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It is very likely that Paul the Deacon visited Rome. An itinerant scholar and monk who was the principal Italian representative of the flowering of intellectual life under Charlemagne, Paul knew about some of the city’s monuments, such as the so-called *templum Romuli* and the Servian walls.[[1]](#footnote-1) He also worked with texts that came from Rome: not only those produced during his lifetime, notably the latest papal biographies in the *Liber Pontificalis*,[[2]](#footnote-2) but also those that were preserved in Rome more securely and in greater abundance than anywhere else. It was almost certainly there that he found the collection of fifty-four of Gregory the Great’s letters that he sent to Adalhard of Corbie;[[3]](#footnote-3) and it is also becoming increasingly clear that he knew very well the texts of Roman law that were still preserved most fully there.[[4]](#footnote-4) Yet the extent of Paul’s knowledge of Rome, which as we shall see went beyond what could be gleaned from books, suggests direct personal acquaintance.

However, in contrast, for example, to Bede, some of whose works he knew, Paul was evasive in the manner in which he wrote about the city, displaying an ambivalence towards its cultural and political significance born both of Paul’s notable sensitivity to the expectations of his audiences and of the contradictory role that Rome played in his own life. When Paul was a young man in the Lombard kingdom, the threats to Rome in 751 and 755–6 from his king Aistulf had precipitated the first Frankish intervention in Italy.[[5]](#footnote-5) Subsequent political machinations culminated in the crisis years of 768–74 in which alliances were forged and broken with rapidity until Frankish military might again had the last word and Charlemagne besieged Pavia, captured the Lombard king Desiderius, seized the Lombard crown for himself and saw his own supporter installed as duke of Spoleto. Despite all of this, Rome appears in the *Historia Langobardorum* (*HL*) only incidentally: the city is rarely the subject of the action, but generally a backdrop, a destination, or the concern of the moment for a principal actor such as Pope Gregory I.[[6]](#footnote-6) In any case, Paul notoriously curtailed the *HL*’s account in 744, thirty years before the Frankish conquest and more than fifty before he sat down to finalise his version of Lombard history. Paul’s hesitancy on the page reflects a fundamentally awkward relationship with the city. It is not surprising that he might have viewed in this way a place that could be seen as a root cause of the Lombards’ traumatic experience of conquest. But through analysing his treatment of Rome we can see more vividly than through any other subject that the interplay between his sources and his immediate context continued to provoke discomfort even after the initial turbulence of 773–4, for Paul wrote many of his works, in so far as they can be dated, in the 780s or 790s, a period of pronounced volatility in the Franks’ own relationship with Rome. Faced with this, Paul found of greater utility for his purposes images of the city drawn from its more distant past.

It would of course be wrong to expect consistency from Paul. Setting aside that he was almost as erratic even in his presentation of his own people, the Lombards, as he was of Rome, he wrote for a number of different patrons and audiences. Rosamond McKitterick’s many contributions to our understanding of Paul include helping us to see how important his audiences were in interpreting, preserving and transmitting his work. Most particularly, McKitterick’s argument that Paul intended the *Historia Langobardorum* to instruct Pippin of Italy’s new Carolingian regime in Pavia about the Lombard past, the better to rule the former Lombard kingdom, reminds us that a History *of* the Lombards need not be entirely *for* the Lombards.[[7]](#footnote-7) Paul himself, after all, freely used both Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica* and Gregory of Tours’s *Decem Libri Historiarum*, both also works that may not have been quite as much of or for a particular ethnic group as was once automatically assumed.[[8]](#footnote-8) The effect of contemporary context coupled with Paul’s attention to his audiences’ expectations make the *HL* a valuable witness to Italian affairs at the time when he was writing, in the later eighth century, as well as a source for the history of Italy between the late sixth and the early eighth centuries.

