

CRISTINA LA ROCCA

Angelberga, Louis's II wife, and her will (877)

In her pioneering book on “Queens, Concubines and Dowagers”, Pauline Stafford rightly emphasized the fundamental difference between the history of kingship and the history of queenship in the early Middle Ages: while the first could easily proceed by considering the institutional transformation of the public role and duties of kings, the history of queenship can instead be traced only by looking at histories of individual queens, including the different stages of their life cycle as the daughters, wives, mothers and, finally, widows of a king.¹ The history of queens at one level could be inextricably connected to their individual origins, characters and personal liaisons, since they had no official and institutional status during the early Middle Ages. Instead, the queen's status was mainly based on her position as king's wife. In principle, therefore, queens would be an ideal subject for our Ego trouble session, as their political activity, their successes and achievements or, lastly, their failures, seem merely the result of a combination of a strong or weak personal character, and of fortunate or unfortunate coincidences. But, as we all know, queens very rarely represented themselves directly: they were instead the object of many narratives describing the negative or positive aspects of their influence over male relatives.² As Kate Cooper wrote some years ago, since the 4th century married men were presented as potentially dangerous figures, precisely because their behaviour and thoughts were constantly under the fluctuating influence of their wives.³ Talking about queens in terms of the narratives about them would simply entail a limited discussion about the efficacy of the rhetoric of womanly influence, a rhetoric mainly directed toward praise or denigration of the king.

Given this discouraging state of affairs I decided to look for aspects of individual consciousness and perception of the self in one of the most controversial and interesting queens of the ninth century, Angelberga, wife of the emperor Louis II.⁴ There are two principal reasons for my choice: the first is that her political role and activity have attracted the attention of historians for a long time. They have insisted that Angelberga was exceptional in comparison to other ninth-century queens. All, moreover, have attributed her exceptional achievements to her personal qualities: Angelberga's own character was considered one of the most important reasons for her success. The second reason for my choice of Angelberga is related to the evaluation of her individual behaviour by modern scholars: most unusually, her life and actions have attracted the same hostility among modern historians as that showed by both early medieval authors and anonymous copyists: “Dotata di virile energia e di forte ambizione, superba, prepotente, avida di ricchezza ... Esempio culminante di quel grande e non sempre benefico potere che certe donne regali di quell'epoca esercitarono sulle vicende pubbliche influenzando nelle risoluzioni politiche di capi e di partiti” wrote Giuseppe Pochettino in 1921,⁵ and in 1986 Simona Gavinelli still thought that Angelberga “fu effettivamente una figura ambigua ...: i maneggi e

¹ Pauline Stafford, *Queens, Concubines and Dowagers. The King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (Leicester University Press 1998); ead., *Powerful women in the early Middle Ages: Queens and abbesses*, in: *The Medieval World*, ed. Peter Linehan/Janet L. Nelson (London/New York 2001) 398–415.

² *Gendering the Middle Ages*, ed. Pauline Stafford/Anneke B. Mulder-Bakker (Oxford 2001); *Gender in the Early Medieval World. East and West, 300–900*, ed. Leslie Brubaker/Julia M.H. Smith (Cambridge 2004); *Agire da donna. Modelli e pratiche di rappresentazione (secoli VI–X)*, ed. Cristina La Rocca (Collection Haut Moyen Âge 3, Turnhout 2007).

³ Kate Cooper, *Insinuations of womanly influence: an aspect of the Christianisation of the Roman aristocracy*, in: *Journal of Roman Studies* 82 (1992) 113–127; ead., *Poteri invisibili: la matrona cristiana tra obsequium e autorità legittima all'epoca di sant'Agostino*, in: *Agire da donna. Modelli e pratiche di rappresentazione (secoli VI–X)*, ed. Cristina La Rocca (Collection Haut Moyen Âge 3, Turnhout 2007) 11–21.

⁴ For Angelberga's career see: François Bougard, *Engelberga*, in: *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 42 (Roma 1993) 668–676; id., *La cour e le gouvernement de Louis II, 840–875*, in: *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (du début du IX^e aux environs de 920)*, ed. Régine Le Jan (Lille 1998) 249–267, at 259–265.

