

# From passageway to frontier: the Alps in Carolingian times

by Katharina Winckler

The article focuses on the Carolingian frontiers within the Alps: starting with their origins in Roman times and the changes in the Merovingian era, it focuses on the broader developments of the Carolingian period, when many areas of the Alps were reframed into new spatial entities, such as the Eastern Alps eventually becoming part of the Eastern Frankish kingdom.

Middle Ages; 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> centuries; alpine frontiers; Carolingians; alpine passes; alpine strongholds; alpine roads.

## Abbreviations

MGH, ARF = *Annales regni Francorum inde ab a. 741 usque ad a. 829, qui dicuntur Annales Laurissenses Maiores et Einhardi*, ed. F. Kurze, Hannover 1895 (MGH, SS rer. Germ., 6).

MGH, Capit. I = *Capitularia regum Francorum*, vol. 1, ed. A. Boretius, Hannover 1883 (MGH, LL).

MGH, Conc. II/1 = *Concilia aevi Karolini (742–842)*, vol. 1: (742–817), ed. A. Werminghoff, Hannover 1906 (MGH, Con., II/1).

MGH, DD Karol. I = *Pippin, Karlmann und Karl der Große*, ed. E. Mühlbacher, Hannover 1906 (Die Urkunden der Karolinger, 1).

MGH, DD Lo I. / Lo II. = *Die Urkunden Lothars I. und Lothars II.*, ed. T. Schieffer, Berlin 1960 (Die Urkunden der Karolinger, 3).

MGH, HL = Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum*, ed. G. Waitz – L. Bethmann, Hannover 1887 (MGH, SS rer. Lang.), pp. 11-187.

MGH, VK = Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, Hannover-Leipzig 1911 (MGH, SS rer. Germ., 25).

Trad. Fr. = *The Traditions of Freising*, in *Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising*, vol. 1: 744–926, ed. T. Bitterauf, Aalen 1967<sup>2</sup>.

Katharina Winckler, University of Trento, Italy, k.vonwinckler@unitn.it, 0000-0001-6062-8797

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup\_referee\_list)

FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup\_best\_practice)

Katharina Winckler, *From passageway to frontier: the Alps in Carolingian times*, © Author(s), CC BY 4.0, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0416-3.08, in Maddalena Betti, Francesco Borri, Stefano Gasparri (edited by), *Carolingian Frontiers: Italy and Beyond*, pp. 95-113, 2024, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 979-12-215-0416-3, DOI 10.36253/979-12-215-0416-3

The Alps appear as a natural boundary that divides the Italian peninsula from the rest of Europe. Yet history tells us that these mountains did not discourage anyone from crossing them. From barbaric tribes to military leaders like Hannibal, Charlemagne or Napoleon, the mountains were a nuisance but not actually a barrier. And it is not by chance that Hannibal lost his eyesight in a winter storm in the Apennines and not in the Alps, which were conceived as less dangerous than the Apennines. The myth of the Alps as a natural frontier is also vivid in Carolingian sources. But even the heroic narrations surrounding Charlemagne's conquest of the Lombard kingdom could not hide the fact that the crossing of the Alps was one of the easiest parts of this conquest. Thus, the image of the Alps as an unsurmountable natural boundary is a *topos* that was used throughout history up until modern times<sup>1</sup>.

For day-to-day life and politics, there were numerous options for communication, trade, and for armies to cross the Alps. These passageways were as much shaped by politics and power as by the specific topography of the mountains. It was the control (or loss of control) of these routes that determined the borders running through the Alps. Therefore, a closer look at the specific alpine geography may help us to understand why some frontiers emerged, why some stayed fluid or were fast changing, whereas others did not change for centuries.

In short, and as already observed by the Romans, the Alps are much steeper on their southern slopes<sup>2</sup>. Also, in the western and central parts of the Alps, the summits can reach altitudes of over 4000 metres. In contrast to that, the last ridge of the Eastern Alps stretching 3000 metres and above is the High Tauern, with the mountains east of the Tauern being significantly below that height. As a consequence, one obstacle for trans-alpine travel cannot be found there: the glaciers. The eastern and northern slopes usually fade out into densely wooded hill land. Additionally, the Western Alps are not as wide and broken up as the Alps east of the Raetian passes. This is significant for human traveling: whilst in the west there is just one, generally high, pass to be crossed, in the east there are two or more, lower passes. Thus, the actual time spent in the mountains is lengthened by many days. These natural features, in combination with the cultural factor that was the importance of the Roman and early medieval centres west of the Rhine and in the Rhône valley, meant that the main trans-alpine traffic went over the passes of the Western and Central Alps: the Montgenèvre/Mont Cenis, Great and Little St. Bernard, and the Raetian (Julier, St. Bernadino, Septimer) passes. Further to the east, the Reschen and Brennerpass were also continually used, partly because they

<sup>1</sup> MGH, VK, 6, p. 9. Desiderius left the alpine *clusae* when he saw that they were not efficient enough to block the Frankish army and preferred to retreat to Pavia. MGH, ARF, p. 36, *ad annum* 773; Winckler, *Die Alpen*, pp. 100-110.

<sup>2</sup> Livy, XXI, 35. For the sake of simplicity, I will call the Italian side of the Alps "southern" although this is not actually true for the Western Alps.

are of such low altitude that the additional crossing of the rainy pre-alpine heights was an acceptable nuisance<sup>3</sup>.

In contrast to modern conceptions of the high areas, peaks and ridges of the Alps as being a natural boundary, this perception was not shared by the ancient dwellers of the Alps. They used both sides of a mountain range for their economic sustenance, using the mountain pastures for livestock and as hunting ground. This ranging back and forth across the high ridges of the Alps can be observed from prehistoric times onwards, with the most famous example being the 5,000 year old mummy called Ötzi at the Tisenjoch, at an altitude of 3,200 metres<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, political entities in the Alps tended to extend from the entrance to the Alps to the exit at the other side, with one or more interconnected pass-routes – in German a “pass-system” – between them. This specific alpine political organisation took shape already in antiquity, for example in the realms of king Cottius in the Western Alps, or of the Noricans in the Eastern Alps. Continuing this spatial organisation, the Roman administration of the Alps created many provinces that lay solely in the mountains and wore their respective names: the *Alpes Maritimae*, *Alpes Cottiae*, *Alpes Graiae* and *Poeninae*. In the east, the provinces of Raetia and Noricum at first reached beyond the Alps, over the Bavarian plains up to the Danube. But the late Roman administration changed that and divided both provinces into two parts, with the only the southern part being located in the mountains. Thus, ancient boundaries were usually positioned at the foot of the Alps and not, like in modern times, on their summits. Another factor in this arrangement were the specific geological conditions of the Alps. The southern alpine valleys have steep rock faces, that were much easier to fortify than the (mostly) mellow hills of the central and north-eastern sides. Thus, we find alpine frontiers and frontier fortifications of Roman and early medieval times mainly on the southern slopes of the Alps, at the exits of the main valleys and traffic routes to the Po plains.

Frontiers and realms of the Alps are closely connected with these alpine roads and passes. It is notable that although, generally, Roman roads, especially over the Alps, were still very much in use in Carolingian times, some important alpine connections changed. The sixth and seventh centuries saw the growing importance of the Mont Cenis over the Montgenèvre. In Roman times this connection between the Rhône valley and the Po valley went through the valley of the Durance, past Embrun over the Montgenèvre pass. At some point in the sixth century, due to the increased traffic from and to the Frankish centres in northern Gaul, the Mont Cenis pass became more important and with it the Maurienne valley. One factor for this was the increasing importance of early medieval pilgrimage and other religiously motivated

<sup>3</sup> Winckler, *Die Alpen*, pp. 62-71 and 114-126.

