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Thank you to Ellie Woodacre and Amy Livingstone for getting our Roundtable at the International Medieval Congress (IMC) at Leeds 2014 off to a good start, to Theresa Earenfight for afterwards putting together the thoughts arising from that panel and a similar one at Kalazamoo in 2014, and to Kathy Krause and the editors of Medieval Feminist Forum for carrying the contributions to publication.

I would like to explore certain ideas about elite medieval women on the European Continent. My particular area of study is ruling women from the second half of the tenth century to the early twelfth century in Germany and northern Italy before, during, and after the Investiture Controversy, when secular and religious powers in Europe were in dispute. The concept of empire in thought and deed dominated northern Italy at various times during this period and in various degrees as the emperor sought to rule from Germany, and the papacy, concerned with purity and reform, sought to wrest control from what it considered an overbearing imperium. In this post-roundtable review I want to examine

1. I would like to thank the University of Sydney, especially the Department of History, the Medieval and Early Modern Centre, and Fisher Library, for support in the development of this article.


3. I will use Europe, Germany, and Italy as convenient expressions for a geography of place. Germany is more correctly called East Francia, and Italy may mean either the kingdom of Italy, which then encompassed the northern areas of the peninsula of the country that we now call Italy, or the whole peninsula, depending on context. Terms
some ideas that seem to predominate when we talk or write about medieval women of any class, with particular reference to Continental ruling women in Germany and northern Italy in the late tenth, eleventh, and early twelfth centuries.

I have five points I would like to make: two deal with a proposed change of focus or a repositioning in the ongoing examination of ruling women; one presents an issue that was particularly relevant to the queens and empresses of Europe; and two apply to medieval studies in general and even history broadly. However, first I need to give some background with particular emphasis on the earlier medieval period within the Germanic and Italian contexts. Please bear with me while I go over some familiar ground in order to lay the groundwork for the later discussion.

**Context**

The successor states to the Carolingians in the tenth century on the Continent were East Francia, the kingdom of Italy, and West Francia.\(^4\) I such as the Saxons, Swabians, etc. were generally used for the people from Saxony, Swabia, and so on in contemporary documents and thought rather than the names of the “country,” but the country names should serve as a convenient geographical handle in the discussion in this paper. The Ottonian period of rule is considered to start with King Henry I (r. 909–936), continues with emperors Otto I, Otto II, and Otto III, and concludes with Emperor Henry II (r. 1002–1024). Emperor Conrad II (r. 1024–1039) is considered to be the first of the Salian line. The period with which this paper deals includes the following Salian emperors: Henry III, Henry IV, and the early reign of Henry V (r. 1099–1125). For an overview of the people and the geography of Germany and northern Italy, see Herwig Wolfram, *Conrad II 990–1039: Emperor of Three Kingdoms*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006), 1–12.


\(^5\) See the discussion in Chris Wickham, *The Inheritance of Rome: A History of*...
intend to deal here primarily with East Francia and the kingdom of Italy and their relationship with one another. Changes in society between the tenth and eleventh centuries affected men and women profoundly. I have to say at the outset that the statements that I am making here concerning women’s potential relative loss of wealth and power in the eleventh century may not apply to every society nor to every woman, especially to women in France. However, I need to present a framework here of broad societal changes so that I can address my first point in the next section, “That Paradigm.”

The real history of women’s ability to gain and retain wealth is a history of changes in scarcity and plenty. Because of a general dearth of people at the beginning of the eleventh century, women had value both for their labor and as bearers of children. Marriage, supposedly an indissoluble personal union and a social instrument, structured patrimony within families through dowries and marriage settlements and the alliances and exchange of land. Combined with the availability of plentiful land, the reverse dowry—the major marriage payment whereby the future husband gave the future wife property (often lands and movable goods)—provided for the maintenance of the future widow. Often the reverse dowry remained in the possession and control of the woman on her husband’s death, enabling her to live independently.6 In Germany the Morgengabe, the morning gift to the bride from her husband after the consummation of their marriage, could be inherited by the bride’s surviving heirs. Consequently sometimes the wary widow had to fight for her entitlements.7 Land was inextricably tied to wealth, and wealth to

---

power. “It was the barefaced competition for property which everywhere gave shape to power.” The situation described above applied broadly in England and on the Continent.

