
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2019

The Redeemed, the Condemned, and the Forgotten: Narratives of Dissenting Aristocratic Identity in Medieval Bavaria

Luke Bohmer
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Medieval History Commons](#)
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Bohmer, Luke, "The Redeemed, the Condemned, and the Forgotten: Narratives of Dissenting Aristocratic Identity in Medieval Bavaria" (2019). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 6733.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/6733>

THE REDEEMED, THE CONDEMNED, AND THE FORGOTTEN: NARRATIVES OF
DISSENTING ARISTOCRATIC IDENTITY IN MEDIEVAL BAVARIA

by

LUKE BOHMER

A.A. Seminole State College, 2012

B.A. Rollins College, 2015

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2019

© 2019 Luke Bohmer

ABSTRACT

Identity in the Middle Ages encompassed numerous methods of transmission. Those of which that survive today include artwork, architecture, and written sources. In the case of written sources, the nobility and the clergy dominated the narrative to a substantial degree. Chroniclers of the Holy Roman Empire in specific saw both regional and pan-imperial narratives influence this identity through the exploration of historical figures. The medieval duchy of Bavaria fell into this milieu but experienced a substantially different relationship with its nobility from the twelfth century onward. The more condensed and consolidated format of medieval Bavaria under the Wittelsbach dynasty – as well as conscious efforts to project said configuration backward through history via chronicles – resulted in a uniquely Bavarian aristocratic identity into the early modern period. This aristocratic identity was the result of chroniclers’ pedagogical and didactic intention across laity and clergy in informing the mores and values of the Bavarian nobility, in addition to the history of their institution. Through Latin and later vernacular chronicles, courtiers and clergy expressed the veneration or damnation of key historical figures in Bavarian history to instill values and sets of ideal behaviors by the end of the fifteenth century. This thesis explores the changing narratives of three such figures, all of whom acted as thematic antagonists to prominent German kings and emperors: Tassilo III, Arnulf the Bad, and Henry the Lion. Ultimately, the widespread virtues of piety, respect for the clergy, and subservience to the emperor formed the main pillars of Bavarian aristocratic identity. However, Bavarian chroniclers required preexisting clerical traditions of chronicling, as well as adherence to the official narratives of the house of Wittelsbach, in order to fit these dissenting historical figures into a usable symbolic context.

To my family and my wife, Julia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Duncan Hardy, for giving me the guidance and direction I needed along the way. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Rosalind Beiler and Dr. Edward Dandrow, who helped me immensely in honing my skills and expanding my knowledge throughout my graduate career. I would like to thank Dr. Peter Larson and Dr. Amelia Lyons for giving me the opportunities to truly dive into history as a profession. I owe my methodology to the works of Dr. Alois Schmid and Dr. Stefan Dicker of the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues Kody Whittington, Matthew Patsis, Onyx de la Osa, Callie Henson, Carys O'Neill, Quintella Greene, and Bryce Fogue for offering their unending support, advice, and insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
The <i>Land Bayern</i> and Germany	1
A Short History of Bavarian Chronicling	9
Narratives of Condemnation and Identity	24
CHAPTER 1: TASSILO III AND THE ROLE OF THE CLERGY	26
Introduction.....	26
The Narrative of Tassilo III	27
Tassilo’s Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries.....	32
Tassilo’s Narrative in the Fifteenth Century.....	35
Conclusion	48
CHAPTER 2: ARNULF THE BAD AND NARRATIVES OF DERISION	52
Introduction.....	52
The Narrative of Arnulf	54
Arnulf’s Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries.....	61
Arnulf’s Narrative in the Fifteenth Century.....	72
Conclusion	86
CHAPTER 3: HENRY THE LION AND DISUSED NARRATIVES OF IDENTITY	90

Introduction.....	90
The Narrative of Henry the Lion	92
Henry the Lion’s Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries	95
Henry the Lion’s Narrative in the Fifteenth Century	104
Conclusion	118
CONCLUSION.....	122
REFERENCES	130

INTRODUCTION

The Land Bayern and Germany

Throughout the majority of the Middle Ages, most of German-speaking Europe was a conglomeration of deeply interconnected entities, such as bishoprics, towns, and territories. It was not until the nineteenth century – and the unification of Germany into a geopolitical state – that top-down, state-run, institutional assertions of self-conception began to flourish in ways twentieth- and twenty-first-century scholars would ultimately label as modern nationalism.¹ However, this type of pan-Germanism did not form from nothing, and indeed the “German Lands” as a cultural concept did factor into the awareness of medieval and early modern Germans.

But how did these lands and their people view themselves as a part of this whole, and how did their inhabitants reconcile their regional and imperial identities? Even though the myriad territories of the Holy Roman Empire knew what it meant to be “German” during the Middle Ages, regional identities existed and were indeed influential. People living in Swabia, Saxony, the Palatinate, and other territories within the empire viewed themselves as both German and something else, consciously aware of their place in an imperial whole. Historians view this sense of identity as encompassing the feeling of personhood, consciousness, and place expressed within a system of society, as well as the mores and values important to the individuals residing within those spheres.² For the Holy Roman Empire, one of the main subsets

¹ Leopold von Ranke, *History of the Reformation in Germany*, trans. Sarah Austin (Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1909), 27-8.

² Philip Gleason, “Identifying Identity: A Semantic History,” *The Journal of American History* 69, no. 4 (1983): 930-1.

of medieval identities that survive today are those produced by the nobility. Art, architecture, and written sources provide insight for modern historians into the nobility's mores and values, or at least the ones they felt obliged to propagate.

The nobility and clergy of the medieval duchy of Bavaria likewise viewed themselves as participants and often managers of this creation of identity. With this curation came a unique concept of Bavarian-ness expressed through the various forms of media available. The noble experience in the medieval German lands was for the most part fluid and fragmented, with acquisitions of land taking place constantly between dozens of noble families. Where the duchy Bavaria differed, however, was the unique and dynastically contiguous position of its nobility. The house of Wittelsbach ruled over Bavaria uninterrupted in some form for seven centuries, during which time they had ample opportunity to inform and educate fellow Bavarian nobility as to what it meant to be Bavarian from their dominant perspective. During this time, the Wittelsbach dynasty became synonymous with the *Haus Bayern*, or house of Bavaria, and thus became synonymous with the nobility of Bavaria as a whole. Outside of surviving material culture, such as art and architecture, one of the primary ways the house of Wittelsbach informed the Bavarian nobility of their own identity was through the commission of chronicles. This identity was heavily curated by the fifteenth century, and the chronicles commissioned during this time became the primary mode of transmission for that identity.

This thesis will attempt to trace the formation of these narratives throughout the high and late Middle Ages through the analysis of chronicles. In addition to the aforementioned fifteenth-century vernacular chronicles, this thesis will analyze the works of their predominant template – the twelfth-century Bishop Otto of Freising – as well as vernacular chronicles written throughout

the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This thesis will use these chronicles for the purpose of identifying and comparing narrative constructions of Bavarian identity through the use of historical Bavarian dukes, specifically for their use as rhetorical exempla for deviant behavior.

For the house of Wittelsbach and the Bavarian nobility in general, aristocratic identity entailed a reverence, adherence, and allusions to a set of norms, mores, and values instilled from the historical memory of the Bavarian aristocracy combined with the broader values held by the nobility of the Holy Roman Empire.³ Historical figures that deviated from these norms provided potential opportunities for the agents of narrative identity formation – chroniclers – to utilize them as pedagogical tools for future nobility.⁴ This thesis attempts to trace the narrative uses of three such exempla of deviant behavior, and how their uses as moral and behavioral counterpoints resulted in the further definition of Bavarian aristocratic identity into the early modern period.

Historians of medieval Germany have studied the intricacies of German identity – both regional and imperial – for over a century, yet Bavarian identity specifically has remained relatively unexplored. In the 1930s and ‘40s, the historiography of German identity primarily focused on the pseudoscientific conceptions of racial origin and cohesion which had come to prominence in the late nineteenth century, yet most historians were not entirely dependent on racial theories in their studies of German culture. One such historian was Otto Brunner, whose research focused on the importance of the concept of the *Land* in the construction of German

³ Jean-Marie Moeglin, “Dynastisches Bewusstsein, und Geschichtsschreibung: zum Selbstverständnis der Wittelsbacher, Habsburger und Hohenzollern im Spätmittelalter,” *HZ* 256 (1993): 595-6.

⁴ Claudia Wittig, “Political Didacticism in the Twelfth Century: The Middle High German Kaiserchronik”, in *Universal Chronicles in the High Middle Ages*, ed. Michele Campopiano and Henry Bainton (York: York Medieval Press, 2017), 97-9.

identity and its association with regional lordship. His thesis on the role of *Länder* in regard to regional identities was somewhat revolutionary at the time, as his interpretation of German medieval political structures purposefully disregarded former historiographical assumptions about the nature of medieval German “states.” While still working within the confines of contemporaneous political and legal histories, Brunner observed that the concept of the *Land* was social, rhetorical, legal, and cultural in nature. Additionally, while the *Land* held rhetorical and linguistic associations with regional vernacular legal customs (*Rechte*), it was not strictly speaking a political entity itself.⁵ His work in his later academic career following the Second World War was able to somewhat eschew anxieties of nationalism by maintaining focus on *Landesgeschichte*, or regional histories.

By the 1970s, postwar anxieties towards addressing pan-German identities had abated, allowing for renewed interest in German identity as a whole. This wider approach coalesced into *Verfassungsgeschichte*, or constitutional history. While an older scholarly tradition, it has since been repurposed to include social and cultural configurations as well as institutions. The constitution in question was that of the Holy Roman Empire as a formal political entity, but also as one with myriad similarities to, interactions with, and influences over its constituent territories. Peter Moraw’s work was one of the first to reevaluate the Holy Roman Empire as a whole in a constitutional, administrative, legal, and social sense following the Second World War. In doing so, he attempted to bridge the myriad isolated regional histories with the overarching and shifting experience of the Holy Roman Empire.⁶ He thereby introduced a

⁵ Otto Brunner, *Land and Lordship: Structures of Government in Medieval Austria*, trans. Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 155.

⁶ Peter Moraw, *Von Öffner Verfassung zu gestalteter Verdichtung: Das Reich im späten Mittelalter, 1250-1490* (Berlin: Ullstein Verlag, 1989).

conceptual framework for future scholars to explore the constitutional dimension of German-ness in the late medieval period in a way that simultaneously addressed both the *Reich* and its myriad states and estates.

Enno Bünz addresses Brunner's thesis of the singular importance of the *Land* in the formation of German identity and further refines the term as a cultural construct innately tied to the German-speaking world for the twenty-first century. This develops upon earlier scholar Karl Bosl's assessment that "[the *Land*] is the old term for the 'state.' In contrast to [the term] '*Reich*,' it is not a self-contained, unitary, homogenous group of people that unites a common lord, but rather an original unity of the people inhabiting the land itself."⁷ The shift from the focus of a *Land*'s institutions to its people facilitated the need for the study of not only the institutions of these various regions, but how they fitted together in a larger whole in a cultural context.

Len Scales, in his 2012 monograph *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*, offers a different approach to the study German identity, namely observing all of its social and cultural manifestations simultaneously. His thesis claims that German-ness as a rhetorical and ideological concept propagated *after* the often-attributed period of the *Kaiserzeit*, the period between the Ottonian dynasty of the tenth century and the fall of the Hohenstaufen dynasty in 1254. According to Scales, political infighting and flimsy institutional influence led paradoxically to a desire on the part of regional actors to create an illusory German unity.⁸ This sense of German unity wove itself into existing regional identities and provided an important foundation for aristocratic self-conception across the Holy Roman Empire. He proves this by

⁷ Karl Bosl, "Wie die Bayern und Schleier entstanden. Zur führenden Rolle des Adels in der Ethnogenese und zur aristokratischen Identität." *Vorträge zur Geschichte Europas, Deutschlands und Bayerns* 2 (2000): 181-2.

⁸ Len Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 2-8.

analyzing the familiar political histories of this period found in chronicles and annals, likely due to the nature of surviving sources, and analyzes them rhetorically and linguistically. This, in turn, paints a picture of early trends in German identity formation prior to when it was commonly attributed. Without Scales' critical and cultural analysis of these sources, paired with the regional political and economic histories of previous historians, these contours would be less immediately visible.

Within this theoretical framework, this thesis aims to follow Scales' pursuit of understanding medieval German identity, but from the perspective of only one of its regions and with closer attention to its aristocratic narrative constructions. In order to observe this change over time, it will apply a linguistic, rhetorical, and cultural framework to the chronicles of the twelfth through fifteenth centuries. Bavaria and its own *Landesbewusstsein*, or sense of regional identity, within the wider Holy Roman Empire has not enjoyed the same rigor of analysis in recent English language scholarship as that of the Empire as a whole, and thus affords opportunities for exploration. Medieval Bavaria itself has historically experienced unique evolutions of its political and noble self-perceptions that may have affected its regional identity in a more nuanced way that Scales' grand scope may have been unable to explore in sufficient depth. These nuances and internal factors are by no means unique to Bavaria, but they provide both similarities and tensions within the wider trends of German identity formation that can be readily observed.

For Bavaria in particular, regional identity became more than a rhetorical abstract under the prolonged preeminence of the house of Wittelsbach. As a political entity, Bavaria possessed carefully-defined borders and self-proclaimed strongholds of aristocratic influence such as

Regensburg and Munich, features which were less common in other territories within the Holy Roman Empire throughout the Middle Ages.⁹ One of the more prominent contributors to the study of Bavarian regional identity in particular is Jean-Marie Moeglin, whose research delves deeply into the role of dynastic continuity and construction under the Bavarian house of Wittelsbach in the development of medieval *Landesbewusstsein*. Moeglin attests that the histories written about the dynasties of Bavaria in the late Middle Ages were not only propaganda, but the manifestations of Bavarian identity expressed through the genealogical constructions of its leaders and the people over whom they ruled.¹⁰ He claims that the major goal of Church chroniclers in the fifteenth century was to tie the Wittelsbach dynasty to the office of Holy Roman Emperor, either by invoking relations to the monarchs or by likening the old Agilolfing stem duchy of the eighth and ninth centuries to the latter's Carolingian suzerains. They would subsequently reinforce ideas of Bavarian independence by claiming equal authority to the imperial rulers. Moreover, Moeglin asserts that these concepts of authority and independence were tied not only to genealogy but to the concept of the *Land* as well.¹¹ While narrative written sources do only provide one of the many avenues of exploration of Bavarian identity – such as art and architecture¹² – the preeminence of the house of Wittelsbach in the traditional narratives of Bavarian chronicling offers a glimpse into aristocratic identity in a more subtle and far more carefully curated way.

⁹ Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 75, 506.

¹⁰ Jean-Marie Moeglin, "Dynastisches Bewusstsein, und Geschichtsschreibung: zum Selbstverständnis der Wittelsbacher, Habsburger und Hohenzollern im Spätmittelalter," *HZ* 256 (1993): 595.

¹¹ Moeglin "Dynastisches Bewusstsein," 602-4.

¹² Brigitte Miriam Bendos-Rezak, "Medieval Identity: A Sign of a Concept," *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 5 (Nov. 2000): 1490-5.

Historians of the Institute of Bavarian History at the Ludwig Maximilian University in Munich have addressed the role of regional histories in shaping identities in a broader scope within the last decade, outlining the continued importance of analyzing medieval *Landeschroniken* (regional chronicles) as well as their shifting purposes and roles within southern German society. Professor Alois Schmid argues for an “interterritorial” interpretation of *Landeschroniken* in order to fully comprehend the fluid political and cultural nature of medieval Bavarian society,¹³ while his protege Stefan Dicker attempts to explore myriad aspects of Bavarian chronicle-writing as a changing medium of aristocratic and political communication, a reflection of distinct motives and agendas relative to towns and regions, and a method of recording current events.¹⁴

In *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte (New Ways of Bavarian Regional History)*, Alois Schmid explains the importance of the *Personenzeichnung*, or “portraits” of historical figures and their role in the narratives of Bavarian chronicling and aristocratic identity formation. In his interpretation, Schmid highlights key individuals that provided educational opportunities for elucidating Bavarian regional identity through their narratives. These individuals consisted primarily of Bavarian rulers who exacerbated tensions between themselves and the Church, or – by extension – the Holy Roman Emperor. Schmid states that these early narratives are vital during the chroniclers’ ostensible turn towards secularization into the fifteenth century, trending away from monks and clerics and toward courtly and urban officials.¹⁵

¹³ Alois Schmid, *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte* (Wiesbaden: GWV Fachverlage GmbH, 2008), 6-9.

¹⁴ Stefan Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen: Studien zur bayerischen Chronistik des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2009), 418-22.

¹⁵ Schmid, *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte*, 21-2.

The traditions from which these chroniclers drew were clerical in origin, and subsequently informed their values, despite later reinterpretation.

Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen by Stefan Dicker focused on these chroniclers and their works, utilizing biographical research to explain the proclivities of their writing styles and the bases for their individual values. This biographical aspect was not only valuable when applied to the chroniclers, but to the aforementioned portraits of the dukes themselves, as proposed by Schmid. By combining the two – as well as attempting to trace the history of their narrative transmission – this thesis attempts to account for conscious changes to historical narrative that might have been readily available, while also understanding the reasoning for said changes within the scope of the time period in which they were written. Taken together, a complete picture is more readily apparent for these dukes, as well as how they were utilized to inform the values of those consuming the chronicles.

Both Schmid and Dicker have outlined a methodology of viewing chronicles and the utilization of historical narratives within the contexts contemporaneous to their writing to better elucidate the state of Bavarian identity in the Middle Ages. It is from this approach that this thesis will attempt to expand on their observations on German identity and apply it minutely to a diverse source base in order to glean broader perspectives on how aristocratic and noble perspectives have changed and potentially shaped Bavarian identity into the early modern period.

A Short History of Bavarian Chronicling

The representations of Bavarian identity that will be considered in this thesis require a short examination of their chroniclers, as well as changing trends in authorship, motive, and style

from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. Chronicling, as it stood in the twelfth century, was largely dominated by the clergy and the proliferation of the monastic world chronicle. Monks and other clergymen constructed chronicles for either internal circulation or as gifts to monasteries and princely courts. These chronicles were written exclusively in Latin, which was seen as the language of the clergy and academics. They usually recounted the entirety of human history from Genesis to the time of writing, mirroring large-scale classical works of ancient Rome. However, even though these chronicles had limited circulation, they usually had very political intents and audiences. Many of these monastic chroniclers were politically conscious and projected their contemporary views onto their accounts of historical events.¹⁶ In the case of Otto of Freising, the original manuscript of his *Chronica de duabus civitatibus* (*The Chronicle of the Two Cities*, 1145), titled as an homage to St. Augustine's book of the same name, was intended originally as a gift for his personal friend before seeing widespread circulation after his death. It eventually found widespread use outside of the monastery system for its savvy observations of political events and intrigue.¹⁷ These monastic chronicles, or *Klosterchroniken* in the German tradition, had limited intended circulation within their own times of writing and adhered to a formal and ontological framework which mirrored the ancient Greek and Roman texts that informed a significant portion of their educations. This "social logic" informed the eventual styles and conventions of the text, and was conversely informed by the audience consuming them.¹⁸

Klosterchroniken usually contained broad theological, philosophical, or epistemological

¹⁶ Michelle Campopiano and Henry Bainton "Introduction", in *Universal Chronicles in the High Middle Ages* (York: York Medieval Press, 2017), 9-11.

¹⁷ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 18-19.

¹⁸ G.M. Spiegel, "Introduction," in *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997), xviii.

digressions and moralized versions of historical events supported by meticulous research. This research was possible through the use of large monastic archives awash with primary sources such as church charters and donations.¹⁹ Chronicling within the monastery had a long tradition dating back to the early Middle Ages, and such chronicles later became the legitimizing factor in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as non-clerical courtiers and urban officials utilized them as evidence.²⁰

Bishop Otto of Freising's chronicle, like many universal chronicles of the Middle Ages, begins with the Book of Genesis and continues into the date of its writing. It continues into the second coming of Christ and the events of the Book of Revelations, musing on the nature of man and piety. Throughout the six books of the chronicle, Otto outlines the broad events of the Old Testament, Classical Antiquity, the Roman Empire, and the New Testament before exploring that could be verified by surviving sources. Otto's clerical education allowed him to apply scripture and theology to historical narrative, yet he approached assertions of the fantastical or divine outside of scripture with a critical eye and a degree of deference.²¹ However, there are specific places where Otto places validity of fact: the Church and specifically the teachings of pro-papal reformist clergy. This allegiance and reverence kept his chronicle's audience narrow.

However, clerical circles in the central Holy Roman Empire began producing vernacular epic chronicles written in verse with the intent of wider circulation by the mid-twelfth century.

¹⁹ Charles Christopher Mierow, "Introduction," in *The Two Cities*, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 22-6

²⁰ *Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte*, volume 2: *Ulrich Füetrer, Bayerische Chronik*, ed. Reinhold Spiller (Munich: M Rieger, 1909); *Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte*, volume 2: *Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, ed. Friedrich Roth (Munich: M Rieger, 1905).

²¹ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 156-7.

One of the earliest examples of vernacular chronicles coincidentally comes from the famous *Kaiserchronik*, ostensibly written in Regensburg between 1140 and 1150 by an anonymous member of the clergy. Chronicles written in courtly High German, though a relatively new development by the time of the *Kaiserchronik*'s composition, differed in intended audience from their older Latin progenitors. They predominantly focused on the deeds of prominent men in order to address some larger themes regarding morality, piety, or honor.²² The switch to the vernacular also drastically expanded the audience base to outside the clergy. While epic poetic traditions dated back to ancient Greece, the switch to the vernacular in the twelfth century marked a desire for a wider audience and demand. These chronicles, though similar to the more overtly embellished courtly romances of France and England, served as a form of “serious entertainment” for the nobility, not simply settling for the allegorical structure of deeply moralistic salvation histories.

English and French epic poems were largely legendary and fictionalized accounts, primarily used as a means of both entertainment and legitimation of the offices to which they pertained and were not explicitly historically based or derived. The *Kaiserchronik* differed in this key regard. Mark Chinca and Christopher Young refer to Nancy Partner's term “serious entertainment” for this style of chronicle, which afforded insight into the history of a position, station, or lineage alongside musings of morality, all while being entertaining and affirming to those consuming it.²³ It is within this paradigm that Bavarian regional chronicles of the late Middle Ages found their inspiration and evidence. The *Kaiserchronik* – and the subsequent

²² Alastair Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 6-8.

²³ Mark Chinca and Christopher Young, “Uses of the Past in Twelfth-Century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German *Kaiserchronik*,” *Central European History* 49 (2016): 34.

vernacular chronicles that were influenced by its format – sought to use the preexisting generic structure of monastic and religious salvation histories to create historically-grounded narratives that imparted historical and cultural importance onto specific offices – like that of the Holy Roman Emperor. Utilizing the language of epic poems ultimately made its content more interesting to read and recite publicly.²⁴

By the thirteenth century, vernacular chronicles intended for open recitation in noble courts had become commonplace, as epic verse chronicles – a format which the *Kaiserchronik* pioneered – became more widespread and found authors outside of the clergy. Viennese court poet Jans der Enikel's *Weltchronik* (1284) is one such example.²⁵ His primary goal was entertainment rather than the education or elucidation of regional clerical history; thus he omitted the historical minutiae which earlier clerical historians such as Otto of Freising explored at length. However, Jans still utilized Otto's work, proving that wider circulation of *Klosterchroniken* by the thirteenth century influenced the more secular arms of German society and provided historiographical precedence and legitimation to later chronicles.

Written between 1270 and 1300, Jans's *Weltchronik*, as well as other thirteenth-century chronicles such as the *Weltchronik* of fellow Austrian Rudolf von Ems, existed in a relative dearth of courtly vernacular chronicle-writing.²⁶ Chronicles written during this time were neither the closely-circulated clerical accounts of Otto of Freising, nor quite the historically-minded epic poems of the *Kaiserchronik*, though the latter was much more sought-after through emulation.

²⁴ Chinca and Young, "Uses of the Past in Twelfth-Century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German *Kaiserchronik*," 30-1.

²⁵ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum. Deutsche Chroniken*, volume 3: *Jansen Enikels Werke*, ed. Phillipp Strauch (Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1900), LXX.

²⁶ Jean-Marie Moeglin, "Die Genealogie der Wittelsbacher: Politische Propaganda und Entstehung der territorialen Geschichtsschreibung in Bayern im Mittelalter." *MIÖG* 96 (1988): 41.

Rather, the *Weltchroniken* of Jans and Rudolf belonged to a chronicling movement that signified the gradual shift towards vernacular chronicling over Latin in more secular circles, as well as its accompanying poetic conventions. Moreover, the existing format of earlier clerical Latin universal chronicles proved to be the preferred base for thirteenth-century courtly poets, who wrote epic chronicles under the patronage of the courts of Vienna (as was the case for Jans) and the emperor (as was the case for Rudolf).

Legitimation of a particular aristocratic line was not the primary focus in thirteenth-century chronicles, as it became in the fifteenth century. Rather, these chronicles were written for very transparent political reasons. In the case of Jans der Enikel's *Weltchronik*, it was written under the patronage of the newly-ascended house of Habsburg after the extinction of the Babenbergs.²⁷ In the case of Rudolf von Ems's *Weltchronik*, it was commissioned to salvage the image of the house of Hohenstaufen after the excommunication of Conrad IV. In point of fact, Rudolf's *Weltchronik*, while largely a biblical epic, stops its narrative to extol the pious virtues of the entire Hohenstaufen dynasty up to Frederick II.²⁸ In these two cases, historical legitimation was not particularly based on the use of primary sources outside of straightforward genealogies.²⁹ However, the influence of Otto's writings, particularly in the case of Jans's *Weltchronik*, began to infuse itself into the chronicles of the thirteenth century. Both chronicles mention common assertions present within Otto's *Chronica de duabus civitatibus*, as well as his *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris (Deeds of Emperor Frederick)*, though not directly in the text.³⁰

²⁷ *MGH Script. Dt. Chron. Enikels Werke*, VI-VIII.

²⁸ *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, volume 20: *Rudolf von Ems Weltchronik*, ed. Gustav Ehrismann (Berlin: Weidmann, 1915), 302-3.

²⁹ *MGH Script. Dt. Chron. Enikels Werke*, 544-8; *Rudolf von Ems Weltchronik*, 302-3.

³⁰ *MGH Script. Dt. Chron. Enikels Werke*, 600.