<sup>4</sup> Gambicorti – Salzer, *Über Gletscher + Grenzen*, pp. 11-12.

travels (for example by bishops) to Rome and further<sup>5</sup>. This had consequences for the economic, political, and ecclesiastical structures in these areas and ultimately also for the borders here (see below). Several Rhaetian passes gained importance for the same reason. It is no coincidence that our knowledge of the use these passes in early medieval times stems from many journeys to Rome by saints and high-ranking officials of the Church. The Great St. Bernard and the Reschen and Brennerpass preserved their importance, although the Brenner route was less used because the road in the narrows of the river Eisack was not usable anymore. Finally, the incursions of Slavs and Avars in the Eastern Alps at the end of the sixth century meant a significant reduction of the traffic on the passes of this part of the mountains.

Man-made factors also shaped the medieval alpine frontiers. One has its roots in Roman times. In the Roman empire important internal frontiers between the toll districts of Illyricum, Gallia and Italia went through the Alps<sup>6</sup>. The Alps were not seen as part of Italia, with a notable exception being Raetia that, according to the late antique order of provinces, was part of the *Italia annonaria*. According to this order, the *Alpes Cottiae* were also part of Italia – but it seems that the position of this province had changed significantly to the southeast, now reaching from the exit of the Alps into the Apennines. Therefore, seemingly, the *Alpes Cottiae* of Late Antiquity were not part of the Alps anymore. This late Roman spatial order of things is curiously re-used by Paul the Deacon, although at the times of his writing the region of Raetia, now parted in Churraetia and Alemannia, had long belonged to Francia<sup>7</sup>. At several points along the main roads crossing the Alps internal tolls were levied, preferably at or near the narrows of the main valleys on the southern side of the Alps. Many of those toll stations lived on in Merovingian and Carolingian times<sup>8</sup>. Therefore, if those stations can be identified, they can serve as a point of reference for the position of early medieval alpine frontiers. For example, the *statio Maiensis* near modern Töll, was located a few kilometres west of Meran<sup>9</sup>. Occasionally, those points were also on the northern side of the Alps, one such example being the monastery of St. Maurice d’Agaune in the Valais, that is, not coincidentally, also positioned at a narrow in an otherwise wide valley<sup>10</sup>. Those narrows proved to be useful for the control of merchants and, later, also for the defence against armies and other intruders. In Late Antiquity

<sup>5</sup> Cantino Wataghin, “*Luoghi di Strada*”, p. 273, no. 18; Winckler, *Die Alpen*, pp. 127-128.

<sup>6</sup> France, *Quadragesima Galliarum*, pp. 153-156 and 331-336; De Laet, *Portorium*, pp. 144-160 and 177-192.

<sup>7</sup> MGH, HL, II, 15-16, p. 82; Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 19 and 225-228, hypothesizes that the pattern of seventh-century coins found in Curia might mean, that Churraetia temporarily belonged to the Lombard and not the Merovingian “currency-zone”.

<sup>8</sup> Kaiser, *Steuer und Zoll*, pp. 4-5, 9.

<sup>9</sup> France, *Quadragesima*, pp. 153-156, 331-336; De Laet, *Portorium*, pp. 153-159; Inscription: < <http://gams.uni-graz.at/o:epsg.424> >; < <https://edh.uni-heidelberg.de/edh/inschrift/HD058369> > (accessed on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2022). Albertoni, *Die Herrschaft des Bischofs*, p. 60.

<sup>10</sup> France, *Quadragesima Galliarum*, pp. 93-96 and pp. 332-334.

uity a new name for the fortified narrows was born: *clusa*, also *claustra* or *clusura*. The late antique Romans used these words for fortifications in the mountains in general, also in areas like the Pyrenees and in South-Eastern Europe. From the early Middle Ages on, it became a widely used, specific term for the fortified narrows in the valleys of the Southern Alps, mostly near or at the borders<sup>11</sup>. The references to these points can thus also serve as an indication for early medieval alpine frontiers.

### 1. *Early medieval alpine frontiers before 788*

Generally speaking, on many occasions the frontiers consisted of well-defined frontier points, mainly castles and *clusae*. They were surrounded by areas that remain uncertain to us. But we have many local sources which show that, on a local level, the exact extent of the realms seems to have been known precisely. This was especially true in areas where the borders were frequently contested, for example the Bavarian Border, that was positioned at different times in different places in the Vinschgau and the Etsch valley. In the second half of the eighth century Bishop Arbeo of Freising recounts the life of the St. Corbinian in his *Vita Corbiniani*. He tells us that at the beginning of the eighth century St. Corbinian was held by Bavarian guards at the *castrum maiense* (today the so-called Zenoburg in Mais, part of Meran), which means that the fortification was then part of the Bavarian territory. When the saint died a while later in Bavaria, he wished to be buried in the *castrum maiense*, near the body of St. Zeno. When his body was brought there, it was Lombard guards who ruled over this place and, initially, thought of the request as a Bavarian trick to enter the castle. Some years later, at the time of Arbeo, this had changed again, and the castle was back in Bavarian hands<sup>12</sup>. Paul the Deacon confirms this by mentioning in the final sentences of his *Historia Langobardorum* that the Lombards seized many castles in that area<sup>13</sup>.

In the context of the border with Bavaria, Paul the Deacon tells another story about alpine frontiers. His account of the marriage of the Bavarian “king’s” daughter Theodelinda with the Lombard king Authari reminds one of medieval epic traditions and is largely anecdotal. But Paul includes a remark on how the frontiers of the realms were marked with the symbolic throw of an axe, so that the king marks a tree that stands at the frontier, with the axe being left there<sup>14</sup>. Similarly, and just two chapters after this statement, Paul recounts a *fama* on how Authari defined the border in the south: he touched a pillar with the tip of his spear and said: «Usque hic erunt Langobardorum

<sup>11</sup> Pohl, *Frontiers*, pp. 118, 123-125; Duparc, *Les cluses* pp. 6-8; Winckler, *Between Symbol of Power*, pp. 114-116.

<sup>12</sup> *Vita Corbiniani* 23, 27, 42-43, pp. 128, 146, 152-153.

<sup>13</sup> MGH, HL, VI, 58, p. 187.

<sup>14</sup> MGH, HL, III, 30, pp. 109-110.

finēs»<sup>15</sup>. In such cases, the territory and borders were, on a local level, well-known and defined. Furthermore, in the last two examples, the borders of the realm are marked like property, as defined in many law codes of the time<sup>16</sup>.

Yet another source of the time seems to describe a ducal frontier being defined like the marking of property. In 769, the monastery of Innichen was founded on the initiative of the Bavarian duke Tassilo (III). It was positioned at the sources of the Drava in the Puster valley, then the southeasternmost point of the Bavarian duchy. Here, we have a surprisingly precise definition of the frontier to the adjacent Slavic realm: «a rivo quae vocatur Tesido usque ad terminus Sclauorum, id est ad rivolum montis Anarasi»<sup>17</sup>. In this case the frontier of the realm marked at the same time the extent of the property. Here, a stream serves as a well-defined and linear marker – like the *limes certus* against the Avars (see below).

