

Epilogue

Imperial Responsibilities and the Discourse of Reforms

It is tempting to think of the Carolingian court as a series of crises and conflicts which ultimately drove people towards their decision to reform or stay put – to resist imperial impetus or to increase its momentum. Indeed, it has often been convincingly argued that conflict, competition and controversy could ultimately prove to be productive in the longer run, at least at an intellectual level. The resolution of tensions and the way observers would reckon with such resolution in subsequent narratives does lay bare many of the inner workings of a society, ideally as well as in reality. Nevertheless, when Paschasius Radbertus wrote in his *Epitaphium Arsenii* that ‘an oath [*sacramentum*] is the end to any controversy [*controversia*]', this meant more than the literal interpretation that the swearing of oaths would not leave any openings for further argumentation during a legal dispute.¹ It implied that controversies were meant to end, and that public statements of certainty were of an almost hallowed nature. Moreover and more importantly, it should not be forgotten that, practically and etymologically speaking, ‘conflict’ and ‘competition’ carry connotations of togetherness: to think about conflicts is to think about how to resolve them together, as part of the web of mutual obligations that ultimately held together a community.²

The vitality of the Frankish *ecclesia* rested on healthy cooperation between its individual members. In the view of those who have been given a voice by history, each of these members, in turn, had their own part to play, their own place in the greater scheme of things while working towards the same goal. The ideal pursued by the prelates in Aachen, by Smaragdus and Benedict of Aniane, was not uniformity, but rather unity and clarity of purpose.³ They were aware that the reforms they proposed depended on a network of interpersonal, interregional and inter-institutional relations that together formed one big imagined, visionary community. These local interests existed in a precarious balance with one another, and changing (or highlighting) one

1 Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, c. 27.2. A new translation of this intriguing text by Mayke de Jong and Justin Lake is currently in preparation, and will appear in the Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library series. Additionally, De Jong is preparing a book on Paschasius Radbertus, titled *Epitaph for an Era*. Both are scheduled to be published in 2019.

2 Newman, *Competition in Religious Life*, pp. 2-16; see also the remarks by Brown and Gorecki, ‘What conflict means’.

3 See also the remarks by Ziegler, ‘Was heisst eigentlich “reform”?', esp. pp. 154-157.

variable could have repercussions that were felt throughout the ecclesiastical hierarchy. As reforms were negotiated, so were the relations between the interested parties. Competencies and obligations, power and authority, the fickle nature of fate and the constancy of institutionalized thought: everything would be reconsidered the moment one of these changed. Such a holistic approach would only be accepted by a group of people who may not have agreed on each particular detail, but who were willing to engage in an ongoing, self-evaluating dialogue that defined the norms guiding the interactions between them.⁴ More importantly, for the idea of reforms to even become communicable those involved must have been aware that they were part of an active (discourse) community.⁵ This awareness has been at the core of this book's main argument.

Feelings of belonging were expressed in the Frankish realm of the eighth and ninth centuries by the way individuals placed themselves (or were placed) within a matrix formed by the intersecting concepts of *ecclesia* and *imperium* – Church and empire.⁶ Fostered by common ideas about life and the afterlife and via the network of communication that encompassed the empire, the discussion on how to keep on improving the Church became more than a means to an end. In some ways, it had grown into one of the *raisons d'être* for the courtly discourse community by 813: the idea that continuous reform was a key pastoral function drove many bishops, abbots, aristocrats to continually exchange ideas, either at court or at a more local level. Regardless of whether or not participants saw themselves as being part of a larger programme or were working towards a set end goal, the recipients of their *correctio* would thereupon be prompted to re-evaluate their relation with the authority that was consolidating its position within the *ecclesia*. Like the *ecclesia* as a whole, reactions to different reform initiatives were characterized by a diversity that went beyond a simple dichotomy of outright rejection or wholesale acceptance.⁷ These reactions reflected the whole gamut of human complexity, and should be seen as attempts to reconcile this complexity with the ideas embodied by the stricter side of these reform initiatives as they were committed to parchment.