Interpreting Paul’s work is perhaps easier when his patrons are identifiable. A poem for Charlemagne pleaded for the return of Paul’s brother who had taken part in a rebellion in 776 and been exiled to Francia.[[9]](#footnote-9) It led to an invitation from the king for Paul to come to Francia, and Walter Goffart has suggested that this was issued in person at Rome during Charlemagne’s visit there in 781, though there is no explicit record of it.[[10]](#footnote-10) Paul presented his epitome of Festus’s *Lexicon* to Charlemagne, who also commissioned his Homiliary. For the Lombard duchess (later princess) Adelperga, the daughter of King Desiderius who had married the independent duke of Benevento Arichis, Paul wrote a continuation and revision of Eutropius’s *Breviarium*, the *Historia Romana*. He wrote the *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus* at the behest of the then bishop of Metz, Angilram, and collected sermons of Gregory the Great for Adalhard of Corbie. The targets of his other works – a Life of Gregory the Great, grammatical treatises (especially his augmented revision of Donatus’s *Ars minor*) and the *HL* – look to have been more diffuse and unspecific. But since the *HL*’s narrative roams across the whole of Italy, it is likely that Paul expected work of this sort, at least, to be read throughout the peninsula, if not beyond.

Paul certainly accepted the ideological centrality of Rome to the world in which he lived. Perhaps the most substantive reference to the city in the *HL* comes in the slightly curious interlude in which he describes the provinces of Italy and locates Rome in Tuscia: ‘in this province Rome is situated, which was once the head of the whole world’.[[11]](#footnote-11) These are Paul’s words, not those of his sources, which in this case are generally identifiable as two sixth-century catalogues, themselves derived from Polemius Silvius’s fifth-century *Laterculus*.[[12]](#footnote-12) But the phrase *caput mundi* (head of the world) is very common in this period.[[13]](#footnote-13)

This is one indication of the multiplicity of available images of Rome: the Rome of all its martyrs, and the Rome of individual saints (Peter, Paul, Laurence, Stephen most prominently); Rome as the seat of its bishop, Rome as the seat of the head of the Church; the Rome of Roman legend and the Rome of the emperors.[[14]](#footnote-14) Elements of these identities often overlapped in texts, as McKitterick has shown.[[15]](#footnote-15) Paul comes closest to recognising the manifold resonances of Rome for a contemporary writer where in a single work, his *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus*, he refers to Rome both as the ‘head of the world’ and as the city of Romulus, and also emphasises the Petrine authority of its bishop by claiming that Metz’s first bishop had been sent there by St Peter.[[16]](#footnote-16) In what follows, we shall see that Paul had a clear preference for the second of these images, connecting Rome with its eponymous founder. We will trace how he adapted the image to suit different contexts and audiences, and incorporated it into an idea of Rome as a source of authoritative Christian practice. The contrast between Paul’s imagery for Rome and that of contemporary writers within Rome itself suggests charged discussions at the time about the ideas behind Rome’s, and Italy’s, recent experiences, and their practical implications.

**The Rome of Romulus**

While Paul toyed with the idea of Rome as an ideological centre, and could not avoid showing it to have been the backdrop to some of the action he was keen to describe, through much of his writing there is in fact a striking consistency in the way he referred to the city. Most often for Paul, it was the archaic Rome, the Rome of Romulus, that flowed most easily from his pen. One of the earliest epithets he wrote about Rome was in the inscription set up on Duke Arichis of Benevento’s new palace in Salerno, begun in 774:

*Aemula Romuleis consurgunt moenia templis*

*Ampla procul fessis visenda per aequora nautis*

The walls rise to a height rivalling Romulan temples

Splendid sights for far-off weary sailors faring windless seas.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Here, very soon after the conquest of the Lombard kingdom, when Paul was searching for a way of casting favourable light on Arichis’s construction in Lombard Salerno, he turned naturally to Rome, and made it suffer by comparison, for its builders were pagans, while Salerno’s was a catholic prince ‘by whose merit the glory of the people is declared throughout Latium’ (ll. 13, 17: *quo merito Latiae dicatur gloria gentis*).[[18]](#footnote-18) Of the various Romes on offer, then, Paul here opted to stress the archaic, pre-Christian Rome.