Many alpine monasteries were located at or near the borders – not only the above mentioned Innichen. Sometimes the monasteries even had property beyond the borders. The testament of Abbo, written in 739, records properly that this Frankish noble made a donation of land to the newly founded monastery of Novalesa in the Susa valley. Since Roman times this valley had belonged to Gallia, up until the exit of the valley into the Po-plains. In the testament we read that Abbo also had property «infra regnum Langobardorum» and «infra fines Langobardorum»<sup>18</sup>. We do not know how the monks of Novalesa administered a property that was located beyond the frontier, for example, how they dealt with the tolls and border-controls? A diploma of Carloman of the year 769 frees Novalesa of every sort of toll<sup>19</sup>, but this did not refer to the Lombard tolls, that were certainly collected. We know from other sources, that in the eighth century the border points at the major roads over the Alps were kept under close observation by the respective authorities. One famous example are the laws of king Ratchis. How and if these laws were administered is not clear, but sources talk about people being stopped at the Lombard border in the Alps<sup>20</sup>. From the Bavarian side we also see a border management at roughly the same time, again recorded in the *Vita Corbiniani*.

<sup>15</sup> MGH, HL, III, 32, p. 112.

<sup>16</sup> The *Lex Baiuvariorum* XIII, 4, p. 113, mentions signs on stones and trees «quae antiquitus constituta sunt».

<sup>17</sup> Trad. Fr., AD 769, no. 34, pp. 61-62.

<sup>18</sup> *The Testament of Abbo*, 8-9, in Geary, *Aristocracy*, p. 44, for property in the Susa valley and the valley of Dubbione, further to the south.

<sup>19</sup> Charter of Carloman, MGH, DD Karol. I, no. 47, pp. 66-67; Castelnuovo, *Les monastères et leurs alpes*, p. 13; Cantino Wataghin, “*Luoghi di Strada*”, p. 282; Ripart, *La Novalaise*, p. 101. The monastery explicitly did not have to pay tolls for their sheep. This hints at a wider-ranging economic activities, maybe even large-scale transhumance, that crossed several administrative borders within the Western Alps.

<sup>20</sup> Pohl, *Frontiers*, pp. 124-126; Albertoni, *La politica alpina*, pp. 55, 60; MGH, ARF, pp. 34-35, *ad annum* 773. According to MGH, ARF, p. 12, *ad annum* 755, King Pippin went over the Alps against King Aistulf of the Lombards, who went to the *Clusae Langobardorum* – however, they (as always) proved to be ineffective.

The *Vita* mentions «auctores montani» who controlled the border in the Vinschgau, near the *castrum maiense*. Those mountain guards accompanied the saint to the border between the Lombard kingdom and the Bavarian duchy. They were also instructed to intercept him in case he wanted to return to Bavaria<sup>21</sup>.

In addition to these heightened military activities of Bavarians, Lombards and Franks at the alpine borders, we see a growing interest in gaining control over alpine areas via ecclesiastical institutions at or near the borders. Some rulers used bishoprics and monasteries to administer and to take care of the roads over the passes and in alpine areas. Other bishops aimed to gain control for themselves, excluding the worldly powers as much as possible. One example is the monastery of Bischofshofen. It was founded at the beginning of the eighth century near the border with hostile Slavic groups, maybe the Carantanians, where the road from Salzburg went over the Alps to Italy. The destruction of the monastery by the «vicinis Sclauis» shortly after its foundation indicates the proximity to the frontiers. After this, it stood empty for a time, according to the *Breves Notitiae*, also because of the «imminentes Sclauos et crudeles paganos»<sup>22</sup>. Eventually it was rebuilt and subsequently stood at the centre of a bitter fight between the bishop of Salzburg and the local family of the Albina, who were supported by Duke Odilo<sup>23</sup>. Even under Carolingian rule, when the whole of the Eastern Alps was part of the empire, the dispute between worldly and ecclesiastical powers was still alive – and, surprisingly too, was the old frontier. In the wake of the rise of Liudewit in 820, the monastery was – again – burned down by its Slavic neighbours: «impii Sclavi incendebant hoc monasterium»<sup>24</sup>.

## 2. Early medieval alpine frontiers after 788

When Charlemagne started his military campaign against the Lombards in 773, we learn that the fortifications at the narrows of the Southern Alps were no obstacle at all to his advance, although the Lombard rulers, as we just saw, had put much effort in reinforcing them. According to the account of the *Annales regni Francorum*, an envoy of Pope Hadrian met Charlemagne in Francia to ask for help against the Lombards, but he had to use the Mediterranean for his travel. This, for the narrator of the Annals, was not the preferred way, but the envoy had to use the sea because the «viae clausae fuerunt Romanis a Langobardis»<sup>25</sup>. So, we see that although the roads over

<sup>21</sup> *Vita Corbiniani*, 9, pp. 110, 128; Winckler, *Grenzen*, p. 23; Jahn, *Ducatus*, pp. 388-391.

<sup>22</sup> *Breves Notitiae*, 3.15, p. 92.

<sup>23</sup> Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, pp. 132-135; Štih, *Der heilige Maximilian von Celeia*, pp. 44-50.

<sup>24</sup> Bischoff, *Salzburger Formelbücher*, p. 28.

<sup>25</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 34, *ad annum* 773.

the mountains could block a single person and his/her entourage, there were still enough other options to reach the destination. When Charlemagne decided to act against the Lombards, it became clear that for a whole army the *clusae* were no obstacle. According to the account, Desiderius had fortified the barriers, but Charlemagne stopped his main army before the *clusae* and simply sent troops over another part of the mountains («mittens scaram suam per montanis»). This supposedly brought Desiderius to leave the fortifications – which were now described as being “open”<sup>26</sup>.

With the overthrow of Duke Tassilo in Bavaria, the Alps where once again united under one rule, that of Charlemagne. We might wonder what this one rule over all alpine territories meant for the borders within, since they were now interior borders. Yet, on a local level, there does not seem to have been much change: the tolls at the former borders were still levied as before. This is illustrated by a letter of Alcuin to the bishop of Curia: he asks the bishop, a friend, to free his merchant (negotiator) of the tolls «in montium claustris», a reference to the fortifications that were already present in Cassiodorus<sup>27</sup>. The *clusae* were still maintained as military fortifications. As usual, they proved not to be very efficient: when Bernard rose against his royal relatives in 817, according to the *Annales regni Francorum* (which has a strong bias against him), he had command over all the *clusae* – but left the fortifications before the actual fight<sup>28</sup>. In contrast to local interests to maintain the frontiers, Charlemagne, on an imperial level, seems to have worked towards re-arranging the alpine territories as a unifying element and not as an obstacle. Firstly, he strengthened the ecclesiastical control over many alpine roads and border posts, giving much administrative power to alpine monasteries and to some bishoprics like Salzburg<sup>29</sup>. We have already noticed that, well before the rule of the Carolingians, some ecclesiastical institutions of the Alps could accumulate much power by using their position along major transalpine roads. Examples of this are the bishop of Churraetia or the monastery of St. Maurice d’Agaune. But it does not seem that this had been a directed plan of the Merovingians – on the contrary, it appears that this was the result of these churches being far away from the centres of power. In that position, they were able to gain considerable autonomy – too much for the taste of Charlemagne, who restricted the powers of the Churraetian bishop<sup>30</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> MGH, ARF (*Annales q.d. Einhardi*), p. 35, *ad annum* 773, p. 37, mention two armies, one over the Great St. Bernard and the other over the Mont Cenis, but does not describe any fight in the mountains at all.

<sup>27</sup> *Alcuini sive Albini Epistolae*, no. 77 (c.791–796), pp. 118–119; Cassiodorus, *Variae* VII, 4, p. 203; Ganshof, *Het Tolwezen*, p. 17; Winckler, *Grenzen*, p. 23.

<sup>28</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 147, *ad annum* 817: «iam omnes aditus quibus in Italiam intratur, id est clusas, impositis firmasse praesidiis». Pohl, *Frontiers*, pp. 126–127.

