Anastasia Brakhman

Extended summary of the PhD project:

Outsider and 'Insider' in the Early Medieval Historiography: Literary Communication at the Ottonian court.

<u>1. The statement of questions, conceptual framework and approaches of the project</u>

Any early medieval historiographical work fulfilled a number of functions: it provided informations, preserved knowledge and memory and it measured humanity's past and present against the divine plan of salvation. All these tasks of medieval historiography are known and well explored. In the foreground of this project there is however a different aspect: the socio-economic intentions of the author towards a special group of readers. The aim to reach a certain audience by means of the text gives the works examined a distinct character and allows to understand them as means of purposive literary communication.

An essential feature of literary communication that distinguishes it from conventional types of written exchange (such as letter) is the claim to universal, impersonal value of the message of the text. Literary communication can be led by different intentions, such as the persuasion of a recipient concerning certain ideological, religious and political ideas, thus pursuing social and economic interests of the author or institution/ social group that he belongs to. Hence, the definition of concrete intentions and social position of the authors appears to be of key importance.

Conceptually the project is designed as research of history of communication. As Volker Depkat has clearly formulated, the history of communication puts „the consideration in the beginning that the society takes place in communication and that the society forms itself from the sum of communications of its participants. Social communication <…> manifests itself as a concrete practice structured by power and hierarchy. It takes historically specific forms which can be identified, descriptively reconstructed and understood as an immanent component of the past".[1] The project affiliates itself with a line of the history of communication inspired by the "*lifeworld*"-concept of Juergen Habermas.[2] Its aim is „to understand communicative praxis from the perspective of the participating actors"; it asks „about conditions for validity of statements from the standpoint

---

[1] See: Volker Depkat, Kommunikationsgeschichte zwischen Mediengeschichte und der Geschichte sozialer Kommunikation, in: O. Auge/ K.-H. Spieß (ed.), Medien der Kommunikation im Mittelalter. 2003, pp. 9-48; here esp. pp. 10f. Original citation in German: Die Kommunikationsgeschichte setzt „die Überlegung an den Anfang, dass sich Gesellschaft in Kommunikation vollzieht, dass Gesellschaft aus der Summe der Kommunikationen ihrer Teilnehmer besteht. Soziale Kommunikation <…> manifestiert sich als konkrete, macht- und hierarchiegefügte Praxis. Dies nimmt historisch spezifische Formen an, die identifiziert, beschreibend rekonstruiert und als Bestandteil vergangener Zeiten verstanden werden können".

[2] Cf. in more detail: Ibid, pp. 12ff.

of communication participants"; it reconstructs „the implicit participant knowledge and the semantic framework of statements embed in the lifeworld context".[3]

As a general field of research the outlined approach offers the "integration and socialisation functions" of communication as well as „formation of personal [but not individual - A. B.] identity".[4] At the level of general questions it explores „what kind of communicative practices structure and accelerate the socialisation of a person, what self-images and notions of social roles are being developed and how a person makes sure of its accessory to the groups by the way of communication".[5] To sum up: „how an individual establishes his connection to the society surrounding him and how he posits himself within it by the way of communication".[6]

Hence the project locates itself in a range of studies of medieval communication history which set out in the later 1980s.[7] The essential distinction of the project, however, is that the conclusions about the communicative modes of the authors are drawn from their texts in order to obtain information about communication and discourse of the specific epoch, as opposed to the more general phenomena usually considered, such as - on the substantial level - rituals or court representation, or - on the level of the origin of a text - relationship between written and oral forms of communication.[8] To put it another way, the project at hand seeks to expand the traditional issue of the "author's intention" and the "circumstances of text formation" by a decidedly communicative aspect.

The project focuses on the communication of a literate outsider, i.e. an author who had no or very limited access to his target audience during the drafting of his text. Thus, the following questions should be answered: How does an educated outsider deal with literary work and the historiographical discourse of his time? What aims does he pursue explicitly and implicitly? What possibilities does he believe may be opened for him as a littérateur, and in what ways does he try to achieve them? By following this line of inquiry, more general questions are raised: about the

---

[3] See: Ibid, p. 27. Original citation in German: Der lebensweltlich ausgerichtete Ansatz setzt sich zum Ziel, „kommunikative Praktiken aus der Perspektive der an ihr beteiligten Akteure zu verstehen"; er fragt „nach den Bedingungen für die Geltung von Aussagen aus der jeweiligen Sicht der Kommunikationsteilnehmer" und rekonstruiert „das implizite Teilnehmerwissen und den im lebensweltlichen Kontext verankerten Bedeutungsrahmen von Aussagen".