The fourteenth century saw a shift in priority under the rising influence of the house of Wittelsbach. Emperor Ludwig IV “the Bavarian,” the first Wittelsbach emperor, patronized chroniclers and scribes in order to foster the legitimacy of the growing dynasty and to keep track of the numerous charters throughout the Holy Roman Empire that he distributed among his relatives. However, these writings contained minimalist narrative genealogies which were not predominantly used for widespread circulation.³¹

The fourteenth century also saw both an epistemological and functional shift in chronicle-writing. Jans Enikel and Rudolf von Ems were less interested in recording the reality of events or even strictly furthering the agendas of themselves or their patrons. Rather, these chronicles were interpretations of events within restrictive literary traditions that prioritized theme, narrative, drama, and structure over accuracy. Indeed, the vernacular chronicles of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries were largely conceived of as works of literature – as are all chronicles and narratives – yet Jans and Rudolf were particularly conscious of their allusions and references to biblical and classical literature. In this regard, their chronicles do not exactly conform to what modern historians viewed as accurate, yet still held an esteemed place as informative works.³² In the southeastern Holy Roman Empire, chronicle-writing in any form reached a new low, coinciding with a period of severe political strife within Bavaria, as well as the outbreak of the plague across all Central Europe.³³ With this dynamic in mind, it is vital to observe the substantial shift in the content, function, and audience of chronicles dealing with Bavarian

³¹ Moeglin, “Genealogie der Wittelsbacher,” 40-1.

³² Christiane Witthöft, *Ritual und Text: Formen symbolischer Kommunikation in der Historiographie und Literatur des Spätmittelalters* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004), 8-9, 18.

³³ Moeglin, “Genealogie der Wittelsbacher,” 41.

history into the fifteenth century, as well as the major players in the explosion of Bavarian chronicling.

Bavaria, particularly after 1349, was marred by sectionalism among the various branches of the Wittelsbach family and multiple divisions of the duchy itself. The growing influence of the Wittelsbachs over the fourteenth century drastically shifted the eventual format of chronicle-writing in Bavaria by the beginning of the fifteenth century, namely through its audience and end goal. Historians of Bavarian *Landesgeschichte* agree that this time period was a watershed moment in Bavarian identity formation among the nobility, as the output of chronicles, as well as the narratives which occupied them, built heavily on traditions of the past for legitimization while utilizing key historical events in ways that were grounded in the sociopolitical climate of their present. These chronicles were utilized for the purpose of promoting certain lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty or as a subversive call to unification of the duchies depending on the chronicler and time period. The explosion of chronicles during this time was the result of competing attempts at legitimization among the Landshut, Ingolstadt, and Munich lines of the Wittelsbach dynasty for rightful sole control of Bavaria.³⁴ However, while these chronicles were written as a means of political propaganda and legitimization, that was far from their only reason for existence.

Dicker asserts that the historical significance of these chronicles in establishing a clear Bavarian *Landesbewusstsein* (sense of regional identity) into the early modern period is central, as the self-ideation and legitimization among the nobility through their association with

³⁴ Moeglin, "Genealogie der Wittelsbacher," 39-42.

prominent historical rulers formed the foundation of early perceptions of regional political identity. The veneration of these positions as pillars of Bavarian identity became paramount, even when allegiances and identities became more numerous and were expressed in more varied ways.³⁵ City chronicles of the sixteenth century made a point to include key trials, edicts, and general happenings of the aristocracy with similar detail earlier chroniclers had with the campaigns of dukes and emperors.³⁶

Bavarian historians regard the period between 1392 and 1503 as an *Aufschwung* or upswing in German chronicle-writing. Moeglin describes this period as having “gesamtbayerischen patriotischen Gefühl” (“a feeling of pan-Bavarian patriotism”).³⁷ This was largely due to the fatigue that many Bavarians felt towards the long-standing feuding between the three competing branches of the Wittelsbach dynasty over control of Bavaria. Since 1255, Bavaria had been split into both Oberbayern (Upper Bavaria) and Niederbayern (Lower Bavaria) between the sons of duke Otto II. The reign of emperor Ludwig IV “the Bavarian” saw a brief reunification under the rule of he and his sons, but after his death in 1347, the duchy separated once again. In 1349, under the *Landsberger Vertrag* (Treaty of Landsberg), Bavaria was split into the three duchies of Bayern-Ingolstadt, Bayern-Landshut, and Bayern-München. Each predominant landowning branch of the Wittelsbach family ruled one (sub-)duchy.³⁸

By the time of Andreas von Regensburg’s landmark regional chronicle in the mid 1420s, the tripartite division of Bavaria had been in place for the better part of a century and resulted in

³⁵ Stefan Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 19-20.

³⁶ *Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert*, volume 15: *Die Chronicken der baierischen Städte: Regensburg. Landshut. Mühldorf. München*, ed. Karl August Muffat (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1878).

³⁷ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 41.

³⁸ Andreas Kraus, *Geschichte Bayerns: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1983), 162-68.

a number of armed conflicts between its duchies, most recently between Bayern-Ingolstadt and the other two in 1420.³⁹ Despite this, thematic undercurrents of vernacular chronicles during this time were relatively consistent. The establishment and legitimation of the Wittelsbachs was of paramount importance, regardless of which line the respective chronicler ultimately supported. In this regard, chronicling in Bavaria had undergone a somewhat radical shift in form, perspective, and intent.

While vernacular genealogies of noble houses existed throughout the Middle Ages, such as Jans Enikel's own *Fürstenbuch* (*Book of Princes*) of the house of Austria, they were still either bound by the conventions of salvation histories and courtly epic poems or constructed purely as a method of recordkeeping.⁴⁰ The fifteenth century saw a gradual fusion and incorporation of these conventional means of courtly discourse with the Latin *Klosterchroniken*, like those of Otto of Freising, to create what would ultimately become Bavarian regional or princely chronicles. One can see the evident influence in *Klosterchroniken* in the combined works of nearly all of the major fifteenth-century Bavarian chroniclers, as they all began their histories in Latin and subsequently translated them into Early New High German.⁴¹ However, the apparent theological overtones and moralizing which were paramount in both *Klosterchronik* and earlier vernacular chronicles began to transform into an apparently more secularized form of history-writing both inside and outside the clergy. Though this deemphasis of the role of religion

³⁹ Kraus, *Geschichte Bayerns*, 70.

⁴⁰ Ursula Liebertz-Grün, *Das andere Mittelalter: erzählte Geschichte und Geschichtserkenntnis um 1300: Studien zu Ottokar von Steiermark, Jans Enikel, Seifried Helbling*, 71-4.

⁴¹ *Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte*, volume 1: Andreas von Regensburg, *sämtliche Werke*, ed. Georg Leidinger (Munich: M Rieger, 1903); *Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte*, volume 3: Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, ed. Georg Leidinger (Munich: M Rieger, 1915).

and overt mentions of God in the chronicles may at first seem like secularization, Alois Schmid claims that fifteenth-century Bavarian chroniclers were simply following the logical extent of one of the earliest forms of clerical chronicling, the salvation history. Salvation histories, similar to *Klosterchroniken*, recounted biblical events, yet did not resort to overt moralization due to the unknowable will of God. Though this may read to modern historians like a largely impartial recounting of events, fifteenth-century Bavarian historians simply viewed God's involvement in events as innate and rarely commented or extrapolated on His will in the text.⁴²

Andreas von Regensburg's *Chronik der Fürsten zu Bayern* is the earliest example of fifteenth-century Bavarian *Landeschroniken* and established a stylistic and thematic precedent. It came about in a similar way to the chronicles of Jans Enikel and Rudolf von Ems – that is to say, a response to a specific political need. Written under the patronage of Ludwig “the Bearded” of Bayern-Ingolstadt in the mid-1420s, Andreas' *Chronik* was as timely as it was reactive. 1420 saw the two-year long Bavarian War between the League of Constance (*Konstanzer Liga*), and Ludwig the Bearded. This conflict was the result of long-running tensions between the three Wittelsbach lines, and came to a head in 1415 at the Council of Constance, where Duke Heinrich XVI of Bayern-Landshut, Duke Ernst of Bayern-München and Johann, Count Palatine of Neumarkt solidified an alliance against Bayern-Ingolstadt. This alliance, also known as the Parakeet Society (*Sittichgesellschaft*), led raiding armies into Bayern-Ingolstadt which ultimately defeated Ludwig at the Battle of Alling in September 1422. Future Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund intervened and forced a cessation of hostilities. In 1425, Ludwig returned to Bayern-

⁴² Schmid, *Neue Wege der Bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 31-3.

Ingolstadt where he subsequently commissioned Andreas to write a chronicle of the princes of Bavaria.⁴³

Andreas himself had been a clerical academic for the vast majority of his life, and this education bled into the assembly of his chronicles. He attended the university of Straubing in 1393 before joining the Augustinian order at the monastery of St. Meng in Regensburg in 1401. By 1405 he was an ordained priest and saw to the expansion and collection of works for the monastery's library, before becoming its deacon in the 1430s.⁴⁴ In this regard, the clerical training that Andreas received was similar, if not more rigorous than the education of the earlier chroniclers mentioned. When approached by Ludwig the Bearded, Andreas used the monastery's records – with which he was intimately familiar – to construct his chronicle first in Latin, then immediately into German upon its completion. In terms of source material, Andreas predominantly utilized two sources: Otto of Freising's *Chronica de duabus civitatibus*, and the *Scheyerer Fürstentafel* (Scheyern Table of Princes).⁴⁵ By the 1470s, Andreas von Regensburg's *Chronik der Fürsten zu Bayern* was a widely circulated and popular lynchpin of Bavarian regional history.⁴⁶

Between 1479 and 1481, the houses of Bayern-Landshut and Bayern-München commissioned Hans Ebran von Wildenberg and Ulrich Füetrer, respectively, to create their own chronicles. Both of the resulting chronicles reflected a growing desire in fifteenth-century

⁴³Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 31.

⁴⁴Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 30.

⁴⁵This vernacular history, originally written on a wooden panel in the Abbey of Scheyern in southern Bavaria in the 1390s, catalogued the line of Bavarian rules throughout the Middle Ages, and was intensely pro-Wittelsbach in intention. The specific genealogies and overarching interpretations present in the *Fürstentafel* were the ones to which Andreas ascribed in his chronicle.

⁴⁶Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 30-3.

Bavaria for reunification of the duchies under one line. These interpretations are quite indicative of the traditions used, as well as the source base.

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg was born in the 1420s into a noble Upper Bavarian family. For the majority of his life he was a knight in the service of Henry the Rich and later George the Rich of Bayern-Landshut. By 1463, he had become chief justice (*Oberrichter*) of Landshut and later steward (*Hofmeister*) to the Landshuter dukes. Ebran only wrote the *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern* at the behest of the duke of Bayern-Landshut, and his political stance favoring the line to which he was associated is much more pronounced in his writing than that of the ostensibly more impartial Andreas von Regensburg. His claims to validity and reputability stemmed from his consistent citation of both Andreas and Otto in his text, instead of relying on the innate esteem of the clergy in regard to recordkeeping and history-writing. Due to his more political and courtly affiliation, the chronicle functions more sharply as a work of Wittelsbach propaganda, relying less on weight of clerical records and genealogies and more on impassioned criticisms of the narratives and individuals present in Andreas von Regensburg's chronicle. Indeed, for Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, his personal criticisms of allegiances, locations, and peoples were exactly as applicable to the eighth century as they were to the fifteenth.⁴⁷

Ulrich Füetrer was born in Landshut in 1430 to a noble family who had lost the majority of their fortune in Henry the Rich's campaign against the wealthy urban families of Landshut. Füetrer himself was first mentioned as a master craftsman in Munich – where he and his family ultimately moved – specifically as a painter and poet. He earned a reputation as a painter for the Abbey of Tegernsee outside of Munich, and later for the city itself under the employ of Duke

⁴⁷ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 82-5.

Albrecht IV. Füetrer's only historical writing, *Die Bayerische Chronik*, was written between 1478 and 1481, and was intended for the court of Bayern-München. Despite his chronicle's influence – Veit Arnpeck was one of its first recipients – it existed only in manuscript form until the late nineteenth century. It was edited by Reinhold Spiller – who also was the first to compile his entire biography – in 1903 into the only print version utilized today. His chronicle subsequently received very little circulation but influenced many later chroniclers of *Landesgeschichte* into the modern period.⁴⁸ Historians such as Jean-Marie Moeglin attribute the commission of the chronicle more steadfastly to the expansionist desires of Albrecht IV in the face of his more influential and wealthier rival, Ludwig the Rich of Bayern-Landshut, who had just commissioned his own chronicle with Ebran. In this regard, at least according to Moeglin and Dicker, Füetrer's chronicle was a glaring direct response to Ebran and the line of Bayern-Landshut's attempt at using dynastic narratives for legitimization, especially for the benefit of exploiting nebulous succession and potential acquisition of land.⁴⁹

By the 1490s, the chronicling traditions of the previous twenty years had become very well-entrenched. Mutual inspiration between these chronicles spawned in very quick succession the simultaneously specific and broad field of Bavarian *Landesgeschichte*. It was in this climate that Veit Arnpeck assembled his Latin and vernacular chronicles. Arnpeck's perspective was significantly informed by trends in humanism at the time, approaching history writing from more classically inspired and traditional methods of chronicling practiced by clerics such as Otto of Freising.

⁴⁸ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 112-3.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 126-30.

Veit Arnpeck was born a cobbler's son in the 1430s in Freising, at the time outside of the jurisdiction of the three duchies. He was able to receive an education in Amberg, a city in Bayern-Landshut, before travelling to Vienna for university. He returned to Amberg after his education and became a chaplain before moving to Landshut to become a priest.⁵⁰ Arnpeck ultimately settled back in his native Freising, but evidence exists of him visiting numerous monasteries in his search for eclectic sources, whose perspectives he mentions and analyzes considerably within his own texts. He was a prolific writer in his later life, compiling the *Chronica Baioariorum* – and the subsequent translation, *Bayerische Chronik* – the *Chronicon Austriacum* (*Austrian Chronicle*), and the *Liber de gestis episcoporum Frisingensium* (*Book of Deeds of the Bishops of Freising*), all between 1491 and 1495. According to Leidinger, Arnpeck may have likely died soon thereafter when an outbreak of plague befell Landshut in 1496.⁵¹

When it comes to Arnpeck's historiographical approach and intention, Dicker explains it succinctly: it does not prioritize the aristocratic pedagogical intention of Andreas von Regensburg, nor seek the moralizing context of Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, nor pursue the literary conception of Ulrich Füetrer. According to Dicker: “[In Arnpeck's mind] the *Bayerische Chronik* should therefore contribute to the glory of God, the love of the *Fürsten* [princes], the comfort of the bishops of Freising, and contain everything worth remembering as far as his skill and style would allow.”⁵² It is clear that Arnpeck's style, specifically within the *Bayerische Chronik*, was informed by prior traditions in Bavarian chronicle-writing both old and new, as

⁵⁰ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 134-5.

⁵¹ Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, XII.

⁵² Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 139.

was the trend of many early humanist works, yet still heavily relied on the well-entrenched sources of Andreas von Regensburg and Otto of Freising.

Narratives of Condemnation and Identity

Scales claims that desire for a preeminent Wittelsbach narrative was halting, sporadic, incomplete and rarely amounted to forming a cohesive whole with the rest of the German territories.⁵³ While this was surely the case, Wittelsbach influence within Bavaria persisted to one extent or another until the beginning of the twentieth century and indeed carved out an extra facet of identity for medieval and early modern Bavarians on top of the newly-forming German identity. The cohesiveness of the narrative was intact but not as strictly curated by the end of the fifteenth century, and ultimately decreased in popularity into the early modern period. However, the house of Wittelsbach pulled from a long – and at times, forgotten – tradition of chronicling to self-identify and legitimize throughout the Middle Ages. By evoking an imperial past through legendary individuals – such as Charlemagne, Otto the Great, and Frederick Barbarossa – and providing their own regional exemplars, the Wittelsbachs were able to insert themselves into the existing conception of a larger German identity on their own terms of self-conception.

These formations of societal exemplars required the dialectical existence of pariahs. Since the time of the *Kaiserchronik* and potentially earlier, the didactic purpose of the inclusion of “bad” historical figures was paramount in the construction of narratives to audiences both clerical and secular.⁵⁴ Monastic chroniclers used such pariahs during the genesis of medieval chronicling within *Klosterchroniken* to impart cautionary tales for other clergy, yet these

⁵³ Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity*, 521.

⁵⁴ Wittig, “The Middle High German *Kaiserchronik*,” 97-8.

messages were repurposed to fit more contemporaneous political agendas into the late Middle Ages. Three of these pariahs among the Bavarian dukes will be the subjects of this thesis: Tassilo III, Arnulf the Bad, and Henry the Lion. Each one has been condemned or ignored to varying extents within the Bavarian chronicling traditions of the high and late Middle Ages, and each stood in opposition – real or perceived – to the exemplars of either imperial or Bavarian ideals of lordship.

To one degree or another, these three dukes of the high and late Middle Ages interacted with imperial and ecclesiastical authority in a way that most in comparable positions found intolerable and negligent. However, the ways in which the narratives of these dukes were utilized over time speaks to a variety of factors intrinsically tied to Bavarian chronicling, such as the preeminence of preexisting chronicling traditions and conscious efforts of legitimation in key points in Bavaria's history. By understanding the context and reasoning for the circulation of these narratives at these very distinct times in Bavarian history, it is possible to glean the value systems and virtues of Bavarian aristocratic identity and how those values fit into German identity as a whole into the early modern period.

CHAPTER 1: TASSILO III AND THE ROLE OF THE CLERGY

Introduction

One of the earliest prevailing narratives evoked through Bavarian chronicle-writing is the contentious life and times of Duke Tassilo III of Bavaria (741-796). The eighth-century duke did indeed have a contentious reign, punctuated by an immensely powerful Bavarian duchy, a strained relationship with Charlemagne, and an eventual forced consignment into monastic life. Due to his proximity to the house of Charlemagne, Tassilo's story was rife with narrative potential and could easily provide avenues of meaning for the Bavarian nobility upon which later chroniclers could elaborate and reinterpret. This proximity and age also contributed to the vast extent in which his narrative was mythologized and the figure himself was replaced by a legend who became didactically useful in the same ways as Charlemagne by the twelfth century.

Around the time of Otto of Freising's writing of *The Two Cities* (1145), Charlemagne himself had reemerged as a figure of discussion with his controversial canonization in 1165. The act itself was intended to garner friendship between Frederick Barbarossa and the pope, yet some of the clergy disapproved and later overturned the decision. Otto of Freising, who was personally in the court of Frederick Barbarossa, was not outspoken on the issue directly in his works; he wrote and passed away seven years before Barbarossa had officially pushed the controversial decision.⁵⁵ However, the narrative potential of Charlemagne as an exemplar of German rulership had already reentered the discussion during Otto of Freising's lifetime, and subsequently elevated those around Charlemagne to a similar – though less esteemed – status. This is an

⁵⁵ Schmid, *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte*, 28-9.

important factor when approaching the changing attitude towards both Charlemagne and Tassilo beginning with some of the earliest chronicles considered in this thesis.

While Tassilo III was a powerful and independent duke in his day, the construction of his narrative in the high and late Middle Ages was not necessarily built upon the condemnation of his independence as was the case for the stories of later similar Bavarian dukes. In the eyes of chroniclers, some aspects of his tenure as the duke of the stem duchy of Bavaria served to soften a perception which – given the clerical and monastic genesis of German chronicling and their enduring references throughout the Middle Ages – made Tassilo III a character of nuance and complexity rather than wholesale derision.

The Narrative of Tassilo III

Tassilo III was born around 741. He hailed from the Agilolfing dynasty, which ruled over the semi-autonomous stem duchy of Bavaria since its establishment in the sixth century under the suzerainty of the Merovingian Franks. Under their arrangement and close ties with the Merovingians, Bavaria enjoyed significant independence. The Merovingians married extensively into the Agilolfing dynasty, and ultimately created strong familial ties between themselves and their Bavarian subjects. The Merovingians allowed the Agilolfing dynasty to semi-autonomously govern Bavaria as a tributary vessel of the Frankish Empire. While Bavaria under the Agilolfings was technically pre-Schism Catholic, it enjoyed little in terms of direct religious administration by the Catholic Church and was essentially Catholic in name only. In addition, the Agilolfings were well entrenched with the pagan Lombards in Italy, insofar as they married into their royal dynasty for over a century and sired nearly a dozen kings and queens. This collusion was

reflected in their approach to Christianity. While this collusion was a source of friction between Bavaria and its suzerain, the Agilolfings were, to an extent, unmolested by efforts of religious administration on the part of the Catholic Church. Conversely, Agilolfing utilization of Christianity throughout the centuries was nearly entirely pragmatic, often foregoing established canon. The establishment of the bishopric of Regensburg in 739 and St. Boniface's later establishment of the Bavarian Church, however, portended the greater machinations of the Catholic Church; yet the Agilolfings used these tactics in many of the same ways the later Carolingians would with regard to law and legitimacy.⁵⁶

The *Lex Baiuvariorum*, or the *Law of the Bavarians*, was a collection of tribal laws drafted and distributed between 741 and 748 by Tassilo's father Odilo following a short-lived and indecisive rebellion against the rising Carolingians.⁵⁷ These laws contained verbatim excerpts from the *Code of Euric*, a fifth-century law code drafted by the Aquitanian Visigoths. They also included aspects of the *Lex Alamannorum*, a law code drafted in the early eighth century by Alamannian duke Lantfrid, who was, coincidentally, killed when Charles Martel invaded Swabia in 730.⁵⁸ One of Odilo's few original laws, ironically, proclaimed that the Agilolfings were the leading noble family of Bavaria, and that they would be in perpetuity. This code was inspired by Agilolfing views of Christianity, which went against Catholic canon in a multitude of ways, including worship of Agilolfing leaders as princes of Christ. By establishing

⁵⁶ Carl I. Hammer, *From Ducatus to Regnum: Ruling Bavaria under the Merovingians and Early Carolingians* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepolis, 2007), 71-7.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 60.

⁵⁸ John Fosberry, *Criminal Justice through the Ages*, English trans. John Fosberry (Rothberg ob der Tauber: Mittelalterliches Krimenalmuseum, 1990. English trans. 1993): 48-52.

themselves to be divinely ordained, the Agilolfings hoped to quell any doubts to legitimacy.⁵⁹

While these areas of the Frankish Empire had become highly Christianized in the centuries since the implementation of these codes, Bavaria's desire to both employ and enforce law codes from Gothic, Roman, and southern Germanic sources shows a distinct ambivalence, if not rebuttal to the Salic laws employed by the Franks since the start of the Merovingian dynasty.

This dynamic of imperial toleration for Bavarian displays of independence quickly changed during Tassilo's lifetime. Pepin the Short and the rising Carolingians sought to consolidate their duchies more directly throughout the Frankish Empire, particularly wealthy and prosperous Bavaria, in much the same way as Odilo and the Agilolfings. Gaining favor and legitimacy with the Catholic Church was the ultimate aim of both parties, though the Carolingians took more closely after their Merovingian predecessors and sought legitimacy through cooperation with the papacy, rather than independent claims to divinity which the Agilolfings adopted through their law codes. Odilo was less interested in patronizing the Church for favor than in fashioning it as a tool for religious legitimation, as evidenced by his meagre donations to the papacy and his friction with St. Boniface over control of the dioceses of Bavaria and Alemannia.⁶⁰ The establishment and the Carolingian patronage of the Church slowly began to eat away at Agilolfing authority, creating a Bavarian aristocracy that became more and more comfortable with the prospect of Carolingian rule. The anxiety felt by the Agilolfings, particularly Odilo and Tassilo, more than likely spurred the somewhat hasty decisions of secession and rebellion as a display of power to the Bavarian aristocracy. The law codes reflect

⁵⁹ Johnathan Bates Couser, "The Chalice of Christ and the Chalice of Demons: The Making of Christendom in Agilolfing Bavaria, 500-788 A.D.," (Dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 2006), 36.

⁶⁰ Hammer, *From Ducatus to Regnum*, 76-8.

this anxiety by using Christianity to legitimize Agilolfing authority as divine and predetermined.⁶¹

It was in this paradigm that Pepin's half-brother, Grifo, sought to exploit his dual Carolingian and Agilolfing heritage. After Odilo's death later in 748, Grifo usurped Bavaria and abducted the two-year-old Tassilo for use as leverage. Tassilo was in Grifo's custody for five years before Grifo was killed by Pepin's forces in battle. Pepin placed his seven-year-old nephew, Tassilo, as duke of Bavaria in 753 while Pepin himself became the sole King of the Franks. Pepin attempted to cement his rule over the Agilolfings by forcing Tassilo to swear oaths to him and his sons Charlemagne and Carloman at an assembly at Compiègne in 757, which later became a key point in justifying Tassilo's eventual deposition as duke.⁶²

The narrative of Tassilo's adult life ultimately became more tumultuous and chaotic than his childhood and later formed the subject of numerous retellings in Bavarian chronicles. Tassilo became sole ruler of Bavaria in 753 at the age of twelve and quickly garnered support among the clergy. He was aware of the growing influence of the Catholic Church during his lifetime, and his close association with the Carolingians further cemented his views on the nature and benefits of clerical administration. One of Tassilo's most prominent – and later, redeeming – decisions as duke was his establishment of half a dozen monasteries in Upper Bavaria, Austria, and Northern Italy while they were still under Bavarian purview. He made numerous donations to the Abbey of Freising, a fact that Bishop Otto would inflate nearly four centuries later.⁶³

⁶¹ Stuart Airlie, "Narratives of Triumph and Rituals of Submission: Charlemagne's Mastering of Bavaria," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999): 100-101.

⁶² Hammer, *From Ducatus to Regnum*, 102.

⁶³ Herwig Wolfram, *Tassilo III.: höchster Fürst und niedrigster Mönch* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2016), 32.

As a military commander, Tassilo's defense of Bavaria was commendable following his dismissal from Pepin's guardianship in 753. The March of Carinthia, in what is today southern Austria, had an uprising of Slavic pagans in the mid 760s and its margrave Cheitmar was unable to garner lasting stability. Upon Cheitmar's death in 769, Tassilo assumed control of the march and over three years was able to defeat and convert the population. This was, from a more practical perspective, one of the main reasons why he required the support of the Catholic Church in southern Bavaria. The foundation of monasteries in what is today Austria was part of a massive missionizing effort in order to quickly and decisively convert the Slavic population. In this regard, Tassilo was almost wholly successful.⁶⁴

In addition to his religious contributions, Tassilo was also very aware of his secular obligations. For centuries, the Agilolfing dynasty was closely tied with the royalty of Lombard Italy, and Tassilo fit that mold without deviation. In 769, he married Luitperga, daughter of Desidarius, King of Italy, and had their son, Theodo, baptized by Pope Hadrian shortly after. According to some historians, this very close alliance with the Lombards, simply by virtue of tradition among the Agilolfings, caught the ire of Charlemagne and his intentions on Italy.⁶⁵ Others posit that this animosity was also in part due to the Lombards' history of paganism, though it fails to explain Charlemagne's marriage to another of Desidarius' daughters.⁶⁶

By 787, Charlemagne had become King of the Lombards through conquest, and summoned his cousin Tassilo to Ingelheim, where Tassilo was sentenced for treason against his suzerain. Tassilo was charged with conspiracy with the invading Avars, as well as the breaking

⁶⁴ Wolfram, *Tassilo III.*, 80-3.

⁶⁵ Hammer, *From Ducatus to Regnum*, 102.