One of the most important questions underlying the case studies in this book was whether or not the act of writing was intended to be the last word in a given discussion, or part of an ongoing movement that the author

4 Van Renswoude, *License to Speak*, p. 14.

5 Musolf, 'Metaphor in the discourse-historical approach', pp. 52–57.

6 Generally, see Jenkins, *Social Identity*, pp. 132–147.

7 See the general reflections in Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse*, pp. 515–584.

hoped would propel the empire forward.⁸ Modern answers to this question will invariably be as diverse as the assumptions of the authors, but it is important to keep in mind that texts such as the *acta* of the councils of 813 or the *Institutio Canoniorum* were not simply vessels for communicating the wishes of a reforming court. As has been shown, these texts also showcase the ability of Frankish bishops to engage in self-reflection. Moreover, if the intention was to correct the *ecclesia* by continuing the discussion about how to actually improve it, texts such as these were also oriented towards the upper echelons of society, meant to admonish and to provide order. Similarly, the works of Smaragdus and Ardo may well have been intended for single recipients or individual communities, but their concern about explaining to the audience how they fit into a larger social whole should be coupled with the awareness that their audience would essentially be society itself. Even if, for example, Smaragdus wrote his *Expositio* primarily for the community of Saint-Mihiel, his intention was to embed his monastery within the Christian world envisaged by the Carolingians, not set it apart. Similarly, the authors of seemingly prescriptive texts – capitularies, *acta*, rules – would be aware that they were not insulated from the consequences of their own writing. This alone invited responses and engendered continued ponderings: as the impact of such proposals made themselves felt, the negotiations on how to continue would start again.

This process has been one of the primary motors of ecclesiastical improvement long before the Carolingians took power, and would continue to be part and parcel of what it meant to be a good Christian for centuries afterwards. The cases presented in this book should be seen as illustrations of this process, as blurry snapshots of an intricate machine in motion. Each of them would come to represent a pivotal figure or text later in history, but at the moment of writing they only had the weight of the past to contend with. They incorporated traditions, subverted authorities, consolidated certainties, and generally (and diligently) tried to live up to expectations. Crucially, these were expectations set not just by people in power. They were formulated by the very people who had to live by those rules – people who were aware that past performance is no guarantee for future results.

The councils organized in 813, right at the time when Charlemagne's reign made way for that of Louis the Pious, illustrate this attitude. Judging from the way each of the groups of prelates gathered across the empire and framed their responses, they accepted the guidance provided by the court while also retaining their own interests and idiosyncrasies. The prologues of the

8 Cf. Dutton, 'Why did Eriugena write?.'

individual conciliar acts from Arles, Reims, Mainz, Chalon-sur-Saône and Tours show that each of the regions represented saw the overlap between *imperium* and *ecclesia* taking shape in a wholly different way, which consequently impacted their views as to their own place in the greater scheme of things. In Arles, for instance, precedence was given to cooperation and unity within the *ecclesia*, albeit without giving up on the traditions lingering in the region. Reims, on the other hand, saw teaching and knowing one's place as the main answer to the questions confronting them, while Mainz emphasized that a clear sense of order needed to be maintained, and that keeping the responsibilities that came with one's place in this order was the most important factor in ordering the *imperium*. Chalon-sur-Saône, for its part, seemed to have seen Charlemagne's agenda as an invitation to engage in *admonitio*, and composed their conciliar acts almost as a moral treatise. Lastly, Tours felt most comfortable simply explaining everyone's place and their duties within the realm. Thus, each of the councils wanted to demonstrate their willingness to answer the call of the court, their answers demonstrate that the Church was still characterized by a certain degree of diversity. These bishops actually welcomed the court's initiative and seemed to have regarded it as a way of carving out their own place in the *ecclesia*, but their collective responses betray their awareness that the final word had not been said yet, and would not be said by them, either.

Taking a cue from this feedback 'from below', it fell to Louis the Pious to compile and collate the court's reaction to these diverse yet unitary council acts. This initiative took the form of another series of councils, this time organized at the palace in Aachen between 816 and 819. The *Institutio Canoniorum* was one of their most visible products. As shown in the second chapter, this text was not necessarily concerned exclusively with setting up rules for the lives of canons, as has long been thought. While this was certainly one of the main themes of this *florilegium*, the text as a whole was mostly concerned with setting up the position of bishops instead. After all, it was the bishops' *ministerium* to ensure that everything in the *ecclesia* would go according to plan. As such, the *IC* more than anything showed the interconnectedness of all things ecclesiastical, and how the bishops tried to make sense of their own place within this tangled skein. They did so, quite unsurprisingly, using the ancient and patristic texts at their disposal. The *IC*, like many similar texts, in reality constituted only the next step in an ongoing debate: formulating these ecclesiastical ideals was as much a question of looking forward as it was of looking back. Being a text composed by – and to a large extent for – bishops, it seems logical that these prelates presented themselves as safeguards for the laity, priests,

