

PRO ... SALVAMENT IN THE STRASBOURG OATHS:

'SAFETY' OR 'SALVATION'?

STUDIES of the Strasbourg Oaths have emphasized the importance of these texts as the oldest example of connected discourse surviving in the Romance languages. The archaic state of the vernacular in the Romance Oaths and certain specifics of their wording have left us with numerous unsolved problems of interpretation.¹ Chief among these is the famous *ñ lostanit*, which still awaits a fully convincing interpretation. Less debated but even more crucial to a proper understanding of the Oaths is the opening phrase *Pro ... salvament*.²

The ambiguity of the meaning(s) and use of *salvament* in the SO follows from the variation in readings proposed by translators and commentators in the nearly four hundred years since the first French translation (1576) by Jean Bodin. One even encounters examples of wavering on the part of the same translator on successive occasions. Were the translator in question a scholar of lesser stature and repute than Robert Bossuat, such uncertainty might be ascribed to causes external to the text. As it happens, Bossuat's change of translation³ illustrates perfectly the two ambiguous points in the SO which are the subject of the present paper: the use of *pro* and of *salvament*. Both of Bossuat's translations are not only possible, but inevitable:

Pour l'amour de Dieu et pour
(ed. 1931) le peuple chrétien et notre commun sauvement
(ed. 1955) le *salut* commun *du* peuple chrétien et de nous-même.

Two changes are to be noted: (1) PRO governing *salvament* (1955) rather than *poblo* (1931), i.e., oblique *christian poblo* understood as genitive rather than ablative; (2) SALVAMENT, from 'commun *sauvement*' to '*salut* commun'. The change in syntax here may well be due to the change in the reading of *salvament*. Now, does *salvament* mean 'safety, protection', or does it mean 'salvation'? Or else does it mean (or ambiguously imply) both? As we shall see, the question admits of no easy answer.

Though the Oaths were sworn for the express purpose of formalizing a mutual PROTECTION agreement between Charles the Bald and Louis the German against their brother Luther, the rendering of *salvament* by a term equivalent to 'protection, safety, well-being' is by no means a majority reading, and E. *salvation* or Fr. *salut* is favored by a number of eminent scholars. Ferdinand

¹ For the tag "archaic" used by E. Muret, A. Ewert, and others with respect to the SO, see W. D. Elcock, *The Romance Languages* (L., 1960), pp. 339-341. For an opposing view (that the language of the French Oaths is "dans son genre tout à fait populaire et en accord avec l'usage linguistique idiomatique de l'époque à laquelle elle appartient"), see A. Tabachovitz, "Les Serments de Strasbourg et le ms B.N. 9768", *V Rom.*, XVII (1958), 52. The view goes back to T.'s doctoral thesis, *La langue de la version fr. des "S. de S."* (Uppsala, 1932), pp. 17f.

² "Pro deo amur & pro christian poblo & nostro commun *salvament*"....

³ From the translation appearing in the 1931 ed. of his *Moyen Age* (Vol. I in the *Hist. de la litt. fr.* [gen. ed. J. Calvet], p. 6) to the one given in the rev. ed. (1955), p. 11.

Brunot, e.g., translates 'salut commun du peuple chrétien et le nôtre';⁴ similarly Lauer (and numerous predecessors): 'notre commun salut', and Ewert: 'the salvation of the Christian people and our common salvation'.⁵ On the other side, and presumably to avoid the theological overtones in *salut* (how does 'félicité éternelle' mesh with a mutual protection agreement?), Bossuat, we recall, in 1931 translated 'notre commun sauvement', as had Claude Fauchet in 1602 (*sauvement* in OFr. meaning 'safety, protection'), and, most recently, R. A. Hall, Jr.: 'our common well-being'.⁶ Interestingly, while Albert Henry was unafraid to gloss *salvar* in the phrase "si salvarai eo cist meon fradre Karlo et in aiudha et in cadhuna cosa" as 'assurer la position et le bien-être, garantir dans ses possessions et dans ses droits' (*Chrestomathie*, Notes, p. 9) — an eminently suitable gloss —, he failed to comment on *salvament*. In any event, safety or salvation, redundant translations such as Brunot's ('salut commun du peuple chrétien et le nôtre') and Ewert's ('salvation of the Christian people and our common salvation') are unsatisfactory, not because they are repetitive (all the participants in the Oaths being Christians; the redactors of the Carolingian oath formulae do not mind this kind of redundancy), but because they fail to convey the full meaning of *salvament*, and thereby obscure the message of the Oaths, a mutual protection agreement, true, but sworn by sovereigns accustomed to associating God and the Christian people to their own partisan enterprises. A priori *salvament* could mean either 'safety', or 'salvation', or both.

