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Abstract

This dissertation focuses on the historical, social, and political context of the Vorau manuscript (Stiftsarchiv Vorau Codex 276), a collection of more than a dozen Middle High German poems from the late eleventh to the mid-twelfth century in addition to Otto of Freising’s *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*. When taken together, the manuscript’s disparate assortment of texts creates a roughly coherent history of the world from Genesis down to about 1160. Compiled by the Augustinian canons of the Styrian house towards the end of the twelfth century under the provost Bernard I, the manuscript references local historical events and individuals that were intimately tied to the region’s monastic houses. The Otakars (1055-1192) and Babenbergs (1192-1246) were the founders and advocates of a large number of the monastic communities, and this dissertation argues that the interplay of interests between the Styrian court and its religious houses forms the backdrop to the Vorau manuscript’s creation. These interests centred on the political legitimacy, social relevance, and stability of both parties that resulted from a monastery’s role in creating a history of a dynasty through commemorative practices and historical writing. This emphasis on dynasty and heritage was also a key aspect of crusading
movement of the twelfth century, playing up the importance of dynasty and heritage in the context of salvation history and increasing demand for the commemorative services offered by canons and monks. The spiritual and secular importance of dynastically driven historical consciousness at Styria’s monasteries and its court constitute the context which imbued the texts of the Vorau manuscript with relevance for its composers and subsequent users.
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Introduction

In 1163 an heir was born to the territory of Styria, a rapidly expanding margravate situated between the duchies of Bavaria and Austria. To mark the occasion Margrave Otakar III founded a small house of canons on a forested tract of alodial land and populated it with Augustinians from the cathedral chapter in Salzburg, and Seckau.\(^1\) In the remaining decades of the twelfth century this small community worked to equip itself for the pastoral and liturgical duties entrusted to it. A core group of texts was essential to the functioning of the new foundation and a scriptorium was established there to produce what was not acquired from neighbouring communities.\(^2\) Vorau Stiftsarchiv codex 276 (henceforth: the Vorau manuscript, or Vorau 276) cuts a rather unusual figure amid the twelfth-century Augustinian house’s manuscript collection.\(^3\) Its large format is perhaps the most immediately conspicuous characteristic, and at 45 by 32.5 cm and 183 folios, it is one of the largest of the medieval books that Vorau possesses.\(^4\) Its contents, too, single it out with respect to the archive’s other holdings. It contains more than a dozen Middle High German (MHG) poems from the late eleventh to the mid-twelfth century—many of which do not survive anywhere else. In addition to Otto of Freising’s *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*, the manuscript contains the *Kaiserchronik* (1ra-73vb), *Vorauer Mosis* (74ra-96ra) (which includes the texts *Genesis, Joseph, Moses, Vorauer Marienlob, Balaam*, *Die Wahrheit* (96ra-vb), *Summa Theologiae* (97ra-98va), *Lob Salomons* (98va-99va), *Drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen* and *Die Ältere Judith* (99va-100va), *Die Jüngere Judith* (100va-108vb), Pfaffe Lambrecht’s *Alexanderlied* (109ra-115va), Frau Ava’s *Leben Jesu, Sieben Gaben des Heiligen

---

\(^1\) For the founding of Vorau, see Joseph Zahn, ed., *Urkundenbuch des Herzogthums Steiermark* (Graz, 1879), vol. I, no. 479 (Henceforth *StUB*).


\(^4\) It should be noted that many of Vorau’s early books were destroyed in a fire in 1237, but according to a later chronicle witness (Vorau Stiftsarchiv Schachtel 263), a number of the codices were rescued by the provost.
Geistes, Antichrist, and Das Jüngste Gericht (115va-125ra), Vorauer Sündenklage (125ra-128rb), the Ezzolied (128rb-128vb), Priester Arnolt’s Von der Siebenzahl (129vb-133vb), Das Himmlische Jerusalem (133vb-135va), and the Gebet einer Frau (135va-rb). When taken together, the manuscript’s disparate assortment of texts appears to create a roughly coherent history of the world from Genesis right down to about 1160.\(^5\) Debate about the codex’s place of origin has generally settled in favour of the small Austrian Stift of Vorau in the province of Styria (Steiermark), over and above its more senior and well-established neighbours such as Seckau and St. Peter’s in Salzburg.\(^6\) In the last quarter of the twelfth-century, the time of the manuscript’s production, Vorau was still a relatively young community. Nevertheless, folio 136\(r\) contains a note that identifies the Vorau provost Bernard (1185-1202) as the commissioning party.\(^7\) The production of such a remarkable codex at a young foundation, the outfitting of which likely placed a heavy burden on its resources, is quite an achievement and further indicates the unique importance of this manuscript within its setting; more than ninety animals were required to furnish the parchment alone.\(^8\) As a singular witness to a large section of the corpus of early MHG literature, the manuscript and its texts have attracted considerable attention from Germanist scholars and comparatively little from those working in other disciplines with the exception of codicology. The works of codicologists who studied the manuscript have centred on where it was produced and by whom, rather than its social and political context.\(^9\) After the early debate between Hermann Menhardt and Pius Fank, though, only smaller studies that deal

\(^5\) Freytag believes there is a program at work in the other two major Sammelhandschriften of the period (ÖNB, Cod. 2721 [W] and Klagenfurt, Kärtner Landesarchiv, cod. GV 6/19 [M]), though he is less convinced by the Vorau manuscript. His assertion that the arrangement is problematic stems from his erroneous belief that the Gesta Friderici was adduced later (see my discussion of this in Chapter 3). Hartmut Freytag, “Die frühmittelhochdeutsche geistliche Dichtung in Österreich”, in Die österreichische Literatur. Ihr Profil von den Anfängen im Mittelalter bis ins 18. Jahrhundert (1050-1750), Teil I. Unter Mitwirkung von Fritz Peter Knapp, ed. Herbert Zeman (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1986), 124-126. On the program of the manuscript see Hugo Kuhn, Text und Theorie (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1969), 143-146.


\(^8\) Wolf, Buch und Text, 124.

\(^9\) See Gärtner’s entry in the Verfasserlexikon for a bibliography.
with the issue as an auxiliary to an examination of one of the manuscript’s texts have attempted to do so. Studies of individual texts seek to plot them on a trajectory of German literary history, but fail to treat the manuscript as a whole. What intellectual or social currents formed the impetus behind its compilation? What value did those who used it derive from it? What made it relevant at that time, at that place? And how does Vorau’s standing within the territory affect our understanding of the manuscript’s creation and subsequent use? These are the questions which concern the present work.

Establishing the group for whom this manuscript was intended is a difficult task. The codex itself offers no information on patrons aside from the note in the Gesta Friderici (see above).

Since the thoughtful collection of texts can be considered a communicative act, an audience must have been intended, and determining where the Vorau manuscript fits into a historical context necessitates a comment on this topic. Aside from Fank and Hutz, two historians with a Styrian background, Klaus Grubmüller posited a connection between the manuscript’s producers and the Styrian court under the Otakars, pointing out, as Fank had done, that the provost Bernard produced many documents for the margraves and may have had a hand in the regency of Otakar IV. The multitude of vernacular texts certainly suggest that an audience which had limited or no access to Latin learning was intended, and we ought, therefore, to look beyond the walls of the Augustinian foundation for the manuscript’s intended public. Bernard’s connection to the Otakarian court supplies an important link that allows us to bring the Styrian court into the possible sphere of interest for the Vorau manuscript. However, Bernard was also active as a notary for the Babenberg archbishops of Salzburg, and when Duke Leopold V (Babenberg) inherited the duchy of Styria in 1192 (within the period of Bernard’s tenure as Provost of Vorau)


12 Bernard drafted the following documents for the archbishop of Salzburg: StUB I, 341, 503, 508; StUB II, 22. SUB II 388 (Admont), 400 (Teutonic Order), 391 (Vorau, for Archbishop Adalbert III). For the Otakars he drafted the founding documents for Vorau (StUB I, 479, 642) and Spital am Semmering (StUB I, 406). He furthermore drafted charters for St. Lambrecht (SUB II, 365), Seckau (StUB I, 499, 546 [for Otakar III], 619, StUB II, 22). Bernard also drafted and corrected the two charters that make up the Georgenberg Compact (BUB I, 65 and 66). This is by no means an exhaustive list, but given the poor survival rate for Styrian charters and the great number composed by Bernard, we can assume that he was responsible for many more. See also Vorauer Handschrift, 41-43.
after Otakar IV’s death, Bernard likely continued in the service of the new dukes, who might also have been the intended recipients.\textsuperscript{13} When the Styrian and Austrian dukes concluded their negotiations for the latter’s inheritance of the former’s territories, Provost Bernard of Vorau drafted the charter (the so-called Georgenberg Compact).\textsuperscript{14} Since Bernard is widely believed to be the sole hand at work in the German section of the manuscript, his involvement with both the Otakars and Babenbergs brings this latter dynasty into our contextual sketch.\textsuperscript{15} Both the Babenbergs and the Otakars, moreover, are frequently mentioned throughout the \textit{Gesta}—a text composed by a Babenberg.\textsuperscript{16} The relative certainties of Vorau 276’s production also allow us to address the question of how it fits into its cultural and historical background. Brian Stock’s notion of a textual community—a group of individuals for whom a text, or an interpreter of a text is a focal point of their interactions within a community setting is helpful in understanding why texts could be so important for groups of people.\textsuperscript{17} Stock describes the role of texts and their interpreters in forming social bonds amongst, and conditioning the interaction of, members of a group. His work highlights the importance of social and historical forces at work in a particular time and place for our understanding of the value of medieval texts, and vice versa. My analysis presupposes the existence of a group (the canons of Vorau and the lay lords of the Styrian court, both Otakarian and Babenberg) and seeks to identify the nature of the ties between them in order to determine the value of the manuscript for its audience or community.\textsuperscript{18} Relevance and use are


\textsuperscript{14} Wonisch, “Urkundenwesen der Traungauer”, 143-144.

\textsuperscript{15} On Bernard’s involvement as the copyist of the German section see Frank, \textit{Vorauer Handschrift}, 41-43.


\textsuperscript{17} Brian Stock, \textit{The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the 11\textsuperscript{th} and 12\textsuperscript{th} Centuries} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 88-92, 522-524.

\textsuperscript{18} The Babenbergs were great patrons of German literature, it should be noted. It has been suggested that Henry Jasomirgott was involved in some way with the creation of the \textit{Rolandslied}, although this cannot be proven. P. Wapnewski, “Der Epilog und die Datierung des deutschen Rolandsliedes”, \textit{Euphorion} 49 (1955), 261-282. Dietmar von Aist may also have been active in Vienna under Henry Jasomirgott. It is not until 1194 that we have solid proof of Babenberg literary patronage, when Reinmar der Alte wrote his “Witwenklage” about Leopold V. Leopold VI’s patronage of literature is matter of some debate, but there is some suggestion that the \textit{Niebelungenlied} was
two distinct categories, however, with the former characterizing the text—or manuscript in this case—as more reflective of group dynamics, and the latter as more determinative. I focus chiefly on setting out the Vorau manuscript’s relevance before offering some thoughts on how it might have been used by its community.

Manuscript evidence has always been an integral part of a medievalist’s engagement with texts, helping to shed light on the evolution of a work by offering variations for comparison and collation. The relation of codices to one another from a codicological perspective allows, in some cases, the movement of texts to be traced and histories of individual works to be composed. But when multiple texts have been collected and set in a purposeful relation to one another, as was the case with the other major vernacular Sammelhandschriften of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in Austria (the Vienna [W], Milstatt [M], and Vorau manuscripts) a different approach to the codex itself must be taken.¹⁹ When a compiler selected disparate texts and envisioned each part contributing to a greater narrative whole, the concepts of copying and transmission are insufficient; these compilers, though they may have contributed little innovation in the texts themselves, nevertheless engaged with the material in a productive way that allows us to see compilation as a creative act in itself.²⁰ Like works of original composition, they were

---

¹⁹ See note 5.

driven by some impulse to create and communicate meaning to a select group of people for whom the information was relevant. Each manuscript has a specific historical context to which it belongs and to which its unique communicative efforts were most effective. Uncovering these contexts is an essential step in reading medieval texts on their own terms and understanding their value for the cultures that produced them. Manuscripts that have a historiographical focus and local connection such as Vorau 276 offer insights into the uses of history and historical writing by various groups, and they can help historians working on medieval historical writing in other areas establish useful comparisons in a broader context, as recent work on the Kaiserchronik has done for Northern and Western Europe. 21 In the following four chapters I will illustrate what I believe to be the social, political, and historical setting in which the Vorau manuscript was created, and from which its unique communicative approach derives meaning. While the content of the manuscript necessitates close readings of the texts, the focus is on the relevance of this manuscript for its users, its community, and its Kommunikationsgemeinschaft. 22 This thesis is a historical reconstruction of context, rather than a literary or textual study.

For some decades now, medieval German studies have been moving away from the source criticism and major literary histories that were characteristic of the many years of excellent and diligent scholarly efforts to produce useable versions of texts and provide context. From the relaxing of some of the more deeply held notions of medieval literary history come the underpinnings of this dissertation. For instance, the role of Cluny and Cluniac reform in the development of early Middle High German (MHG) literature has had a diminished influence in the scholarship of recent decades. 23 And the idea that literature and literary production shifted from the monastery to the court has lost traction in favour of a view that sees it as a much more complex process involving the slackening of the distinction between literate clergy and illiterate

21 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).
nobles. It involved individuals at court who served secular lords but were nevertheless clerics, and powerful prince bishops who were ideally placed between the ecclesiastical and the secular to sustain an interest in more secular literature like the epics and exercised enough influence over the people involved in its production to drive it forward. Even the patron-author relationship might be more complex than hitherto acknowledged. It could have developed out of kin relations or could have been mediated by a third party like a bishop, provost, or court cleric in some instances. Generally speaking, examining the culture that produced literature in the twelfth-century Empire involves looking more closely at the intersection of ecclesiastical and secular spheres and determining the significant areas in which these two overlap. This study intends to do precisely that. Its approach brings Medieval German textual studies into much closer contact with the interests of historians, and this study hopes to underscore the need of such interdisciplinary work that brings as much of the specificity as possible to the study of a single significant manuscript like Vorau 276.

In the course of this work I will stress the importance of local factors in understanding both textual and manuscript production. By examining the other manuscripts created at Vorau I will attempt to set Vorau 276 in relation to the broader textual holding of the canons, even if these codices are somewhat thematically distinct. I will seek to introduce as much relevant material across as many disciplines to my study as the sources allow, with the hope of demonstrating the value of a more rounded approach to the local. Studies that focus on texts often tune out the specifics of each manuscript’s origin and historical, political, or social setting. This study will highlight the complex and manifold impulses behind each act of manuscript production, with the implication that we cannot undervalue the circumstances of individual instances of texts, even if


they were widely copied throughout the Middle Ages. A next step might be to bring this particular research to bear on the broader pictures. What might we learn about the *Kaiserchronik* in the Middle Ages, for instance, based on what we know about its earliest copy? More general studies of medieval composition can benefit from empirical research on individual copies, treating each as productive acts reacting to stimuli particular to a time and place. In this way my research hopes to show that one of the best ways to approach the question of what value people saw in producing and copying specific (historical, literary, or scholarly) texts—and thus understand broader appeal—is to examine in depth, where possible, the circumstances peculiar to each copy’s creation.

In the first chapter I sketch the political backdrop of the territory in which Vorau is located, and demonstrate where the interests of the Styrian margravial court and the region’s monasteries and canonical houses overlapped or intersected. To do so, I examine the growth of the territory of Styria during the twelfth century under the Otakars, with a focus on the efforts of these margraves (and later duke) to accumulate lands and privileges and establish themselves as regional and imperial magnates. Chief among the Otakars’ strategies was the acquisition of the right of advocacy (Latin *advocatia*, and German *Vogtei*) over Styria’s religious houses, which was meant to establish the Styrian margrave as a representative for the cloistered in the secular affairs from which they were barred. Styria’s monasteries were liberally patronized by the Otakars, who showed themselves as devout and staunch defenders of the Church throughout the twelfth century. As patrons and advocates, the Otakars and their monasteries were part of a mutually beneficial relationship in which each party helped to establish and safeguard the permanence of the other. The composition of historical texts and the cultivation of the *memoria* of the Styrian ruling house by the region’s monasteries created an image of dynasty and

---


continuity with the past that was central to the Otakarian bid for political legitimacy. In helping to establish this legitimacy, the Styrian monasteries and canonical houses—Vorau included—laid the foundations for their own legal and political permanence by demonstrating the validity of the authority of their patrons, founders, and protectors. The construction of the past through historical writing and commemorative practices in monastic houses was central to the interests of both the court and the communities the Otakars founded and supported. When it became clear in the 1180s that Otakar IV would not produce an heir, the ensuing succession crisis—resolved to the benefit of the Babenberg dukes of Austria—would see Otakarian memoria retain its importance for the monastic communities that created it. The new ruling house continued to foster the commemoration of the Otakars because it supported their claim to legitimacy within Styria. This chapter shows this process playing out at the regional level and at Vorau specifically.

Chapter 2 adduces the dynamic of the crusading movement to my image of the political and social background of twelfth-century Styria. Here I discuss crusading as a social phenomenon and the ways in which it became a meaningful aspect of the connection between court and monastery in Styria. It is the manuscript itself that suggests that the crusades were an important part of the cultural background to the production of the Vorau manuscript; in the form of Otto of Freising’s Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris, the Vorau manuscript contains an account of the preparations for the Second Crusade, and it also provides documentary information concerning the campaign itself, including a copy of the influential bull Quantum praedecessores. This bull’s recruitment propaganda was disseminated by Cistercian preachers in France, the Empire, and England in the lead-up to the Second Crusade and made an appeal to lay nobles and their sense of pride in their family’s and dynasty’s achievements. The image of dynastic continuity so central to the Styrian court’s relationship with its monasteries was a powerful tool for crusade preachers, and Styria’s nobles answered the call to the mid-century crusade, as did the Babenberg Henry Jasomirgott. The Babenbergs, moreover, were the region’s preeminent

29 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 37.
31 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 43.
crusading family, whose participation in the campaigns of the twelfth century continued well into the thirteenth and included some disreputable episodes. The crusading movement allowed both lay nobles and the monastic foundations they patronized to take part in an event that would enhance the reputation of the dynasty and add to the political legitimacy of both parties. I describe with specificity the many ways the impact of the crusading movement can be observed in Styria from the twelfth century into the Babenberg period and the way in which this complex phenomenon played out within the framework of the relationship between the Styrian court and its monastic/canonical houses. For the Babenberg successors the crusades continued to define their reigns and remained an influential dynamic in the exercise of their lordship in Styria.

Building on Chapter 2’s treatment of crusading in Styria, Chapter 3 asks how the Vorau manuscript’s texts might have been a relevant expression of some aspect of the intersection of interests between court and Vorau’s canons with respect to the crusading movement. The chief textual objects of this chapter are the Kaiserchronik, Vorau Alexander, and the Ezzolied. Drawing on the expressions of crusader rhetoric contained in the manuscript itself, I discuss how these texts could be read in a crusader context and how they might have been germane to an audience aware of the influential propaganda of the papal and Cistercian preaching campaigns. As in Chapters 1 and 2, the dynamics of dynasty and heritage play an important role in my analyses, and I outline the function of these topics in the narratives of the Kaiserchronik and the Vorau Alexander. Issues of dynasty and heritage were particularly relevant at the time of the Vorau manuscript’s composition because it coincided with a change in ruling house within Styria, when the Babenberg Leopold V obtained the duchy after the death of the childless Otakar IV. With respect to the Ezzolied, the focus is on the Christocentrism of the poem and its appeal to crusaders whose personal piety was very closely linked to their particular mode of imitatio Christi. Moreover, the Ezzolied’s characterization of man’s relationship with God as one of mutual service to a lord reflects a secular conception of a political hierarchy and seems tailored to an audience for whom these metaphors would have made sense. The context of the crusading movement was not simply a general phenomenon, it had an impact on the association between court and monastery, influenced the way in which they interacted and the textual material these institutions produced. In this chapter the readings of the texts I propose are set not

---

against the crusading movement in general, but concern specifically the form the movement took in Styria when introduced to the dynamics that condition the contact of the Otakars/Babenbergs and their monastic/canonical houses.

Chapter 4 focuses on the most fundamental aspect of the court-monastery relationship: the salvation of individual souls. Monasteries founded by lay lords often came into being as pious acts offered to the Lord for the salvation of the souls of an individual and his or her family. These institutions cared for the souls of their patrons during life, and even after death. My treatment of the Vorau manuscript and its place at the intersection of monastic and Otakarian/Babenberg interests necessarily takes this fact into account. Here I discuss the Vorau manuscript’s texts that are of a more eschatological character, with the redemption of souls in mind. In the context of the crusades, the salvation of individuals was a core concern and my readings of the texts in this group—which include the Vorauer Mosis, Drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen, the Jüngere and Ältere Judith texts, the Lob Salomons, Gebet einer Frau—highlight the ways in which they might have appealed to lay nobles whose redemption was offered to them through the violent medium of crusading. In many of the texts drawn from the Old Testament, the opposition of God’s elect and an oppressive heathen adversary was a fundamental aspect of their eschatological themes. The characterization of an embattled faith might have appealed to crusaders in the build-up to the crusades throughout the twelfth century in general. In my discussion of the Vorauer Mosis, however, I demonstrate that the attitudes of the compilers and users of the codex toward crusading and Christian violence in general were much more complex than my analysis hitherto conceded. Even though the crusading movement still plays an important role in the examination of the texts of this section, the chapter offers some more room for interpretation and acknowledges the fundamental interest of personal salvation that concerned both monastery and Styrian nobles.