As the eleventh century progressed, increased population ensured that land became less abundant for both men and women, so means were found to redistribute what remained. In Germany the demise of the lavish endowments of Ottonian monasteries that had occurred in the tenth century shows one way in which possessions were snatched back and how the newly-released wealth supported the increase in comital holdings: “the Saxon princes became somewhat less tolerant of wealthy widows disposing of great inheritances. Instead they forced them to remarry and used their possessions to build up those competitive territorial lordships which the prolonged impotence of the later Salian emperors in Saxony made possible.” So too, as competition intensiﬁed, inheritance customs and the purpose of marriage changed; consequently women’s inheritance suffered more than men’s. The fragmentation of tenth-century estates caused by the division of the inheritance among all children gave way to a rise in primogeniture (the right of succession and inheritance of a ﬁrstborn, especially a ﬁrstborn son). In replacing partible inheritance by women and men with primogeniture, families sought to “preserve, build up and consolidate the patrimony.” The rise of castellans and knights as progenitors of the patrilinear dynasties of the later Middle Ages ousted earlier family structures. We must note, however, Constance Bouchard’s argument that in medieval Francia, families had always privileged male descendants. The shift in ownership within the family patrimony has been summarized as follows:

Sorbonne, 1995), 268–70.


Women no longer serve as the nodules through which pass the surest kinship ties. The daughter is treated as a marginal member of her father’s lineage, and after her marriage, her children will leave it entirely; their allegiance passes to her husband’s line. Women also lose the claim to a full (or at least fair) share with their brothers in the family patrimony.\textsuperscript{12}

By the early twelfth century, marriage to ensure dynastic survival had become a distinct concept in addition to the sacramental ideal of marriage. Discussing Philip I of France’s second marriage, around 1100, Georges Duby wrote that marriage, “overt, public, ceremonious, surrounded by special words and deeds, is at the center of any system of values, at the junction between the material and the spiritual.”\textsuperscript{13} In such a reorientation of the nature of marriage as both dynastic and sacramental, the wife’s ownership and control of land, and therefore her wealth, gave way to ownership by the husband. Younger sons were now forbidden to marry or were required to marry later, and fewer lands were available for brides. Alternatively in Germany the adoption of stricter Germanic rules of incest was used to exclude them. The stricter rules encouraged a culture of initiation via tests and trials before breeding and an emphasis on marriage as the knight’s ultimate goal. The reluctant groom had to be coaxed to marry; the reverse dowry declined and all but disappeared by the end of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} David Herlihy, \textit{Medieval Households}, Studies in Cultural History (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 82.


women and limited their opportunities to retain wealth. The rise of the fief, given primarily for military service and passed undivided to the eldest son, excluded people who could not give military service, that is, women.\textsuperscript{15} In 1037 Emperor Conrad II issued the \textit{Constitutio de feudis}, which barred women specifically from the inheritance of fiefs in Italy.\textsuperscript{16} However, later emperors attempting to impose a similar regimen in Germany met with indifferent success.\textsuperscript{17}

In the same way as an aristocratic woman had greater opportunities to acquire wealth at the beginning of the eleventh century than at its end, so too she could avail herself of comparatively more opportunities to exercise power. In the same way as the queen could wield power at that time, so too educated abbesses, usually from the royal families, and especially in Ottonian Germany, headed great foundations, minted coins, held markets, made their abbeys key stopping points for the itinerant royal retinue, presided over Saxon assemblies, on occasion ruled in the king’s absence, and generally exercised significant power and managed great wealth obtained from endowments.\textsuperscript{18} Abbess Mathilda of Quedlinburg was a case in point. Daughter of Empress Adelheid and Emperor Otto I and “famous for the care with which she presided over the Saxon assemblies,” she ruled as regent in Germany for her parents and later for her nephew, Otto III, during their absences in Italy.\textsuperscript{19} It can be seen that certain noble women were privileged, especially the women of the Saxon aristocracy in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, because