[4] See: Ibid, pp. 26f.

[5] Cit.: Ibid, p. 27. Original citation in German: Es wäre zu fragen, „durch welche kommunikative Praktiken die Vergesellschaftung des einzelnen strukturiert und vorangetrieben wird, welche Selbstbilder und Rollenvorstellungen sich ausbilden und wie der einzelne sich in der Kommunikation seiner Zugehörigkeit zu Gruppen vergewissert".

[6] Cit.: Ibid, p.27. Original citation in German: „wie sich <…> der einzelne durch Kommunikation zu der ihn umgebenen Gesellschaft in Beziehung setzt und sich in ihr verortet".

[7] See: Hedwig Röckelein, - Chancen und Grenzen eines mediävistischen Forschungszweiges, in: Das Mittelalter 6, 1 (2001) pp. 5-13, here pp. 5f. with notes 4-10; also for example: Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, Symbolische Kommunikation in der Vormoderne, in: Zeitschrift für historische Forschung 31 (2004), pp. 489-527; Gerd Althoff, Die Macht der Rituale. Symbolik und Herrschaft im Mittelalter. 2003 as well as many previous studies of G. Althoff.

[8] See note 7.

communication of a learned author with a political and cultural milieu that is partly alien to him, about the process of integration and the relation to the recipients. Relying on exemplified analysis, the consequences to which these special circumstances of text formation led should be distinct, as well as similarities and distinctions between an 'outsider' and 'local' contemporary authors (,insiders') concerning the usage of literature for establishing communication.

The usage of the term 'outsider' (resp. its counterpart 'insider') for characterizing the relationship between a writer and the nearest circle of a ruler in the 10th century is admittedly connected with some difficulties. As it has become sufficiently clear in the course of the investigation, one does not deal with the dissociation of the 'strangeness' in terms of ethnicity or faith.[9] In addition, it seems impossible to define the ruler court of the 10th century by its structure or personal constitution because no circle of consistently present aristocracy can be made out. Furthermore, for this period of time the mechanisms of social mobility cannot be traced comprehensive enough.[10] Therefore, the established research approaches (such as systems theory of Niklas Luhmann or the court research, German "Hofforschung")[11] apparently do not appertain to describe adequately the relation between 'outsiders' and 'insiders' and their recipients. It should also be noted that the analysis of the early medieval historiography can only operate with one side of a communicative exchange, i.e. that of the author, while the opinion or reaction of his recipients cannot be revealed due to the missing sources. Hence the use of such terms as ingroup/ outgroup, exclusion/ inclusion, integration/ disintegration appears to be questionable since they are primarily intended to describe a reciprocal process.[12]

Within the project the terms 'outsiders'/ 'insider' occur therefore historically with regard to the institutional affiliations and the personal relationships of the author. Hence, authors who possessed a permanent connection to a (religious) institution holding itself a firm position in the society of the Ottonian empire, are referred to as 'insiders'. By means of their home institutions, the 'insider'

---

[9] For example in the sense of Volker Scior; cf.: V. Scior, Das Eigene und das Fremde: Identität und Fremdheit in den Chroniken Adams von Bremen, Helmolds von Bosau und Arnolds von Lübeck. 2002. Or that of Walter Pohl; see, for example, the latest volume: W. Pohl (ed.), Sprache und Identität im frühen Mittelalter. 2012.

[10] This is partly due to the source situation; the situation changes visibly during the 11th century. Cf.: Herbert Zielinski, Der Reichsepiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002 - 1125), Wiesbaden 1984; Albrecht von Finck Finckenstein, Bischof und Reich. Untersuchungen zum Integrationsprozeß des ottonisch-frühsalischen Reiches (919 - 1056) (= Studien zur Mediävistik 1), Sigmaringen 1989.