monks and canons under their responsibility. They represented anyone attempting to live the perfect Christian life, enabling religious communities to persist and thrive. After all, it was their ability to operate within the secular and ecclesiastical spheres, combined with their learning, which enabled them to watch over the people of the world, and protect them from themselves.

Smaragdus would have sympathized with their plight. He may have even shared it. If the emergence of a Carolingian discourse community was a consequence of a direct dialogue between the ruler and the members of the inner circle of the court, his decision to compose his moral treatise in a format reminiscent of a so-called 'mirror for princes', in which a (sometimes fictional) ruler was counselled on the right way to rule seemed only logical. Although the mechanisms of *admonitio*, like so many themes in this book, had been put into place long before, it is no coincidence that the so-called *speculum principum* re-emerged as a separate genre precisely in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.⁹ This was, after all, a time when the wages of empire had been newly formulated and when the legacy of Charlemagne needed to be safeguarded. In addition to being purely admonitory, the treatises composed by Smaragdus were thus also written with a view towards maintaining the existing order, and impressing upon its audience the importance of maintaining the new world order, often in explicitly biblical terms.

Smaragdus' triptych of works – the *Via Regia*, the *Expositio* and the *Diadema Monachorum* – attempted to bridge the conceptual gaps between the ideals of the *ecclesia* and the exigencies of the *imperium*, and clear up any remaining misgivings about what this meant for those aspiring to live a perfect life. Given Smaragdus' background, it comes as no surprise that he felt that monks were in the optimal position to do so; his *Expositio*, for instance, shows how he intended the teachings of saint Benedict of Nursia to be a guiding principle for everyone who had chosen to live a monastic life. His *Diadema Monachorum* takes an even more idealistic approach and describes how a regular life was only the beginning; although written specifically for use in monastic communities, Smaragdus never closed off the possibility that others could attain the 'crown for monks'. This becomes even clearer in his *Via Regia*, ostensibly written for an otherwise unspecified ruler. If the *Expositio* was intended to show monks how they should live, the *Via Regia* attempted to do the same for people living in the world. In both cases, the correct 'way' to accomplish this was to follow the actual

9 Anton, *Fürstenspiegel*.

via regia, the king's highway. That, for Smaragdus, was the symbol for the right way of life in spite of all the challenges that get thrown on the path. By following this *via regia*, everyone should eventually be able to don their own *diadema monachorum*.

Smaragdus described his world in idealistic terms, and seems to have been aware that only monks, isolated as they were behind the walls of their (internal) cloister, were able to reach the heights of the contemplative life described in his works. Nonetheless, the central text to the final case study of this book purports to describe a situation that does exactly that. The *Vita Benedicti Anianensis* presents us with a world view in which the monastic life was linked with imperial ideals, and in which the emperor could be one of the monks. While it should be acknowledged that this was not the only monastic reaction to Louis' *correctio*, the monastic model represented in the *Vita Benedicti Anianensis* took the model pioneered under Louis the Pious to its logical extreme, and opted to show its abbot as being equally capable of leading the *ecclesia*, if not more so. To Ardo, Benedict's personal journey had become a political one, which ultimately benefitted both his local community and the empire at large. More importantly, his hero's journey towards becoming an exemplary monk and abbot had prepared him for life in the political arena in a way that the court never could.

This is a common thread through the cases presented in this book. Whereas the normative ideal shown in the *Institutio Canonorum* leaned heavily on the explanation of how one could hold a high-level *ministerium* and still be a good Christian in the world, the *Vita Benedicti Anianensis* set out to explain how a sufficiently trained monk could accomplish the very same, regardless of the secular pressures he would have to endure. This came close to the ideal propagated by Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel: everyone could aspire to perfection, but it would require a monk's discipline and the support of one's superiors, peers, friends, and even enemies. If everybody aspired to the same goals, the only real dangers to society would be complacency and a false sense of security.