⁶⁶ Wolfram, *Tassilo III.*, 34-42.

of oaths made to Pepin in Compiègne about the submission of men to his campaign in the Aquitaine in 763. While, allegedly, the council called for Tassilo's execution, Charlemagne cited familial leniency and forced Tassilo to become a monk. The charges were used to force Tassilo out of his position as duke of Bavaria, as all of the charges brought against him were over twenty years old. Ultimately Tassilo died in the monastery, with rule of the new Kingdom of Bavaria passing to Charlemagne and later his grandson Ludwig the German.⁶⁷

From a twenty-first century understanding of this period in history, it seems fairly evident that Tassilo's treatment as duke of Bavaria following Charlemagne's rise to prominence reflected the latter's conscious desire to confiscate the more independent Agilolfing holdings in Bavaria and Northern Italy. However, control of the narrative also rested with Charlemagne. The proliferation of high-profile chronicles regarding his exploits, such as Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni (Life of Charlemagne)*, as well as Carolingian supremacy over the clergy, resulted in a narrative of belligerence, fallibility and impiety on the part of Tassilo that persisted for centuries in a similar basic form.⁶⁸

Tassilo's Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries

Tassilo's narrative, as it stood at the genesis of vernacular chronicling in the twelfth century, was little more than an aside to the numerous deeds of Charlemagne. The *Kaiserchronik* briefly mentions the strife caused by Grifo's rebellion and later Tassilo's deposition but focuses almost exclusively on Charlemagne's perspective and that of his key lieutenants.⁶⁹ Certain

⁶⁷ Kraus, *Geschichte Bayerns*, 47-51.

⁶⁸ Airlie, "Narratives of Triumph and Rituals of Submission: Charlemagne's Mastering of Bavaria," 95-6.

⁶⁹ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores. Deutsche Chroniken*, volume 1: *Die Deutsche Kaiserchronik*, ed. Edward Schröder (Hannover: Hahn, 1895), 345-50.

prominent individuals of the clergy, however, sought to immortalize the narrative with some significance within their *Klosterchroniken*, the most preeminent of which was the *Chronica de duabus civitatibus*, or the *Chronicle of Two Cities*, written by Bishop Otto of Freising in 1145. Otto approaches Tassilo's narrative with more nuance than he would later contentious Bavarian rulers such as Arnulf, primarily due to the duke's patronage of the Church during a pivotal time when clerical infrastructure in the duchy was being developed.

Otto's narrative of Tassilo starts with Grifo's rebellion, which he puts the context of Grifo's antagonism to Pepin. Tassilo's abduction is reconceptualized as him being driven out by Grifo, omitting the fact that his kidnapping occurred when he was a toddler. Otto gives Grifo and his rebellion very little mention in *The Two Cities*, instead utilizing the event as the context for how Tassilo came to the throne of Bavaria through the grace of Pepin.⁷⁰ Otto gives Pepin himself a prominent role in Tassilo's life, conceptualizing him as Tassilo's patron, savior, and adoptive father. It is then an important event, according to Otto, that Tassilo and the nobles of Bavaria swore oaths to the line of Pepin under penalty of death.⁷¹ The alleged breaking of these oaths later played a predominant role in Tassilo's expulsion and forfeiture of Bavaria to Charlemagne.

Otto paradoxically inflated Tassilo's religious contributions as duke to a much larger degree than any chroniclers before him. In addition to the numerous charters for monasteries and donations, Otto significantly influenced the narrative of Tassilo's piety by claiming that he and his son Theodo received the St. Corbinian during his pilgrimage and established the Abbey of Freising at their meeting place. In actuality, Corbinian visited duke Theodo of Bavaria and his

⁷⁰ *MGH Script. Dt. Chron. Deutsche Kaiserchronik*, 346.

⁷¹ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 350.

son Grimoald in 724.⁷² Whether this was an error on Otto's part or an intentional misattribution is unclear, but Otto's influence on subsequent chronicle-writing traditions ultimately meant that this misconception persisted well into the early modern period and heavily impacted future perceptions of Tassilo's piety for centuries.

Although the *Kaiserchronik* does not directly mention Tassilo or his narrative in its content, the omission is indicative of the differentiation in traditions and the changing priorities of vernacular chronicles. Bavaria and its dukes are given preeminence throughout the *Kaiserchronik*, yet Tassilo's narrative is barely mentioned in passing. The problems in Bavaria that loomed over Pepin's – and later Charlemagne's – rule are given little elaboration in the *Kaiserchronik*. Rather, the chronicle mentions a conflict in Bavaria before specifically focusing on the establishment of the Kingdom of Bavaria under Charlemagne. However, rather than remaining with Charlemagne, the *Kaiserchronik* briefly diverts to a certain Gerolt of Swabia, who was given the title *Heerführer*, or prefect, of Bavaria. While Charlemagne held direct control over Bavaria, Gerolt's inclusion is, according to Alastair Matthews, used as more of a narrative device to highlight God's intervention and support of Charlemagne's crusade against the Lombards than his actual administrative role.⁷³ This decision on behalf of the *Kaiserchronik*'s author fits neatly into Chinca and Young's observations on the nature of twelfth-century vernacular chronicles; the chroniclers used narratives for legitimization of the nobility, but drew that legitimacy less from historical fact and more from immediately-preceding conventions of moralistic salvation histories and emotional and dramatic courtly romances.⁷⁴

⁷² Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 348.

⁷³ Matthews, *The Kaiserchronik*, 75.

⁷⁴ Chinca and Young, "Uses of the Past," 19-22.

While the *Kaiserchronik* and Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities* were both written during the 1140s and '50s, they ultimately had wildly divergent priorities, audiences, values, and social logic. While Otto's writings mostly covered theology and biblical history for the vast majority of its length, the way in which the events were researched and presented attest to the more rigorous nature of the traditions under which it was written, namely *Klosterchroniken*. While the *Kaiserchronik* was also an ostensibly historically-based narrative, the tradition from whence it drew prioritized drama, moralism, and entertainment above accurate recounting of important events in the history of the Holy Roman Empire and Bavaria. In the case of Tassilo specifically, the narrative value of Tassilo and Charlemagne's exchange may not have fit the themes that the *Kaiserchronik's* author was attempting to build at that point in the story, namely the emphasis on the righteousness of Charlemagne's endeavors by claiming that God personally bestowed a righteous general and prefect upon him in the form of Gerolt of Swabia. Tassilo's narrative played a much more extensive role in chronicles going forward, as they more extensively drew from Otto's meticulous and portentous account of events. Otto's narrative prioritized the complex moral theology of Tassilo's actions, as well as his myriad – and overinflated – contributions to the Bavarian Church. However, Otto's use of the flawed hero duke did not gain traction through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Tassilo's Narrative in the Fifteenth Century

Tassilo's narrative, along with chronicling in general, enjoyed an unprecedented upswing in the fifteenth century thanks to the political disunity of the 1390s. As the question of "who should rightly rule Bavaria" became muddled and the simple answer of "Wittelsbach" became

less clear, reaffirmation of values such as piety and subservience to the emperor became more important to convey through the newer format of vernacular *Landeschroniken* intended for courtly consumption and pedagogy. This changing social logic led to significant reinterpretations of Tassilo III and the esteemed works of Otto of Freising in surprising ways.

Otto's *The Two Cities* and the *Kaiserchronik* influenced Andreas of Regensburg's treatment of Tassilo in both the Latin and German versions of his chronicle, yet Andreas elaborates on it dramatically and instills an air of judgement towards Tassilo's actions and personal relationships. Shortly after Tassilo's introduction in the chronicle, Andreas mentions the oath of fealty Tassilo gave to Charlemagne and Pepin, this time over the body of St. Denis of Paris. While this small detail was an embellishment on Andreas' part, the swearing and breaking of oaths still played a pivotal role in this portrayal. Andreas went so far as to mirror Otto's exact language on the matter, claiming that Tassilo "disregarded" or "forgot" his oath to Pepin (*vergas*) and abandoned his uncle's campaign in the Aquitaine.⁷⁵

One of Andreas' unique contributions to the Tassilo narrative is the continual mention of Tassilo's relation to Charlemagne, addressing and readdressing his status as a blood relative (*geborener frewnd – geborener Freund*).⁷⁶ While this distinction is implied through Otto's referral to Pepin as Tassilo's uncle, Otto does not explicitly make the distinction within *The Two Cities*. Andreas' desire to emphasize their familial dynamic could be due to a variety of reasons, such as the heightening potential for familial drama for entertainment purposes. However, the most likely reason for this distinction, especially in the context in which the term is used, is to

⁷⁵ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 606.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 605-9.

attribute direct lineage between the ducal house of Bavaria and the Carolingians. Moreover, it highlights the perceived supremacy of Carolingian overlordship, considering that Charlemagne, Ludwig the German, and at least two more generations of Carolingian rulers presided over Bavaria before succumbing to the Luitpoldings of the tenth century. Prior to the supremacy of the Wittelsbachs into the thirteenth century, legitimation of the myriad dynasties which ruled over Bavaria – such as the Liutpoldings, Liudolfings, Luxemburgs, Salians, Welfs and Hohenstaufens – depended on the precedence that they were either descended from the line of Charlemagne and its constituent branches or stemmed from a dynasty whose members mirrored Charlemagne in action, as was the case of the Bavarian Liudolfings and Henry the Fowler.⁷⁷ In this regard, bloodline was supremely important, and it was a factor that Andreas sought fit to emphasize.

Along these lines, Andreas also emphasized deviation from the Carolingians and allegiance with their enemies. The most telling example of this trend within Andreas' account of Tassilo is in Luitperga's scandalous manipulation of her otherwise pious and honorable husband. Andreas characterizes Luitperga as having ulterior motives, namely her desire for Tassilo to usurp Italy from her father Desiderius with the help of the Huns. Moreover, Andreas asserts that it was under her whim that he abandoned the oaths of Pepin and showed sympathy for the marauding Avars. This interpretation likely stemmed from Charlemagne's ultimate conquest of the Lombards in the 770s and the hostility that Desiderius held towards the office of the pope. This narrative was useful, in both legitimizing Charlemagne's righteousness, as well as the Lombards' impiety. Andreas frames this dichotomy succinctly, stating that Charlemagne was at

⁷⁷ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 614.

war with Desiderius and that Tassilo around the same time married Desiderius' daughter.⁷⁸ He conveniently fails to mention Charlemagne's brief marriage – and speedy annulment – to Desiderius' other daughter, Desiderata, prior to the conflict. For narrative purposes, this omission was a particularly handy tool of comparison and used this simple juxtaposition for in the increasingly public nature of vernacular chronicles into the fifteenth century.

Andreas von Regensbug inflated nearly every detail of Tassilo's narrative relative to Otto of Freising's, but none more so than Tassilo's personality, motivations, and hostility during his conflict with Charlemagne. Andreas frames Tassilo's involvement against Charlemagne as openly antagonistic, citing his desire for the Lombard throne as his primary motivator. Andreas goes so far as to claim that Tassilo took up arms against Charlemagne following the death of Desiderius, naturally under sway to the machinations of Luitperga. In a desperate bid to stop further conflict, Pope Adrian and two other bishops approach Tassilo in an attempt to remind him of his oaths given to Pepin and Charlemagne in his youth, but he still manages to disregard them. Ultimately, this conflict is stopped by the pope himself, but only under the condition that Tassilo and his followers reinstitute the oath. The pope goes as so far as to tell Tassilo that Charlemagne and his men have no debt to God for the looting and burning of his lands should he remain disobedient. Fearing the pope's words, Tassilo surrenders peacefully. Andreas paints Tassilo's subsequent judgement in Ingelheim relatively the same as Otto's account, with the main exception being that he was simply following the wishes of his wife. Tassilo claimed before the assembly that Luitperga convinced him to broach an agreement with the Avars to enter the empire and invite hostile words and deeds upon it. According to Andreas, Tassilo easily

⁷⁸ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 607-8.

succumbed to Charlemagne's judgement and kingly power and was compelled to confess. While Charlemagne was still moved by compassion, as Otto had professed, Andreas gives him the extra motivation of familial sympathy and the grace of God when it came to his decision for leniency.⁷⁹

Tassilo's religious contributions, such as the establishment of half a dozen monasteries, are present within Andreas' recollection, but gives them far less attention than in Otto of Freising's reckoning. However, he does include an immensely symbolic late life and death which was likely meant to explain his modest veneration in Bavarian monastic circles and later influence in the chronicles of the late fifteenth century. Andreas claims that Tassilo, having recognized his grave misdeeds, readily welcomed monastic life in France before traveling to numerous monasteries and ultimately dying at *Kloster Lorsch* in Hesse. He then continues with an anecdote in which Charlemagne visits Lorsch and during his stay has a prophetic dream of Tassilo walking hand in hand with an angel into heaven. Shortly thereafter, Tassilo dies of fever and is accepted by God with grace and humility. It is only in this context that Andreas mentions his establishment of monasteries and the dedications which still existed within them by the fifteenth century. One such dedication, an often-repeated epitaph, provided the most enduring summation of Tassilo's life which became prevalent in later chronicles: "Zum ersten herzog, darnach künig, und zum lezten ein münich," (at first a duke, after that a king, and finally a monk.)⁸⁰

⁷⁹ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 607-8.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 609.

Andreas von Regensburg's description of the events of Tassilo's life served an important purpose at the time of its construction, as it is reflective of the Bavarian political and cultural milieu in the early fifteenth century. Tassilo's portrayal as a tragic figure takes precedence over that of a historical political actor in Andreas's chronicle due to the thematic underpinnings that Andreas himself inculcated into his narrative in order to shape contemporary understandings. He substantially diminished the narrative of Tassilo's piety, while still present to a noticeable degree, in relation to Otto's chronicle in lieu of highlighting Tassilo's ambition and disobedience. While this may seem an odd choice for a chronicle recounting the high points of the history of Bavaria's rulers, it serves a clear purpose. According to Dicker, dynastic continuity and *Familienrecht* (family law) were of prime importance to Andreas von Regensburg, more so than his own opinions as to any "rightful" ruler of Bavaria.⁸¹ This would explain his condemnation of Tassilo's breaking of oaths and the continued mention of his familial relationship with Pepin and Charlemagne, as well as the ascription of kingly ambition to his wife Luitperga by virtue of her being the daughter of the king of the Lombards.

Roughly fifty years after the construction of Andreas von Regensburg's *Chronik von den Fürsten zu Bayern* came the Bavarian chronicles of Hans Ebran von Wildenberg and Ulrich Fuetrer. Both of these chronicles were reactive to Andreas von Regensburg's and each other's works. Hans Ebran von Wildenberg was part of the nobility of Bayern-Landshut and reinterpreted the clerical traditions that informed Andreas von Regensburg's perspectives. While Andreas von Regensburg attempted to recontextualize the narratives of earlier *Klosterchroniken* in a tradition more in line with wider courtly consumption, Hans Ebran von Wildenberg

⁸¹ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 73-5.

subsequently utilized this growing form of the vernacular regional chronicle to enforce the longstanding political and ethical implications of historical figures such as Tassilo.

Ebran's *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, thanks to Andreas von Regensburg's influence, was critical of Tassilo's actions, albeit to a much more inflammatory degree. The criticism of his marriage to Luitperga and her subsequent manipulations are still present from Andreas' account, yet the folly is framed less as a betrayal of familial Carolingian loyalty and more as an irksome and ill-advised political maneuver. Instead of portraying Tassilo as a duke who aspired to rule his own independent kingdom, Ebran paints him as a gullible man who was seduced by his wife into betraying his liege lord.⁸²

Moreover, Ebran's account of Tassilo's condemnation in Ingelheim forgoes any commentary on Charlemagne's divine mercy in saving him from execution, instead simply restating Andreas nearly verbatim.⁸³ These choices likely stemmed from Ebran's background as a courtly and judicial official. Ebran's choice to use Andreas' chronicle verbatim, however, illustrates his instrumentality in the creation of the Bavarian aristocratic narrative in the fifty years after its writing. Andreas' chronicle enjoyed a widespread ubiquity as a tool of self-identification outside of a strictly Ingolstadt-aligned perspective. In this regard, his less partisan "pedagogical intention" cemented a clear historiographical tradition in the final decades of the fifteenth century across all three Wittelsbach lines, influencing the aristocratic clamor for reunification that finally came to fruition in 1505.⁸⁴

⁸² Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 54-5.

⁸³ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 55; Andreas von Regensburg, *sämtliche Werke*, 608.

⁸⁴ Moeglin, "Genealogie der Wittelsbacher," 42.

Hans Ebran's *Chronik*, though heavily influenced by the relatively impartial Andreas von Regensburg, is not without a few cases of very transparent editorializing. One such section, placed between Tassilo's banishment and his founding of monasteries, comes across as Ebran's personal reflection on the entire narrative:

O hertzog Tassilo, wie hastu so ubel gethün an der selb, auch deinen nachkömen und dem haws zu Beiern, das du dich nit in genaden des gerechten keiser gehalten! Hast dich ein weib verfürn lassen. Es ist gütlich zugelawben, das dich der keiser der höchsten ambtman einen des romischn reichs gemacht hielt, nachdem du seiner nachster mag [einer] gewesen pist.⁸⁵

O duke Tassilo, how you have done such evil onto yourself, your successors and the house of Bavaria, that you did not remain in the good graces of the emperor! You allowed yourself to be seduced by a woman. It is amicable to believe, that the emperor would have made you one of the highest officials of the Roman Empire, since you could have been one of his successors.

This candid statement is indicative of Ebran's core beliefs regarding Tassilo's narrative, namely that of the sanctity of the Carolingians and the retroactive relief he holds towards Charlemagne's assumption of Bavaria following Tassilo's deposition. Moreover, Ebran maintains Andreas' perception of Tassilo as a tragically misguided figure, seduced by his wife into abandoning his obligations to his king and squandering the potential of becoming emperor himself. Ebran's condemnation, however, is not cushioned as much by the continuous observation of Tassilo's contributions to the Bavarian Church present throughout Andreas von Regensburg's narrative. Ebran's perspective from the position of court attendant and judge yield the same conclusions about Tassilo, yet his criticisms of Tassilo's political misdeeds are less contextualized around morality, piety, and eventual salvation and more around the pragmatic outcome for the Bavarian aristocracy. Ultimately, the narrative of Charlemagne's usurpation of Bavaria was placed into the

⁸⁵ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 57.

context of the rightful Carolingian nobility, to whom the Wittelsbachs constantly claimed relation, wresting control from an unfit ruler.⁸⁶

Contemporaneous to Ebran's chronicle, and one that also mentions Tassilo III at length, is that of Ulrich Füetrer. According to Dicker, Füetrer's proximity to the clergy at Tegernsee (though he was not a clergyman himself) and the religious subject matter of most of his poetry and paintings gave him a more theological and less political inclination in his work when compared to Ebran's. However, he still relied heavily on Ebran's interpretation for the purpose of contextualizing the events and responding to the claims of legitimation. While Ebran was focused more on the political history of Bavaria as a whole, Füetrer's goal was to highlight dynastic succession and deeds in detail, even those which may have been seen as unsavory in the face of revered figures like Charlemagne and Otto the Great.⁸⁷

The content of Füetrer's *Bayerische Chronik* regarding Tassilo's narrative is the most comprehensive of the fifteenth-century chroniclers, as every deed done – whether real or fictitious – is explained exhaustively. To this end, Tassilo's exploits in his rendition are many, and often unsubstantiated by existing evidence. Rather than using strict genealogies, such as the *Scheyere Fürstentafel* used by Andreas von Regensburg and – by extension – Ebran, Füetrer leans on fabrication to create allusions to other venerable historical figures and support assessments of character, temperament, and motivation. In turn, Füetrer creates a compelling and dramatic narrative which more closely suited his existing skillset and mindset. One such poetic addition is that of Tassilo's first wife, Nicostra, the Sicilian noblewoman, who dies sometime

⁸⁶ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 60.

⁸⁷ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 114-6.

before Tassilo's marriage to Luitperga (he does not include a timeframe). By Fūetrer's reckoning, Nicostra was the only person able to soften Tassilo's pitiless and mean demeanor and to convince him to give himself to a life of piety and patronage of the Church. According to Spiller, her inclusion was likely a reference to the relationship between the Merovingian king Clovis and his wife Clotilde, who encouraged him to become the first Christian king of the Franks. This decision has clear internal logic, as the Agilolfings had close ties and familial relationships with the Merovingian Franks, yet – like the Merovingians – were ultimately replaced by the unerring Carolingians.⁸⁸ Fūetrer also erroneously states that Tassilo and his uncle Grifo worked in tandem against Pepin and Charlemagne during Grifo's uprising, despite Tassilo being a child at the time. This, in turn, makes Pepin's forgiveness in exchange for the recitation of oaths, as well as Charlemagne's mercy at the council in Ingelheim, much more dramatic and salient.⁸⁹

Fūetrer's predilection toward the minutiae of the lives of Bavarian nobles lends itself to embellishment of Ebran's work as well. One such embellishment lies in Ebran's mention of the mythical founding of Kremsmūnster Abbey. According to Ebran's use of Kremsmūnster's own *Klosterchronik*, the abbey was founded upon the spot where Tassilo's son Gunther died after being gored by a boar, hence the presence of a wounded boar on the Kremsmūnster coat of arms. Fūetrer goes into detail as to the grief that this event brought Tassilo, and how his next wife Liutperga encouraged him to discard his subsequently compromised piety.⁹⁰ Dicker suggests that Fūetrer was fully aware that his chronicle would invite comparison to Ebran's work, so the

⁸⁸ Ulrich Fūetrer, *Bayerische Crhonik*, 46-7.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 76, 105-6.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 48-9; 105.

structure and style became his main point of differentiation. In response, Füetrer leaned into his poetic background and treated the genealogies of the Wittelsbachs and their forbearers as he would his earlier poetic works, such as his *Buch der Abenteuer (Book of Adventure)*, which chronicled the genealogies of the knights of the Holy Grail.⁹¹

In this regard, Füetrer's *Bayerische Chronik* was less concerned with the politics of the time and more with the emotion and thematic underpinnings of the events involved, as well as subsequently mythologizing these narratives for a noble audience. While it served a similar purpose to the more pedagogical or opinionated works of Andreas and Ebran, respectively, its intent towards manufacturing and defining an ideal Bavarian noble is much more apparent. Füetrer's intent was to ascribe value and meaning to Bavarian history – as earlier poetic traditions had – and the similarity to earlier vernacular verse chronicles, such as the *Weltchroniken* of Rudolf von Ems and Jans der Enikel, is plain to see. Füetrer's chronicle is an example of Bavarian history as entertainment, but more specifically, Bavarian history as chivalric romance. Within the chronicle, Tassilo's narrative is well-established in existing traditions as a historical counterpoint to the rightful and more pious rule of the Carolingians – from which the Wittelsbachs claim direct descent – but the historical and genealogical legitimization tactics used by Andreas von Regensburg and coopted by Hans Ebran von Wildenberg are merely the setting and stage for Füetrer's claims to Tassilo's incongruity of character to the contemporary morals of fifteenth-century Bavarian nobles. This mentality more closely resembles and mirrors the intent behind the author(s) of the *Kaiserchronik*, who utilized the preexisting genre of salvation histories to create an entertaining yet informative work in

⁹¹ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 114-5.

ascribing a place and conduct to the nobility. The main differences with Füetrer's work lie less in a generic change over time that one might expect over the course of three centuries, but rather in his conscious desire to take an observable and politically-motivated trend in regional history writing and infuse older and continually popular literary and thematic conventions into the same content in order to set it apart.

Veit Arnpeck's treatment of Tassilo is by far the most critical of the other Bavarian chronicles written during the fifteenth century, although he does subscribe to many of Andreas' and Otto's interpretations. He challenges many assertions as to Tassilo's motivations and temperament, and grounds his narrative in distinct chronological context. Without using his name, Arnpeck directly refutes Andreas von Regensburg's claim that Tassilo was ever king of the Lombards, stating that Tassilo was simply in line for the crown.⁹² Arnpeck's work is indicative of the exhaustive precision and forensic analysis of many early humanists. He is one of the few to state the year of Tassilo's birth, as well as the years of many major events in his lifetime, such as the council in Ingelheim.⁹³ The judgments of Tassilo's character present in the chronicle are few and far between, and those that do exist are phrased identically within the traditions of earlier fifteenth-century chroniclers. One example is the fictitious story of Tassilo's march against Charlemagne, where bishops Formosus and Domasus reminded the duke of his oaths to Pepin.⁹⁴ These inclusions were more likely part of the still rigidly conventional style of German chronicle-writing, specifically to clergymen whose seminal works Arnpeck wanted to pay homage. However, this did not prevent Arnpeck from being critical of others' work, nor

⁹² *Veit Arnpeck, sämtliche Chroniken*, 467.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 467-79.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 468.

discourage him from providing alternate interpretations. The role of Luitperga, for example, is unique in Arnpeck's chronicle because he avoids any condemnation of Tassilo's alleged foolishness in being swayed by his wife. Instead, he simply states that Liutperga was desirous of the Lombard throne and convinced Tassilo to ally with the Huns in order to take it back. Arnpeck's portrayal of this dynamic is particularly noteworthy, as portions are chosen verbatim from both Andreas von Regensburg and Ebran, yet include none of their personal contributions. In point of fact, Arnpeck then devotes the next page in addressing the myriad different versions of the Tassilo narrative without passing direct judgement on the vast majority of the claims.⁹⁵ While this practice of deference and critical interpretation follows the trends in what historians today refer to as Renaissance humanism, Arnpeck simply utilizes the traditions put forth by his clerical predecessors – Andreas and Otto – to a much larger degree and prioritizes the information conveyed through eclectic sources.

By the end of the fifteenth century and the reunification of Bavaria in the early sixteenth, humanist practice and rigor were becoming more and more commonplace. However, the period of proliferation for the Bavarian regional chronicle had died down. The perception of Tassilo III, however, had become increasingly solidified by these accounts, among others. The seventeenth century was kind to the memory of the duke through veneration in church projects such as frescoes, statues, and devotional art regarding the abbeys he had founded, leaving an enduring legacy of a pious duke who was ultimately redeemed in the eyes of God.

⁹⁵ Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, 470-2.

Conclusion

Schmid's assessment of Tassilo's narrative in Bavarian chronicles identifies a goal between *Klosterchroniken* and the more politically minded secular chronicles of Ebran and Füetrer. Tassilo represented the period before direct Carolingian control of Bavaria, Bavarian independence, and the patronage of the Bavarian Church, but existed as a figure in opposition to Carolingian hegemony and Carolingian memory in the ensuing centuries. His patronage of the Church, however, made the condemnation of his moral standing a little more difficult under the chronicling traditions of the monasteries.⁹⁶ While Schmid does address the utility of Tassilo's narrative to Wittelsbach-backed chroniclers and the slight differences in approach to his misdeeds, he does not address the rhetorical and intellectual traditions upon which these texts drew, nor the reason for the omnipresence of the narrative in the fifteenth-century context.

