, NE, 1994); I. Moreira, *Dreams, visions and spiritual authority in Merovingian Gaul* (Ithaca, NY 2000).

² J. Keskiaho, 'The handling and interpretation of dreams and visions in late sixth- to eighth-century Gallic and Anglo-Latin hagiography and histories', *EME* 13 (2005), 227–48; on normative texts briefly at 244 n. 70.

³ J. Keskiaho, *Dreams and Visions in the Early Middle Ages. The Reception of Patristic Ideas (400-900)*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought 99 (Cambridge, 2015).

⁴ See e.g. P. Riché, 'La magie à l'époque Carolingienne', *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-lettres, comptes rendus des séances* (1973). pp. 127–38, at pp. 132–3; B. Filotas, *Pagan Survivals, Superstitions and Popular Cultures in Early Medieval Pastoral Literature*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts 151 (Toronto 2005), pp. 236–8.

been interpreted as firmly critical of dreams.⁵ On the other hand, Isabel Moreira has argued that the Merovingian church was far from hostile to Christian dreaming. She has also observed that Merovingian authorities do not seem to have been concerned about dreams as a disciplinary issue, since they are not discussed in contemporary canonical texts, such as the *Vetus Gallica*, a collection of canons compiled in Merovingian Gaul.⁶ Nevertheless, other collections with canons addressing dreams were known and used at least by the early eighth century. Moreover, as Moreira also noted,⁷ around this time a canon on dreams appeared in penitentials.

In this article I seek to relate early medieval normative texts prohibiting the heeding or interpretation of dreams to the reception of authoritative theological opinion on dreams. This means reviewing the reception of the one Latin translation of a canon of the council of Ancyra (314) that connects dreams with divination. It is not only the sole early

⁵ M.E. Wittmer-Butsch, *Zur Bedeutung von Schlaf und Traum im Mittelalter* (Krems, 1990), 108–10, 114–15, following D. Harmening, *Superstitio. Überlieferungs- und theoriegeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur kirchlich-theologischen Aberglaubensliteratur des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1979), 109–110; also M. Semeraro, *Il 'Libro dei sogni di Daniele'. Storia di un testo 'proibito' nel Medioevo* (Rome, 2002), 37–72.

⁶ I. Moreira, 'Dreams and Divination in Early Medieval Canonical and Narrative Sources: The Question of Clerical Control', *The Catholic Historical Review* 89 (2003), pp. 621–42, at pp. 629–33; similarly Semeraro, *Il 'Libro dei sogni di Daniele'*, 48–49. For divination in the *Vetus Gallica* see ch. 44, ed. H. Mordek in *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich. Die Collectio Vetus Gallica, Die älteste systematische Kanonensammlung des fränkischen Gallien. Studien und Edition*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 1 (Berlin, 1975), pp. 521–5.

⁷ Moreira, 'Dreams', pp. 628–34.

canonical text mentioning dreams this way, but also influential, as it was adopted into penitentials from the early eighth century. From the eighth century it was gradually replaced by a similar injunction against the heeding of dreams, drawn from Mosaic Law. I show that canons associating dreams with divination were noticed and included in new texts, and explore the possibility that they may have reached widely those engaged in pastoral work, stimulating discussions of the nature of Christian dreaming. I investigate whether interest in these canons was motivated less by disciplinary problems than by ecclesiastical attitudes, built especially on the reception of the views of Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), the central early medieval authority on dreams.

Normative or prescriptive texts tell us what the authorities wished would take place, more concretely than exegetical or theological texts, for example. Since the beginning of Christian legislation in the fourth century, normative texts have included prohibitions of divination. The derivative and often repetitive nature of these prohibitions led Dieter Harmening to argue that lists of deviant practices were perpetuated long after they had ceased to be relevant, and that they consequently tell us little about the existence of the prohibited practices.⁸ More recently this argument has been challenged as extreme: scholars have pointed to regional variations in these texts, emphasising how they were composed and copied to fit needs as they were perceived. Nevertheless, these texts tell of us about the practices their authors wanted to prohibit, rather than that these practices necessarily existed.⁹

⁸ Harmening, *Superstitio*, esp. pp. 11, 50, 54, 318.

⁹ R. Meens, *Her tripartite boeteboek. Overlevering en betekenis van vroegmiddeleeuwse biechtvoorschriften (met editie en vertaling van vier tripartita)* (Hilversum, 1994), 267–306; Y. Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul a.d. 481–751*, Cultures, Beliefs and Traditions, Medieval and Early Modern Peoples 1 (Leiden, 1995), pp. 169–72; N. Zeddies,

From collections of canonical texts prescriptive sentences were incorporated into other texts, with perhaps wider social reach. Penitentials are manuals for confessors, listing sins and offences and corresponding penances.¹⁰ Rob Meens has argued that lay penance became more widespread and regular in the eighth century with the introduction of a requirement to take communion at least three times a year (and to be confessed beforehand).¹¹ Meens noted that while some manuscripts with penitentials are larger, and contain canon law texts and guides for bishops, many are smaller, and contain texts relating to liturgy or pastoral care, suggesting connections with pastoral work.¹² Meens' criteria may be refined through recent studies into the kinds of books early medieval priests used.¹³ Can manuscript copies of

Religio et sacrilegium. Studien zur Inkriminierung von Magie, Häresie und Heidentum (4.–7. Jahrhundert), Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 3, Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften 964 (Berlin, 2003), pp. 129–132, 305, 322–323; Y. Hen, 'The early medieval West', in D.J. Collins (ed.), *The Cambridge history of magic and witchcraft in the West. From antiquity to the present* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 183–206, at p. 186.

¹⁰ See R. Meens, *Penance in medieval Europe 600–1200* (Cambridge, 2014).

¹¹ R. Meens, 'The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance', in P. Biller and A.J. Minnis (eds), *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, York Studies in Medieval Theology 2 (York, 1998), pp. 35–61, at pp. 37–8.

¹² Meens, *Het tripartite boeteboek*, pp. 220–31, 260–6.

¹³ See Y. Hen, 'Knowledge of Canon Law Among Rural Priests: The Evidence of Two Carolingian Manuscripts from around 800', *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 50 (1999), pp. 117–34; R. Pokorny in MGH *Capitula episcoporum* 4 (Hanover, 2005), 9; S. Keefe, *A Catalogue of Works Pertaining to the Explanation of the Creed in Carolingian Manuscripts*, *Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia* 63 (Turnhout, 2012), esp. p. 16; C. van Rhijn,

prescriptive text be used to determine how wide a reach sentences on dreams had?

Was the introduction of sentences on dreams in normative sources an attempt to control some practice or belief?¹⁴ How far was the reception and use of decrees associating dreams with divination connected with the reception of Gregory the Great's teachings on dreams in contexts engaged in reform or Carolingian *correctio*?¹⁵ While promulgating and collecting canonical and other normative texts are in some sense always acts of reform, I use the term to designate especially contexts where also other available sources testify to striving towards the renewal of ecclesiastic and social norms in accordance with authoritative texts.¹⁶

Not all engaged in reforms agreed on the significance of dreams. Dreams and visions were important to relic cults, in the formation of theologies of the afterlife and in

'Manuscripts for local priests and the Carolingian reforms', in S. Patzold and C. van Rhijn (eds) *Men in the middle. Local priests in early medieval Europe*, *Ergänzungsbande zum Reallexicon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 93 (Berlin, 2016), pp. 177–98, at pp. 179–80; and Y. Hen, 'Priests and books in the Merovingian period', in *idem*, pp. 162–76.

¹⁴ Cf. Riché, 'La magie', p. 133.

¹⁵ On *correctio* see R. McKitterick, 'Unity and diversity in the Carolingian church', in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, *Studies in Church History* 32 (Woodbridge, 1996), pp. 59–82; *ibid.*, *Charlemagne. The formation of a European identity* (Cambridge, 2008), esp. pp. 306–11.