⁵ Giuseppe Pochettino, *L'imperatrice Angelberga (850–890)*, in: *Archivio Storico Lombardo* 48 (1921) 39–149, at 39 and 41.

le debolezze di una personalità locale, in un'epoca di confusione e di frazionamento politico, hanno il sapore della cronaca spicciola che solo un diretto spettatore contemporaneo poteva cogliere con gusto sapido e velato sarcasmo."⁶ These judgments were not only directly inspired by the early medieval assessments of Angelberga, but also support the idea that Angelberga's political efficacy was primarily tied to the private and controversial aspects of her female gender. Her career was thought to constitute a political anomaly that could only be explained by negative and strong 'female' power. In the *Annales Bertiniani*, Hincmar not only represented her husband Louis II as *imperator Italiae*, but he seized every opportunity to represent Louis's action as strongly conditioned by the continuous presence of his queen at his side: greed and insolence were Angelberga's characteristics for the Salerno Chronicler and for Erchempertus as well.⁷ These narratives' judgements aside, it is interesting to note that anonymous writers expressed their opinion on Angelberga's character. Their assessments dwelt on the negative aspects of the empress' moral quality and ambition by means of examples derived from classical authors. On fol. 186r of Bern, Burgerbibliothek ms 363 written in Milan at the end of the IX century,⁸ for example, the name Angelberga is written beside Horace's verses in Sat. 1, 2, 123 describing a prostitute *candida rectaque sit, munda hactenus, ut neque longa/ nec magis alba velit quam dat natura videri*. In the same manuscript, Angelberga's name is also written at fol. 99r beside the line of Servius, In Aen., III, 297 *consuetudinis regiae fuit, ut legitimam uxorem non habentes aliquam licet captivam tamen pro legitima haberent, adeo ut liberi ex ipsa nati succederent*. In both cases, Angelberga's female aspects were used as a tool of denigration, showing the great attention and disenchantment expressed about her activities by someone reading this codex.

Angelberga's short biography from our sources is nevertheless dense with facts and activities: born probably during the 830s, Angelberga married the emperor Louis II of Italy in 860 probably after having been his concubine for about ten years. Their union produced two daughters, Gisla and Ermengarda, and no male heir. A widow from 875, she probably died in 890 in Piacenza, although no source bothers to mention either this event or the place of her burial. As has been stressed recently, as a widow she did not withdraw from politics; on the contrary, she managed to maintain "a position as a key power-broker in Italian politics".⁹

The sources on Angelberga are quite substantial in number, and varied in quality: the official diplomas issued by her husband in her favour,¹⁰ her presence as intermediary in Louis's diplomas on behalf of other subjects,¹¹ the narratives of Hincmar and of Erchempertus, Pope John VIII's letters to her, coins bearing her name; private charters, and public *placita*.¹² This great variety of sources testifies not only to the fact that Angelberga really was a public figure, but also that she was depicted as such: indeed, narrative and documentary sources always stress her presence beside her husband in the palace, on the long journeys to Southern Italy, and at solemn assemblies not as a mere decorative appendage for the king, but as an active and sometimes controversial player.¹³ It is difficult to determine in fact whether the frequent emphasis on Angelberga's constant presence at the emperor's side is intended simply to register a fact or to express an anomaly in terms of her influence and pressure on the king's decision making. François Bougard has rightly noted that, after 860, Angelberga is the only person who can address herself directly to the emperor in the diplomas, while all the other members of the aristocracy need the presence of an intermediary figure in order to obtain imperial generosity

⁶ Simona Gavinelli, Per un'enciclopedia carolingia (codice bernese 363), in: *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 26 (1983) 1–25, at 17.

⁷ Hincmar of Rheims, *Annales Bertiniani* a. 869 (ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. sep. ed. [5], Hannover 1883) 99: *Hlotarius autem Romam rediens, a latere ad suum fratrem in Beneventum usque pervenit, et apud eum per Engelbergam multis petitionibus et muneribus atque inconvenientibus obtinuit, ut ipsa Engelberga cum eo usque ad monasterium Sancti Benedicti, quod in monte Cassino situm est, rediret. Quo etiam Adrianum papam eidem Engelbergae et sibi ex iussione imperatoris venire fecit, et apud eum, datis illi multis muneribus, per ipsam Engelbergam obtinuit ... Engelberga denique redeunte ad suum imperatorem, Adrianus papa Romam reversus est.*

⁸ *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypicae editus* (ed. Hermannus Hagen, Lugduni Batavorum 1897), examined by Gavinelli, Per un'enciclopedia carolingia 1–25.

⁹ Simon MacLean, Queenship, nunneries and royal widowhood in Carolingian Europe, in: *Past & Present* 178 (2003) 3–38, at 27.