Tassilo's narrative as a whole underwent a significant reassessment in the fifteenth century, coinciding with changes in the political landscape, the composition and context of Bavarian court culture, and the traditions of chronicle-writing that had developed throughout the Middle Ages. For fifteenth-century Bavarian chroniclers, Tassilo's narrative held great symbolic significance, yet – as is the case with many literary movements – they did not have an entirely unified intent or set of values through which to express that significance. Otto of Freising's interpretation of Tassilo was the first to portray him as a pious yet flawed duke who held special importance to Otto personally, considering his particular investment to the history of Freising in his writings. Vernacular chronicles such as the *Kaiserchronik* and the chronicles of Jans Enikel and Rudolf von Ems stemmed from an entirely different tradition than Otto of Freising's, and the

⁹⁶ Schmid, *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte*, 21-2.

narrative of Tassilo and Charlemagne within Bavarian court culture in the twelfth century subsequently held little significance. These world chronicles were indeed used as a form of legitimization of the elite, but the rhetorical and cultural framework that they were built upon prioritized the moralizing and allegorical nature of epic poems and courtly romances over ostensible historical truisms such as genealogies and clerical records.

Numerous genealogies were compiled throughout the fourteenth century in an attempt to cement the house of Wittelsbach as the only legitimate house of Bavaria through the attribution of noble Carolingian lineage. The regional chronicles of the fifteenth century utilized these genealogies – as well as clerical chronicles such as Otto's *The Two Cities* – to bring legitimization to the family in a more narrative form. Tassilo's narrative was a focal point for fifteenth-century chroniclers for a number of reasons, namely for his conflicting perception as a patron of the Church and talented military leader, but a traitor to his suzerain and to those to whom he swore an oath of fealty.

There was one principal way in which these chroniclers sought to justify this dichotomy: by taking Andreas von Regensburg's lead and proclaiming that Tassilo rebelled against the Carolingians through the seduction and coercion of his wife Luitperga. This interpretation was contextualized in different ways, yet the implication of the queen as instigator was universally present, even in Arnpeck's ostensibly more measured and composed account. This was due to both the political aims of fifteenth-century chroniclers and the existing genre structures of fifteenth-century courtly writing in general. Luitperga's assumed significance in Tassilo's narrative stemmed from her connection to one of Charlemagne's antagonists, Desiderius. Desiderius's hostility towards the papacy and the Lombards' subsequent defeat left later

chroniclers with a surviving Carolingian perspective as to the moral character of those connected to him. In this regard, the demonization of Luitperga affirmed politically what existing narratives of courtly romance addressed thematically and generically. This is readily apparent in Füetrer's rigid adherence to the courtly trope of the temptress archetype, juxtaposed by Tassilo's fictitious first wife, Nicostra, whose inclusion was itself an allusion to the legendary relationship between King Clovis and his Christian wife. By the time of Arnpeck's recollection, the myriad interpretations distilled from Andreas, Ebran, and Füetrer pointed to the common denominator of Liutperga's probable involvement in Tassilo's disobedience. However, Arnpeck's humanist education discouraged a moralistic approach or frequent editorializing.

In regard to Tassilo's monastic life and support of the Church, the influence of *Klosterchroniken* is still observable and significant. When viewed as a rhetorical and allegorical narrative, Tassilo's only saving grace in the support of the Church not only reflects the vested interests of the authors in question, but simultaneously the traditions of the Bavarian court leading up to that point. The duke of Bavaria was indeed meant to be pious, yet this was informed as much by the Latin-language clerical groundwork of chronicles that the information was pulled from as by the rhetorical and generic conventions of the vernacular epic poems and stories which tied them together going into the early modern period. The crafting of narratives of events in the eighth century can ultimately act as a prism for understanding the twelfth through fifteenth centuries, particularly through the lens of piety and its value as a virtue of the nobility. Tassilo III functioned as both a cautionary tale to Bavarian nobles desirous of more power and, by the end of the fifteenth century, an exemplar for the redemptive power of Church patronage.

By this token, the same can be said for other virtues and other figures of Bavarian history that served an intended narrative purpose, such as duke Arnulf of Bavaria.

CHAPTER 2: ARNULF THE BAD AND NARRATIVES OF DERISION

Introduction

Although the narrative of Duke Tassilo III and Charlemagne is indicative of the broader trends and utility of Bavarian chronicling in the Middle Ages, it is far from the only one worthy of detailed study. While the dispute between the two figures found its use in preserving and enforcing Wittelsbach legitimacy throughout the twelfth through fifteenth centuries, it also illustrated the relationship and between twelfth- and thirteenth-century clerical interpretations of the event over the later, more secularly minded interpretations of the fifteenth century. This relationship is more observable in the narrative of Duke Arnulf of Bavaria (d. 937) and his disputes with German King Henry the Fowler in the mid-tenth century.

For roughly seven centuries, scholars and chroniclers referred to Arnulf as “*der Böse*,” or, “the Bad/Evil.” This epithet found its roots in later characterizations of Arnulf as an opportunistic and ambitious would-be king, using all resources available to him – including land and property belonging to the Church – to rebel against his king and carve Bavaria out as his own personal kingdom. However, according to sources contemporaneous to Arnulf, such as Bishop Liudprand of Cremona, Arnulf’s conception as uniquely debased among Henry the Fowler’s enemies is entirely absent. Instead, Arnulf is viewed as simply an influential opponent to Henry’s ambitions as emperor and a political thorn in the side of those sympathetic to the Saxon Ottonians. This choice is particularly telling considering Liudprand’s work as a whole is

littered with character assassinations and condemnations of the moral failings of Henry's and Otto's enemies.⁹⁷

The conception and characterization of Arnulf as evil persisted through the boom in Bavarian chronicling of the fifteenth century, and in some respects became more exaggerated as subsequent interpretations built upon their predecessors' passionate condemnations. It provided a clear pedagogical and moralistic narrative which simultaneously affirmed the established hierarchies of power within the Holy Roman Empire and reinforced assumed notions as to the nature of nobility, piety, and kingship. Seventeenth-century chronicler Christoph Gewold was one of the first to doubt the validity of Arnulf's epithet, "der Böse," yet for most historians into the twentieth century, the heretical nature of Arnulf's behavior was taken at face value.⁹⁸ However, the genesis of this narrative is much more concentrated around one particular chronicler and the institutions that inordinately favored his interpretation.

Portraits of Arnulf in the Bavarian historical tradition were varied, yet stemmed from the seemingly immutable authority of Otto of Freising and his scathing condemnations. Otto himself was informed by his research of regional monastic chronicles (*Klosterchroniken*), which by the end of the twelfth century already had close ties to the Wittelsbachs. His influence even spread to more popular methods of historical writing and education. Arnulf's reviled reputation is more closely and inextricably tied to twelfth-century monastic interpretations than as a thematic counterpoint to venerable figures of authority, as was the case of Tassilo and Charlemagne. In this regard, the more Bavarian chroniclers were informed by earlier clerical traditions and

⁹⁷ Liudprand of Cremona, *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, trans. Paolo Squatriti (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 84-7.

⁹⁸ Alois Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf (907-937) in der Deutschen Geschichtsschreibung von seinen Zeitgenossen bis zu Wilhelm von Giesebrecht* (Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Lassleben, 1976), 1-2.

contemporaneous influence of the Wittelsbachs, the more Arnulf's reputation became entirely negative.

The Narrative of Arnulf

In order to better understand how Arnulf's narrative was utilized throughout the high and late Middle Ages, it is important to understand Arnulf's actions and why some interest groups viewed them as particularly contentious or repugnant. While Arnulf's conduct as duke was unorthodox, to put it charitably, it was still not as worthy of condemnation as later historians had ascribed and fell well within the lines of acceptable behavior among tenth-century nobility.

The transition from the Carolingian to the Ottonian dynasty during the early tenth century was not a smooth one, and the state of the Frankish Empire reflected this fractured relationship between the empire and its duchies. King Konrad I's authority over East Francia was plagued by infighting and instability. His election as king was unanimous, yet his tenure was tumultuous. Henry the Fowler, at the time Duke of Saxony, engaged in open rebellion against Konrad, but eventually came to a compromise to ensure Saxon autonomy.⁹⁹ More importantly, however, Konrad's ascension to the throne spurred the first large-scale wars between Bavaria and the office of the Holy Roman Emperor in the tenth century.

Arnulf himself was the second generation of the Luitpolding dynasty, a military family established by Luitpold, margrave of Bavaria (~850-907). As margrave, Luitpold was charged by the Carolingians with protecting the expanding March of Carinthia (the southernmost region of modern-day Austria) against the marauding Magyars (Hungarians). Luitpold's acquisitions as

⁹⁹ Ludwig Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux: Studien zu Herzog Arnulf von Bayern, 907-937* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2003), 12, 26.

margrave allowed for a vast accumulation of personal wealth and land, which he used to garner favor with the various bishops in and around Bavaria including those of Salzburg, Regensburg, and Passau, who Emperor Arnulf (not to be confused with Duke Arnulf of Bavaria) had invested in the final years of the ninth century. These gifts usually included charters and grants of land and money as acts of patronage and piety. Reciprocally, Emperor Arnulf supported Luitpold and his vassals with their own grants of land. Luitpold became increasingly involved in the dealings of the episcopate, moderating a number of synods and accompanying bishops on military campaigns against the Hungarians. Luitpold's success in imperial and ecclesiastical politics ended, however, with his death at the hands of the Hungarians at the Battle of Pressburg (modern-day Bratislava) in 907.¹⁰⁰

Luitpold's death was a catalyst in many ways, not least for Arnulf's ascension to duke of Bavaria. The duchy of Bavaria was formed immediately following Luitpold's death, given to Arnulf for his father's service. The election of Konrad I, the first non-Carolingian king of East Francia, struck a chord with Arnulf upon the former's unanimous election in 910. Arnulf was less compliant than his father with the office of the king of East Francia. According to Helmut Beumann, Arnulf put greater emphasis on Bavarian independence than his father, resulting in outspoken contention between him and Konrad.¹⁰¹ Moreover, according to Alois Schmid, Arnulf claimed that he had an equal – if not greater – claim to the throne of East Francia than Konrad, a claim shared by numerous members of the German nobility following Konrad's election.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 24-7.

¹⁰¹ Helmut Beumann, *Die Ottonen*, (Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1997), 14.

¹⁰² Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 25-6.

After Luitpold's death at the Battle of Pressburg, Arnulf took it upon himself to accrue all available resources in order to keep the Magyars from expanding further into German territory. The most immediate form of revenue and manpower came from Church holdings, a practice which Schmid claims was well within the rights of the nobility of the tenth century.¹⁰³ Arnulf took advantage of this practice to an extensive degree. The monastery of Tegernsee in Upper Bavaria, for example, was forced to relinquish roughly 11,800 head of cattle in 910.¹⁰⁴ This understandably did not engender much love for Arnulf within monastic circles, but as a practice perceived by the nobility, it was simply on a slightly larger scale than was commonplace. Moreover, Arnulf quickly became well-known and lauded for his defense of the river Inn in 913, garnering respect from the South German nobility and ensuring secured borders in Bavaria for over a decade.¹⁰⁵

Arnulf eventually earned the ire of Konrad to the point of military action. According to Schmid, Arnulf was not interested in imperial or royal prospects. Rather, he was interested in affirming the status of Bavarian autonomy through what Schmid refers to as a *Sonderkönigtum*, or a kingdom under the purview, partnership, and possibly suzerainty of East Francia.¹⁰⁶ In this regard, Arnulf's aspirations had historical precedent, as Bavaria enjoyed great autonomy under the suzerainty of the Merovingians. It was likely that Arnulf viewed, as many German nobles did, the election of Konrad as proof of weakening Carolingian hegemony. In that regard,

¹⁰³ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 19.

¹⁰⁴ Kurt Reindel, *Die bayerischen Luitpoldinger von 893-989: Sammlung und Erläuterung der Quellen* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1953), 91.

¹⁰⁵ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 50.

¹⁰⁶ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 18.

Arnulf likely petitioned for greater autonomy, instead of the unchecked ambition and imperial aspirations he would be later known for throughout the Middle Ages.

While Arnulf's relationship with Konrad was contentious, it was amicable and mutually respectful both before and after Konrad's election. However, in 914, Arnulf's pushes for greater autonomy soured their relationship and ultimately resulted in open conflict. According to Holzfurtner, the "rebellion" of the duchy was not intended to carve out a piece of East Francia as an independent Bavarian kingdom, but rather the *Sonderkönigtum* that Arnulf had been striving for since he assumed the duchy in the first place. Eventually, Konrad, with the help of his allies, marched on Regensburg in 916 after an episcopal synod further legitimized his movement against Arnulf among the clergy. Arnulf treated the episcopate in much the same way as his contemporaries, such as Konrad, who was simultaneously an abbot of the monastery of Kaiserswerth. Many of these dukes and kings, along with the clergy they invested, conceptualized Church holdings as their own, as they fell within what they believed was their sphere of influence. With the power of episcopal investment stripped from Arnulf through his conflict with Konrad, the synod further legitimized Konrad's rule and affirmed the allegiance of the regional episcopate. It is important to note that at this event, Arnulf's secularization of monastic land was unlikely to have been the root cause, as Holzfurtner notes that the practice was not mentioned in the records of the proceedings.¹⁰⁷

The historiography of Arnulf's career after this point has come to a conspicuous lack of consensus. According to the prevailing narrative, the one first established in Liutprand of Cremona's *Anapodosis* in the 950s, Arnulf fled to Hungary with his wife and sons after the

¹⁰⁷ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 57.

taking of Regensburg, where he stayed for roughly two years. Arnulf then allegedly returned to Bavaria, leading a rebellious army against Konrad.¹⁰⁸ Among modern historians, the prevailing narrative posits that Emperor Konrad had succumbed to wounds inflicted in battle with Bavarian forces shortly after Arnulf's unlawful return from exile. However, more recent scholarship posits that this might not have realistically been the case. While Liutprand's account is the most contemporary to Arnulf's life, his patronage under Otto the Great would have incentivized him to make allusions and references to Otto's campaigns against the Hungarians in the 950s, as well as understate the size and breadth to the general opposition of Konrad. According to Holzfurtner, it was more likely that Arnulf fled from an occupied Regensburg, only to quickly regain strength by appealing to a sympathetic Bavarian and Swabian nobility over the next two years.¹⁰⁹ However, the fact remains that Konrad, the first elected king of East Francia, died suddenly in December 918.

Konrad's death proved an effective incentive for Bavarian and Swabian nobles to make pushes for more land and appeals for greater autonomy. It is unclear which event precipitated the other, but by May 919, both Henry the Fowler of Saxony and Arnulf had been named king and had their claims recognized by outside duchies. This conflict was swiftly resolved, however, after a summit in Regensburg in 920/921, where Arnulf conceded the throne to Henry in exchange for extensive rights and privileges. These included episcopal investment and minting. While Liutprand – and some twentieth-century historians – claim that these concessions were based on Arnulf's reluctance to be forcefully subjugated by a much more powerful enemy in

¹⁰⁸ Beumann, *Die Ottonen*, 29-31.

¹⁰⁹ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 119-122.

Henry and his allied duchies, Holzfurtner views the situation somewhat differently. He postulates that – in keeping with historical precedents of Bavarian suzerainty to the Frankish king – Arnulf had no aspirations in the throne of East Francia, even though he had the strength and support to do so.¹¹⁰ This interpretation takes into account Bavaria’s unique history in the broader Carolingian empire and its successors, namely its nobility’s internalization of the idea of partial independence yet willing compliance with Frankish suzerainty. Moreover, Holzfurtner’s interpretation paints a picture of Bavarian strength and autonomy in the face of later chronicles’ depictions of a weak and fraught duchy.

Arnulf’s concession and negotiation with Henry the Fowler led to a relatively prolonged peace, beginning in 921 and continuing until Henry’s death in 936 and Arnulf’s own death nearly a year to the day later. During this time, Arnulf returned the vast majority of previously used property to their subsequent monasteries and reimbursed them for seized assets in the form of donations.¹¹¹ Arnulf used his extensive liberties in order to enforce Bavarian dominance and resolve land disputes in Bohemia and Northern Italy, respectively. The prevailing narrative of these events, prior to Schmid’s – and later Holzfurtner’s – interpretations, painted Arnulf’s acts as single-minded aggression and expansion.

More recent interpretations, however, frame these acts of expansion and consolidation within the framework of compliance, rather than ambition. Holzfurtner posits that Arnulf was likely well aware of the dependence of Bohemia under the kingdom of East Francia even under the Carolingians, and his actions therein were done in good faith to Henry and respect to his

¹¹⁰ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 126-7.

¹¹¹ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 22.

position. In the case of the Italian campaign, Arnulf believed he could capitalize on the political unrest of the region to acquire some land that had traditionally belonged to Bavaria but abandoned the campaign at the faintest sign of resistance. According to Holzfurtner, the underlying reasoning for this had less to do with expanding Bavaria for its own sake and more to do with finding a suitable holding in Northern Italy to give to his son by exploiting the favorable nobility of the region.¹¹²

After Henry the Fowler's death in 936, Otto of Saxony was quickly crowned king of East Francia. Arnulf himself attended Otto's coronation and showed no ill will towards the young king.¹¹³ Shortly after Arnulf's death, however, Otto quickly proved he was a more consolidatory ruler than his father. Through the second half of the tenth century, the dynamic of power between Bavaria and the rest of East Francia under the Ottonians increasingly favored the latter, despite efforts by Arnulf's sons.¹¹⁴

Arnulf's eldest son, Eberhard, succeeded his father after his death in the Summer of 937. He attempted to affirm the relationship between Bavaria and East Francia agreed upon by Arnulf and Henry but met heavy resistance and was deposed in 938 after a short rebellion. Otto appointed Arnulf's younger brother, Berthold, as duke, under the pretense that Otto was recognized as sovereign of Bavaria and given the rights to clerical investment.¹¹⁵ Assumption of the Bavarian episcopate became a key point in Otto's consolidation efforts in the short term, and would later change the dynamic of clerical allegiance in Bavaria away from the duke and trend more towards the office of the king himself. Holzfurtner states that, even though he had largely

¹¹² Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 103-9.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 134-5.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 140.

¹¹⁵ Beumann, *Die Ottonen*, 58.

the same rights and autonomy as Arnulf, Berthold lacked the influence and respect that his older brother was able to garner. As a result, his decade-long tenure as duke – even replete with victories over the Hungarians – was overshadowed by his father and older brother.¹¹⁶

Ultimately, the Luitpolding dynasty absorbed itself into the Ottonians with the marriage of Arnulf's daughter, Judith, to Otto's younger brother, Henry. Henry was then appointed duke of Bavaria following Berthold's death in 948. This officially cemented Ottonian dominion over Bavaria while simultaneously giving due consideration to the authority of Arnulf's line. However, the Luitpolding dynasty as it had existed for roughly two generations no longer existed.

Arnulf's Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries

During and immediately after Arnulf's lifetime, his behavior was not viewed as anything worthy of the disdain his legacy had garnered in the coming centuries. He operated well within the expected behaviors of the South German nobility, and those who dealt with him likely conceptualized his pushes for independence as in line with veneration for Bavaria's ties to the Carolingian past, as well as with the stellar career of his father, Luitpold. However, the early twelfth century brought with it fundamental changes to Bavaria's nobility and clergy, who vastly reinterpreted Arnulf's narrative to better fit the dynastic concerns of the Wittelsbachs.

The earliest vernacular accounts of tenth-century Bavaria were not particularly concerned with Arnulf and his exploits. The *Kaiserchronik* mentions only one event that could be associated with Arnulf: the invasion of the Hungarians and the Bavarian/Swabian victory at the

¹¹⁶ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 140-3.

river Inn in 913. The mention is brief, consisting of only six lines and never mentioning Arnulf or anyone else involved by name.¹¹⁷ As far as twelfth-century vernacular chroniclers were concerned, Arnulf's exploits were not particularly remarkable or noteworthy. This dynamic changed, however, with the writings of Otto of Freising.

Otto's scathing condemnation of Arnulf ultimately set the tone for future chronicles for the next four centuries. Otto's work was not the oldest recounting of Arnulf in a negative light, though it was certainly among the most widely circulated.¹¹⁸ The earliest counts of Arnulf's singularly damning action of mass secularization stemmed from the writings of Gerhard, the Provost of the Cathedral of Augsburg in the 980s. His *Vita Sancti Udalrici* (*The Life of St. Ulrich*) was the first to mention of Arnulf's secularization as remarkable and condemnable, as well as the first to insert St. Ulrich into a pivotal role in Arnulf's narrative.¹¹⁹ Gerhard described the secularization as the *destructio multorum monasteriorum*, "destruction of many monasteries," and laid the groundwork for the morally-oriented narrative of opposition between Arnulf and the righteous St. Ulrich and his ally in Christ, Henry the Fowler.¹²⁰ This conceptualization was not unheard of at the time, as monastically-produced salvation histories of the tenth through twelfth centuries often revolved around character judgements of historical persons.¹²¹

Gerhard's writings, as well as the smaller monastic histories produced in Upper Bavaria, influenced Otto's own interpretation Arnulf's life. From this earlier point –the ninth to the mid-twelfth centuries – the motivations for this portrayal seem somewhat self-explanatory. From the

¹¹⁷ *MGH Script. Dt. Chron. Deutsche Kaiserchronik*, 364.

¹¹⁸ Joachim Ehlers, *Otto von Freising, ein intellektueller im Mittelalter: Eine Biographie* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2013), 261-2.

¹¹⁹ Reindel, *Die Bayerische Luitpoldinger*, 80-92.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 80.

¹²¹ Chinca and Young, "Uses of the Past in Twelfth Century Germany," 20-1.

perspective of the monasteries involved, particularly the exceptionally-exploited monastery of Tegernsee, Arnulf's secularization was disruptive and destructive.¹²² Moreover, the political makeup of the episcopate had been dramatically reworked, seeing as the king of East Francia maintained the sole right to invest bishops to the Bavarian Church following the deposition of Eberhard. However, these regional experiences and agendas ultimately received a significant amount of exposure through Otto of Freising's *Two Cities*, as his source base for Bavarian aristocratic history consisted of smaller chronicles from the monasteries of Upper Bavaria.

Otto of Freising's narrative of Arnulf's career reads as something of a tirade in his predominantly deferential and seemingly dispassionate chronicle. Otto ignored the majority of Arnulf's earlier accomplishments against the Hungarians and instead merely referenced the invasion as a whole and its effects on Bavaria and Swabia. This went as far as to not referencing Arnulf at all at the Battle of the Inn. Otto mainly concerned himself with Arnulf's rebellion against Konrad and his exile into Hungary.¹²³ In his recollection, Arnulf utilized the death of King Konrad – who curiously died in a manner wholly unrelated to Arnulf in this account – as an opportunity to reenter Bavaria and wage war with the newly-elected Henry. Otto claimed that the virtuous Henry persuaded Arnulf to halt his illegal campaign of conquest across his former holdings in exchange for the return of his duchy. It was then under Henry's beneficence that Arnulf was allowed his churches and monasteries, which he promptly exploited and robbed of their property for the benefit of his army. Otto then cites Gerhard's *Life of St. Ulrich* directly with a distinctive parable: a dream St. Ulrich experienced after Arnulf's return from Hungary.

¹²² Reindel, *Die Bayerische Luitpoldinger*, 91.

¹²³ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 376.

The dream details two swords, one representing Henry the Fowler, the other representing Arnulf. The two swords are identical, save for Arnulf's missing its hilt. According to Otto, the two men were identical, save for Arnulf lacking "wisdom and justice" (*capite et iusticia*). This comparison speaks to the apocryphal nature of Arnulf's relationship with Henry present within tenth century clerical accounts, which is altogether absent from early courtly epics such as the *Kaiserchronik*.

Understanding the historicity of Otto's claims and how they differ from modern accounts of what may have actually happened, is important in highlighting key thematic through-lines which chroniclers utilized and appropriated in the following centuries for a variety of potential reasons. Otto first mentioned Arnulf in relation to the death of Luitpold, who was killed in battle by the invading Hungarians. The battle in question was the disastrous Battle of Pressburg in 907, which also caused the deaths of the archbishop of Salzburg, the bishops of Freising and Bolzano-Brixen, and nineteen Bavarian nobles.¹²⁴ Otto may have had multiple reasons for understating this event. For narrative purposes, Otto utilized the invasion of the Hungarians to outline the state of the Frankish Empire as a whole. He structured these events to set up the ultimate assertion that the Kingdom of Germany which resulted from Konrad's eventual death was a natural successor to Charlemagne's empire in a similar way that the Ptolemies of Egypt succeeded the Pharaohs.¹²⁵ The reason for this structure likely resides in contemporaneous attitudes towards the Carolingian Empire, as the twelfth century saw Charlemagne's cultural resurgence under a consolidationist Frederick Barbarossa. Otto's proximity to Barbarossa and the

¹²⁴ Reindel, *Die Bayerischen Luitpoldinger*, 67; Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 23, 32.

¹²⁵ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 376-7.

office of the emperor in general may have informed this interpretation, especially the traditional perception of Arnulf as an anti-king to the rightful and justly-elected Henry.

As for the deeds of Arnulf himself, Otto paradoxically attempts to understate both his positive and negative contributions to Bavaria. Otto gives little stock in one of Arnulf's greatest victories against the Hungarians, the Battle of the Inn in 913, instead stating that they were defeated by Swabians and Bavarians. Otto then immediately states that Arnulf rebelled against his king and was forced to flee to Hungary before detailing Konrad's death, the rightful election of Henry the Fowler, and the justification for the Kingdom of Germany to succeed the Frankish Empire. Otto may have maintained this particular perspective to portray respect and strength to the office of Emperor Konrad. While Konrad was elected unanimously, his rule was rife with invasions from without and revolts from within. Despite Otto's assertion, Arnulf was not the only noble in rebellion against Konrad. Multiple Swabian and Rhenish nobles rebelled following the election and many of them claimed they had comparable or greater claim to the throne.¹²⁶ Moreover, it is still ambiguous whether Arnulf's rebellion was directly responsible for Konrad's death, as Konrad was allegedly wounded and later died in December of 918.¹²⁷ In regard to Arnulf's secularization of Church holdings and his rebellion against Henry, Otto depicts Arnulf as "at first too weak, expending all of his energies to become king."¹²⁸ It is likely that Otto's lack of condemnation towards Arnulf's actions and minimization of his impact were attempts to maintain Konrad's credibility and understate Arnulf's influence over – and disruption of – imperial politics.

¹²⁶ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 27-9.

¹²⁷ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 120-2.

¹²⁸ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 379.

As well as misrepresenting Arnulf's relative power during his reign, Otto of Freising also attempted to recontextualize his secularization as a whole. In *The Two Cities*, Otto places Arnulf's secularization after his reconciliation with Henry in 919, rather than between 907 and 914, when Hungarian invasions were at their peak.¹²⁹ Holzfurtner and Schmid attest to Arnulf's procurement of Church lands as a means of supplying what they refer to as the *Ungarnabwehr* (defense from the Hungarians), which was a widespread practice throughout the South German nobility in this time of crisis.¹³⁰ By placing Arnulf's secularization of Church lands during a time of relative peace, Otto portrays him as abusive of his own position. This distinction better suits Otto's purpose of portraying Arnulf as the antithesis of Henry in every possible way; by his reckoning, Arnulf is impious, ambitious, and disobedient. Through this characterization, Ulrich's alleged vision was essentially the apocryphal evidence needed to support this depiction of Arnulf.