\textsuperscript{15} Herlihy, “Medieval Marriage Market,” 9; Olson, \textit{Early Middle Ages}, 171–72.
\textsuperscript{17} Herlihy, “Land, Family and Women,” 100.
\textsuperscript{19} Althoff, “Saxony,” 271.
of longevity and relatively greater freedom to inherit property, control great wealth, and to wield great power.20

Women in the early Middle Ages were able to exploit opportunities that a less centralized and less ordered environment afforded. Some women excelled in the specifically religious sphere. Bishop Adalhelm of Sées attributed his see and his life to the virgin saint Opportuna, who lived in the late eighth century. According to Adalhelm, not only men but also women and young girls provided models of sanctity, although a woman’s sanctity was different from a man’s.21 The lives of Merovingian women such as queens Radegund (died 587)22 and Balthild (died ca. 680)23 and of Carolingian women such as Liutberga of Wendhausen (died ca. 880)24 achieved praise in sacred biographies, albeit based on “male, patristic...[and] canonical” models.25 Radegund, initially active as queen of the Franks, chose “ascetic virtuosity,” became a deaconess, lived in various monasteries, and may have refused, out of humility, the offer of the position of abbess at the monastery of Poitiers.26 Similarly

20. Karl Leyser, Rule and Conflict, 49–73.
26. For the succinct phrase “ascetic virtuosity,” which summarized Radegund’s choice, see Janet L. Nelson, “Queens as Jezebels: The Careers of Brunhild and
Queen Balthild of Neustria, having exercised real power, abandoned court politics under pressure to enter the monastery of Chelles (which she had endowed), living there humbly for fifteen years until her death in about 680.\textsuperscript{27} The aristocratic woman Liutberg remained a virgin, secluded herself in a monastic cell, and attained the status of a “pious \textit{virago},” even eventually assuming a functional asexuality. Liutberg’s life story conforms to the monastic virginal model.\textsuperscript{28}


\textsuperscript{28} For the phrase “pious \textit{virago},” see Smith, “Female Sanctity,” 19. For other aspects of Liutberg’s life, see ibid. 6, 20158, 22, 24, 35.
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Bernhard of Septimania, Dhuoda had been caught up in the civil war raging among the sons of Louis the Pious on the latter’s death. Dhuoda’s manual gave advice to her elder son, whom his father had sent as hostage to his own godfather Charles the Bald, a son of Louis. Situated as she was in her absent husband’s castle at Uzès, located in southern France just north of Arles, it fell to Dhuoda to define for her son those desirable qualities and appropriate actions which he needed to master in order to negotiate tricky court politics and to become a wise and holy nobleman.30

As the century progressed, the occasions for women to exercise power diminished. Concomitant with the rise of nobles and the development of more circumscribed governmental structures, the power of the king was called into question and, consequently, so was that of his queen, especially in Italy and Germany. Although the king/empire still maintained a court and his household, he and his retinue became less central to power as nascent bureaucracies formed. As the machinery of government became more impersonal, aristocratic men were able to exercise public power as administrators of the new institutions, but this opportunity was not formally open to noblewomen, who were relegated to private power in a shrinking sphere as the household became increasingly marginalized while other power structures gained prominence. England was an exception in that public institutions never completely died out under the king.31 On the Continent, especially in France, public institutions eventually reemerged. Altogether, everywhere the growth of a more organized society consigned family, household, and women to the periphery.32


32. McNamara and Wemple, “Power of Women the Family (1973),” 126–41. McNamara re-examined and reaffirmed her views later in Jo Ann McNamara, “Women and Power Through the Family Revisited,” in Gendering the Master
As well as changes in the secular sphere, changes in the ecclesiastical domain affected women to their detriment in different ways. With the enforcement of celibacy of the clergy, the opportunity for clerical wives to exercise power as part of the “parish” disappeared.  

33 Not only women’s power but also women’s status itself was reduced.  

34 So too the rise of the importance of the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, disadvantaged the abbesses, canonesses, and nuns who, while they had always been dependent on priests, now found themselves privileging those ordained men for bearing the sacrament to them. “As society became better organized and ecclesiastically more right-minded, the necessity for male dominance began to assert itself.”  