[11] See for example some of the newer studies based on the approach of Niklas Luhmann, that work in particular with the terms exclusion / inclusion: A. Gestrich / R. Lutz (ed.): Studien zu Fremdheit und Armut von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart (Inklusion/Exklusion. Studien zu Fremdheit und Armut von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart, Bd. 5). 2008; C. Bohn, Inklusion, Exklusion und die Person. 2006. For the „Hofforschung" see esp.: U. C. Ewert/ S. Selzer (ed.), Ordnungsformen des Hofes. 1997; R. Butz, J. Hirschbiegel, D. Willoweit (ed.), Hof und Theorie. Verstehen durch Erklären eines historischen Phänomens. 2004.

[12] See note 11 as well as Julia Dücker/Marcel Müller, Bilanz eines Aufbruchs, in: M. Borgolte (ed.), Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter. 2011, pp. 561-586, here esp. pp. 561-571.

authors were integrated in the Ottonian society, including their relationship to the ruler himself.[13] This kind of social position had first to be won by the outsider.[14]

2. Outline, chronological limits and sources of the project

The statement of problems and questions as described above leads to the following outline of the PhD research:

1. The outsider at the Ottonian court: literary communication of Liudprand of Cremona

    1.1. Liudprand's biography and work: Designing of literary communication

    1.2. Self-representation of the author and his social demands in the *Antapodosis*

    1.3. The circles of recipients and communicative levels of the *Antapodosis*

    1.4. Literary communication of Liudprand of Cremona: conclusions

2. Ottonian historians: literary communication of 'insiders'

    2.1. Widukinds of Corvey *Res gestae Saxonicae*

    2.2. Hrotsvits of Gandersheim *Gesta Ottonis*

    2.3. *Continuatio Reginonis*

As a case study for the research of the communication of the literate outsider I have chosen the Œuvre and the biography of Italian cleric Liudprand acting in the middle of 10th century at the court of Otto the Great. After the breaking off with his earlier master, king Berengar II of Italy, Liudprand left the Italian kingdom and went to the court of Otto I (not later than 953). Up to his death (between 970 and 973) he remained in service of the Saxon ruler and was entrusted with different tasks - presumably as a court notary,[15] according his own report also as a translator and an envoy - including two diplomatic missions to the imperial court in Constantinople. By the second Italian campaign of Otto I, Liudprand was appointed bishop of Cremona (961/962). During the almost twenty years of his service Liudprand wrote at least four texts - two historiographic (*Antapodosis* and *Liber de Ottone Rege*), a sermon *(Homelia Paschalis)* and a diplomatic report (*Relatio de*

---

[13] See basically Franz-Josef Arlinghaus, Konstruktionen von Identität mittelalterlicher Korporationen - rechtliche und kulturelle Aspekte. In: M. Späth (ed.), Die Bildlichkeit korporativer Siegel im Mittelalter. Kunstgeschichte und Geschichte im Gespräch. 2009. pp. 33-46, esp. p. 37: „Vielmehr war es der Personenverband, über den die Inklusion einer Person in die Gesellschaft insgesamt erfolgte. Damit realisierte sich die Vergesellschaftung nicht über die in den jeweiligen gesellschaftlichen Bereichen ausgeübten Rollen, sondern der Person ‚als Ganzes' wurde in ihrer Eigenschaft als Mitglied eines bestimmten Verbandes ein konkreter Platz in der Gesellschaft zugewiesen". ("Rather it was the social group through which the inclusion of a person in the society took place. The association was thus achieved not through the roles played in the respective fields of social life, but the person as a 'whole' has been assigned a specific place in society as member of a particular collective.")

[14] Only term 'insiders' is going to be used in quotes below, in order to avoid the connotations established in today's usual discourse.

[15] According to the assumption of Wolfgang Huschner; cf.: W. Huschner, Transalpine Kommunikation im Mittelalter. 3 volumes, 2003. Vol. II, S. 558-84. Critique: H. Hoffmann, Notare, Kanzler und Bischöfe, in: DA 61 (2005), pp. 103-59, esp. pp. 468-71.

legatione Constantinopolitana). Liudprand's texts, written in different stages of his career, have proved to be viable examples of literary communication. The earliest and most extensive of Liudprand's works, *Antapodosis* has shown itself as especially lucrative for the central question of this project - literary behaviour of the outsider towards the social group whose acceptance he aspires; hence, it has been put in the centre of the research. The later texts of Liudprand explain the change of his communicative behaviour after acceptance by the aspired social group.