34 I would like to make a brief note about the terminology employed in this dissertation. Terms such as heathen, righteous, chosen people, God’s elect, infidel, and any other word or combination of words that might imply a moral appraisal of any aspect of either faith on the part of author must not be divorced from the historical setting that imbued them with connotations temporally and culturally discrete from the twenty-first century. These words reflect the ideologies and values of those who used them in the twelfth century and I have employed them because they are essential in interpreting the historical record and understanding medieval cultures and their artifacts on their own terms.
My treatments of the Vorau manuscript’s texts are motivated by a desire to show that although each has its own textual and transmission history, their purposeful aggregation was a creative act with a cultural and historical impetus specific to Vorau, Styria, the Otakars, the Babenbergs, and anyone else involved in the codex’s creation and subsequent use. I have attempted to direct a historian’s efforts towards the manuscript and in bringing to light its historical context, I demonstrate that the manuscript itself can be viewed in much the same way as individual works of medieval historical writing. Vorau 276 represents an engagement with the past on the part of a local community that was aware of its place within the broader framework of salvation history. The manuscript is much more than a collection of texts to be read in isolation; the individual works participate in a rough chronology and an undeniable association is therefore created between them that invites us to see them as interacting with one another and influences our reading of each as parts of a greater whole. It is my hope that this dissertation and the example of Vorau 276 will help demonstrate the importance of the specific circumstances of the creation, composition, and compilation of individual manuscripts in discussions of medieval historical writing, and the significance of the local historical setting that imbues each instance of copying or compilation with relevance and meaning for those involved in its creation and use. In this way we might also explore more deeply the often obscure network of relationships and interests that existed between individuals and groups involved in the production of historical writing, and understand the value they attributed to this medium.
CHAPTER 1

At the Crossroads of Court and Cloister: The Growth of Styria and its Monastic and Canonical Communities

1.1 Introduction

In 1203 Archbishop Eberhard II of Salzburg, Duke Leopold VI of Austria, Abbot Rudiger of Admont, Gerold the provost of Seckau, and a number of other ecclesiastical and secular nobles gathered at Fischau to settle a dispute between Abbess Otilia of Göß and the powerful Styrian ministerial Ulrich of Stubenberg. 1 Ulrich had brought a suit against Otilia for what he considered a breach of the relationship between the two. The abbess, he claimed, had appointed various officers to administrative positions (officia) and had parcelled part of the abbey’s lands out as fiefs (infeudationes) without his consent. The Fischau charter documents the resolution of the case which hinged on whether or not Ulrich was the legitimate advocatus (German Vogt) of the abbey, as he claimed to be. Typically a secular lord who founded or patronized the house, the advocate was an important, yet potentially troublesome figure for the monastery. 2

---

1 Joseph Zahn, ed., Steirisches Urkundenbuch vol. II (Graz, 1879), no. 65. Henceforth cited as StUB II.
2 This position is a very difficult one to define owing to the manifold changes it underwent from century to century and place to place. The following studies provide a good introduction to the topic and its complexities, but the extent to which these authors rely on specific instances for support is telling of the ambiguous status of the advocate even from monastery to monastery. Susan Wood, The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 355-372, 584-601; Benjamin Arnold, Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 195-201; John Freed, The Counts of Falkenstein: Noble Self-Consciousness in Twelfth-Century Germany (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984); H.J. Schmidt, “Vogt, Vogtei” in Lexikon des Mittelalters (Stuttgart: Verlag J.B. Metzler), vol. 8, cols. 1813-1814. In the following discussion we are limited in what we are able to conclude about the Styrian monastic houses from the individual documents and the language they employ. It may not be entirely clear precisely what rights and privileges the Styrian margraves exercised with respect to the foundations for which they served as advocate, and extrapolating this information from sources which do not specifically examine Styria or the particular monasteries concerned is problematic. The impression I have received from the documents under examination (e.g. a lack of complaints brought against the advocate himself) and subsequently confirmed by the character of Otakarian rulership towards their own monasteries and the church in general, is that the Otakars appear to have been satisfactory advocates. It should be noted, however, that the margraves nevertheless saw the advocacy of monasteries as a vital plank in their policy of increasing their Landesherrschaft. In some cases, the parties perceived themselves as engaged in a feudal relationship that entailed hierarchy and subservience. For instance, in a document concerning Seckau given by Duke Leopold VI in 1202, the duke makes clear that the monastery is obliged to seek his express permission regarding their management of their holdings. See StUB II n. 50 and my discussion of this document below at note 38. In the case of Göß, Otakar acquired the advocacy from the emperor at a time when he was building up his power in the region. Otakar IV, moreover, appears to have taken over the advocacy from his father for many of Styria’s houses, which demonstrates...
(German Vogtei) was a position intended to help a monastery perform some of the things that were necessary, but forbidden because of their worldly nature. Because monasteries often had some judicial power themselves, but were prohibited from carrying out certain legal actions, an advocate might serve the monastery’s interest in that regard. Certainly protection and any action that required force had to be carried out by the advocate. There was a tremendous amount of variety in the duties of such a figure across the many centuries from its origin in late Antiquity, and tremendous regional and local variances as well. It is a phenomenon difficult to characterize generally, and although it was a formally contracted position, the duties of an advocate were never fixed. An advocate was a representative in the sphere of worldly affairs (such as representing the monastery at a royal or princely court), but might also hold his own juridical processes during disputes as a representative of higher justice, and often claimed the right to authenticate and authorize transactions of property. Although a community was meant to be able to freely choose their advocate, by the middle of the eleventh century their lay possessors often treated these positions as hereditary privileges that constituted part of their administrative authority and Lehnwesen in a particular territory. Advocates often used their unclear status to interfere in the affairs of monastic communities under their care (often to the detriment of the community), and it began to form a part of the territorial rulership (Landesherrschaft) as well, even if an advocate of a monastery was not necessarily its territorial lord. Those seeking to expand their influence in territories either already, or not yet under their control increasingly involved themselves in monastic affairs, as Ulrich appears to have done in the example above. Despite charters of immunity from secular interference granted to many monasteries by the papacy, the reality of the situation depended heavily on local politics, and by about 1100 many abbots and even bishops in Germany were dependent on their advocates and lords for protection; throughout the twelfth century the position of advocate continued to be an important part of the

that they considered these positions hereditary. Even though we might, strictly speaking, consider these practices abusive, there is little indication the Otakars were harming their charges.


This was indeed such a problem that one of the major components of the reform movement during the tenth and eleventh centuries was the dismantling of such privileges among the laity. U. Stutz, “The Proprietary Church as an element of Medieval Germanic Ecclesiastical Law,” in *Medieval Germany*, ed. G. Barraclough (Oxford: OUP, 1961), vol. 2, p. 35-70. The forbidding of the clergy from exercising their legal status in secular jurisdiction played into the hands of the German secular nobility, forcing clergymen and monks to appeal to lay lords for the application of justice in some cases. Arnold, *Princes and Territories*, 197. On abuse of the office see Wood, *Proprietary Church*, 330, and Arnold, *Princes and Territories* 199-201.
Landesherrschaft. Ulrich charged the abbess with disregarding her obligation to carry out her affairs with the consent of the advocatus, which the ministerial claimed to be. Otilia’s complaint of Ulrich’s injurious conduct was upheld by the higher authorities of the duchy, the archbishop of Salzburg and the duke, who appealed to an older, unnamed source (presumably documentary) which clearly states that Göß was an imperial abbey and the emperor himself was the advocatus. This privilege of the emperor’s, however, was bestowed upon the then margrave of Styria, Otakar III, as the document itself makes known, and not on Ulrich of Stubenberg. Ulrich, apparently unable to respond to the force of the proof brought against him, withdrew his suit against abbess Otilia and swore not to appeal the decision. The authority of the Styrian margraves had held, despite the end of the Otakarian dynasty in 1192.

Behind the withdrawal of Ulrich of Stubenberg’s suit against Abbess Otilia lay over a century of ‘state’ building in which Styria’s religious houses played a major role in a way that extended well beyond their activities creating infrastructure and bringing new land under cultivation. These institutions helped the Otakarian dynasty consolidate its rule over its territories by acting as outposts of the secular ruler’s authority. When the Babenbergs inherited Styria they continued to play this role, simultaneously reinforcing the legitimacy of both houses. Although the precise relationship between the margraves/dukes and Styria’s religious houses varied from case to case and could change over time—Göß, for example, was initially an imperial abbey—the Otakarian advocates were nevertheless major patrons who received spiritual services in return for their

7 Indeed the language used in the document describing the outcome of Ulrich’s actions evokes this relationship in its description of the nature of the harm caused by Ulrich. It reads, “Although the church of Göß was privileged from its ancient founding, that it should only have the Roman emperor as the advocate, he provided for the security and needs of that church...that which was provided for security turned to harm.” Cum ex antiqua fundacione Gossensis ecclesia sit priuilegiata quod solum Romanum imperatorem habere debeat advocatum ad cautelam et utilitatem illius ecclesie fuerat prouisum...quod prouisum fuerat ad cautelam tendit ad noxiam. StUB II, no. 65. Arnold, Princes and Territories, 197.

8 ...vices suas in advocatia tali imperator Romanum duct Styriae committeret. Although we do not possess a report of the events which led to Otakar receiving the advocacy over Göß, it is very likely that this occurred in 1152, at the imperial assembly in Regensburg during which he also received the advocacy over Seckau. A document from 1197 (StUB II, no. 22) given by the archbishop of Salzburg which recounts the founding of Seckau gives a report on the 1152 Assembly. Helmut J. Mezler-Andelberg, “Landesfürst und Klöster in der Steiermark bis zum 13. Jahrhundert. Ein Überblick”, in Festschrift für Julius Franz Schütz, ed. Berthold Sutter (Graz: Böhlau, 1954), 439.

9 For the debate on the correct name for the Styrian dynasty see Julius Strandt, “Das Gebiet zwischen Traun und Enns”, Archiv für Österreichische Geschichte 94 (1906), 465-661; and more recently, Heinz Dopsch, “Die steirischen Otakare. Zu ihrer Herkunft und ihren dynastischen Verbindungen”, in Das Werden der Steiermark, ed. Gerhard Pferschy (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1980), 10-109. For simplicity, I refer to the entire dynasty (Otakar I, Otakar II, Leopold, Otakar III, and Otakar IV) collectively as the Styrian Otakars, or the Styrian margraves.
While often endowed with a certain degree of autonomy with respect to the secular political hierarchy, these institutions depended on the power of the advocate for the preservation of this right, if challenged legally or threatened physically. By upholding and safeguarding the authority of the Styrian Otakars, the region’s religious houses saw to their own security and status. The Otakars were aware of the role that monastic communities could play in creating and maintaining authority, and consciously pursued and accumulated advocacies over the vast majority of monastic foundations within their territory. The Babenbergs, moreover, as the new advocates understood that the decades of Otakarian commemoration could be put to use in establishing the legitimacy of their succession to a territory to which they held no dynastically-rooted claim. The episode from Göß given above constitutes a broadly applicable example of how the Styrian margraves and their religious houses mutually supported one another’s authority and cooperated in corroborating (and if necessary, judicially defending) the rights and privileges accumulated over the course of generations, and the ways in which this dynamic retained importance into the Babenberg period. Power and legitimacy were very much intertwined with monastic interests in twelfth-century Styria.

In the High Middle Ages ancestry and the perception that a contemporary ruler could claim to be part of a chain of authority legitimately received, held, and relayed in continuous dynastic succession was at the core of noble self-conception and served as a social precondition of rulership. An untold number of family and dynastic histories that trace their lineage to a glorious, more often than not, Carolingian forbear testify to the persistence and importance of this aspect of noble identity throughout the Middle Ages. Shopkow suggests that dynastic

---

10 As in many places, Styria’s monasteries considered the margraves their lords, in the sense that they owed homage or rents or participated in a dynamic of legal and social subordination. On advocates as lords of their monasteries see Folker Reichen, *Landesherrschaft, Adel und Vogtei: Zur Vorgeschichte des spätmittelalterlichen Ständestaates im Herzogtum Österreich* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau, 1985). In the foundation document for Vorau, however, it appears that the margrave recused himself from any direct overlordship. Otakar III established the canons on his own land (*predium nostrum*) which he gave as a gift (*manu potestativa*) to Archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg (*tradidimus...ad Jvuaensem sedem*). Eberhard, is referred to as Otakar’s lord (*domini nostri Eberardi*). StUB I, no. 479. The canons of Vorau would likely then have considered the archbishop of Salzburg their temporal as well as spiritual lord. That Otakar handed the land over to the ecclesiastical hierarchy is consistent with what we know about the dynasty’s commitment to supporting the reform movement within their territories. See section 1 below. The relationship between lay lord and their proprietary church could be quite complicated and was subject to a high degree of regional variation. For a good introduction to this topic that also touches on the South-east of the empire see Susan Wood, *The Proprietary Church*, 355-372, 584-601.

11 In the next section of the chapter I provide more specific information about the way in which the Otakars used the position of advocate as a ‘state’-building tool.

12 See Ch. 2.
history is not necessarily reflective of a growing noble self-consciousness but stems from political concerns. Periods of dynastic change and political uncertainty often drove institutions such as monasteries to produce these texts in an effort to maintain a continuity with the past. Stability was rooted in the past, and disconnecting with that past (through a change in the ruling house, say) was perceived as a threat. Hence, it was most often monasteries that commissioned and produced dynastic histories in an effort to demonstrate their contiguity with a particular family.¹³ Tracing an ancestor in the Middle Ages could mean an attempt to bring to light a dynastic founder who was still tangibly related to those yet living, such as the Welf genealogies (for all their faults).¹⁴ The commemorative practices carried out by the monasteries patronized


by the Otakars invoked the names of deceased dynastic adherents and maintained their memory and presence within the community. For the Styrian monasteries that owed their existence and status to a defunct ruling house, the change in lordship would have presented an appropriate moment for the creation of a history such as Vorau 276. The maintenance of memory, which touched many aspects of a religious house’s activities, prevented the legacy of dead ancestors and relatives from being lost, and in effect helped to craft an image of dynastic continuity and an unbroken chain of authority that extended back for generations.

It is clear that the Otakars understood that rulership in twelfth-century Styria was inextricably tied to religion and, more specifically, to the region’s monastic and religious houses. Court and cloister bolstered each other’s authority and each party recognized the utility of this practice. But the connection between the Otakars and their foundations did not lose relevance during the succession crisis of the 1180s, or even after the death of this dynasty. The Babenberg dukes who ruled Styria after 1192 made use of the efforts of the region’s monasteries to legitimize the Otakars by continuing to foster their commemoration and by positioning themselves as heirs to Otakarian authority. The example of Göß described above is particularly illustrative of the significance of Otakarian commemoration in Styria after the transference of the duchy to Babenberg rule. To characterize this relationship, however, as a brutally political and practical one would ignore the important fact that the cooperation of secular and ecclesiastical spheres of society was one of the highest ideals of a Christian Europe having very recently undergone the trauma of a major and violent rift between the two in the form of the Investiture Conflict.

---

15 Founders needed to make their monastic institutions strong and equip them with the tools to defend themselves from the interference of others. This in turn strengthened the authority of the ruler who bestowed the privileges that underpinned this independence, with the monastery now serving as an outpost of the founder’s authority that could check the advance of would-be challengers. Michael Borgolte, “Stiftungen des Mittelalters im Spannungsfeld von Herrschaft und Genossenschaft”, in Memoria in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters, ed. Oexle, Otto Gerhard, and Dieter Geuenich (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1994), 276. In the case of Styria, Mezler-Andelberg says it most succinctly: “Die Steiermark ist unter den Otakaren in einer Zeit entstanden, die durch eine im Bewußtsein der Mitlebenden nicht trennbare charakteristische Verbindung von Politik und Religion, weltlicher Macht und Kirche geprägt erscheint.” Helmut J. Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform und Fürstenglaube. Bemerkungen zur Religiösen Haltung der Traungauer”, in Das Werden der Steiermark, ed. Gehard Pferschy (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1980), 141.

Moreover, this relationship often involved a familial facet, as many brothers and sisters began their lives in the lay noble households that supported the religious houses in their territories. The Styrian margraves, together with their viribus religiosis enjoyed the social and political benefits of a mutual interest in each other’s well-being and the maintenance of legitimate authority. The political dimension of this relationship is the subject of this chapter.

1.2 The Growth of Styria in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries

In the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries a relatively minor noble family from the Chiemgau, Bavaria, rapidly increased its allodial holdings in a border march, later called Styria—a name derived from the first seat of the ruling house at Steyr—and accrued imperial privileges at such a rate that within one hundred years the margraves, and later dukes of Styria, could rightly claim to be among the most powerful magnates of the empire. So powerful, in fact, that in 1180 the margrave of Styria was able to remove himself and his territory from feudal ties to the new duke of Bavaria, Otto of Wittelsbach. From their base at Steyr, the Otakars added to their modest allodial holdings in the area, benefitting heavily from a fortuitous series of inheritances from cousins whose marriages proved childless. The county in the Enns Valley and the mark in Mur valley were some of their earliest acquisitions in Styria, inherited at the death of Arnold II of Wels-Lambach in 1055. Otakar I married Williberg of the powerful Eppenstein family that ruled much of the Mur valley, and with the death of this dynasty in 1122 Leopold, the Strong (1122-1129), Otakar II’s son, doubled his territory.

17 The rapid rise of Styria under the Otakars is well documented. Oto Luthar, The Land Between: A History of Slovenia (Frankfurt a.M.: Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2008); Joseph Gaisberger, Lauriacum und seine römischen Alterthümer (Linz: Francisco-Carolium, 1843); Heinz Dopsch, Karl Brunner, and Maximilian Weltin, eds., Österreichische Geschichte 1122-1278. Die Länder und das Reich. Der Ostalpenraum im Hochmittelalter. Vol 3 (Vienna: Uebereuter, 1999); Hans Pirchegger, Geschichte der Steiermark (Graz: Leykam Verlag, 1996); Dopsch, “Die steirischen Otakare”, 75-140. The earlier history of the Otakars is somewhat murky, though Heinz Dopsch has attempted to clarify it. His chapter (“Die steirischen Otakare”) is a good source of information on the history of this dynasty in eleventh century. Otakar I is first referred to as a margrave in an imperial document given at Mainz in 1056, shortly after he inherited some of the Carinthian territories from Godfrey of Pitten. StUB I, no. 62; Gaisberger, Lauriacum, 225. For a very good summary of the early history of Steiermark, see Dopsch, Brunner, and Weltin. Österreichische Geschichte.

18 Dopsch, “Die steirischen Otakare”, 119; Dopsch, Brunner, and Weltin, Österreichische Geschichte, 297.

19 Dopsch, “Die steirischen Otakare”, 94.
Spanheim-Trixen on crusade in 1147, who had married Kunigunde, a sister of Leopold’s, the Otakars inherited a sizeable territory around Maribor. And when Count Ekbert III of Formbach-Pitten also died heirless on campaign with the emperor in 1158, his territory fell to his cousin, Otakar III of Styria. Sometime between 1129 and 1138 Otakar’s uncle Otto of Cordenon died, leaving a sizeable tract in Friuli to the Styrian margrave. Styria had taken shape within the span of a century, with the margraves, crucially, able to count the vast majority of the lands within Styria among their own allodial holdings.

The territories the Otakars accumulated during this period of rapid expansion housed a large group of monastic and canonical institutions. Otakar II founded the first of the Styrian-Otakarian houses that would come to play such an important role in the region’s history. The abbey of Garsten (1082), a Benedictine house, was established as a Hauskloster for the dynasty. Leopold the Strong followed his father’s example and founded the Cistercian house of Rein in 1129 on land inherited from his father. Otakar III, the next of the Styrian margraves, continued the pious tradition of his forefathers and brought into being the Carthusian house Seitz (1165), the Augustinian foundation of Vorau (1163), and the pilgrim hostel Spital am Semmering (1160). These last two houses served to bring a great deal of territory under cultivation, and as the default advocate according to the ius fundatoris (a right of advocacy enjoyed by the founder) these places also constituted outposts, representatives of not only the Christian faith but also of the Styrian ruling house and its authority. Reformed canons living under the rule of Augustine became more numerous in the course of the twelfth century, and it was perhaps their stated intention to cultivate relationships with the community outside of their house that made them suited to the new foundation at Vorau. Perhaps it was the willingness of the canons to

---

20 Gaisberger, Lauriacum, 298.
21 Pius Fank, Das Chorherrenstift Vorau (Vorau: Im Selbstverlag des Stiftes Vorau, 1959), 9.
22 Gaisberger, Lauriacum, 280.
24 See the contents of the lost founding document in StUB I, no. 175.
25 Fank, Das Chorherrenstift Vorau, 10. Žiče (Seitz) is now located in Slovenia.
orchestrate the difficult task of clearing, plowing, and rendering fertile a heavily forested valley that made them choice candidates for the task. Moreover, in the document which confirms Otakar’s new foundation, given by Archbishop Conrad II at Admont in January 1168, the responsibility of those stationed there in ministering to those outside the community is clearly stated. This mandate to be involved in the secular world may have been appealing for a lay ruler such as Otakar looking to build out his lordship by means of his religious institutions. Spital am Semmering, which was meant for the relief of poor people and for pilgrims returning from the Holy Land, perhaps best typifies the way in which new monastic foundations could yield benefits beyond those spiritually rooted. Pilgrim traffic was drawn into Styria, and Otakar used this opportunity and demand for increased infrastructure to accommodate the pilgrims to build roads that connected his Italian territories in Friuli to Styria, Austria, and Carinthia, and the hospital became an important commercial base for operations in this relatively underdeveloped area. In the same way Vorau brought Styrian margravial court authority and productivity to a heavily wooded region which hitherto had contributed little to the secular coffers or Styria’s spiritual account. Monasteries employed mercenarii, labourers who carried out the tasks necessary for the maintenance of the community, and they helped produce finished goods from the raw materials the monastic estates yielded. These practices contributed to the growth of markets in the area and a greater variety of goods available there, which in turn made


28 StUB I, no. 503.
29 StUB I, no. 723.
30 Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 150.
31 As Fank notes, the first four canons from Salzburg were certainly accompanied by fratres conversi, whose labour was required to help prepare the way for the construction of the first buildings. These lay brothers were an essential workforce that performed many of the tasks that sustained the canons, otherwise occupied with their parochial duties. Fank, Chorherrenstift Vorau, 10. There are few sources which describe the pastoral activities of the canons after the foundation of Vorau and the extent to which they participated in archiepiscopal administration of the region. It appears that Styria’s religious houses began to regard their allegiance to the margraves as (at least as) equal to that owed to the archbishop. See my discussion of the omission of the archbishop from certain mid-century Styrian charters below at note 36. See also, Weinfurter, Salzburger Bistumsreform, 68-69.
markets more attractive. In Styria, as elsewhere, religious communities were essential components of the economic and social growth of the region.

The monastic houses in the Otakars’ territory were cultivated and cared for by succeeding generations of this ruling house. And the institutions they founded and patronized played a role in building the power of the Otakars, who worked to consolidate and accumulate privileges and rights within and without their borders. Aside from important imperial concessions such as the Bergregal (mining rights), advocacies such as that of Göß described above established a judicial and (perhaps) political role for the holder with respect to spiritual institutions, which typically controlled large tracts of land. In one instance, the acquisition of an advocacy actually resulted in a concrete territorial increase for the march. When the last of the Eppenstein dynasty, Duke Henry III of Carinthia, died in 1122 leaving his considerable holdings to Leopold the Strong, he also transferred the advocacy of St. Lambrecht (located in the County of Friesach) to the margrave. The right of protection was the hereditary property of the duke, and once transferred, the monastery and its holdings were effectively now part of Styria. Most importantly, however, because the advocacy of a monastery could be held by a lord, ecclesiastical or (usually) secular, regardless of whether or not it lay within his territory, assuming the role of advocate over the Styrian monasteries allowed the Otakars to limit the amount of influence outsiders (including the archbishop of Salzburg) could exert within their territory. During the eleventh century, Archbishop Conrad I of Salzburg tied monasteries to lands that were held by lay nobles, an act that essentially constituted the donor as a founder with the responsibility of looking after the foundation.

Aside from the ius fundatoris over Rein (Cistercian), Vorau (Augustinian), Seitz

---

32 Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 149.
33 The next chapter will go into greater detail concerning the discernable aspects of the piety of the Styrian Otakars. These include Garsten, Rein, Spital am Semmering, Vorau, Seitz, Gleink, Traunkirchen, Lambach, St. Lambrecht, St. Paul im Lavanttal (Carinthia), Viktring (Carinthia), Ossiach (Carinthia), Formbach, Seckau, Admont, and Göß. Record of Otakarian beneficence towards nearly all of these institutions survives, though based on the vicissitudes of survival of medieval material it is difficult to say with certainty which of these the margraves may have favoured over and above the others. We can say, however, that Admont has the greatest surviving body of charters documenting the generosity of the Otakars. Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 141-163.
34 Otakar III received the Bergregal from Friedrich Barbarossa at the same Regensburg Assembly as he received the advocacy of Seckau, and likely Göß. Clearly this was an occasion of some significance in the history of Styria. Dopsch, “Die steirische Otakare”, 118. See my preceding discussion of advocacy in the opening pages of this chapter and at note 2.
36 Gert Melville, The Worlds of Medieval Monasticism: History and Forms of Life (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2016), 134. For the progress of monastic reform in southern Germany and Austria see also Nigel F. Palmer’s
(Carthusian), and the Spital am Semmering, the margraves of Styria were advocates of Garsten, Traunkirchen, Kremsmünster, St. Ehrentrud (though this was located in Salzburg), Lambach, St. Lambrecht, Viktring, Ossiach, Formbach, Seckau, and Göß—in short, of all the major monastic and canonical houses in their realm, with the exception of Admont and Gleink, of which they believed themselves to be co-founders.  By the time Otakar III founded Vorau, he held more influence over the monasteries (in the form of advocacies) than the formidable duke of Austria and the region’s highest ecclesiastical official, the archbishop of Salzburg.

Indeed, Mezler-Andelberg notes that by the early thirteenth century several charters from Seckau documenting dispute resolutions refer to the (now) duke as iudex, and omit mention of the archbishop of Salzburg entirely, a practice which contravenes canonical legal custom.