A woman of interest from the end of the eleventh century is Ger-cendis, who was not able to appropriate the role of queen or empress, or of a religious, however broadly defined they might be at the time she lived. Nevertheless she made the best of the circumstances in which she found herself, as we can see by her actions. She played a leading role in the revolt at Le Mans, first heard of as a commune in 1070. There


documentation in two charters shows Gercendis acting as a count in her own and her family’s interest. As the daughter of Count Herbert (called “Wake the Dog”), she came from illustrious comital ancestors, the Counts of Maine. She had originally been married to a duke; she afterwards married a marquis; she became the ward and then the mistress of another nobleman, Geoffroy of Mayenne. During the uprising she remained in Le Mans and had the power to consider whether she might hand the city over to Geoffroy. Her son eventually became a count, but was deposed by William the Conqueror. In those challenging times, Gercendis found her path to power via the comital rather than the imperial or the royal route.

1. That Paradigm

In summary, we have been presented with a paradigm about how women in the early Middle Ages in a more disordered time COULD do better than women in the second half of the eleventh century and later, when the Church was becoming more centralized, power more structured and hereditary, and “male dominance began to assert itself.” By the phrase “COULD do better,” I mean that opportunities might be available to


accomplish more, because control was more diffuse and unstructured and pockets of female power could emerge.

Not even powerful early medieval kings such as Rothari and Charlemagne could bring social reality fully into line with prescriptive norms. In practice, women characteristically lived their lives in the interstices of ideology and convention. As we shall see, that gap was often considerable, a cause of vulnerability for some but of opportunity for others.\(^{38}\)

The paradigm that is often presented occurs as a result of the changes between the tenth and eleventh centuries. The social context had changed, it is claimed, from one of diffused sources of authority and social mobility to one in which authority was more obviously and coherently articulated, and people were mostly controlled by a public system. Although the general shift to a public system was clear, the use of private laws did not totally disappear. New laws regulating the relationships between lords and subjects, for example, were private while, though fewer, some old private laws remained to demonstrate the endurance of the model from Carolingian times when authority was strongly but simply articulated by impersonal rules and the personal charisma of the monarch.\(^{39}\) Such claims are generalizations and need to be evaluated in their temporal and geographical context. Nevertheless on the whole society was becoming more organized.

Recent scholarship has queried this paradigm. For example, Duby's assertion about a change in inheritance, family structure and women's status in France about the year 1100 has been challenged.\(^{40}\) The first


\(^{40}\) See, for example, George G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), 51–64, especially 55, 60. See also Amy Livingstone, *Out of
question is then, does the model or paradigm need to be more finely nuanced? That is, can this model or paradigm be applied in general to all women or does it apply to Continental women operating in Germany and northern Italy? I want to examine this question for those two locations in particular using selected case studies, and then to touch briefly on the four other points I mentioned at the beginning of this paper.

I have looked in detail at a queen in the early Middle Ages and a countess concerned with church reform a hundred years later. Those two women were Empress Adelheid and Countess Matilda of Tuscany.\textsuperscript{41} They bookended the changes of the eleventh century and provide a fine contrast with each other. Whereas Empress Adelheid functioned in northern Italy and Germany in the late tenth century in the period when women had more “elbow room,” Countess Matilda, active in the late eleventh century and early twelfth century in northern Italy, was confronted with a period of change during which the mantle of authority was shifting from the exercise of personal charisma to conformity within a new authoritarian society.\textsuperscript{42} Did Matilda actually help develop


\textsuperscript{42} Professor R. I. Moore used the term ”women’s elbow room” in reference to the relatively better opportunities for women to access wealth and power in the
the more organized, structured, and authoritarian society that emerged during the eleventh century?

Let us examine Empress Adelheid and Countess Matilda in more detail. Empress Adelheid and her daughter-in-law, Empress Theophanu, reached the pinnacle of political and religious power. They are examples of Ottonian women who took advantage of disordered times and found ways to forge significant pathways.43 Adelheid was born with the advantage of noble parents in about 931. On her father's death in 937, her mother married Hugh, king of Italy, and Adelheid was betrothed to her stepbrother. On Hugh's death in 947, Adelheid became queen of Italy. Her young husband died soon after in 950. Berengar II of Ivrea, seeking to consolidate the kingship of Italy, held her captive. She took the initiative, escaped, avoided her captors, and sent word to the leading man in Saxony, Otto I. They married at Pavia, the acknowledged royal seat of the kingdom of Italy. With Otto I Adelheid bore a daughter, Mathilda, who became Abbess of Quedlinburg, and a male heir, Otto II. Adelheid was a major intervener in the diplomata of emperors Otto I, Otto II, and Otto III in turn. She owned more land than her son, the emperor Otto II. She founded and endowed great monasteries. Her