<sup>29</sup> Here, the close relations of Arn with Charlemagne also played a role. Dopsch, *Salzburg*, pp. 35–36.

<sup>30</sup> Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 53–55.



One example of the Carolingian enhancement of the ecclesiastical structures in the Alps is the monastery of Müstair, founded near the summit of a pass in the later eighth century. The legend attributes the foundation to Charlemagne, but it is possible that Duke Tassilo of Bavaria had already initiated the establishing of this monastery. However, we have no sources talking about this, and the buildings date from the Carolingian era<sup>31</sup>. The monastery was positioned at an interior, political (though not ecclesiastical) border between Bavaria and Churraetia, near the summit of the Ofenpass<sup>32</sup>. This was an old, local connection between Curia, the upper Inn valley and the Vinschgau. This connection had gained importance in the ninth century, when traffic between the Rhine valley area north of the Alps and Italy had increased significantly<sup>33</sup>. At the foot of this pass in the Vinschgau at Mals a further church was built. In this church we have a unique fresco of a Carolingian noble and an ecclesiastical church founder, who worked together for this church and, possibly, also the roads connecting the different realms. This Carolingian noble is of very high rank, and Herwig Wolfram presumes that it may even be King Pippin of Italy himself<sup>34</sup>. The connection of the alpine monasteries with worldly powers and transalpine routes is also apparent in the *Notitia de Servitio Monasteriorum* of 817, in which we see that the monasteries of Mondsee, Kremsmünster and Novalesa, all located at important routes over the Alps, had to deliver *dona et militia*<sup>35</sup>.

When Charlemagne decided to divide his empire in 806, the text that records his plan – the *Divisio regnorum* – encapsulates the idea of the connecting Alps. In this regard, the text stands in stark contrast to the other passages and documents that deal with the partitions of the Carolingian empire. In the *Divisio regnorum*, the Alps play a most prominent role, appearing in the very definition of the two kingdoms for Louis and Pippin. Furthermore, the third clause stated explicitly, and in addition to the definitions of the three realms, that the three sons should each have a route to Italy that belongs to their part of the empire: «viam in Italiam quae ad regnum eius pertinent», that is Charles through the Aosta valley and Louis through the Susa valley. Those valleys were also the border zones. Remarkable is the statement that the Aosta valley belongs to the north-alpine realm of Charles, an indication that this idea was possibly disputed at this time. Pippin was explicitly granted the *noric* – that is the Reschen and Brenner – and Churraetian passes, al-

<sup>31</sup> Some wooden parts are dated by dendrochronology in the late eighth century, Sennhauser, *Kloster Müstair*, pp. 137 and 148-149, sees the «strategisch bedeutende Funktion» (strategical important role) of the monastery mainly in the years around 800, under Charlemagne's rule and as a monastery built to host *missi* and other official travellers.

<sup>32</sup> Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 145-149.

<sup>33</sup> Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 223-228.

<sup>34</sup> Wolfram, *Pippin von Italien*, pp. 249-252.

<sup>35</sup> *Notitia de Servitio Monasteriorum*, MGH, Capit. I, p. 350.

though they were positioned well within his realm<sup>36</sup>. The realm, that Charlemagne shaped for his son Pippin in this text, that is Bavaria and Italy, including the whole of the Eastern Alps, is obviously inspired by some late antique spatial ideas, either the late Roman praetorian prefecture of *Italia* or its successor, the realm of Theoderic<sup>37</sup>. Pippin's realm lasted only a short time, but we will meet this idea of one realm that reaches from the heartland of Italy far beyond the Alps to the Danube or even the North Sea reoccurring for the next decades. Unfortunately, the idea of keeping the passageways free for the kings to "help their brother" was wishful thinking, and the partition was never fully accomplished as Pippin and Charles both died before their father<sup>38</sup>.

After the *Divisio regnorum*, we increasingly find text passages describing alpine frontiers. Additionally, we see the emergence of new frontiers cutting through the Alps. We owe most descriptions of alpine frontiers to disputes: the frontiers within the Carolingian kingdoms were contested not only by the different successors of Charlemagne but also by counts and bishops aiming at extending their power. One example is the re-orientations of the Eastern Alps to the north-alpine realms. In late Roman times, the Eastern Alps were part of the prefecture of *Italia*. But although being part of the Roman empire for almost half a millennium, even in late Roman times the province Noricum was perceived as a somewhat backwards region<sup>39</sup>, although the material culture and buildings in the Drava valley and its surroundings prove otherwise. The church structure and building styles show a remarkable richness and demonstrate a cultural attachment to the regions south of the Alps<sup>40</sup>. When the area had become Slavic from the end of the sixth century on, it is again the south, that is Friuli, that first mentions the names of the Slavic groups in this region – the Carantanians and the Crainians. Paul the Deacon speaks of a broad frontier zone running along the Karawanken and the Slovenian Alps<sup>41</sup>.

<sup>36</sup> *Divisio regnorum*, MGH, Capit. I, pp. 126-130: clause 1 for Louis «Morienam, Tarentasiam, montem Cinisium, vallem Segusianam usque ad clusas et inde per terminus Italicorum montium usque ad mare»; clause 2 for Pippin «et inde per Hrenum fluvium sursum versus usque ad Alpes» and clause 4 for Charles «ita ut Karolus et Hludowicus viam habere possint in Italiam ad auxilium ferendum fratri suo, si ita necessitas extiterit, Karolus per vallem Augustanam, que ad regnum eius pertinent, et Hludowicus per vallem Segusianam, Pippinus veri et exitum et ingressum per Alpes Noricas atque Curiam».

<sup>37</sup> Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume*, p. 158; Albertoni, *La politica alpina*, p. 68; Kaiser, *Chur-rätien*, pp. 57-58. Furthermore, this idea might have reflected the Lombard influence sphere of the early seventh century, with Bavaria connected to the Lombard kingdom via marriage (Theodelinda). Another connecting element might have been the Aquilean Schism, common in the Church of the Lombard kingdom, Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 69-71. It might have reached over the Alps and included the Bavarian Church.

<sup>38</sup> Fried, *Elite und Ideologie*, pp. 80-82. For the *Divisio Regnorum* see also Kaschke, *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen*, pp. 298-323.

<sup>39</sup> See, for example, the description of the wild Noricans in Florus, *Epitome Rerum Romanorum*, II, 22, xii; Winckler, *Die Alpen*, pp. 101-102.

<sup>40</sup> Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 68 and 73-74; Wolfram, *Die Goten*, p. 323; Ladstätter, *Die Spätantike*, pp. 345 and 365-368.

<sup>41</sup> Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich* pp. 74-75; Štih, *Carniola, Patria Sclavorum*, pp. 127-128; Winckler, *Raumwahrnehmung*, pp. 43-46; MGH, HL, IV, 37, pp. 130-132.