¹⁰ Ludovici II DD 30, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51 66, 67 (ed. Konrad Wanner, MGH DD Karolinorum 4, München 1994) 125–127, 146f., 155–162, 165–167, 196–199.

¹¹ Ludovici II DD 42, 50, 56, 60, 65, ed. Wanner 149–152, 162–164, 175–178, 183–185, 194f.

¹² Johannes VIII, *Registrum epistularum* e.g. 44, 82, 91, 94, 116 (ed. Erich Caspar, MGH EE 7, Berlin 1928) 42f., 77f., 87f., 89f., 106f.

¹³ *Chronicum Salernitanum* 117 (ed. Ulla Westerbergh, *Studia latina stockholmensia* 3, Stockholm/Lund 1956) 129–131.

and gifts. In this way, Louis anticipated the notion of the distant and unapproachable Italian emperor Barbara Rosenwein has associated with the later period of Berengar's reign.¹⁴

The most important document that enables us to investigate Angelberga's self-consciousness and sense of identity is her will, written in the nunnery of San Salvatore of Brescia in 877, two years after the death of Louis.¹⁵ Like most early medieval wills,¹⁶ this document both records elements of Angelberga's different roles and thus her changing identity during her life, and offers a firm statement concerning the future of a royal widow. If early medieval wills can generally be considered as accurate reflections of the ambitions and patrimonial strategies of the individual testators, then her testament as a widowed early medieval queen can be considered one means offered to her by the written word to defend herself against the attacks of her political enemies. At the same time it can illuminate particular characteristics of her individual identities as a land owner, as a member of the royal family, and finally as a woman.

If we adopt Stafford's proposed stages of a woman's life in relation to Angelberga's successive yet simultaneous identities as daughter, wife, mother and widow, the first thing to note is that her family origins are never declared in the testament nor in any other source. It is for this reason that historians still struggle to identify her family background. In 1921, for example, Giuseppe Pochettino surmised that she was a Lombard, of modest origins,¹⁷ while Hlawitschka connected her with the important family of the Supponids, whose various members held public office or served as bishops in the eastern part of the Po plain.¹⁸ More recently, Mathieu made Angelberga a daughter of William of Toulouse,¹⁹ while François Bougard has suggested the possibility of a Lombard origin, either through the Beneventan dynasty or a Brescian connection with direct descent from the last Lombard king Desiderius.²⁰ From our perspective, all these conflicting hypotheses on Angelberga's family background must be used to underline the fact that, even when her own relatives (brothers, uncles) appear in charters or diplomas, they are never connected explicitly to the queen nor does she mention them as such. Only the painstaking research of Hlawitschka and other prosopographers has succeeded in reconstructing Angelberga's family connections. If, as Régine Le Jan and Jinty Nelson have repeatedly stressed, the connection between a woman and her own kindred remains very important after her marriage,²¹ the identity of the married Angelberga is totally defined by her relationship with Louis as wife. In the will, written *cum consensu propinquorum et parentum meorum*, her three brothers Egifredus, Ardengus and Suppo subscribed the document not as brothers but as *comites*, and their personal relationship with Angelberga is never declared in the diplomas Louis II enacted in their favour. Instead, they preferred their institutional title of *comes* or roles directly connected to the emperor. Suppo, for example, had been called *dilectus consiliarius*.²² In the charters, Angelberga's identity as a member of the Supponid group was totally eclipsed by the public identity of Angelberga, not as simple wife of Louis II, but from 860 as *imperatrix augusta* (that is ten years after Louis was crowned *imperator*), a title that she continued to use even after her husband's death in 875. It is interesting in

¹⁴ Bougard, Engelberga 671; Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space. Power, Restraint and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Cornell 1999) 137–155.

¹⁵ *Codice diplomatico Cremonese 1* (ed. Ettore Falconi, Cremona 1979) 49–58.

¹⁶ On the recent debate on the nature of early medieval wills, see *Sauver son âme et se perpetuer. Transmission du patrimoine et mémoire au haut Moyen Âge*, ed. François Bougard/Cristina La Rocca/Régine Le Jan (Collection de l'École Française de Rome 351, Rome 2005).