Although the eleventh century was a period of very close relations between the archbishop and the monasteries of his archdiocese—Conrad I of Salzburg was a major reformer, who worked to free his diocese’s monasteries from lay and imperial interference—the twelfth bears witness to a marked decline in the influence of the region’s top ecclesiastical prelate with respect to the monastic houses, increasingly supplanted by the generous and just secular advocate. This decline in archiepiscopal influence and authority with respect to the cloistered is not an instance of suppression or forced subservience, far from it. In a document from 1202 Duke Leopold VI unambiguously defends Seckau from any legal interference by his judicial officials without his
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However, Admont’s possessions in Styria were under the advocacy of the Otakars. Mezler-Andelberg, “Landesfürst”, 440.

One such document was given at Admont on June 4th, 1202. Though it does not refer to the duke as iudex, he nevertheless settled a dispute between some of his judges and the monastery of Seckau without the involvement of the archbishop’s officials. StUB II, no. 50. This might be interpreted in several ways. Either the Otakars had earned themselves a great deal of leeway with the Church for their unwavering support, or the monasteries felt their primary allegiance was to their secular lord, or with the easing of tensions between the emperor and the church the issue was no longer as polarizing and political.

This is development is particularly striking in Styria, where a very strong tradition of clerical and monastic reform under the archbishops of Salzburg had been underway for over a century. The Otakars, especially the second and third of that name, had enthusiastically supported these efforts and inadvertently became increasingly influential. Melville, The Worlds of Medieval Monasticism, 133. The archdiocese of Salzburg was a prince-bishopric, and the office was held by one who was simultaneously a member of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and a lay lord. The position of the archbishop as a lay lord was much strengthened after the return from exile of Conrad I in mid-1121. following the Concordat of Worms but he remained a member of the papal party while animosities smoldered during this period. The title of prince was not used until Frederick I did so in 1160. Heinz Dopsch, “Salzburg”, in Lexikon des Mittelalters (Stuttgart: Verlag J.B. Metzler), vol. 7, cols. 1333-1334.

Stefan Weinfurter notes that the election of Bernard as provost of Vorau, who he believed was close to the Otakars, was in part behind that community’s increasing distance from the influence of the archbishop in Salzburg and Vorau’s mother house. Salzburger Bistumsreform, 68-69.
express permission, echoing the previous Styrian ruling house’s concern for the well-being and status of its monastic charges.\[^{41}\]

The power dynamics at play in twelfth-century Styria allow us a glimpse of where the interests of court and cloister overlapped, a glimpse made possible by the survival of the documents which witnessed the diets and meetings where power was brokered. Within the carefully constructed legal language we find clear and calculated statements about the nature of authority and power in twelfth-century Styria. Document redactors needed to ensure that the physical manifestations of authority over which they presided were forceful, recognizable as legitimate, and above all, imbued with permanence. Documents and their language were constructed with calculated intent: everything from the liturgical formulae like the Trinitarian invocation so frequently initiating Styrian documents at this time—meant to channel the power of divine corroboration—to the first-person speech of the text bolstered its force and the authority of its issuer.\[^{42}\] When we read statements about power in the Styrian documents of this period, therefore, we cannot pass over them as blandishments or dismiss them as mere formulae. A charter of the monastery of Rein—a forgery from around 1210 which nevertheless mirrors the text of the 1138 original, according to Mezler-Andelberg—gives a clear expression of how the Otakars viewed their power with respect to their monasteries.\[^{43}\] Otakar affixed his seal, as the document states, to ensure the permanence of an act undertaken, “…ut in servorum dei tutela, cum sacerdotali auctoritate etiam secularis potestas euigilet.”\[^{44}\]

Undoubtedly this quotation gives explicit voice to the *Herrschaft*-building strategy of the Otakars, acquiring not only territory but the guardianships over the monastic houses situated

\[^{41}\] *Igitur inter cetera monasteria quorum nos deus aduocatum esse constituit, Seccoviensem ecclesiam ad meliorem statum promouere cupientes, omnibus iudicibus sub principatu nostro constitutis sub obtentu gratie nostre dextrice precipimus quatinus super prediis iam dicte ecclesie absque speciali mandato nostro nullius querimoniam audire uel aliquid indicare presumant, quoniam ecclesie nobis aduocacionis iure attinentes predia sua absque audiencia uel speciali commissione nostra amittere de iure non possunt. “Therefore, desiring to advance the church of Seckau (among the other monasteries of which God has established us as advocate) to a better state, we strictly prohibit all judges established under our authority and the protection of our grace to presume to hear or to adjudicate any complaint by anyone with regard to the possessions of the aforesaid church without our particular mandate, since churches belonging to us by right of advocacy cannot legally alienate their possessions without our knowledge or special permission.”* StUB II n. 50.


\[^{43}\] Mezler-Andelberg, “Landesfürst ”, 444.

\[^{44}\] “…so that in the guardianship of the servants of God (i.e. the monks of Rein), secular power might be vigilant along with priestly authority.” StUB I, no. 175.
within their borders. The statement also clearly demonstrates an awareness on the part of the
document’s issuer (Otakar) of the importance of these institutions in maintaining the authority of
the secular lord. This phrase, appended to the *corroboratio*, the section of the document meant
to ensure authenticity and permanence, underscores this fact. In the Göß case, the monastery was
successful in upholding the privileges granted decades before and extended the authority of the
Styrian margraves beyond the life of the dynasty itself.

1.3 The Styrian Succession Crisis and the Union of 1192

At some point in his youth (probably in the early 1180s), Otakar IV (born 1163), the first duke of
Styria, began to manifest signs of the severe illness that would eventually claim his life. This
condition, it became clear, would prevent him from producing an heir. Otakar, therefore, needed
to select an heir who was acceptable to his vassals, and also to the emperor; even though Otakar
ruled over largely allodial territory and a collection of rights that did not stem from the empire, it
would have been unlikely that these could be separated from the ducal rank, and that title had to
be granted by the emperor. During the next few years, likely well aware that he would be
unable to produce an heir, he concluded an agreement with Leopold V of Austria and his son
Frederick that made the Austrians the heirs to his properties, rights, and titles. These were
Styrian duke’s distant cousins through his Babenberg great-grandmother’s (the daughter of
Leopold II of Austria) marriage to Otakar II. Provost Bernard of Vorau was involved in the
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45 The acquisition of authority over, or privileges with respect to monasteries was not the Otakars’ chief means of
increasing their power, but it was nevertheless important for its consolidation, and, as I argue, for its maintenance
and longevity. It should not be underestimated or overlooked, according to Mezler-Andelberg, *Landesfürst*, 442.
46 One report on the duke’s illness comes from Jans Enikel, *Fürstenbuch*, ed. Strauch. MGH Deutsche Chroniken
III/2 (Hanover: Hahn, 1900), 619f.
47 Heinrich Appelt, “Die Steiermark im Gefüge der Reichspolitik Kaiser Friedrichs I.,” in *800 Jahre Steiermark und
Landeskommission für Steiermark, 1992), 40. As regalia, the Otakars had held since 1164: Bergbau, Münzrecht,
48 This marriage did not entitle Leopold to the duchy of Styria as hereditary successor, however, and the Babenbergs
could not claim this right. It was the agreement concluded by Otakar IV and Leopold V that established the
Babenbergs as heirs to Styria. Leopold V and Frederick I were subsequently invested by Henry VI, who made no
objection to their succession. When Leopold V died in 1194, the emperor allowed Austria to be inherited by
Frederick I, and Styria by his brother Leopold VI, even though it ran contrary to the Georgenberg Compact that
stipulated Styria should remain in the hands of the duke of Austria. Spretizhofer, “Union von 1192”, 41.
drafting of this document, so important to the settling of the succession crisis of the 1180s.\(^\text{49}\) Although very little is known about the negotiations that led up to the eventual 1186 drafting of the Georgenberg Compact at the market town of Enns, the agreement is likely to have been made during a series of meetings in 1184.\(^\text{50}\) The first took place in April between Leopold V, Otakar IV, and a representative of the emperor at Admont, and the second in May at Fischau. The negotiations may have been discussed again at the Whitsunday Court in Mainz in 1184, where Otakar IV’s representatives were present.\(^\text{51}\) Although the terms of the Georgenberg Compact survive in multiple versions, we rely on some rather meager sources for the events of the succession itself in 1192.\(^\text{52}\) We do not know why Leopold was chosen by Otakar IV, though he makes possible reference to the matter in the Georgenberg charter itself, stating that the Austrian duke was in the best position to administer the territory with justice.\(^\text{53}\) From the document itself, it is clear that Otakar was concerned with the equitable treatment of his vassals after his death, and he wanted to ensure that the holdings and accumulated rights of the monastic communities he so liberally patronized would go unmolested under the new regime.\(^\text{54}\) The banning of the judicial ordeal shows his receptiveness towards the concerns of the clergy, but other provisions are clearly meant to cement the privileged position of the clerics his dynasty supported. For example, the charter documenting the transaction gives the clergy the right to be seated first at the duke’s table, a concession made at the expense of the region’s nobility.\(^\text{55}\) A second, smaller document was intended to inform the knights, ministerials, and monasteries of the provisions of

\(^{49}\) Wonisch, “Urkundenwesen der Traungauer”, 143-144.

\(^{50}\) Freed has suggested a date as early as 1180 for the negotiation of the succession agreement between Otakar, Leopold, and Barbarossa, a date which corresponds with the reorganization of the southern empire in the wake of Henry the Lion’s deposition. John B. Freed, Frederick Barbarossa: a Prince and the Myth (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 438. For the charters themselves: Georgenberg Compact, and the shorter Georgenberg Patent, StUB I, 677 and 678 respectively.

\(^{51}\) Dopsch, Brunner, and Weltin, Österreichische Geschichte, 299.

\(^{52}\) Otacherus dux Stiriae absque liberis decedens, Liupoldum ducem Austriae terrae suae ac patrimonii, ex testamento heredem prius institutum, successorem reliquit. “Otakar, duke of Styria, about to depart without heirs, first established Leopold, the duke of Austria, as the heir to his allods and his lands, according to his will.” Annales Admuntenses. Continuatio Admuntensis (1140-1425). MGH, SS 9, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach (Hanover: Hahn, 1851), 586. Accepit eundem ducatum de manu imperatoris valde solmeniter apud Wormaciam. “He received the duchy from the hand of the emperor with great solemnity at Worms.” Magnus of Reichersberg, Chronicon. MGH SS 17, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach (Hanover: Hahn, 1861), 519.

\(^{53}\) BUB I, 65.

\(^{54}\) Dopsch, Österreichische Geschichte, 301.

\(^{55}\) Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 143
the Compact, and was given to Vorau for safekeeping.\textsuperscript{56} Beyond the duke’s insistence on maintaining the status of the monasteries in his territory after his death, that Otakar clearly looked to his family’s spiritual centres for the safeguarding of his policies is telling. These were responsible for keeping the authority of the dynasty intact even after it no longer existed, and as we shall see below, the policies of the Otakars lived on. The lengths to which Otakar IV and his vassals went to secure the rights of the latter during the succession crisis is indicative of the anxiety surrounding the change in dynasty. Clearly those in Styria who had benefitted from the patronage of the Otakars felt their position was in potential jeopardy.\textsuperscript{57} Once the Otakarian advocates ceased to be, the monasteries and other vassals would have to look to other means to enforce their claims to that which had been given. Below I will elaborate on the way in which both the Styrian monasteries and their new overlords responded to the tension about the new political order, and the role the Otakars continued to play therein long past their extinction.

In many ways the episode from Göß is a microcosm for the fate of the Styrian monasteries after the death of Otakar IV in 1192. Abbess Otilia, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, must have been able to provide some proof that the (then margrave) was the rightful advocate, nullifying Ulrich’s claim to be involved in the abbey’s affairs. Privileges stemming from the advocate (the emperor, and later the margrave as the document explains) entitled the abbess to conduct the business of the house of which she was the head, and protected her from injurious external interference. The assertion of these rights, because it rested on the legitimacy of the granting party, entails a confirmation of that authority with some legal force. Abbess Otilia, in defending the authenticity of her own privilege, simultaneously thwarted an attempt to usurp the authority of the duke of Austria (acting in his capacity as duke of Styria, who held the advocacy after the extinction of the Otakars in 1192), and all those who had previously held this right. Styrian monastic houses stood to benefit from good relations with the secular lord of the region, and the two shared a common interest in the maintenance of the authority vested in him.\textsuperscript{58} Even


\textsuperscript{58} Otakar IV, for instance, was a powerful ally of his monasteries. The unfortunately scant documentary record shows that in 1172 the margrave came to the defense of one of his monasteries, St. Lambrecht, the possessions
after the death of the Otakars, the importance of this dynasty’s actions and the ways in which their legitimacy was presented by the region’s monastic communities was of direct consequence for the new ruling house.

1.4 The Creation and Maintenance of Secular Identity and Legitimacy in the Monastery

Styria’s territorial growth was much more than just the accumulation of territories and privileges. As the documents examined above illustrate, questions of authority and jurisdiction continually arose, and those who sought to defend themselves from encroachment needed to be able to support their claims. Charters naturally served this function, with chanceries and document redactors imbuing their creations with as great a sense of permanence as possible, so that the force of the action might endure beyond the life of the granting party. This was one strategy that was meant to establish lasting authority, and as the guardians of collections of documents monasteries naturally played a major role in this process. Styria’s monasteries and canonical houses also contributed to creating and maintaining the social foundation on which the authority of the secular nobility rested in the twelfth century. The legitimation of power stemmed from a perceived link to a prestigious ancestor, real or imagined, whose right to wield power lay cemented in an unassailable past. Often composed in response to dynastic change or political turmoil that disrupted stability, family histories that connected a given religious house to a long-standing dynasty manufactured a sense of continuity with the past that was central to reestablishing social and political order, and securing a monastery’s place within it. This
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59 Ancestry was an incredibly important part of a right to rule and could be manipulated by rulers who understood its role in creating and maintaining authority. Henry the Lion, for instance, began to emphasize his connection to his Saxon forefathers rather than his Bavarian links while attempting to regain his influence in his former duchy. In the St. Blasius gospel book a full-page illumination shows Henry and his wife flanked by their Billung, Supplinburg, and Brunonen relatives from whom he received his Saxon territories. His identity came to depend on his Saxon roots, as his status as Reichsfürst rested on his position in Saxony, having been stripped of his Bavarian possessions. Otto Gerhard Oexle, “Die Memoria Heinrichs des Löwen”, in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, ed. Karl Schmid, and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1984), 155. The dedication poem at the beginning of the St. Blasius Gospel book, for example, names Henry nepos Karoli. Oexle, “Die Memoria Heinrichs des Löwen”, 67.

60 Ibid., 248.
simultaneously furnished a family or dynasty with their own authoritative written record of their historically rooted claim to rulership. Again we can observe religious houses collaborating to maintain secular authority in a manner that was mutually beneficial.  

1.4.1 Historical Writing in Vorau

*Genealogia marchionum de Stire*

Although we will never have a full picture of Vorau’s output of historiographical works during the late-twelfth century, some later manuscripts and historical works can help fill in the gaps in what does survive. Aquilinus Julius Caesar (born 1720 in Graz, died 1792), Vorau canon and historian of Styria, attempted to create a reliable history of the Otakars based on the—largely medieval—sources at his disposal. It is clear from a number of passages in his impressive work that he was able to make use of manuscripts and documents that no longer survive. One such instance involves a dynastic history written in Vorau sometime between 1180 and 1200, most likely around 1192 when the dynasty that ruled Styria for roughly 150 years came to an end. Fortunately, however, it later resurfaced in a fourteenth-century manuscript now kept at the ÖNB (cod. 389) that contains, among other texts, a list of emperors, popes, bishops of Salzburg, a text on the origin of the Normans, an account of the Lombards entering Italy, charters of the archbishops of Salzburg, the chronicle of Honorius Augustodunensis, and two texts on Bede and Isidore. Although this is a fourteenth-century manuscript (copied at Vorau), Caesar’s history makes reference to two other earlier manuscripts that are now lost, but one of which was almost certainly a twelfth-century original. Often dismissed as unreliable, this small document has been reproduced in an edition, and is known as the *Genealogia marchionum de Stire* in the
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63 Ibid., 104 ff.

64 Caesar, *Annales ducatus Styriae*. 105. The *Genealogia* also survives in another manuscript from the fifteenth century, München, Bayer. Hauptstaatsarchiv., KL Formbach 5 1/2, f. f. 34v.
MGH. It outlines the history of the Styrian Otakars from the beginning of the eleventh century up to the reign of Otakar IV. In a detailed narrative it describes not only the succession of Styrian margraves, but also the marquesses and their dynastic connections. It connects the Otakars to the dukes of Austria, Emperor Henry V, the Eppensteins, the Welfs, the dukes of Carinthia, and other imperial nobles.

The only other material the Genealogia conveys is the founding of Styria’s monasteries. If a margrave and/or his wife founded a monastery or house of canons during their lifetime, the Genealogia makes an explicit reference to that event. Among the communities noted are Garsten (Otakar II), Rein (Leopold), Vorau, Seitz, and the Spital am Semmering (Otakar III). This dynastic history constitutes a clear example of the importance of family history for the monastery. The text enmeshes the history of Styria’s monastic and secular institutions in a way that makes them seem equally inseparable and as relevant as the familial bonds between the Otakars and the leading dynasties of the empire. Often composed during times of dynastic crisis or political uncertainty, dynastic histories provide stability, and the suggestion that this text was composed at the end of the twelfth century when it became clear that Otakar IV would not leave behind an heir, is most likely rooted here.

Vorau was the youngest of Otakar III’s foundations and, about to lose its chief benefactor, it might have felt at greatest risk, not having had the amount of time to accrue other patrons and properties that might sustain it. Producing a dynastic history solidified not only the existence and identity of its contributors, but helped create the image of an endowed and powerful dynasty. Any assault on the privileges granted by this family might have been considered an offence against the great families to which the document connects the Otakars.

We can only speculate regarding the motivations of the Vorau canon who composed the history, but its strategy and object are clearly discernable. It positions the Otakars among the powerful families of the region and the empire. It places the region’s monasteries in the history of a long-

---


66 This notion is elaborated by Leah Shopkow, “Dynastic History”. 
standing and deeply connected family and left an enduring message about the interconnectedness of this dynasty and the Vorau canons that would be seized upon by future generations.

**Stiftsarchiv Vorau Schachtel 263**

Two small paper manuscripts in the Stiftsarchiv Vorau, which today are catalogued discreetly (though not discretely) as the contents of Schachtel 263, chronicle the history of the Augustinian house of Vorau and the Styrian Otakars in parallel narratives. The older and larger of the two (fifteenth century) is regrettably missing its opening two pages which likely contained a prologue. It progresses in more or less annalistic format with headwords or years (when known) introducing important events. The younger (eighteenth century, according to Fank) is a reworking of the older, the individual entries having been recast in a continuous narrative. The chronicler switches from Roman to Arabic numerals when he reaches the fifteenth century, suggesting that he has made use of a much older work no longer extant. Both chronicles make heavy use of documentary material; the history of the house, obviously having been cobbled together from the scant surviving records from the time, reads like a series of documentary excerpts. These histories, nevertheless, preserve the information that was important for those composing a record of their institution.

Endowments, privileges, and confirmations are all reproduced in verbatim excerpts, establishing the roots of the house in the firmest substrate. But each entry is accompanied by the circumstances of its occurrence, the granting party’s name, and the name of the recipient monastery’s founder. One entry typical of these chronicles relates the contents of the Georgenberg Compact, and clearly demonstrates the importance of dynastic ties in the history of Vorau in Otakar IV’s motivation to donate the 500 *Hufen* to that house. Moreover, it was Vorau’s Provost, Bernard, who crafted the document, and whose personal hand can be seen in the corrections he made. Duke Otakar made the donation, according to the chronicle, for the
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67 In the prologue to the younger text the author states his reasons for writing, one of which includes wanting to follow in the footsteps of his fathers [vestigia patrum sequi volentes], perhaps an indication of a tradition of historical writing at Vorau that predates this text. Because the older manuscript is missing its first two pages, it is impossible to determine whether they shared this prologue; however, the fact the two texts are nearly identical copies of one another through the first several folios might suggest an answer.

sake of his parents, and he also included the other monasteries specifically founded by his parents and grandparents in the text. The dynastic motivations for the gift are of great importance to the image of Vorau being constructed in these histories. The naming of family members and their deeds (by reference to their acts of patronage) encourages the perception of the legitimacy of the granting party, a legitimacy which is assured by the reference to dynastic forebears and the authority inherited by the granter. In turn, the privileges enacted and bestowed by this source of authority held much greater force, and Vorau’s past and present status, are secured. The reiteration of the circumstances of the original act in these later retellings bind them to the historical narrative surrounding Vorau, which itself carries a kind of weight having been fixed in script.

Perhaps even more telling is the fact that immediately following the prologue of the younger chronicle and preceding the history of Vorau itself is a dynastic history which runs a full three pages in the younger text (pp. 4-7). While the older chronicle is missing the first two pages which likely contained the prologue, the dynastic history probably occupied the same position in the text as it does in the younger version. It is introduced by the title De origine nostri fundatoris, a meaningful prefix that inflects the monastic history to which it is appended. To these later chroniclers—and perhaps an earlier, unknown one—the history of Vorau could not be related in isolation, or rather, a history of Vorau did not exist in isolation from that of the Styrian Otakars. While documents preserved by a monastic house testified to individual instances of the exercise of power, the enplotting of a cascading authority flowing through each succeeding generation shaped and maintained an identity for the Otakars that revolved around empowered ancestors, a characteristic platform for secular noble authority. Vorau linked itself to this authority through the written word in an unequivocal statement about the legitimate origin of its collection of rights and privileges.
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69 Younger chronicle, Stiftsarchiv Vorau, Schachtel 263, p. 16. The chronicle reproduces text from the Georgenberg Compact, a document of unparalleled importance in Styria’s history. Recognizing that he would die without an heir, Otakar IV left his territory with his distant cousin, the duke of Austria. However, the document is remarkable for the degree to which it protects the monastic foundations of his family, endowing them with specific privileges and massive land grants. See StUB I, no. 677; Rauch, “Die Erwerbung des Herzogtums”, 269-299.
1.4.2 Life After Death: *Memoria* and the Creation of Dynastic Identity

Tracing the history of a founder’s family history as a means of notarizing their facility to rightfully wield power and investing dependent institutions with portions of that authority helped establish an identity for a noble house.\(^\text{70}\) But as we have seen, the importance of a founder or a benefactor’s actions did not cease with their death. Commemorative practices that probably began as family’s effort to expiate the unatoned-for sins of a dead loved one changed after the turn of the first millennium.\(^\text{71}\) The Christian belief in the afterlife and a conviction that the dead might still influence the course of living events—as the intervention of a saint might accomplish—meant that some care needed to be taken in curating the memory of the departed. The living, in turn, might also influence the afterlife by mitigating the burden of purgatory through good works done in the deceased’s name. People began to prepare the communities in which they lived to continue to work on their behalf once they had departed. Angenendt notes that during the twelfth century the fate of the soul after death was a serious and pertinent question among theologians as well.\(^\text{72}\) The belief that the burden of atonement could be, and ought to be inherited by one’s kin also began to gain popularity, and an emphasis on payment meant that if individuals did not wish to encumber their successors, preparations needed to be


\(^{71}\) Ibid., 97.

\(^{72}\) Ibid., 79-199.
Traditionally, it was the role of the priest who was meant to intervene on one’s behalf, but this role gradually fell to the monasteries. Patrons could pay money for the monks to feed and clothe the poor in their name, or simply donate goods and property in exchange for the liturgical services of the monks, who would sing masses in one’s name and utter prayers. In response to ever increasing demand for the services of the monks, necrologies and *libri vitae* were used to keep track of what was given, by whom, and what was to be rendered in return. Sheer volume led monasteries to create associations amongst themselves to share the burden of prayer and intercession and increase its efficacy. All of this business amounted to a contract which really only came into force after an individual’s death. Necessarily, the binding nature of these agreements entitled the dead donor to services rendered upon death, and in order for these contracts to remain valid, the dead needed to retain some status. Simply founding a religious house whose chief purpose was to pray on one’s behalf was an effective means of assuring that one’s soul was adequately tended to. Many noble families established or supported groups of monks to this end, and these, in turn, owed their existence and livelihood to the contract made between them and the founder. As we will see, it served the interests of the monastery to preserve the image of its benefactors, to uphold their legal status by keeping them present through liturgical celebrations and a textual recognition of their beneficence. This image of the founder or patron as a part of the community can be collectively referred to as a person’s *memoria*, a term which encompasses a broad range of practices across a long span of time. In the following paragraphs I will describe the ways in which the Styrian religious houses participated in the creation and maintenance of Otakarian *memoria*, and the significance of these actions for both parties.