Around the year 800, after the conquest of the Avar realm, Archbishop Arn of Salzburg, the head of the Bavarian Church, had a vital interest in securing power over these areas. He probably used his influence on Charlemagne to settle a decade-old dispute with the Patriarchate of Aquileia over the ecclesiastical affiliation of this area. In Late Antiquity the patriarch of Aquileia was head of the Church of the valleys of the Eastern Alps, but he could not exercise his power when the region was in the hands of (probably) pagan Slavic rulers. From the beginning of the eighth century on, the Bavarian rulers and, shortly afterwards, the Bavarian bishops, started to extend their power over the alpine regions<sup>42</sup>. And soon, if we believe the account of the so-called *conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum*, the Salzburgian Church had sent missionaries to the area and was also granted the right over this area by the pope<sup>43</sup>. A dispute between the Churches followed and at the latest when both dioceses became part of one empire, a solution to the problem became necessary. The result was an arbitrary verdict that survives in a charter issued by Charlemagne in June of the year 811<sup>44</sup>. The charter assigned the Eastern Alps north of the Drava to Salzburg, and the part south of the river to the Patriarchate of Aquileia. While Aquileia argued with their ancient rights, it was enough for Salzburg to state that the popes of the mid-eighth century had given the young Church of Salzburg the rights over this area<sup>45</sup>. However, these charters no longer exist. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the popes gave Salzburg the right over a *provincia Carantana*: the name Carantania was not even used at that time in Bavaria and Salzburg, then under the rule of Bishop Virgil, was not yet an archdiocese. This means that either of the older bishoprics of Passau and Säben or Freising, with the frontier-monastery of Innichen, were equally valid candidates for a papal grant over this ecclesiastical territory. It seems quite unlikely that only Salzburg received such a decree. Curiously, no other Bavarian Church has any contemporary discussion about papal decrees dealing with the mission of the Carantanians. All things considered, this argument seems rather questionable.

But the contemporaries were certainly aware of this. So, why was Salzburg able to win Charlemagne over to creating this frontier? The whole arbitrary verdict reflects the situation of the beginning of the ninth century when, at the court in Aachen, the view on those eastern areas changed. A new political situation had emerged after the death of Pippin and made a substantial reshaping of the area possible. This verdict stands in contrast to the order of the Carolingian realms as expressed in the *Divisio regnorum*. It is not a coincidence that the charter was issued not even a year after the death of Char-

<sup>42</sup> For the sixth and seventh centuries Frankish and Bavarian policy towards the Alps see: Jahn, *Ducatus*, pp. 7-9 and 17-18.

<sup>43</sup> Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 73-74; Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, pp. 276-285.

<sup>44</sup> Charter of Charlemagne, MGH, DD Karol. I, no. 211, p. 282; Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 166-168; Winckler, *Raumwahrnehmung*, pp. 48-51.

<sup>45</sup> Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich*, p. 284.

lemagne's son Pippin in 810. The highly influential and powerful patriarch of Aquileia, Paulinus, had died in 802<sup>46</sup>. His successor, Ursus, was not able to attend the discussions on the verdict and had to send a representative, his successor Maxentius. As Bishop Ursus died in the same year, in 811, this could mean that Arn pressed for the verdict in a time when the Patriarchate of Aquileia was between leaders. Archbishop Arn and his supporters thus changed the older perception of that territory under King Pippin and the patriarchs of Aquileia. They wanted to re-create a realm based on late Roman models, with the alpine provinces being southward-looking to the Italian peninsula. Yet, after their deaths, the “northerners” won, and the orientation of the Eastern Alps was changed to look towards Bavaria. Perhaps Louis the Pious had already ideas for the realm of his younger son, Louis, later called “the German”. We note this in the *ordinatio imperii* of 817, where Louis received the parts north of the Alps including the eastern areas. But it can certainly be seen as a move against Bernard of Italy<sup>47</sup>. The verdict of 811 demonstrates that in Carolingian times borders were newly-drawn regardless of ancient rights or traditions, based on the political influence of the actors and their political purpose. In this case, the goal had been the strengthening of the Salzburgian Church and, ultimately, the influence of the eastern Frankish kingdom over this area.

The *ordinatio imperii* of 817 between Louis the Pious and his sons saw his eldest son Lothar acting as a co-ruler over a realm that extended from the North Sea to the Apennines, with the central part of the Alps in the middle. The text does not mention either the Alps or the passageways anymore. The new shape of the core area of the empire required numerous journeys over the Alps – not only by imperial administrators but also by the rulers themselves. In post-Carolingian times, starting with Otto I, these journeys were to be known as the famous *Italienzüge*. But in the first half of the ninth century such travels were narrated in a matter-of-fact way, with the Alps mostly not even being mentioned – apparently there was no glory in business travels<sup>48</sup>. In contrast to this omission of the Alps, the text names other parts of the empire more precisely, notably the ones in the east, such as Carantania. This area was now part of the realm of Louis “the German”. That means that, only six years after the ecclesiastical organisation as expressed in the charter of Charlemagne of 811, the political organisation had followed.

However, on a local level that organisation is not that clearly visible. The local secular administration seems to have remained just as in the times of King Pippin. According to the *Annales regni Francorum* the province of the Carantanians was, as late as in 828, ruled by Balderich, duke of Friuli, and

<sup>46</sup> He was the only bishop mentioned at the *conventus ad ripas Danubii* that was held in 796 when the Frankish army (under Pippin) went against the Avars – a sure sign that it was he who was seen as the superior to all the bishoprics in the area. *Conventus episcoporum ad ripas Danubii*, MGH, Conc. II/1, p. 176; Wolfram – Diesenberger, *Arn und Alkuin*, p. 87.

<sup>47</sup> *Ordinatio imperii*, MGH, Capit. I, p. 270; Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, p. 184.

<sup>48</sup> For example, in MGH, ARF, p. 165, *ad annum* 824, when Lothar: «in Italiam profectus est».

attached to his duchy<sup>49</sup>. He shared the command over the Bavarian eastern frontiers in Pannonia with Count Gerold of Bavaria<sup>50</sup>. However, the shape and extent of their territory in the east, as well as the exact nature of their co-rulership, is not at all clear and is the subject to many theories<sup>51</sup>. This might be more than just a lacuna in the sources: it seems, that there was also a lack of knowledge (and interest) at the Carolingian court of that time, as reflected in the *Annales regni Francorum*. Explanatory sentences in the text show that knowledge of the administration of these new areas was not common and that the situation in these eastern parts of the realm was even for the contemporaries somewhat confusing<sup>52</sup>.

Alternatively, those who knew how painfully small Carolingian influence in the eastern areas really was, might not have talked about this openly. As a consequence, we have sources that express an imperial idea of vastness when describing the eastern frontiers, for example, in the poem by Patriarch Paulinus of Aquileia, celebrating Duke Eric of Friuli after his death in 799<sup>53</sup>. We can assume that Paulinus of Aquileia knew those areas quite well, nevertheless he chose to extend the empire far into the imaginary. The eastern alpine frontiers, as visible in the charters, show an area of influence that was much smaller than anticipated after the victory against the Avars. It probably reached not beyond the area between Bavaria and Carnuntum. This might also have played a role in the deposition of Duke Balderich in 828<sup>54</sup>. The lack of knowledge of the eastern frontiers in the *Annales regni Francorum* is also evident in the description of a campaign against Liudewit in 820: one of the three armies travelled «de Italia per Alpes Noricas» to reach Liudewit's stronghold in Siskia. Usually, this name is used for the Reschen or Brennerpass – see for example in the above mentioned *Divisio Regnorum* of 806. But it is not possible to reach the Save via the Brenner/Reschenpasses when coming from Italy. Therefore, in this context the *Alpes Noricas* can only mean one of the passes that lead into the Carniola and Pannonia via modern Slovenia, most likely the old Roman road *Ad Pirum* (today Hrušica). The paths of the other two armies are narrated quite precisely: one travels from Bavaria along the Danube and through Pannonian swamps to the Drava, and the other through Carantania, along the Drava and then further on to the Danube at Siskia, where all three armies meet<sup>55</sup>.

<sup>49</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 174, *ad annum* 828.

<sup>50</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 143, *ad annum* 824, the emperor sent a count: «ad Baltricum et Geroldum comites et Avarici limites custodes in Carantanorum provincia», Wolfram, *Conversio*, pp. 168-173; Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 192-197.