Ottonian period than later on. R. I. Moore, email to Dr Lynette Olson, 2 July 2009. For more about the shifts between the tenth and eleventh centuries and the emergence of the Canossans during that period, see Wickham, Inheritance of Rome, 513–14; Chris Wickham, “Property Ownership and Signorial Power in Twelfth-Century Tuscany,” in Davies and Fouracre, Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages, 221–44.

contemporaries praised her as *imperatrix augusta*, \(^{44}\) *augusta praecela*, \(^{45}\) “celebrated august empress of the Romans,” \(^{46}\) and addressed her as “exalted lady, cherisher of kings and kingdoms, the most noble Adelheid always august and unconquerable. . . . through her unique intelligence and bountiful wisdom she subjected the whole imperium to herself.” \(^{47}\) She was one of the first saints to be canonized by a pope.

Adelheid acted as regent of the empire four times during her life. She successfully undertook this responsibility because she had the credentials and ability and was able to make use of the unusual circumstances that applied to her Italian connections. Although Italy had been conquered by various Carolingian rulers, and especially thoroughly by Charlemagne in the late eighth century, and had consequently been influenced by Carolingian practices, prior Lombard influences that favored the right of royal women to transmit kingship to their next husband still lingered. \(^{48}\)

Countess Matilda of Tuscany (also known as Matilda of Canossa) was a proficient negotiator, warrior, and ruler of extensive lands in Tuscany, the Apennines, and northern Italy, albeit her property did not approach...

---


\(^{45}\) Ibid., s.a. 992, p. 482.

\(^{46}\) “inclita Romanorum imperatrix augusta.” ibid., s.a. 999, p. 508.

\(^{47}\) “Dominę precelsę regum regnorumque altrici nobilissimę Adalheidę augustę semper invictissimę. . . . cuius solum ingenium tam larga est sapientia auctum, ut sibi totum subiugaret imperium.” Froumond, *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, ed. Karl Strecker, *MGH Epp. sel.* 3:1–96 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1925, repr. 1964), Ep. 1, pp. 2–3. *Inclita* and *invictissima* are terms used in Late Antiquity and are redolent of imperial authority at that time. I am grateful to Dr. Lynette Olson and to Professor Dexter Hoyos for enlightenment about the influence of the late-empire Latin style therein. For Adelheid’s miracles, see Giuliano Sala and Giorgio Vedovelli, *Vita e miracoli di Adelaida di Borgogna: Epitaphium Adalheidae imp. Liber miraculorum*, Le Fonti 1 (Torri del Benaco: Centro Studi per il Territorio Benacense, 1990).

the vastness of Empress Adelheid’s landed possessions.49 Her supporters praised her as a “new Deborah,”50 *domina,*51 *nota Ducatrix,*52 *virago,*53 “[r]enowned Matilda,”54 “Matilda, that most dear and faithful daughter of St. Peter”55 and attributed to her many other worthy epithets. She championed seven popes unstintingly in support of church reform in the struggle against King and then Emperor Henry IV, and with her army eventually drove him out of Italy.

In contrast to Countess Matilda, we can look at an empress such as Agnes, married to the Emperor Henry III in Germany in the mid-eleventh century and active in approximately the same time period as Countess Matilda. Empress Agnes, like Empress Adelheid a century before, was asked to take on the regency for her son (and Adelheid was also asked to do so for her grandson, twice). Adelheid succeeded very well in the earlier period. In contrast, Agnes had the regency and, indeed, her son himself (the future Emperor Henry IV), taken from her. Countess Matilda of Tuscany, active at approximately the same time as


51. Ibid., 2.7.692, p. 176.

52. Ibid., 2.7.729, p. 178.


Agnes, appears to have been much more successful in the eyes of many of her contemporaries.