The empire inherited by Louis the Pious was a complex mechanism of interdependent parts. Each of its intricacies, from the smallest cog to the hands moving across the clock face, had a function to fulfil. Although the mechanism itself would be working towards a singular goal, everyone attempting to study this machinery will invariably focus on different parts, shining light from different angles, interpreting its function in different ways. The clockwork that was the Carolingian empire had as many faces as there were people watching it, repairing it, using it – something that holds

true for contemporary actors as much as for modern historians.¹⁰ More important, however, is the observation that in such an empire, regulated by the expectations of everyone with a part to play, even the ruler would never have been on the outside looking in. At best, Louis and his entourage had a slightly better overview of what made the empire tick. As they must have been aware, their position at the top of the hierarchical order may have given them more control, but it still did not allow them to force the many constituent parts of the *ecclesia* in a way counter to its nature. What their vantage point must have given them, then, was the expectation that things could, should and would eventually get better.

The different texts studied in this book each show how such expectations helped shape the Carolingian rhetoric of authority, how this authority was legitimized, and why it would be accepted in the first place. Whether combating heterodox movements or attempting to right perceived wrongs in the empire proper, whether actually advising rulers *in concreto* or only telling stories with moralizing intentions, the composers of the narratives discussed here were all reflecting on their own position vis-à-vis the imperial authority that was propagated from the centre. Those actually at the centre were simultaneously considering what this meant for them and the responsibilities they had to bear; the tools to argue about empire, authority and *ecclesia*, were created while the discursive rules of the community that was being built up around the highest echelon of Carolingian society took shape. This in itself also explained and re-emphasized the idea that the collective burden should be shared among everyone partaking in the empire. To them, authority was not a function of the enforcement of rules. Their empire was held together by social or even ideological power, and part of that ideology consisted of continuous renegotiations of the conditions under which it would be justified to retain (or accept) one's authority. Reforms were an important if unspoken part of these negotiations, as the ability and willingness to improve oneself was one way of gaining authority, while helping others become better persons counted as a visible way of doing this.

This is one of the many factors underlying the continuities and changes visible during the last years of the reign of Charlemagne and the early years of Louis the Pious. They had different personalities, were raised differently, and it seems safe to say that their respective styles of rulership were quite different from the outset. It has been suggested that Charlemagne was 'learning on the job' as his *imperium* was shaped, due in large part to the force of his personality and his aptitude for choosing the right men for whatever task

10 See Rosenau, 'Many damn things simultaneously', pp. 107-119.

was at hand.¹¹ Louis the Pious, on the other hand, inherited an empire that seemed as coherent as it ever would be, and with it – influenced, perhaps, by the organization of the councils of 813 – he inherited a mission. His auspicious beginnings seemed to have shaped his rulership into something that was altogether more ‘programmatically’ than his father’s had ever been.¹² But even if Louis felt he came burdened with glorious purpose, he too must have realized early on that a ruler never acted alone.

In the end, it was the imperial courtiers, the ecclesiastical elites – be they from Louis’ Aquitaine or from Charlemagne’s Aachen – who helped shape Louis’ personal views on the dynamic system bequeathed unto him by his father into the reforms that exemplified the first years of his reign. When we regard their texts as snapshots of an ongoing process, these courtiers emerge as agents of change while also being the guardians of continuity. More importantly, they were the masters of the ecclesiastical discourse that held everything together. Whether it was Smaragdus dispensing advice to whomever needed it, Ardo reflecting on his abbot’s role(s) at the imperial court, or the collective of elites that helped compose the *Institutio Canoniorum*, they all contributed to the ‘extended court’, a dynamic system in which the emperor’s penance at the Council of Attigny that opened this book would be a logical consequence of the system they had created for themselves. Conversely, as long as the emperor continued to listen to the advice petitioned from his subjects, and these subjects upheld the order by working together in peace and harmony, the empire would continue to function. The bishops and abbots who composed the texts studied in this book thus stand in the shadows of what they knew had been tried before – and would cast their own shadow as well – but at the moment of inscription, their texts were as predictive as they were prescriptive. They were not meant to exercise power, but to express hope.