To refer to Romulus in this context is of course not an original textual image. Paul is perhaps the earliest medieval witness to the memorialization of Romulus in Rome’s topography, even if his *Romulea templa* are hard to identify precisely, but in textual terms Romulus had been accorded a prominent place in Christian chronography since Augustine had made him a significant figure in the history of the earthly city.[[19]](#footnote-19) It is more directly useful to focus on the adjective *Romuleus*, the occurrence of which in the *Historia Langobardorum* points towards the specific sources from which Paul drew it: it comes in a chapter that refers explicitly to Donatus, on whom Paul had written, and to Virgil. His use of *Romuleus* therefore indicates the extent to which Paul was familiar with a rich tradition about Rome’s earliest years. As is well known, he included in the *HL* the epitaph for the West Saxon king Ceadwalla who had died in Rome in 689. This includes the lines

*urbem Romuleam vidit templumque verendum*

*Aspexit Petri, mistica dona gerens*

Bringing his mystical gifts, he saw the Romulan city

And gazed upon Peter’s temple, worthy of reverence.[[20]](#footnote-20)

The same epitaph is reproduced by Bede in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*. But Paul does not seem to have used Bede here: either he copied the text independently from the same sylloge of Roman inscriptions as Bede used (or a related copy), or Paul had himself seen the epitaph.[[21]](#footnote-21) In any case, as well as showing that the term *Romuleus* was familiar to the composer of Ceadwalla’s epitaph in late seventh-century Rome, Paul’s use of it underlines that he also was deliberately employing a word that he knew to be redolent of Rome’s archaic beginnings.[[22]](#footnote-22)

The pedigree of the adjective *Romuleus* can be quickly sketched. It goes back at least to the Augustan poets, probably most prominently to *Aeneid* VIII: ‘the new-built palace bristling with Romulan thatch’ (*Romuleoque recens horrebat regia culmo*). Paul knew Virgil, and cited the Aeneid in the *HL*.[[23]](#footnote-23) We can trace uses of the term through Claudian, Ennodius and Avitus, to Cassiodorus, for whom the senate was *coetum Romuleum*.[[24]](#footnote-24) Paul seems to have known Ennodius’s letters,[[25]](#footnote-25) and he almost certainly read Claudian. It is tempting to think he might even have seen the copy of the latter’s *In Eutropium*, which includes the term *Romuleus*, that is listed in Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Preussische Kulturbesitz Diez B. Sant. 66, a well-known if problematic manuscript that collects grammars by Donatus, Servius and Pompeius, a text entitled *De litteris*, and excerpts from Books I and III of Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*. On spare leaves and blank spaces were added some short texts including poetry deriving from Charlemagne’s court before 791 (and including one poem by Paul), as well as a list of books.[[26]](#footnote-26) There is a good chance (I will put it no more strongly than that) that the manuscript is of Italian provenance. It was certainly produced in connection with Charlemagne’s court, and in this context we should note that *Romuleus* was known to a number of Paul’s contemporaries in Francia: it appears once each in the works of Godescalc, Alcuin and Paulinus of Aquileia.[[27]](#footnote-27) Later it was used by ‘Hibernicus Exul’, Florus of Lyons, Hincmar of Rheims, Heiric of Auxerre, John Scotus, and ‘Poeta Saxo’, though none shows quite the fondness of Paul for the term.[[28]](#footnote-28) The familiarity of this adjective to other court luminaries confirms what is suggested by Paul’s reproduction of Ceadwalla’s epitaph: that *Romuleus* had a certain currency at the right time and in the right milieu for Paul to be confident that it would be understood.