The question I want to ask is: was Countess Matilda exceptional in Italy or was Matilda acting against the paradigm? To consider that question we must remember that her mother, Countess Beatrice, was powerful in her own right and that Countess Adelaide of Turin ruled over large areas of land. That is, WERE women in Germany and Italy, who could not help but be strongly influenced by the hovering presence of the empire, more formally constrained after, say, the middle of the eleventh century (and this has been the accepted paradigm), but with some exceptions, for example Countess Matilda, OR were women not more constrained after the middle of the eleventh century, and Matilda and other women were just carrying on in the same old way (contra the paradigm)? Furthermore, were women who operated in Germany and northern Italy in general functioning under more flexible rules than those in other areas of the Continent and in England?

2. Refocus

My second point arises out of the first one. As a consequence of the above discussion, let us continue to expand our scope now to examine ruling women, not just empresses or queens. This is happening and I welcome it. The “Kings and Queens 3” conference at Winchester in July 2014, which took place directly after the International Medieval Congress at Leeds, did just that by taking “Entourage” as its theme. This collection for Medieval Feminist Forum adds to the expansion. For example, Amy Livingstone uses the twelfth-century Countess Ermengard of Brittany (ca. 1070–1147) as a springboard to discuss larger questions, and Constance Berman examines thirteenth-century “Lady/Lords” and their varied careers. In our assembly of ruling women, we must not forget the abbesses, canonesses, and other religious women, who ruled with great independence especially in Ottonian Germany. Two Gerbergas, one an aunt of King Henry I (d. 936) and another his...

56. In recent conversations with me, Alison Creber, whose subject is Countess Adelaide of Turin, strongly disagrees that the paradigm applies.
granddaughter, were abbesses of Gandersheim. On the instruction of her abbess Gerberga II (d. 1002), the canoness Hrotsvitha wrote the *Gesta Ottonis* (Deeds of Otto) in order to support the Ottonian dynasty.\(^{57}\) Abbess Mathilda of Quedlinburg (d. 999) has already been mentioned. Her niece Adelheid (d. 1043, not to be confused with Empress Adelheid) became abbess first of Quedlinburg and then added three other convents to her responsibilities.\(^{58}\) Abbess Adelheid’s sister Sophie (d. 1039) followed her as abbess of Gandersheim. Those three women presided over assemblies with their imperial relations. Abbesses Adelheid and Sophie were important consultants in the selection of the last Ottonian emperor, Henry II. Religious women from later periods, especially those active in Germany, continued to wield direct political power. The religious and saintly aspects of their lives have often been examined, but not always the complementary ruling aspects of their lives.

### 3. Biography and Life Cycle

My third point concerns how we frame our studies of women. Let’s go beyond the biography and the life cycle. There has been very valuable work undertaken in the last thirty years or so to understand the lives of medieval women, especially ruling women. Women are often examined from the point of view of their life cycle—virgin, bride, wife, mother, dowager. Empress Adelheid and Countess Matilda were not so categorized. Rather Empress Adelheid’s life-cycle function or position was often linked to a ruling function. She was “the most famous lady and

---


mother of kingdoms”\textsuperscript{59} and the “mother of all kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{60} Countess Matilda’s two marriages and the birth of her daughter were ignored by her biographer, Donizo, who emphasised instead her virtue, her military qualities, and her wisdom. I wonder if we are sometimes overly caught up in the life-cycle viewpoint. After all, we don’t talk very much or not in the same way about ruling men as virgin, new-husband/groom (is there an equivalent word for male bride?), father, widower. Can we break out of the virgin, bride, wife, mother, dowager life cycle? Can we re-examine the categories under which we sometimes examine women?