¹⁷ Eduard Hlawitschka, *Franken, Alemannen, Bayern und Burgunder in Oberitalien (774–962). Zum Verständnis der fränkischen Königsherrschaft in Italien* (Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte 8, Freiburg im Breisgau 1960) 271–273, deriving his hypothesis from Salvatore Pivano, *Il testamento e la famiglia dell'imperatrice Angelberga*, in: *Archivio Storico Lombardo* 49 (1922) 263–294.

¹⁸ Charles E. Odegaard, *The empress Engelberga*, in: *Speculum* 26 (1951) 77–103, at 77, simply stated that “her subsequent career, in any case, makes it probable that she was well born and well educated”.

¹⁹ Jean-Noël Mathieu, *Recherches sur les origines de deux princesses du IX^e siècle: la reine Guille de Bourgogne et l'impératrice Engelberge*, in: *Onomastique et parenté dans l'Occident médiéval*, ed. Katharine S.B. Keats-Rohan/Christian Settapani (*Prosopographica et Genealogica* 3, Oxford 2000) 171–184.

²⁰ François Bougard, *Les Supponides: échec à la reine*, in: *Les élites au Moyen Âge. Crises et renouvellements*, ed. François Bougard/Laurent Feller/Régine Le Jan (Collection Haut Moyen Âge 1, Turnhout 2006) 381–401.

²¹ Régine Le Jan, *D'une cour à l'autre: les voyages des reines de Francie au X^e siècle*, in: ead., *Femmes, pouvoir et société dans le haut Moyen Âge* (Paris 2001) 39–52; Janet L. Nelson, *Gendering courts in the early medieval west*, in: *Gender in the Early Medieval World. East and West, 300–900*, ed. Leslie Brubaker/Julia H.M. Smith (Cambridge 2004) 185–197.

²² *Ludovici II D. 50*, ed. Wanner 164: *Supponi strenuo vasso dilectoque consiliario nostro*.

this connection to note that Louis himself, in the diplomas drawn up in her favour, also used epithets of affection and love (such as *dulcissima*, *desiderabilissima*, *carissima*) and these too are strongly connected to her position as wife.²³ Louis also used the ambiguous expression *consors regni nostri*, which defined the structure of the *consortium regale* primarily as a married royal couple,²⁴ but Angelberga never used this expression to define herself. This indicates that, from the queen's perspective, the *consors regni* identity was in a sense much weaker and more vague than that of *regina* or *imperatrix*. *Consors regni* could be a title used only in a gendered context by the king to define his wife and not vice versa: in other words, despite the claims about the meaning of this expression as a strong and positive contribution to the definition of the powers of the queen,²⁵ this particular title was not regarded as of sufficient interest or importance to be highlighted or even used by this *consors regni* herself.²⁶

In the will of 877, Angelberga's identity is formally and exclusively connected to her previous position as Louis's wife. As such, she had the control of the royal female monastery of San Salvatore in Brescia, and she received in full ownership a long series of grants of public land from her husband in the decade 864–874.²⁷ Because she was a royal widow, the will itself does not take the form of a private charter (unlike the will of Cunigunda, Bernard's of Italy wife in 835, for example),²⁸ but instead is a mixture of private and public document. It opens with an *invocatio* (*In nomine sanctae et individue Trinitatis*), and an *intitulatio* (*Angilberga domni Hludovici dive memorie piissimi imperatoris olim coniux et imperatrix augusta*). A solemn *narratio* explains the contents and confirms the legitimacy of the bequest itself, and the *dispositio* uses the verb *deliberavi* directly inspired by royal diplomatic vocabulary. The will concludes with a long *minatio* towards all who might dare to *inrumperere aut violare* Angelberga's dispositions and who will be judged *ante tribunal tremendi iudicis* and will end up *cum Iuda traditore in Gehenna regni eterni*.

The core of the testament is aimed at defining Angelberga as a founder of the new female monastery of Saint Sixtus in the city of Piacenza.²⁹ This institution was to have the role of commemorating Louis, herself, their children and *nostrorum in commune parentum*, establishing in particular the same daily and annual rituals for the couple, and devoting a similar effort to remembering the members of the royal family. These included: three hundred *pauperes* to be fed on the anniversary of Louis' death, three hundred on that of Angelberga's, and on every Good Friday 24 *pauperes* were to be fed in the proportion of 12 for Louis and 12 for her. The new monastery was therefore intended to commemorate a royal couple on the basis of a shared memory, inserting Angelberga's family into this royal network.³⁰ Angelberga was therefore claiming that one of her roles as widow was to uphold her husband's memory, even though, as we know, Louis was not buried in Angelberga's monastery. As Andrew of Bergamo vividly reports, Louis died in Brescia, where the local bishop Antonius wanted him to be buried in the Church of Saint Mary; but Anspert, the archbishop of Milan, sent the bishops of Bergamo and Cremona to Brescia to claim Louis's body for his monastery of St. Ambrose, where the other