In the twelfth century, the concept of *memoria* went well beyond springing a relative from purgatory. Establishing a group of religious individuals to pray for one’s soul and incorporate their name and deeds in the liturgical celebrations of the community made them a focal point of
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74 Angenendt, “Theologie und Liturgie”, 151.
76 Ibid., 222.
its spiritual life. Because the dead were still considered part of the living community, with a presence, and a personal and legal standing, the reading of a founder or benefactor’s name from the necrology during the liturgy made him or her present before God and the congregation in a very real, very living way. All the deeds carried out during life were recalled to the living with important legal repercussions; a person’s status did not change with death, and so, neither could the status of any of their legal transactions. Everything remained in force.

While Otto-Gerhard Oexle, Karl Schmid and others have convincingly demonstrated that memoria was a cultural phenomenon that permeated nearly every aspect of communal life in the Middle Ages, I am chiefly concerned with its importance in legitimizing the creation and maintenance of secular power. Rulership (Herrschaft) needs provenance, as Oexle (echoing Jan Assmann) writes, because it is through the remembrance of history that rulership becomes legitimized. Memorial and commemorative practices, the responsibility of the monasteries and canonical houses to which they were entrusted, meant not only financial and material gain for the cloister, but also an opportunity to participate in the creation of a tradition of (lordly) authority borne by the written historiographical material the monks and canons produced and the liturgical actions (commemorative masses) they carried out. This historiographical material could take many forms, as we shall see below.

The monastic and canonical foundations of the Styrian Otakars, who enjoyed a close relationship with the ruling house, stood to benefit from their role in generating these foundational dynastic narratives. In the Göß example given above, the identity of the true advocatus was an important piece of information and helped the abbess preserve the autonomy of her community. Monasteries were uniquely aware that their present depended so heavily on their past. The privileges and rights they enjoyed in the present were rooted in the past and generally resulted from specific events (for example, before departing on crusade a ruler often made a large donation to secure his memoria), and this needed to be documented to retain force. So even after the founder or patron was dead the knowledge of their deeds could still influence the

79 On this aspect, see in particular, Oexle, “Die Gegenwart der Toten”.
81 Sauer, Fundatio und Memoria, 80-82.
present, and knowledge of this relationship had to be kept current for just that reason. Below we will see this dynamic at work, as Styria’s monastic communities were able to continue to assert their rights over donations made by the Otakars by invoking that house’s rightful and lawful ability to confer gifts despite the death of their patrons. The efforts of these communities to maintain the presence of the Otakars and their dynastic memory was very important to the Babenbergs when they inherited Styria in 1192. The perception of legitimate Otakarian authority predicated on dynastic history served as a foundation for Babenberg lordship in their new duchy, and they preferred an image of their own legitimacy as an extension of Otakarian lordship.

1.4.3 Necrologies and Anniversarial Books

Necrologies and anniversarial books which catalogued the death dates of patrons and members of the community, were used to coordinate liturgical commemoration and also served as sources that testified to power relations and familial ties. In many of these books, entries were accompanied by a note about what had been exchanged for said services and were used to preserve important information about the relationship of the donor and recipient house. These books, sometimes introduced by a foundation story or some historiographical notes, are thus historiographical as well as legal. In the necrology of the Styrian monastery of Seckau, for example, the monks took care to note Otakar’s relationship with that house. On the 7th ides of May, it states that, “Otacharus dux Styrie, noster advocatus; hic dedit nobis villam in
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83 Vorau codex 99, a mid-fourteenth-century manuscript contains such notes on fol. 3r.

84 Sauer, Fundatio und Memoria, 39.
Waltensdorf et alpes supra Iudenburch et alia.\footnote{\textsuperscript{85} “Otakar the duke of Styria, our advocate, gave to us the house in Waltensdorf and the mountain pastures around Iudenburg, among other things.” Sigismund Herzberg-Fränkel, ed., Necrologia Germaniae. Tomus II. Dioecesis Salisburgensis. MGH (Berlin: Weidmann, 1904), 433.} This note establishes Otakar IV as the advocate of Seckau and in addition documents the donation made for his yearly commemorative services, simultaneously reinforcing the margrave’s authority, and the monastery’s right to possess that which was lawfully given by him. Whenever rituals were held on the day of Otakar’s death, the transaction noted in the necrology was legitimized, and so too his authority to have it carried out.

In establishing a lasting impression of legitimately enacted business between ruler and monastery the former’s authority to act is a crucial part of the equation, hence the purposeful identification of Otakar as \textit{advocatus} in the example above. Necrologies also helped create and preserve dynastic memory, which invested a lord with the right to wield power.\footnote{\textsuperscript{86} Gerd Tellenbach, “Die historische Dimension der liturgischen Toten-Memoria,” in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswaert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1984), 20-214; Gerd Althoff describes a Merseburg Necrolog which transmits a full list of emperors in addition to the Liudolfinger, for whom the liturgical celebrations were noted. Not only does it offer an image of dynastic continuity fundamental to noble legitimacy, but it also presents it alongside a list of emperors in a clear association between the two power structures. Althoff, “Beobachtungen zum liudolfingisch-ottonischen Gedenkwesen”, in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswaert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1984), 649-665.} The monks of the abbey of Rein, founded by Margrave Leopold the Strong in 1129, made a note in their necrology for Otakar III that gives much more than the anniversary of his death. On the 8th ides of May, “Famil[iaris] Otarkerus marcho styrie fil[ius] fundatoris et fundacionis Runensis cenobii consumatur precipuus.”\footnote{\textsuperscript{87} “Otakar, Margrave of Styria, our \textit{familiaris} and son of the founder of monastery of Rein passed on.” Otakar IV’s death was also commemorated at Rein, and he is mentioned in the same text as his father, likewise as \textit{familiaris}. Necrologia Germaniae. 355.} Acknowledging the connection between the founder and the patron for whom anniversarial celebrations were being held demonstrates the importance of this link for the cloistered and their house. Because this entry was likely read aloud in full during the ceremony, every mass held in Otakar III’s memory was an affirmation of his heritage, of the contribution of his father, and the monastery’s close connection to the family.\footnote{\textsuperscript{88} Angenendt, “Theologie und Liturgie”, 138.} In addition, the history of the Styrian rulers was integrated into the ritual life of the monastery, and the familial bond between father and son, founder and patron, was voiced as part of the sacred celebration of the liturgy. Family history was not simply recorded in the necrologies, anniversarial books, and historical
writing of monasteries, it was presented alongside scripture during commemorative masses and imbued with a kind of sacrality itself.  

Necrologies and anniversarial books are increasingly recognized as instances of historiographical production, and their function is essentially that. The only real discrepancy between a necrology and a chronicle is the amount of information it contains. Many necrologies were equipped or paired (codicologically) with annals, martyrologies, or calendrically arranged historical data. The practical-liturgical function of necrological documents did not exclude their use as historical ones. The necrology created at St. Emmeram in Regensburg—a house with a Styrian connection—gives members of the monastic ‘family,’ then a list of the bishops of Regensburg, benefactors from secular families, the deceased being honoured from brother houses, the names of Carolingian, Ottonian, and Salian rulers and their families, Bavarian nobility, and the burghers of the city who patronized the monastery. It is clear from this example that the documentation of the dead went well beyond the memorial and liturgical use for which they might initially have been recorded. Three twelfth-century manuscripts kept at Vorau (33, 171, and 367) which contain copies of the Salzburg annals, supplemented, altered, and combined with other texts to varying extents, all contain necrological notes, most importantly marking the death of Otakar III. The manuscript context of some of these necrological notes also suggests that their function was not solely liturgical. Codex 99 for example, is a manuscript that contains directions for various
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89 Ibid., 189.
90 Eckhard Freise has noted the connection between annals, necrologies, anniversarial books, and calendars and attempts to refine our terminology. At the very heart of his chapter, though, is the fundamentally historiographical nature of records of the dead. For more on this debate, see Eckhard Freise, “Kalendarische und annalistische Grundformen der Memoria”, in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, ed. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Fink, 1984), 441-557. See also N. Huyghebaert, ed. Les documents nécrologiques. Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Typ. 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972).
masses (13r-83v). The necrological notes appear on 5v, preceded by one folio containing a charter in which Walbrun and his wife Bertha of Stubenich donated a vineyard to the canons in 1249. The next four folios are occupied by the details of Vorau altar dedications (see below) from around 1170 to 1338, and the relics contained therein. Finally, a canon named Jacob made some notes in 1387 about the foundation.

The largest of the Vorau manuscripts containing necrologies begins with dates in the fourteenth century, the earlier versions of these codices likely having been destroyed in the fire of 1237, in which the only manuscripts that seem to have survived were those in the care of the provost himself. However, given the content of Vorau’s founding document (see below), and its unambiguous statement regarding that house’s intended purpose, we must assume the existence of necrologies and anniversarial books prior to the 1237 fire, especially since the later codices transmit death dates from before that time. That we see information from an extinct dynastic line meticulously copied into codices hundreds of years later is an indication that the relevance and force of the information these codices transmit did not diminish with the death of the Otakarian line in 1192. Codex 89 of the Stiftsarchiv Vorau, for example, contains some necrological notes contained within a Salzburg breviary beginning with the early fourteenth century. Otakar III’s death is noted here, as well as his status as founder of Vorau. The month in which Otakar IV died, May, is absent from this codex, but the fact that Otakar III’s death is the only one before 1200 that is reported underscores its importance to the composer of the notes. In fact, many of Vorau’s later necrological manuscripts record Otakar III’s demise. Codex 99 contains some anniversarial notes from 1372 onward that also record the death of the Styrian margrave.

Codex 328 contains marginal necrological notes from the fourteenth century, and Otakar IV’s
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93 Caesar, *Annales ducatus Styriae* 703.
94 Part of Hermann Menhardt’s argument for Salzburg as the origin of Vorau codex 276 rests on the fact that Vorau burned down in 1237, destroying much of the house’s textual stock. However, Pius Fank counters that those books in the care of the provost were saved from the fire, and that these books would not have been included in the inventory of the library written around 1200 (Stiftsarchiv Vorau codex 17, f. 183v). On the first point, Fank cites the ‘very old chronicle’ (one of the paper chronicles kept in Schachtel 263) in which the chronicler describes the death of provost Bernhard II (pp. 22-23), who succumbed to the flames while literally throwing his books out the window to safety. On the second point, Fank argues that the 1200 inventory did not include the provost’s books, since the 1300 inventory (Stiftsarchiv Vorau codex 342, f. 1v) written by the custos Ditricus explicitly lists only the books in his care. It is likely then, that the 1200 inventory would also only have cataloged the books in general use. Menhardt, “Die Vorauer Handschrift”, 116-159; Fank, “Kam die Vorauer Handschrift”, 374-393.
death is given in addition to his status.\textsuperscript{97} The fourth manuscript, codex 216, is a fragment, and only transmits the deaths of those who perished from February 22\textsuperscript{nd} to March 9\textsuperscript{th}. Neither Otakar died within this this period, and it is impossible to determine if they were present in this codex, though it seems likely.

1.4.4 Babenberg \textit{Memoria} in the Styrian Monasteries

With the passing of the Otakarian dynasty and the installation of the Babenbergs as their successors, the Styrian monasteries lost their chief patrons. It appears, however, that the Babenbergs had patronized at least some of the Styrian monasteries while the Otakars were still alive. Aside from St. Peter’s in Salzburg, the Babenbergs patronized the abbeys of Garsten and Gleink.\textsuperscript{98} Naturally Admont was a focus of Babenberg largesse, since they held the advocacy of that community.\textsuperscript{99} After 1192 the new ruling dynasty left a much larger footprint in the documentary record of Styria’s monasteries. As advocates and patrons, the Babenbergs had a role to play in the life of these places, and their donations entitled them to the same commemoration as that received by the Otakars.\textsuperscript{100} Accordingly, we find many of the Babenberg margraves and dukes of Austria in the necrologies and memorial books of Styria’s monasteries. It should be noted, however, that none appear in Vorau’s fragmentary necrological record.\textsuperscript{101} In the Rein necrology, a conglomeration of two fourteenth-century codices in its modern edition (ÖNB cod. 987 and Rein MS 35) only Leopold VI is recorded, and he does not appear anywhere

\textsuperscript{98} Leopold IV made a donation to St. Peter’s in Salzburg, BUB I, 8. Henry Jasomirgott also donated to St. Peters in 1156 (BUB I, 23) and 1160 (BUB I, 19). In a forgery from sometime before 1235 but nevertheless dated to 1171 Henry confirmed several properties in the Riedmark for Garsten (BUB I, 40), and later that year he confirmed that he was taking on the advocacy of that community’s holdings in the Riedmark, which Otakar had supposedly given up. On this document, see also ULE I, 16, pg. 130. In 1182, Leopold V granted Garsten freedom from tariffs on the Danube for transporting wine and other goods related to the upkeep of the community, which he did out of a desire to travel to the Holy Sepulchre, and out of his particular esteem for Otakar IV (BUB I, 61). Somewhat later, he also donated several properties in the Enns valley to Gleink (BUB I, 84).
\textsuperscript{99} In 1169 in Vienna, Henry Jasomirgott declared his desire to exercise the advocacy of Admont in the same manner as his predecessor, Count Gebhard of Burghausen (BUB I, 37). In 1179, two years after succeeding his father, Leopold V reiterated that he had accepted the same position (BUB I, 56).
\textsuperscript{100} Babenberg patronage of Styrian monasteries has been documented in the following (surviving charters). Rein: BUB I, 148; StUB II, 259. Seckau: BUB I, 124; BUB I, 85. Seitz: BUB I, 90; BUB I, 154; StUB II, 246. Spital am Semmering: StUB II, 148. No charters survive that testify to Babenberg patronage of Vorau.
\textsuperscript{101} The months in which Henry Jasomirgott (January), Frederick I (April), Leopold VI (July), Leopold V (December) died do not appear in one of Vorau’s necrological codices (MS 302). But none of these rulers are present in the more comprehensive codices 225 and 200.
else in that house’s commemorative materials. At St. Lambrecht, Henry Jasomirgott and Leopold VI appear in the necrology, but Frederick I does not. Leopold V died late in December, 1194, and the codex breaks off before the end of that month. At Seckau, all four of the Austrian dukes appear to have been commemorated. Frederick I is even noted to have died while on crusade (in expeditione). Interestingly, the duchess Theodora, Henry Jasomirgott’s Byzantine wife appears in this house’s necrology as well. At Admont, as one might expect, most of the Babenbergs—who were the advocates of that house—are present. Strangely, Frederick I is not recorded, even though the codex (Admont cod. 575, from the early twelfth century) records others who also died on April 16, as well as the names of those who died well after 1198 (Leopold VI, for instance).

The Styrian monasteries that kept the memory of the Babenbergs alive would have helped to sustain the authority of the new rulers and their own rights and freedoms in much the same way that they did for the Otakars. Creating the memoria of the new dynasty would certainly have been in the interest of these communities after the Otakars ceased to rule the territory, but as we will see, Otakarian memoria still had an important part to play. Perhaps it is telling that the Styrian necrologies, aside from Admont, do not name the Babenbergs as advocates, a privilege they reserved for their founders and chief patrons, the Otakars. And Vorau, as mentioned above, does not appear to have been a significant locus for Babenberg memoria within the region. While the Babenbergs would become a significant part of the history of Styria’s monastic institutions, the Otakars, their role as advocates, and their deeds in life remained crucial points of historical and legal reference.

---

102 *Necrologia Germaniae*, 348.
103 Ibid., 311, 333. This necrology is a composite, made up of two manuscripts. The oldest (MS 325) stems from around 1170 and runs up to the fifteenth century, and the later (MS 391) was copied sometime between 1329 and 1358. See p. 309.
104 Ibid., 404 (Henry Jasomirgott), 411 (Frederick I), 419 (Leopold VI), 433 (Leopold V). The Graz codex 390 (mid-fourteenth century) contains notes from the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, while 286 (mid-twelfth century) transmit this monastery’s necrological notes from the twelfth and thirteenth. There are several other anniversarial and confraternal books in which the Babenbergs do not appear. See p. 356.
105 Ibid., 403.
1.4.5 Vorau’s Role in Creating Memoria

Vorau was intended as a memorial foundation and its purpose is expressly stated in the founding document given at Fischau in 1163. It makes known the margrave’s explicit motivations and vision for the new foundation:

Quia testante sacra scriptura, elemosinarum largitate peccata remittuntur fidelibus, idcirco nos diuini timoris et amoris intuitu pro salute nostrae et dilecte coniugis nostre Chvnegundis, nec non et karissimi filii nostri Otakari et omnium antecessorum nostrorum quoddam predium nostrum Vorowe dictum ad Jvuauensem sedem potestatiua manu tradidimus et in eodem predio uiros religiosos secundam regulam beati Augustini uiuentes iugiter ibidem permansuros auctoritate domini nostri Eberhardi uenerabilis achiepiscopi collacauimus qui apud omnipotentem deum pro nostris et omnium antecessorum nostrorum peccatis assidue intercedant et orent.106

Family memoria, the Styrian ruling house, and Vorau were inextricably bound together from the outset. In fact, Vorau existed because Otakar was conscious of the importance of his dynastic connections and took steps to ensure that these were not forgotten. The canons of Vorau, in their commemorative actions, would not only help expiate the sins of the deceased and keep their memory alive, they would preserve their presence in the community with all the legal implications therein. Vorau contributed to an increasing sense of dynastic awareness in Styria that buttressed the authority of the Otakars from a legal standpoint as described above, but also by contributing to that image of heritage so crucial to the social foundations of power.

Furthermore, as the document makes clear, this act of foundation was concerned with the future of the family as well, in the shape of the young Otakar IV. This document gives the impression of a savvy leader who, as is widely accepted, understood what went into building legitimacy and power, and how to pass on a solid foundation for succeeding generations of Styrian rulers.107

When Otakar IV came of age, he had the advantage of all the careful preparation of his forefathers. Indeed this position was so well crafted that the margrave refused to pledge his

106 “Because, as sacred Scripture attests, sins are forgiven the faithful by the giving of alms, we, considering our fear and love of the God, for our salvation and that of our beloved wife Kunegund, as well as of our most beloved son Otakar and of all our ancestors, we, by our authority to besotw gifts, have handed over a certain estate of ours called Vorau to the see of Salzburg, and on the same estate we have established religious men living together according to the rule of the blessed Augustine, to abide there by the authority of our lord the venerable Archbishop Eberhard, who should pray and intercede with almighty God without remission for our sins and those of our ancestors.” StUB I, no. 479.

107 See note 17.
allegiance to the new duke of Bavaria, Otto of Wittelsbach, even though the margrave of Styria had been a vassal of Bavaria throughout the former’s existence. The commemorative activities of the canons of Vorau and other monastic houses in the region were integral in laying the groundwork for the growth of Styrian authority. Because Vorau’s existence was so closely linked to the ruling house and its history, the canons would have benefitted from their efforts to support the authority upon which they depended. The two chronicles catalogued in the Stiftsarchiv merely as Schachtel 263, prefaced with a dynastic history, are born of this recognition. Perhaps the age of these two chronicles makes them better witnesses to the fact that Vorau’s history was inseparable from that of the ruling house, a history in danger of obscurity because of the interval of centuries that needed to be reiterated at the time of composition in order to retain its substance.

We have already examined the various manuscripts in which the memoria of the Otakars was preserved for liturgical purposes, and it is clear that the rituals keeping the founder and his relatives alive and present in the community of the faithful were dutifully upheld for at least two centuries after the extinction of that dynastic line. Without knowing how long these manuscripts continued in the use of the canons at Vorau, it is impossible to gauge the persistence of these practices (though the discussion below offers some evidence). The generosity of Otakar III and his son toward Vorau is well documented, with the latter making special provisions for the continued existence of that house, as well as the others established by his predecessors when he made preparations for his heir-less death. When Otakar IV died in 1192 and another dynasty took over Styria, these commemorative practices increased in importance in a world where the (immediate) family responsible for their well-being and protection was no longer physically present.

1.4.6 The Burial of Otakar III

The issue of memoria at the heart of Vorau’s inception in the mid-twelfth century never lost relevance. The debate concerning the whereabouts of the remains of the last two Otakars, sparked by the Styrian historian and canon of Vorau Aquilinius Julius Caesar in the later
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eightheenth century, continued well into the twentieth (very nearly into the twenty-first!), with the former Vorau Stiftsarchivar Ferdinand Hutz having the last word in 1997.\textsuperscript{109} After the turn of the first millennium, the physical remains of a founder took on an increasing significance for the religious houses entrusted with their memoria.\textsuperscript{110} The grave of the founder was at the centre of a monastic community’s understanding of its function in the world. If a house could confirm its purpose as a site of memoria by the presence of a grave, its legal claims to the privileges granted by the individual were much stronger.\textsuperscript{111} Some of the legal bonds between a founder and an institution were tied to the grave itself as expressions of an interrelationship. Indeed, the decreasing frequency of representations of the deceased’s image on the tomb, Christine Sauer argues, points to an increase in the significance of the grave itself and the remains enclosed therein.\textsuperscript{112} Many examples of founder-chronicles (Stifterchroniken) include descriptions of the role of the grave within the liturgical remembrance. Graves were always set before an altar as well, to ensure an intense spiritual connection with the events of the mass. Unlike the commemorative practices recorded in a monastery’s codicological holdings, the grave of a founder exercised a real influence over events in the life of the house, over the layout of its sacred spaces, and the manifestations of its liturgical encounters with the divine. The founder or patron’s grave was a place of tremendous importance to a monastery, and endowed the memoria of that individual with a force far exceeding that associated with his or her legal status. Incorporation into the religious services of an institution amounted to a divine approbation of their relationship and a confirmation of each party’s legitimacy.\textsuperscript{113}

\begin{thebibliography}{113}
\bibitem{110} Sauer, \textit{Fundatio und Memoria}, 118.
\bibitem{111} Sauer suggests that the images of the founder holding a small architectural model which denoted the nature of their association with the church were seen as expressions of a legal relationship between the two. Ibid., 124ff.
\bibitem{112} Ibid., 126.
\bibitem{113} Sauer, \textit{Fundatio und Memoria}, 116-128, 152-159. Jürgen Wolf offers an interesting discussion of the miracles associated with the graves of founders contained within churches that highlights just how important they were for the community of monks. At Rheinhardsbrunn in Thuringia, many wonders were claimed to have occurred at the grave of the Landgrave Louis IV, husband to the famed Elisabeth of Thuringia. The brothers composed a \textit{vita} of Louis which benefitted from the added weight of the miracles associated with his resting place. Louis might be not be considered a typical case because he died on crusade and could have also been considered a martyr, though the example is nevertheless illustrative of the importance of the grave itself. Jürgen Wolf, “Die Heiligenlegenden als multivalente Gattung zwischen klösterlich-dynastischer Memorialekultur, Chronistik und Laika-Privater Andacht: Beobachtungen am Elisabethleben des Johannes Rothe”, In \textit{The Medieval Chronicle} IV (2006), 203-213. See also Karl Heinemeyer, “Landgraf Ludwig IV. von Thüringen, der Gemahl der hl. Elisabeth”, \textit{Wartburg-Jahrbuch 2000} (Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner), 17–47. For the \textit{vita} see, H. Rückert, \textit{Das Leben des heiligen Ludvig, Landgrafen in Thüringen nach der lateinischen Urschrift übersetzt von F. Köditz von Salfeld} (Leipzig, 1851).
\end{thebibliography}
Otakar III expressed a wish to be buried at the Cistercian abbey of Rein, with its founder, his father Leopold. For unknown reasons, however, his body never arrived.\textsuperscript{114} Seitz has long since claimed to possess the remains of Otakar III, although according to Hutz, this is based on an inscription in a necrology much too late to refer to Otakar.\textsuperscript{115} The origin of Seitz as the resting place of Otakar III stems from Caesar, who took the word of the abbot when he claimed that although the necrology on which he based his claim was from 1600, he had copied the original before it was destroyed. In fact, the earliest names in the 1600 necrology begin at 1500.\textsuperscript{116} As support, the abbot produced the skeletal remains of three individuals: a woman, a man, and a smaller person, thought to be a younger man. In truth, the abbot had no idea who these people were.