¹⁶ See e.g. newly Catholic Spain: R.L. Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus in the Visigothic Kingdom, 589-633* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2000); eighth-century Northumbria or the continental reform activities of Boniface and his associates.

political discourse.¹⁷ To some ecclesiastics the revelatory potential of dreams was more important than their problematic nature. Paul Dutton has shown how the authors of some Carolingian vision texts sought to open “an oneiric door on otherwise indeterminate and inaccessible truths”, promoting moral reforms.¹⁸ For others the search for authoritative social and ecclesiastical norms entailed a keen awareness of the theological authorities who had recommended treating dreams with great care. The most influential of such authorities was Gregory the Great. While acknowledging, indeed promoting, the truth of some dreams, he argued that dreams have so many possible origins that they should not be easily believed.¹⁹

Gregory’s brief discussion was easy to excerpt and by the beginning of the eighth century it was available in several collections as an authoritative teaching on dreams. The reception of Gregory’s ideas prompted affirmations in narrative texts that due care had been taken to ascertain whether the narrated dreams came from God. Active engagement with Gregory’s views on dreams is seen in the seventh century in Visigothic Spain and the ‘Columbanian’ monastic foundations in Francia, and in the eighth in Anglo-Saxon England and the area of the Anglo-Saxon missions, as well as with the theologians associated with Carolingian *renovatio*.²⁰ As we shall see, the reception of sentences connecting dreams with augury coincides with the reception of this theological opinion.

¹⁷ Theologies of the afterlife: I. Moreira, *Heaven’s purge. Purgatory in late antiquity* (Oxford, 2010).

¹⁸ Dutton, *The Politics*, esp. p. 76; also Keskiaho, *Dreams*, pp. 65–8.

¹⁹ Gregorius Magnus, *Moralia in Iob* c. 8.24.42–3, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143 (Turnhout, 1979), pp. 413–14; *ibid.*, *Dialogi* c. 4.50, ed. A. de Vogüé, Sources Chrétiennes 251, 260 and 265 (Paris 1978–1980), pp. 3.172–176.

²⁰ Keskiaho, *Dreams*, pp. 93–136, with further references.

Dreams as Divination in Canonical Collections

It is necessary to begin by looking more closely at the earliest conciliar text prohibiting the interpretation of dreams, its reception in early medieval canonical collections, and how this reception relates to interest in Gregory's thought on dreams. As Moreira pointed out, this text is found in a Latin translation of the acts of the council of Ancyra (c. 314), the so-called *Isidori vulgata*.²¹ Canon 24 of these acts forms the basis of much of early medieval normative opinion on the subject of dreaming: 'Those who observe auguries, auspices or dreams or any divinations in the manner of pagans, or take into their homes such people to inquire into anything through sorcery or to purify their homes, having confessed must do penance for five years according to ancient rules'.²²

General prohibitions of divination may have covered forms of divination by dreams. Yet only when dreams are explicitly included in a definition of non-Christian

²¹ Moreira, 'Dreams', 630, 633.

²² *Concilium Ancyritanum interpretatio quae falso dicitur Isidori secundum formam vulgatam*, ed. C.H. Turner, *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, canonum et conciliorum Graecorum interpretationes Latinae, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1899–1907), pp. 2.33–115, at p. 112: 'Qui auguria, auspicia siue somnia uel diuinationes quaslibet secundum more genti[li]um obseruant, aut in domos suas huiusmodi homines introducunt in exquirendis aliquibus arte maleficia aut ut domos suas lustrent, confessi quinquennio paenitentiam agant secundum antiquas regulas constitutas'.

divination is it clear that practices around dreaming could be considered in that context.²³ However, when a source connects dreams with divination, it need not be taken to encompass all dreaming. The prohibition left space for negotiation: a prohibition of divination by dreams ‘in the manner of pagans’ could stimulate definitions of dreaming in a ‘Christian manner’.²⁴

The *Isidori vulgata* -translation was probably produced in the late fifth or early sixth century, possibly in Italy.²⁵ As Moreira notes, neither the original Greek acts, nor their other Latin translations, mention dreams.²⁶ Furthermore, a look at the manuscripts transmitting the canon appears to complicate matters: many pre-Carolingian copies of the canon read *omnia* (all) instead of *somnia* (dreams). Yet the latter is probably the original reading:²⁷ it is attested

²³ G. Dagron, ‘Rêver de Dieu et parler de soi. Le rêve et son interpretation d’après les sources Byzantines’, in T. Gregory (ed.) *I sogni nel medioevo. Seminario internazionale, Roma, 2-4 ottobre 1983* (Rome, 1985), pp. 37–56, here at p. 39. Cf. G. Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*, *Historia, Einzelschriften* 143 (Stuttgart, 2000), p. 54.

²⁴ If no one Christian way of dreaming, there was a continuous search for Christian views on dreams; see e.g. Keskiäho, *Dreams*, p. 132. Generally on shifting definitions of Christianity and paganism see R. A. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge, 1990); Hen, *Culture and Religion*, esp. pp. 157–62; I. Wood, *The Missionary Life. Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe 400–1000* (Harlow, 2001), esp. pp. 250–6.

²⁵ See G. Martínez Díez, *La Colección canonica Hispana* 1, *Estudio*, *Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra, Serie canónica* 1 (Madrid, 1966), 280; J. Gaudemet, *Les sources du droit de l’église en occident du IIe au VIIe siècle* (Paris, 1985), 77–8.

²⁶ Moreira, ‘Dreams’, 629–33.

²⁷ Cuthbert Turner took it as such, see already his apparatus in *Concilium Ancyritanum*, 112.

early, in a turn of the seventh century manuscript copied in Verona,²⁸ and found in copies of the canon in different canonical collections, so if it were an interpolation, it would have been made several times in the tradition.

Prohibiting the observance of dreams seems not to have been the intention of the fathers of Ancyra, so why did the authors of the *Isidori vulgata* add dreams to the definition of divination? Dreams had been associated with divination already in the legislation of the Christian emperors.²⁹ However, assuming that the reference to dreams was added in the *Isidori vulgata* translation when it was created, the immediate influence behind the amendment is probably Jerome's Vulgate, as his translations of Deuteronomy XVIII.10 and Leviticus XIX.26 pair paying attention to dreams with augury.³⁰ Perhaps the inclusion of dreams in the definition of divination was from the beginning motivated by an authoritative idea of what constituted divination, rather than any specific disciplinary problem.

²⁸ Verona, Biblioteca capitolare, MS LIX (s vi/vii, Verona?; *Codices latini antiquiores*, E.A. Lowe (ed.), 11 vols. and a supplement, Oxford 1934–71, hereafter CLA + volume and item number; 4.509), the canon at fol. 240r. This reading is found also in the *Collectio Theodosi diaconi*, Verona MS LX, etc. (s viii ex., Verona?; CLA 4.510; Suppl., 51, 53), fol. 58v. On the collection see L. Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400–1140). A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature* (Washington, D.C. 1999), 38.

²⁹ See *Theodosiani libri XVI* c. 9.16.6, T. Mommsen and P.M. Meyer (eds) (Berlin, 1905), p. 461 = *Codex Iustinianus* c. 9.18.7, P. Krueger (Berlin, 1877), p. 837. See Semeraro, *Il 'Libro dei sogni di Daniele'*, 38–40.

³⁰ Esp. (and compare with the canon in n. xv, above) Deut. XVIII.10: 'Nec inveniatur in te qui lustret filium suum aut filiam ducens per ignem aut qui ariolos sciscitetur et observet somnia atque auguria ne sit maleficus'.

How was the canon transmitted, and what do copies of it tell us? An ecclesiastical centre had incentive to ensure that its library had a comprehensive variety of normative texts.³¹ At the same time, collections of canons could also be creatively compiled for particular purposes.³² When an individual canon has been included after clearly selective engagement, its inclusion is more likely to have taken place on purpose. Moreover, the fact that the tradition of the canon carried variant readings (*omnia* and *somnia*) adds significance to the chronological moment when we can see that copyists, after selective engagement with sources, have reproduced a text associating dreams with divination.

The early sources in fact suggest little interest in associating dreams with divination. All three copies of the *Isidori vulgata* translation extant from Merovingian Gaul

³¹ See e.g. H. Wurm, *Studien und Texte zur Dekretalensammlung des Dionysius Exiguus*, Kanonistische Studien und Texte 16 (Bonn, 1939), pp. 104–6; H. Mordek, ‘Kirchenrechtliche Autoritäten im Frühmittelalter’, in P. Classen (ed.), *Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter*, Vorträge und Forschungen 23 (Sigmaringen, 1977), pp. 237–55.