The peculiarity of Liudprand's writings can neither be ascribed exclusively to his outstanding erudition (by the standards of the Ottonian empire) nor to the author's personal character or other purposes generally assumed, such as "world history/ history of salvation". In the case of Liudprand, we rather face the reaction of a learned and ambitious cleric in the extraordinary situation in his life who was forced to leave his familiar social and cultural milieu and had to try integrating himself into a new social environment. Nevertheless, Liudprand's high level of education is to be regarded as the most important precondition of his literary communication, for it enabled the author to use literary texts as a mean of integration, promotion and preserving of the achieved position. Accordingly, the project argues that Liudprand's literary communication is primarily shaped by his social position (and the consequent intentions) and not by traditional historiographical or literary aims.

Given the outlined considerations, a detailed comparison on the synchronous level appears to be indispensable. Firstly the "Deeds of the Saxons" (lat. *Res gestae Saxonicae*), written by Widukind of Corvey, will be considered. The text stands closely to Liudprand's *Antapodosis* not only in terms of chronology but also in terms of its form and extent; similarities regarding intentions and target audiences are at least possible. The distinction between the social statuses of both authors becomes clear already at superficial examination: Most likely a descendant from Saxon nobility and a member of the Saxon monastery Corvey, Widukind occupied a firm position within the social framework of the Ottonian empire. During the reign of Otto I, Corvey, the former Carolingian Abbey, stood under the guardianship of Archbishop William of Mainz, Otto's natural son and leader of the royal chapel; the monastery maintained furthermore close relations with Otto's royal mother Matilda,. By contrast, Liudprand disposed neither of enduring personal relationships nor of connections to any institute north of the Alps before having written the *Antapodosis*.[16] Furthermore, the usage of Widukind's text for the purposes of *memoria* in the monastery of Quedlinburg, closely

---

[16] The thesis of W. Huschner, Liudprand was taken shortly after his arrival to Saxony at the royal chapel and therefore possessed extensive personal relationships with clerical and secular aristocracy, based solely on paleographic argument, which has not proven to be particularly convincing. See, above, note 15.

connected to the Ottonian dynasty, as well as for instruction of princess Matilda hints at a (not necessarily narrow) relation to the court.

Widukind's literary communication was based on other preconditions than that of Liudprand's *Antapodosis* and therefore could be designed noticeably less sophisticated, either as a result of the lower educational level of the Saxon or – as it will be argued in the project - because he had other thematic priorities and aspired partially to another kind of audience. Thus, the differences between Widukind's and Liudprand's literary communication resulting of a comparing analysis of two bodies of work only do not entitle to claim fundamental differences between 'outsider' and 'insider' communication. It is therefore reasonable to consult another text written at about the same time such as Hrotsvits "Deeds of Otto" (lat. *Gesta Ottonis).*

The social position of Hrotsvit, a canoness of the prestigious nunnery Gandersheim, led by Gerberga, Otto's niece, is comparable to that of Widukind; Hrostvit can be also described as an 'insider'. On the one hand, the author addresses to partially similar audience as Liudprand and Widukind - William of Mainz and the future Otto II. On the other hand, in case of Hrotsvit one can expect a high level of education as well as more extensive usage of the paraenetic discourse, which approximates her work to that of Liudprand's. A comparison between Liudprand and the two Ottonian historians, different in terms of their literacy and intentions, should allow to come closer to the distinction between 'outsider' and 'insider', especially since different types of literary communication with the same group of recipients within the Ottonian court would be identified.

Finally, it remains disputable whether the *Continuatio Reginonis* is to be considered. Since the authorship of Adalbert of Magdeburg cannot be proven, it seems (at least at the first glance) hardly probable to estimate the work as a text of an 'insider'.

A detailed examination of the Ottonian historiography forces to exclude a comparison on the diachronic level (for example with Paulus' Diaconus *Historia Langobardorum*) for reasons of time and work efficiency. A development of epoch-spanning features of literary communication of an outsider remains – opposite to previous plans - beyond the scope of the PhD project.