Codex 99 of the Stiftsarchiv Vorau contains a partial necrology, but also a fourteenth-century calendar which records the dedication of many of the house’s altars during the period of 1228-1338.\textsuperscript{117} Under an entry for the Provost Marquard on fol. 5r, it states that on July 14, 1335, Henry II of Burghausen, bishop of Seckau dedicated an altar to the Holy Ghost in Vorau’s Stiftskirche. It reads, “...dedicatum est altare iuxta sepulchrum fundatoris ecclesie Vorawensis a domino Heinrico venerable Sekkoviensis ecclesie episcopo...”\textsuperscript{118} In addition, Thomas Ebendorfer’s mid-fifteenth-century \textit{Chronicon Austriacum} states that Otakar’s body was brought to Vorau and buried in 1164, a source which, according to Hutz, has gone totally ignored.\textsuperscript{119} Vorau’s codex 85, containing some biographical notes on the house’s provost, notes under Marquard that he translated the remains of the founder into the place where they now rest and had a tomb made.\textsuperscript{120} The context of the entry (early thirteenth century), combined with what we know about Vorau’s founding indicate that the founder mentioned in codex 85 is Otakar III. It would have been extremely unusual for Vorau’s canons to refer to anyone other than Otakar as a

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{114} Mezler-Andalberg, “Kirchenreform”, 152. \\
\textsuperscript{115} Hutz is even skeptical of Seitz’s claim to house Otakar IV’s earthly remains. Hutz, “Otakar Begräbnis”, 13-14. \\
\textsuperscript{116} The codex in question is kept at Ljubljana; however, there is a copy kept at Graz (UB Graz, cod. 640). \\
\textsuperscript{117} See Pius Fank, \textit{Catalogus Voraviensis seu Codices manuscripti Bibliothecae Canonicae in Vorau} (Graz, 1936). \\
\textsuperscript{118} “An altar was dedicated by lord Henry, venerable bishop of Seckau next to the tomb of the church of Vorau’s founder.” See also Hutz, “Otakar Begräbnis”, 15. \\
\textsuperscript{119} Hutz, “Otakar Begräbnis”, 14; Hieronymus Pez, ed., \textit{Scriptores rerum Austriacum, tomus II} (Leipzig, 1725), col. 718. \\
\textsuperscript{120} ...fundatorem de cripta in locum, ubi nunc iacet, transtuli et sepulchrum fieri fecit. fol. 89r. See also Hutz, “Otakar Begräbnis”, 16. 
\end{flushright}
In the fourteenth-century fragment of the Vorau necrology, furthermore, Otakar is referred to as *fundator ecclesie Vorawensis*.

Hutz makes a strong case for Vorau as the final resting place of Otakar III, and the fact that two separate communities competed for the honour for centuries speaks volumes. Indeed the inscriptions dating from the fourteenth century clearly indicate that the canons of Vorau, or at the very least the scribes creating these books, believed that Otakar’s body lay beneath the foundation’s church. The presence of the founder’s body where his commemoration took place meant a connection to the ruling house that was stronger than those between a mere benefactor and a monastery, or another house that took part in the memorial activities through *Verbrüderung*. The physical presence of Otakar III during the liturgical ceremonies that manifested him for all those taking part added an element of prestige to the community. A community that could claim to watch over the remains of its founder was immediately in a strong position to resist any challenge to its rights or possessions, as the presence of the founder provided the grounds for the community’s existence, and lent plausibility to its body of charters documenting the founder’s actions. Graves were a point of contact with the past, both the monastery’s own and that of the founding family, and they served to keep that past current. They gave life and veracity to the historiographical writing of an institution and imbued that writing with even more importance. They might even provide a medium of education, instruction, and an example of piety and charity to be imitated.

As the surviving necrologies, anniversarial books, and cartularies from the Styrian monasteries demonstrate, commemoration of the Otakars was quite widely practiced. Ossiach, Rein, Admont, St. Lambrecht, St. Paul, Seitz, Geirach, Garsten, the cathedral chapter of Salzburg, and Seckau all memorialized at least the last two members of the Styrian ruling house. Although Otakar I died on a pilgrimage to Rome and was buried there, Otakar II lies at his foundation of
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122 Vorau Stiftsarchiv codex 89 (formerly CCXXV). *Necrologia Germaniae*, 438.
124 Ibid., 183-186.
125 All of these necrologies and anniversarial books have been (heavily) edited in the MGH series and can be found here: Sigismund Herzberg-Pränkel, ed. *Necrologia Germaniae. Tomus II. Dioecesis Salisburgensis*. MGH (Berlin: Weidmann, 1904). The following documents in StUB I record donations made by the Otakars in exchange for commemorative services: Admont (410, 564, 631, 649, 691), St. Lambrecht (257), Rein (261, 552, 698), St. Paul (482), Seckau (546, 619), Seitz (620, 644), Geirach (655), Garsten (702).
Garsten. Leopold’s grave can be found at Rein, which he also established, and Otakar III, as we have seen, rests in Vorau. Perhaps the distribution of the founders’ remains across the Styrian houses was yet another plank in the policy of these rulers intended to strengthen their authority by reinforcing their religious houses. The centuries-long dispute that involved three of Styria’s monastic and canonical houses is born of a clear recognition of the benefits and importance of possessing the remains of a founder. Any house which enjoyed this privilege would have been especially concerned with the history of the family that patronized it so heavily, and with the maintenance of that family’s power base.

1.4.7 Charters and the Creation of Memoria

The scholarly discourse on memoria, its broader function within a lay and secular society, and its mechanisms has devoted less attention to the role that cartularies and the documents preserved within them played in a group’s remembrance of an individual.126 Many of the Otakars’ documents which survive from the period of about 1150-1200 illustrate the manifold ways in which the giving of a fief could contribute to the memoria of an individual, his or her familial connections, and simultaneously build the image of dynasty and ancestry that was so central to the wielding of secular power.

On a basic level, the exchange of land or privilege for intercessory prayers which so many of these charters record, precipitated the commemoration of an individual. However, the language of these documents and the frequent inclusion of parents and ancestors—more often than not already long deceased—helped codify these relationships and contribute to a narrative of dynastic continuity beneficial to all parties. In the pool of documents under examination here, this typically occurs in two scenarios. During the reconfirmation of privileges granted by the preceding generation, the current ruler explicitly named these parties and their deeds, simultaneously bringing the authority of the previous ruler back to contemporary awareness and taking on that same legitimate authority (by symbolically reenacting the original deed). In the second scenario, the donation was made not only for the sake of one’s own salvation, but also that of parents and ancestors, which established commemoration not only of the individual, but the entire dynastic line. In both cases, the documents show long lists of both secular and ecclesiastical witnesses who were present at the time the action being codified took place. Family memoria and the dynastic narrative were thus at the centre of very public displays of authority.

In 1182 at Radgona (Radkersburg), Otakar IV renewed the monastery of Seitz’s possessions granted by his father, and enhanced them with a further gift of money and land.127 Otakar IV began the document by asserting that he desired to make known what his father had done for the praise and glory of God, the Virgin, and St. John the Baptist. He proceeded to mention himself, and his dynastic status, “We, his successors in name and heredity...‖.128 The document then recounts Otakar III’s gifts, and each enhancement given by his son is keyed to one of these prior donations. For example, because Otakar III promised to provide money for the construction of necessary buildings, his son Otakar IV gave fifteen marks every year for the upkeep of these structures.129 Here Otakar IV reiterated and endorsed this exercise of his father’s authority with a gift of his own that also sought to build upon and strengthen what was given earlier. By also noting the conditions under which these donations were given, the document must be considered

127 StUB I, no. 620.
128 Ego Otacher dei gratia dux Styrensis omnibus Christi fidelibus tam futuris quam presentibus per presentia scripta notum fieri volo quod pater meus memorie felicis Otacher marchio Styrensis ad laudem et gloriam omnipotentis dei et eius genitrice ac perpetue virginis Marie sanctique Ioannis baptiste...collocavit. Nos vero nominis et hereditatis ipsius successores... StUB I no. 620.
129 Et quia pater meus quando eos adduxit, edificia necessaria eis se facturum promissit, nec in hoc eis subtraximus manum nostre pietatis, quin potius constituimus eis xv marcas dari singulis annis quo usque necessaria edifica construantur. StUB I, no. 620.
within the context of memorial practices, and the ways in which these help contribute to a narrative of dynastic history. A witness list of fifteen named individuals and many other unnamed (alii multi) underscores the public function of this important symbolic declaration of power and heritage. Otakar IV’s confirmation and continuation of these actions reinforced their legitimacy, the legitimacy of Otakar III’s preceding authority to enact them, and at the same time demonstrated the latest ruler’s place in the chain and his assumption of hereditary authority.  

A document given at Graz in 1182 provides an excellent example of the historiographical dimension some charters can evince, and the ways in which they can contribute to building a kind of dynastic history. In this charter Otakar IV of Styria confirmed several liberties and privileges granted by his father to the abbey of Seckau. It provides a great deal of historical information, and even informs us of Otakar III’s reason for supporting the abbey. In the process the document redactor made a clear statement about the heritage of the Otakars that leaves little doubt about the importance of these charters in contributing to the image of a ruling house. Otakar IV made this confirmation so that the deeds of his father and the founder of that place, Adalram of Waldeck, would not be forgotten, and because he held Adalram in high esteem. But the redactor heaped praise upon Otakar III, covering all the attributes of a rightful ruler. He called the Styrian margrave powerful by his noble birth, as well as in appearance, dignity, and wealth. Adalram’s choice of Otakar III for the advocacy of the monastery is clear evidence of the close relationship between the two. Perhaps this note about the Styrian margrave’s outstanding qualities refers to the essential characteristics a worthy ruler must possess and

---

130 Also of interest in this document is Otakar IV’s declaration that he and his father do not wish to hand over the advocacy of the monastery to anyone outside the family. *Advocatiam vero eiusdem loci neque pater meus neque nos alicui tradere voluimus, nisi nobismet ipsis.* Again in Radgona (Radkersburg) in 1182, Otakar IV is witnessed reconfirming some judicial privileges of Seitz, and forbids his ministerials from interfering in the Carthusians’ business. The document opens with the young margrave acknowledging the actions of his father and stating his desire to persist in them. *Quoniam diuina bonitas suos cultores beneficiis nunquam destituit sed diuitiis et honoribus circumquaque multiplicat, felicis memoria patris nostri Otochari marchionis Styria piam erga dilectos nobis fratres in Seitz fauorem et inextinctum propensius exequi cupientes, confirmamus eisdem concessas omnes libertates,*  

131 Unde nosse debetis, quod precibus assiduis crebrisque monitis domini Wernheri Seccowensis prepositi benignas aures apposuimus et antiquam factum strennuissimi patris nostri marchionis Otakarii cum eodem preposito fratrequo Adalrammo uiro illustri et religioso Seccowensis monasterii fundatore ne obliuio aboleat, ad memoriam deducere dignum accessit.  

132 Unde nosse debetis, quod precibus assiduis crebrisque monitis domini Wernheri Seccowensis prepositi benignas aures apposuimus et antiquam factum strennuissimi patris nostri marchionis Otakarii cum eodem preposito fratrequo Adalrammo uiro illustri et religioso Seccowensis monasterii fundatore ne obliuio aboleat, ad memoriam deducere dignum accessit. Siquidem pater noster genere, specie, dignitate, diuitiis pollens, iam dictum fundatorem magna gratia familiaritatatis habuit eo quod idem adhuc in seculari conversione manens multo fidelitatis ossequio tam corpore quam rebus sibi seruiit. Otakar was chosen by Adalram and the provost of Seckau to be the advocate of that house at an assembly in Regensburg. There was clearly a close relationship between the two. See STUB II, no. 22.
constitutes a public confirmation of Otakar’s authority and nobility. In any case, this document presents a very open declaration about the margrave’s heritage, and it should not be dismissed as a banality or a phrase of customary praise. Indeed, such direct acclaim for the quality of Otakar’s lineage is uncommon in the Styrian documents under examination, and its deliberate inclusion is telling. The witness list gives thirty-nine names, et alii multi plures.

In one of only a handful of surviving documents that pertain to Vorau, the redactor was careful to include in the charter (in which Otakar IV confirmed the donation of one of his ministerials) that Vorau was founded by Otakar IV’s parents, and it was done for their memory and that of their relatives.133 The phrase, “We desire the entire community of the faithful to know...” introduces the transaction, which also involves a clear statement about who founded the place.134 When the document proceeds to outline precisely what property changed hands, it is careful to include yet another reference to the founders.135 The history of the community and the knowledge of its founders appear to be crucial information that bore inclusion in legal documents pertaining to its property. Every transaction includes a reference to the shared history of the community in question and the family which founded it, and in some cases even the grounds for its creation. During these public exercises of authority, family history and heritage appear inseparable.

Family history also plays a major role in a document given at Graz, in 1189.136 Otakar IV refunded the monastery of Rein for the reappropriation of three villas which had been given by his father and confirmed by his mother after the former’s death. He claimed to have been ignorant of the transaction, since the document had been sent to the archbishop of Salzburg. He returned all the property with the exception of five manses and reconfirmed his father’s donation. The document presents a lengthy family history that precedes the introduction of the matter at hand and sets out family and dynastic relationships in a conspicuous and deliberate manner. It reads,

133 StUB I, no. 642.
134 Vide scire volumus uniuersitatem cunctorum fidelium quod nos petitione dilectissimi...ministerialis nostri ad hoc induci concessimus, quidquid de predis suis locis deo sacratis et a parentibus nostris siue etiam a nobis fundatis conferre uoluerit, auctoritate nostre licentie conferat. StUB I, no. 642.
135 Ex hac igitur permissione quidquid iuxta Graece forum nostrum et secus locvm qui dicitur Guntern, culvum uel inculvum, quesitvm uel inquesitvm habuit quod etiam Ruzonis dispensatoris nostri beneficivm fuit, sancto Thome apostolo fratibusque deo in Uorowe ministrantibus per manus Bernhardi prepositi super reliquias pro animabus parentvm nostrorum suorumque fidel devotione contradidit. StUB I, no. 642.
136 StUB I, no. 698.
...pater meus felicis memorie Otaker marchio de Styra monasterium Runense quod pater suus marchio Livpoldvs cognomento Fortis auus meus a fundo construxit et ubi etiam sepultus in pace requiescit, uotum patris adimplens, prediis suis per duersa loca sitis pro remedio anime sue et animarum parentum suorum absolutione ampliare et sustenare curavit. Fecit autem hoc sicut scriptum inde priulegium docet, cum beniuolo assensu coniugis sue matris mee Chvnigvndis marchionisse tradens ac delegans manu potestatia super altare dei semperque uirginis Marie in Rvna ad usus fratrum deo ibidem fumulantium duas salis patellas in Enstal apud Ahorn, et beneficia duo in Mittelindorf, et in Hartperch unum beneficium, et duo curtilia loca cum uinea...post dies autem uite seu filii hereditibus succedentibus siue non succedentibus, hec allodia illi ecclesie confirmavit...cum igitur ego patri defuncto heres successissem, supradictas tres uillas ad meum detinui seruitium, donec tandem dei nutu commonitus et meam reueram iusticiam et fratrum predicti cenobii sinceram sine dubio iusticiam recognoscens, easdem uillas ex toto mihi abdicans, domui dei eodem per omnia iure quo pater meus olim tradiderat ac testamento firmauit, restitu...137

This very dense excerpt details three generations of Styrian rulers and their relationship to that foundation. The two generations that succeeded Leopold—and even his wife—felt and pursued a familial responsibility to Rein. For anyone reading this document, and for those present during its creation, the case also presents an image of dynastic continuity and demonstrates a long standing and deep connection between the monastery and the ruling house. Moreover, there is a clear message that justice has been served by the latest dynastic representative, a familial justice that stretches back generations. Rein’s position is clearly established through its commemorative responsibilities with respect to its founder, and it thereby succeeded in preserving its property rights. Otkar IV’s position is also clear. He was the grandson of a Styrian margrave, and the son of a Styrian margrave, and the documentation of this case stands as witness. When Otakar eventually restored the property to the monks, he took care to reconfirm the privilege, and thus reassert his place in a chain of hereditary authority that might have been seen to wobble if he had

137 “...my father Otakar, margrave of Styria, of blessed memory, in fulfillment of the vow of his father, took care to support and augment the monastery of Rein—which his father, the margrave Leopold, called ‘the Strong’, my grandfather, founded and built, and where he rests in peace entombed—with his own estates located in diverse areas, for the relief of his soul and for the absolution of the souls of his ancestors. And he did this, moreover, just as the written document states, with the benevolent agreement of his wife, my mother, the marquess Kunigunde, delivering and granting by his authority to make gifts upon the altar of the Mother of God and perpetual Virgin Mary in Rein, two salt pans in Ennstal near Ahorn, and two fiefs in Mittelindorf, and one in Hartberg, and two smaller vineyards for the use of the brothers serving God there...And she confirmed those allods to that church after the days of her life, whether she had heirs succeeding or not...When, therefore, I succeeded my deceased father as heir, I retained the aforementioned properties for my service, until finally, admonished by the will of God, recognizing my injustice and the sincere justice of the brothers of the aforementioned monastery beyond doubt, I restored those same properties to the house of God by the law with which my father once established and confirmed by testament, evacuating them entirely...” StUB I, no. 698. The document which sets out the original fiefs also survives, and can be found in StUB I, no. 257.
undermined the business of his ancestors carried out under legitimate premises. All of this transpired under the gaze of thirty-six named witnesses, and many other unnamed. The violation of such an old privilege by a ruler who by birth ought to have upheld it would have undermined and destabilized the system of mutual reinforcement between monasteries and ruling house which has been the focus of this chapter. The resolution arrived at indicates the importance of a case of this nature. Both parties needed to sustain that which the other provided. Rein needed the old privilege to stand in order to maintain its ownership and an air of inviolability that a strong ruler instilled in its foundations, while at the same time maintaining the authority of that ruler. Otakar needed to fall in line, or risk endangering the image of the continuity of Otakarian authority that the Styrian monasteries helped to create.

Much like the examples discussed above, charters that record more straightforward transactions such as the giving of various properties for intercessory actions, frequently contain references to family members of previous generations and their actions. Thus the written records of these proceedings serve to reinforce an image of dynastic history, and take on a historiographical function. They often name family members specifically in connection with memoria, mention their previous actions with respect to the monastery in question, and set out the relationships between members of the dynasty in very clear ways. A charter from Rein given in 1147 shows that the written records of donations could be used to help create continuity of authority, not only by means of commemorative practices, but by projecting it onto future generations. Otakar III made a substantial donation to that community, “...pro remedio anime mee et animarum parentum meorum absolutione...” Since his father Leopold was buried there, Rein was already responsible for commemorating the ruling house, but this document goes beyond assuring that he and his ancestors will be remembered there; it demonstrates that by patronizing the same memorial institution as his father, the Styrian margrave was conscious of engaging a legacy of continuous authority. The charter states that, “Post dies autem uite mee filiis heredibus succendentibus siue non succedentibus hec allodia illi ecclesie confirmaui...” Otakar III committed the succeeding generations to the same agreement that he had entered into with the

138 “...for the sake of my soul, and for the absolution of the souls of my ancestors.” StUB I, no. 261. This formula occurs in several other documents from this period. StUB I, no. 410, for example, a donation made by Otakar III to Admont in 1160.

139 “After the days of my life, moreover, I have confirmed the possessions of that church for my sons, succeeding as heirs or not...” StUB I, no. 257. This wording served as the basis for the document issued forty years later (StUB I, no. 698), in which the monks of St. Lambrecht remind Otakar IV of this agreement.
monks of St Lambrecht, providing the opportunity to participate in the unbroken line of authority by which he made this agreement. At the same time, the monks stood to benefit, since Otakar III’s gift was now safeguarded well into the future, as indeed was the case when Otakar IV came to maturity and unknowingly violated the agreement. The charter of this resolution draws directly on the one given by his father forty years prior (see above), further emphasizing the continuity of Styrian authority. It appears, too, that this was an effective technique of projecting authority into the future for the use of succeeding generations. In 1162, Otakar III made a donation to the cathedral chapter of Salzburg, and his reasons for doing so reflect an awareness of the commitments of his predecessors, and thus testify to the force of these kinds of forward-looking gestures. Describing the motivations behind the donation, the document reads, “Quod factum...quia ad nos hereditario iure respicere videbatur.”

Indeed this recognition of inherited responsibilities and authority was carried out in front of a very large gathering of the region’s nobility, as the extensive witness list—nearly as long as the document itself—demonstrates. In some cases, the charters explicitly state that the next generation is present. This detail was surely not included without grounds, as the formulaic structure and purposeful wording of all these documents illustrates. More likely, the reigning ruler desired to connect the next generation to the action which was being recorded, to make it explicitly responsible for the charter’s contents, and investing it with the authority to uphold it. Given at Maribor in 1164, one of Otakar III’s testaments states, “...ego Otaker marchio Stiriensis una cum vxore mea Chunigunda predia ministerialis nostri Heinrici Gruke in ualle que dicitur Lauenda, sita apud uillam Edelinge et apud Houe, et apud Kienberch simul cum familia, presente filio nostro Otakero ecclesie sancti Paul et fratribus inibi servientibus pro remedio anime mee et parentum meorum manu potestatiau contradidi.”

The young Otakar is not given as part of the witness list, but was included in the body of the document alongside the donors as if in recognition that he would play some future part in upholding the contents of the document. Considering that the child was only a year old in 1164 when the document was redacted, the elder Otakar must have been laying the foundations of his son’s authority.

140 “What was done...seemed to us to respect the hereditary law.” StUB I, no. 469.
141 “I, Otakar, margrave of Styria, together with my wife Kunigunde, hand down by my authority, with our son Otakar present, the possessions of our ministerial Henry of Gurk in the valley which is called Lavant, situated near the villa of Edelinge near Hove, and Kienberg, together with their households, to the church of St. Paul and to the brothers living and serving God there for the sake of my soul, and that of my ancestors.” StUB I, no. 482.
Looking back to Vorau’s founding document, it appears that a similar process is at work here. The charter specifically mentions Otakar IV, a child of barely a year at the time of its founding. Vorau and its group of canons would always be there to intercede on behalf of Otakar IV’s soul, as the document sets out, but in naming the young heir, it invites him to take part in the same authority that his father received from his father. For the canons of Vorau, including Otakar IV in the document guaranteed the patronage of the next generation and assured that house’s protection and patronage for at least that period of time. The document links Vorau’s well-being with that of the dynasty and implied an obligation on the part of the canons to participate in the maintenance of authority in all the ways discussed above. In light of the observable efforts of the canons to pursue the commemoration of the Styrian dynasty’s past, we ought also to seek the ways in which they fulfilled their future responsibilities and secured the future of the dynasty as well. Naturally this involved looking to the past and setting the foundations of a lasting authority, and it is perhaps in the context of Vorau’s founding, of the expectations that Otakar III placed on his new institutions, that we might view the creation of a manuscript like Vorau 276.