Otto of Freising's work may have been the most high-profile chronicle to critically approach the rule of Arnulf of Bavaria, but it was informed by much smaller existing works spread out throughout Upper Bavaria's monasteries. One monastery, however, played a greater role in the construction of Arnulf's narrative through the proliferation of Otto's interpretation and the strict curation of the growing esteem of the house of Wittelsbach.

The Abbey of Scheyern in the bishopric of Freising was intrinsically involved with bishop Otto and the Wittelsbachs. The monastic group was first established in 1078 in

¹²⁹ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 379; Reindel, *Die Bayerischen Luitpoldinger*, 80.

¹³⁰ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulfs*, 19; Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 62-3.

Bayrischzell before being moved to the castle of the small village of Scheuern in 1119.¹³¹ It was no coincidence that Scheuern itself was one of the final bastions of the Luitpolding dynasty, with Arnulf's son, Arnulf II, constructing its castle in 940 and one of the first to use the title *Graf von Scheuern* (Count of Scheuern).¹³² The monks of Scheuern followed the Benedictine traditions of the monastery of Hirsau, which spearheaded the Swabian monastic reform movement during the Investiture Controversy. However, shortly after the monastery's relocation to Scheuern, the local counts became heavily involved in its administration. From the end of the twelfth to the mid-thirteenth centuries, the counts of Scheuern also functioned as advocates (*Vögte*) of the monastery. This fundamentally shifted the dynamic away from monastic reformers who wanted to divest themselves from secular authority over religious appointments and subsequently forced the monastery to reconcile their reformist attitudes with being explicitly controlled by those same secular authorities.¹³³ The authorities in question were the forefathers of the house of Wittelsbach, who attempted to fashion the Abbey of Scheuern into their own version of the Abbey of St. Denis near Paris, that is to say a repository for official chronicles as well as its dynastic crypt.¹³⁴

This desire for dynastic continuity and direct control over the spiritual aspects their holdings might have been one of the reasons for Otto of Freising's open disdain for the early Scheuern Wittelsbachs. Otto himself was conspicuously disdainful of the Wittelsbachs as a whole, primarily for their favoritism of the emperor and opposition to papal primacy during the

¹³¹ Ferdinand Kramer, "Geschichtsschreibung Zwischen Rückbesinnung auf Hirsauer Tradition und Adeligem Machtanspruch: Eine quellenkritische Studie zur Scheuerner Chronik," *Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte* 57 (1994): 363-4.

¹³² Karl Bosl, *Bosls bayerische Biographie* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1983), 28.

¹³³ Kramer, "Geschichtsschreibung Zwischen Rückbesinnung auf Hirsauer Tradition," 368-71.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 351-2.

Investiture Controversy. His stance was firmly in the camp of papal authority, and early Wittelsbach attempts to maintain secular control over the Bavarian Church was a point of contention for Otto. Moreover, the Wittelsbachs supported the house of Welf during their conflicts with Otto's and Barbarossa's house of Babenberg. This could provide a reason for Otto's harsh treatment of Arnulf, as the Luitpolding dynasty historically had ties to the counts of Scheyern, an office held by the prominent Wittelsbach of his own time, Otto Rotkopf. One of the purest examples of Otto of Freising's disdain for the Wittelsbachs appears in the *Two Cities*, where he recounts an anonymous count of Scheyern – likely one of Arnulf's sons – who allegedly colluded with the Hungarians before Otto the Great's famous Battle of Lechfeld. Bishop Otto takes it upon himself to insult Count Otto Rotkopf of Wittelsbach by equating the lineage of the counts of Scheyern to traitors and barbarian sympathizers.¹³⁵ Ironically, it was Bishop Otto's patron, Frederick Barbarossa, who catapulted the early Wittelsbachs to the ducal seat of Bavaria with the appointment of Otto Rotkopf in 1180, some forty years after Otto's death.¹³⁶ However, Otto of Freising's harsh judgement on the house of Wittelsbach, and the subsequent recontextualizing of Arnulf through his association with it, appear to have been either ignored, coopted, or left unnoticed by those assembling the official story of the dynasty at the monastery of Scheyern.

Abbot Konrad of Scheyern was the first to compile its chronicle during the 1210s. While abbot of Scheyern, Konrad predictably worked closely with the house of Wittelsbach, as well as their competitors, in the religious oversight of the diocese of Freising. On occasion, he mediated

¹³⁵ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 53-4.

¹³⁶ Moeglin, "Genealogie der Wittelsbacher," 35-6.

territorial disputes between other monasteries and Duke Ludwig and personally oversaw appointments to hundreds of clerical positions.¹³⁷ Konrad's tenure as abbot was inextricably linked to the more secular side of ducal administration, and it was likely that codifying the dynastic continuity of the newly-ascended house of Wittelsbach aided in that venture. By the end of the century, this narrative was given even greater validation and elucidation through the efforts of the monastery of Niederalteich, until a "definitive" narrative of dynastic continuity was available for the Bavarian nobility by the fourteenth century.¹³⁸

The accounts of Arnulf from Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities* and the *Chronicle of Scheyern* have many similarities, though the latter was much more inflammatory and slanderous in its depiction of the duke. In regard to his secularization, the *Chronicle of Scheyern* follows bishop Otto's lead in recontextualizing Arnulf's secularization, citing Otto in the text as the first to record the affront. Due to this reliance on Otto's work, Konrad also places Arnulf's annexation of Church property as an opportunistic response to regaining his position as duke, rather than as a significantly earlier occurrence made for the defense of Bavaria against invasion.¹³⁹ The most outlandish of abbot Konrad's assertions is the claim that Arnulf, upon fleeing to Hungary after his defeat at the hands of King Konrad, married a Hungarian princess in a pagan wedding. This detail seems to have been dropped in later vernacular translations of the chronicle.¹⁴⁰ This claim to paganism was a conscious choice in abbot Konrad's mind – and Bishop Otto before him – to distance and invalidate the Luitpolding branch of the counts of

¹³⁷ Kramer, "Geschichtsschreibung Zwischen Rückbesinnung auf Hirsaurer Tradition," 360-1.

¹³⁸ Karl Rudolf Schnith, "Die Geschichtsschreibung im Herzogtum Bayern unter den ersten Wittelsbachern (1180-1347)" in *Wittelsbach und Bayern* (Munich: Hirmer, 1980): 360-2.

¹³⁹ Reindel, *Die Bayerischen Luitpoldinger*, 81-2.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 106-7.

Scheyern, of whom the first Wittelsbach duke was a member. By delegitimizing the now defunct Luitpoldings, Konrad and his successors at the Abbey of Scheyern could focus on constructing an official Wittelsbach narrative which could persist through the Middle Ages.

The vernacular mentions of Arnulf by the early thirteenth century primarily stem from the short rhyming chronicles (*Reimchroniken*) of Eberhard von Gandersheim and the *Chronicle of Brunswick*, as well as the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (*Saxon World Chronicle*), the first German-language chronicle written in prose. These chronicles, similar to the *Kaiserchronik*, found their audiences not in the ecclesiastical elite but in the nobility whom they were meant to entertain and educate. In their attempts to educate, these chronicles turned to pre-established sources of ecclesiastical authority for authenticity, namely *Klosterchroniken* and the works of Otto of Freising. However, their depictions of Arnulf highlight significantly different aspects of his life, namely his victory over the Hungarians at the Battle of the Inn. Arnulf's secularization of Church land is either downplayed, absent, or attributed to the Hungarians themselves in the case of the *Sächsische Weltchronik*.¹⁴¹ One of the main reasons for this decision could stem from the fact that the three chronicles were Saxon in origin, and therefore followed a different narrative progenitor.

More noteworthy than that is the poetic chronicles' unique decision to attribute King Konrad's death directly to Arnulf himself, rather than simply stating his death or remaining vague as to how he was wounded in battle. This likely stemmed from the chronicles' Saxon origins and their access to the writings of Benedictine chronicler Widukind of Corvey, whose *Res gestae saxonicae* (*Deeds of the Saxons*) was the most widespread source of this assumption.

¹⁴¹ Reindel, *Die Bayerischen Luitpoldinger*, 104-5.

In this case, both the regional and personal biases are immediately transparent, as Widukind, Eberhard, and the chronicler of Brunswick use almost identical language to describe both Konrad's death and Arnulf's hand in it.¹⁴² The decision to add this detail at the expense of Arnulf's secularization may have been to help emphasize Henry the Fowler's importance in stabilizing East Francia and establishing a lasting imperial dynasty. If so, it would prove a far cry from Otto of Freising's and Konrad of Scheyern's goal to lambast Arnulf's moral standing and distance him from the newer, more esteemed Wittelsbachs.

Otto of Freising's and Konrad of Scheyern's attempts to control the narrative of Arnulf were extremely successful for a number of reasons. Even though Otto of Freising was incredibly critical of the Wittelsbachs during his lifetime, Arnulf's secularization of Church land – as understood by early monastic chronicles – was antithetical to Otto's views of the relationship between clergy and nobility. Konrad and the monks of Scheyern, writing roughly seventy years after Otto, expounded on his perspective of Arnulf with the added intention of disparaging and delegitimizing his rule. This intent is patently obvious through their claims regarding his and his brother's marriages to Hungarian princesses. The purpose of such inflammatory claims was the dynastic legitimization of the Wittelsbachs at the expense of the extinct Luitpoldings. The third factor for Arnulf's characterization in the high Middle Ages – besides Otto's disdain for lay authority over the clergy and Konrad's circle's desire to legitimize the Wittelsbachs – was the ease with which the characters of Arnulf and Henry the Fowler could be made thematically and morally opposed. The dualistic nature of the king/anti-king perception of the events of the time created a compelling narrative on which the more nuanced biases of later authors were grafted.

¹⁴² Reindel, *Die Bayerischen Luitpoldinger*, 118, 129.

Arnulf's Narrative in the Fifteenth Century

The fifteenth century saw a renewed interest in the formation and legitimization of particular arms of the Wittelsbach dynasty during a period of familial strife and disunity. As with the narrative of Tassilo III, the narrative of Arnulf posed another opportunity for interested parties within the courts of Bayern-München, Bayern-Ingolstadt, and Bayern-Landshut to put their own unique perspectives on a contentious and traditionally derided figure. By this point, centuries' worth of regional chronicles had been constructed in the tradition of bishop Otto and the Abbey of Scheyern. Unlike Tassilo, who was able to strike some measure of pity or grace within some chronicles, Arnulf was universally reviled and had few to no redeeming qualities present in accounts mentioning him.

The division of the house of Wittelsbach at the end of the fourteenth century saw a subsequent split in its official narrative. The *Landesteilung* (division of patrimony) of 1392 facilitated another boom in Wittelsbach efforts for legitimation, but the family was not unified in that regard, due to frequent exchanges of territory. One of the main efforts for legitimation outside of chronicling, which nevertheless influenced their construction, was the creation of the *Scheyerer Fürstentafel* (Scheyern Table of Princes) and the commission of numerous artistic depictions of the dynasty throughout all three duchies. Duke Ludwig the Bearded of Bayern-Ingolstadt commissioned the construction of the *Fürstentafel* shortly after the division of the duchy for the express purpose of creating a definitive reference to the legitimacy of the Ingolstadt Wittelsbachs on the walls of the Abbey of Scheyern itself, while duke Ludwig of Bayern-Landshut commissioned a number of frescos on the walls of many Landshuter castles. These tangible reference materials provided ostensibly more credible claims to certain arms of

the Wittelsbach dynasty, and played a substantial role in the works of fifteenth-century chroniclers.¹⁴³

Andreas von Regensburg was one of the first to specifically write a chronicle of Bavaria. Since he was associated with the court of Bayern-Ingolstadt, it was his job to utilize the Abbey of Scheyern – which lay within the influence of Bayern-Ingolstadt but was ostensibly free of secular oversight – in order to write his chronicle. Unsurprisingly, Andreas von Regensburg's chronicle follows the narrative of Otto of Freising and the *Chronicle of Scheyern* quite closely, only diverging to elaborate on the disparate claims of the two.

Andreas von Regensburg begins his account of Arnulf with the duke's rebellion against King Konrad. Similar to most other accounts on the rebellion, Andreas keeps the details vague regarding the circumstances of Konrad's death following Arnulf's return from exile in Hungary. This section bears the greatest similarity to Otto of Freising's account, as he translates some sentences verbatim from the original Latin.¹⁴⁴ Also similar to Otto's account is his incorrect chronology regarding the secularization of Church land, painting the act as an exploitation of his position once he was allowed to return as duke. This serves largely the same purpose which Otto intended: to retroactively remove the necessity for the secularization of Church land as a normal and effective method for the nobility to consolidate their holdings in times of crisis. This perspective was popular among reformers such as Otto, and those who followed similar pro-papal clerical traditions, such as Andreas.

¹⁴³ Moeglin, "Genealogie der Wittelsbacher," 42.

¹⁴⁴ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 615.

One of the primary themes throughout Andreas' criticism of Arnulf is his proclivity to mention the obedient (*gehorsam*) nature of the Bavarian nobility in comparison. According to Holzfurtner, this was patently not the case. The system, as it existed in the tenth century, was filled with infighting, regionalism, and bids for dynastic consolidation throughout eastern and southern Germany, most of which hastened the collapse of Frankish hegemony.¹⁴⁵ By painting the Bavarian nobility – as well as the nobility of the entire Holy Roman Empire – as obedient and respectful of the elections of Konrad and later Henry the Fowler, Andreas attempted to maintain Arnulf as outside of the norm. In actuality, Arnulf was within the norm with the exception of the influence he was able to successfully muster against Konrad and Henry.

Andreas follows bishop Otto's suit in his emphasis on the prophecy of St. Ulrich. Moreover, Andreas seems to put more stock into the apocryphal event than Otto himself. Rather than copying Otto's works verbatim, as he had done for a significant portion of his chronicle, he attempts to give greater credence to the event through elaboration of key details. Similar to the traditions of *Klosterchroniken* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Andreas attempts to make his moral judgements on Arnulf as unambiguous as possible. Otto's interpretation of Ulrich's vision of the two swords was that Arnulf simply lacked "wisdom and guidance." Andreas explicitly states the reason for this perceived lack of moral character, that is to say, the secularization and kingly ambitions. By Andreas' recollection, Arnulf was revealed to Ulrich as the hiltless sword because he was deemed as useless in comparison to the utility and might of Henry:

Das ist der Arnoldus, den man vermerkcht damit, das sand Ulreich, bischoff zu
Auspurg, als man das in seiner legend list, ein swert an ein gehilez geczaigt wart,

¹⁴⁵ Holzfurtner, *Gloriosus Dux*, 114-6.

der unnützlich begert künig warden, darumb er beschedigt das reych, und das er daz behaben möcht, darumb zestört er dy kirchen und chlöster und begabt mit iren gütern dy layten.¹⁴⁶

It should be noted regarding this Arnold that St. Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg, as one reads in his hagiography, was shown a sword without a hilt; [it was] he who injuriously desired to become king, to which end he damaged the Empire, and he so wanted to obtain this that he destroyed the churches and monasteries and endowed the laity with their estates.

Andreas' attempts to clearly state the reason for Ulrich's prophesy, namely Arnulf's secularization of Church land, whereas Otto attempted to keep the affronts themselves implied. For added moral impact, Andreas includes an aside, stating vaguely that Arnulf's death was in part because Ulrich's pleading to change his behavior had gone unheeded.¹⁴⁷

Andreas von Regensburg's writing style reflects and expounds upon earlier traditions while simultaneously attempting to change their focus. Chronicle-writing by the fifteenth century had evolved to include the education of the nobility and the elucidation of their position and legitimacy within a historical framework. Moreover, moral judgements present within earlier chronicling traditions practiced by the clergy were still present, though with an added element of pedagogical explanation as to the real-world consequences of immoral leadership. This is especially prominent in Andreas' case, as his criticisms of Arnulf's actions contain both an explicit political ramification or explanation, as well as overt spiritual condemnation.

There are two primary examples of this dynamic present within Andreas' chronicle. The first is his observation of Arnulf's control over the Bavarian clergy following his reinstatement as duke, which Andreas presents as a concession made by Henry the Fowler in order to prevent

¹⁴⁶ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 615.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 615.

unnecessary violence. He describes this concession as having unintended consequences, however; he outlines Arnulf's ensuing disregard for the clergy's right to their own property as his "jurisdiction/authority over all bishops in Bavaria" (*gewalt über all bischoffe in Bayren*).¹⁴⁸ The primary purpose this judgement serves is to reinforce the ideal level of involvement the nobility should have with the clergy and their property. Despite the relative success of reformists in the eleventh through thirteenth centuries, the nobility still regularly wrested control of land from the clergy within their jurisdictions.¹⁴⁹

The second, more specific example of Andreas' style of both spiritual and moral pedagogy involves his account of the treatment of Arnulf's body after his death in 937. Andreas' chronicle is the first of the fifteenth-century *Landeschroniken* to mention Arnulf's final resting place in the Abbey of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, and to infer that the body itself might not actually have been there. By Andreas' recollection, Arnulf's body was indeed originally buried at St. Emmeram's Abbey, but at some point, the spirit of St. Emmeram himself judged Arnulf to be unsuitable for interment, and demanded his body be removed. His body was subsequently exhumed and cast into the lake near Scheyern, where it was accepted by the Devil. This particular detail within Arnulf's narrative had a discrete purpose from the perspective of an author in the Wittelsbach camp and the desecration of the bodies of evil advocates and nobles was by this time a traditional narrative trope in clerical polemics and didactic poetry.¹⁵⁰

One of the main aims of the *Chronicle of Scheyern* – as well as earlier *Klosterchroniken* – was the authors' conscious efforts to distance Arnulf from the Wittelsbach dynasty through

¹⁴⁸ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 615.

¹⁴⁹ Kathleen Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 161.

¹⁵⁰ Wittig, "The Middle High German Kaiserchronik," 97-9.

delegitimization. Regensburg itself served as the capital of the duchy of Bavaria under the Agilolfings and the Kingdom of Bavaria under the Carolingians. The Abbey of St. Emmeram in particular was an important symbol for the German nobility, as it served as the resting place for queen Emma of the East Franks (wife of Ludwig the German), Engelberga (wife of emperor Ludwig II), and the last two Carolingian emperors, Emperor Arnulf, and his son, Ludwig the Child. Rather than giving Arnulf legitimacy in sharing his resting place with foundational Bavarian figures, Andreas von Regensburg – as well as those from whom he claimed to have heard the story – utilized divine judgement as a means of justifying the alleged absence of his body. This further confirms the Wittelsbachs' primary goal of legitimization, as well as the anxieties over the existence of an apostate like Arnulf to that goal.

Andreas' primary contribution to the house of Wittelsbach – outside of being the de facto forefather of Bavarian *Landeschroniken* – was his reinterpretation of Bavarian dynastic continuity for the fifteenth century.¹⁵¹ The goal of chronicling by the fifteenth century had shifted from the legitimization of the Wittelsbach dynasty as a whole to the exultation of the particular branch of the Wittelsbach dynasty each individual chronicler was aligned with. Arnulf's reputation suffered significantly from this dynamic, as portions of Otto of Freising's chronicle were summarily dismissed to provide historical precedent for favoring one branch of the Wittelsbach dynasty over the other. This served the express purpose of neatly tying together the unbroken dynastic continuity the Wittelsbachs desired throughout the Middle Ages. The change in question involves the significant shift of making Arnulf "the Bad" a Carolingian and the wayward son of Emperor Arnulf, and fabricating a brother, Werner, who becomes the count

¹⁵¹ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 47.

of Scheyern.¹⁵² With this revision, pro-Wittelsbach chroniclers stripped Arnulf of his complicated Luitpolding lineage, while giving precedent to inter-dynastic delegitimization through the damnation of his memory. Moreover, by creating the apocryphal Werner, the Abbey of Scheyern was able to tie the Wittelsbach dynasty directly to the Carolingians without accounting for a more complex genealogy.

Alois Schmid observed that one of the first instances of this shift in genealogy existed in internal records of the Abbey of Scheyern and did not begin to gain widespread circulation until an updated edition of the Chronicle of Scheyern appeared at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Andreas von Regensburg based his chronicle on these claims, even at the expense of Otto of Freising's otherwise unquestionable interpretation of events.¹⁵³ This interpretation was useful for the Ingolstadt branch of the Wittelsbachs, as it justified and gave historical and moral precedent to the disavowal of unsuited members of a noble dynasty. Rival claims to power persisted throughout the tripartite division of Bavaria, and historical examples of inter-dynastic exclusion was a common tactic for legitimacy. However, Andreas' chronicle and his interpretation of events and genealogy continued to have profound influence over the next century of *Landeschroniken* outside of Bayern-Ingolstadt.

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg's *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern* reflects the precedents set by Andreas and Otto in most respects. Ebran adheres closely to the Scheyern genealogy popularized by Andreas and copies entire portions of vernacular translations of Otto's work found in earlier chronicles. For the most part, the narrative of Arnulf is very similar to

¹⁵² Andreas von Regensburg, *sämtliche Werke*, 614-5.

¹⁵³ Schmid, *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 75.

Andreas' *Chronik von den Fürsten zu Bayern*, including the prophesy of St. Ulrich and the anachronizing of Arnulf's appropriation of Church land. Key differences prevail within this narrative, however, given the author's writing style and position in the Wittelsbach nobility.

Ebran personalized his account with editorial asides, such as his lamentation to duke Tassilo over his folly of ambition.¹⁵⁴ In a display of transparency, Ebran cites the exact section of *The Two Cities* in which Otto mentions Arnulf's Luitpolding ancestry and then addresses the bishop directly over his allegedly fallacious claims:

O, du hoch gepreister fürst Otto de Freising, mir tzimbt nicht dir bidertzusprechen, [...]; aber fil barer antzaigen seind, dadurch man erkenen mag, das die tzben pruder, hertzog Arnold und graf Bernher von Scheiren, kaisser Arnolfi sün gebessen, als man fint in irer istori.¹⁵⁵

O, you praiseworthy prince, Otto of Freising, it is not seemly for me to disagree with you, [...]; but there is much clearer evidence through which one can perceive, that the two brothers, Duke Arnulf and Count Werner of Scheyern, were emperor Arnulf's sons, as one finds in their history.

This illuminating aside further outlines the friction between the two main inspirations for *Landeschroniken* in the fifteenth century, that is to say, the chronicle of Otto of Freising and that of the Abbey of Scheyern. While the former greatly influenced and informed the latter, the Chronicle of Scheyern and the chronicles of Andreas von Regensburg saw fit to streamline the narrative of Arnulf into a form that was not only easier to recount but served a practical, political purpose. This dichotomy and friction was not lost on Ebran, as he felt compelled to explain how one of the most credible sources for Bavarian history at that time was patently false in his account.

¹⁵⁴ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 57.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 74-5.

Another proclivity of Ebran's interpretation of Arnulf stems from his more secular perception of events. Ebran's position as *Hofmeister* of Bayern-Landshut required him to have a greater stake in the political realities of Bavaria and provided him with a different perspective on portrayals of key nobility outside the influences of a strictly clerical education. Regarding Arnulf, Ebran organizes his failings more along these terms. Rather than utilizing the more religious moral approach to the narrative used by earlier *Klosterchroniken* and their spiritual successors – like those of Andreas von Regensburg – Ebran broaches the subject along the lines of political efficacy and overall quality of rulership. Even though moral judgements are still present in this interpretation – given the traditions of the medium – Ebran's angle of condemnation stems from a perception of Arnulf's ineptitude at being a proper ruler, whether it is obeying his suzerain or king, effectively taking territory, or properly managing his duchy.¹⁵⁶

According to Dicker, Ebran was forced to differentiate his writings from Andreas von Regensburg's by honing in on the specific importance of individual bloodlines of each line of Wittelsbach and the outcomes that each member precipitated onto Bavaria as a whole.¹⁵⁷ While this structure and content was meant to laud the Landshuter Wittelsbachs, the projection of these values backward onto pre-Wittelsbach Bavaria further shaped and defined the memory of Arnulf's actions. By coopting Andreas' clerical narrative into one ostensibly more accessible by the nobility and divested from moral judgement, Ebran effectively recontextualized Arnulf's narrative for a new audience while keeping the overall nature of condemnation untampered. Though Arnulf was still considered evil for his illegitimacy, ambition, and disregard for the

¹⁵⁶ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 73-6.

¹⁵⁷ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 83-5.

rights of the Church, Ebran saw fit to add an ineptitude and arrogance to Arnulf that could only be remedied with the intervention of proper leadership in the form of the Ottonians, much like his interpretation of Tassilo and the intervention of Charlemagne.¹⁵⁸

Ulrich Füetrer's interpretation, according to Dicker, relies almost exclusively on Ebran's structure, as well as his and Andreas' exact wording.¹⁵⁹ That being said, Füetrer's *Bayerische Chronik* differs in interpretation in some key respects. Given Füetrer's artistic and poetic background – as well as the more overt aims of his benefactors, the Bayern-München Wittelsbachs – many key events were recharacterized to make Arnulf simply a more compelling antagonist. One glaring example of this treatment lies in his appraisal of Arnulf's secularization, which he characterizes as the literal wanton destruction and pillaging of monasteries with the army of Hungarians and “other heathens” he had recruited while in exile. With this conception, Arnulf is reduced to simply another Hungarian warlord, which Füetrer had up to this point categorized with uniform disdain.¹⁶⁰ On the sliding scale between entertaining embellishment and pedagogical or educational merit, liberties such as this one – which fall outside even the established tropes and interpretations put forth by later chronicles – place Füetrer's chronicle on the side of entertainment more than the other fifteenth-century contemporaries.

Dicker postulates that one of the reasons for embellishments such as this revolve around the relative impotence of the duchy of Bayern-München around the time of Füetrer's writing. According to Dicker, duke Albrecht IV commissioned the chronicle more expressly for the purpose of historical interest and entertainment rather than a conscious attempt to solidify

¹⁵⁸ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 78-9.

¹⁵⁹ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 115.

¹⁶⁰ Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 131.

genealogies. In terms of relative power, the duchies Bayern-Ingolstadt and Bayern-Landshut were more direct competitors of one another, leaving the court of Bayern-München with less potential to legitimize itself within the Wittelsbach sphere. As such, the court of Bayern-München employed courtiers such as Füetrer to pursue narratives that were less calculated, leading to more liberal use of historical embellishment. Moreover, the Wittelsbach-München line under Albrecht was in danger of extinction at the time of Füetrer's writing – given the lack of male heirs within the family – further disincentivizing Füetrer to make dynastic succession and legitimation a top priority.¹⁶¹

As transparent as Füetrer and the court of Bayern-München's motivations for chronicle-writing might seem relative to their contemporaries in the other duchies, that does not diminish Füetrer's influence in propagating the narrative of Arnulf in a demonstrably more negative light. His more entertaining narrative, removed even further from historical reality than those of his contemporaries, reflects the consensus at the time that Arnulf was indeed a damnable figure. However, the reason for that damnation – even within the traditions set by Andreas von Regensburg – seem to have been easily disregarded in favor of a more digestible narrative for the growing audience of those interested in *Landeschroniken*.