Here I would like to add \textit{verbatim} Theresa Earenfight’s comments on the first draft of this section of my paper with which I am in agreement:

One of the points that came up in the roundtable at the Exceptionalism conference was that timelines are written by men. But both Joan Kelly and Julia Smith (I mention her comments in my essay) argue that we need to take charge of what we identify as points of change. It seems to me that this is what Penny’s driving at, but I think it also can go farther. For example, if we claim another timeline, it might be one that rejects politics and war (the latter is such a tedious way to mark historical moments) [and] follows history based on changes to marriage and inheritance laws, economic practices, literacy, expansion of Europe, and medical history.\textsuperscript{61}

4. Female and Male Power

My fourth point picks up on work by Amy Livingstone and Lois Huneycutt and others, who have asked the question: Is there just power—not male or female power? Yes. To some extent there is just power. However, I cannot help thinking about the problems Empresses Adelheid and Theophanu, in the late tenth century, and Empresses Kunigunde and Agnes, in the eleventh century, had with their dower


\textsuperscript{60} “omnium . . . mater regnorum.” Ibid., Letter 74, p. 105.

\textsuperscript{61} Email from Professor Kathy Krause, 27 December 2015.
lands; lands that were given to them in very strong and firm language in the charters and the diplomata entirely for their use.\textsuperscript{62} Then the emperors—their husbands, sons, or grandsons—seized the various properties, which were then allocated as though they were imperial lands.\textsuperscript{63} This was particularly prevalent in Italy and Germany. In Ottonian and Salian Germany, the reverse dowry reverted to the wife’s husband or his heirs. Confusion over the reverse dowry and the \textit{Morgengabe} (mentioned above) meant that those lands might be considered dower not \textit{Morgengabe}, and consequently could be confiscated. Empress Adelheid’s landed property was subject to attack for those reasons. Not only was this an attack on her possessions, but it was also a direct threat to her power.\textsuperscript{64} Consequently let us examine the theme of “male” and “female” power further. Does power differ between them? Do we sometimes create our own ideas about power by unintentionally applying different criteria and thereby examining men and women differently? Do we ask different questions and do we have different discussions in modern society when we interview women and when we interview men about how they define and exercise power and how they show leadership?

\textbf{5. Language and Other Barriers}

My fifth point concerns the language silos that still occur. Let’s break down the language barriers between countries. I want to highlight a matter raised by Professor Chris Wickham at a roundtable on Italian

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{64} Nash, “Shifting Terrain,” 67–69.
\end{itemize}
history and historiography at the International Medieval Congress at Leeds in 2012. His concern was that many articles and books are highly oriented towards single language bibliographies, scarcely acknowledging the research undertaken in other languages. As a result, much work can be missed or conversely duplicated. Congresses and conferences, for example the IMC at Leeds and the Kings and Queens conferences, and other sessions that have been held at Kalamazoo and elsewhere are contributing to breaking down these barriers. However, I was particularly struck again by this issue when I attended the commemoration of the twelfth centenary of Charlemagne’s death at Aachen in 2014, shortly after our Roundtable of 2014. The tribute produced some splendid books—a small erudite, well-illustrated pamphlet available in a number of languages and a hefty three-volume set of scholarly articles. Of the latter, one volume depicts and discusses in detail the art considered to be sponsored or influenced by the Charlemagne School of the late ninth/early tenth centuries.  

Two volumes, subtitled Place of Might, contain the Catalogue and Essays. The explanations, descriptions, and essays are in German in these volumes. Quite a wide variety of scholars from a number of countries have contributed, but the majority are German. The people I met there were surprised that a person from an English speaking country would go to the exhibition in Germany. My otherwise knowledgeable guide wondered why the French would be interested in Charlemagne. None of this is totally surprising, and integration and sharing of knowledge works all ways. Nevertheless this visit highlighted that communication among the world’s babel of nations can be improved.

Summary

So in summary:

1. Could women in the Early Middle Ages, in a “more disordered time” do better than their counterparts in the later Middle Ages, in


a “more bureaucratic and ordered time” (the paradigm) OR is the paradigm wrong, and women’s exercise of power carried on much as before? Let’s nuance the paradigm to further our understanding of women’s opportunities in certain locations or periods or under certain conditions.

2. Let’s continue to expand the examination of the activities and opportunities of empresses and queens to other ruling women.

3. Let’s consider other prisms through which to examine women besides the life cycle.

4. Let’s examine the idea of “male” and “female” power further. Does power differ between men and women? Are we inventing our own ideas of power by inadvertently examining men and women differently?

Let’s break down the language barriers between countries, and consequently other barriers.

I’d be interested to know your thoughts.

*University of Sydney*