Salvament is a coinage of Carolingian Latin. With its original and primary meaning of 'safety' (Du Cange, "*tutela, immunitas, protectio*", s.v., first entry), it occurs repeatedly not only in the Capitularies of Charles the Bald,⁷ but in the Romance Oath itself when used as a verb ("si salvarai eo cist meon fradre", etc.). However, its secondary (derivative) meaning is indeed 'salvation' (*salut*), and in the Capitularies *salvamentum* functions in this sense interchangeably with *salus* and *salvatio*. In a number of cases, as we shall see, it implies simultaneously temporal safety and spiritual salvation.

⁴ *HLF*, I (1905), 144, and earlier (1896) in Petit de Julleville's *Hist. de la langue et litt. fr.*, I, lxxviii. Brunot's rendition is, in a statistical sense, the most "authoritative"; it has been accepted and proposed by M. Cohen (*Hist. d'une langue: le fr.* [P., 1947/1965₃], p. 73) and continues to be reproduced in the most recent histories of the language (e.g., W. Kesselring, *Grundlagen der frz. Sprachgesch.* [Tübingen, 1973], p. 191, and J. Caput, *La langue fr.: hist. d'une institution* [P.: Larousse, 1972], p. 25).

⁵ Ph. Lauer, *Nithard: Histoire des fils de Louis le Pieux* (P., 1926), pp. 105 (Fr.) and 107 (Gm.); Alfred Ewert, "The Strasbourg Oaths", *Philol. Soc. Tr.* (1935), p. 17n2; id., *The French Language* (L., 1933/1943₂ ... 1961), p. 352. Same trans. in Elcock, p. 334n1.

⁶ Cl. Fauchet, *Antiquitez gauloises et françoises* (P., 1602), f. 331; quoted in J.-G. Espiner-Scott's ed. of F.'s *Rec. de l'origine de la langue ...* (P., 1938), p. 55n1; R. A. Hall, Jr., "The Oaths of Strassburg: Phonemics and Classification", *Lang.*, XXIX (1953), 318.

⁷ *Capitularia regum Francorum, Legum sectio II*. The ed. ordinarily cited (e.g., Ewert, Roques, Ewald) is the one by A. Boretius and V. Krause (Hannover, 1883-87). For a complete and orderly presentation of the Latin oath formulae matching the phrasology of the SO, see K. Ewald's compilation (computer-assisted?) of prototypic Carolingian "Formelhafte Wendungen in den SE", *V Rom.*, XXIII (1964), 35-55: all the essential data, no obtrusive speculation, an extremely valuable contribution.

How is the term to be understood in the SO? Is the specifically temporal translation (Hall, Bossuat 1931) to be preferred to, e.g., Ewert's 'salvation'? In preserving the original temporal meaning of *salvament*, the Hall-Bossuat group sacrifices the spiritual one, just as the Ewert-Brunot group ('salvation') does the opposite. Both meanings cannot be adequately preserved by any one word in modern Fr. or Eng., since, contrary to Gm. *Heil* and It. *salvezza*, 'salvation' is unequivocally spiritual in de- and connotation, as is *salut* for most speakers of modern French. *Salut* has undergone semantic restriction such that its earlier political meaning⁸ is entirely overshadowed by the theological notion of salvation — the exact opposite of *salvament*, which means 'safety' first and 'salvation' only derivatively and by implication (i.e., when found in context with other specifically Christian notions).