³² R. McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 253–4.

read *omnia*,³³ as does the influential, possibly sixth-century Italian *Collectio Vaticana*.³⁴ Nevertheless, if the dates proposed for some of the collections only surviving in later manuscripts are to be trusted, collections with the reading *somnia* were probably also known in Merovingian Gaul.³⁵

³³ See the *Collectio Corbeiensis*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France (hereafter BnF), lat. 12097 (s vi¹, Gaul; CLA 5.619), the canon at fol. 18r; the *Collectio Coloniensis*, Cologne, Dombibliothek, MS 212 (s vi/vii; France?; CLA 8.1162; Suppl., 62), fol. 163v; and the *Collectio Albigensis* in Toulouse, Bibliothèque municipale (hereafter BM), MS 364 (before 666/7, Albi; CLA 836), which is defect – see the copy, Albi, BM, MS 2 (s ix ex., Southern France; B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, 3 vols., B. Ebersberger ed., Wiesbaden, 1998–2013, no. 16; hereafter cited as B + Arabic numeral), fol. 40r. On these collections see Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 44, 46–7, 47–8; and W. Kaiser, ‘Beobachtungen zur *Collectio Corbeiensis* und *Collectio Bigotiana* (Hs. Paris BN lat. 12097 und Hs. Paris BN lat. 2796)’, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung* 92 (2006), 63–110.

³⁴ See e.g. Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV), Vat. lat. 1342 (s viii, Italy; CLA 1.9; Suppl., 43), the canon at fol. 30v; BAV, Barb. lat. 679 (s viii/ix, probably Central Italy; CLA 1.65; Suppl., 44), fol. 27r. On the collection see Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, pp. 25–26, 38; and F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Graz, 1870), pp. 761–3.

³⁵ See e.g. the probably seventh-century *Collectio Sancti Mauri*, e.g. BnF lat. 1451 (a. 800–815, the region of Tours; CLA 5.528), fol. 49r. See further Kéry, *Canonical collections*, 45–6. Another such collection might be the *Collectio Hispana Gallica*, see below.

However, from the eighth century the reading *somnia* appears in manuscripts from contexts where Gregory's views on dreams were valued. The *Isidori vulgata* -translation is found in the early seventh-century *Epitome Hispana*, composed perhaps for or by the bishop of Braga.³⁶ The relevant canon is here abbreviated, showing selective engagement with the material: the text dispenses with presumably irrelevant varieties of divination but retains the interpretation of dreams.³⁷ In the early seventh century the canon mentioning *somnia* was also incorporated in the *Collectio Hispana*.³⁸ These collections were created following the Visigothic kingdom's conversion to Catholicism, in a search for consensus in the acceptance of episcopal authority through unity in religious life and thought.³⁹ Bishop Isidore of Seville (d. 636), the leading ideologue of these reforms, also reminded his readers of the dangers of dreams, rephrasing Gregory's discussion. Around the middle of the century Taio of Zaragoza also included the latter in his *Sententiae*, as Gregory's teaching on dreams.⁴⁰

³⁶ Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, pp. 57–59, with further literature; generally Martínez Díez, *La colección*, 281–286.

³⁷ *Epitome Hispana* c. 5.18, ed. G. Martínez Díez, *Miscelanea Comillas*, 37 (1962), pp. 321–466, at p. 348.

³⁸ See Martínez Díez, *La colección*, pp. 280–6. The relevant canon is *La colección canonica Hispana* c. 2.24, eds. G. Martínez Díez and F. Rodríguez, *Monumenta Hispaniae Sacra*, serie canónica 3 (Madrid, 1982), p. 102. See further Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 61–7.

³⁹ For these reforms see Stocking, *Bishops, Councils, and Consensus*, e.g. 22.

⁴⁰ See Isidore, *Sententiae* 3.6, ed. P. Cazier, CCSL 111 (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 215–20; Taio, *Sententiae* 4.7, ed. J.-P. Migne, PL 80 (Paris, 1863). cols. 919D–21A; Keskiäho, *Dreams*, pp. 112–15, 119–21.

Both collections were influential vehicles for the canon, especially the *Epitome*. It appears to be a text created for practical use: unlike the large canonical collections it could fit in a portable manuscript. By the eighth century it was found also in Italy and Francia.⁴¹ Excerpts, including the canon on divination, appear in eighth- and ninth-century manuscripts apparently prepared for priests and bishops invested in reform, in contexts where Gregory's *Dialogues*, with his discussion of dreams, was probably also available: one copy has been tentatively associated with the circle of the missionary and reformer Boniface (d. 754), while in two other manuscripts, one produced for Bishop Baturich of Regensburg, the *excerpts* are included in a collection of texts for the use of bishops.⁴² Also the *Hispana* was known in Merovingian Gaul by the eighth century.⁴³ In the ninth it provided the conciliar texts to which

⁴¹ See G. Martínez Díez, 'El Epítome Hispánico. Una colección canónica Española del siglo VII. Primera parte, estudio', *Miscelanea Comillas* 36 (1961), pp. 5–90, at pp. 23–27; H. Mordek, 'Aera', *Deutsches Archiv* 25 (1969), pp. 216–22, at p. 219 n. 20.

⁴² Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, Ny. Kgl. S. 58 8^o (s viii¹, North France?; R. Meens, 'The Oldest Manuscript Witness of the *Collectio Canonum Hibernensis*', *Peritia* 14, 2000, pp. 1–19, at pp. 1, 3–7, 12–14; cf. CLA 1568), at fols. 60v–61r; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 2232 (saec. ix in., Southeast Bavaria; B 7226), fols. 63r–74v; Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14468 (a. 821, Regensburg, for Bishop Baturich; B 3208), fols. 3v–11v. On the latter two see H. Mordek, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta. Überlieferung und Traditionszusammenhang der fränkischen Herrschererlasse*, MGH, Hilfsmittel 15 (Munich, 1995), pp. 335–9 and 911–15, R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), p. 37. On the *Dialogues* in eighth-century Northern Francia and Bavaria; see Keskiaho, *Dreams*, 108, 233–4.

⁴³ See Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 67–68.

the Ps.-Isidorean forgeries were added (whence the name of the translation, *Isidori vulgata*).⁴⁴ However, these forgeries were not a significant vehicle for the transmission of the canons: only four out of twenty ninth-century copies seem to have included them.⁴⁵

One version of the canon that suggests interest in definitions of divination is found associated with early eighth-century Northumbria. The *Collectio Sanblasiana* is an originally Italian collection with the canons of Ancyra in the *Isidori vulgata* –version. Although its text of the relevant canon in most manuscripts reads *omnia*,⁴⁶ one early copy reads *somnia*. Now in Cologne, this manuscript was copied in the early eighth century by a Northumbrian

⁴⁴ *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. P. Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863), p. 263. On the forgery, see, with references to further literature, E. Knibbs, ‘Ebo of Reims, Pseudo-Isidore, and the Date of the False Decretals’, *Speculum* 92 (2017), pp. 144–83, at pp. 144–6.

⁴⁵ For the manuscripts see Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 100–8; S. Williams, *Codices Pseudo-Isidoriani. A Palaeographico-Historical Study*, Monumenta Iuris Canonici C:3 (New York, 1971). The four are BAV, Vat. lat. 630 (s ix med., Corbie; B 6844), the canon at ff. 80vb–81ra; BAV Ottob. lat. 93 (s ix, Chartres?; B 6433), the canon at f. 38rb; and two mutilated manuscripts, Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek, Rep. II 2° 7, (s IX ¾, Corbie; B 2274) and BnF lat. 9629 + lat. 1557 (s ix 4/4, area of Reims; B 4614; J. Contreni, ‘*Codices Pseudo-Isidoriani: The Provenance and Date of Paris, B. N. ms lat. 9629*’, *Viator* 13 (1982), pp. 1–14).

⁴⁶ See e.g. BnF lat. 3836 (s viii², Corbie?; CLA 5. 554; *Suppl.*, 54), fol. 10v; BnF lat. 4279 (saec. ix med., probably West France; B 4296), fol. 24v; BnF lat. 1455 (s ix², near Reims, Sens?; B 4015), fol. 7v. On the collection Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, p. 31.

scribe either in Northumbria or on the Continent.⁴⁷ It is either a copy of a collation made earlier (in Italy?), or perhaps – given that an early eighth-century Northumbrian text quotes the relevant canon in the same version as the manuscript⁴⁸ – witnesses to the study of canon law in Northumbria, roughly in the time of Bede (d. 735).

In the Cologne manuscript the canon is clearly the result of comparison between different translations: not only does it mention *somnia*, but it has also been expanded using another early translation of the same canons, the so-called *versio Prisca*,⁴⁹ whence a ruling that priests practising divination are to be defrocked has been added.⁵⁰ The editor appears to have sought a comprehensive definition of divination. Thus the inclusion of dreams in the list of divinatory practices more probably reflects his ideals about the subject than concrete

⁴⁷ Cologne, Dombibliothek, 213 (s viii in.; CLA 8.1163; Suppl., 62); see also R. McKitterick, ‘Knowledge of Canon Law in the Frankish Kingdoms Before 789: The Manuscript Evidence’, *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 36 (1985), pp. 97–117, at pp. 109–15; and M.D. Elliot, ‘Canon law collections in England ca 600–1066: the manuscript evidence’, Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto (2013), pp. 250–3.