One point arising from this view of the imperial machine is that the Carolingian courtiers who were actively involved in this process seemed to have been aware of their own dynamic community. They needed to be flexible about their ideas, because they fully appreciated that whatever answer they provided would never encompass the full complexity of the world they inhabited.¹³ Smaragdus, consistent though he was, was aware of the many ways a good Christian life could be led, and used his works to present a variety of available options. More than only prescribing rules

11 Nelson, *Opposition*, p. 25.

12 Suggested by Davis, *Charlemagne’s Practice of Empire*, pp. 429–436.

13 Another example of this is given by Nelson, ‘The *libera vox* of Theodulf of Orléans’, pp. 288–306.

and regulations, the *Institutio Canoniorum* also set out to provide moral guidance to bishops and their communities, and was more intent to use its many patristic sources to demonstrate how having authority and being a good member of the *ecclesia* were not mutually exclusive. Providing a narrative example of this mode of thought, the *Vita Benedicti Anianensis* was composed to show its audience how living a good life and following God's order(s) would enable court and cloister, *imperium* and *ecclesia* to coexist without having to resort to compromises.

To acknowledge that variety was a fact of life did not preclude attempts at establishing consensus or even feelings of unity, however. The members of the Carolingian intellectual elite knew all too well that, when all was said and done, the empire they hoped to represent required a certain measure of control to remain together. Additionally, the idea that they were responsible for the salvation of their subjects led to the conclusion that they should have a greater say than most in the ways this salvation could be obtained. Regardless of whether this was about regulating monastic *consuetudines*, about separating monks from canons, or about establishing orthodoxy, this was what motivated them to set the agenda and try to put up the boundaries within which stakeholders were allowed to speak. Again, this mentality was limited by the fact that whatever agenda was decided upon needed to be realistic, acceptable to and accepted by the communities they were trying to improve. It is for this reason that the authors studied in this book placed so much emphasis on the internalization of (what they thought were) proper Christian teachings. In the end, salvation was between God and individual believers, priests, bishops, abbots and kings bore responsibility for ensuring everybody would be in a position to achieve it on their own. Behavioural changes were thus, paradoxically, in the end maybe less important than the attitude behind these changes. The end goal would be to engender the will to do good, be just, eschew pride, etc. within the *ecclesia*. There were many ways that led there – each person's *via regia* came with its own twists and turns.

The sources studied show two ways to deal with the challenges thus posed. Firstly, in spite of the many debates hiding underneath the surface of the sources, the unanimity of the collective taking the decisions would always be emphasized. When a debate moved from one level to the next, as was the case with the *Institutio Canoniorum*, it was important to show that the texts used and the lessons taught had been agreed upon by everyone present, before they would be passed on. In this sense, it may be reiterated that the intended 'normative' character of this text should not be exaggerated, either. As implied in the letters sent to Arn of Salzburg, Magnus of

Sens and Sicharius of Bordeaux along with the definitive copies of the text, the emperor was all too aware of the human element in his deliberations: while the importance of possessing a fully correct copy of the decisions was underscored, it was equally important to listen to the *missi* who would come to check on the progress made in the space of a year after having received this communication. As shown by the various capitularies written for such *missi*, they were fully expected to provide additional guidance as they saw fit. Letters such as the ones accompanying the *Institutio Canonorum* thus not only allow a glimpse of any additional deliberations that did not find their way into the final text, but also show how Louis did not see this particular part of his *correctio* as finished once the *Institutio Canonorum* had been promulgated. In other words, this too was an ongoing process.

This leads to a second important factor holding the Carolingian elite discourse community together: the *persona* of the ruler, and how it would be used. While the respective personalities of Louis the Pious and Charlemagne undeniably played a role in the shaping of Frankish society, even more important was how their authority was perceived, how they exercised it, and under which terms it was accepted. Theirs was a role to play. Their public image would be carefully built up in the very texts that carried their messages, and would also influence the responses composed by those who received them. Again, this was a continually developing dialogue that is sometimes more pronounced than others. There are several different versions of Louis the Pious at work within the texts treated in these chapters, only one of whom spoke with the voice of the ruler himself.¹⁴ The Louis from the introduction of the *Institutio Canonorum* was an arbiter of reform. He shared qualities with the abbatial emperor in Ermold's *Carmen in Honorem Hludowici*, or Ardo's *Vita Benedicti Anianensis*, but he was in a different *persona* all the same. It should be noted that these narratives present a confirmation of an ideal for a specific audience, whereas the emperor in the *Institutio Canonorum* also reflects the self-awareness on the part of the authors that they needed their ruler to have acted in the way they chose to describe him. Smaragdus may not have written his *Via Regia* about a specific king, but it certainly was addressed to one, the subtext being that the ruler should indeed embody the best the realm had to offer. Against a backdrop of centuries-old traditions of loyalty and *fides*, combined with new ideals of *correctio* and religious authority, it befell the ruler to transcend the boundaries separating the *ecclesia* and its monastic communities from the world around them. Whether described as *rex et sacerdos* or *caesar et abba*

