Representation of the Acts of Political-Symbolic Communication in the Narrative Sources of the Ottonian Age

Introduction

The topic of my project is closely connected with one of the most significant academic debates in medieval ritual studies of the last decades: the discussion regarding possibility to reconstruct politic rituals on basis of the descriptions of contemporary medieval authors, who often were bias because of their own politic sympathies and antipathies and therefore purposely misrepresented real symbolic acts. Problem of author subjectivity in such descriptions was extensively treated by Ph. Buc in his monograph "The Dangers of Ritual"[1]; this work attracted attention of his colleagues and provoked a heated discussion between such prominent specialists in medieval ritual studies as G. Althoff, G. Koziol, J. Nelson and many others[2].

If in the historiographic tradition the subjectivity of narrative sources was regarding rather as an impediment, preventing correct reconstruction and interpretation of politic rituals, in my PhD thesis I would try to look at the same problem from another perspective. I am going to analyze political ritual descriptions as complex combinations of eyewitness accounts, of adoptions from previous and contemporary literary tradition and, in some instances, even of fantastic or semi-fantastic images created by medieval writers themselves. So my object of research is not mere political ritual as such, but also description of ritual as a particular phenomenon of the medieval political culture.

The chronological framework of my research is relatively narrow: I will focus on the periods of government of Henry I. (919-936) and Otto I. (936-973). The time of establishment of the Saxon dynasty and of rise of the Ottonian empire

---

[1] Buc P. The Dangers of Ritual. Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory. Princeton; Oxford, 2001.

[2] Koziol G. The Dangers of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study? // Early Medieval Europe. № 11. 2002. P. 367–388.; Nelson J. L. The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory by Philippe Buc. Review // Speculum. 2003. Vol. 78, № 3. P. 847-851.; Althoff G. Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter. Darmstadt, 2003.

seems especially representative for studies of "political symbolism". By this example is possible to observe the formation of a new "symbolic language", necessary for legitimation of the Ottonian dynasty, – taking into consideration, that behind these "newly-made" rulers from the Saxon ducal family initially did not stand any deep tradition of the representation of royal and imperial power. Among those who elaborated such "language" were Ottonian court historiographers and chroniclers – and in my research I would try to investigate what was their role in this complicated process.

Owing to the long and influential historiographic tradition of researches in that field, the investigation of the Ottonian politic culture became an important trend of the medieval studies. So, in my project I have to consider methodological approaches of some different and even confronting scientific schools. It is especially important to mention the so called "liturgical school", the most influential in the first half of the 20th century, the structuralist anthropological studies flourished in the 1970-1990, and the "skeptical" post-modern approach, developed in the beginning of our century[3].

To explore various strategies of the description of symbolic acts and to reveal some patterns and approaches, common for different authors, I am going to use a comparative method. I would like to focus on the most significant narrative sources depicting political history of the time of Henry I. and Otto I. My source base includes the works of different genres (*historia*, chronicle, hagiography) and of different periods (created by contemporaries of Otto I. or by the subsequent authors, working under the late Ottonians). Crucial for my research are such authors as Liutprand of Cremona, Widukind of Corvei, Adalbert of Magdeburg, Ruotger, Thietmar of Merseburg, Hrotsvith of Gandersheim.

By the work with each source I will focus on the chapters and passages including descriptions of symbolic acts and will attempt to analyze these episodes

---

[3] Here I use periodization of ritual studies, presented by D. Warner: Warner D.A. Rituals, Kingship and Rebellion in Medieval Germany // History Compass. № 8. 2010. P. 1209-1220. Among the most significant researchers of the "liturgical school" he mentioned, first of all, P.E. Schramm and E.H. Kantorowicz; eminent representatives of the "structuralist ritual studies" are historians of the "Annales School" (primarily J. Le Goff, J.-C. Schmitt) and G. Althoff. Ph. Buc could be considered as a bright representative of post-modern approach.

in detail, taking into account political context and individual peculiarities of authors. Inasmuch as I can give here only a brief outline of my thesis, I will present first of all the works of Liutprand[4] and Widukind[5]. Biographies, political commitments and author's approaches of these two writers were very different, but both of them created many impressive and bright descriptions of symbolic scenes, and often of the same episodes, which let us make some interesting comparisons.