⁴⁸ The *Discipulus Umbrensius*, for which see below.

⁴⁹ On the *Prisca* see C.H. Turner, ‘Chapters in the History of Latin MSS of Canons. V. The Version called Prisca: (a) the Justel MS (J) now Bodl. e Mus. 100–102, and the *editio princeps* (Paris, 1661)’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929), pp. 336–46, at pp. 340 and 355; C.H. Turner, ‘Chapters in the History of Latin MSS of Canons. VI. The Version called Prisca: (b) the Chieti MS (= I), now Vatic. Regin. 1997’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 31 (1930), pp. 9–20, at pp. 10–11.

⁵⁰ Cologne 213, fol. 24v. Cf. *Concilium Ancyritanum interpretatio quae dicitur Prisca* 23, ed. C.H. Turner, *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta*, pp. 2.18–27, at p. 27.

disciplinary concerns. In early eighth-century Northumbria, in the case of authors such as Bede, such ideals were informed by Gregory's discussion of dreams.⁵¹

The text of the canon mentioning *somnia* was thus noticed in early seventh-century Spain, eighth-century Northumbria, Northern Francia and Bavaria. The appearance of the canon in these contexts coincides with known interest in Gregory's views on dreams in connection with the search for norms for Christian living in authoritative books. The reading *somnia* in the relevant canon is also found in the *Collectio Quesnelliana*,⁵² a possibly Roman compilation, which appears to have been the main collection of the canons of the early oecumenical councils circulating in Northeastern Francia before the reign of Charlemagne.⁵³ Moreover, in some Carolingian manuscripts of canonical collections, *omnia* in the text of this

⁵¹ E.g. Colgrave ed., *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an Anonymous Monk of Whitby* (Lawrence, KA, 1968), pp. 102–5; Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* c. 5.9, ed. M. Lapidge, *Sources Chrétiennes* 489–491 (Paris, 2005), p. 4.52; Kesiahho, *Dreams*, pp. 31, 43–44.

⁵² Of the eight pre-tenth-century manuscripts I have seen all but one, all with this reading: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (hereafter ÖNB), MS 2141 (c. 780, Rhineland (Lorsch?); CLA 1505), fol. 12r; Vienna MS 2147 (c. 780, Rhineland (Lorsch?); CLA 1506), fol. 30r; Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 191 (s viii ex. / ix in., Northeastern France; CLA 873), fol. 21v; Arras 572 (644) (s viii ex. / ix in., Northeastern France; CLA 713; B 86), fol. 24v; BnF lat. 3848A (s ix in., Metz or related centre? B 4287), fol. 11v; lat. 1454 (s ix 2/4, Central France(?); B 4014), fol. 58r; and lat. 3842A (s ix 2/4, Northern France; B 4281), fol. 41r.

⁵³ McKitterick, 'Knowledge'. On the collection Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, pp. 27–9.

canon has been amended to *somnia*, suggesting a strong link by that time between dreams and auguries.⁵⁴

Many other translations of the oecumenical councils circulated, and the *Isidori vulgata* canon on divination with *somnia* is only found in the minority of the extant manuscripts of pre-Carolingian canonical collections.⁵⁵ It nearly disappears from collections compiled in the Carolingian period, where the oecumenical canons are given in some other Latin translation, often in that of Dionysius Exiguus.⁵⁶ Even if his translation was not presented by

⁵⁴ In the *Collectio Bigotiana* the canon reads *somnia*, although its source was the *Collectio Corbeiensis* (which reads *omnia*); see BnF lat. 2796, fols. 108–153 (s ix ¼, North France; B 4232), at fol. 139r. See also Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Edili 82 (B 1207), a *Vaticana* manuscript with *omnia* corrected to *somnia* at fol. 18ra.

⁵⁵ From Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, 2–86: out of 96 pre-tenth-century copies of collections of oecumenical councils made before c. 750, 38 have the *Isidori vulgata* but only 24 read *somnia*. Of 122 copies of collections dated to c. 750–900 only one carries that translation. See Supporting information. Texts of the same genre likely had similar overall chances at survival, making comparisons of manuscript numbers within a genre probably meaningful; see e.g. Jaakko Tahkokallio, ‘Manuscripts as Evidence for the use of Classics in Education, c. 800–1200. Estimating the Randomness of Survival’, *Interfaces. A Journal of Medieval European Literatures* 3 (2016), 28–45.

⁵⁶ See Supporting information: the *Isidori vulgata* reading *somnia* in this canon is found in about 10% of Carolingian manuscripts of canons but in only one Carolingian collection. On the Dionysio-Hadriana e.g. Mordek, ‘Kirchenrechtliche Autoritäten’, pp. 238–9, 244–7; K. Zechiel-Eckes, *Die Concordia canonum des Cresconius. Studien und Edition*, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, Studien und Texte 5 (Frankfurt am Main, 1992),

Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne in 774, as has been supposed,⁵⁷ a shift in preference seems to have taken place. However, the Carolingian reforms certainly did not do away with associating dreams with divination: in the penultimate section of this article we will see how the Carolingians characteristically sought out the highest authority for their definition of unlawful divination, finding sentences associating dreams and divination in the Old Testament.

Penitentials and the Heeding of Dreams

However, in order to deepen our understanding of the reception of the canon mentioning dreams we need to look next at the evidence for its reach and use. In the early eighth century, when the *Sanblasiana* was possibly augmented in Northumbria and the canon mentioning dreams excerpted from the *Epitome Hispana*, the latter was also inserted into the relatively new normative tradition of penitentials, intended for use in pastoral work.⁵⁸ The appearance of this canon in penitentials confirms that it was noticed as a comprehensive definition of non-approved divination. This shows that the adoption of the canon was less a reaction to any reality of problematic dreaming practices than acting upon the ideal that dreams were problematic.

pp. 163–4. Kéry, *Canonical Collections*, pp. 14–18, lists c. 70 manuscripts of the collection before s X.

⁵⁷ See A. Firey, ‘Mutating Monsters: Approaches to “Living Texts” of the Carolingian Era,’ *Digital Proceedings of the Lawrence J. Schoenberg Symposium on Manuscript Studies in the Digital Age* 2:1 (2010), article 1, available at <https://repository.upenn.edu/ljsproceedings/vol2/iss1/1>.

⁵⁸ On penitentials see esp. R. Meens, *Penance*; also Meens, ‘The Frequency’.

As Moreira noted, the first penitential to cite the relevant canon of Ancyra is the so-called *Discipulus Umbrensius* -version (DU) of teachings attributed to Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury (d. 690).⁵⁹ It was probably produced in Northumbria in the early eighth century.⁶⁰ After proscribing women who perform diabolical incantations, the DU introduces a version of the canon on divination that also mentions dreams.⁶¹ It seems to have been added to underline the canonical nature of the prohibition. The compiler, having probably looked for a comprehensive repudiation of pagan practices, quotes the interpolated canon found in the possibly Northumbrian edition of the *Sanblasiana*.⁶²

The DU seems to have spread mainly in the area where the Anglo-Saxon missionary and reformer Boniface worked, and appears to have been used there in pastoral work. Apart from the earliest, copied in Salzburg at the end of the eighth century, the manuscript copies originate in centres connected with Lorsch and Fulda.⁶³ Two of the three

⁵⁹ Moreira, 'Dreams', 629.

⁶⁰ See T. Charles-Edwards, 'The Penitential of Theodore and the *Iudicia Theodori*', in M. Lapidge (ed.) *Archbishop Theodore. Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 141–74, at pp. 139–51, 155, 157; R. Flechner, 'The Making of the Canons of Theodore', *Peritia* 17–18 (2003–2004), pp. 121–43, at pp. 126–30.

⁶¹ *Paenitentiale Theodori* c. 1.15.4, ed. P.W. Finsterwalder, *Die Canones Theodori Cantuariensis und ihre Überlieferungsformen* (Weimar, 1929), p. 311.

⁶² Cologne 213, fol. 24v. See M. Lapidge, 'The school of Theodore and Hadrian', in *ibid.*, *Anglo-Latin Literature 600–899* (London, 1996), pp. 141–68, at p. 162 and n. 122; Elliott, 'Canon law collections', pp. 270–2.