Veit Arnpeck's work attempted to harken back to what contemporary scholars believed to be a more academically sound, objective, and rigorous method of chronicling. His reverence for classical and early ecclesiastical chronicles of the early and high Middle Ages shines through in nearly all of his works, as his chronicles bear the marks of exhaustive research and ostensible objectivity befitting early humanists, such as inclusion of exact dates. His appraisal of Arnulf,

¹⁶¹ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 118-9.

however, may appear to vehemently contradict this ethos. Schmid explains this aptly in his assessment of Arnpeck's views of the duke: "For Arnpeck, Arnulf is not only the destroyer of the Bavarian Church, but a depraved individual in every respect, an immoderate eater and drinker, whose evil and harsh demands against the clergy earned the obscene mockery and ridicule of St. Ulrich and all priests."¹⁶² Arnpeck's esteem for older and eclectic sources seemingly created a narrative more closely mirroring earlier narratives and preconceptions of Arnulf.

One of Arnpeck's primary source bases – outside of the obligatory writings of Otto of Freising – was in fact the Freising Traditions Codex, as well as the bishopric's official copybook. The use of this source facilitated Arnpeck's intimate knowledge of the exchange and annexation of Church goods under Arnulf, as well as centuries-old transcriptions and copies of *Klosterchroniken* not intended for circulation. While Arnpeck was familiar with the genealogy of the Abbey of Scheyern simply through citation of Andreas von Regensburg and Ebran, his perspective forwent the carefully-curated and omnipresent narrative and bloodline that had emanated from the Wittelsbach abbey for centuries.¹⁶³ Arnpeck fully regarded Arnulf as the son of margrave Luitpold and decided not to address any prevalent narrative to the contrary, largely ignoring the recent tradition of the use of the phrase "ettlich sagen" (some say) present in nearly every other chronicle in the fifteenth century when addressing a prominent or contradictory narrative. This decision was likely influenced by Arnpeck's humanist education at the university of Vienna, one of the earlier centers of humanism outside of Italy. The rich chronicling tradition of his native Freising also led to a style and methodology that not only revered Otto in a

¹⁶² Schmid, *Das Bild der Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 69.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 73.

rhetorical sense, but one he intentionally attempted to match in scope, content, and attention to detail.¹⁶⁴

Though he maintains traditional condemnation of Arnulf, Arnpeck's reverence for earlier sources helped to fully divorce him from the Wittelsbach narrative and construct one that was markedly different from his contemporaries and immediate predecessors. Arnpeck's lack of interest in dynastic continuity was something of note, according to Dicker, as his education favored the history of the structures of Bavaria as a whole, rather than bending that narrative around a particular dynasty. Arnpeck even goes so far as to dedicate the entire prologue of his original Latin chronicle, *Chronica Baioariorum*, to his perspective that the machinations of dynasty have no influence as a political element in the history of Bavaria.¹⁶⁵ As such, Arnpeck's primary goal with regard to Arnulf was to focus on his ultimate impact on the duchy of Bavaria holistically, which he does using nearly all of the predefined tropes found in high medieval *Klosterchroniken*.

Arnpeck adds much more detail to the pre-existing tropes and apocryphal events present in the clerical accounts of Arnulf, such as the prophesy of St. Ulrich and Arnulf's final resting place in the "Teufelssee" (Devil's Lake) outside of Scheyern. Arnpeck gives Ulrich's prophesy significantly more gravitas, weight, and narrative detail than in other contemporaneous chroniclers. In addition to the dream of the two swords, Arnpeck describes the spirits of saints and martyrs appearing before Ulrich and proclaiming that if Arnulf refuses to recant for his desecration of the churches, that he will die within a year, replete with conversations between the

¹⁶⁴ Schmid, *Das Bild der Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 73-4.

¹⁶⁵ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 141.

immortal saints over Arnulf's misdeeds. Naturally, Arnulf refuses St. Ulrich's plea to recant, insolently stating that he is in such fine health and so prosperous that it would be impossible.¹⁶⁶ According to Schmid, these details were later inventions that had been likely passed down as an evolution of apocryphal anecdotes among the Bavarian clergy, rather than through any existing sources. This is a notable decision on Arnpeck's part, as his primary philosophy as a chronicler was to compile information from older writings that he deemed more reliable and less embellished.¹⁶⁷

However, despite the moralizing and editorializing of this portion of the Arnulf narrative, Arnpeck's chronicle is the most accurate account of the time. His use of records outside of chronicles, such as charters and contracts for goods exchanged, allowed him to follow Arnulf's reign to the year. Schmid postulates that the reasoning for this ostensible dissonance in integrity vis-à-vis the prophesy of Ulrich and Arnulf's death may have been due to an apparent rhetorical need for Arnulf to stay a pariah in the eye of the Bavarian nobility. Since Arnpeck's account lacked the Wittelsbach-approved detail that Arnulf was an illegitimate heir of the Carolingians, he instead decided to accentuate earlier clerical moralizing to act as a didactic warning for nobles attempting to make enemies of the Church.¹⁶⁸

Arnpeck's methodology harkened a shift in chronicling into the early modern period, as chroniclers became less involved in exploring and establishing the dynastic continuities of its rulers and more involved in either urban chronicling or monastic humanism (*Klosterhumanismus*). Nevertheless, some tropes and eccentricities present in Arnpeck's

¹⁶⁶ Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, 479-80.

¹⁶⁷ Schmid, *Das Bild der Bayernherzogs Arnulf*, 74-6.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 77.

chronicles have much older and fewer formal origins and influences regarding Arnulf. While Italian and Viennese humanists such as Arnpeck garnered a reputation for large source bases and exhaustive research, he was still susceptible to the presuppositions and cultural preconceptions found within said source bases and his innate personal biases as a clergyman.

Conclusion

The narrative of Arnulf of Bavaria is the most contentious and varied of the narratives discussed in this thesis, primarily due to its consistent re-appropriation across the centuries. From the earliest *Klosterchroniken* of Freising and Tegernsee, the damnation of Arnulf's memory was simply a reaction to his conduct; he had appropriated vast swathes of land and goods from the Church in order to defend Bavaria from the Hungarian invasions of the early tenth century. While more courtly-minded chroniclers contemporaneous to Arnulf, such as Liudprand of Cremona, realized that Arnulf's secularization was somewhat excessive and derided his attempts at independence, he was not reviled as a pariah and permanent stain on the duchy of Bavaria.

The twelfth and thirteenth centuries saw a radical shift in this narrative by the end, as earlier *Klosterchroniken*, spurred on by exceptionally prolific entries such as Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities* in the 1140s, played into an official narrative set forth by the house of Wittelsbach at the Abbey of Scheyern. This narrative – codified in the *Chronicle of Scheyern* in the first half of the thirteenth century by Abbot Konrad – provided a template for the narrative that would persist into the ensuing centuries. Arnulf's narrative in the fourteenth century – as with the process of chronicling in general – did not experience any significant proliferation outside the Church.

The increase of chronicling after the tripartite division of Bavaria in 1392 resulted in the reassessment of the Arnulf narrative after a century of apocryphal additions on behalf of both the regular and secular clergy. These additions included further elaboration on Otto of Freising's prophecy of St. Ulrich, the anachronizing of Arnulf's secularization after his reinstatement as duke following his rebellion against Henry the Fowler, and the mislabeling of Arnulf of Bavaria as the son of Emperor Arnulf of East Francia. These changes all served an important purpose in dynastic legitimation. Andreas von Regensburg worked closely with the Abbey of Scheyern to maintain continuity of narrative regarding Arnulf, at times actively contradicting the seemingly immutable works of Otto of Freising.

Andreas' influence dictated the narratives of other competing chronicles which appeared later in the century, such as those of Ebran and Füetrer, which highlighted and embellished different aspects respective of their authors' occupations and relative power of their patron houses. In the case of Ebran, his position as *Hofmeister* of Landshut and status as a noble rather than a clergyman manifested as a predilection for meticulous detail for dynastic succession among all three branches of the Wittelsbachs and editorializing asides. Füetrer's chronicle – though nearly identical to that of Andreas with regard to general content – took great liberties in the characterizing of Arnulf, as his aims were more transparently for entertainment rather than lauding the house of Wittelsbach or the legitimization of a particular branch. This likely came from his more creative occupation as painter and epic poet combined with the comparatively weak position of his patron Munich Wittelsbachs around the time of his writing. Altogether, these fifteenth-century interpretations proved the progenitors of Bavarian *Landeschroniken*,

which monastic and clerical humanists later redefined and reinterpreted in the sixteenth century after the reunification of Bavaria in 1505.

Veit Arnpeck's chronicles provided a glimpse of the humanist template when applied to the narrative of Arnulf. While Arnpeck vehemently denounced the importance of the Wittelsbach hegemony over Bavaria, he ultimately utilized many allegorical and didactic devices created through official pro-Wittelsbach interpretations and honed throughout the Middle Ages. In foregoing more recent chronicles on Bavarian history, Arnpeck relied on the official records and chronicles provided by the diocese of Freising. This source base, and his veneration for the traditions of monastic histories, led him to utilize the narrative of Arnulf to many of the same ends as those histories. However, with the shifting nature of chronicling from recordkeeping to pedagogy by the time of his writing, Arnpeck required a cautionary tale to which the nobility had previously been exposed. By utilizing more contemporaneous details to the narrative than the vast majority of his source base, Arnulf was able to effectively convey Otto of Freising's sentiment, albeit to a greater extent and for a different purpose.

Arnulf of Bavaria's tenure as duke was one of extreme highs and lows. He gained the ire of the Church and sections of the nobility who viewed Bavarian autonomy as a threat to imperial authority. Even though Arnulf likely viewed himself as a servant to his king or emperor and acted logically along those lines in his conditional resistance to assimilation and consolidation, his actions retroactively became labelled as overly ambitious and impious through reinterpretation. The role of his narrative ranged from a cautionary parable of salvation history, to a justification for dynastic ostracism and infighting, to an example of political ineptitude, to the devious machinations of a one-note antagonist, and to a synthesis of all of the above

throughout the fifteenth century, all indicative of the political strife and the intellectual and rhetorical changes transpiring among Bavaria's elite into the early modern period.

Moreover, Arnulf's narrative provided a perfect opportunity for political, rhetorical and ideological recontextualization throughout the centuries. Chroniclers from Otto to Arnpeck viewed him as a nexus of misdeeds and personality flaws that could not be redeemed even in the most charitable sense. Bavarian aristocratic identity solidified itself around narratives such as Arnulf's, as it was sufficiently grounded in historical fact to act as a real-world parable along the lines of courtly poetry and salvation histories. These histories informed the values of the Bavarian nobility and – into the early modern period – the Bavarian urban elite.

However, this phenomenon was not universal for all dissenting Bavarian dukes, as such concerted efforts to reduce such figures to symbolic or rhetorical devices were rarely as unanimous. The various backgrounds of Bavarian medieval chroniclers created a variety of perceptions when writing on Tassilo III, as he held some redeeming qualities in the eyes of both the Church and those who acknowledged his power as a ruler. However, as we shall see in the next chapter, the reign of Henry the Lion – while as remarkable and controversial as Tassilo's and Arnulf's, did not merit nearly the same treatment.

CHAPTER 3: HENRY THE LION AND DISUSED NARRATIVES OF IDENTITY

Introduction

Tassilo III and Arnulf, aside from being either deposed or disgraced in some fashion during their tenures as dukes of Bavaria, served a narrative purpose within Bavarian chronicles as vectors for enhancing the reputation of the house of Wittelsbach. With the case of Tassilo, his deposition marked the turn of the duchy of Bavaria to the Carolingians. Arnulf's tenure similarly involves the Wittelsbachs, as the creation of the margraviate of Scheyern directly resulted from the power vacuum caused by Otto the Great's forceful removal of Arnulf's son. The historical career of Henry the Lion, duke of Bavaria from 1156 to 1180, holds many of the hallmarks that would have earned him condemnation in the eyes of Wittelsbach-aligned chroniclers. However, this is emphatically not the case. Despite Henry the Lion's deposition directly resulting in the ascension of Count Otto Rotkopf of Scheyern to duke of Bavaria, Bavarian chroniclers gave his narrative no special attention throughout the entirety of the Middle Ages.

Henry the Lion is the last Bavarian ruler present in the works of Otto of Freising. Otto's death in 1158 stopped his narrative in a pivotal moment, in which his immutable influence – as far as thirteenth- through fifteenth-century Bavarian chroniclers were concerned – was no longer able to provide the quasi-canonical source base for later works. The loss of this influence is readily apparent in later accounts of Henry the Lion. The gap in question between Otto of Freising's death and Henry's own in 1195 required subsequent chroniclers to conduct extensive research into local chronicles and charters in order to glean anything other than perfunctory and formulaic details regarding Henry's rule. With this lack of an established tradition to build upon,

the chroniclers of the fifteenth century were less able to project morals and mores – or the breaking thereof – upon Henry’s narrative.

While other Bavarian rulers within the chronicles of the fifteenth century were given similarly vague and formulaic treatments in regard to their deeds, the treatment given to Henry the Lion is conspicuous due to the larger storytelling trends that the chroniclers had employed with other key figures in the history of the Wittelsbachs. Moreover, Henry the Lion’s family, the Welfs, had historically been deeply entrenched in the nobility of Swabia, Bavaria, and Austria, and were seen as erstwhile rivals to the house of Wittelsbach.¹⁶⁹ Using Tassilo and Arnulf as examples, deposition – let alone open hostility and enmity to the king and the nobility – otherwise merited severe condemnation or personal observation on behalf of the chroniclers of the fifteenth century at the very least.

We shall see in this chapter that Henry the Lion, while deeply dynastically and economically entrenched in southern Germany, rarely warranted mention according to the Bavarian chroniclers of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and most of the fifteenth centuries. There were many factors at play that led to this dynamic, such as the intense regionalism between Saxony and Bavaria during the thirteenth century, the general disinterest of the prevailing Wittelsbach narrative to which Otto of Freising contributed, and the effect Otto’s death early in Henry and Barbarossa’s reign had on future depictions in later chronicles. This dynamic created a perception of Henry the Lion that was largely incongruous to the fashion in which chroniclers described contentious dukes adjacent to pivotal moments in the history of the Wittelsbach dynasty.

¹⁶⁹ Joachim Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe: Eine Biographie* (Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2008), 13-4.

The Narrative of Henry the Lion

Henry the Lion was born to Duke Henry the Proud of Saxony and Bavaria in the early 1130s. His paternal family belonged to the house of Welf, which had been deeply entrenched in the south of the Holy Roman Empire by the twelfth century. The Welfs rose to prominence through a series of fortuitous successions, marriages, and scandals, first with Welf IV's appointment to the duchy of Bavaria after the deposition of his father-in-law, and second with Henry's grandfather's marriage to duchess Wulfhild of Saxony. Henry the Proud warred with Emperor Conrad III over the legality of proclaiming himself duke of multiple duchies, and eventually was forced to abdicate Bavaria to the house of Babenberg. Henry the Proud naturally contested this decision and engaged in open rebellion against Conrad and his allied nobles before dying of a sudden illness. Henry the Lion, while still a minor, was held in Saxony under the stewardship of his mother while his uncle Welf VI continued the rebellion to take Bavaria in his brother's name. By 1150 Henry the Lion, now the Duke of Saxony, had participated in the Wendish Crusade to curry favor with the newly elected Frederick Barbarossa.¹⁷⁰

Henry the Lion, along with Welf VI and Count Otto Rotkopf, became part of Barbarossa's entourage when he was elected king in order to keep them from squabbling over the duchy of Bavaria. This practice of patronizing powerful nobility and taking direct interest in their holdings formed an integral part of Frederick Barbarossa's *Machtpolitik* (power politics), which Joachim Ehlers describes as a practice meant to stymie the growing problem of immensely powerful nobles. Another key aspect of Barbarossa's style of leadership was his willingness to

¹⁷⁰ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 39-44.

profoundly redistribute the holdings of his dukes in order to further curtail consolidations of power. One such division, much to Henry the Lion's chagrin, was the creation of the duchy of Austria in 1156 from nearly half of the margraviates of Bavaria. Barbarossa intended this division as part of a compromise between Henry the Lion and the Babenberg Henry Jasomirgott, brother of Otto of Freising and the first Babenberg Duke Leopold III, in order to stop their open war and curtail the growing influence of the Bavarian regional families of Andechs and Wittelsbach.¹⁷¹

With the "Bavarian Question" resolved, Henry the Lion began his rule of Bavaria in earnest, though not with enthusiasm. Due to the political and dynastic foundations of Saxony, Henry the Lion was able to garner greater influence and exert greater control, despite not directly owning many of its holdings. Meanwhile, according to John Freed, the powerful regional dynasties in Bavaria left Henry somewhat frustrated and disinterested due to the comparative lack of mobility.¹⁷² Nevertheless, the Bavarian compromise indebted Henry to Barbarossa, resulting in his practically compulsory involvement in the emperor's expedition into Italy from 1156 to 1157.¹⁷³

Henry's rule of Bavaria extended almost exclusively to its trade and exportation of resources, predominantly salt. Economic historian Ruth Hildebrand postulated in the 1940s that Henry the Lion likely wanted to form Bavaria into a financially absolutist "state" akin to Norman Sicily, but was unable to due to the powerful bishoprics and noble dynasties. While this comparison no longer persuades many historians today, it still illustrates Henry the Lion's

¹⁷¹ John B. Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa: The Prince and the Myth* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), 428.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 428-9.

¹⁷³ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 89.

willingness to mold Bavaria into a wealth-generating territory in order to fund his large projects in Saxony.¹⁷⁴ His command of the economy did not escape the notice of chroniclers – as will be discussed later – not least due to his efforts creating a rivalry with none other than Otto of Freising himself in 1158. The rivalry in question revolved around the forced demolition of the bridge over the river Isar, which ran through the diocese of Freising. The destruction of the bridge was meant to manipulate salt trade routes from the Alps to better favor Henry's plans for Saxony and led Otto of Freising directly to appeal to his nephew Frederick Barbarossa to proffer another compromise. The result largely benefitted Henry at the expense of Otto, though the diocese of Freising received a percentage of the profits gained through the new route.¹⁷⁵ This, however, was neither the first nor the last time Henry the Lion overstepped his bounds and overestimated his standing with the emperor.

According to Freed, Henry the Lion relied heavily on his perceived goodwill with Barbarossa. While it did carry him rather far with the nobles of Saxony and Albrecht the Bear of Brandenburg, Henry's constant rivalry and antagonism with the court of Barbarossa – and eventually Barbarossa himself – ultimately led to his deposition and exile. Most modern historians believe the reason for Henry's deposition is in line with those mentioned in a handful of chronicles. Henry had refused to accompany Barbarossa on another campaign into Italy in 1176 to protect the papacy and the resulting disastrous defeat pushed him out of the emperor's good graces permanently.¹⁷⁶ Moreover, his standing with his own bishoprics had continued to decrease due to appropriation of Church land in Saxony. This ultimately resulted in an armed

¹⁷⁴ Ulf Dirlmeier, "Heinrich der Löwe und 'die Wirtschaft,'" *Heinrich der Löwe. Vorträge und Forschungen* 57 (2003): 294-304.

¹⁷⁵ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 164-5.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 317-9.

conflict between Henry and Bishop Ulrich of Halberstadt from 1177 to 1179.¹⁷⁷ By 1180, Henry the Lion had become a liability and obstacle in the minds of Frederick and the nobility allied with him, so Henry was ultimately stripped of his duchies and exiled to England, the homeland of his wife. He was able to return five years later to his favored city of Brunswick, where he became its patron until his death in 1195.

Henry the Lion's Narrative in the Twelfth Through Fourteenth Centuries

As was the case for the other two examples in this thesis, the foundation for the chronicling traditions of Henry the Lion can be traced back to Otto of Freising. However, Henry the Lion was in the unique position of being personally involved with Otto himself for decades. As such, Otto of Freising's proximity to the events drastically colored his accounts regarding Frederick in the *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris* (*The Deeds of Emperor Frederick*), as well as the aforementioned *The Two Cities*.

Because of when *The Two Cities* was compiled, nearly a decade before *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris*, Otto only refers to Henry the Lion as the son of Henry the Proud, who Otto claims had died suddenly after having thrown Saxony and Bavaria into chaos with his disputed claims. Henry the Lion's young age required his mother to oversee all decisions regarding the relinquishment of the duchy of Saxony. This decision was meant to placate King Conrad III from further violence. Otto then brings events of the chronicle to the present with the account of Henry's uncle Welf VI waging war against Conrad in his name.¹⁷⁸ While Henry's inclusion in

¹⁷⁷ Knut Görich, "Jäger des Löwen oder Getriebener der Fürsten? Friedrich Barbarossa und die Entmachtung Heinrichs des Löwen," in *Staufer und Welfen: zwei rivalisierende Dynastien in Hochmittelalter*, ed. Werner Schuller und Florian Herschberger (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet), 109.

¹⁷⁸ Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 434-6.

this chronicle was tangential, it spoke to the larger trend in Otto's chronicling in general. One of Otto's aims in recounting current events in his chronicles, as observed by Mierow and Ehlers, was to maintain an impression of imperial unity for readers.¹⁷⁹ By the time of Barbarossa's tenure as king, this aim became more and more pronounced and, unfortunately, less and less grounded in the reality of the situation.

Otto compiled the *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris* in 1157 primarily to laud Frederick's success on his first Italian expeditions and to celebrate his election and imperial coronation. Due to Otto's familial ties to the Welfs, Babenbergs, and Hohenstaufens, he seldom mentioned the numerous armed conflicts and unrest between the families. By 1150, Henry the Lion was in full revolt against Emperor Conrad while his uncle Welf was attempting to raise a rebellion in Bavaria. These events are wholly absent in Otto's account, who stated that all was well in the German realm immediately before Frederick's coronation.¹⁸⁰ Otto's unwillingness to address this conflict readily illustrated his desire to paint his nephew's empire as anything other than discordant. To this end, he was able to significantly influence the perception of this time period and the narrative of Henry even before Henry himself became a major player in the princely politics of the Holy Roman Empire.

In terms of direct mention of Henry, the majority of Otto's work focuses extensively on Barbarossa's handling of the dispute between Henry the Lion and Henry Jasomirgott over the duchy of Bavaria, as well as Henry's part in Frederick's expedition into Italy. In his typical style, Otto goes into the exhaustive detail regarding nearly every aspect of the dispute. Unlike the other

¹⁷⁹ Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa: Otto of Freising and his Continuator Rahewin*, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), f. 110; Joachim Ehlers, *Otto von Freising, ein intellektueller im Mittelalter*, 123-4.

¹⁸⁰ Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 110.

disputes between imperial authority and Bavarian rulers, however, Otto had the added benefit of personally attending most if not all of the events described in the *Gesta*. Between 1153 and 1156, Otto describes Barbarossa's attempts at an amicable resolution to the question of the duchy of Bavaria's lordship. By Otto's recollection, attempted diets at Speyer, Goslar, and Regensburg proved fruitless, with both parties unwilling to acknowledge the other as legitimate.¹⁸¹ Otto's recollections of the outcomes and reasoning behind these events are likely accurate, due to his position in Frederick's court and familial relation to events, yet he goes out of his way to avoid accusations of wrongdoing. While older historical figures had the benefit of predetermined perceptions and traditions within Otto's writings – or were dynastically and practically so far removed from the events of his present – the diplomatic approach to the figures with whom he had personal relationships sometimes rings uncharacteristic of his typical chronicling style. In the case of Tassilo III and Arnulf, Otto pulled upon existing historical interpretations in addition to his own research. Descriptions of the motives and mindsets of these figures were either common knowledge within his circles or relied on these interpretations to form a logical narrative. Mentioning how Charlemagne was “moved with compassion” at the trial of Tassilo or that Arnulf's son Berthold “recklessly” conspired with the Hungarians served to inform the reader of Otto's values, yet Henry the Lion's actions were met with surprisingly little scrutiny for a historical actor who was contributing to the disunity of the empire.¹⁸²

Throughout the entirety of the detailed description of these diets, Otto lauds Barbarossa's ability to mediate and appease the two lords. This perception of Frederick as the lawgiver and

¹⁸¹ Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 120-4.

¹⁸² Otto of Freising, *The Two Cities*, 351, 381.

bringer of peace persisted throughout the Middle Ages. His subsequent expeditions into Italy with the help of the lords in his retinue and his deft maneuvering of those lords throughout the Holy Roman Empire cemented his reputation. However, Otto's account of these events, particularly the dispute between Henry the Lion and his own brother Henry Jasomirgott, possibly obfuscated a more practical purpose of statecraft. According to Ehlers, Frederick was mainly concerned with finding a solution to the Bavarian question that would avoid open conflict, but also with securing plenty of manpower for his expeditions into Italy throughout the 1150s through 1170s. Even though Henry Jasomirgott had a stronger claim technically to Bavaria through imperial decree, Barbarossa favored Henry the Lion – likely for assurance of his help in Italy – and made him unofficially the duke of both Bavaria and Saxony in 1154 immediately preceding their first expedition that October.¹⁸³ Otto, due to his close relationship with Frederick and Henry Jasomirgott, was aware of this decision and noted it in his *Gesta*, though it is misrepresented and recontextualized to serve a more symbolic significance. He states that in December 1153 Frederick was moved by Henry the Lion's desire to have his ancestral homeland returned to him and had made the decision to at least partially resolve the matter until after his first Italian expedition.¹⁸⁴ This proceeding may have indeed been the case in a less formal capacity and in a fashion that Otto would also have been able to witness personally. It is likely, according to Ehlers, that these talks had persisted for months before a more formal resolution had been met and before the final, symbolic resolution of the splitting of the duchy of Bavaria.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 87-9.

¹⁸⁴ Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 124-5.

¹⁸⁵ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 96-99.

Otto's account of the Italian expeditions understandably focuses on Barbarossa, yet Henry is mentioned a handful of times. The most prominent event by far is the siege of Tortona, where Henry the Lion laid camp in the suburbs outside the citadel, and by implication poisoned the river running through the fortifications to hamper the defenders. Meanwhile, Otto of Freising – who had frequently denounced Count Otto Rotkopf of Scheyern as a would-be tyrant of his holdings in Bavaria – remarked on his heroism as Frederick's standard-bearer.¹⁸⁶ It is likely that some of Otto's tales of heroism regarding Count Otto Rotkopf, or at least his patronage on behalf of Frederick, had some basis in fact. Otto Rotkopf was indeed the standard-bearer for Frederick's Italian campaigns and on one occasion had saved Henry the Lion's army from an ambush in Verona, according to Isengrim von Ottobeuren.¹⁸⁷ In point of fact, the lack of any description regarding Henry the Lion's warfighting ability or tactical prowess during the entirety of Otto's section on the siege of Tortona or the Italian campaign at large hints at – according to Leila Werthschulte – deference to his and Frederick's own correspondence when describing Henry the Lion.¹⁸⁸ Even during Henry the Lion's tenure as duke of Bavaria, whether official or unofficial, the noble families of Wittelsbach and Andechs were still more influential within both their regions of note, as well as in the wider circles of influence in the southern Holy Roman Empire, despite the house of Welf's Swabian origins.