²³ Ludovici II DD. 34, ed. Wanner 136 (*nobis dilecta*); *ibid.* 40, 49, 65, ed. Wanner 147, 162, 195 (*nobis amatissima coniux augusta*); *ibid.* 42, 54, ed. Wanner 151f., 172f. (*dilectissima coniux nostra*); *ibid.* 45, 50, 56, 60, 67, ed. Wanner 156, 164, 177, 184, 198 (*dilecta coniux nostra atque consors imperii*); *ibid.* 46, 48, 66, ed. Wanner 158, 160, 196 (*dilecta coniux nostra carissima scilicet augusta*); *ibid.* 51, ed. Wanner 166 (*Angilberga serenissima augusta et imperatrix atque desiderabilissima coniux nostra*).

²⁴ Paolo Delogu, "Consors regni". Un problema carolingio, in: *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo e Archivio Muratoriano* 76 (1964) 47–98.

²⁵ Bougard, *La cour* 263.

²⁶ The only case known to me when this title was used by a woman is Amalasantha, Theoderic's daughter, defining the role of her *consors regni* (not husband) Theodahad: Cassiodorus Senator, *Variae* X, 3, 2; X, 4, 1 (ed. Theodor Mommsen, MGH AA 12, Berlin 1898) 298f.

²⁷ Cf. above n. 10.

²⁸ *Codice diplomatico Parmense* N° 2 (ed. Edoardo Benassi, Parma 1915).

²⁹ This monastery was built on public land, next to the town walls, in 874 with the rights of *infra ipsam urbem Placentinam vel circumcirca, publicas stratas ad sui monasterii fines dilatandos atque muniendos immutare*: Ludovici II D. 67, ed. Wanner 197–199.

³⁰ After Louis's death, Angelberga was indeed claiming precisely this role with pope John VIII: Johannes VIII, *Registrum epistularum* 91, ed. Caspar 87: *Quia intimasti pontificio nostro anniversalem magne recordationis domni Ludohuici imperatoris et, ut pro eo proprias orationes celebrassemus, rogastis, gaudemus et impigre suo pro merito modis omnibus faciemus*; *ibid.*, ed. Caspar 212; *Et ideo pro predicta annua commemoratione ipsius domini et senioris vestri ne turbemini, quod modo vos pro absolutione prefati archiepiscopi non audivimus, nam in eodem die, quo ipse de saeculo migravit, pro animae illius requie sempiterna sacrificium erimus Domino oblaturi; etiam et pro anima Supponis fraterna moti compassione omnipotentem Dominum deprecamur, ut suorum absolutionem valeat percipere delictorum*.

kings of Italy (Pippin and Bernard) were already buried.³¹ It is entirely possible to see Angelberga's action in the light of the conflict over the right to bury and to commemorate Louis: while the archbishop of Milan claimed it as his prerogative to commemorate the memory of the Carolingian king, Angelberga and the bishop of Brescia asserted their rights to be the guardian of Louis's memory in the city and episcopal seat where the royal convent of San Salvatore had been established since the time of Desiderius.³² In 877, the foundation of a new monastery at Piacenza allowed Angelberga to act officially as a royal widow. The transmission of the monastery itself through her daughters, that is, through the female line, was thus designed to perpetuate Louis's imperial memory through the agency of women.³³

In her testament Angelberga's identity is mainly related to landed property, accurately defined in the three main lines of legitimacy: as daughter (*quantuncumque michi inibi legibus pertinet*), as aristocrat landowner (*in antea Deo propicio acquirere potuero*), acquired by different means and different types of charters (imperial *precepta*, *per emptione*, *donationum cartulas*), finally as wife (*cortes meas que michi in dotis nomine advenerunt de eodem domino et vir meus*). From our own perspective, there are two elements that could be emphasized: the precise knowledge of property rights connected to different kind of charters, but also a vivid sense of the importance of the written word to legitimate action, and to protect and preserve different stages of identity. As is well known, Angelberga's *carta dotalicii* is not only the first written *dotalicium* for a queen in early medieval Europe, but the date of the charter (originally 860) was subsequently changed in the document itself, and moved forward by ten years to 850: in 860 Angelberga's original status of *épouse de la jeunesse* was therefore cancelled and exchanged for the status of a full wife. The problems Lothar II had in proving the publicity of his liaison with Waldrada had obviously warned Angelberga of the value of a written proof of her condition as a full wife.³⁴