1.4.8 The Role of Otakarian *memoria* after 1192: The Foundations of Babenberg Legitimacy in Styria

We have seen the ways in which the Styrian monasteries and their chief patrons, the Otakars, worked to mutually support the rights and legitimacy of one another through the use of charters and memorial practices, but the extinction of the Otakars in 1192 threatened the position of those who had been so dependent on them. The strict limitations placed on the new duke’s authority within Styria set out in the Georgenberg Compact is likely a reflection of this anxiety.\(^\text{142}\) Those who were protected under this agreement were able to continually affirm the rights accumulated under the Otakers. Asserting the validity of such claims depended on the continued recognition of the Otakars as legitimate political actors. For example, the policies of Duke Frederick II, who earned the telling sobriquet the Quarrelsome, had transgressed against the provisions of the Georgenberg Compact—for example, by levying a tax on his Styrian vassals without their consent in the early 1230s. These, in turn complained to the emperor, who issued a confirmation

\(^{142}\) The terms of the agreement that so favoured the ministerials of the region are also a reflection of their growing status and an indication of their political leverage.
of the freedoms and rights granted by Otakar IV, which the document states were freely given.\textsuperscript{143} In 1214 at Rome, Pope Innocent III confirmed the rights and holdings of Rein in a document that references both Leopold the Strong and his wife Sophie in their capacity as founders, as well as the succeeding Otakars and their contributions to the foundation.\textsuperscript{144} The Otakars and their deeds were a crucial prerequisite for the papal confirmation. In 1211, Leopold VI had to order the restoration of several properties to the Spital am Semmering which a Styrian ministerial, Erchenger of Landsee, had unlawfully occupied.\textsuperscript{145} The document explicitly states these were given rightfully by Otakar III, and hence they belong to the hostel. The foundation succeeded in asserting its rights based on the legitimacy of the Otakars, which they helped to create.

But the continued relevance of the Otakars within Styria could also work in favour of the Babenberg dukes, and it appears that they understood the importance of maintaining the rituals and practices in the region’s monastic communities that kept an image of a legitimate Ottokarian dynasty part of the collective memory. The Babenberg newcomers benefited by encouraging the perception of their authority as that of the Otakars exercised by a different, but lawfully invested, hand. Crucially, the Babenbergs (rightfully) styled themselves as the heirs to the Styrian duchy, a position established by Otakar IV. In the charter described above, in which Leopold VI returned the properties to the Spital am Semmering seized by Erchenger, the Styrian duke makes explicit that the authority he held to return the properties came from the Otakars. It reads, “Eo vero ab hac luce subtracto, cum filius eius Otakarus ex marchione dux pueriles adhuc aget annos, cui nos quoque, sine herede decedente, hereditario iure successimus...”\textsuperscript{146} Not only did the legitimacy of the Otakars aid the foundation in reclaiming its holdings, but it also provided a platform for the exercise of Babenberg authority as the new lords of Styria.

After the Babenbergs became dukes of Styria, they were active in confirming the gifts and rights granted by their predecessors in an effort to demonstrate this continuity of authority. Aside from Admont, Seitz (in charters dated 1207, 1227),\textsuperscript{147} Seckau (1192, 1202),\textsuperscript{148} Rein (1205, 1210, 1210,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{143} StUB II, 354. Dopsch, “Österreichische Geschichte”, 304-306.
  \item \textsuperscript{144} StUB II, 127.
  \item \textsuperscript{145} BUB I, 181.
  \item \textsuperscript{146} “When Otakar [III] was taken from this life while his son Otakar [IV]—who became duke from the march—was still in his childhood, to whom, having died without heirs, we succeeded by the law of heredity...” BUB I, 181.
  \item \textsuperscript{147} BUB I, 154; StUB II, 246.
  \item \textsuperscript{148} BUB I, 85; BUB I, 124.
\end{itemize}
1211, 1228, 1246),\(^{149}\) Gleink (1192-1194),\(^{150}\) Garsten (1204),\(^{151}\) and the Spital am Semmering (1211 and 1217)\(^{152}\) received either gifts or confirmation from the Babenbergs of the charitable actions of their official precursors. Many of these charters confirming the actions of the Otakars—which span the entire reign of the Babenbergs in Styria—make explicit reference to the Otakar in question, or to the specific act of donation, often naming the property itself. The Babenbergs, by confirming, legally, the actions of their predecessors, demonstrated a continuity with the previous holders of the office and positioned themselves as the next legitimate rulers in an unbroken chain of authority.\(^{153}\) For example, in a charter given in 1192—a time at which the legitimation of their authority in Styria would have been particularly pertinent—Leopold V took Seckau under his advocacy and confirmed the possession of a property in Waltersdorf and one in the Seetaler alps near Judenburg. This document, written by Vorau’s provost Bernard, makes clear that Leopold saw his authority as a continuation of the Otakars’, and that he encouraged this perception through careful wording. It reads, “...post obitum dive memorie dilecti cognati nostri ducis Otacheri ducatum Styrie administrandum suscepissemus...Indulsimus etiam eis ac indultum ibidem confirmavimus libertatem possidendi predium Waltensdorf, sicut in testamento supra memorati Otacheri scriptum invenimus, eum sancte Marie Seccowe pro remedio anime sue tradidisse.”\(^{154}\) The Babenberg dukes, just as each successive member of the Otakarian dynasty, affirmed the legitimate authority of their predecessor and thereby their own, by means of confirmation of rights and holdings. A similar formulation beginning with an assertion that Leopold and his successors were the heirs to the Styrian duchy followed by a reference to the Babenberg confirmations for Styrian monasteries often employ the phrase *manu potestativa* in referring to Otakarian authority. This phrase can be translated as a “by a competent hand”, a reference to the exercise of legitimate authority (i.e. “with the authority to do it.”). See for example BUB I, 83 and 174. Wood, *Proprietary Church*, 229.

\(^{149}\) BUB I, 124; BUB I, 174; BUB I, 176; BUB I, 259; BUB II, 437.

\(^{150}\) BUB I, 83.

\(^{151}\) BUB I, 143.

\(^{152}\) BUB I, 148; BUB I, 181. This last document refers to a *privilegium* of Leopold V and a gift of a mill by Henry Jasomirgott.

\(^{153}\) Babenberg confirmations for Styrian monasteries often employ the phrase *manu potestativa* in referring to Otakarian authority. This phrase can be translated as a “by a competent hand”, a reference to the exercise of legitimate authority (i.e. “with the authority to do it.”). See for example BUB I, 83 and 174. Wood, *Proprietary Church*, 229.

\(^{154}\) “...after the death of our beloved kinsman Duke Otakar, of blessed memory, we took up the administration of the duchy of Styria...we grant, moreover, to them [the brothers of Seckau] that which was conferred, and we confirm the freedom of possessing the property Waltensdorf, just as we found written in the testament of the afore-mentioned Otakar, that he gave it to Seckau for the salvation of his soul.” BUB I, 85.
lawful act of donation by the Otakars can be observed in many documents from the Babenberg period in Styria.\textsuperscript{155} The active role the Babenbergs took in fostering the commemoration of the Otakars is telling evidence that the defunct Styrian rulers and their lasting presence was directly relevant to the lordship of the new ducal dynasty. The Babenberg efforts to continue Otakarian memoria certainly served their needs, and although they could not claim a particularly close kinship, the frequent use of the adjective cognatus (kinsman) in their pre- and post-1192 charters suggests that there might have also been a familial concern at play.\textsuperscript{156} This connection might have been emphasized in the Babenberg presentation of themselves as heirs to Styria, helping to underscore the rightful origins of their authority, or at least take some part in the prestigious deeds of the Otakars for political purposes. After all, the Babenbergs had no claim to Styria by way of paternal descent.\textsuperscript{157} The arengae of several Babenberg charters may be considered evidence of this former point. They resound with the rhetoric of dynasty and heritage that was common throughout the twelfth century, in part due to its centrality in crusade propaganda from 1145 onward. For example, in a charter referenced above (BUB I, 181) given by Leopold VI in 1211, the duke sets out his reasons for the following actions. It reads, “...ut dum laudabilia facta antecessorum nostrorum principum, que in constructionibus ecclesiarum pio exercuerunt studio, violari non permittimus, divinitus ipsis collatorum pro pietatis operi premiorum quodammodo participes esse valeamus.”\textsuperscript{158} The text proceeds to describe the lawful (legitime) founding of the Spital am Semmering by Otakar III. References contained in the document to the pious work of previous princes undoubtedly referred to the actions of Otakar in establishing the hostel, and Leopold’s declaration of his desire not only to uphold and laud these, but also to partake in them

\textsuperscript{155} See for example, BUB I, 124, 143, 154, 174, 181; BUB II, 334, 437. Many of these documents explicitly relate that Leopold had been made Otakar’s heir, not merely that he took over the administration. See for example BUB I, 181, which states that with Otakar ...sine herede decedente, hereditario iure successimus. “...departing without an heir, we succeeded [him] by the law of inheritance.”

\textsuperscript{156} One charter from 1182, in which Leopold granted Garsten freedom from tariffs on the Danube pertaining to certain goods, contains a peculiarly strong expression of Leopold V’s connection to Otakar IV. The action was undertaken, ...propter familiaris amicitiam dulcissimi amici et cognati mei Styrensis ducis Odacher, quem precordialiter diligo. “...on account of the familial friendship of my dearest friend and kinsman, Duke Otakar, whom I love with heartfelt affection.”

\textsuperscript{157} The Babenberg Elizabeth married into the dynasty, and thus her brother’s descendants had no lawful claim to the Styrian patrimony.

\textsuperscript{158} “...so that we might not allow the laudable deeds of our princely ancestors, which cultivated a pious zeal in the construction of churches, to be violated, we desire to partake in some way in these divinely inspired [deeds] of those previous worshippers, for the sake of piety.”
in some measure shows a desire to appropriate the admirable deeds of the previous dynasty. A further document from 1192, issued after the death of Otakar IV, in which Leopold V took the abbey of Seckau under his protection, makes similar use of dynastic rhetoric in reference to the Otakars to underscore the value of these and their deeds for the establishment of the new ruling house.

In nomine sancte et individue trinitatis. Ego Leupoldus dux Styrie et Austrie omnibus fidelibus imperpetuum. Respicientes gloriosa facta inclitorum principum per tempora transacta, quibus gloriam suam provexerunt dum cultum dei ardentii desiderio magnificie ampliaverunt, monasteria fundantes, fundata defensantes, elemosinarum largitiae plurima pauperibus Christi administrando, equitatis lance omnia strennue gubernando, animadversionis ratione ad imitandum invitamur quatenus glorie eorum participes perpetui efficiamur, nos quoque similie forma exempla virtutem posteris inveniamur. Notum igitur esse volumus tam posteris quam presentibus, quia cum divina gracia dispensente post obitum dive memorie dilecti cognati nostri ducis Otacheri ducatum Styrie administrandum suscipessemus...libertatem loci sui simulque inducendi advocatum argumentis privilegiorum...et in tutelam nostrae protectionis pro mansuetudine nostre clemencie suscepius. Indulsimus etiam eis ac indulum ibidem confirmavimus libertatem possidendi preedium Waltensdorff, sicut in testamento supra memorati Otacheri scriptum invenimus, eum Sancte Marie Seccowe pro remedio anime sue tradidisse.  

The dynastic rhetoric of imitating the commendable example of one’s forefathers is at once a reference to the previous pious Babenberg rulers, but also to the Otakars, whose generosity towards the institution for which the charter was given is noted. One cannot read the statement about Otakar’s donation in insolation from the rhetoric in the arenga. Leopold V clearly sought to establish himself as a successor to the Otakars in much more than the legal sense, and such pointed statements as the one noted above highlight the

---

159. “In the name of the holy and indivisible trinity. I, Leopold, Duke of Styria and Austria, to all the faithful in perpetuity. Looking back upon the glorious deeds of renowned princes through the ages, by which they brought forth their glory while magnificently increasing their worship of God by an ardent desire, founding monasteries, defending these foundations, caring for the poor of Christ through generously distributing alms, by ruling in all matters with the scales of equity, we are challenged to imitate them to whatever extent we are able to partake in their perpetual glory, and we might also be found as examples of virtues in a similar way for our successors. We desire it to be known for those who come after and those in the present that, because, by divine grace we took on the administration of the duchy of Styria after the death of our beloved kinsman Duke Otakar of blessed memory...we take under the guardianship of our protection in the custom of our mercy, the legitimate freedom of that place [Seckau] to select advocates in disputes concerning their rights. We grant and confirm, moreover, for these same brothers the freedom granted to them of possessing the property of Waltensdorf, just as we found written in the testament of Otakar, mentioned above, that he handed it down to Seckau for the salvation of his soul.” BUB I, 85.
desire of the new ruling house in the duchy of Styria to be associated with their predecessors and their actions.

Babenberg commemoration of the deeds of the Otakars is evident in the documentary record and so too is the political utility that the image of continuity these charters presents. One such, dated August 28, 1201, at Admont establishes beyond any doubt that the cultivation of Otakarian memoria by Styria’s new ruling dynasty went well beyond invoking their deeds in a symbolic way. Leopold VI bestowed the chapel of St. Martin near Gröbming in the Enns valley on Admont for the sake of his soul. At the end of the charter, Leopold states that he desired to have two candles burning constantly on the altar of St. Blasius, day and night, “in memoriam eternam, tam nostri, quam et patris nostri, nec non et Odoacris Stirensium ducis, et omnium parentum nostrorum.” This concrete act of commemoration demonstrates the continued value and relevance of the Otakarian dynasty for the Babenbergs in Styria; Leopold carried out this act nearly a decade after the death of Otakar IV in 1192. Only implied in the document’s wording is the familial connection between the two, which appears to be a detail of diminished relevance, as one might expect a conspicuous reference to the consanguinity of the two men if this were a motivating factor. In light of what we know about the Babenbergs’ use of Otakarian memoria for their own political ends, it appears that this charter represents an indication that the persistence of the Otakars in the collective memory was a worthwhile investment, one which Styria’s monasteries must have been more than willing to accept.

1.4.9 The Grave Monument of Otakar IV

After Otakar IV died his remains were taken to his family’s foundation of Seitz despite a fourteenth-century forged document (dated 1177) that declared his preferred resting place as Seckau. In the intervening centuries, much information about the location of Otakar IV’s grave has been lost (see the burial of Otakar III above), and it was certainly moved at some point
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160 “...for our eternal memory, as well as that of our father, and of Otakar, duke of the Styrians, and of all our forefathers.” BUB I, 118.
during the Baroque period. Sometimes in the first few decades of the thirteenth century, his grave was adorned with a stone likeness of the duke (fig. 1). It featured Duke Otakar laying (or standing), in an ankle-length garment, his closed fists stacked one upon the other clasping in front of his body an item that could be interpreted as a pilgrim’s staff, or two items, namely a sword and cross. The vacant space above each shoulder within the heavy border (only broken by a diadem upon Otakar’s head) is filled with quarter-rondels of vegetal designs. It shows Otakar in an idealized state, with no trace of the debilitating disease that so affected his adult life. Vidmar believes his image is reminiscent of those depicting knights later in the century. This grave image is the earliest in the Steiermark and surrounding area (the next closest stems from mid-century) and represents a rather singular monument to the last Otakar.

The monument was created well after Otakar died in 1192, and it has been suggested that Leopold VI, in conjunction with Seitz’s prior, Nicholas, was the commissioning party. The Styrian and Austrian duke’s close relationship with Seckau’s prior is well documented, and the former even received his crusading indulgence from his monastic companion. The grave and its monument were likely placed in the ecclesia minor, a smaller chapel located a short distance from the monastic complex at Seitz but nevertheless under its purview, probably because the site was more suited to offering a wider public the opportunity to visit the grave without disrupting the business of the monastery. Although there are no documents specifically linking Leopold with the grave monument, there are several that demonstrate he heavily subsidized the construction of the church, which was begun sometime after 1210. Leopold is likely responsible for the very rich program of decoration executed at this otherwise unassuming and relative unimportant place of worship set at a remove from the centre of the monastery’s spiritual affairs.

The commissioning of this monument was a major step in fostering the commemoration of the Otakars and we can understand the impulse behind its creation, whether it stemmed from Seitz
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161 Vidmar, Grabmal, 21.
162 Ibid., 71.
163 Ibid., 18.
164 Ibid., 18.
166 Vidmar, Grabmal, 50.
167 These are discussed in greater detail in Milnarič, Krtuziji Žiže, 53-56.
itself, or from the Styrian court. This visual representation of the Otakarian dynasty, so singular at its time of creation, would likely have stood out and thereby served as an effective reminder of the deeds of the defunct rulers. For Polona Vidmar, it is a politically motivated statement made by Leopold and his monastic ally, Nicholas, that proclaims the Babenbergs as heirs to a legitimate lordship in Styria, a position which is supported by the depiction of the duke in full lordly grandeur.\footnote{She believes that “…der Grund für die reiche bauskulpturale Ausschmückung der Seitzer ecclesia minor wie auch für die Errichtung des Hochgrabs von Otakar I. der politisch motivierte Entschluss Leopolds VI. von Babenberg war, die Herrschaft des Hauses Babenberg in der Steiermark durch dieses Monumente zu bestätigen und zu legitimieren. Mit der Georgenberg Handfeste ist das Herzogtum Steiermark durch die Schenkung Otakars I. an seinen Verwandten Leopold V. von Babenberg an die Babenberger gekommen. Die Hervorhebung der “überzeitlichen Präsenz” des ersten Herzogs durch die Errichtung des Grabmals mit figürlicher Darstellung und die reiche Ausschmückung des umgebenden Raumes, eine Art Mausoleum, war eine politische Aussage über die legitime Übertragung der herzoglichen Macht von den steirischen Otakaren an die Babenberger, und somit ein dynastisches Monument.” 47-48} It is nothing short of a dynastic monument that establishes a “timeless presence” of the Otakars, affirming their right to rule in full public display, and thus their right to transfer their duchy to the Babenbergs. This argument is commensurate with what we know about the Babenbergs’ continued commemoration of the Otakars and the ways in which they used the image of Otakarian legitimacy to bolster their authority and lordship in the region. This innovative and hitherto unseen medium of dynastic memoria is a telling witness to the extent to which the Babenberg duke’s of Styria went to secure their position with reference to the past, and just how important it was for them to keep that past current. We ought, therefore, to view Otakar IV’s grave monument within this program of commemoration carried out for political purposes that demonstrates the continuing relevance of the Otakars for the Babenbergs decades after the dynasty died out.
1.5 Inventing Ancestry: The Dietrich of Bern Episode in the Vorau Kaiserchronik

Throughout this chapter I have examined a variety of sources produced in Styria’s monasteries that demonstrate the way in which these institutions and the Otakars participated in creating an image of the ruling house’s past that would help sustain the legitimacy of both parties. Creating a past for a dynasty fulfilled a key requirement that was perceived to authenticate a lord’s suitability to rule. Claiming descent from an ancient and well-known ancestor was a powerful tool for medieval rulers, and many dynasties throughout the period sought to trace their lineage back to a glorified ancestor, or invent such a connection. This figure was often crucial in establishing some political claim and set the tone for the subsequent image of the dynasty that a text would portray. This historical writing around Henry the Lion and the Welfs deployed
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169 Image courtesy of Vidmar, Grabmal, 17.
different dynastic founders depending on their political ambitions. The dedication poem at the beginning of the St. Blasius Gospel book goes even further and asserts Carolingian ancestry for Henry, calling him nepos Karoli. While the material examined so far has not made such claims for the Otakars, the Styrian ruling house does feature in the Vorau manuscript’s copy of Otto of Freising’s Gesta Friderici (fol. 136v-183v), a narrative of the deeds of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa that covers a large swath of mid-twelfth-century imperial history. This text, as well as the material examined so far, is concerned with only a few generations of the Otakars, but one curious instances in the Vorau manuscript’s version of the Kaiserchronik suggests that some user of the manuscript might have interpreted one of the figures in the Zeno/Dietrich of Bern episode as an ancestor of the Styrian margraves. An Ôtacher from Stîre plays a major role as an antagonist in an episodethat took place around six-hundred years before Styria existed.

Unfortunately there is too little twelfth-century evidence to know whether or not the Vorau canons and Styrian nobles would have seen this part of the text as an affirmation of the historically rooted nobility of the ruling house, but some interesting fifteenth-century marginalia do suggest that, at the very least, later users did perceive a connection between the

171 Oexle, “Die Memoria Heinrichs des Löwen”, 67. Indeed Henry did descend from Charlemagne. Judith, Count Welf’s daughter married Louis the Pious, and their granddaughter married the first count of Flanders. Their descendent—also named Judith—married Duke Welf IV, who was the great-grandfather of Henry the Lion.
173 The translation of Stîre to Steiermark comes via the partial translation by Mathias Herweg. Edward Schröder is the only other commentator who, to my knowledge, has acknowledged that an Otakar of Steiermark is represented in this text. This rendering more closely resembles the Latinized version of the word frequently encountered in the documentary sources (stire in the nominal genitive, or adjectivally as stirensis). While contemporary vernacular sources are lacking, Jansen Enikel names the territory Stîr in his Fürstenbuch of the late thirteenth century. Jansen Enikel, Fürstenbuch, ed. Philipp Strauch. MGH Deutsche Chroniken 3 (Hanover: Hahn, 1891), 619; Mathias Herweg, ed., Die Kaiserchronik. Eine Auswahl (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014); Edward Schröder, ed., Die Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen. MGH Detsche Chroniken 1,1 (Munich: Hahn, 1892, repr. 1984), 71.
Kaiserchronik’s Ôtacher von Stîre, and the Otakars of the twelfth century. Aside from the corrective notes, there are not many marginalia in the Vorau manuscript, but the Kaiserchronik is one text which does exhibit some signs of use. A later hand has made note of the location of significant emperors and popes or episodes of interest. These notes are scarce, but next to the first mention of Ôtacher on folio 60r, someone has made the note “Otacher.” It is particularly interesting that neither Zeno, the emperor in question, nor Dietrich of Bern, the real focus of the passage, were interesting enough for the reader to note them. This indicates that the reader was interested in the figure who resembled the Styrian margraves of two centuries prior, and who could have been considered an actual ancestor of those Otakars who were so important in the history of Styria.

In the Zeno/Dietrich of Bern episode, heritage and dynasty feature prominently and play a role in our interpretation of the scene, of the Ôtacher figure himself, and whether or not we can consider the text and the marginalia as an instance of Vorau’s participation in the construction of a mythological heritage for the Otakars. Given Vorau’s involvement in the creation of dynastic memory described above, this possibility cannot be ruled out and the matter deserves further attention. The Old High German Hildebrandslied and Kaiserchronik are the first vernacular sources on Dietrich until around 1200, with the appearance of the Nibelungenlied. Therefore, the absence of any surviving Dietrich texts in the period from Styria’s emergence in the late
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174 Joachim Heinzle provides an excellent introduction to the Dietrich of Bern material in a Middle High German context. Joachim Heinzle, Einführung in die mittelhochdeutsche Dietrichepik (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999). See also Elisabeth Lienert, Esther Vollmer-Eicken and Dorit Wolter, eds., Dietrich-Testimonien des 6. bis 16. Jahrhunderts (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2008); Florian Kragl, “Mythisierung—Herolysierung—Literarisierung. Vier Kapitel zu Theoderich dem Großen und Dietrich von Bern”, PBB 129 (2007), 66-102. For a study that generally covers the earlier Dietrich material see Edith Marold, “Wandel und Konstanz in der Darstellung der Figur des Dietrich von Bern”, in Heldensage und Heldendichtung im Germanischen, ed. Heinrich Beck (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988), 149-182. For the sources on the Kaiserchronik see above all Friedrich Ohly, Sage und Legende in der ‘Kaiserchronik.’ Untersuchungen über Quellen und Aufbau der Dichtung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968), esp. 32-33; Stephan Müller, Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik. Zu Text und Forschungsgeschichte einer verlorenen deutschen Reimchronik (Heidelberg: Winter, 1999); Irene Schmale-Ott, “Untersuchungen zu Ekkehard von Aura und zur Kaiserchronik”, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte 34, no. 2 (1971), 403-461; and the intro to Edward Schröder, ed., Die Kaiserchronik eines Regensburger Geistlichen. MGH Deutsche Chroniken, I, 1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1892). Dietrich of Bern appears in the following strophes and lines of the B (St. Gallen) version of the Nibelungenlied: 1347,1; 1352,2; 1354,1; 1364,1; 1372,2; 1381,3; 1719,2; 1722,2; 1723,1; 1726,3; 1728,3; 1729,2; 1748,1; 1749,2; 1750,2; 1752,2; 1758,2; 1873,2; 1874,2; 1901,1; 1902,4; 1983,1; 1984,1; 1985,1; 1987,4; 1988,3; 1991,1; 1992,1; 1993,4; 1995,4; 1999,2; 2137,1; 2235,3; 2236,1; 2240,1; 2243,4; 2244,1; 2250,3; 2252,2; 2253,2; 2255,1; 2257,3; 2283,3; 2288,1; 2296,3; 2298,2; 2306,1; 2307,3; 2308,4; 2313,1; 2319,3; 2345,1; 2346,1; 2348,1; 2349,1; 2350,2; 2351,1; 2353,1; 2355,1; 2357,1; 2358,1,4; 2360,3; 2361,1; 2362,1; 2365,1; 2377,3. Joachim Heinzle, ed., trans., comm. Das Nibelungenlied und Die Klage. Nach der Handschrift 857 der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen (Berlin: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 2013).
eleventh century to the composition of the *Kaiserchronik* around 1150, strongly suggests that the inclusion of an Ôtacher of Steiermark figure is the work of the *Kaiserchronik*’s author himself. The Latin sources for the *Kaiserchronik*’s Dietrich material which we can identify (Jordanes and Frutolf of Michelsberg), were either composed well before Styria’s existence (Jordanes), or make no mention of the territory at all (Frutolf). A closer examination of this complex scene from the *Kaiserchronik* and its valuation of the Ôtacher figure may help shed some light on the matter.