The main point of my thesis is to give a complex characterization of peculiarities of Ottonian ritual descriptions and, whenever possible, to show how they corresponded with real political events and convictions of the author. Here I will give a brief overview of some crucial questions of my work. First of all, I will make a few necessary remarks regarding the problem of definition of "symbolic acts". Then I will try to show how the basic elements of symbolic act's descriptions could be used by a writer to confirm his idea (when he was trying to demonstrate the might of the Saxon dynasty and its undoubted superiority over the rivals in the struggle of power). In conclusion there will be designated the types of descriptions and will be posed a problem of the "synthesis" of different types.

Problem of definition

As Ph. Buc has clearly shown, the acts of representation of power, described by Ottonian writers, often were dissimilar from the modern historiographic concept of "political ritual". Here, referring to the sources, I would try to find out basic characteristics of such acts according to the Ottonian writers.

---

[4] For the further biographic information see for example: Karpf E. Liutprand von Cremona // LexMA. Bd. 5. München; Zürich, 1991. Sp. 2041-2042; Herbers K. Liudprand von Cremona // BBKL. Bd. 5. Herzberg, 1993. Sp. 139–140.; Chiesa P. Liutprando di Cremona (Liuto, Liuzo) // DBI. Vol. 65. Roma, 2005. P. 298-303.; Gandino G. Il vocabolario politico e sociale di Liutprando da Cremona. Roma, 1995. ; Hoffmann T. Diplomatie in der Krise. Liutprand von Cremona am Hofe Nikephoros II. Phokas // FMASt. Bd. 43. 2009. S.113-178.

[5] Beumann H. Widukind von Korvey, Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Ideengeschichte des 10. Jahrhunderts. Weimar, 1950.; Althoff G. Widukind von Corvey. Kronzeuge und Herausforderung // FMASt. Bd. 27. 1993. S. 253-272.; Idem. Widukind von Corvey // LexMA. Bd. 9. München, 1998. Sp. 76-78.; Nass K. Widukind // VL. Bd. 10. München, 1999. Sp. 1000–1006.; Springer M. Widukind von Corvey // Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde. Bd. 33. 2006. S. 586–592.

In the Ottonian literature are mentioned and described some different public symbolic acts, designated in the modern scientific literature as political rituals of coronation, unction, *deditio*[6]*, adventus domini*[7] etc. The German authors of the 10th century did not use any blanket terms to designate the actions of this kind. So, the term *caerimonia* (ceremony) occured in the Carolingian writings and was frequently used by the late medieval authors[8], but was uncommon for Ottonian narrative sources. The term *ritus* (rite) was rare in occurrence in Ottonian writings, and was used as a designation of a religious rite, mostly with the negative connotation: a pagan, impious rite[9]; also there was not used the derivative adjective *ritualis*.

It is interesting to analyze the titles of chapters dedicated to description of political rituals and other symbolic scenes[10]. It would seem, these brief accounts give us some examples of "generalized" designation of symbolic acts: *De conventu populi ad Aquasgrani palatii et **electione** novis regis eiusque **unctione**[11]; De admirabili domo quae dicitur Magnaura et **susceptione nuntii**[12]* and so on. But, for example, describing the act of coronation, Ottonian authors did not designate it as *coronatio,* they only described the act with a verb (*coronare*[13]) or a verbal expressions (*coronam conferre, coronam suscipere*[14]). Not rarely in the indexes authors also only "retold" the events, without mentions of specific terms for symbolic acts: *Quomodo populus pro patre eligit filium eius in principum*[15]; *De*

---

6 See Reuter T. Unruhestiftung, Fehde, Rebellion, Widerstand: Gewalt und Frieden in der Politik der Salierzeit // Die Salier und das Reich. Bd. 3. Sigmaringen, 1991. S. 297-325.; Koziol G. Begging Pardon and Favor. Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France. Ithaca; London. 1992.; Althoff G. Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde. Darmstadt, 1997.