<sup>51</sup> This uncertainty is visible in the different modern cartographical visualisations of this area – mostly, the eastern frontier is positioned far in the east, at the Danube Bend. When reading the sources, it seems unlikely that any Frankish official ever went that far.

<sup>52</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 118, *ad annum* 819: in this year Balderich goes to Carantania: «quae ad ipsius curam pertinebat».

<sup>53</sup> Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 153-158, esp. p. 157.

<sup>54</sup> MGH, ARF, p. 174, *ad annum* 828. Wolfram, *Conversio*, pp. 182 and 262-266.

<sup>55</sup> MGH, ARF, pp. 152-153, *ad annum* 820. Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 189-190.

An insufficient understanding of the Carolingian realms and its frontiers was shown even by Lothar himself: two different sources narrate that, in course of the planning of yet another division of the empire in 839, Lothar asked someone else to define his part because he did not know the territories of the empire<sup>56</sup>. This story was used to enhance the negative image of Lothar that runs consistently through the texts – but nevertheless, it was deemed believable for the audience. Regarding the south-east of the empire, it probably was the uprising of Liudewit against the Carolingian rulers that finally spread local knowledge of the territory and frontiers to the Carolingian “headquarters”. After this event, the descriptions and affiliations of the region become less nebulous in the sources. According to them, it seems that in 828 the worldly re-orientation of the Eastern Alps to the North was completed. The south-eastern regions of the empire were divided into four parts, with the Eastern Alps being assigned to Bavaria<sup>57</sup>.

In other areas of the Alps old associations also changed. Churraetia was already from the seventh century on attached to the Merovingian realms, albeit loosely. But ecclesiastical affiliation from Milan to Mainz only changed in Carolingian times, at the latest in 843<sup>58</sup>. As indicated above, the Western Alps consisted, in Roman times, of the provinces *Alpes Maritimae* as well as the *Alpes Graiae* and *Poeninae*, that were in the later empire part of the praetorian prefecture of Gallia. The attachment of the *Alpes Cottiae* is not that clear, because late antique lists of provinces view this province (like Raetia) as part of Italia. However, the province seems to have not been within the Alps anymore, but to have consisted mainly in the north-western part of the Apennines<sup>59</sup>. According to Roman inscriptions, the toll district of Gallia had ended at the exit of the Susa valley to the plains of the Po<sup>60</sup>. Early medieval sources mostly see the area as belonging to Merovingian Gallia, as expressed most prominently in Abbo’s testament, where the *limites Italiae* also lie at the exit of the Susa valley<sup>61</sup>. We already wondered what the monks of Novalesa did with the revenue of the property beyond the borders in the Lombard kingdom, as they presumably had to pay the tolls to the Lombard kings. An indication that this was an issue is visible in a peculiar succession of charters. In 773 Charlemagne as *rex Francorum* confirmed the *immunitas* of the monastery for property «in regno nostro», that is, in Francia<sup>62</sup>. Only six years lat-

<sup>56</sup> Nithard, *Historiarum libri III*, I, 7, p. 11: «ignorantia regionum», and Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici Imperatoris*, 60, p. 530: «propter ignorantiam locorum».

<sup>57</sup> For Liudewit see Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 186-192. According to the *Annales regni Francorum* in 828, Duke Balderich was deposed and the eastern march «inter quartuor comites divisa est», Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 194-197; Wolfram, *Conversio*, p. 182 and esp. pp. 262-266.

<sup>58</sup> Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 13, 58 and 101-103.

<sup>59</sup> *Laterculus Veronensis*, in *Geographi Latini minores*, pp. 127-128. A reminiscence of this survives in MGH, HL, II, 16, p. 82, see note 7 of this article.

<sup>60</sup> France, *Quadragesima Galliarum*, pp. 326-328.

<sup>61</sup> Although ecclesiastically that was not clear, see below.

<sup>62</sup> MGH, DD Karol. I, no. 74 (773 III 25), p. 107.

er, in 779, after the conquest of the Lombard kingdom, a confirmation of the *immunitas* was issued. But this time, Charlemagne was also «rex Francorum et Langobardorum» and in the text he explicitly included Italy into the immunity: «infra regna deo propicio nostra Francia, Italiae»<sup>63</sup>. The *immunitas* for the Italian parts of the empire was only the first step towards a wider change that associated the whole Susa valley up to the summit of the Mont Cenis to the kingdom of Italy. A first hint for this is a charter of the year 825, issued by Lothar for Novalesa. It deals with the building of a hospice at the summit of the Mont Cenis, by order of Louis the Pious. The hospice was endowed with property that belonged to Novalesa and, as compensation, Novalesa received the monastery of Pagno, located in the kingdom of Italy<sup>64</sup>. Another charter of 845, again by Lothar for Novalesa, concerned the valley of Bardonecchia. It stated that the *comes* of Turin was responsible for some criminal cases<sup>65</sup>. This verifies the assumption that the valley and the monastery now belonged to the kingdom of Italy. So, these frontiers were, quite uniquely for the time, positioned near or at a mountain pass, but still within economically usable land, and not on the high ridges<sup>66</sup>. In 845 another charter issued by Lothar confirms the exemption of all kinds of tolls for the monastery. Here, the position near the frontier fortifications is defined with one specific term for a duty that was levied at the narrows, the *clusaticum*<sup>67</sup>. Significantly Joseph, the abbot of Novalesa, was at the same time bishop of Ivrea (844-855), a bishopric that lies at the exit of the Aosta valley near a *clusa* – he might have been an expert on what we would call today “frontier management”.

The situation in the Western Alps is complicated further by the complex history of the affiliation of the bishop's seat in St. Jean de Maurienne. This bishopric lies in a valley to the west of the Mont Cenis in Frankish territory, and was disputed between the (arch-) bishops of Vienne, the Tarentaise and Turin from Merovingian times on – not least because of the passes of Mont Cenis and Montgenèvre that were claimed by their respective bishops<sup>68</sup>. In the times of Gregory of Tours, the association of the Maurienne seems to have

<sup>63</sup> MGH, DD Karol. I, no. 125 (779 V 23), p. 175. The monastery of St. Denis was faster: already on March 14, 775 it was exempt from the tolls that were levied at the cluses: «telloneo nullo exclusatico infra regna Francia et Italia»: MGH, DD Karol. I, no. 93, p. 134; Ganshof, *Het Tolwezen*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>64</sup> MGH, DD Lo I. / Lo II., no. 4 (825 II 14, Marengo, in Italy), pp. 60-62; Ripart, *La Novalaise*, p. 106; Cantino Wataghin, “*Luoghi di strada*”, pp. 293-294.

<sup>65</sup> MGH, DD Lo I. / Lo II., no. 92 (845 X 10, Aachen), p. 225: the *immunitas* is explicitly limited, for cases of criminal justice had, according to the charter, to be handled by the count of Turin «pro criminalibus culpis de quibus sacerdotis et monachis non est licitum iudicare, [...] Unde volumus ut [...] veniant ante comitem in civitate Taurinis».

<sup>66</sup> *Chronicon Novaliciense* for AD 972, p. 122: «fere alpes Sigusiae civitatis quae est confinis Italiae»; Ripart, *La Novalaise*, p. 104.

<sup>67</sup> MGH, DD Lo I. / Lo II., no. 91 (845 VI 14, Aachen), p. 223.

<sup>68</sup> Mazel, *L'évêque*, p. 186.

been with the see of Turin<sup>69</sup>. The dispute ended in 794 when, in an attempt to solve this problem, at the council of Frankfurt, a new diocese was created: the Tarentaise. It had three suffragans, the Maurienne, Aosta and Sion. The archbishopric of Embrun was also reinstated, after its disappearance in Merovingian times<sup>70</sup>. But even after this solution was put in place, the frontiers remained unstable for the next centuries<sup>71</sup>.