3. The first part of the project: results

The in-depth analysis of Liudprand's texts (the first, already completed part of the research) has revealed a close connection between the biography of the author, the events he had taken part in, and his literary work. This can be summarized as follows: Liudprand has always created his texts with the aim to make his social advancement possible or to keep the obtained position. For this purpose, the author chose each time consciously a specific circle of recipients that seemed promising to him

and a communicative strategy that was devised accordingly. The author put in account not only his personal position but also the current political situation as well as the cultural background of his recipients. Moreover, the wide range of strategies of literary behaviour, which the author applied depending on intention and target public, was specified: Liudprand saw his texts – this is the intermediate result of the research - as important mean of social advancement, as an effective way to reach those recipients, on whom, from his point of view, his career depended.

The characteristics of Liudprand's literary communication is explained at length by taking the example of his most important work, the *Antapodosis*. As it is clearly implied by its design and thematic priorities, the text should primarily present the extraordinary erudition of the author and his extensive knowledge of Italian and Byzantine history. Moreover - this follows from the analysis of the author's self-referential passages - Liudprand stresses his diplomatic skills, his command of the Greek language as well as specific clerical competences such as erudition in the Holy Scriptures. In his first work Liudprand shows thus his versatility in several fields of activity at once - as a legate at the Byzantine court, as a vicar in the royal chapel and as Otto's adviser in the affairs of the *Regnum Italiae*. There was basically only a very narrow target public which could be relevant for the realisation of such ambitious plans: Otto I and influential counsellors within the king's nearest circle. However, Liudprand was not able to achieve an immediate, direct access to the desired recipients. He was therefore forced to look for a detour to reach the aspired audience and could seek only an indirect form of communication with it.

The discourse of the *Antapodosis* - namely its argumentation based on numerous paraenetic patterns which actually carry the author's main political statements in the text – points at a well educated and high-ranking cleric as the ultimate addressee of the *Antapodosis* who was intended to be impressed by the presentation of the author's erudition and knowledge. The most suggestive candidate seems to be the Archbishop William of Mainz. For William, one of the most influential churchmen in the royal circle, could certainly accomplish Liudprand's acceptance at the court of the Saxon ruler (for example as a royal chaplain) the author was striving for. The orientation of the *Antapodosis* to the Archbishop of Mainz becomes clearer when one takes a closer look at another detour, used by the author to reach his target recipient. This bypass leads to Rather, the former bishop of Verona, who has found at the time of drawing up of the *Antapodosis* an honourable accommodation in the East Frankish kingdom under William's custody. In the *Antapodosis* Liudprand shows his respect for Rather's erudition and expresses the compassion for his fate of exile (a fate shared with Liutprand). From Liudprand's point of view, these literary reverences should induce Rather to support the author's case before his powerful patron. Rather of Verona, standing closest to Liudprand because

of his origin, social position and education level, becomes thus an intermediary towards the aimed addressee of the *Antapodosis*, to whom Liudprand had apparently no direct access.

William of Mainz has definitely not to be regarded as the sole pragmatic recipient of the *Antapodosis.* To the high-ranking addressees of the Liudprand's work also belongs Otto I. The fully biased representation of the conflict between Otto and Henry of Bavaria in the *Antapodosis* was conceived for the Saxon ruler as well as a comprehensive description of the past and contemporary history of the *Regnum Italiae,* which, in turn, was aimed to illustrate Liudprand's profound knowledge of the affairs of the kingdom, recommending the author as the king's adviser.

Altogether, a certain structure of highly influential recipients of the *Antapodosis* is emerging: William of Mainz turns out to be the actual target, appealed to directly or by the detour of the clearly addressed Rather. At the top of this hierarchy stands, however, Otto I who might perhaps be seen rather as an ideal than an reachable ultimate addressee of Liudprand's work.

The analysis of the works of Liudprand of Cremona allows furthermore to reveal a number of characterizing features of literary communication typical for an educated outsider; these features should represent basic points of comparison in the second part of the research. Among the most important of them should be mentioned: (1) fundamental orientation of the author towards the ruler and the court,[17] while the actual (or pragmatic) recipient of the work should be most likely of a clerical origin; (2) apparently exaggerated forms in which the author expresses his loyalty towards the recipients (which indicates his unsafe position at the court); (3) literary work as a letter of application - depending on the situation, the author stresses his abilities and skills more or less emphatically; (4) stress on the transfer of knowledge to fulfil aspirations of the author for a special position like the adviser of the king.