Fortunately, the interpretation of *salvament* need not be based (as are some of the proposed readings of *ñ lostanit*) on philological intuition and etymological legerdemain derived from rarely-attested phenomena; for in the case of *salvament*, adequate, even abundant evidence exists in the Capitularies. From these Ewald presents no fewer than 63 different oath formulae in which *salvamentum* and its synonyms (*salvatio* and *salus*) are used almost interchangeably. How and to what extent are the Latin formulae from the Capitularies important for the understanding of the SO in general, and of the uses and meanings of *salvament* in particular? Part I of the question invites a brief review of answers so far proposed, after which we may proceed to Part II.

I. Though no one denies that the Latin formulae must be taken into account as prototypic models, their usefulness in interpreting the vernacular oaths is at present considered limited and subject to qualification. For while it has often been pointed out that the general phraseology and specific wording of the vernacular oaths are, in the main, modeled on the Latin formulae habitually used in Carolingian oaths and contracts, recent studies have made patent the fact that the formulae were not rigidly fixed in form and that many of them circulated in widely varying versions.

Diez was the first to point out (1846) the similarity between the phrasing of the opening sentence of the Romance oath and that of the passage "ad nostram communem salutem et honorem et ad populi christiani nobis commissi salvamentum" used in the 860 treaty (Coblenz) concluded by the same three brothers (*Altrom. Sprachdenkmale*, p. 7). Koschwitz went one step further, remarking that "die ganze Konstruktion von *pro bis salvament* ist lat. Eidformeln nachgebildet" (*Kommentar*, p. 40). Using this observation as a point of departure and feeling that the German versions of the Oaths read "more smoothly" than do the French and were therefore to rank as closer to a supposed Latin original, Ewert in 1935 put together from phrases garnered here and there in the Capi-

⁸ I.e., the meaning of *salvament* familiar from the SO: 'salut d'une nation, d'un pays, d'un peuple' = 'safety, protection' (cf. examples [Bossuet, Fénelon, Montesquieu, etc.] in Littré and the Revolutionary "Comité du salut public", "mesures de salut public" [legis.], etc.).

ularies a composite reconstruction of the supposed Latin original, thus managing to account for most of the "awkward" and "obscure" passages in the French version (notably *n̄ lostavit*) (art. cit., fn. 5 above; summarized by Elcock, pp. 336-339). Mario Roques immediately pointed out (*M.Æv.*, V [1936], 157-172) that Ewert's prototypic formulae had been somewhat arbitrarily chosen; that others could be found to justify the "awkward and obscure" passages in the French version; and that E. had chosen for each phrase of the vernacular oaths only one Latin formula from among many alternatives. Questioning the authenticity of E.'s hypothetical Latin original (comparable doubts had been voiced by Tabachovitz in his thesis [fn. 1, above], pp. 18-20), Roques concluded that in the particular situation in which the Oaths were formulated,

un texte latin n'était plus de mise, des traductions calquées sur le latin pas davantage, et non plus des calques d'une langue à l'autre. Il a fallu rédiger des textes parallèles, directement ou à l'aide d'un modèle latin ou vulgaire, en les formulant dans l'esprit et pour l'intelligence de ceux auxquels ils s'adressaient. (170)⁹

In light of Ewald's compilation of "formelhafte Wendungen", Roques' assertion quoted above should be qualified to read that the vernacular texts were not "des traductions calquées [tout à fait et mot à mot] sur le latin", since in some instances certain phrases are unquestionably direct renderings from the Latin ("pro deo amur" from "pro Dei amore", etc.). Roques is obviously aware of this, and the point he is making is a general one: The discovery of exact correspondences (Fr., Gm., Lat.) in some places in the Oaths does not oblige us to view with suspicion their absence from others, since variations, even in a legally binding bilingual contract, are not only possible but unavoidable. Agreeing with Roques, Tabachovitz concludes: "On ne saurait, dans l'interprétation des textes en langue vulgaire des Serments, se régler servilement sur les formules des serments latins" (p. 51, art. cit., fn. 1, above). However, if such is the case (and Ewald's compilation shows clearly and abundantly that it is), one should not go to extremes so as to imply (with Tabachovitz¹⁰) that the French texts owe little to the Latin formulae.