Very shortly after the expedition's return to Bavaria, Henry Jasomirgott officially conferred the duchy of Bavaria on Henry the Lion. According to Otto, who was confirmed to be present at the event itself, Henry Jasomirgott handed over seven banners to Henry the Lion,

¹⁸⁶ Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 134-5.

¹⁸⁷ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 96.

¹⁸⁸ Leila Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, (Stuttgart: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2007), 84.

representing the seven counties which constituted Bavaria. Henry the Lion then handed Henry Jasomirgott two in return, thus creating the duchy of Austria with Jasomirgott as its first duke. This was a rather deft political move on Frederick's part, as the reorganization of the East Mark made it so that his uncle, Henry Jasomirgott, was not viewed as subservient to Henry the Lion.¹⁸⁹ Otto of Freising was all too willing to laud this decision, commenting on the cunning and skill of such a remarkable resolution to the dispute.¹⁹⁰ This was not the first time that Emperor Frederick had redistributed property from his subjects, nor was it the last. His willingness to make drastic reforms within the empire served to cultivate a unity that Otto himself had attempted to propagate on multiple occasions within his *Gesta*, oftentimes failing to mention disputes that were either ongoing or beyond Frederick's ability to solve with nonviolence.

The creation of the duchy of Austria was one of Otto's last accounts written in the *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris* before his death in 1158. Henry the Lion is mentioned one last time in the *Gesta's* third book as having rescued the city of Trent from two counts who had held a bishop hostage in 1156. While some historians had originally believed that Otto's rights disputes with Henry in 1158 had been glossed over for the sake of preserving the *Reich*, new research suggests that even though the chronicle as a whole continues until 1166, it is likely that Otto had not contributed to it after June of 1157.¹⁹¹ The *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris* was continued by Rahewin, a notary at the Abbey of Freising who had assisted Otto on his construction of the chronicle. Rahewin continued the *Gesta* in a vastly different style than his predecessor, which relied more closely on allusion to classical texts and biblical parables than on firsthand

¹⁸⁹ Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 163-4.

¹⁹⁰ Otto of Freising, *Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 163-4.

¹⁹¹ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 82.

experience or extensive research outside the monastery of Freising. As such, Rahewin's contribution to the chronicle, while mentioning Henry the Lion exhaustively, did little to contextualize his actions in the wider empire in the same level of detail as Otto himself.

In 1158, Henry the Lion and his army accompanied Barbarossa on a second expedition to Italy. The framing of the expedition as the main event in the *Gesta's* fourth book highlights the vast difference in style and priority between Otto of Freising and Rahewin, seeing as the first expedition was the crux of the third. Instead of the detailed, strategic, and analytical style indicative of Otto's writings, Rahewin spends portions of the book casting figures such as Henry, Frederick, and Welf VI into archetypes of classical literature, in this case those of Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum* (*Jugurthine War*). The sections in question paint Henry the Lion as equal to Cato the Younger, while his uncle Welf VI is likened to Julius Caesar. These sections muse on their physical appearances, demeanors, dispositions, and temperaments during the campaign, with little regard given to the actual events or how they occurred. Moreover, Rahewin further adheres to Otto's goal of imperial unity by speaking at length on the graciousness in which Henry the Lion was accepted as the duke of Bavaria, despite constant pushback from the Wittelsbachs and Andechs that he actually endured.¹⁹² It is more difficult to differentiate between observations of the figures' characters and poetic license within these allusions, especially considering that Otto's accounts were so conservative regarding descriptions of Henry the Lion's demeanor, attributes, or actions without Frederick's approval. Rahewin uses literary embellishments more often and more elaborately than Otto of Freising. The result, over time, was that his more florid continuation saw its content absorbed into the normative narrative of

¹⁹² Rahewin, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 278-9; Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 162-3.

Bavarian history, due to its pairing with Otto's terser, less poetic writings. The only portion of Rahewin's contribution of the chronicle which contain less allegorically or symbolically-infused observations is the closing appendices, added between 1160 and 1168. The only mention of Henry the Lion in this section was one curt sentence: "A serious war broke out between the Saxons and duke H[enry the Lion] of Bavaria."¹⁹³ This refers to the nearly constant conflict between Henry the Lion and Albrecht the Bear of Brandenburg within the duchy of Saxony.¹⁹⁴ By the fifteenth century, Otto's works had become such a ubiquitous source in Bavarian chronicling that Rahewin's contributions were given a measure of gravitas, despite knowledge that the final portions of the *Gesta* were not written by Otto himself. In the case of the thirteenth century, the narrative of Henry the Lion had faded from Bavarian chronicling, or any chronicling outside of Saxony.

Mirroring the overall trend in German chronicling in general, the thirteenth century saw a precipitous downturn in mentions of Henry the Lion. Outside of monastic *Jahrbücher* (year books) and Saxon chronicles, scholars spoke little about the duke, and those who did were hardly laudatory to his reign. The Hohenstaufen hegemony that Barbarossa was able to cultivate was effective in painting Henry the Lion as an opportunistic antagonist anywhere in the empire outside of Brunswick, certain portions of Saxony, and Welf-aligned portions of Swabia. Even then, some chronicles, such as Swabian provost Burchard von Ursberg's *Weltchronik*, portray Henry the Lion as a pitiable figure with bad luck.¹⁹⁵ In Austrian sources of the thirteenth century, such as Jans Enikel's *Weltchronik*, Henry the Lion is merely a vehicle for Austria's ascension to

¹⁹³ Rahewin, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, 336.

¹⁹⁴ Ehlers, *Heinrich der Löwe*, 49, 55-7.

¹⁹⁵ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 129-31.

a duchy, seeing as one of Enikel's main goals was to chronicle the line of Babenberg following its extinction and the recent transition to the Habsburgs.¹⁹⁶

Saxon chronicles and *Jahrbücher* of the early thirteenth century were the first to include two dependent events which later became ubiquitous and supremely important to solidifying and codifying the rhetorical antagonism between Henry the Lion and Barbarossa, even within Bavarian sources: the genuflection of Emperor Frederick before Henry the Lion in Chiavenna in 1176 and Henry's subsequent genuflection before Frederick in Erfurt in 1181. Barbarossa's *Kniefall* (genuflection) was a major point in the third recension of the *Sächsische Weltchronik* (*Saxon World Chronicle*), written around 1290. According to Werthschulte, the scene added to recension C's *Weltchronik* served a specific purpose in painting Henry the Lion as comparably powerful to Barbarossa, but ultimately disparaging to the office of the emperor and his place within the hierarchy of the empire.¹⁹⁷ This framing fits comfortably within the tropes of twelfth- and thirteenth-century *Klosterchroniken*, which utilized parables of historical figures to inform the virtues of subsequent generations of clergy.

In the minds of the Bavarian clergy of the thirteenth through fourteenth centuries, especially those of Scheyern, Henry the Lion was relatively incidental. Konrad of Scheyern's official Wittelsbach narrative pays little concern to the duke, nor any of the families that ruled Bavaria between Arnulf and Count Otto Rotkopf of Scheyern. As far as the official narrative was concerned, this period was one of strife and one the margraves of Scheyern were a shining example of their salvation. Henry's only mentions in the Scheyern Annals are the years of his

¹⁹⁶ Siegfried Haider, "Jans Enikel," *Neue Deutsche Biografie* 10, (1974), 338-9.

¹⁹⁷ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 140.

deposition and death. Conversely, nearly every major event involving Count Otto Rotkopf was meticulously recorded.¹⁹⁸ Bolstered by the complimentary nature of Otto of Freising's accounts of the loyal bannerman, Otto Rotkopf, and the comparatively brief and curt nature of his accounts of Henry the Lion, the abbots of Scheyern found the inspirational and aspirational figure in their margrave instead of their duke. The exploration of themes within the Bavarian experience was not seen in any significant way until major aspects of Saxon chronicles seeped into strictly Bavarian regional historiography by the fifteenth century.

Henry the Lion's Narrative in the Fifteenth Century

Henry the Lion's narrative in the fifteenth century was ultimately informed by influences and sources outside of Bavaria. This dynamic stemmed from Andreas von Regensburg's codification of Bavarian and Saxon interpretations, which utilized Otto's *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris*, the *Chronicle of Scheyern*, and the *Saxon World Chronicle* as sources. Within subsequent fifteenth-century chronicles, the inclusion of the Saxon interpretation of Henry the Lion's interaction with Barbarossa at Chiavenna and the exact reason for Barbarossa's decision to depose the duke were sources of mild confusion, as more readily available Bavarian sources had a dearth of information on the figure outside of Otto and Rahewin's works. Andreas von Regensburg's synthesis became a nearly verbatim template for the works of Ebran and Füetrer, and persisted in less widely-circulated interpretations until the growing influence of Arnpeck's more research-oriented approach by the end of the century.

¹⁹⁸ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores.* volume 17: *Chounradi Schirensis. Chronicon, Catalogi, Annales*, ed. Philipp Jaffé (Hannover: Hahn, 1861), 630-1.

Andreas von Regensburg's account was forced to contend with very limited information relative to the others present in this thesis. Within Bavaria, Henry the Lion's legacy up until the fifteenth century was largely ignored, especially by the official narrative from Scheyern. Consequently, Andreas von Regensburg approaches the narrative more cautiously than he did that of Tassilo III and Arnulf, presenting different perspectives to address its ambiguity. In predictable fashion, Andreas adheres to the narrative of Otto of Freising, although with a few exceptions. While portions of Otto's *Gesta* were predominantly intact within Andreas' account, he may have seen most of his observations as either too irrelevant or unimportant to include in his vernacular chronicle, particularly those on Henry the Lion's role in Barbarossa's Italian campaigns. This could potentially come across as an incongruent stylistic choice due to wide swaths of Andreas von Regensburg's chronicle simply containing Otto of Freising's words translated verbatim, particularly when they pertain to Bavarian nobility. However, due to the lack of Bavarian narrative sources outside of Otto of Freising at this time – relegated to clerical documents and *Klosterchroniken* – Andreas von Regensburg might have interpreted a lack of regional sources as a lack of interest or impact in the figure. Instead Andreas focused his work on the verifiable documents he likely had access to, such as edicts born from diets and the documents regarding the creation of the duchy of Austria.

Along this vein, Andreas von Regensburg is the first to introduce a full transcription of a letter, ostensibly written by Barbarossa, to officially recognize the duchy of Austria under Henry Jasomirgott. The section – containing solely the letter – outlined the terms of the creation of the duchy, the rights of succession, and the enumeration of land and goods. It concluded with the list of witnesses – including the Archbishop of Salzburg and Otto of Freising – and finally the date,

October 15, 1176.¹⁹⁹ The letter itself later became a staple inclusion in Hans Ebran's chronicle. However, fifteenth-century chroniclers found the following events throughout the course of Henry the Lion's rule far less certain.

Due to the formulaic nature of Henry's depiction – stemming from lack of sources, lack of desire, or both – Andreas von Regensburg's account became not only a template, but a near facsimile for all major regional chronicles that came after him. Andreas' work largely contained the same matter-of-fact tone and detachment as Barbarossa's letter, and for the most part later chroniclers copied these observations wholesale. However, one event stands out as an amalgam of the various interpretations of the narrative and provided subsequent chroniclers many opportunities for thematic framing and projection of their individual values: the apocryphal *Kniefall* of Barbarossa.

Barbarossa's genuflection at Chiavenna in 1176 was a very uncouth and atypical behavior for a standing emperor, and therefore provided Andreas the only opportunity to muse on the nature of a man who would rebuff his own emperor begging for his aid. In this section, Andreas critically considers Henry the Lion's attributes as recorded by Rahewin; he is of profound intelligence, fiercely proud, and a competent leader who possessed impressive physical strength. However, the existing narrative of the *Kniefall* had colored Andreas' perceptions of the duke and his personality, leading him to inquire as to the nature of the duke's behavior and the reality of his supposed virtues. As far as Andreas was concerned, Henry the Lion's virtues – such as ambition and strength and tenacity – coalesced into arrogance, which caused him to fall out of

¹⁹⁹ *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*, 634-5.

the good graces of the emperor by 1180.²⁰⁰ As for the *Kniefall* itself, Andreas approaches it critically, claiming:

Dy ursach sölicher grosser tat hab ich nicht gelesen, dann in einer dewtschen chroniken hab ich also funden: Heinrich herczog zu Sachsen und Bayren, der fürdt grosse ritterschaft ze hilff kayser Fridreich in Italiem. Da kom der kayser entgegen herczog Heinrich und pat in, es wären dy sachhe in frid gesezt, das er nu wider gein heym züg. Do in der herczog darinn nicht geweren wollt, da knyet der kayser für in und begert, das er wider gein heym züg. Das sach ein ambtman des herczogen und sparch zu im: Her, ir habt dy kayserlich kron bey den füssen; gedenkcht, das sy euch fürbas köm auf das haubt. Des wartes merchung macht herczog Heinrich sein lebtage gegem kayser nimmermer überwinden.

I have not read what the cause of so great an act [might be], though I have found this in a German chronicle: Henry, duke of Saxony and Bavaria, led a great force of knights to aid Emperor Frederick in Italy. There, the emperor came before Duke Henry and requested of him that he return home if peace should be achieved. Because the duke did not want to defend him in this [endeavor], the emperor knelt before him and requested that he return home. An officer of the duke saw this and said to him: “My lord, you have the emperor’s crown at your feet; consider that in the future it could find its way onto [or above] your head.” Because of this striking remark, Duke Henry was never able to overcome the emperor for the rest of his life.²⁰¹

The “German chronicle” he is referring to was likely the *Saxon World Chronicle*, which is identifiable by a number of thematic and narrative cues. While the *Saxon World Chronicle* is not the main source for Barbarossa’s *Kniefall*, it was the most widely circulated. The passage in question also refers to Henry’s officer warning him of the repercussions of defying the emperor, an act which ultimately portended his downfall.²⁰²

Moreover, the inclusion of such a prominent Saxon chronicle speaks to the regional nature of Henry the Lion’s reputation, as well as Andreas’ pan-imperial source base. While the

²⁰⁰ Andreas von Regensburg, *sämtliche Werke*, 635.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 635-6.

²⁰² Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 139-40.

narratives of Tassilo and Arnulf were readily established by the fifteenth century within Bavaria, the widespread disinterest in Henry the Lion forced Andreas von Regensburg – and others – to incorporate sources from farther afield to fill in sizable gaps. This practice, however limited, notably diverged from the official Wittelsbach narrative in a way that incorporated and acknowledged different chronicling and storytelling traditions from other German-speaking regions. While still greatly limited in the use of these outside chronicles, the willingness to draw upon them speaks to a wider practice of utilizing more diverse sources growing by the turn of the sixteenth century with the rise of humanism.

However, Andreas remained the only prominent chronicler in the practice of citing more eclectic chronicles for nearly five decades. Instead, subsequent chroniclers, notably Ebran and Füetrer, decided to use Andreas' work not only as a template, but as the primary Bavarian source of information regarding depictions of Henry the Lion in any significant detail. This similarity could likely be traced to the differing occupations of the three men, as well as the climates in which the chronicles were written. Andreas von Regensburg was an archivist at the church of St. Mang, where he had profound exposure and access to multitudes of chronicles from throughout the Holy Roman Empire. Conversely, both Ulrich Füetrer and Hans Ebran von Wildenberg were explicitly employed and lived within the courts of Bayern-München and Bayern-Landshut, respectively. In particular, Ebran's status as a knight and Füetrer's occupation as court artist colored their interpretations of Andreas' work in notably divergent ways.

Hans Ebran von Wildenberg's *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern* takes a matter-of-fact approach to Henry the Lion unlike his usual writing style. The majority of his work, while succinct, contains copious amounts of editorialization which made Ebran's biases and opinions

evident. However, as it pertains to Henry the Lion, Ebran's stylistic choice is wholly absent. Instead, the handful of pages regarding the duke are annalistic, reducing Andreas' more narrative-focused account down to lists of the numerous diets that led to the creation of the duchy of Austria. Consequently, the largest contiguous passage in Ebran's chronicle regarding Henry the Lion is Barbarossa's letter, transcribed by Andreas von Regensburg.²⁰³

Ebran's occupation as a knight in the court of Bayern-Landshut seems to have colored his interpretation of the duke significantly, creating substantial variation in the ways in which he approached the narrative when compared to Andreas. As is apparent by this point, Ebran's writing style focused primarily on the dynastic machinations of the Wittelsbachs, or at least of individuals who had an impact on eventual Wittelsbach history and the personal conceptions of his compatriots and benefactors.²⁰⁴ However, when compared to his interpretations of other dukes who had been deposed by their emperors – namely Tassilo III and Arnulf the Bad – Ebran is significantly more restrained in his description of Henry. The primary aim of Ebran's chronicle, and the reason for its commission, was to codify the Landshuter Wittelsbach narrative contemporaneously with other efforts emerging in the rival duchies. To this end, Ebran sought to unambiguously define the rise of the Wittelsbachs as a turning point in Bavarian history. In turn, 1180 – the year of Henry the Lion's deposition and the placement of Otto Rotkopf as duke of Bavaria – became profoundly important for the purposes of the chronicle. Immediately following Henry the Lion's deposition, the typical laudatory remarks return to Ebran's description of the

²⁰³ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 104-6.

²⁰⁴ Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 89-90.

new Wittelsbach duke, and great care is taken in the subsequent chapters to inflate and lionize Wittelsbachs – and later, Landshuter Wittelsbachs – of note.²⁰⁵

Ulrich Füetrer's *Bayerische Chronik* approaches the narrative of Henry the Lion from the point of view of a poet. Consequently, his position as court painter and poet for the house of Bayern-München informed the priorities of his work, namely the recognition of potentially dramatic moments and events. This ultimately worked in the favor of Henry the Lion's narrative being expressed in greater depth in Füetrer's work, yet it was ultimately influenced by a tremendous amount of artistic license. As opposed to Ebran's nearly omnipresent use of Andreas von Regensburg's chronicle in his work, Füetrer uses a handful of sources, such as the lost *Chronicle of Brother Peter* and the Welf Annals (*Annales Welfici*), to complete – or at least bolster – the scant narrative of the duke commonly found within Bavarian chronicles.²⁰⁶ However, this use of more numerous sources did not translate to accuracy. In point of fact, it is in many details the inverse.

One of Füetrer's main stylistic choices present in the majority of his chronicle is the forceful comparison and allusion to differing historical events in order to impart similarity of significance and theme, or to simply bring dramatic tension or weight to an event. Henry the Lion spent comparatively little time in Bavaria as opposed to Saxony, due to the more fluid nature of the Saxon noble families. Therefore, notable events regarding his reign as duke were few and far between, and, prior to Barbarossa's infamous *Kniefall*, did not make for dramatic or entertaining reading. Until that event, the main occurrence that Füetrer decided to focus on is the

²⁰⁵ Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, *Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*, 106-7; Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 85.

²⁰⁶ Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 162-3.

dispute between Henry the Lion and Otto of Freising in 1158. Fūetrer's account of Henry the Lion in general is more laden with inaccuracies – such as referring to the duke as “Hainrich von Prawnsweig” [Henry of Brunswick] throughout, even though he gained this title after being deposed – yet the embellishment on the incident between the duke and the bishop is indicative of Fūetrer's priorities. Fūetrer includes the Isar Bridge dispute, yet fallaciously places it in the middle of his account of the tenth century and the conquests of Otto the Great in Hungary.²⁰⁷ Scholars such as Werthschulte are unable to glean any specific motive from this decision, other than it was in the rough geographical area of Otto the Great's Hungarian campaign that was being described in the passage.

Werthschulte describes this narrative choice – and references to Henry the Lion in general – as proof of Fūetrer's unwillingness to accurately record his exploits, considering his use of phrases verbatim from multiple, widely-circulated chronicles.²⁰⁸ However, given Fūetrer's allegiance with the court of Bayern-München, the inclusion of the incident becomes more notable. The bridge in question was very close to the city of Munich, and the dispute between Otto of Freising and Henry the Lion was the first recorded instance of the city in official documents.²⁰⁹ It is possible that the context of the dispute was one of the earliest mentions of Fūetrer's patron city, and its inclusion in his account of Otto the Great's immensely significant campaign against the Hungarians in 970 was meant to associate equal importance to the location. Through this association, the chronicle's courtly readers might have found the observation

²⁰⁷ Ulrich Fūetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 146.

²⁰⁸ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 153.

²⁰⁹ Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 166-7.

complimentary. Either way, when it came to creative liberties that could be taken with the narrative of Henry the Lion, Füetrer was more than willing to make them.

Füetrer's account of Henry the Lion proper predictably creates dramatic and thematic significance out of his life. However, the events used to create these dramatic aspects ultimately betray a surprisingly eclectic source base. Füetrer borrows extensively for the *Saxon World Chronicle* and Rahewin's and Otto of Freising's *Gesta*, subsequently appropriating their biases regarding the degree to which Henry the Lion was a loyal prince to Emperor Conrad III and his fellow nobles.²¹⁰ This subsequently addresses Henry the Lion's Saxon perception, which had undergone substantial reimagining following his death. Füetrer may have been aware of Henry the Lion's Saxon reputation as a legendary figure and benefactor and attempted to use the more widely-circulated – yet still scant – works from the region to fill in unsatisfying gaps. Rather than displaying the more unsavory reality of the conflicts between Henry the Lion, Conrad, and the various dukes and margraves vying over portions of Saxony, Füetrer instead utilizes the Freisinger angle of underplaying the conflict while citing the laudatory aspects of his rule that had existed from the thirteenth century in Saxon and Welf circles.²¹¹

As it pertains to Henry the Lion's deposition, Füetrer reveals dissatisfaction about the lack of information regarding its root cause. Utilizing Andreas von Regensburg's account, Füetrer expresses the same confusion as to why a duke described so positively – “an entirely personable man, handsome in appearance, strong in body, masculine in mind and heart...forgiving to the evil and unlawful...and wise in counsel” – was summarily deposed and

²¹⁰ Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 162-3.

²¹¹ Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 163; Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 155-7.

forced to flee the empire for no apparent reason. In order to address this, Füetrer quotes Andreas' recollection verbatim, including the reference to an unnamed German chronicle and the ominous warning uttered by Henry's officer (*Amtmann*) regarding his audacity at Chiavenna.²¹²

Ulrich Füetrer's chronicle is ultimately much less factually accurate than its contemporaries, yet paradoxically references a wider base of sources. This dichotomy can widely be attributed to a rich literary tradition in Saxony which elevated the duke to legendary status in a remarkably short amount of time following his death. According to Werthschulte, Henry the Lion was quickly assigned a dual reputation in the German – or at least Saxon – consciousness by the middle of the thirteenth century: that of a powerful "*Territorialfürst*" ("territorial prince") of the high Middle Ages, and of a protagonist of a series of regional sagas and folk tales. The origin of Henry the Lion's namesake – the taming of the Lion of Brunswick – had mythical origins in the *Heinrichssage* (*Saga of Henry*), a series of folk tales which quickly formed in the city of Brunswick in the late twelfth and early half of the thirteenth centuries. These fantastical tales – which included the slaying of a gryphon – took place during Henry the Lion's very real pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1172.²¹³ Füetrer is one of few chroniclers during this time to address the pilgrimage and does so with the detached approach of an official chronicler instead of a poet.²¹⁴ However, his knowledge of Henry the Lion's mythical reputation could be a reflection of his ultimate befuddlement regarding his deposition. It is possible that – given Füetrer's familiarity with and access to larger pan-German folkloric and literary traditions rather than strictly Bavarian historical sources – his assessment of Henry the Lion introduced and

²¹² Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 163.

²¹³ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 158-9.

²¹⁴ Ulrich Füetrer, *Bayerische Chronik*, 162.

highlighted a regional dichotomy in reputation and perception that he was able to notice and address to a degree that other chroniclers had not, despite being overall less factually accurate.

Veit Arnpeck predictably approaches the narrative of Henry the Lion with the totality and rigor of a fifteenth-century humanist. The duke's narrative within his chronicle takes significant cues from Otto of Freising's work, but also utilizes a wealth of information that was likely compiled from clerical sources such as charters and official records. Arnpeck meticulously recounts every diet that Henry the Lion had participated in, as well as when he acquired the advocacy (*Vogtei*) of various monasteries within Bavaria.²¹⁵ Moreover, his account demystifies the biases that were apparent in Otto's early narratives. Unlike Otto of Freising, Arnpeck had no personal stake in the perception of events of the late twelfth century. Moreover, his additional drive to comb through official records revealed the very real unrest that had been occurring during the reign of Conrad III and the early reign of Barbarossa.²¹⁶ As such, Arnpeck's perception of Henry the Lion was hardly romanticized and approached the figure with deference and a critical eye for source material.

Arnpeck's chronicle meticulously outlines every event leading up to the creation of the duchy of Austria in exacting detail, including Henry's accompanying Barbarossa on his Italian campaign.²¹⁷ Rather than simply mentioning the list of official diets which were held to resolve the dispute between Henry the Lion and Henry Jasomirgott, Arnpeck also includes times during which the three figures met in informal capacities and when they travelled. Much like Otto's account, Arnpeck implies that the decision to split Bavaria to resolve the conflict was met before

²¹⁵ Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, 503.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 498-9.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 503.

the official ceremony in Regensburg and the exchange of banners.²¹⁸ As was customary in Bavarian *Landeschroniken* by the end of the fifteenth century, Arnpeck also includes Barbarossa's official letter regarding the creation of the duchy of Austria and the enumeration of privileges and duties doled to both parties. The inclusion of these details speaks to the more holistic approach to Arnpeck's research process, as well as the respect for not only the broader strokes of older chronicling traditions such as Otto of Freising's, but of newer contributors such as Andreas von Regensburg.

When it comes to his perception of Henry the Lion, Veit Arnpeck's forensic approach does much to both dispel preconceptions of his rule and highlight the dearth of sources from the Bavarian perspective. The majority of the fifteenth-century chronicles mentioned in this thesis drew inspiration from either the *Saxon World Chronicle* or Andreas von Regensburg – who extensively used said chronicle – for their accounts of Henry the Lion. The *Saxon World Chronicle* itself was laudatory of Henry the Lion, which these later chroniclers were able to confirm with the charitable descriptions recorded by Otto of Freising and Rahewin. Consequently, the dissonance between the popular conceptions of Henry the Lion ultimately rung as contradictory to his ultimate fall and disgrace. This contradiction is openly remarked upon Andreas von Regensburg's and Ulrich Füetrer's works, who both mused on how such a beloved duke could have fallen from grace so quickly. According to Werthschulte, this dissonance likely started with Andreas von Regensburg, and his influence later influenced

²¹⁸ Veit Arnpeck, *sämtliche Chroniken*, 501.

Füetrer.²¹⁹ Arnpeck's research, however, afforded him enough evidence to definitively claim the formerly ambiguous reason for Henry the Lion's fall.