7 MacCormack S. G. Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: the Ceremony of Adventus // Historia. Vol. 21. 1972. P. 721-754.; Kantorowicz E. H. The «King's Advent» and the Enigmatic Panels in the Doors of Santa Sabina // Art Bulletin. Vol. 26. 1944. P. 207-231. and many others.

8 Data are presented on the basis of the text search in the digital base of MGH series.

9 E.g, Ant. I.1.; Wid. I.18; III. 65.; Hrot.I.4.; I.8.; II.1.; II.6. and other.

10 The indexes of chapters are represented in the works of Liutprand and Widukind.

11 Wid. II.1.

12 Ant. VI.5.

13 Ant. II.26; Wid. II.1.

14 Ant. II.20; Wid. II.70.

15 Wid. III.76.

eodem, qui regis postmodum ad misericordiam venit[16] (title of the chapter, describing the act of *deditio*).

The use of terms like *unctio, susceptio, deditio* is irregular in Ottonian writings, and there is no certainty that we can speak about immutability of meaning in different cases and in the works of different authors[17]. So, in the Ottonian narrative sources we cannot rely on any generic terms designating either various kinds of political-symbolic acts or the whole complex of them. But we could at least give an indirect definition, basing on recurrent details and characteristic features, common for different symbolic act descriptions.

There are many elements that go to make up the image of performative act in the narrative: particular circumstances of place and time, specific gestures, objects and verbal formulas. Not all of these components are mentioned necessarily in every case; but different combinations of them determine the specific "symbolic context" of situation.

Very frequently in the Ottonian symbolic act descriptions is accentuated the publicity (*sub testimonis totius populi, coram omni populo, presente populo, convocato omni populo, dum universali populi conventus*[18] and so on). The *populus* in some cases is not only represented as a witness of an act, but also directly participated in it: *populus levavit voces in caelum* (expressing approval of king's election)[19], *omnis populus dextras in excelsum levans cum clamore valido inprecati sunt prospera novo duci*[20]. That significance of publicity in symbolic acts descriptions is closely connected with the early medieval gap between orality and textuality, with the lack or scarcity of immediate documentary witnesses in that period. Ottonian writers who depicted events that happened half a century or some decades ago from them, describing public acts, had to use testimonies allegedly seen and remembered by numerous eyewitnesses.

---

[16] Ant. IV.35.
[17] So, for example the term *deditio* often was used by Widukind, but was absent in the work of other authors.
[18] Ant. IV. 28.; Wid. I. 26, 41.; II.10,16,31.
[19] Wid. I. 38.
[20] Wid. II. 1.

So, it is possible to define the object of this investigation as descriptions of public symbolic acts (which are not necessarily recurring[21]). Considering that the publicity of a scene, the presence of "all the people", implies a specific communicative act between "active" and "passive" participants, we could also use a term "act of symbolic communication", - referring to the concept of G. Althoff[22].

The use of elements of symbolic act's descriptions by Ottonian writers

The primary purpose of the Ottonian representation of power in the periods of government of Henry I. and Otto I. was creation of a new "symbolic context" to confirm the legitimacy of the newly-established Saxon dynasty and to demonstrate the might of these rulers. In a short time a German ducal family became royal and then imperial dynasty. Ottonian authors had to conceal the rapidity of this change and tried to make semblance of continuity of the tradition. To achieve this goal they could emphasize certain elements of their descriptions of symbolic acts.

Special role in the Ottonian descriptions of symbolic scenes belongs to the symbols of power inherited by Ottonians from their predecessors (material objects which could testify the continuity). Acquisition of insignia or relics was describing as a peculiar ceremonial scene and in some cases even as an act of legitimation.