II. Now, what specifically do the Latin formulae disclose about the first phrase of the Romance Oaths? First, that syntax varies considerably: for the phrase *pro deo amur*, Ewald finds every sort of variant: *pro Dei amore*, *pro Dei*

⁹ Cf. G. Paris: "Il ne me semble pas résulter de cette restauration [G.P.'s, "dans le latin usité à cette époque pour des actes et dans des circonstances semblables"] la conclusion que le texte roman soit une traduction du latin". He goes on to cite reasons ("constructions tout à fait romanes") why not, despite Diez's disapproval: "L'objection de Diez est que dans un passage le texte allemand est supérieur au français; cela est vrai, mais ne prouve rien..." — which is precisely Roques' reply to Ewert. See "Les S. de S., introduction à un commentaire grammatical", in *Miscellanea ... Cair-Canello* (Firenze, 1886), pp. 85f.

¹⁰ From the observations of Roques and Tabachovitz himself to the effect that there is variation in the formulae, "il s'ensuit que leur langue [French oaths] n'est pas 'latinisante' et qu'elle est dans son genre TOUT À FAIT POPULAIRE et en accord avec L'USAGE LINGUISTIQUE IDIOMATIQUE de l'époque à laquelle elle appartient" (my emphasis; see fn. 1, above).

omnipotens amore, propter Deum et propter illius amorem, ad amorem Dei, pro divino amore and so on, not to mention all the vars. wherein *timor* or *honor* or *voluntas* or some other noun is substituted for *amor*, with the prep. *pro*, *per*, *propter*, *ad*, *cum*, *ob*, *secundum*, *in*, *de*, etc. (36). As regards the hierarchic sequence "God and the Christian people, 'us' (the princes) and the people", Ewald notes that it is conventional, and lists 25 more and less widely differing versions of the same basic formula (39f.). As for the meaning of *salvamentum* in the Oaths, careful scrutiny of the Latin formulae reveals not only that *salvamentum* is synonymous and interchangeable with *salvatio* and *salus*, but that all three mean alternately either 'safety', or 'salvation', or both. The following examples are selected from Ewald, whose formulae I have numbered successively from 1 to 63 (1-32 [p. 37], 33-38 [p. 38, *salus* twice in n. 11], 39-63 [pp. 39f.]).

1. *salvamentum* = *salus* = *salvatio*:

ad dei voluntatem atque sanctae ecclesiae statum suamque *salutem* et populi *salvationem* (52); ad dei voluntatem et sanctae ecclesiae *salvationem* ac communem honorem nostrum ac *profectum atque salvamentum* totius populi christiani (45); ad dei voluntatem et sanctae ecclesiae restaurationem et honorem atque defensionem et ad *nostrum communem honorem et salvamentum atque profectum* et ad *salvationem ac pacem* christiani populi (46); ad dei voluntatem et sanctae eius ecclesiae statum et honorem atque defensionem et ad *nostram communem salutem* et honorem et ad populi christiani ... *salvamentum et pacem* (48; 49 is word for word the same except for *illorum* for *nostram*)

2. 'safety, protection, preservation, well-being':

In addition to the preceding examples (*salvamentum et pacem*, 48f.; *salvationem ac pacem*, 46), one finds as well *salutem et pacem* (25f.); *salutem sive prosperitatem* (34); *pacem vel salvationem* (59); *salvationem vel custodiam* (61); *salvamento aut adiutorio* (2); *adiutorium et salvamentum* (41)

3. 'salvation':

pro ... aeterna *salute* christiani populi et animarum suarum vita perpetua (57); pro *salute* et reparatione humani generis (21); ad statum et munimen sanctae Dei ecclesiae, ad *salvationem* omnium fidelium per Dei misericordiam ... (18), etc.