⁶³ Excluding excerpts: Vienna lat. 2195 (s viii ex., Salzburg; CLA 10.1508); Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS Mp.Th.Q. 32, fols. 1–12 (s ix in., the Würzburg–Fulda area; B

DU-manuscripts with the canon on divination and dreams appear to have been intended for use in pastoral work.⁶⁴

From the DU, or inspired by it, Frankish clergy included the canon mentioning dreams in other penitentials, but in these it was quoted as an independent norm, not simply as a justification of a new one. The earliest of these penitentials are three closely related texts, the so-called *Paenitentiale Remense*, the *Excarpsus Cummeani*, and the *Capitula iudiciorum*.⁶⁵ In the second quarter of the eighth century the first two seem to have passed through Corbie,

7538), fragment; Vienna lat. 2223 (s ix in., a center connected to Fulda; B 7223), the relevant chapter at fol. 9r; BAV, Pal. lat. 554, fols. 1–4 (s ix¹, Lorsch?; B 6538), frg; BAV, Pal. lat. 485 (s ix², Lorsch; B 6531), fol. 113r. See also Finsterwalder, *Die Canones*, pp. 4, 88–96, 103–116; and Meens, *Penance*, pp. 229–230.

⁶⁴ Vienna lat. 2223 (Meens, *Het tripartite*, p. 244); and Pal. lat. 485, on the nature of which see F.S. Paxton, ‘*Bonus liber*: A Late Carolingian Clerical Manual from Lorsch’, in L. Mayali and S.A.J. Tibbetts (eds), *The Two Laws. Studies in Medieval Legal History Dedicated to Stephan Kuttner*, Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law 1 (Washington, D.C., 1990), pp. 1–30; cf. Keefe, *A Catalogue*, p. 360.

⁶⁵ F.B. Asbach, *Das Poenitentiale Remense und der sogenannte Excarpsus Cummeani. Überlieferung, Quellen und Entwicklung zweier kontinentale Bussbüchen aus der 1. Hälfte des 8. Jahrhunderts* (Regensburg, 1975), pp. 215–216; L. Körntgen, ‘Der *Excarpsus Cummeani*, ein Bußbuch aus Corbie?’, in O. Münch and T. Zotz (eds) *Scientia veritatis. Festschrift für Hubert Mordek zum 65. Geburtstag* (Ostfildern, 2004), pp. 59–75, at pp. 67–8; Meens, *Penance*, pp. 108–11; Moreira, ‘Dreams’, 631.

where they were edited to complement the *Vetus Gallica*.⁶⁶ The *Excarpsus* and *Remense* reproduce the relevant canon in identical form. It is much like that in the DU, but it has been collated against another translation of the same canon, possibly that in the *Collectio Quesnelliana*.⁶⁷ The editor of the canon may have worked in the circle of Boniface, who was in contact with Corbie regarding canonical issues.⁶⁸

Most copies of these penitentials associating dreams with divination are found in manuscripts probably intended for use in pastoral work. The oldest copy of the *Excarpsus*, accompanied in the manuscript by excerpts from the *Epitome Hispana*, is from the first half of the eighth century. It was possibly prepared for the circle of Boniface or a similar group concerned with reform.⁶⁹ The other copies of the *Excarpsus* come mainly from Southern Germany and Switzerland, but the text also circulated in Northern Francia, and spread into Northern Italy in the early ninth century.⁷⁰ Of the seventeen early manuscripts of the *Excarpsus* and the *Remense*, eleven are either liturgical or pastoral in character, or only contain the

⁶⁶ Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform*, pp. 217–21, and more generally at pp. 86–94; also Asbach, *Das Poenitentiale*, pp. 19–20; Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 237, 239.

⁶⁷ *Paenitentiale Remense* c. 8.17, ed. Asbach, *Das Poenitentiale*, p. 58²; *Excarpsus Cummeani* c. 7.16, ed. F.W.H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendländischen Kirche* (Halle, 1851), p. 482. For the *Quesnelliana* text see Turner's *apparatus* to *Concilium Ancyritanum ... Isidori*, p. 112.

⁶⁸ See Meens, *Penance*, p. 108.

⁶⁹ Copenhagen Ny. Kgl. S. 58 8^o, fols. 1v–34r, 44v–52r; Ancyra ch. 24 at fols. 26v–27r. Boniface suggested by Meens, 'The Oldest Manuscript', pp. 12–14.

⁷⁰ Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 231–6.

penitential in one codicological unit, suggesting that they were intended for pastoral work.⁷¹ This is the case also with the *Capitula iudiciorum*, compiled perhaps in Northern France before the end of the eighth century:⁷² its circulation appears to have focused in Southern Germany, Switzerland, and in the later ninth century, Northern Italy, and four of the five manuscript copies of the text could be characterized as intended for pastoral use.⁷³ The canon on divination

⁷¹ Pastoral (after Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 232–233, 234, 237, 239): Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, MS 10127-10144 (s viii/ix, North France or Belgium; B 741) *P.*

Remense, pastoral also according to Andrieu in Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform*, p. 276 and Hen, ‘Knowledge’, but cf. McKitterick, ‘The Knowledge’, p. 116; BnF lat. 1603 (s viii/ix, Northeast France; CLA 5.531), *P. Remense*, the canon at fol. 129ra, classified as pastoral also by Hen, ‘Knowledge’, but cf. Keefe, *A Catalogue*, pp. 304–5; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodl. 572 (s ix1, Northeast France; B 3787), fol. 61r; Sélestat, Bibliothèque humaniste, MS 132 (s ix, Mainz?; B 5972); Vienna lat. 2171 (s ix³/₄, Southeast Germany; B 7221), fol. 42vb; Vienna lat. 2225 (s ix/x, South Germany; B 7224), fol. 23v. Liturgical (Meens, *Het tripartite*, 234): Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS. Phill. 1667 (s viii/ix, Southeast France; CLA 8.1056); BnF lat. 2296 (s ix med., Saint-Amand; B 4161), fol. 1v. Only the penitential (Meens, *Het tripartite*, p. 231): Zürich, Zentralbibliothek, MS Rh. 30, fols. 14r–24v (s viii ex., Switzerland; CLA 7.1019), defect; Oxford Laud. Misc. 263, fols. 66r–81r (s ix2/4, Mainz; B 3852a), fol. 74v; St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 550 (s ix 2/4 and later, Switzerland; B 5761), p. 208.

⁷² *Paenitentiale Capitula iudiciorum* c. 16.2, ed. Meens, *Het tripartite*, p. 460. See Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 138–176.

⁷³ Pastoral (Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 244): St. Gall 150, pp. 232–84 (s ix in., St Gall; B 5609), the canon at p. 304; Vienna 2223, fols. 31v–32r. Collections of penitentials (Meens,

and dreams was also included in the so-called *Paenitentiale Vindobonense B*, compiled in Salzburg and surviving in a collection of penitential texts from the end of the eighth century,⁷⁴ and the so-called *Paenitentiale Martenianum*, surviving in a manuscript for pastoral work copied after the middle of the ninth century north of the Loire.⁷⁵ The clear majority of the manuscripts of these penitentials are moreover smaller than the average size of manuscripts in this period. While not the only criterion, this supports the impression that these texts circulated mostly in books meant for frequent consultation.⁷⁶

Through these penitentials the prohibition of observing dreams may have reached a significant proportion of those engaged in pastoral work. Penitentials including a canon to

Het tripartite, pp. 242–3): Vercelli, Biblioteca capitolare, MS CCIII (s ix4/4, North France; B 7019), BAV, Vat. Lat. 5751 (s ix/x or x in., Italy; B 6910), fol. 45v.

⁷⁴ *Paenitentiale Vindobonense B* c. 34.16, ed. Meens, *Het tripartite*, p. 414. Moreira, ‘Dreams’, 631. The manuscript is Vienna 2195.

⁷⁵ *Paenitentiale Martenianum* c. 48, ed. W. von Hörmann, ‘Bußbücherstudien. 1. Das sog. *Poenitentiale Martenianum*’, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung* 35 (1924), pp. 358–483, at p. 381. The manuscript is Florence Ashb. 82 (s ix 2/3, North of the Loire; B 3692), see Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 237–8.