Thus in Liutprand's "Antapodosis" in narration about accession of Henry I. to the throne is only briefly mentioned the election of the king and almost nothing is said about the coronation, but is described in detail the scene of transmission of royal insignia by Henry's predecessor Conrad I, the only king of the Franconian dynasty (Conradines). According the narration of Liutprand, before his death Conrad summoned all the German dukes (except Henry himself) and ordered to bring crown, sceptre and royal vestments. On his deathbed he delivered a speech begging (or rather commanding) to transmit the insignia to Henry. Then the Dukes

---

[21] Public acts described in Ottonian narratives often are not systematic reproducing, as a concept of ritual implies. In many cases such scenes are "unique", connected with a specific, extraordinary situation, and sometimes probably they did not happen in reality, but were "invented" by a historiographer himself.

[22] Althoff G. Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde. Darmstadt, 1997. S. 232.; Idem. Zur Bedeutung symbolischer Kommunikation für das Verständnis des Mittelalters // Frühmittelalterliche Studien. Bd. 31. 1997. S. 373.

fulfilled his will: they came to Henry and "repeated" the same symbolic scene: they retold to him the words of Conrad and transmitted the insignia[23].

Thereby the writer managed to accentuate that the power was inherited by Henry from the previous king. His election is described rather as a procedure of secondary importance, at the same time Liutprand tried to hold back the king's renunciation of anointing. Exactly the scene of transmission of the insignia became in "Antapodosis" the main procedure of his accession to the throne, the "quasi-coronation".

Widukind described the same transmission of insignia otherwise: Henry got the insignia bequeathed by Conrad not from all the dukes, but personally from Eberhard of Franconia, the brother of the deceased king. The act of transmission from Conrad is represented not as a public ceremony, but as a private conversation of two brothers. But the giving of insignia by Eberhard to Henry also is represented as an important, though not crucial, element of his inauguration.

The crown and other Carolingian regalia, according both of these testimonies, were received by Saxon dynasty through the mediation of Conradines. As for another symbol of power, the Holy Lance, the versions of two authors are different. Widukind had mentioned it among other insignia, received from Franconian dynasty.

According Liutprand, Henry got the Lance from Rudolph II., king of Burgundy[24], but the line of succession was much longer: this relic was inherited from the first Christian Roman emperor, Constantine the Great. The writer recounted that in the Holy Lance were inserted the Nails of the True Cross, which

---

[23] Ant. II. 20. "Septimo denique regni sui anno vocationis suae ad Deum tempus agnovit. Cumque memoratos principes se adire fecisset, Heinrico solummodo non praesente, ita convenit: 'Ex corruptione ad incorruptionem, ex mortalitate ad inmortalitateru vocationis meae tempus, ut cernitis, praesto est; proin pacem vos concordiamque sectari etiam atque etiam rogo. Me hominem exeunte nulla vos regnandi cupiditas, nulla praesidendi ambitio inflammet. Heinricum, Saxonum et Turingiorum ducem prudentissimum, regem eligite, dominum constituite. Is enim est et scientia pollens et justae severitatis censurae habundans'. His ita prolatis propriam coronam non auro, quo poene cuiuscumque ordinis principes pollent, verum gemmis preciosissimis, non solum inquam ornatam, sed gravatam, sceptrum etiam cunctaque regalia indumenta in medium venire praecepit ac, prout valuit, hujusmodi verba effudit: 'Heredem regiaeque dignitatis vicarium regalibus his ornamentis Heinricum constituo; cui ut oboediatis, non solum consulo, sed exoro'. Quam jussionem interitus et interitum mox est oboedientia prosecuta. Ipso namque mortem obeunte memorati principes coronam cunctaque regalia indumenta Heinrico duci contulerunt; atque ut rex Chuonradus dixerat, cuncta per ordinem enarrarunt. Qui regiae dignitatis culmen et prius humiliter declinavit ac paulo post non ambitiose suscepit ».
[24] Ant. IV. 25.

were recovered by Saint Helen, mother of Constantine. Liutprand did not mention any other owners of the Lance; so possession of that relic (and at the same time – insignia) made semblance of "direct" succession to the Roman imperial tradition and substantially transformed the image of the ruler of Saxon dynasty.