14 Ubl, 'Die Stimme des Kaisers'.

simul, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious were expected to be held in equal regard by secular and ecclesiastical elites alike, and as such their role in shaping their own *imperium* worked in much more subtle ways than can be found by merely attempting to reconstruct the life and deeds of the emperor.¹⁵

The circumstances surrounding Louis the Pious' succession would have influenced this perception, as hinted in the descriptions of the councils of 813 and Louis' coronation in various narrative sources. More than any other Carolingian ruler, Louis the Pious rose to his *imperium* in a period where his responsibilities all but overlapped with the expectations of the *ecclesia*. In that sense, the penance at Attigny marked neither the end of the beginning nor the beginning of the end. In the optimistic first decade of his rule, clear of the teleological perspective we have been granted by hindsight, 822 may not have been seen as a low point for an emperor whose piety had gained him the reputation of being able to live like a monk. It is tempting to think that Smaragdus would have been proud of Louis, or at least of the *persona* the new emperor had created for himself.

The ruler was only as important as his ability to catalyse and engender discussions among his followers. The emphasis on cooperation and the realization that decisions needed to be made consensually before committing them to the permanence of parchment was a recurrent theme in the conciliar acts of 813. It underpinned the compilation of the *Institutio Canoniorum*, and allowed Ardo, Smaragdus and Benedict to take on the role expected of them. The texts and traditions – ancient, patristic, contemporary – shared among the participants in the Carolingian experiment cemented the discourse community, either because their relative merits would have been discussed at the many councils held in the course of the Carolingian reforms, or because they had been compiled into cohesive narratives by individual observers.

Taken together, the cases presented allow us an insight into this evolution of an ecclesiastical ideology of reform between courtly idealism and the ethics and pragmatism of those involved in its implementation.¹⁶ Far from reflecting an actual coherent programme, these were elite thinkers weighing in on the question how to improve the state of the Church as they prepared for the next round of debate. The authors studied moreover show that they inhabited several roles at once: bishops reforming themselves, monks glorifying the empire to increase their monastery's standing, or abbots addressing an audience well beyond the walls of the cloister. Thus, they demonstrate the complexities, dialogues, and the many ways an ideal

15 On the use of this title for Charlemagne, see Angenendt, 'Karl der Große'.

16 Armstrong, 'Ethics'.

vision of society could be described. They also show the importance of separating reconstruction from representation when it comes to researching the networks around them, or the world they were describing. This work has shown how the authors behind these narratives were aware that the world did not start and end with the texts they were composing, and that their harmonious ideals often clashed with the harsh realities of everyday life. This is what makes the sources so complex: they truly were a product of their time and the society they sprang from.

Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, retelling a metaphor centuries in the making, explains how the early medieval *ecclesia* was built by many individual 'living stones' which, together with the apostles and the prophets, were constructing a 'spiritual building', a 'dwelling not made with hands, that will last eternally in heaven'.¹⁷ Even if the Carolingian *ecclesia* would end up being greater than the sum of its parts, each of these parts would have to be hewn to perfection in order for the collective to function. In a similar way, the focus on several key texts in their proper context may not allow us a full view of the Church that the Carolingians were sketching, but it does grant a deeper understanding of the way they tried to make their dreams into a reality, and how they tried to live up to the great expectations they had set for themselves.¹⁸

17 *DM*, c. 60. On this metaphor and its impact on early medieval realities, see Bennett, *Metaphors of Ministry*, pp. 103-105; Thunø, *Apse Mosaic*, pp. 159-171.

18 Tremp, 'Die letzten Worte'.