⁷⁶ Of the 41 manuscripts of the penitentials mentioning dreams, the size (height + width of the page) of 12 is less than 320 mm; 23 are between 320–490 mm; and six between 490–670 mm (after Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 509–18; and B; see Supporting information). Average for the period is c. 490 mm, see M. Maniaci, ‘Costruzione e gestione dello spazio scritto fra Oriente e Occidente: principi generali e soluzioni specifiche’, in *Scrivere e leggere nell’alto medioevo, Spoleto, 28 aprile–4 maggio 2011*, Settimane 59 (Spoleto, 2012), pp. 473–511, at p. 483.

this effect circulated from the early eighth century onwards, especially in Northeastern Francia and Southern Germany. Penitential practice probably varied from place to place, with the texts transmitted by the surviving manuscripts serving as starting points for individual pastoral workers.⁷⁷ However, dreams were well represented in the material they used when preparing to administer penance. Roughly two thirds of the surviving eighth-century manuscripts with penitentials, and a third of the ninth-century manuscripts, carry texts where dreams are included in a definition of divination.⁷⁸ These manuscripts, and especially the eighth-century copies, may be too few to allow firm conclusions to be drawn, but their numbers nevertheless suggest that texts with the Ancyra canon mentioning dreams were far from rare.

Supposing that the decree on divination from dreams reflected concerns about current *practices*, it might be argued that the area of Anglo-Saxon and Frankish missions and new ecclesiastical settlements in Germany, where there are likely to have been encounters with actual pagan practices, would be to the places where such concerns arose.⁷⁹ However,

⁷⁷ C. van Rhijn, 'The local church, priests' handbooks and pastoral care in the Carolingian period', in *Chiese locali e chiese regionali nell'alto medioevo, Spoleto, 4-9 aprile 2013*, Settimane 61 (Spoleto, 2014), pp. 689–706, at pp. 703–5.

⁷⁸ Based on Meens, *Het tripartite*, pp. 26–69 and Meens, *Penance*, pp. 45–139, 226–37, counting each manuscript only once and controlling dates from B: seven out of ten s viii manuscripts (excluding those dated s viii/ix), and 29 out of 89 s ix manuscripts (excluding those dated s ix/x). See Supporting information.

⁷⁹ On the idea of paganism and Merovingian legislation see Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 180–9; R. Meens, 'Reforming the Clergy: a context for the use of the Bobbio Penitential', in Y. Hen and R. Meens (eds) *The Bobbio Missal. Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 154–67, at p. 166.

beginning with the tradition of Theodore's teachings,⁸⁰ these texts can often be associated with *correctio* in already Christian congregations. Moreover, the concrete practices for the prohibition of which the penitentials cite the canon on divination and dreams are never about dreams. The inclusion of dreams among proscribed religious practices is more probably the result of learned authors actively seeking new norms in canonical and theological texts, such as those of Gregory the Great. At least Boniface, active in the areas where these penitentials circulated, and the Northumbrians, as whose disciple the author of the DU identifies themselves, were not only interested in dreams and visions but also concerned about handling them properly, making Gregory the Great their guide in the matter.⁸¹

As with the canonical collections, the Carolingian period seems to have brought a move away from penitentials that contain the canon proscribing paying attention to dreams. This change was unrelated to the canon itself but due to Carolingian preference for authentic and authoritative texts, which led also to the production of normalised penitential texts based on official sources. Such penitentials were produced by Halitgar of Cambrai (817–831) and Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856).⁸² The survival of earlier penitentials may have been adversely affected by Carolingian attitudes to these older penitentials. However, unlike Halitgar's penitential, Hrabanus's reply to disciplinary queries by Bishop Heribald of Auxerre (828–857)

⁸⁰ On Theodore see Lapidge, 'The school'; and generally J. Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 108–17 and 166–81.

⁸¹ See *Bonifatii et Lulli epistolae* c. 10, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae 3 (Berlin, 1892), p. 252; also c. 59, p. 319. Keskiaho, *Dreams*, pp. 31–3 2, 57, 64–6 5, 72, 135.

⁸² Meens, *Penance*, pp. 130–7.

includes the canon on divination and dreams, lifted from the DU.⁸³ Although, like his source, Hrabanus also uses the canon to justify a decree on a matter not related to dreams, he probably agreed with the prohibition it expressed. In his commentary to Ecclesiasticus he writes about the problematic nature of dreams, on the basis of Gregory's ideas.⁸⁴

Mosaic Law on Dreams

The prohibition of heeding dreams did not disappear from normative sources, but became more often adduced from Mosaic law.⁸⁵ Patristic authors had referred to Old Testament sentences against paying attention to dreams to point out that not all dreams were true, and in circles interested in reform and *correctio* Mosaic Law came to be increasingly considered as a source for legal norms.⁸⁶ It may be a result of the reception of this canonical and patristic opinion that

⁸³ Hrabanus Maurus, *Ad Heribaldum*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae 5 (Berlin, 1899), pp. 512–3; R. Kottje, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus. Ihre Überlieferung und ihre Quellen*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 8 (Berlin, 1992), pp. 7, 9, 113–31, 252.

⁸⁴ Hrabanus Maurus, In Sirach, J.-P. Migne ed., PL 109 (Paris, 1864), cols. 1005D–1007C; see Keskiaho, *Dreams*, 130–1.

⁸⁵ See also Harmening, *Superstitio*, p. 100.

⁸⁶ See R. Kottje, *Studien zum Einfluss des Alten Testaments auf Recht und Liturgie des frühen Mittelalters (6.–8.) Jahrhundert*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 23 (Bonn, 1964), pp. 106–9; R. Meens, 'The Uses of Old Testament in Early Medieval Canon Law. The *Collectio Vetus Gallica* and the *Collectio Hibernensis*', in Y. Hen and M. Innes (ed.), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 67–77, at pp. 75–7.

the verse from Leviticus used by Gregory the Great as proof for the existence of empty dreams is cited in eighth- and ninth-century prescriptive texts on divination. In the Carolingian period we also see dreams and visions used as prominent political and religious arguments,⁸⁷ likely also stimulating search for difference between permitted and prohibited dreaming.

The first to quote the Old Testament on dreams in the context of a normative discussion of divination are two probably eighth-century texts, a letter attributed to Gregory II (JE 2153) and the so-called *Scarapsus Pirminii*. The latter is attributed to Pirmin, the apostle of Alemannia, in one manuscript, but mostly circulated either as an anonymous piece or in the name of either Augustine or Pope Gregory (II). It was probably composed in the middle of the eighth century, perhaps in Eastern Francia, and circulated mostly in manuscript contexts suggesting it was intended for use in pastoral work.⁸⁸ Like the Ancyra canon in the DU, the Biblical verses that introduce the matter of dreams (Leviticus XIX.26; Deuteronomy XVIII.10; Jeremiah XXIX.8) are quoted in order to prohibit a specific list of superstitious practices.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ See Dutton, *The Politics*.

⁸⁸ A. Angenendt, *Monachi peregrini. Studien zu Pirmin und den monastischen Vorstellungen des frühen Mittelalters*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 6 (München, 1972), pp. 55–74; E. Hauswald, ‘Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des *Scarapsus (Dicta Pirminii)*’, in P. Ní Chatháin and M. Richter (eds), *Ireland and Europe in the early Middle Ages: texts and transmission* (Dublin, 2002), pp. 103–22, at pp. 109–11, 115–6; also R. Meens, ‘Fragmente der *Capitula episcoporum* Ruotgers von Trier und des *Scarapsus Pirminii*’, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 48 (1992), pp. 167–77, at p. 173.

⁸⁹ *Scarapsus* c. 2.22, ed. G. Jecker, *Die Heimat des hl. Pirmin*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 13 (Münster, 1927), pp. 55–6.

The second text, presented as a letter of Gregory II to bishop Martin, travelling in Bavaria in 716, notes that because dreams are vain by biblical authority, no attention should be paid to them.⁹⁰ The earliest manuscript evidence of the letter is from the end of the eighth century, and doubts have been cast on its authenticity. Maximilian Diesenberger has however pointed out that apart from one manuscript its early copies, all from South German or Swiss centres, accompany the Corbie recension of the *Vetus Gallica*, prepared probably in the the 720's, and further one of them seems to be a copy of a manuscript written in the late 740's, judging by where a chronicle contained in it ends. Thus the letter is unlikely to date from c. 800, as Lothar Vogel argued, and may be authentic or a mid-eighth-century forgery.⁹¹ In the latter case its stance on dreams may be influenced by the *Excarpsus Cummeani* with which it circulates in four manuscripts,⁹² but, especially as the latter presents no biblical argument, the views of Gregory, who does cite the Bible, may be a more probable inspiration.

⁹⁰ *Litterae Gregorii II Papae Decretales* c. 5, ed. J. Merkel, MGH Leges 3 (Hanover, 1863), p. 454.