The episode begins with an introduction of Zeno, a Greek emperor who loves his people more than he does the Romans. He appoints Etius as a regent so that he can depart for Constantinople, where he wishes to remain. Then the author turns to the elder Dietrich and gives a brief family history that involves the next two generations of that line (Dietmar and the younger Dietrich) and their feud with the descendants of Etzel. The younger Dietrich is sent to Constantinople to be reared at Zeno’s court. When Etius insults the queen and the events are made known to Zeno, the regent, anticipating a violent reprisal, goes to Styria to recruit Ôtacher as an ally, convincing him that he would be doing a service to his own honour and the empire to take the throne. The Romans receive Ôtacher as a welcome alternative to their absentee emperor. Zeno then commands the faithful Dietrich to drive Ôtacher out and restore the imperial dignity, and Dietrich succeeds in killing Etius in battle at Ravenna soon after. With Ôtacher hopelessly besieged by Dietrich, the former insults Dietrich’s lineage in front of both armies, leading to a showdown between the two leaders in which Dietrich prevails. With Zeno’s enemies having been defeated, Dietrich proceeds to Rome where he receives the fealty of the citizens. Pope John, however, complains to the emperor that Dietrich’s supposed parentage—he was believed to be the illegitimate son of a concubine, the same insult levelled against him by Ôtacher—brought dishonour upon the imperial office. Enraged, Dietrich drives the pope into exile in Pavia where the pontiff is bottled up and eventually starved to death. The Roman Christians bewail their loss and the author describes Dietrich’s fate: seized by demons and thrown into a volcano where he would burn until the Last Judgement.

---


176 The episode runs from v. 13,825 to v. 14,193 in Schröder’s edition, from which all subsequent quotations have been drawn.
The Zeno/Dietrich of Bern episode has garnered much interest from the scholarly community. Aside from the author’s integration of Latin/written and vernacular/oral sources, and a very interesting comment on the authority of textual sources (14,176-14,178), he appears to have critically evaluated his material and reconciled contradictory accounts of the Dietrich figure. Some confusion regarding the identity of Dietrich and his correct chronological location led Frutolf of Michelsberg to address the situation in his Weltchronik in the eleventh century. Now, for the first time an author asserted that the two Dietrich’s suggested by Frutolf were a grandfather and grandson, separated by Dietmar. The Kaiserchronik author, with his very clear explication of the three generations, hoped to have ended the untruths and misunderstanding surrounding Dietrich and went so far as to challenge anyone who disagreed to produce a source.

Swer nú welle bewæren,
daz Dietrîch Ezzelen sehe,
der haize daz buoch vur tragen.

177 Here I do not refer to the different inflections authors placed on the Dietrich/Theoderich figure in order to cast him in a positive or negative light, but rather the confusion on the part of medieval authors about who he was and when he lived. For the various positive and negative depictions of the Dietrich see Shami Ghosh, Writing the Barbarian Past. Studies in Early Medieval Historical Narrative (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 236-243. For an overview of the negative portrayal of Dietrich see Edith Marold, “Dietrich als Sinnbild der Superbia”, in Arbeiten zur Skandinavistik: 6 Arbeitsagtung der Skandinavisten des Deutschen Sprachgebiets, ed. Heinrich Beck (Frankfurt a.M: Lang, 1985), 443-486. For the significance of the Latin/written and vernacular/oral dimension of this episode see Ernst Hellgardt, “Dietrich von Bern in der deutschen ‗Kaiserchronik‘. Zur Begegnung mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition”, in Deutsche Literatur und Sprache von 1050-1200. Festchrift für Ursula Hennig zum 65. Geburtstag, ed. Annegret Fiebig und Hans-Jochen Schiewer (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995), 93-110.

178 The confusion about Dietrich’s identity and chronology stems from contradictory accounts. The Rabenschlacht and Hildebrandslied, in which we hear that Ermenrich, Dietrich, and Etzel (Attila) all lived at the same time, agree in essence with the story as it is transmitted in the Annals of Quedlinburg and a chronicle of Würzburg. However, Jordanes’ history of the Goths contradicts these sources by stating that the three were not contemporaries. The discrepancy here clearly irritated those interested in the story. Frutolf of Michelsberg, for instance, perceived this and attempted to address it in his chronicle by offering three possibilities to reconcile the sources. Either Jordanes was wrong, the vernacular texts were wrong, or they are depicting a different Ermenrich and a different Dietrich (i.e. that there must have been two Dietrichs, chronologically discrete). Heinze, Einführung, 20-23. See also Ohly, Sage und Legende, 219; Hellgardt, “Dietrich von Bern”, 97ff. For the Dietrich episode in Frutolf see Georg Waitz, ed., “Ekkehard Chronicon univerale”, in Chronica et annales sevi Salici. MGH SS 6 (Hanover: Hahn, 1844, repr. Stuttgart, 1963), 127-129. For the Dietrich section in Jordanes see Theodor Mommsen, ed., “De origine actibusque Getarum”, in Iordanis Romana et Getica. MGH AA 5/1 (Hanover: Hahn, 1882), 269-304; Andreas Goltz, Barbar—König—Tyrann: Das Bild Theoderichs des Großen in der Überlieferung des 5. bis 9. Jahrhunderts (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 267-299. Georg Heinrich Pertz, ed., Annales Quedlinburgensis. MGH Annales et chronica aevi Salici (Hanover: Hahn, 1852), 31; Georg Heinrich Waitz, ed., Chronicon Wirziburgense. MGH SS in Folio 6 (Hanover: Hahn, 1844), 23-24.

179 Hellgardt also recognizes a critical engagement with the sources in this respect. “Dietrich von Bern”, 104.

180 “Now, whoever might assert that Dietrich saw Etzel, let him produce the book.” Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 14,176-14,178. All citations from the Kaiserchronik have been taken from Schröder, Kaiserchronik.
With these lines the author makes a strong statement concerning the state of knowledge about Dietrich and the measures he has taken to set things right. This demonstrates an engagement with his sources and an effort to produce a distinct portrayal, which draws on, yet distinguishes itself from those which came before. Ohly has identified what he believed to be a process of simplification within the narrative, in which the confusion surrounding Dietrich’s flight has been streamlined, with the author compacting what had played out over the reign of several emperors in Jordanes and Frutolf into the reign of Zeno. The deeds of Dietrich’s brothers, Walamir and Witimar, too, have been bundled into the Dietrich figure, further indicating the author’s conscious depiction of the material.\textsuperscript{181}

But the author’s engagement with his sources and his attempt to create a distinct Dietrich story runs much deeper than this very blunt statement. Friedrich Ohly, Karl Stackmann, and most recently Ernst Hellgardt, have all engaged with the somewhat unusual structure of this episode. Dietrich’s life is divided into two very distinct episodes in which his characterization swings wildly from one extreme to the next. During his early life and the events that led to his entry into Rome and the defeat of Ôtacher, Dietrich is a helt lussam, and all the young nobles have to serve him.\textsuperscript{182} When he departs Constantinople to make war on Ôtacher and Etius, he does so for the honour of the empire. His characterization corresponds in almost all respects to the hero which the author would have known from the heroic oral tradition, and to some extent in the Jordanes-Frutolf tradition. However, once installed in Rome, Dietrich takes issue with an accusation made by Pope Leo, Boethius, and Symmachus, and has the three holy men imprisoned and starved to death. Here he is described as the ubel wuotgrimme whose sins against Christians and God earn him the divine punishment of burning in a volcano until the last judgment.\textsuperscript{183} This story comes down to us via Gregory the Great (among others), and served a primarily exemplary function in that context.\textsuperscript{184} By the end of this episode no Christian audience, however steeped in the heroic

\textsuperscript{181} Ohly, \textit{Sage und Legende}, 219.
\textsuperscript{182} Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, v. 13,932.
\textsuperscript{183} Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, v. 14,153.
tradition, could have arrived at any valuation of this character that stopped short of complete and utter condemnation.185

This break or jump in the narrative is the focus of much of the scholarship on this episode. For Ohly, the Kaiserchronik author commutes Dietrich’s sin at the end of the episode from heresy—as is the case in the spiritual interpretation of the material—to one more psychologically rooted.186 When Dietrich is accused of being a bastard, he reacts, and we are meant to be more understanding of his actions against the three holy figures in light of his anger. This, in turn, suggests that the author attempted to bring the character as he is presented by Gregory into harmony with his earlier depiction as the faithful guardian of the empire. A heretic who destroyed the unity of the imperial faith simply did not fit with his heroic depiction, and thus the author made an adjustment. Ernst Hellgardt, however, rightfully points out that Dietrich’s punishment in the text is incommensurate with such a crime of passion, but still befits a perpetration of heresy. He attempts to mend the disjunction by arguing that the Kaiserchronik author was much closer to the heroic tradition than the spiritual, and when these two came into conflict, the vernacular/oral tradition won out. This, for Hellgardt, is indicative of a process at work throughout the episode and the text as a whole, of working out the problems of adapting Latin sources to vernacular uses, and incorporating a large body of orally transmitted, yet deeply engrained, material on the same topic. Hellgardt also sees the alteration of the story of Dietrich’s father and grandfather as it is depicted in Frutolf and its re-presentation in the flight motif as further evidence of the predominance of the heroic in the Kaiserchronik.187

Karl Stackmann argues that this break in the narrative and in the portrayal of Dietrich’s character is a structuring tool used by the Kaiserchronik’s author.188 In his opinion, the origins of these changes in character are to be found in the text, and he offers a closer examination of the
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185 On the positive and negative depictions of Dietrich see Marold, “Dietrich als Sinnbild”; Goltz, Barbar, 267-299.
186 Ohly, Sage und Legende, 220, 224.
188 The most significant of these is the change in the character Etius, who is installed by Zeno, recognized by the people of Rome, and has the authority to rule. Etius then insults the emperor’s wife and refuses to reconcile with her, inciting the conflict which brings Otacher and Dietrich into Italy. The narrator does not offer any explanation for the origin of this dispute. Karl Stackmann, “Dietrich von Bern in der Kaiserchronik. Struktur als Anweisung zur Deutung”, in Idee—Gestalt—Geschichte. Festschrift für Klaus von See, ed. Gerd Wolfgang Weber (Odense: Odense University Press, 1988), 71 ff. Tibor Pézsa is more or less in agreement with Karl Stackmann. Tibor Pézsa, Studien zu Erzähltechnik und Figurenzeichnung in der deutschen ‘Kaiserchronik’ (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1993), 113-116 and 219.
character Zeno as a problematic figure. Zeno’s old age is frequently acknowledged in the text, suggesting an unfitness to rule. Paired with his dislike for Rome and desire to spend the rest of his life in Constantinople, we are presented with an emperor who is derelict in his duties. By investing Dietrich, whose questionable heritage is a continual theme in this episode, Zeno has acted against the empire. This naturally holds consequences for the narrative. Ötacher’s challenge to Dietrich outside Ravenna, in which he calls him the son of a concubine, is not a slanderous remark, and Zeno has acted unjustly by giving authority to someone without proper noble heritage, as Leo points out towards the end of the episode. Hellgardt, however, questions why the author would resort to such subtle means of undermining Dietrich’s character, he feels that Stackmann’s notion of breaks in the logic of narration does not quite accomplish what he claims it does.

Hellgardt’s chapter leaves some lingering questions which need answering. The issue of disunity in the portrayal of Dietrich is not satisfactorily answered, in my opinion, and aside from Stackmann, there is little mention of the significance of the Ötacher figure, of interest to us here. Determining the logic of the episode as a whole is an important part of making sense of Ötacher’s role, and for this we must reconcile the author’s significant intervention in the material with the contradictory portrayals of the Dietrich figure. Following the impulse of Ohly, Stackmann, and Hellgardt, the figure of Dietrich the hero must still be brought into some kind of

---

189 This theme is first introduced in the second line of the episode (13,826), and then again in line 13,980. Both of these incidents occur at important points in the text. The only characteristic the author presents for Zeno in the introduction is his advanced age. The second occurs when Étius is inciting Ötacher to enter Italy, and dismisses Zeno’s authority based partially on his age.

190 Although Stackmann is uncertain how much weight the author assigns to the accusations of Dietrich’s parentage. The fact that he receives a divine punishment for his imprisonment and murder of Pope Leo indicates that the pontiff’s charge of illegitimacy was founded on truth. “Dietrich von Bern”, 73.


192 The very material the author seeks to restructure along the lines of the oral/heroic tradition (Dietrich’s ancestors and his flight) stems from that very tradition. The fact that a simplification needed to be made suggests some frustration with his oral sources, a sentiment first stated in the prologue of the work. If the author’s predilection for this type of source is winning out against a more learned Latin tradition, the author’s challenge to produce a written source to dispute his portrayal reinforces the author’s faith in written historiographical texts as authoritative. In addition, the problem of Dietrich’s heritage and birth are not sufficiently addressed by Hellgardt, simply discussed as elements that are common themes throughout the heroic tradition. But the restructuring of the earlier material into a clear succession of generations certainly suggests that Dietrich’s place within that line is an important question, and it is addressed in several moments in the text. The Ötacher figure, too, is seldom discussed. He plays a major role in the text, and his characterization—or lack of negative characterization—creates tension around Dietrich and his actions. The fact that Ötacher is the other character, alongside the pope, a figure of considerable authority, to question Dietrich’s heritage suggests there might be some substance to the accusation. Hellgardt’s analysis does not take into account the logic of the text as a whole, as a narrative of noble and ignoble conduct on the part of rulers, and how Ötacher’s portrayal might complicate our image of Dietrich in light of this.
unity with that of Dietrich, the pope’s murderer. Both Hellgardt and Stackmann agree that the issue of Dietrich’s parentage is central to the narrative, and I believe this same theme constitutes a common thread that runs through several important stages of the narrative: the elder Dietrich’s flight, Dietmar’s return, and the younger Dietrich’s life and reign. Whether or not Dietrich is of noble birth is crucial to an audience’s valuation of his deeds and actions, and whether or not the Ôtacher figure is judged positively or negatively.

When Dietrich’s birth is reported to Dietmar, no mention of the child’s mother is made.\(^{193}\) In contrast to Dietmar’s birth, in which the child is described as *hêrîch* and *kuon*, Dietrich’s inherent attributes are not at all described.\(^{194}\) Dietmar proclaims that his child will rule Rome and the emperor will have to pay him homage, which immediately prompts *nidâre* to advise the emperor that Dietmar wants to possess the empire for himself, and that he could never recognize Dietmar’s son, since he is also the son of a *kebese*. This is the first instance in which Dietrich’s lineage is questioned, and the theme returns at crucial points in the narrative.\(^{195}\) Stackmann notes that the author seems unsure of how much weight he should assign to the rumours about Dietrich’s heritage, but eventually arrives at the conclusion that they must have been founded, because if God himself visited a punishment on Dietrich at the end then the papal messengers who made the accusation for a third time in the text were correct.\(^{196}\) The second occurrence of this theme comes in the lead-up to Dietrich’s duel with Ôtacher outside Ravenna, in which the latter proposes to settle the conflict between their two armies in single combat. Ôtacher wants Dietrich to admit he is not noble, and that he was born of concubine; Dietrich’s response is not one of denial, but a simple acceptance of the duel. He replies, “I am no woman”, and the narrator tells us that he will gladly let this duel decide that battle.\(^{197}\) Ôtacher’s demand was impossible for Dietrich to fulfill regardless of the accusation’s truth. The pointed nature of the Styrian’s barb is not at all coincidental, however. In fact, if we take a closer look at the theme of Dietrich’s heritage and how it affects the narrative, Ôtacher’s challenge is of heightened significance.

\(^{193}\) Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, v. 13, 897.

\(^{194}\) Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 13,850-13,851; 13,897.

\(^{195}\) Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 13,905-13,913.

\(^{196}\) Stackmann, “Dietrich von Bern”, 73. See vv. 14,141-14,149. Here Dietrich is referred to as an *ungeborner* man.

\(^{197}\) Ôtacher gesach daz,/ daz iz frum niene was./ er gie ûf den burcgraben,/ er hiez Dietrîche sagen,/ er newære niht edele./ geborn von ainer kebese./ getorst er mit im vehten/ vor só manigem guoten chnehte/ er wolte in urtaile sezen den lip./ ‘nu nebin doch ich niht ain wîp’./ sprach der helt Dietrich. vv. 14,110-14,120.
Dietrich’s heritage is consistently tied not only to his ancestral land of Mêrân, but also to Lombardy where the narrator frequently reiterates the ties that go back generations. But when Dietrich invades Italy with the agreement of Emperor Zeno, these ties play no role, and where Dietrich’s father and grandfather had been able to rely on these connections in dire situations, the complex of relations seems to breakdown where Dietrich is involved. The effect is to undermine the hero’s ancestral connections to Lombardy, and thus his lineage. For example, when the elder Dietrich is driven from his land by Etzel, he flees to Lombardy where he has relatives. After Dietrich’s death, Dietmar is able to return to his homeland but is soon vexed by Etzel’s sons and in order to defend his territory, he seeks outside help, from his relatives in Lombardy who come to his defense.

Dietmår gâhete harte,
er sante ze Lancparten,
nâch sine mâgen.
hai wi willich si im alle wâren!

But when Ôtacher undertakes his invasion of Italy, his first stop is Pavia, in Lombardy. Here the narrator reports that the Lombards willingly went into his service.

Er rait ze der burch ze Bavaie,
Lancparten dienet im dô vur aigen.

Dietrich, then, in an effort to restore what he believes to be the tarnished honour of the emperor, implores the aged Zeno to grant him permission to invade Italy. Dietrich makes a point of asserting that his ancestors come from Lombardy and will surely serve him.

mag ich dîne helfe dar zuo hân,

---

198 After the deposition of Henry the Lion in 1180, Frederick Barbarossa made Count Berthold III of Andechs duke of Meranien (now essentially Dalmatia). Perhaps the presence of this familiar place name (a place not far removed from the Otakarian territories in Friuli) would have helped the audience see the action playing out within a familiar geography, and reinforced the possibility that the Kaiserchronik was describing an ‘historical’ Otakar of Styria. A similar use of familiar geographical places names occurs in the the Judith texts described in Chapter 4. On the reorganization of the southeast of the empire in 1180 see Freed, Barbarossa, 428-452, and 438 on Berthold of Andechs. On the Andechs family in the twelfth century see Lothar Hennig, ed., Die Andechs-Meranier in Franken: europäisches Fürstentum im Hochmittelalter (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1998).

199 Schröder, Kaiserchronik, v. 13,849.

200 “Dietrich hurried to send to his relatives in Lombardy. O how willing they all were to serve him!” Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 13,881-13,884.

201 “He (Ôtacher) rode to the city of Pavia, the Lombards went at once into his service.” Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 13,984-13,985.
vil willic ist mir Mêrân,  
mîn kunne ist ze Lancparten.\textsuperscript{202}

It is clear that Dietrich feels that should he enter Italy, the Lombards will support him in throwing off Ôtacher, a result that seems unlikely given that they had just recently accepted Ôtacher without question or quarrel. Several lines later, when the narrator lists the lands from which Dietrich raised his army, Lombardy is not given.

vil sciere er sich besante  
von lande ze lande.  
Riuzen unde Pomerân,  
Prizuzen unde Pôlân,  
Petsenære und Valwen,  
die Winde allenhalben,  
Scalvenîe und Criechen,  
Affrikære kômen willeclîche  
dem helede Dietrîche.\textsuperscript{203}

In short, he gathered an army from everywhere but Italy. In the ensuing battle between Etius and Ôtacher on one side and Dietrich on the other, the armies clash until Ôtacher and his men withdraw to the city of Ravenna. When Dietrich lays siege, he makes plans to destroy the houses in the city if the citizens will not rebel against Ôtacher and send him out. When they do not, Dietrich duly sends his men against the city.\textsuperscript{204} Lombardy and Dietrich’s relations there, who have always supported his ancestors in their time of need, play no role whatsoever, and the fact that the people of Ravenna are unwilling to surrender Ôtacher to Dietrich and the imperial army does not at all suggest an environment that is amenable to one of their self-professed own. In a text so heavily painted with heroic shades, in which service to a lord, even over generations was an obligation demanded by personal, familial, and national honour, it is particularly conspicuous that the Lombards are absent from Dietrich’s efforts to reclaim Italy. As we have seen, Ohly describes the compression of the narrative of Dietrich’s ancestors as a process of simplification (see above), and Hellgardt sees it as a restructuring of the material to correspond to the heroic tradition depicting Dietrich’s flight, but I believe the version presented by the author is very

\textsuperscript{202} "If you’ll help me, Meran is willing to serve me, my kin are in Lombardy." Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 14,009-14,011.

\textsuperscript{203} “Hurriedly he sent from land to land. Russians and Pomeranians, Prussians and Poles, Pechenegs and Cumans, all the Wends, Slavs, Greeks and Africans all came willingly to the hero Dietrich.” Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 14,019-14,027.

\textsuperscript{204} Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 14,097-14,104.
well-suited to set up the absence of Dietrich’s ancestral allies later in the text, and underscore the
differences between himself and his unequivocally noble forefathers.

The theme of Dietrich’s lineage has a major role to play in this episode and it is problematically
portrayed by the author, to say the very least. Logically, Dietrich’s questionable pedigree
complicates our analysis of the Zeno figure, who barely features in this episode at all. In the
introduction, as stated above, the narrator describes him as old, an accusation which calls into
doubt his fitness to rule, and a negative characteristic which is reprised when Etius recruits
Ôtacher.\textsuperscript{205} In the introduction, the author also criticizes Zeno’s desire to be in Greece, rather
than Rome. The scene in which the Romans welcome Ôtacher and declare their unwillingness to
recognize an absentee emperor just a few lines later, recalls the criticism levelled against Zeno in
the introduction.\textsuperscript{206} Emperor Zeno has contravened the responsibilities of his office by
abandoning his post, and then allowing a person to step into power whose heritage is openly
questioned by credible characters and undermined by the narration. Indeed, this last act leads to
the final scene in which Leo, Boethius, and Symmachus complain to the emperor of his
transgression by allowing the illegitimate Dietrich to take the throne, and meet their cruel end at
the hands of that same man. The theme of legitimate and noble birth runs through all three parts
of this episode, links them together, and creates an underlying logic in the text. Dietrich’s
actions in defending the man who raised him at his (Greek) court, put him in his service and
placed him on his trusted council, are not negatively adjudged by the narrator. Indeed, upholding
the honour of one’s lord is an essential part of that relationship. His fight against Ôtacher, then, is
just, and Dietrich’s portrayal as a brave warrior, a good leader, and a faithful servant of the
empire is entirely commensurate with his actions. His only fault is his ignoble birth, and the
only criticism of the figure (14,154) appears when this fault is actually of serious consequence
for the empire: when he takes power in Rome. Dietrich, as the various characters point out, has
no place on the throne, but how can he be criticized for playing the role of dutiful vassal?