4. The second part of the project: the key aspects of the comparative analysis and preliminary results
In the second part of the project a comparative study is to be carried out. There is not only the particular cast of Liudprand's literary communication to explain and to evaluate by contrasting it with contemporary works of the similar genre but also some more general conclusions to draw, regarding the nature, orientation and limits of literary communication in the early Middle Ages. Following reference points are considered as the central aspects of the comparative analysis:

- social position of the author
- orientation and recipients of the text

---

[17] The rulers court is understood as a circle of high-ranking decision makers of clerical and lay origin, whose proximity to the king and therefore ability to influence upon the issues of the empire made them an aspired audience for the historiographers, discussed in this project.

- drawing up intentions
- forms and discourse of literary communication; hereto thematic priorities and patterns of argumentation which in their turn lead to conclusions about intentions and target public.

The investigation will focus on Liudprand's *Antapodosis* to be confronted with a number of texts composed by Ottonian historiographers.[18] Other works of Liudprand will be also taken in account, as far as significant parallels or differences arise. At this point the project is still work in progress, therefore only some preliminary results can be shown.

The comparison between the *Antapodosis* and the *Res gestae Saxonicae* Widukind's of Corvey (not yet definitively completed) allows to make the assumption that the estimated difference between the intentions of the both authors is dependent on the institutional affiliation, a given with Widukind, lacking in the case of Liudprand. Hereby becomes, as we believe, Liudprand's famous "egocentrism" explainable: While Liudprand seeks for his own social advancement, Widukind provides the powerful recipients of his work with an "interpretation model" of their history[19] which should not only contribute to their self-assurance but also draw their attention to the meaningful role and salvational impact of the author's monastery. Furthermore, the key points of the *Antapodosis* - transfer of knowledge and advise for the ruler - have their thematic focus on the foreign countries, Italy and Byzantium, according to the author's primary aim to present his skills convincingly, whereas Widukind's work refers to the Ottonian empire, in particular to Saxony as its native core. Despite its sophisticated forms the paraenesis of Liudprand is to be understood only as ruler's advice. The admonition of Widukind, on the contrary, is to be regarded as emphatic and practical ruler's instruction, although its form and language appear to be much more modest.

In view of the discursive level the usage of the paraenetic language and ideas in the *Res Gestae Saxonicae* reveals - in comparison to the *Antapodosis* – a clearly more limited scope: Very few theological patterns are applied for re- and interpretation of princely behaviour; characterizing epithets are used instead. Widukind's literary communication clearly has not its focus on the theologically shaped discourse of exhortation (as in Liudprand's *Antapodosis*) but on ideas defining the East Frankish nobility's way of life, such as "honour", "clemency", "loyalty" and "glory".[20] (Partly similar communication can be found in Liudprand's *Relatio*.) The nature of Widukind's discourse cannot be, however, exclusively explained by his noble origin or his "simple"

---

[18] As presented above, see section 2 of the project summary.

[19] See: Ernst Karpf, Von Widukinds Sachsengeschichte bis Thietmars Chronicon, in: Settimane di studio 32. 1986, pp. 547-584, here esp. pp. 567-71.

[20] See basically the contributions by Gerd Althoff, compiled in: G. Althoff (ed.), Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde, Darmstadt 1997.

religiosity.[21] Rather one faces here – as we hope to prove – an important evidence for the primal orientation of the *Res Gestae Saxonicae* to high-ranking secular recipients.

5. The expected output of the project

The presented PhD project should contribute to not only a better understanding of individual authors and their motives but also throw some new light on the creative (especially communicative) potential of the early medieval historiography, on its social position as well as convey a more nuanced picture of the cultural background, the interests and knowledge of the Ottonian elite.

---

[21] Thus many a judgment of earlier research, see for example: Paul Hirsch, Einleitung. I. Widukind von Korvei, in: P. Hirsch/ H.-E. Lohmann (ed.), Widukindi monachi Corbeiensis Rerum gestarum Saxonicarum libri III (= Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi (SS rer. Germ), Vol. 60) 1935, pp. V–L.; Martin Lintzel, Die politische Haltung Widukinds von Korvei [Sachsen und Anhalt 14 (1938)], reprint in: M. Lintzel (ed.), Ausgewählte Schriften: in zwei Bänden, Vol. 2 (1961), pp. 316–346.