In certain cases the meaning, less clear, could be construed as 'safety' or 'salvation', e.g., "de dei voluntate ... et sanctae ecclesiae ac regni fidelium *salvamento*" (43). In such cases it is arguable on the basis of the meaning of *ecclesia* (= *universitas fidelium*, rather than an institution, even less an edifice), that *salvamentum* (or *salus* or *salvatio*) *ecclesiae* suggests the salvation of the faithful rather than their protection, safety, or well-being. By the same reasoning the common phrase *salvamentum* (or synonyms) *fidelium* could mean 'salvation of the faithful' or 'protection of the subjects', since *fideles* alternates with *populus* (or, worse, *populus christianus*, e.g., 45-49) in speaking of the *regnum* — a term itself not always exempt from ambiguity, as in "de ... sanctae ecclesiae ac regni fidelium *salvamento*" (43).

From the preceding examples and others in Ewald, *salvamentum*, *salus*, and *salvatio* emerge (1) as applying, interchangeably, to people as subjects (*fideles*, *populus*), people as Christians (*fideles*, *populus christianus*, *ecclesia*), princes (*nostra* [-um] *communis* [-e] *s.*), and the state (*regnum*); and (2) as serving, interchangeably, to denote 'safety, protection, preservation', on the one hand, and, on the other, 'eternal salvation', according to the context. The numerous cases of ambiguity of all three terms make it difficult to determine the exact ratio by which 'safety' prevails over 'salvation'; clearly the former meaning predominates in the Capitularies.¹¹

Since the answer to our basic issue is that either meaning or both can be understood, another question arises with respect to the double meaning of *salvament*: whether the ambiguity inherent in the word was consciously exploited by the redactor of the SO for partisan purposes. Was it deliberately or accidentally that the notions of love of God and the safety/salvation of the Christian people became related in the minds of Charles' and Louis' soldiers in committing themselves to a MILITARY agreement against Luther? Quite apart from the double value of *salvament*, a fundamental question arises concerning syntactic ambiguity in the first phrase of the Oaths: In the minds of Louis, Charles, and their respective soldiers who witnessed and participated in the Oaths, what relation was there understood to prevail among God, the Christian people, and the "us" of *nostro*, associated by anaphora in the frame "pro ... et pro ... et [pro (understood)]"? Once more, the element of ambiguity is confirmed by the number of divergent readings proposed by translators and commentators.¹²

In support of the hypothesis that the loose syntax and equivocal meaning of

¹¹ Tabachovitz touches upon the ambiguity of *salvament* indirectly, in discussing the "sens trop vague" of *salvar*:

L'acception principale en commençait probablement dès cette époque à s'éloigner de celle du *salvare* du latin médiéval, qui est "sauvegarder, protéger (secourir, aider)" (cf. DE CANGE, s.v.: "salvum et incolumem praestare"), c.-à-d. le sens demandé par le contexte dans les *Serments*, et à se rapprocher de celle de "sauver" ... (art. cit., 53n1)

Such a semantic evolution would match very neatly the 'safety'/salvation' bi-valence we have seen in *salvament*. Unfortunately the Capitularies offer no clear-cut evidence to support T.'s assumption: "Der Deutungsversuch von Tabachovitz würde überzeugen, wenn die Voraussetzung des Bedeutungswandels von *salvar* zutreffen sollte. Diese Voraussetzung ist aber keineswegs gesichert" (S. Becker, *V Rom.*, XXVIII [1969], 10). Becker refers to Ewald's examples of *salvar*, but NOT to those of *salvamentum*, *salus*, and *salvatio*. True, *salvar* in the Capitularies is used predominantly in the sense of 'protect, safeguard' ("salvare et adiuvere; invicem nos salvemus et adiuvenus; regem ... salvaret atque defenderet", 42); also, in no case does *salvar* clearly mean 'sauver' in the theological sense (which is the point at issue, since *sauver* = *sauvegarder* would involve no change of meaning), though certain cases are ambiguous, perhaps bi-valent (e.g., "quantum Deus vos salvaverit et vos vos ipsos salvaveritis") in the same way *salvament* often resonates in both directions while being tantamount neither to 'safety' (devoid of overtones of 'salvation') nor vice versa. However, the fact that both semantic poles are clearly attested for *salvament* could be offered, against Becker's reservations, in support of Tabachovitz's view of semantic change, or, at least, differentiation in *salvar*.