⁹¹ M. Diesenberger, 'Sammeln und Gestalten – Erinnern und Vergessen. Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg und die Ursprünge des Salzburger Episkopats', W. Pohl ed., *Die Suche nach den Ursprüngen* (Wien, 2004), pp. 171–189, at pp. 175–176. Cf. L. Vogel, 'Bayern und Rom im frühen achten Jahrhundert. Über die römischen Synodalakten von 721 und das päpstliche Kapitular von 716 zur Einrichtung einer bayerischen Kirchenprovinz', *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 63 (2000), pp. 357–414, esp. pp. 409–12.

⁹² With the *Vetus Gallica* and the *Excarpsus*: Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB.V.113 (s viii ex., Rhaetia; CLA 9.1360); BnF lat. 10588 (s ix¹, Burgundy or South France; B 4649); St. Gallen 675 (s ix¹, Southwest Germany; B 5832); and Vienna lat. 2171. With the *Vetus Gallica*: Einsiedeln 205 (s ix², Switzerland; B 1119); with the letters of

It is thus with clear precedent that Mosaic Law prohibiting divination by dreams appears in Charlemagne's famous reform capitulary of 789, *Admonitio generalis*. It was intended to reinstate existing law, and referred to the example of King Josiah who, finding Judah rife with idolatry, reinstated Mosaic law.⁹³ Thus, alongside canon law, possibly from the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, the law of Moses figures prominently in the capitulary. As a royal capitulary the *Admonitio* was widely distributed through its primary recipients (bishops, counts).⁹⁴ Its implementation was overseen by the *missi dominici*, who were royal representatives in their assigned areas, with the power to act as judges and to inspect the conduct of clergy and laity.⁹⁵

Gregory the Great: Vienna lat. 943 (s ix in., Salzburg; B 7174–6). See also Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform*, pp. 231, 235, 299.

⁹³ McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 1–11; H. Mordek, 'Fränkische Kapitularien und Kapitulariensammlungen', in *ibid.*, *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung. Aufsätze über Kapitularien und Kapitulariensammlungen ausgewählt zum 60. Geburtstag* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), pp. 1–53, at p. 15; M. Garrison, 'The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in *The Uses of the Past*, pp. 114–61, at pp. 146–7; McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, 239–42.

⁹⁴ For the manuscripts see Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 85–90, 172–7, 178–85, 357–64, 587–605, 676–80, 731–3, 920–43; also Mordek, 'Karolingische Kapitularien', in *Studien zur fränkischen Herrschergesetzgebung*, pp. 55–80, here pp. 72–3. For the manuscripts with selections that include c. 65 see Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 335–8; 883–8 and 911–15.

⁹⁵ On Charlemagne's *missi* see J.R. Davis, *Charlemagne's Practice of Empire* (Cambridge, 2015), esp. pp. 32–35, 50–87, 294–298; also McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 260–2.

The *Admonitio* quotes sentences against dreams as grounds for addressing contemporary problems, but they were also taken seriously in their own right. Chapter 64 quotes verses from Leviticus (XIX.26) and Deuteronomy (XVIII.10–11) a reminder that divine law prohibits magic, augury and the interpretation of dreams. Then follows Charlemagne's own decree, proscribing practitioners of magic of different kinds.⁹⁶ However, in order to offer grounds for new decrees, the quoted sentences and their literal meaning had to have authority. Moreover, we know that Carolingian theologians knew and valued what Gregory had said about the problems of dreams.⁹⁷ Thus it is not surprising that the sentences against dreams appear independently, not simply as grounds for a more specific decree, already in Charlemagne's *Capitulare missorum item speciale*, which survives in a copy of a collection prepared c. 806 by or for Gerbald, bishop of Liège (785/7–809).⁹⁸

From the *Admonitio* the sentences on dreams found their way to normative texts written by bishops for their dioceses. The *Admonitio* had charged the bishops of the realm with the observance of canons and with teaching their clergy and their congregations to live as Christians. Episcopal statutes, often drafted for practical and immediate application, are one

⁹⁶ *Admonitio generalis* c. 64, H. Mordek, K. Zechiel-Eckes & M. Glatthaar (eds), MGH

Fontes Iuris 16 (Hanover, 2012), p. 216.

⁹⁷ E.g. *Opus Caroli contra synodum* c. 3.26, A. Freeman with P. Meyvaert (eds), MGH

Concilia 1, Supplementum 1 (Hanover 1998), p. 464; Keskiäho, *Dreams*, 206, 212–213.

⁹⁸ *Capitulare missorum item speciale 802?* c. 40, ed. A. §, MGH Capitularia regum Francorum 1 (Hanover, 1883), p. 104, quoting Deuteronomy XVIII.10 without attribution; Harmening, *Superstitio*, pp. 100–1. For the manuscript, Mordek, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 37–41. On Gerbald also McKitterick, *Charlemagne*, pp. 264–5;

sign that bishops answered this call.⁹⁹ In his directives for an episcopal visitation, Gerbald, who had acted as a royal *missus*, expected his representatives to find and report to him all kinds of frowned-upon religious activity, including the interpretation of dreams.¹⁰⁰ This reference to dreams appears to have been inspired by the Biblical verses quoted in the *Admonitio*, and likely attests to their influence and literal interpretation. Gerbald's directions were found useful by the bishop (Erpuin?) of Senlis, who issued, perhaps in the 830s or 840s, a shortened version of it (still mentioning dreams) in his capitulary.¹⁰¹

Thus, although the *Admonitio* quoted sentences against heeding dreams only quoted as a foundation for new rules, the episcopal capitularies demonstrate how such older sentences were taken as current authorities in themselves, just as happened in the penitentials with the canon on dreams. Where these decrees mostly speak of heeding or interpreting dreams, two texts related to the council of Paris in 829 proscribe, similarly appealing to Mosaic law,

⁹⁹ See A. Bühler, '*Capitularia Relecta*. Studien zur Entstehung und Überlieferung der Kapitularien Karls des Großen und Ludwigs des Frommen', *Archiv für Diplomatik* 32 (1986), pp. 305–501, at pp. 432–9; C. Van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord. Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period* (Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, 6) (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 24 – 48; W. Hartmann, *Kirche und Kirchenrecht um 900. Die Bedeutung der spätkarolingischen Zeit für Tradition und Innovation im kirchlichen Recht*, Schriften der MGH 58 (Hanover, 2008), pp. 78–83.

¹⁰⁰ *Capitula II Ghaerbaldi* c. 10, ed. P. Brommer, MGH Capitula episcoporum 1 (Hanover, 1984), p. 29: 'Ut inquirantur sortilegi et aruspices ... et qui somnia observant'. On the nature of this text see Van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, p. 102.

¹⁰¹ *Capitula Silvanectensia I* c. 1.11, ed. R. Pokorny, MGH Capitula episcoporum 3 (Hanover, 1995), pp. 82–3.

interpreters of dreams (*somniorum coniectores*). They are listed among other practitioners of prohibited arts, labelled ‘undoubtedly remains of pagan practice’.¹⁰² It does not seem, however, that these prohibitions are any more connected to actual practices than the decrees so far surveyed. In fact the decree still probably echoes the *Admonitio*, but lists practitioners, rather than practices. Somewhat similarly Herard, archbishop of Tours (856–870) prohibited interpreters of dreams (*somniarii*) in his statutes.¹⁰³ It may be that the shift from practices to practitioners is an attempt to define more closely what exactly was objectionable about dreams. The prohibition of interpreting dreams was in any case already well known: some episcopal statutes, or texts posing as such, even included the Ancyra canon on divination in the *Isidori vulgata* -translation.¹⁰⁴

It seems clear that a definition of objectionable religious practices that included (the interpretation of) dreams was received and passed on to their flocks by at least a significant part of the Carolingian episcopate. A quarter of Carolingian royal capitularies and councils

¹⁰² *Concilium Parisiense a. 829* c. 3.2 (69), ed. A. Werminghoff, MGH Concilia 2.2

(Hanover, 1908), p. 669: ‘quae ex ritu gentilium remansisse non dubium est’; also *Episcoporum ad Hludowicum imperatorem relatio a. 829* c. 54, ed. V. Krause, MGH Capitularia regum Francorum 2 (Hanover, 1897), p. 44. On these texts see Mordek, ‘Fränkische Kapitularien’, p. 23.

¹⁰³ *Capitula Herardi* c. 3, eds. R. Pokorny and M. Stratmann, MGH Capitula episcoporum 2 (Hanover, 1984), p. 128; on the text, see also McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 64–6.