The incidence of *Romuleus* in Paul’s work, encapsulating his appeal to the notion of archaic Rome, therefore exemplifies the discretion in his attitude to the city that was required by his attentive audiences and shifting contexts. It does not appear at all in his earliest dateable work, the *Historia Romana* (*HR*). The *HR* was written almost certainly before 774 at the request of Adelperga and with the express intention of introducing a more Christian flavour to its direct source, Eutropius’s *Breviarium*, itself written in 369 as an augmented summary of Livy and previous imperial histories.[[29]](#footnote-29) Paul’s version only went some way to satisfying the demand for Roman history among readers of the Carolingian period, since scriptoria continued to copy Eutropius’s *Breviarium*, which maintained a circulation independent of the *HR*, and the latter may not have been widely read (if at all) north of the Alps.[[30]](#footnote-30) Eutropius did not use the adjective *Romuleus*, but he did provide Paul with the stories about Romulus that he reproduced in the *HR*.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Paul’s rewriting of Roman history is especially significant for the way in which it recasts the conceptual relationship between Rome and Constantinople. His most important adaptation of Eutropius was, as Maya Maskarinec has perceptively explored, to add a section at the beginning that traced the history of Rome before Romulus, starting with the reign of Janus.[[32]](#footnote-32) Maskarinec has identified a number of similarities between Paul’s treatment of the origin of the Romans in the *HR* and that of the Lombards in the *HL*: both bore earlier names; both had stories about their acquiring of their current names; both shifted geographical location, migrated, crossed boundaries; and for both he gives an account of the development of their customs.[[33]](#footnote-33) Whereas Roman ethnographers had contrasted ‘barbarian’ *gentes* cemented by clannishness and genealogy with a *populus Romanus* defined by citizenship (and therefore by the state), Paul depicted the Romans themselves as bound by genealogical ties. This left dangling the notion of citizenship, understood by Eutropius in its intrinsic sense of attachment to a city: the city of Rome. The parallel is not exact, however, for while the Lombards are given a single point of origin, the Romans’ origin is described as the melding together of Latins and other peoples, to form *unus populus* (not *una gens*). Nevertheless, the effect of opening the *HR* with the pre-Romulan history of Rome was to detach the city from the people who bore its name, making Rome, as a concept if not a real place, available to any who might be associated – or associate themselves – with it. This of course left open the possibility of a ‘papal’ understanding of the city: as the seat of St Peter and his successors. But it is important to underline that at the time at which the *HR* was written (before 774), the most important potential association of Rome in Paul’s mind was with his own people, the Lombards.[[34]](#footnote-34)

While Charlemagne’s conquest of the Lombard kingdom and evident power over Rome threw up new descriptive possibilities when writing about the city, Paul remained attached to the trope of archaic Rome. But he could now give it new resonance. The epitaph he wrote for Charlemagne’s queen Hildegard, who died on 30 April 783 includes the lines:

*Cumque vir armipotens sceptris iunxisset avitis*

*Cigniferumque Padum Romuleumque Tybrim*

*Tu sola inventa es, fueris quae digna tenere*

*Multiplicis regni aurea sceptra manu*.[[35]](#footnote-35)

And when the warlike man had joined to his ancestral sceptres

The swan-decked Po and Romulan Tiber

You alone were found, who was worthy to hold

In your hand the golden sceptres of the manifold kingdom.

This is a direct reference to the conquest of Italy; and one, moreover, that fully includes Rome in that conquest. The message recurs in the *Liber de episcopis Mettensibus*:

*Romanos praeterea, ipsamque urbem Romuleam, iampridem eius praesentiam desiderantem, quae aliquando mundi totius domina fuerat, et tunc a Langobardis depressa gemebat, duris angustiis eximens, suis addidit sceptris; cunctaque nihilominus Italia miti dominatione potitus est.*[[36]](#footnote-36)

Meanwhile he [Charlemagne] added to his sceptres, freeing from grave perils, the Romans, and that Romulan city, long since desiring his presence, which was once the mistress of the whole world, and then groaned oppressed by the Lombards; and likewise he took the whole of Italy into his kindly lordship.