When it comes to Henry's deposition, Arnpeck refrains from explicitly using Barbarossa's *Kniefall* as its monumental cause. He does indeed place the incident at Chiavenna as one of the primary reasons that he ultimately fell out of Barbarossa's favor, but also succinctly outlines how Henry the Lion was attempting to command the economy and welfare of Bavaria, specifically the clergy. In the case of the *Kniefall*, Arnpeck approaches the event with his critical style and casts doubt on the validity of Barbarossa's genuflection itself. Instead, Arnpeck uses the common phrase "ettlich mainen" (some believe) in order to distance himself from claiming the event was absolute fact. In addition, Arnpeck more than simply alludes to the outcome of Barbarossa's failed Italian campaign, instead outlining the exact battle in which Henry the Lion's forces would have turned the tide.²²⁰ Unsurprisingly, in one of the few instances of passionate editorializing over Henry the Lion in any Bavarian chronicle, Arnpeck views the Isar Bridge incident with Otto of Freising as equally scandalous to Henry the Lion's obstinate display in Chiavenna. In point of fact, Arnpeck views Henry the Lion's antagonism towards Otto of Freising and his perceived disregard for his property as sacrilege (*frävel/fräveltat*). He portrays the destruction of the bridge and Henry's assumption of Otto's trade routes as a severe overstep of ducal authority and lauds the emperor's decision to resolve the issue with Otto of Wittelsbach following Henry's deposition.²²¹ The perception of this event as more than a simple dispute of rights speaks to both Arnpeck's background as a clergyman and his views on secular assumption

²¹⁹ Werthschulte, *Heinrich der Löwe in Geschichte und Sage*, 154-5.

²²⁰ Arnpeck, 504.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 505.

of Church lands, about which he was profoundly outspoken when discussing other Bavarian dukes. Moreover, this mindset was likely heavily influenced by his absolute veneration of the Freisinger *Hochstift*, or the sovereignty and autonomy of the bishopric of Freising free of secular authority.²²² Arnpeck was able to construct a narrative of a duke who expressed a disregard for both secular and religious authority in the form of both Barbarossa and Otto of Freising, providing substantial evidence for himself to answer the question of why such a well-loved duke was deposed.

Not only does Arnpeck accurately infer the reason for Henry the Lion's deposition, which had perplexed earlier Bavarian chroniclers, he was also the only prominent chronicler of the century to explicitly note the significance of his deposition as the opportunity for the ascension of the House of Wittelsbach to dukes of Bavaria, a paradigm that persisted to Arnpeck's present day.²²³ Arnpeck subsequently delves into the life of now-Duke Otto of Wittelsbach with a substantially greater degree of specificity with regard to genealogy. Due to the separations of Bavaria in the ensuing centuries, the adherence to the official Scheyern genealogy was of prime importance to fifteenth-century chroniclers, at least until more contemporary divisions caused these chroniclers to favor and legitimize certain branches. In the case of Arnpeck, the Landshuter Wittelsbachs took priority, but – unlike many of his immediate predecessors – Arnpeck approached the history of the Bavarian nobility in its entirety; this even included more in-depth research into non-Wittelsbach dukes.²²⁴ This willingness to delve into figures that had very little to do with Bavaria during their rules separated Arnpeck's methodology even more, and

²²² Dicker, *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen*, 156-7.

²²³ *Ibid.*, 506.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 159-160.

illustrated a consistent mindset towards dukes who he believed had failed both God and emperor, albeit to a diminished degree.

Conclusion

Despite Henry the Lion's twenty-four-year rule of Bavaria and his centrality in the ascension of the house of Wittelsbach, chroniclers largely perceived his impact as almost conspicuously negligible for centuries following his death. This possibly stemmed from a variety of reasons early on, from the incomplete nature of Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici* and his unwillingness to acknowledge any dispute between Babenberg, Hohenstaufen, and Welf, to Rahewin's highly formulaic and symbolic depictions of Henry in the later books of the *Gesta Frederici Imperatoris*, and to the more general dynastic disinterest in the period between Wittelsbach county and Wittelsbach duchy. The event of Otto's death in 1158 did much to shape the subsequent Bavarian accounts of the duke, simply by nature of the sheer ubiquity of his works and the dearth of Bavarian sources that were widely available outside of his. Consequently, the lack of historical writing on Henry the Lion within Bavaria by the thirteenth century was not so much happenstance as it was a conscious effort for Otto of Freising – and later the Welf rival, the Wittelsbachs of Scheyern – to underplay a contentious time in the history of the Holy Roman Empire as well as the true significance of a controversial figure.

The perception of Henry the Lion does, however, show a regional awareness of traditions outside Bavaria. His importance in influential Saxon and Swabian chronicles filtered through to some of the chronicles considered in this chapter, although they often only mentioned their specific details in passing. The vast differences in the duke's perception between Bavarian and

Saxon chronicles encompass much more than simple historicity, with the latter elevating the figure to mythical patron and pious hero of the city of Brunswick. These regional traditions, which largely formed less than a century following Henry the Lion's death, ultimately did find their way into Bavaria, albeit in a more literary and representative capacity. These chronicles, such as the *Saxon World Chronicle* and the *Annales Welfici*, eventually became potentially confusing counternarratives to fifteenth-century chroniclers such as Andreas von Regensburg and Ulrich Füetrer.

For Andreas, Ebran, and Füetrer, the rule of Henry the Lion seemed to function as a narrative prelude to the much more compelling and politically relevant rule of the Wittelsbachs. However, in the case of Andreas von Regensburg and Ulrich Füetrer, their knowledge of regional chronicles did allow for the inclusion of more detailed information in the history of their duchies, admittedly from a position of skepticism in the case of Andreas. The dissonance of quantity and forms of information between the two regional traditions caused more interested chroniclers to muse as to the validity of the accounts, leading to a small source base and the inclusion of the few concrete documents that exist, such as Barbarossa's letter and the account of the Isar Bridge dispute.

Only with the adoption of humanist methods by scholars such as Arnpeck does a slightly more holistic and forensic approach to Bavarian history begin to take shape, though not one any less conditioned by bias and agenda. Arnpeck's account of Henry the Lion synthesizes the earlier chronicles of Otto of Freising and the Annals of Scheyern with the wider source bases of their immediate predecessors, Andreas von Regensburg and Ulrich Füetrer. While the two later chroniclers found utility in mentioning outside sources and expressed curiosity in delving deeper

into the specifics of the duke – notably the reasoning for his deposition – the priority of extolling the Wittelsbachs or Wittelsbach-adjacent figures led to either a disinterest in Henry the Lion or lack of access to sources useful to filling out his narrative. Veit Arnpeck ultimately took many more non-narrative records into account compared to his counterparts, exercising historical rigor in filling in the gaps in Henry the Lion's account. Ironically, Arnpeck's novel degree of research into the figure likely contributed to him approaching Henry the Lion as a more traditionally subversive Bavarian duke along the lines of Tassilo and Arnulf. His ultimate goal of extolling the autonomy of the bishopric of Freising, as well as the supremacy of the Landshuter Wittelsbachs, still colored his perception of Bavarian nobility in a way consistent with early German humanists.

Henry the Lion's popular perception in Bavaria throughout the High and Late Middle Ages varied greatly from the twelfth to fifteenth centuries. As a duke, Henry wished to expand his personal influence in Saxony to much greater success than his ancestral inheritance in Bavaria. Henry was relatively hands-off in his rule of Bavaria, ultimately attempting to fashion the duchy into a moneymaking asset to support his preferred Saxony. Consequently, Bavarian chroniclers inherited a far smaller narrative tradition, despite Henry exhibiting many of the same behaviors that earned other dukes far less apathetic reputations. This lack of their own narrative traditions forced later Bavarian chroniclers to observe those from without in order to fill in the gaps. Veit Arnpeck's chronicle shows a completion of this narrative to a degree that was no longer concerning or contradictory, and fit more comfortably within the paradigm of controversial leaders of Bavaria.

The formation of Bavarian aristocratic identity in the late Middle Ages relied heavily on the traditions of earlier regional chronicles. Moreover, the chronicles in question required a relatively wide distribution within Bavaria, as well as auspicious authors. Without those two criteria, transgressions might not have been enough of a reason for the negative characterization of historical figures. Such was the case with Henry the Lion. Even though he faced deposition and had dramatic and exploitable interactions with a popular historical figure that could be easily utilized for rhetorical purposes, his narrative was nearly wholly ignored within Bavarian circles. Without the existence of local sources, historical figures such as Henry were unsuitable for informing nobles – and later urban elite – of correct behavior and values through contrast, and were given little to no exploration of their narratives. Veit Arnpeck's account of the duke demonstrates this dynamic, as he was able to use an eclectic source base to uncover evidence to support this historically and traditionally enforced goal of medieval chronicling and apply those mores to a previously unknown or uninteresting figure. This, in turn, sheds light on the changing nature of chronicling into the sixteenth century with the decline of the political *Landeschronik*.

CONCLUSION

By the beginning of the sixteenth century, Bavarian *Landeschroniken* began to wane in production. Bavaria was forced to unify following the War of Landshut Succession in 1505, and the myriad pushes for legitimacy had once again solidified under the ideals of one Bavarian line of Wittelsbach.²²⁵ While there were various methods of legitimation within the three competing Wittelsbach families – such as rival genealogies – chronicling played a large role in forming Bavarian identity at this particular point in time. However, this was mainly an explosion of aristocratic self-definition out of political necessity and drew upon a long history of both distinctly Bavarian and German cultural touchstones. Shapers of Bavarian aristocratic identity in the fifteenth century relied on older traditions of chronicling, and courtly writing in general, to meet a need, yet the way they sought to meet this need was simply a contemporaneous codification of preexisting aristocratic ideals reflected through narrative. The narratives of the great and terrible rulers of Bavaria sought not only to legitimize bloodlines, but to evoke the earlier traditions of aristocratic education through parable. This thesis explored the changing perceptions of three deposed dukes of Bavaria, the ways in which chroniclers utilized their narratives, the factors that led to their distinct perceptions throughout the centuries, and how the values reflected in their narratives contributed to Bavarian aristocratic identity formation into the early modern period.

Tassilo III of Bavaria, the last Agilolfing duke, had lost his duchy to Charlemagne and was condemned as an oath-breaker and conspirator. He had attempted to maintain Bavarian

²²⁵ Kraus, *Geschichte Bayerns*, 183-4.

independence, but ultimately this independence conceded to Carolingian consolidation. One of the earliest accounts of Tassilo's narrative that gained widespread circulation was Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities*, which framed Tassilo himself as a tragic and misguided figure but lauded his patronage of the Church. This perception of the duke persisted through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries relatively unchanged. Andreas von Regensburg and other fifteenth-century chroniclers expounded upon Tassilo's narrative extensively with the inclusion of the official Scheyern genealogy, drawing greater ties between Tassilo and Charlemagne. This was vital in the Wittelsbach narrative, as the monks of Scheyern utilized Tassilo's proximity to the Carolingian bloodline to plausibly position the Scheyern Wittelsbachs as close to the line of Charlemagne as possible for greater practical legitimacy and rhetorical association. The later fifteenth-century chronicles of Ebran and Füetrer emphasized this proximity to the Carolingians in different ways, yet came to the similar conclusion that Tassilo's deposition was a just decision despite his own Carolingian heritage and that his patronage of the Church was indeed a redeeming factor. Arnpeck's work attempted to get to the heart of Tassilo's narrative with sweeping refutations of established texts, devoting considerable time to debunk the more fantastical misconceptions and mischaracterizations of the figure. However, the broader themes of Tassilo's narrative remained the same to with regard to the elucidation of Bavarian aristocratic values of piety and patronage to the Church. By the sixteenth century, a Bavarian duke should be a servant of the Church – specifically the monasteries within his domain – as well as a servant to his emperor. The use of Tassilo in specific illustrated the dangers of excessive Bavarian autonomy, but the virtue of supporting its churches.

The narrative of Duke Arnulf, on the other hand, illustrates the importance of older clerical sources in the opposite direction. Arnulf's appropriation of Church land during his tenure was not an uncommon practice, and his eventual return of most of the property likely did not reflect an explicit disdain for the Church. However, Otto of Freising's influence – as well as his specific views on the limited role of secular authority over the Church and the house of Wittelsbach – recontextualized the practice to be far more condemning. This point of view was similar to that of most monastic circles of the twelfth century, whose *Klosterchroniken* provided the source base for later, more politically-motivated chronicles. Andreas von Regensburg again set the trend of fifteenth-century *Landeschroniken* by expounding upon the pedagogical potential of Arnulf's narrative for the nobility. A clergyman himself – and one profoundly influenced by the success of reformists throughout the Middle Ages – Andreas accentuated key aspects of Otto's account, such as the prophecy of St. Ulrich. Even though Arnulf was lauded in his time for Bavaria's successful defense against the Hungarians, his appropriation of Church land, deposition, exile, and return were recontextualized as indicative of a man who was overly zealous, too independent, and held little regard for institutions that should be respected. The all-encompassing genealogy of the Wittelsbachs also played a role in Arnulf's subsequent depictions, as his ties to the counts of Scheyern Wittelsbach were subject to considerable revisions under the monastery's official narrative throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The opposing influences of Arnulf's narrative in both the chronicle of Scheyern and Otto of Freising's *The Two Cities* were remarked upon in the later chronicles of Ebran and Fuetrer, namely with regard to Scheyern's streamlining of Arnulf's genealogy. In an uncharacteristic display, Veit Arnpeck's usually measured and deferential chronicle contains

even more contempt and vitriol than the earlier fifteenth-century works. Through the copious monastic records of confiscation, Arnpeck's disdain for the figure was rooted in his own pool of primary sources. Nevertheless, as was the case with Tassilo III, the use of Arnulf's narrative was to enforce the tripartite virtues of a good Bavarian duke through contrast: allegiance to the emperor, submission and respect for the clergy, and connection to the house of Wittelsbach. Due to the intense association of the Wittelsbachs with the aristocracy – and by extension the official perception of Bavarians – these themes of simultaneous subservience to the Church and emperor and independence to the rest of the territories of the Holy Roman Empire further informed the values of Bavarian identity.

However, the breach of these criteria did not always spell the condemnation of the figure in question, nor were figures who were in breach of these criteria used as an educational opportunity for the nobility. Such was the case with the narrative of Henry the Lion. Even though he was deposed of his duchies for attempting to supersede imperial authority and the said deposition resulted in the ascension of the Wittelsbachs to dukes of Bavaria, Henry the Lion was largely unremarkable in the eyes of Bavarian chroniclers throughout the Middle Ages until the fifteenth century. This lack of interest stemmed from a number of sources, beginning with the nature of Henry the Lion's rule of Bavaria in general. Even though Bavaria was his birthright, and he had ruled it as duke for nearly thirty years, Henry had visited his duchy only a handful of times during his entire tenure. This simple lack of presence and inability to dramatically manipulate the ecclesiastical or secular makeup of Bavaria led to only a few instances on which later chroniclers could hone. Paradoxically, the wider influence of Saxon chroniclers in later accounts did much to inform the Bavarian perspective of the duke. In lieu of their own sources,

Saxon works filled in the gaps that Bavarian chroniclers were forced to contend with, enabling them to form a more coherent narrative. Once aspects of this narrative were readily employed by the fifteenth century, Henry the Lion's story began to more closely resemble those of Tassilo and Arnulf, though not nearly with the same level of detail. In this way, the *Saxon World Chronicle* was instrumental in providing a narrative backbone through the dramatic framing of Barbarossa's *Kniefall*. Veit Arnpeck's chronicle subsequently illustrated that – when given a larger pool of sources – the virtues of Bavarian dukes expressed in the chronicles of the fifteenth century did indeed apply to the narrative of Henry the Lion. While this practice could have been purely out of curiosity and rigor of research, Arnpeck could have also possessed a desire to serve in the glorification of the *Land* and *Haus Bayern* through didactically inserting this figure within predetermined criteria for what makes a bad Bavarian noble and – by wider circulation and consumption – what makes a bad Bavarian.

Taken together, the ways in which these three dukes were codified into aristocratic rhetorical memory throughout the Middle Ages speaks to the priorities of the elite and the ways in which they attempted to self-identify through contrast. Through the elucidation of deviant noble behavior, chronicles in the fifteenth century sought to define legitimacy and virtue within their own small noble audience. This goal was different than earlier Bavarian *Klosterchroniken* – as was the audience – which was intended for consumption by the clergy in limited numbers before Otto of Freising.

Otto's contribution to the shaping of Bavarian aristocratic identity cannot be overstated. The rigor and minutiae of his world chronicle – along with exploring in detail secular events in recent institutional memory – set it apart from the biblical epics of most of his contemporaries.

The small rise in popularity of Latin world chronicles written in the late twelfth through thirteenth centuries did not quite reach the same level in rigor or source material as Otto's works, and instead sought to adhere stylistically to more traditional salvation histories with historical figures in the place of biblical ones. The upswing in chronicles at the end of the fourteenth century required more politically-motivated narratives for the purpose of dynastic legitimation, yet the main traditions that had existed had either derived from courtly epics, monastic chronicles, or earlier world chronicles that had appropriated elements of both. *The Two Cities* and the *Deeds of Emperor Frederick* provided not only the factual and interpretive bedrock for the narratives of Bavarian aristocratic identity for the fifteenth century but heavily informed their values. In every case, Andreas, Ebran, Füetrer, and Arnpeck elaborated upon or mused over the bishop's observations and opinions regarding the dukes, even though the context and audience for the narratives being used were vastly different from Otto's original intent. This was either direct or indirect, as Andreas von Regensburg's work was so effective in summarizing the works of Otto of Freising that his interpretations became the standard for the subsequent chronicles later in the century. It was not until Arnpeck's humanistic approach and greater detail to primary sources that he was able to either reinforce or refute some aspects of Otto of Freising's interpretations.

As a whole, Bavarian identity by the fifteenth century was a construction with multiple origins and layers of influence. Scales was correct in his assessment that inhabitants of the Holy Roman Empire's constituent entities had some self-conception of being part of a German whole, and that concerted attempts at legitimization through conscious codifying of aristocratic identity were fleeting and sporadic. However – while he does not refute the persistence of regional

identities, far from it – these concerted efforts towards aristocratic identity formation do seem more informative than he concedes, especially in a region where the nobility had been unusually cohesive and tied to their ruling dukes throughout the Middle Ages. Bavaria’s nobility, the *Haus Bayern*, remained under Wittelsbach control for seven centuries in total. With Moeglin’s observations that regional identities that historians can observe through surviving sources were largely those of the nobility, such a unique institutional domination was sure to have added another layer to the myriad identities expressed by Bavarian aristocracy. More general pan-imperial sentiments of aristocratic identity remained consistent between German territories – such as piety, subservience to the Church’s institutions, and loyalty to the position of the emperor or king – yet the filter of the Wittelsbachs (and more specifically, the official records of Scheuern) further defined Bavarian-ness in unique ways.

The dissonant dukes of Bavaria served a rhetorical purpose over the course of centuries, and that purpose changed through audience, author, and reaction to current events. The political uncertainty of fifteenth-century Bavaria required a scrambling for identity within all parties involved. This search forced them to find or construct narratives of legitimation and clarification with regard to genealogy, but also for behavior and virtues in a way that the other territories of the Holy Roman Empire had not seen significant need to codify. The early sixteenth century saw the emergence of even more identities in the form of urban affiliation and confessional identity. By then, the need for a unifying Wittelsbach narrative had abated, yet the paradigm of the *Haus Bayern* persisted. While chronicles meticulously detailing the genealogies of the Wittelsbachs gave way to urban chronicles, it is important to remember that this push was not forgotten, the chronicling traditions passed down, appropriated, and reinterpreted throughout the Middle Ages

did not die, and renaissance and humanist chroniclers did not forget the works that informed many of their self-conceptions. While medieval chronicles have been historically dismissed as propagandistic or ahistorical in modern memory, their value as tools in the narrative construction of identity has promising potential for future research.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters. Volume 20: *Rudolf von Ems Weltchronik*. Edited by Gustav Ehrismann. Berlin: Weidmann, 1915.

Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte vom 14. bis ins 16. Jahrhundert. Volume 15: *Die Chronicken der bayerischen Städte: Regensburg, Landshut, Mühldorf, München*. Edited by Karl August Muffat. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1878.

Liudprand of Cremona. *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*. Translated by Paolo Squatriti. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum. Deutsche Chroniken. Volume 1: *Deutsche Kaiserchronik*. Edited by Edward Schröder. Hannover: Hahn, 1895.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum. Deutsche Chroniken. Volume 3: *Jansen Enikels Werke*. Edited by Phillipp Strauch. Hannover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1900.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum. volume 17: *Chounradi Schirensis. Chronicon, Catalogi, Annales*. Edited by Philipp Jaffé. Hannover: Hahn, 1861.

Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa: Otto of Freising and his Continuator Rahewin*. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Otto of Freising. *The Two Cities*. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte. Volume 1: *Andreas von Regensburg, sämtliche Werke*. Edited by Georg Leidinger. Munich: M Rieger, 1903.

Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte. Volume 2: *Hans Ebran von Wildenberg, Chronik von den Fürsten aus Bayern*. Edited by Friedrich Roth. Munich: M Rieger, 1905.

Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte. Volume 2: *Ulrich Fuetrer, Bayerische Chronik*. Edited by Reinhold Spiller. Munich: M Rieger, 1909.

Quellen und Erörterungen zur bayerischen und deutschen Geschichte. Volume 3: *Veit Arnpeck, sämtliche Chroniken*. Edited by Georg Leidinger. Munich: M Rieger, 1915.

Reindel, Kurt. *Die bayerischen Luitpoldinger von 893-989: Sammlung und Erläuterung der Quellen*. Bavaria: C. H. Beck, 1953.

Secondary Sources

Airlie, Stuart. "Narratives of Triumph and Rituals of Submission: Charlemagne's Mastering of Bavaria." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 9 (1999): 93-119.

Bendos-Rezak, Brigitte Miriam. "Medieval Identity: A Sign of a Concept." *The American Historical Review* 105, no. 5 (Nov., 2000): 1489-1533.

Beumann, Helmut. *Die Ottonen*. Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne: W. Kohlhammer, 1997.

Bosl, Karl. *Bosls bayerische Biographie*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1983.

Bosl, Karl. "Wie die Bayern und Schleier entstanden. Zur führenden Rolle des Adels in der Ethnogenese und zur aristokratischen Identität." *Vorträge zur Geschichte Europas, Deutschlands und Bayerns* 2 (2000): 171-185.

Brunner, Otto. *Land and Lordship: Structures of Government in Medieval Austria*. Translated by Howard Kaminsky and James Van Horn Melton. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Bünz, Enno. "Das Land als Bezugsrahmen von Herrschaft, Rechtsordnung und Identitätsbildung. Überlegungen zum spätmittelalterlichen Landesbegriff." *Vorträge und Forschungen* 61 (2005): 53-92.

Campopiano, Michelle and Henry Bainton. *Universal Chronicles in the High Middle Ages*. York: York Medieval Press, 2017.

Chinca, Mark and Christopher Young. "Uses of the Past in Twelfth-Century Germany: The Case of the Middle High German *Kaiserchronik*." *Central European History* 49 (2016), 19-38.

Couser, Jonathan Bates. "The Chalice of Christ and the Chalice of Demons: The Making of Christendom in Agilolfing Bavaria, 500-788 A.D." Dissertation. University of Notre Dame, 2006.

Cushing, Kathleen. *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

Dicker, Stefan. *Landesbewusstsein und Zeitgeschehen: Studien zur bayerischen Chronistik des 15. Jahrhunderts*. Cologne, Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2009.

- Dirlmeier, Ulf. "Heinrich der Löwe und 'die Wirtschaft.'" *Heinrich der Löwe. Vorträge und Forschungen* 57 (2003): 293-309.
- Ehlers, Joachim. *Heinrich der Löwe: Eine Biographie*. Munich: Siedler, 2008.
- Ehlers, Joachim. *Otto von Freising, ein intellektueller im Mittelalter: Eine Biographie*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2013.
- Fosberry, John. *Criminal Justice through the Ages*, English. Translated by John Fosberry. Rothberg ob der Tauber: Mittelalterliches Krimenalmuseum, 1990. English translation, 1993.
- Freed, John B. *Frederick Barbarossa: The Prince and the Myth*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Gleason, Philip. "Identifying Identity: A Semantic History." *The Journal of American History* 69, no. 4 (1983): 910-931.
- Hammer, Carl I. *From Ducatus to Regnum: Ruling Bavaria under the Merovingians and Early Carolingians*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2007.
- Holzfurtner, Ludwig. *Gloriosus Dux: Studien zu Herzog Arnulf von Bayern, 907-937*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 2003.
- Kramer, Ferdinand. "Geschichtsschreibung Zwischen Rückbesinnung auf Hirsauer Tradition und Adeligem Machtanspruch: Eine quellenkritische Studie zur Scheyerner Chronik." *Zeitschrift für bayerische Geschichte* 57 (1994): 351-381.
- Kraus, Andreas. *Geschichte Bayerns: von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1983.
- Liebertz-Grün, Ursula. *Das andere Mittelalter: erzählte Geschichte und Geschichtserkenntnis um 1300: Studien zu Ottokar von Steiermark, Jans Enikel, Seifried Helbing*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1984.
- Matthews, Alastair. *The Kaiserchronik: A Medieval Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Moeglin, Jean-Marie. "Die Genealogie der Wittelsbacher: Politische Propaganda und Entstehung der territorialen Geschichtsschreibung in Bayern im Mittelalter." *MIöG* 96 (1988): 33-54.
- Moeglin, Jean-Marie. "Dynastisches Bewußtsein und Geschichtsschreibung: zum Selbstverständnis der Wittelsbacher, Habsburger und Hohenzollern im Spätmittelalter," *HZ* 256 (1993): 593-635.

- Moraw, Peter. *Von Öffner Verfassung zu gestalteter Verdichtung: Das Reich im späten Mittelalter, 1250-1490*. Berlin: Ullstein Verlag, 1989.
- Scales, Len. *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Schmid, Alois. *Das Bild des Bayernherzogs Arnulf (907-937) in der Deutschen Geschichtsschreibung von seinen Zeitgenossen bis zu Wilhelm von Giesebrecht*. Kallmünz: Verlag Michael Lassleben, 1976.
- Schmid, Alois. *Neue Wege der bayerischen Landesgeschichte*. Wiesbaden: GWV Fachverlage GmbH, 2008.
- Schnith, Karl Rudolf. "Die Geschichtsschreibung im Herzogtum Bayern unter den ersten Wittelsbachern (1180-1347)" in *Wittelsbach und Bayern*, edited by Hubert Glaser, 359-368. Munich: Hirmer, 1980.
- Spiegel, G.M. *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Witthöft, Christiane. *Ritual und Text: Formen symbolischer Kommunikation in der Historiographie und Literatur des Spätmittelalters*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004.
- Wolfram, Herwig. *Tassilo III.: höchster Fürst und niedrigster Mönch*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2016.