Insignia – the material evidence of veracity of narration – are described elaborately, with a special attention to details. Describing the crown, Liutprand underlined that it was decorated not only with gold, but also with jewels[25]; this way author emphasized the superiority of Henry I. over his potential rivals in the struggle for the throne: if many German Dukes had golden crowns, a jeweled crown was a privilege of king, – commented the writer himself. His description of the Holy Lance is especially wealthy in details, he dedicated to that relic an extensive digression[26]. Material symbols of power are represented in such scenes with concreteness, while other details often could be described indefinably.

Another way to show the continuance and continuity of Ottonian tradition of "symbolic representation" is reiteration of similar models of description in different contexts. So, Widukind used the same approach depicting the election of Henry I. in 919, the royal coronation of Otto I. in 936, and the public "recognition" of power of Otto II. after the death of his father in 973. Actually, those acts occurred in very different political context: Henry I. succeeded to the predecessor from another ducal family and refused to be anointed; Otto I. succeeded to his father and was anointed and crowned; Otto II. already since 961 was crowned as a co-ruler of Otto I. and the act described by Widukind was only an additional "affirmation" of his status.

Author described that distinctions, but first of all emphasized resemblance and reiteration of the symbolic acts. In every case Widukind mentioned the

---

[25] Ant. II. 20. "coronam non auro, quo poene cuiuscumque ordinis principes pollent, verum gemmis preciosissimis, non solum inquam ornatam, sed gravatam".

[26] Ant. IV. 25. "Erat enim exepta ceterarum specie lancearum novo quodam modo novaque elaborata figura, habens iuxta lumbum medium utrobique fenestras. Haec pro pollicibus perpulcrae duae acies usque ad declivum medium lanceae extenduntur. Hanc igitur Constantini Magni, sanctae filii Helenae, vivificae crucis inventricis, fuisse adfirmant. Quae media in spina quam lumbum superius nominavi, ex clavis manibus pedibusque domini et redemptoris nostri Iesu Christi adfixia cruces habet".

"designation" of a new monarch by the previous ruler (in the course of an act the will of predecessor was declared publicly by a person empowered to do it: by the brother of the previous king Eberhard of Franconia in the case of Henry I., the by the archbishop of Mainz during the coronation of Otto I.). Another immutable element is a procedure of "election" of the king by the people (which were in fact reduced to the expression of support of the decision which was already made: the people in a crowd threw up their arms and saluted the king, proclaiming his name)[27]. Underlinig the reiteration of the same elements Widukind represented fundamentally different symbolic scenes as a kind of stable, reproducing ritual.

There were presented two of the peculiarities of Ottonian symbolic act's descriptions: the special attention to the material objects as means to confirm a narration about past and the reiteration of the same models of description in different contexts. Undoubtedly for the confirmation of their ideas medieval writers could use also a plenty of other symbolic elements, in their disposal was a big set of different means.

It is not quite clear if we can speak in different cases about conscious use of these elements by authors; their approach most probably was not so pragmatic or utilitarian. But anyhow they transformed their descriptions giving their own interpretation, even if only implicit. The writers did not describe an actual ritual, but composed an image of the ritual as it should be. And maybe the most interesting question is how were that "imaginary rituals" and "literary reality" connected with real politic events of that time?