Another point of interest and one that could seem in total contradiction to the public image Angelberga made for herself, was her involvement in the sphere of land exchange, exactly as a 'normal' aristocrat. If one of the characteristics of the public power is its special relation to property (the king can confiscate or distribute land, acting at a different level from that of the land market),³⁵ Angelberga *augusta* did not hesitate to buy land and to use her superior position to obtain land at a lower price, at least in the case of Ratcausus, *capellanus domini imperatoris*.³⁶ Greedy Angelberga? Certainly not. As land market research has shown, exchanging land was conceived in the early Middle Ages as a way to create or consolidate relationships, bonds of clientele, and friendship. Therefore the price of the land was determined by the desire of the seller to create new ties or reinforce old ones: the higher the identity of the buyer, the lower the price. Buying land at a low price then, was the sign of Angelberga's prestige and also of her will to build up her own clientele, underlining the possibilities for a queen to act as a private subject, traversing the invisible barrier between the king and aristocracy, between public and private subjects.

As her will demonstrates, the public and private dimensions of Angelberga's identity were specifically interlaced and connected. The *imperatrix augusta* could then transform herself into *domina mea*, as Ratcausus calls her,³⁷ and as certainly did her *vassi*, whose names are recorded in charters and listed in the testament.

I should like to conclude this chapter with a brief observation on Angelberga as mother. As has been stressed many times, Angelberga did not have a son, but two daughters. If this was certainly a handicap for the continuity of her power over time, the fact did not imply a passive elaboration of a future for her daughters – they were instead conceived as means of continuity of the female line in the two main sites of Angelberga's power.

³¹ Janet L. Nelson, Carolingian royal funerals, in: *Rituals of Power. From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Frans Theuvs/Janet L. Nelson (The Transformation of the Roman World 8, Leiden/Boston/Köln 2000) 131–184, at 160f.

³² Cristina La Rocca, La reine et ses liens avec les monastères dans le royaume d'Italie, in: *La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (du début du IX^e aux environs de 920)*, ed. Régine Le Jan (Lille 1998) 269–284 at 273–275.

³³ MacLean, *Queenship* 17.

³⁴ Ludovici II D. 30, ed. Wanner 126–127; Gudila von Pölnitz-Kehr, Kaiserin Angilberga. Ein Excursus zur Diplomatie Kaiser Ludwigs II. von Italien, in: *Historisches Jahrbuch* 60 (1940) 429–440; Bougard, Engelberga 668; Cristina La Rocca, Les cadeaux nuptiaux de la famille royale en Italie, in: *Dots and douaires dans le haut Moyen Âge*, ed. François Bougard/Laurent Feller/Régine Le Jan (Rome/Paris 2002) 499–526, at 513–520.

³⁵ As rightly pointed out by Janet L. Nelson, *Kingship and Royal Government*, *The New Cambridge Medieval History* 2, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge 1995) 383–430, at 402–403.

³⁶ *Le carte più antiche di sant'Antonino di Piacenza (secoli VIII e IX)* (ed. Ettore Falconi, Parma 1959) 52–53, 57–62.

³⁷ *Codice diplomatico Cremonese* 1, 58.

Gisla, bearing a Carolingian name, was in fact an oblate in the monastery of San Salvatore in Brescia, the monastery that from Desiderius's time had been connected to the public role of the queen Ansa;³⁸ the second, Ermengarda, was thought of by Angelberga as her heir to her monastic property in Piacenza and thus responsible for the continuation of prayer and remembrance for Louis, while her marriage to Boso was thought to hold the potential for a new royal couple. But Gisla, the little girl, soon died and only Ermengarda survived. In her will, Angelberga repeatedly calls her *unica mea*. She thus demonstrates in this very human way both the mournful memory of a mother who has lost a child, and the maternal affection and hope for her remaining daughter's future.

³⁸ In 861 Gisla was given to the monastery of San Salvatore in Brescia (Ludovici II D. 34, ed. Wanner 136–137), after her death (ante 868) the same monastery was granted to Angelberga (Ludovici II D. 48, ed. Wanner 160–161).