The power struggles between the various Carolingian kings in the following decades saw a frequent change in the association of alpine territories with the different kingdoms. But although the borders between the kingdoms ran directly through the mountains, and in contrast to the text of 806, the Alps were never specifically mentioned again. That means that the exact locations of those alpine territories and their borders is not known, although, at least in the main valleys, they seem to have been known to the local rulers fairly precisely. Alas, most charters of that time do not provide exact descriptions. Due to the transmission through later copies, some charters carry interpolations that are difficult to interpret. To present an example: in 824 Lothar issued a charter confirming various rights to the Church of Como. However, the remarks about the tolls and *clusae* of Chiavenna are, according to the editor of the MGH edition, Theodor Schieffer, a later interpolation<sup>72</sup>.

### 3. Conclusion

On a local and regional level, in the first half of the ninth century, some areas of the Alps changed their political and cultural orientation for good. The most prominent example is the Eastern Alps with the *provincia Carantania*, that was attached to the north-alpine realm of Louis “the German”<sup>73</sup>. Here, local ambitions had separated the region both from the late antique order of space that connects Noricum with Illyricum and Italia, and the early medieval one, when it looked southwards to the duchy of Friuli and south-eastwards towards the Slavic polities. The change in orientation took some decades and was only finalised after the uprising of Liudewit in 820 and the deposition of Duke Balderich, apparently because of his inabilities to exercise Carolingian authority in the south-eastern areas of the Empire. Due to the strong interest of Louis the German in this area, and the weak rulers of the kingdom of Italy, the area became a confirmed part of Eastern Francia. We can see similar

<sup>69</sup> Gregory of Tours tells us in his *Liber in Gloria martyrum*, c. 13, pp. 47-48, that the Maurienne belonged to the jurisdiction of the bishopric of Turin. Cantino Wataghin, “*Luoghi di strada*”, pp. 271-272, no. 14.

<sup>70</sup> *Concilium Francofurtense* a. 794, MGH, Conc. II/1, p. 167.

<sup>71</sup> Mazel, *L'évêque*, pp. 39, 81-83 and esp. pp. 198-200; Poole, *The See of Maurienne*, p. 3.

<sup>72</sup> MGH, DD Lo I. / Lo II., 824, pp. 54-59. See also a similar charter for the rights of Como in DD Karol. I, no. 202, p. 271.

<sup>73</sup> For Churraetia: Kaiser, *Churrätien*, pp. 13-14.



disputes in the Central and in the Western Alps, although there the disputes lingered on even after Carolingian times.

On an imperial level, the idea of one realm extending far beyond the Alps to the north and to the south was prevalent in early-ninth century Carolingian ideas of the shape of the empire's core area. One of the last implementations of this idea is in the treaty of Verdun in 843, when the middle part ruled by the emperor, Lothar, extended from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, with the Alps in the centre. Supposedly, these spatial ideas had their roots in the Carolingian interpretation of a Roman order of space, where the Alps were also located in the (geographical) centre of the empire. They were perceived as a passageway and a connecting element. Ultimately, such a kingdom expanding from the North Sea or the Danube to the Apennine and beyond, proved not to be administrable. One reason is that the regional particularism in the Alps was very strong, a development that saw local rulers (re-)gain strength and even royal honour. But it is also due to the fact that, though the Alps are not a barrier, they are an obstacle that makes quick travel impossible, for both natural as well as human reasons. If one passageway is blocked, it is possible to use another one, but this detour normally takes significantly more time and effort. Furthermore, the administration of mountainous areas, as well as their economic structures, are fundamentally different from those of other areas of Europe and therefore administered best by locals. This resulted in the development of administrative units that – like in Roman times – usually stretched from one entrance to the Alps to the exit, thus covering one area of connected passages over the mountains. In this way, the whole Alps became a border zone that was broken up in several administrative subdivisions – a development that gained momentum in the later Middle Ages with the appearance of so-called pass-states. These polities owed their existence to the position on a main route over the Alps and their frontiers were drawn at the point where the routes left the Alps to enter the flat lands<sup>74</sup>. Thus, after the Carolingians, the imperial policy changed: it became more important and efficient for the crossing of the Alps politically to control these territories than to organise and control fortifications and frontier posts directly.

<sup>74</sup> For the term see Seelmann, «... zu einer Beständigen», p. 57, esp. note 7 for the term. Early examples are Curia and Carantania, later Savoy, Tyrol, Salzburg and, finally, Switzerland.

## Works cited

- G. Albertoni, *Die Herrschaft des Bischofs. Macht und Gesellschaft zwischen Etsch und Inn im Mittelalter*, Bozen 2003 (Veröffentlichungen des Südtiroler Landesarchivs, 14).
- G. Albertoni, *La politica alpina dei Carolingi*, in *Carlo Magno e le Alpi*, pp. 49-74.
- Alcuini sive Albini epistolae, ed. E. Dümmler, Berlin 1895 (MGH, Epp. 4), pp. 1-481.
- Astronomus, *Vita Hludowici Imperatoris*, ed. L. Tempe, in *Thegan, Die Taten Kaiser Ludwigs. Astronomus, Das Leben Kaiser Ludwigs*, Hannover 1995 (MGH, SS rer. Germ., 64).
- Lex Baiuoriorum. Das Recht der Bayern. Edition und Übersetzung*, ed. R. Deutinger, Regensburg 2017.
- B. Bischoff, *Salzburger Formelbücher und Briefe aus Tassilonischer und Karolingischer Zeit*, München 1973.
- Breves Notitiae*, ed. F. Lošek, in *Notitia Arnonis' und Breves Notitiae'*, pp. 88-119.
- G. Cantino Wataghin, "Luoghi di strada" nell'arco alpino altomedievale, in *Carlo Magno e le Alpi*, Spoleto 2007 (Atti del XVIII Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto Medioevo), pp. 269-298.
- Cassiodorus *Senatoris Variarum*, ed. T. Mommsen, Berlin 1894 (MGH, Auct. ant., 12).
- G. Castelnuovo, *Les monastères et leurs alpes: stratégies pastorales, enjeux politiques, choix commerciaux*, in *Attraverso le Alpi: S. Michele, Novalesa, S. Teofredo e altre reti monastiche. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Cervere-Valgrana, 12-14 marzo 2004)*, ed. F. Arneodo – P. Guglielmotti, Bari 2008, pp. 9-24.
- Chronicon Novaliciense*, ed. L.C. Bethmann, Hannover 1846 (MGH, SS, 7), pp. 73-133.
- S.J. De Laet, *Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains, surtout à l'époque du Haut-Empire*, Brügge 1949.
- H. Dopsch, *Salzburg zur Zeit Erzbischof Arns*, in *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, ed. M. Niederkorn-Bruck – A. Scharer, Wien-München 2004 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 40), pp. 27-55.
- P. Duparc, *Les cluses et la frontière des Alpes*, in «Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes», 109 (1951), pp. 5-31.
- Florus, *Epitome of Roman history*, ed. E. Seymour Forster, London-New York 1929.
- J. France, *Quadragesima Galliarum: l'organisation douanière des provinces alpestres, gauloises et germaniques de l'Empire romain; (I<sup>er</sup> siècle avant J.-C. III<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.)*, Roma 2001.
- J. Fried, *Elite und Ideologie oder die Nachfolgeordnung Karls des Großen vom Jahr 813*, in *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (début IX<sup>e</sup> siècle aux environs de 920)*, ed. R. Le Jan, Villeneuve d'Ascq 1998 (Collection Histoire et littérature régionales, 17), pp. 71-109.
- M. Gambicorti – A. Salzer, *Über Gletscher + Grenzen. Die jahrtausendealte Tradition der Transhumanz in den Alpen*, Bozen 2017.
- F.L. Ganshof, *Het Tolwezen in het Frankisch Rijk onder de Karolingen*, Brussel 1959 (Mededelingen van de kininklijke vlaanse academie voor wetenschappen, 21.1).
- P. Geary, *Aristocracy in the Provence: The Rhône Basin in the Dawn of the Carolingian Age*, Stuttgart 1985 (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 31).
- Geographi latini minores*, ed. A. Riese, Heilbronn 1878.
- Gregory of Tours, *Liber in Gloria martyrum*, ed. B. Krusch, Hannover 1885 (MGH, SS rer. Merov., 1.2), pp. 34-111.
- J. Jahn, *Ducatus Baiuvariorum. Das bairische Herzogtum der Agilolfinger*, Stuttgart 1991 (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, 35).
- N. Jaspert, *Grenzen und Grenzräume im Mittelalter: Forschungen, Konzepte und Begriffe*, in *Grenzräume und Grenzüberschreitungen im Vergleich. Der Osten und der Westen des mittelalterlichen Lateineuropa*, ed. K. Herber – N. Jaspert, Berlin 2007, pp. 43-72.
- R. Kaiser, *Churrätien im frühen Mittelalter. Ende 5. bis Mitte 10. Jahrhundert*, Basel 1998.
- R. Kaiser, *Steuer und Zoll in der Merowingerzeit*, in «Francia», 7 (1980), pp. 1-17.
- S. Kaschke, *Die karolingischen Reichsteilungen bis 831. Herrschaftspraxis und Normvorstellungen in zeitgenössischer Sicht*, Hamburg 2006.
- H. Krahwinkel, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter. Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum Ende des zehnten Jahrhunderts*, Wien-Köln-Weimar 1992 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 30).
- S. Ladstätter, *Die Spätantike*, in *Am Rande des Reichs. Die Römer in Österreich*, ed. H. Wolf-