Symbolic act's descriptions as a synthesis of literature and reality

So, one of the crucial questions of my work: which way political rituals were reflecting in the "literary reality" of Ottonian narrative sources? It is possible

---

[27] Compare the episodes Wid. I. 26.;II.1.; III.76.

conventionally subdivide symbolic act descriptions into three types: (1) first-hand testimonies about the events seen by historiographers with his own eyes or described according to an eyewitness account; (2) adoptions from previous literary tradition; (3) symbolic acts, "constructed" by authors themselves in their narratives (often, also on the basis of revised literary tradition).

But example of Ottonian literature could clearly demonstrate that those three types of descriptions are represented in pure form very rarely; more often there is a combination of them. Here I will analyze one of the brightest examples of this kind: Liutprand's description of deposition of Pope Benedict V. on the synod initiated by Otto I. in 964.

Under the pretence of ecclesiastical or judicial ritual here is depicted actually a political ritual. Benedict was elected Pope against the will of Otto, Pope while Leo VIII., adherent of the emperor, was deposed. The public subversion of Benedict represented a scene of triumph of Otto over his political opponents, an act of recovery and confirmation of his authority in Rome.

At first sight, the description is founded on the eyewitness account. In "*Gesta…*" Liutprand had mentioned several times that he was an immediate participant of the events, he listed his name among other church dignitaries, who participated in the synods initiated by Otto I. in struggle for the control over the Holy See[28]. In all probability, the writer was present also at the synod organized to depose Benedict. It would be logical to suppose that the detailed and impressive description of the ritual, created by Liutprand, is a reconstruction of "real" events seen with his own eyes.

But at the same time this description is very similar to an episode from his earlier work "Antapodosis", - scene of the so called Cadaver Synod. The trial over exhumed body of Pope Formosus in 897 and his posthumous deposition were initiated to prove illegitimacy of his actions as Pope, - particularly of the imperial coronation of Arnulf of Carinthia. Both descriptions are composed according to the same scheme. Is described the appearance of the defendant, dressed in the "unduly

---

[28] Ott. IX.

appropriated" papal vestments, his accusation in the form of rhetorical question[29], the scene of deposition in the course of which was taken off the sacerdotal vestment of accused and he was symbolically bereft of vicarial power[30], and finally the pronouncement of judgment[31].

I suppose that two descriptions seem so similar not only as they recount about the same ritual including a stable set of symbolic actions; analogy between the episodes is probably deeper. The fact that Liutprand working on "*Gesta…*" used his narration about Cadaver Synod is confirmed for example by the repeating of the same theological argumentation as in the "*Antapodosis*". In both cases Liutprand adduced a passage on how Judas Iscariot was deprived of power "to bind and to loose"[32].

It is interesting that Liutprand borrowed the theological passages on Judas from the works of Carolingian writers Auxilius and Eugene, who described the Cadaver Synod a short time after the events[33]. On basis of the testemonies of the dame authors Liutprand had described the ritual of deposition of Formosus; and, as it was displayed above, the description from "Antapodosis" also has much common with the episode from "*Gesta…*". So, even depicting a scene seen by his own eyes, Liutprand used the previous literary tradition, - the line of succession runs up to Carolingian literature of the late 9th century.

---

[29] Ant. I. 30. "Cum Portuensis esses episcopus, cur ambitionis spiritu Romanam universalem usurpasti sedem?"; Ott. XXII. "Qua tibi auctoritate quave lege, o invasor, haec pontificalia indumenta usurpasti? […]".

[30] The three fingers of Formosus were snapped to "deprive" him of the right of benediction, Benedict transmitted to the Pope Leo pallium and the pastoral staff: Ant. I. 30. "[…] digitisque tribus abscisis […]"; Ott. XXII. "Post haec pallium sibi abstulit, quod simul cum pontificali ferula, quam manu gestabat, domno papae Leoni reddidit".

[31] Ant. I. 30. "[…] in Tiberim iactare praecepit cunctosque, quos ipse ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos iterum ordinavit […]"; Ott. XXII. "[…] diaconatus eum ordinem habere permittimus, et non iam Romae, sed in exilium, ad quod destina…".