On his return to Italy, among the texts Paul prepared for Charlemagne was an Epitome of Festus’s *De verborum significatu*. In its covering letter, he noted:

*… et praecipue civitatis vestrae Romuleae, portarum, viarum, montium, locorum tribuumque vocabula diserta reperietis …*

… and you will discover [in the Epitome] words treating especially of your Romulan city, of its gates and streets and mountains and places and tribes …[[37]](#footnote-37)

It can hardly be chance that from Festus’s massive dictionary-cum-encyclopaedia Paul chose to stress these expressions: the importance of Rome is again underlined. But its significance had changed; three times in perhaps five years, Paul had used the imagery of archaic Rome to repeat a simple message: Rome was Charlemagne’s. This is consistent with the view conveyed by some of his contemporaries. In his famous ‘mirror of princes’ letter to Charlemagne, the English priest Cathwulf counted among the king’s achievements that ‘you have entered golden and imperial Rome, and happily received from the king of kingdoms the kingdoms of Italy with all their precious things’ (*auream et imperialem Roman intrasti, et Italiorum regna cum omnibus praeciosis a rege regnorum suaviter accepisti*);[[38]](#footnote-38) and Alcuin addressed a poem to Charlemagne stating that ‘greatest Rome has you as master’ (*habet te maxima Roma magistrum*).[[39]](#footnote-39) By linking this mastery with Rome’s eponym, Paul emphasised the deep, ineradicable roots of Charlemagne’s power in Italy.

**Rome as a source of authority**

The appeal to archaic Rome was not therefore simple antiquarianism and it allowed Paul to link different strata from Rome’s history to his own time. This becomes clearer when we examine his use of an epithet similar to *Romuleus*, this time in relation to St Benedict:

*Moenia celsa Numae nullo subruentur ab hoste*

*Turbo, ait, evertet moenia celsa Numae*

‘The lofty walls of Numa will be broken down by no foe.’

‘[Only] the whirlwind’, he [Benedict] says, ‘will overturn the lofty walls of Numa.’[[40]](#footnote-40)

These verses in epanaleptic distichs are inserted into Book I of the *HL*, part of the first of two elegiac poems on the life of Benedict that draw most of their material from Gregory’s Life of Benedict (Book II of the *Dialogues*) and were certainly written earlier than the completed History.[[41]](#footnote-41) The verses here match the passage in the *Dialogues* in which Benedict prophesies during the Gothic siege of Rome that it will be natural forces, rather than any human enemy, that will bring about the city’s fall.[[42]](#footnote-42) Given both the context of the *Dialogues* and Paul’s own concerns, the Goths must here be seen as a conscious analogue to the Lombards, who are introduced to the story only three lines later, where Paul refers to Benedict’s influence on Lombard monasticism (*gens eadem reparat omnia saepta gregis*); further on, he has Benedict referring to the Lombards’ failure to capture Rome.[[43]](#footnote-43) But of course it is striking that the walls that they have failed to knock over are not those that had been for centuries the main and defining circuit, begun by Aurelian in 271, but those he calls ‘Numa’s’: in other words, the archaic circuit known (almost certainly inaccurately) as the ‘Servian’ walls.[[44]](#footnote-44) These withstand all human agency, even, he might be thought to imply, outlasting the walls of Monte Cassino itself, the Lombards’ destruction of which he also treats in the *HL*.[[45]](#footnote-45) This was a message to the Lombards that they should abandon violence towards Rome and follow Benedict on the road that he plotted from the city to the cloister.