- ram – V. Gassner – S. Jilek – S. Ladstätter, Wien 2003 (Österreichische Geschichte, 15 v.Chr.–378 n.Chr.), pp. 285-368.
- Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita*, ed. R.S. Conway – C. Flamstead Walters, Oxford 1929.
- F. Lošek, ‚Notitia Arnonis‘ und ‚Breves Notitiae‘, in *Quellen zur Salzburger Frühgeschichte*, ed. H. Wolfram, Wien-München 2006 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 44), pp. 9-178.
- F. Mazel, *L'évêque et le territoire. L'invention médiévale de l'espace (V<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Paris 2016.
- Nithard, *Historiarum Libri III*, ed. E. Müller, Hannover-Leipzig 1907 (MGH, SS rer. Germ., 44).
- W. Pohl, *Frontiers in Lombard Italy: The Laws of Ratchis and Aistulf*, in *The Transformation of Frontiers: From Late Antiquity to the Carolingians*, ed. W. Pohl – I. Wood – H. Reimitz, Leiden-Boston-Köln 2001 (The Transformation of the Roman World, 10), pp. 117-142.
- R.L. Poole, *The See of Maurienne and the Valley of Susa*, in «English Historical review», 31 (1916), pp. 1-19.
- L. Ripart, *La Novalaise, les Alpes et la frontière (VIII–XII siècle)*, in *Attraverso le Alpi: S. Michele, Novalesa, S. Teofredo e altre reti monastiche. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Cervere-Valgrana, 12-14 marzo 2004)*, ed. F. Arneodo – P. Guglielmotti, Bari 2008, pp. 95-114.
- P. Seelmann, «... zu einer Beständigen rechten und heytern March gesetzt und benambset ...» – *Grenzen und Räume in Savoyen-Piemont*, in *Grenzen des Friedens. Europäische Friedensräume und -Orte der Vormoderne (Mainz 2010-07-15)*, ed. M. Peters, Mainz 2010 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Beiheft online 4), pp. 55-66. URL: < <http://www.ieg-mainz.de/vieg-online-beihefte/04-2010.html> > (accessed on May 19<sup>th</sup>, 2022).
- H.R. Sennhauser, *Kloster Münstair, Gründungszeit und Karlstradition*, in *König, Kirche, Adel. Herrschaftsstrukturen im Mittleren Alpenraum und angrenzenden Gebieten (6. – 13. Jahrhundert)*, ed. R. Loose – S. Lorenz, Bozen 1999, pp. 125-150.
- P. Štih, *Carniola, Patria Sclavorum*, in *The Middle Ages between the Eastern Alps and the Northern Adriatic. Select Paper on Slovene Historiography and Medieval History*, Leiden 2010, pp. 123-135.
- P. Štih, *Der heilige Maximilian von Celeia, die Maximilianszelle und die Anfänge der Karantanenmission*, in «Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburger Landeskunde», 160 (2021), pp. 38-58.
- Vita Corbiniani*, ed. F. Brunhölzl, in *Vita Corbiniani. Bischof Arbeo von Freising und die Lebensgeschichte des hl. Korbinian*, ed. H. Glaser – F. Brunhölzl – S. Benker, München-Zürich 1983, pp. 77-157.
- K. Winckler, *Die Alpen im Frühmittelalter. Die Geschichte eines Raumes in den Jahren 500 bis 800*, Wien-Köln 2012.
- K. Winckler, *Between Symbol of Power and Customs Station: early Medieval Fortifications in the Eastern Alps according to written sources*, in «Atti della Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati», a.a. 262, II/2, ed. B. Maurina – C.A. Postinger, Rovereto 2012, pp. 107-127.
- K. Winckler, *Grenzen in einer grenzenlosen Zeit? Frühmittelalterliche Herrschaftsräume in den Alpen*, in «Histoire des Alpes – Storia delle Alpi – Geschichte der Alpen», 23 (2018), pp. 17-29.
- K. Winckler, *Raumwahrnehmung und Aneignung von Raum in den frühmittelalterlichen Ostalpen*, in *Der Ostalpenraum im Frühmittelalter – Herrschaftsstrukturen, Raumorganisation und archäologisch-historischer Vergleich*, ed. M. Diesenberger – S. Eichert – K. Winckler, Wien 2020, pp. 35-54.
- H. Wolfram, *Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum. Das Weißbuch der Salzburger Kirche über die erfolgreiche Mission in Karantanien und Pannonien*, ed. P. Štih, Ljubljana 2012.
- H. Wolfram, *Pippin von Italien (781–810) und St. Benedikt in Mals*, in *Spes Italiae. Il Regno di Pipino, I Carolingi e l'Italia (781–810)*, ed. G. Albertoni – F. Borri, Turnhout 2022, pp. 249-252.
- H. Wolfram, *Grenzen und Räume. Geschichte Österreichs vor seiner Entstehung*, Wien 1995 (Österreichische Geschichte, 378–907).
- H. Wolfram, *Salzburg, Bayern, Österreich. Die Conversio Bagoariorum et Carantanorum und die Quellen ihrer Zeit*, Wien 1995 (MIÖG, Ergänzungsband, 31).
- H. Wolfram – M. Diesenberger, *Arn und Alkuin 790 bis 804: zwei Freunde und ihre Schriften*, in *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, ed. M. Niederkorn-Bruck – A. Scharer, Wien-München 2005 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 40), pp. 81-106.

Katharina von Winckler  
k.vonwinckler@unitn.it  
Università degli Studi di Trento