[32] Ott. XIV. "Iudas, domini nostri Iesu Christi proditor, immo venditor, cum ceteris prius ligandi atque solvendi potestatem a magistro […] acceperat […].Quamdiu enim bonus inter condiscipulos fuit, ligare atque solvere valuit; postquam vero cupiditatis causa homicida factus vitam omnium occidere voluit, quem postea ligatum solvere aut solutum ligare potuit nisi se ipsum, quem infelicissimo laqueo strangulavit?". Ср. в «Антаподосисе» в главе о Трупном синоде: Ant. I. 30. " […] hi, qui a Iuda, domini nostri Iesu Christi proditore, ante proditionem salutem seu benedictionem apostolicam perceperunt, ea post proditionem propriique corporis suspensionem minime sunt privati, nisi quos improba forte defaedarunt flagitia. Benedictio siquidem, quae ministris Christi impenditur, non per eum qui videtur, sed qui non videtur, sacerdotem infunditur".

[33] Aux. 19.; Eug. 2.; See Leyser C. Episcopal Office in the Italy of Liudprand of Cremona, c.890-c.970. // EHR. Vol. 125. № 515. 2010. P. 811.

This example demonstrates an important peculiarity of the Ottonian literary tradition, - many of Ottonian symbolic act's descriptions were in fact complex combinations of borrowings from the works of previous authors and elements of the actual "symbolic practice". There is a need of the detailed analysis which could help us to comprehend how these elements were combined in each case.

It is important to understand that constructing and describing in their works images of symbolic acts Ottonian writers thereby translated their ideas and gave necessary interpretation to the events. This "imaginary" reality of narrative in fact was not separated from the real political practice; there existed a common field, where an image of ritual could be equally or even more important, than an actual ritual. I suppose that investigation of the problem of descriptions of symbolic acts in early medieval sources from this point of view could be very fruitful and I hope to continue my research in this field.

Research perspectives

Here I presented some examples to illustrate my observations about the specificity of Ottonian symbolic act's descriptions, and I hope to continue my investigation in the future on the basis of deeper analysis of a wide range of Ottonian writings. I am also planning to use in my future work supplementary sources, primarily Wets-Frankish and Byzantine, by investigation of cultural influences on the Ottonian tradition of representation of power. The problem of the so called "symbolic mimesis" (interactions between "symbolic centers" and "symbolic provinces", borrowings and reconsideration of symbolic forms) also will be deeper investigated by me in the course of further research.

I hope that my project could contribute to not only a better understanding of individual authors, their motives and approaches, but also of the whole dynamic process of formation of the Ottonian political-symbolic language. I believe that the participation in your PhD and post-doctoral training school would greatly help me achieve these goals, develop my ideas and improve the level of my work.

List of abbreviations

Ant. – Liudprandi Antapodosis // Die Werke Liudprands von Cremona / Hrsg. von J. Becker. Hannover; Leipzig, 1915 (MGH SSrGus, [41]). S. 1-158.

Aux. – Auxilii in defensionem sacrae ordinationis papae Formosi // Auxilius und Vulgarius / Hrsg. von E. Dümmler. Leipzig, 1866. S. 59-95.

Eug. – Eugenii Vulgarii de causa Formosiana libellus // Auxilius und Vulgarius / Hrsg. von E. Dümmler. Leipzig, 1866. S.117-139.

Hrot. – Hrotsvithae Opera omnia / Hrsg. von P. von Winterfeld. Berlin, 1902. (MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, [34]).

Ott. – Liutpandi Liber de rebus gestis Ottonis Magni imperatoris // Die Werke Liudprands von Cremona / Hrsg. von J. Becker. Hannover; Leipzig, 1915 (MGH SSrGus, [41]). S. 159-172.

Wid. – Widukindi monachi Corbeiencis Rerum Gestarum Saxonicarum libri tres / Hrsg. von Hirsch P., Lohmann H. E. Hannover, 1935 (MGH SSrGus, [60]).