¹² The following examples illustrate the diversity of syntax encountered in various translations of the opening phrase (cf. fn. 2, above). For works not already cited, complete references are available in C. W. Wahlund's survey covering "Trois siècles (1576-1875) de littérature relative

salvament (whereby God and the salvation/safety of the Christian people are linked with a partisan cause — “OUR” common defense and well-being) may have served to convey the enduring idea that ‘God sides with us against our enemies’, let us recall that the SO, besides being a venerable *Sprachdenkmal*, are, first and foremost, a partisan document.¹³ Also to be borne in mind is the context in which the Oaths were sworn.

Just before the battle of Fontenoy (June 841), Louis and Charles send a message to Luther contending they want peace; the exact wording, however, is that Luther “should leave the *Christian people* in peace” (“ut ... sineret ecclesiam Dei et universum populum christianum pacem habere”; Lauer, p. 72). And when war appears unavoidable, they are careful to describe the impending battle (Fontenoy) as a ‘judgment of God’ (“omnipotens Dei iudicium”, *ibid.*, p. 76). Finally, when Charles and Louis, victorious at Fontenoy, address their armies in the *adnuntiones* prior to the swearing of the oaths at Strasbourg, they adduce three reasons for the necessity of the pact: fraternal duty and fidelity; the good of the Christian people; justice and God’s will. Note the structure of their argument: since Luther has gone against God’s will, the Christian people, and our common safety, it is incumbent on us, for the preservation of all three, to swear these oaths.¹⁴

In sum, the notion that ‘God is on our side against our enemies’ is the impression conveyed both by the opening phrase of the Oaths and by the *adnuntiones* (for Roques, an “exposé politique”; for Lauer, a “harangue”). It is unnecessary to show why Charles and Louis should have wanted to convince their partisans

au plus ancien monument de la langue française” (in *Mél. Picot* [P., 1912], I, 225–238), and in Bossuat’s *Manuel*.

1. *Christian populo* ablative (a), genitive (b):
 - a) *Pour ... et pour (+ peuple) ... et*: Bonamy (1751), Jaucourt (1765), Champollion-Figeac (1809), A. Thierry (1846), Lauer (1926), Bossuat (1931)
 - b) *Pour ... et pour (+ salut) ... et*: Gasté (1887), Brunot (1896, 1905), Bossuat (1955)
2. Same as 1, a and b, but first *et* omitted:
 - a) *Pour ... pour (+ peuple) ... et*: Mandet (1840)
 - b) *Pour ... pour (+ salut) ... et*: Krafft (1901)
3. Same as 1b and 2b, but second *pour* omitted (resulting in a different word order), and a different prep. substituted before *salvament*:
 - a) *Pour ... et DU ... et DE*: Bodin (1576)
 - b) *Pour ... et DU ... À* (causal): Fauchet (1602)
4. *Par* for *pour*, third *pour* expressed: *Par ... et du ... et pour* Ducloux (1741).

Variation in punctuation (commas) is disregarded. In all cases *pour*, unless expressed after *et*, is understood, except where older renditions replace it by *à* (Fauchet) or *de* (Bodin). The main ambiguity and source of variation is the one illustrated in Bossuat’s two discrepant readings alluded to at the outset (‘*Pour le peuple et pour notre s.*’ vs. ‘*pour le s. DU peuple et pour notre s.*’, a) and b) in 1–2). Additional interpretations could no doubt be added to the above list; not all the titles listed by Wahlund and Bossuat were available to me.