¹⁰⁴ See *Capitula Radulfi* c. 38, ed. P. Brommer, MGH Capitula episcoporum, pp. 1.262–3; *Capitula Vesulensia* c. 33, ed. R. Pokorny, *idem*, p. 3.353; and the *Statuta Bonifatii* c. 33, ed. R. Pokorny, *idem*, p. 3.365; on these texts see also McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 59–60.

ruling against divination, and well over half of the texts edited as episcopal statutes touching on such issues, explicitly mention dreams among the practices prohibited as divination.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, almost two thirds of the ninth-century manuscripts of these texts contain prohibitions of heeding dreams.¹⁰⁶ Even if the surviving materials are not entirely representative of what circulated in the ninth century, the results suggest that most of the more influential decrees on divination defined it to include the interpretation of dreams.

Normative Sources and the Negotiation of Christian Dreaming

Normative decrees on dreams were not always simply copied, nor necessarily introduced based on observed practices, but could be motivated by a learned conviction that dreams could originate in spiritual influences and were therefore problematic. The intentional inclusion of dreams in decrees defining divination probably reflects theoretical discomfort with dreams, and a striving towards more correct Christian living based on authoritative texts, such as those of Gregory the Great. Moreover, such decrees mentioning dreams spread in normative texts and ultimately reached those ministering to lay congregations. They may have done so already at the beginning of the eighth century in some areas, but had certainly done so by the ninth.

¹⁰⁵ From the index to MGH *Capitula regum Francorum*, pp. 2:580 and 619, s.v. *auguri**, *divinationes* and *divinus vel sortilegus*: nine capitularies on divination (excluding the *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*), three mentioning dreams. MGH *Concilia*, pp. 2.2:949 and 962: three council acts, none discussing dreams. MGH *Capitula episcoporum*, pp. 4:163, 183: eight episcopal statutes, five discussing dreams.

¹⁰⁶ After Mordek, *Bibliotheca*; MGH *Capitula episcoporum*; B: 18 out of 30 manuscripts with chapters discussing dreams. See Supporting information.

How do these decrees relate to what we know of the kind of dreaming ecclesiastical authorities considered problematic or non-Christian? Virtually all early medieval dreams that have left a surviving record are Christian dreams. At the first glance there is such an abundance of these stories – dreams of saints, of heaven and hell – that it is tempting to conclude that contemporaries saw no problem with dreams. Nevertheless, patristic teaching on dreams was clear: some were undoubtedly true, yet at the same time other dreams were certainly false. While all early medieval dreams may be religious dreams, not all religious dreams were necessarily true.¹⁰⁷

The definition of true and false dreams was continuously negotiated, and the normative texts surveyed in this article relate to these processes. I have shown that interest in the canon associating dreaming with divination coincides with interest in Gregory's thought on dreams, suggesting that the two may be causally linked. It is possible that Gregory's thought influenced these normative texts even directly, as it highlighted the Old Testament decrees on divination that the Carolingians adopted as the basis for their capitularies on the subject.

The need to mark Christian dreaming apart from observing dreams 'in the manner of pagans' is discernible also in hagiographical dream-stories.¹⁰⁸ Especially in the developing genre of visions of the afterlife it became usual to separate them from 'mere' dreams. When these stories first appear in seventh-century Francia, the visions take place either explicitly in dreams or in states indistinguishable from dreaming. However, already early eighth-century narratives from Anglo-Saxon England take care to mark such visions as having been experienced during temporary death and as such distinct from dreams. This appears to be

¹⁰⁷ Dutton, *The Politics*, pp. 28–49; Moreira, *Dreams, Visions*, pp. 12–38; Keskiäho, *Dreams*, esp. pp. 24–59.

¹⁰⁸ Keskiäho, *Dreams*, p. 26.

largely due to an awareness in these contexts of authorities – such as Gregory the Great – warning of the dangers of dreaming.¹⁰⁹

Of course, challenges to Christian dreaming might also come from inside learned culture. Guides to prognosticating from dreams circulated at least from the ninth century, but although they clearly derive from pre-Christian antiquity, it is not clear if they were used, how, or how widely, in this period: later they appear to have been both used by those who considered themselves Christian and also condemned as non-Christian by others.¹¹⁰ Instead of a culture of pagan or non-Christian dreaming, the clearest context for the canons I have surveyed and their proliferation is Christian discussions about dreams.

Certainly not all assessed the problems of dreams in the same way. In the *Visio Wettini*, written soon after 824 at Reichenau, the central vision occurs in a dream (*somnium*). This seems deliberate: in one episode a bishop (foolishly) refuses to believe a dream, rephrasing as justification apparently the above mentioned letter attributed to Gregory II.¹¹¹ This, implying that Christian dreams were different from those to which such canons referred, was clearly one way of using normative texts in negotiating a definition of Christian dreaming. Similarly,

¹⁰⁹ *Idem*, pp. 59–71. For a case of Carolingian care with dreams see J. Nelson, ‘Dhuoda on Dreams’, in C. Leyser and L. Smith (eds), *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe* (Farnham–Burlington, VT, 2011), 41–53.

¹¹⁰ For the so-called *Somniale Danielis* -texts see L. DiTommaso, *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*, *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 20 (Leiden, 2005), pp. 236–59; L.S. Chaddam, *Anglo-Saxon prognostics, 900–1100. Study and texts*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History 153 (Leiden, 2007), esp. 127–38.

¹¹¹ Heito, *Visio Wettini* c. 10, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetae 2 (Berlin, 1884), p. 271; Keskiö, *Dreams*, pp. 66–70.

prohibiting and thus affirming the reality of non-Christian divination by dreams could be a way of setting apart a conceptual space for Christian visions. A possible example is Boniface, tentatively associated with the *Excarpsus* and the manuscript excerpting the *Epitome Hispana*, but also narrating visions of the afterlife.¹¹² Like all authoritative texts, such normative decrees could in learned discussion be used not only against but also in support of the things they seemed to prohibit.

Mayke De Jong has drawn attention to how sorcery or witchcraft could be a very serious matter to a community invested in *correctio*,¹¹³ but dreaming may not have been as serious an issue. An awareness of the problematic nature of dreams, such as that evidenced in the possibly Northumbrian Sanblasiana and the DU, may have motivated Abbess Hild of Whitby (d. 680) to convene a panel to examine Caedmon, who had received the gift of song in a vision.¹¹⁴ However, when Charlemagne consulted pope Hadrian on the visions of a monk, it may have been more due to the disturbing content of these visions than to the king's decrees against the interpretation of dreams, although such incidents may well have convinced Charlemagne and his bishops of these decrees.¹¹⁵ When Rabanus Maurus, who as we have seen was very well aware of what Gregory and the canons said about dreams, discovered a woman who had preached on visions she pretended to have seen, he had her flogged, if primarily for preaching without a licence.¹¹⁶ Indeed, not all who distrusted dreams saw non-Christian

¹¹² *Bonifatii et Lulli epistolae* c. 10, p. 252.

¹¹³ M. De Jong, *The Penitential State. Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814–840* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 200–2.

¹¹⁴ Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* c. 4.22.2–3, pp. 3.332–6.

¹¹⁵ *Codex Carolinus* c. 88, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae* 3, p. 625.

¹¹⁶ *Annales Fuldenses* s. a. 847, ed. F. Kurze, MGH SRG 7 (Hanover, 1891), pp. 36–7.

dreaming primarily as a punishable offence. Regino of Prüm (about 906), in his famous reference to women who dreamt of riding with the goddess Diana, argues that the visiting bishop should mainly try to convince them that these are empty dreams.¹¹⁷

The reception of Gregory's teaching on dreams supported the inclusion of dreams in definitions of divination, and where these were noticed they probably gave additional stimulus to attempts at defining Christian dreaming. The handling of dreams was contextual, and a prescriptive sentence against the interpretation of dreams probably did not mean all dreams, nor was it necessarily applied so. However, the inclusion of dreams into definitions of unlawful divination meant that dreams could be made into a disciplinary issue if this was deemed necessary. The only evidence we have of dream cultures that could have inspired these proscriptions is of Christian practices of narrating dreams about political events, saints and the afterlife. Where the value of individual (tales of) dreams was negotiated, these prescriptive sentences were one well-represented voice that likely found varied uses. In the end, through positing the existence of dreaming 'in the manner of pagans', they may have helped clear a conceptual space for its opposite, Christian ways of dreaming.

¹¹⁷ For Regino, see his *De synodalibus causis* c. 2.371, ed. W. Hartmann after F.W.H. Wasserschleben, *Das Sendhandbuch des Regino von Prüm*, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe 42 (Darmstadt, 2004), pp. 420–1; and Keskiaho, *Dreams*, pp. 213–4.