Paul had introduced Benedict already in the *HR*, in an interjection inserted pointedly between a description of the riches showered on Belisarius in Rome after his victory over the Goths and the report of the treaty between Justinian and the Lombards, then in Pannonia.[[46]](#footnote-46) In the poems, as we have seen, he portrayed Benedict both as one fostered in Rome and as a shepherd of Lombard monasticism. One of his purposes in doing so was surely to put forward the prospect of a Rome in which Lombards played a full part, not least as faithful Christians. Among the specimens of Rome-dwelling Lombards in the *HL*, Paul pays most attention not to the Roman ally Transamund who fled to the city when defeated by Liutprand, but to Petronax, born in Brescia but ‘spurred by the love of God’ (*divino amore conpunctus*) to Rome, whence Pope Gregory II enjoined him to set out to refound Monte Cassino.[[47]](#footnote-47) It is hard not to see in his story of Petronax elements of Paul’s own. If one part of the attractive force that Rome exerted on Paul was formed by the texts that the city preserved, another was the desire to follow the example of Benedict, and of Petronax.

Paul most directly associated Benedict and Monte Cassino with Rome, and connected all three to Charlemagne, in the so-called ‘covering letter’ of the text of the monastic Rule to which Benedict’s name is attached, preserved in St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 914. The letter purports to be by Paul’s superior, the abbot of Monte Cassino, Theudemar,[[48]](#footnote-48) but the author’s familiarity with Gregory’s *Dialogues* has convinced most commentators that Paul, with his long attachment to Monte Cassino, was the true author of the text.[[49]](#footnote-49) The letter is not really about Rome, properly speaking: the version of the Rule in this manuscript does not come from Rome – it comes from Monte Cassino, whence it was requested by Charlemagne when he visited the abbey in 787 – and the letter does not explicitly mention Rome at all.[[50]](#footnote-50) But it does state that the copy of the Rule attached to it was ‘transcribed from that codex which he [i.e. Benedict] wrote with his own saintly hands’,[[51]](#footnote-51) and in the *HL* Paul recounts the elaborate story of the Rule’s preservation in Rome and its despatch by Pope Zacharias to the newly refounded Monte Cassino in the 740s.[[52]](#footnote-52) The *HL* therefore adds an extra dimension to the message conveyed to Charlemagne by the ‘covering letter’, in which Rome appears tangentially because Paul’s main focus there is correct monastic practice especially as laid down not only by Benedict but also by Gregory the Great. It is one among several indications of Paul’s contribution to the greatly heightened profile that Gregory came to enjoy in the Carolingian age as an authentic doctor of Christianity.[[53]](#footnote-53) Paul notes that the number of Old Testament readings in summer was changed at Monte Cassino to conform with Roman practice instituted by Gregory,[[54]](#footnote-54) and he tells a story from Book II of Gregory’s *Dialogues* (the Life of Benedict) when discussing correct monastic dress.[[55]](#footnote-55) As a means of validating Monte Cassino’s relationship with Rome, Gregory was safely distant in time from the fraught situation at the time of the letter’s writing in, probably, the late 780s,[[56]](#footnote-56) when Pope Hadrian was trying to assert his territorial power within the boundaries of the Beneventan duchy where Monte Cassino stood, and Charlemagne fairly consistently resisted him.[[57]](#footnote-57) By the time Paul was writing the *HL* in (probably) the mid-790s, on the other hand, Frankish attention had shifted elsewhere, towards the Bavarians, the Saxons, the Avars and the imperial title.[[58]](#footnote-58) While the covering letter therefore identifies Gregory as the authoritative filter for Benedict’s work,[[59]](#footnote-59) the *HL* makes explicit that that venerated pope was just one of the several strata that comprised Rome’s long guardianship of Benedictine practice.

A desire to show how Rome and the Lombards could accommodate each other (especially through the latter’s guidance by Rome-hallowed monasticism) is a current that runs through Paul’s entire oeuvre from his earliest works, but the events of 773–4 inevitably changed his perspective. Charlemagne’s conquest of the Lombard kingdom with papal encouragement, and his visit to Rome in force around Easter 774, while Pavia was still under siege, decisively established him as the ruling force in central as well as northern Italy. Accordingly, Paul was keen to stress the Roman elements in the pedigree of Rome’s new ruler: by rather gratuitously (and inaccurately) inserting into the *HL* a reference to ‘Anschis, the son of Arnulf, who is believed to be named after Anchises the former Trojan’,[[60]](#footnote-60) he cast Charlemagne as a successor of Romulus, whom even in the *HR* he had lauded as the progenitor of Roman *imperium*.[[61]](#footnote-61) Paul’s most consistent image of Rome may have been archaic, or even pre-archaic, but he made sure it had a very contemporary resonance.