¹³ Cf. Ewert’s suspicions with respect to Nithard:

It is much more probable that the oath was retouched by a later hand, and I suggest that the hand was that of Nithard, who wrote his History in a large measure as a justification of Charles the Bald and whose desire to bolster up the case of his sovereign may have been responsible in the first instance for the preservation of the full text of the Oaths in his book. (art. cit., 24)

Here again in Ewert there is an echo of Gaston Paris, speaking this time of “Nithard, partisan du roi de France” (art. cit., 87).

¹⁴ ... Cum autem nec fraternitas nec christianitas nec quodlibet ingenium, salva iusticia, ut pax inter nos esset, adjuvare posset, tandem conati rem ad iudicium omnipotentis Dei detulimus ... in quo nos, sicut nostis, per misericordiam Dei victores extimus ... At ille post haec non contentus iudicio divino ... insuper et populum nostrum incendiis rapinis cedibusque devastat. Quamobrem nunc, necessitate coacti, convenimus et, quoniam vos de nostra stabili fide ac firma fraternitate dubitare credimus, hoc sacramentum inter nos in conspectu vestro jurare decrevimus. (Nithard, ed. Lauer, pp. 102–104)

that their cause, rather than Luther's, was pleasing to God (Luther, after all, had lost the *judicium Dei*); what matters is to demonstrate HOW this could be accomplished, how a complex pattern of connotations and resonances could be established in the auditors' minds by means not only of the double value of *salvament* with its temporal and spiritual meanings, but, equally important, by the semantic and syntactic ambiguity of the prep. *pro* and the nouns it governs in the familiar anaphoric frame.

What was the immediate impression on Charles' soldiers of the words *commun salvament*? Given the place of *salvament* in the sentence, the dominant association could have been either with *nostro* and *commun* (which, strictly, refer to Louis and Charles, although usually translated 'common s. of the [whole] Christian people'), or with "God and the Christian people". In all likelihood, the notions of safety and salvation, the Christian people's and "our own", were hazily differentiated in the minds of the participants; here the ordering of the construction accomplishes the same associative identification of partisan interests with those of God and the Christian people implicit in the *admonitiones* and in the message to Luther before Fontenoy. (Much later, the same idea would be made explicit by churchmen such as Odilon of Cluny, Alexander II, and Gregory VII in convincing the crusaders that salvation belonged automatically to those who died defending God and the Christian people; cf. *Roland*, ed. Bédier, 1134f.)

The oaths are sworn "pro deo amur", which means not only 'for the love of God' (causal: on account of, due to our love of God), but also, more generally, 'before God and in His name, with God as witness'. As we move to the second *pro*, the construction becomes distinctly more problematic, for here we encounter unmarked *Christian poblo* with its double value: "et pro christian poblo et nostro commun salvament". With respect to the Christian people, *pro* here carries the meaning it had in the first phrase, 'for the sake of, in the name of, on behalf of' (assuming *christian poblo* is construed as an ablative), a meaning for *pro* which becomes pragmatic and causal when applied to "*nostro commun salvament*": 'IN ORDER THAT our common safety be preserved', or 'for [the preservation of] our common safety' (following here Hall's reading). Interestingly, "OUR common good" is implicitly rather than explicitly linked to "love of God" and "Christian people;" *pro* is expressed before the latter two, whereas *nostro commun salvament* is joined thereto merely by the connective *et*, with *pro* implied.

Thus the association of the three notions of love of God, the Christian people, and our common safety (against Luther, a partisan idea), all three syntactically joined together and mutually related to convey (whether by conscious effort or not) the general idea that God is on our side against our enemies, hinges not only on the double spiritual/temporal meaning of *salvament*, but, more significant, on the — perhaps consciously exploited — semantic flexibility (or flaccidity) of the preposition *pro*. [JONATHAN BECK, *Emory University*]