**Conclusion: alternative images of Rome**

This topicality is in direct contrast to Paul’s anonymous contemporaries who were sitting in Rome writing for and about the popes. During the course of Paul’s career, scribes in the Lateran palace were making significant revisions to the more recent parts, at least, of the *Liber Pontificalis* (*LP*), the serial biography of the popes that had been begun *c.* 535, periodically extended, and maintained on a fairly regular basis since the early eighth century.[[62]](#footnote-62) At least three different recensions were composed of the Lives of Gregory II, Gregory III, Zacharias and Stephen II: that is, the popes from 715 to 757.[[63]](#footnote-63) Given this variety, precise dates of their composition are impossible to pin down – in practice the *Liber Pontificalis* was a set of texts in fairly constant flux – but they were certainly written during the next three pontificates, of Paul I, Stephen III and Hadrian I, with the highest probability that they were worked up during the pontificate of, and reflect some of the agenda of, Hadrian.[[64]](#footnote-64) The only other indigenous examples of Roman authorship in this period are the letters collected in the so-called *Codex epistolaris Carolinus*, written also by scribes working in the Lateran palace, albeit in a different office.[[65]](#footnote-65) Not one of these writers makes any use whatsoever of the terms for Rome of which Paul was fond. *Romuleus* in fact appears nowhere in the *LP* at all (neither in the eighth-century nor the pre-eighth-century Lives), so it can have formed no part of the inherited vocabulary of papal scribes in the era of Hadrian. It only crops up later, and then rarely, in the correspondence of Popes Nicholas I and John VIII, probably under the influence of the well-documented cultural shift in mid-ninth-century Rome.[[66]](#footnote-66) When papal writers in Rome needed to describe activity in Rome, apart from using the bare name ‘Roma’, and the circumlocution *urbs*/*civitas Romana*, they only ever used ecclesiastical references. It is very striking that, for instance, journeys to and around the city are always orientated around churches. But it is not surprising: the same mentality was at work here as in the Einsiedeln Itinerary, which omits mention of some rather obvious pagan monuments, like the Mausoleum of Hadrian.[[67]](#footnote-67) Thus ‘… the *Liber Pontificalis*, the itinerary texts, historical canon law collections, and historical martyrologies all insisted on the city of Rome’s Christian past.’[[68]](#footnote-68) Paul did not. This was not because he was a Lombard: Lombards were not automatically or consistently inimical to the city of Rome, to Christianity as practised in Rome, or to the Roman Church. Paul was very ready to write approvingly of popes like Gregory, to relate the power of Roman martyr relics, and to write a revised Roman history centred on the city. Everything we have noted above points to Paul’s personal familiarity with the city. But even if he were not one of those Lombards who spent time in Rome in the eighth century, like the unfortunate priest Waldipert who was one of several fall guys in the papal election crisis of 767–9, or the unnamed visitors for whom the *schola Langobardorum* was built, he was not some alien ‘other’ in relation to the city, nor was it to him.[[69]](#footnote-69) He was a fully engaged actor in the dramatic politics of that time, just as his audience was very often – to judge from the earliest surviving manuscripts of some of his works – close by in Italy rather than far away in Francia, and for those very reasons he was an extremely careful writer on contemporary affairs.

By repeatedly invoking the city’s archaic past, Paul was by-passing a number of other cultural and historical resonances, and, given the contrast in this respect with his contemporaries in Rome itself, this must have been because he found them problematic. But this was not a problem about or with Rome’s past. It arose from very contemporary concerns: Paul aestheticised the distant past in order to make his own immediate present more tractable, responding with sensitivity to the needs and expectations of contemporary audiences.
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