When scholars have sought to reconcile the opposite yet concurrent depictions of the Dietrich
figure in this episode, they have attempted to make one correspond to the other. In fact, these
two depictions work together, as we have seen, and viewed within the broader context of the

\textsuperscript{205} Schröder, Kaiserchronik, v. 13,980.
\textsuperscript{206} Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 13,990-13,991.
*Kaiserchronik* itself the interpretation outlined above is relatively unproblematic. This episode deals with themes of succession and exemplary conduct within imperial history, both personified in the Dietrich character. But where does this leave us with the Ôtacher figure, the true object of this analysis? The author himself, as Ernst Hellgardt points out, presents the Styrian in a positive light, as a *kuon* and *vermezzen* lord.\(^{207}\) Regardless of Etius’s conduct, he presents the opportunity to Ôtacher as one that will bring him honour in the following lines:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rôme gemache ich dir undertân,} \\
\text{die crone solt dû von rehte hân.} \\
\text{Rômâre enphâhent dich.} \\
\text{ouch vermiz ich mich:} \\
\text{daz rîche behabest dû iemer mit êren.}\!^{208}
\end{align*}
\]

As stated above, Ôtacher is eagerly received by the Lombards and the Romans, who declare their desire to be free of their absentee lord. His challenge to Dietrich is all the more poignant when we consider the conditions under which Ôtacher was willing to accept the crown; his rule was being challenged by Dietrich, whose own fitness to rule was completely undermined by the doubt cast on his birth. It is likely that Ôtacher saw Dietrich’s presence in Italy as unjust, and perhaps it is of some significance that Ôtacher’s complaint was carried forward by a pope, and two of his associates once Dietrich succeeded in taking power.

There appears to be no negative judgment of the Ôtacher figure in the text, and while he is not the focus of the episode, he certainly plays a pivotal role in advancing the narrative, but also as one of the bearers of the theme of Dietrich’s ignoble birth. When we consider the extent to which the author of the *Kaiserchronik* intervened in the material to present his own version of events, it is difficult to accept Stackmann’s notion of authorial distance from the material, or Hellgardt’s assertion that Zeno receives no explicitly negative valuation.\(^{209}\) It is difficult to assume the habitus of the *Kaiserchronik*’s medieval audience, but it is much more difficult to imagine that a text which itself claims to present the good and evil deeds of popes and emperors would remain entirely impartial.\(^{210}\) We must, however, view it in light of this manuscript’s and the text’s important connection to Styria. For its twelfth-century readers or listeners, it is highly significant


\(^{208}\) “I’ll make Rome subject to you, and you’ll have the crown rightfully. The Romans will welcome you. I’m certain you’ll always rule the empire with honour.” Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 13,975-13,979.


that the current ruler of that territory shared the name of a character in the Dietrich of Bern episode. What significance might this have had?

One might easily imagine a scribe making the jump from Odoacer, the historical Scirian soldier who made himself emperor, to Otacher from Stîre. However, Frutolf never states that he comes from Sciria, but instead, ab extremis finibus Pannoniae, and merely had the help of a great number of Sciri.\footnote{Frutolf of Michelsberg, \textit{Chronicon Universale}, 128.} Jordanes does name Odoacer as king of the Sciri, although it is unclear whether the \textit{Kaiserchronik} author had this text at his disposal, and the Jordanes material probably arrived in this text via Frutolf.\footnote{Hellgardt, “Dietrich von Bern”, 97. It should also be noted that Otacher, Othakarus, Otachrus, Otaker are all variant spellings of the name as we know it (Ottokar, Otakar) that are well attested in the documents and books produced in Styria during the twelfth century.} Friedrich Ohly does not even address the transmutation from Odoacer to Ótacher, simply referring to the character as Odoaker in his work on the \textit{Kaiserchronik}, and neither Hellgardt nor Stackmann take note of this fact. Otakar can be rendered as Odoacer in Latin, though as we have seen in Styria’s Latin necrologies, it was not. Nor did the later hand, who annotated the Vorau manuscript in Latin, opt for this rendition. And perhaps it was a fortuitous scribal error whereby \textit{Scire} became \textit{Stire}—though this seems particularly unlikely to me given the astronomical odds that confusion between c and t could align so perfectly chronologically and geographically with the Styrian margrave’s name.\footnote{Moreover, it should be noted that these two letters are very easily distinguished from one another in the Vorau manuscript, which clearly indicates that we are not simply misreading the medieval hand, and that a \textit{t} was consciously written. Furthermore, Schröder’s edition notes two variant spellings. In both the Wolfenbüttel manuscript of the fourteenth century and the Heidelberg manuscript of the thirteenth (as well as those related directly to these, numbers 5 and 6 in Schröder’s list) the name is spelled \textit{Otacker}. In the Mainz fragments, the name appears as \textit{Otaker}.} If, though, we can overlook the odds and attribute this to scribal error, we must assume that the scribe accepted as plausible (or even true) that an Ótacher of Styria existed in the fifth century and bore some kind of connection to the Otakar’s of the scribe’s day. The description of Ótacher’s territory even seems to accurately reflect the geographical realities of Vorau and Styria. When Etius tries to sway Ótacher to his plan he remarks that he possesses nothing but mountains and passes.\footnote{\textit{er} (Etius) sprach: ‘dû bist in ainem gevelle,/ du nehäst niht wan gebirge unt enge… “He said: you’re located in a valley, you have nothing but mountains and passes…” Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv. 13,971-13,972} Because Vorau itself is situated in a valley, with the Massenberg to the southeast and the increasingly barren tops of the alpine foothills rolling away to the Northwest, any local of Styria could have easily accepted the description of Ótacher’s territory in the
Kaiserchronik as resembling their own, adding further weight to its plausibility. However, scribal confusion seems so much more unlikely when we consider that the compilers of the Vorau manuscript had a second Kaiserchronik exemplar on hand, with which they corrected their own copy.\textsuperscript{215} Furthermore, the corrections were made by the Provost Bernard, who, according to the vast number of codices and charters which bear the hallmarks of his hand, was an accomplished and diligent scribe, whose concern for accuracy led him to seek out a second Kaiserchronik exemplar at a time when they would not have been so readily available.\textsuperscript{216} Two possibilities remain. Either the inclusion of Otakar is the work of the original author, or it goes back to the Vorau compilers, and thus, appears to have been a conscious alteration. The former might suggest the Kaiserchronik’s inclusion in the Vorau manuscript because of its local connection, and the latter indicates a desire to integrate the locality in the broader sweep of imperial history. In either case, however, the local connection appears to be of consequence for our reading of the manuscript’s version of history, its connection to Styria, and for our notion of its audience and intended recipients. Users of this text might have seen this figure as an ancestor of their current lord, a legendary forebear who was noble enough and brave enough to assume power in the empire for its own good, and who struggled against such a well-known figure as Dietrich of Bern. This is exactly the kind of embedding in legend and history that noble houses desired in order to cement their power and status in the authority of the past, and so much better if the historical context was also well-known to a noble audience. It is also worth noting that the texts of the Vorau manuscript are bookended by references to local history, which, if we acknowledge the salvation-historical and eschatological elements to the codex’s construction, might be of some significance.

\textsuperscript{216} See Fank, Vorauer Handschrift, in general for Bernard’s engagement with textual production in the region, and p. 9 specifically, for his assertion that Bernard was the corrector. Fank is supported in this by Wolf. Wolf, Buch und Text, 300. Wolf also reiterates Nellmann’s theory that the second exemplar came from Mainz, on the grounds that Bernard and the archbishop had a personal connection. Nellmann, “Kontamination”, 390; Wolf, Buch und Text, 300.
1.6 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the interconnectedness of secular power and religious institutions and the particular role this dynamic played in the rise of Styria and its ruling house, both Otakarian and Babenberg. The margraves understood the advantage of founding monastic houses, supporting them, and keeping them close, and so too did the Babenberg dukes after them. For over a century, at the height of Styria’s influence in the empire the Otakars diligently cultivated these outposts of their authority. The monks, in turn, understood the utility of maintaining close ties to the rulers, and they employed the means at their disposal to do so. The documents they produced stood as records of gifts and privileges, and a means to defend them; the charters were testaments to an exercise of real authority on the part of the secular rulers of the territory and when the monasteries defended their rights and property, they defended the Otakars’ right to carry out such actions. When the Babenbergs came to power, these charters became even more important witnesses to actions the chief authors of which could no longer be called upon in their defense. The monks and canons also worked to underpin the authority of their patrons by providing the material and services necessary for creating and maintaining the public image of their power. They wrote dynastic histories to link their patrons to other important families, to their powerful and glorious ancestors, and created an impression of legitimate authority passed down uninterrupted from generation to generation. Within these narratives, the composers embedded the history of their own institutions, grafting their origins onto a larger history that could be called upon to support their legal claims. If a monastery could be tied to a dynasty by an authoritative written source, that family’s patronage seemed all the more authentic, genuine, and resistant to challenges. Many of the charters that survive from twelfth-century Styria demonstrate the importance of establishing dynastic continuity and the role it played in ensuring the permanence and stability of authority. That permanence and legitimacy later served as the foundation for Babenberg authority in a territory to which they had no hereditary claim. Vorau’s specific involvement in these practices was one of the focuses of this chapter, and an examination of its founding document revealed the extent to which the Otakars relied on the canons to support their authority. The memorial liturgical practices carried out there helped keep past exercises of Otakarian authority present in the collective consciousness and reiterated their legal force. As the site of Otakar III’s grave, Vorau held a privileged place among Styrian monasteries as the caretakers of their dynastic image and their power.
In exploring the interaction of Styrian monasteries and the secular court of the Otakars and Babenbergs throughout the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, this chapter has sought to bring to light a context into which manuscript 276 can be set. The creation and maintenance of authority is one of the chief areas of overlap between these two institutions, and Vorau played a central part in that process. In fact, the only person that was certainly involved in the creation of the manuscript, the second provost, Bernard, was involved in all the areas outlined above including the drafting of the Georgenberg Compact that ended the succession problem with which Otakar IV was faced. As the house’s leader, his liturgical responsibilities connect him to the creation of memoria for the Styrian ruling house, and his role as document redactor for Otakar III, Otakar IV, and the Babenberg archbishops of Salzburg is widely known. He bore a great deal of the burden of keeping Vorau relevant and thriving, and it is very difficult to imagine that such a figure, so broadly engaged with the Styrian court would not have understood the mutual benefit the two institutions stood to gain from supporting one another’s authority. Although rather little is known about this figure, that which is certain portrays him as a link between court and canons within the context of power relations and authority. He had Otto of Freising’s Gesta Friderici copied into the Vorau manuscript, a text which records the major events of the first half of the twelfth century, and which specifically mentions the Styrian margrave, and several Babenbergs on multiple occasions. In an otherwise nebulous mass of contextual information, he provides a fixed point of reference and creates a link between the Vorau manuscript and the historical and social context of power and authority that has been the focus of this chapter.

---

217 Fank, Vorauer Handschrift; Wonisch, “Urkundenwesen der Traungauer”, 52-149; Hutz and Wind, Das Vorauer Evangeliar. See also note 12 of my Introduction.
Chapter 2
Ruler, Christian, Crusader: Lay Religiosity and the Monastery During the Crusading Movement of the Twelfth Century

2.1 Introduction

The central theme of the previous chapter was the political dimension of the relationship between Styrian monasteries and the Otakars/Babenbergs and an exploration of the overlap in interests in this sphere. This chapter looks to the spiritual side of this relationship, tracking, as far as the sources allow, the ways in which the Otakars expressed their piety with respect to their monastic communities and how, in turn, these spiritual institutions participated in and shaped the religiosity of the region’s lay nobles. Power was shared across the ecclesiastical and the secular spheres with both parties working to create and maintain a platform of legitimacy that benefitted each. To characterize this relationship as a purely practical one is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of Christian medieval society, and especially the power dynamics at play in Styria at this time. The Otakars were a dynasty deeply devoted to the supporting the ecclesiastical hierarchy and its institutions and they actively fostered and defended these within and without their borders.\(^1\) As we have seen, this was also part of a power-building strategy, and though the Styrian margraves and the Babenberg dukes undoubtedly understood their responsibility to protect the Church as a fundamental aspect of their role as Christian rulers, the crises in the Holy Land during this century resulted here, as elsewhere, in an even stronger weld between lay noble identity and lay noble piety.\(^2\) The social phenomenon of the crusades of the twelfth century was a particular point of interaction between the Styrian ruling house and its monasteries, during which the spiritual (and political) goals of the Church dovetailed particularly well with a sense of lay identity described previously.\(^3\) This was a climate in which lay nobles

---

\(^1\) See, Dopsch, *Österreichische Geschichte*, 290-293.


\(^3\) With respect to lay noble piety and political interests I refer to my previous chapter and also what follows here. But for more on the way in which the political and spiritual goals of the Church were brought together during the
were directly confronted with notions of their role as Christian rulers participating in events with historical significance at the familial, local, and universal levels. Crusade preachers asked nobles to think about what it meant to be part of a dynasty and a family, and what political and religious responsibilities this placed on an individual. After the trauma of the Investiture Conflict, the crusades of the twelfth century offered some measure of reconciliation, an opportunity for a reappraisal of the interplay of secular and ecclesiastical power within the divine ordering of the world. The crusades demonstrated the salvational value of the proper pursuit of

---

4 The following studies describe the importance crusading came to have within the family tradition, which although of considerable local import, might also stretch beyond the limits of a region. Anne E. Lester, “A Shared Imitation: Cistercian Convents and Crusader Families in Thirteenth-Century Champagne”, Journal of Medieval History 35 (2009), 353-370; Kathleen Thompson, “Family Tradition and the Crusading Impulse”, MP 19 (1998), 1-34; William J. Purkis, “Elite and Popular Perceptions of the Imitatio Christi in Twelfth-Century Crusade Spirituality”, in Elite and Popular Religion, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006), 54-64. At the universal level, the notion that the crusades were part of a salvationist historical plan were current, and informed crusaders certainly saw themselves as fulfilling the deficient role the Hebrews played in the Old Testament when they failed to capitalize on God’s invitation to the Promised Land. See my discussion of this topic in Chapter 4.

5 See the studies by Lester, Thompson, and Purkis cited in the note above, in addition to Jonathan Riley-Smith, “Family Traditions and Participation in the Second Crusade”, in The Second Crusade and the Cistercians, ed. Michael Gervers (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992), 101-108. See also my discussion of the crusading bulls below.

6 In his writings regarding the crusades, Bernard of Clairvaux made extensive use of the two sword metaphor for spiritual and temporal power. The abbot of Clairvaux played a major role in disseminating propaganda that was designed to entice those wielding temporal power to use it toward a religious end. He was, therefore, partly responsible for renewing the discourse on power and spreading it throughout central Europe on his preaching campaign. Ludwig Schmugge, “Zisterzienser, Kreuzzug und Heidenkrieg”, in Die Zisterzienser. Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit, ed. Kaspar Elm, Peter Joerifen, Hermann Josef Roth (Aachen: Rheinland, 1980), 62; For a good introduction to the climate of relations between the papacy and the Empire at this time see Colin Morris, The Papal Monarchy. The Western Church from 1050 to 1250 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 79-133, 154-197, and for the impact of the crusades in this context see 143-154 in particular. Gert Melville, The Worlds of Medieval Monasticism: History and Forms of Life. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2016), 133; Karl F. Morrison, ed., The Investiture Controversy: Issues, Ideals, and Results (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971); Uta-Renate Blumenthal, The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988). See also note 16.
worldly power, and that a way of life familiar to the laity might not be at odds with the moral precepts of their religion. Those who preached the crusade brought this message to Europe’s lay nobles and packaged it in a familiar language. They wove a religious vocation into the fabric of noble identity by emphasizing the hereditary connections between themselves and the crusaders who captured Jerusalem. It was an attempt to direct attention to what was perhaps the premier example of secular and ecclesiastical cooperation in the service of the lord—a grafting of profane politics onto a personal and communal religious ideal.

At the time of the Vorau manuscript’s production there was some recognition that the crusades had produced a positive effect in some regions of Christendom, with the internal disarray and habitual feudal and dynastic conflicts between lords at least in some measure concerted and redirected towards the foes of the Christian religion. Otto of Freising specifically remarked that the Second Crusade transformed the German lands, only recently, yet thoroughly, gripped by a virtual civil war around Conrad III’s successor. The years immediately preceding the Third Crusade, too, were characterized by mounting tension between Archbishop Philip of Cologne and Frederick Barbarossa, and many anticipated open war. When the call to crusade was made

---


8 See notes 5 and 6. In particular Riley-Smith, “Family Traditions”; Bull, Knightly Piety.


10 The origin of, and problems associated with this line of argumentation within the crusading historiography has been succinctly described by Bull, “Roots of Lay Enthusiasm”, 177-180. Bull’s acknowledgement that local political dynamics determined the extent of involvement and compliance with the peace mandate is noteworthy and he points to several useful syntheses of the work of George Duby that bring together his various regional studies for France, which help illustrate the variety of responses. J. Flori, L’essor de la chevalerie XIe-XIIe siècles (Geneva: Droz, 1986), 20-35, 119-141; J.-P. Poly and E. Bournazel, The Feudal Transformation, trans. C. Higgitt (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1991), 10-39, 88-102, 107-113. See also Kaeuper, Chivalry and Violence, 75-77.

by Gregory VIII in late 1187, Frederick declared his willingness to take part in the expedition, but that his conflict with Philip prevented him. The situation in the Empire was cooled when Philip and Frederick made peace at the Court of Christ (March, 1188), as a direct result of the impending crusade.\textsuperscript{12} Not merely a series of military campaigns, the crusades were a social movement that affected every level of society, as Otto’s comments suggest, and those who could not fight took up supporting roles.\textsuperscript{13} As I will demonstrate later, the monasteries of Styria, and indeed those in most other European lands, saw a marked increase in their importance and influence during this time, as departing crusaders frequently made large donations for prayers of divine favour for the journey and for intercessory masses if death should occur.\textsuperscript{14} Naturally these institutions fostered a crusading spirit among the lay nobility, not only because they stood to benefit materially, but because reorienting the violence inherent in secular power structures toward the enemies of Christendom made a virtue out what was generally sinful conduct. Monasteries and canonical houses in Styria and abroad supported the crusading movement for the degree of harmony it engendered between pious and profane values among the laity, and its goal of expanding the Christian world Empire according to the Lord’s will.\textsuperscript{15} Religious and secular elements of society found a point of engagement in the crusading movement that was of the highest interest to both parties.

In this chapter I will demonstrate the presence and influence of a crusading ideology in twelfth-century Styria that drew heavily on the notions of dynasty and heredity, already defining elements in the relationship between court and monastery. I will describe the ways in which this pervasive rhetoric filtered into Styria under both the Otakars and the Babenbergs, and had an impact on local noble identity. It will become clear that this rhetoric and indeed the crusades as a broader movement were important personal, social, and historical reference points for the canonical compilers of the manuscript as well as the Styrian court of the Otakars and Babenbergs, who were renowned for generations of crusading exploits. Furthermore, we must

\textsuperscript{12} Freed, Barbarossa, 468-474.

\textsuperscript{13} Lester, “A Shared Imitation”, 353-370.

\textsuperscript{14} Many of the documentary sources which appear in this and the previous chapter bear witness to the importance of the monastery in the mind of the crusaders. For a particularly informative example, see that of Geoffrey, Count of Perche in Thompson, “Family Tradition”, 28-29.

reevaluate the texts in Vorau 276 from this perspective, reading them as part of a discourse relevant to a twelfth-century Styria under the spell of the crusades.

2.2 Crusading Propaganda in the Twelfth Century

The capture of Jerusalem in 1099 was a seismic event that shook and excited the Christian imagination across the European continent. Returning crusaders had incredible stories to tell that rang in the ears of insatiable listeners, spawning some of the most well-known works of medieval historical writing and fiction alike. Christian authors saw God’s will for the course of history unfolding before their very eyes and the demand for first-hand accounts testifies to their desire for proximity to the events of the First Crusade. Albert of Aachen, for example, overlooked the popular *Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum* when composing his work, opting rather for eye-witness accounts and an early version of the *Chanson d’Antioche*. There was a tremendous enthusiasm around the success of this campaign and the significance of its outcome registered with not only the historians, but also theologians and ecclesiastical thinkers who proclaimed the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies. The writing of crusader

---


accounts was the beginning of a process of integration, of incorporating the events of the late eleventh century into the narrative of salvation history. After this first wave of crusade writers, theologians stepped in to work through the implications of not only taking possession of their religion’s sacred places, but the manner in which it was carried out. The histories acted as a basis for the development of a theology around crusading and an increasingly sophisticated discourse about its place in a Christian society. By the time the need for a second crusade arose, there existed a strong and theologically sanctioned platform for the development of the spiritual marketing of violent conflict to Europe’s armed classes. But in many ways it was the pressure to send another concerted force to the Holy Land that led to the development of an incredibly successful, centrally directed recruitment strategy that would form the basis of crusading rhetoric for the next century.

The fall of the city of Edessa in 1144, capital of the oldest of the crusader states, after about a month-long siege by Zengi, the atabeg of Mosul and Aleppo, was a major blow to Christendom and few failed to realize the implications of such an event. By mid-1145 a delegation sent by Raymond of Antioch, including the Bishop of Jabala, Hugh, reached the papal court and impressed upon Eugenius III the urgency of the situation. The pontiff’s response was a bull whose pointed appeal backed by one of the early twelfth-century’s most highly regarded ecclesiastical figures, Bernard of Clairvaux, brought together an army from across the continent. Thinking cut both ways, as preachers again turned to cryptic prophecies to explain the disasters that unfolded in the Holy Land throughout the twelfth century. Karen Skovgaard-Petersen, *A Journey to the Promised Land: Crusading Theology in the Historia de profectione Danorum in Hierosolymam (c. 1200)* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2001).


20 For a general outline of the events of the Second Crusade see Geoffrey Hindley, “The Second Crusade: Disaster on the Road to Damascus”, in *The Crusades: a History of Armed Pilgrimage and Holy War* (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2003), 71-86; chapters 9, 10, and 11 of Philips, *The Second Crusade*.

Quantum Praedecessores, first issued in 1145, was the major carrier of the papacy’s crusading message in the lead up to the departure of the expedition in the summer of 1147.\textsuperscript{22} King Louis VII and the French nobles were the initial recipients, a fortunate coincidence since Louis was already preparing a pilgrimage to atone for his role in an incident in which he, already under papal interdict, was responsible for the burning of a church in Vitry-le-François that cost the lives of over 1,000 people.\textsuperscript{23} While Louis may not have paid much attention to the bull initially, counseled by Bernard of Clairvaux, he eventually sought Eugenius’ blessing for his expedition. Bernard’s first crusade sermon at Vézelay was not recorded, but it certainly drew on Quantum Praedecessores and the subsequent preaching campaign throughout France, the Low Countries, and the German lands was responsible for the bull’s wide dissemination.\textsuperscript{24} After a brief reiteration of the events of the First Crusade, the bull contains a powerful appeal to the nobility to emulate the example of their fathers and continue their legacy. Eugenius claimed that he was acting with divine authority, and the indulgences he offered for service in the Holy Land were sanctioned by the Church. The entire message, in fact, was imbued with a sacrosanct character that made the appeal to a deeply-enshrined sense of dynastic responsibility part of a much larger phenomenon; establishing local power and legitimacy through the creation and maintenance of dynastic identity was a virtual imperative that stemmed from religious and historical concerns.\textsuperscript{25} The original crusaders were elevated to the status of exempla, their achievements in fulfilling both their profane and religious roles as lay princes held up as a paradigm. The sense of continuity that Eugenius and the crusade preachers strove to emphasize was probably responsible for the naming of the 1147 expedition as the Second Crusade.\textsuperscript{26} It could not be disconnected

\textsuperscript{22} Phillips, Second Crusade, 37-59.
\textsuperscript{25} R. Howard Bloch, Etymologies and Genealogies. A Literary Anthropology of the French Middle Ages (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983), 64-79; “In brief, time entered into the land in a new sense to redefine an entire class; the conceptual reflex of this aristocratic appropriation of time, land, and name is genealogy. The textual instrument of these changes in the aristocratic family is the genealogy as genre, already in evidence among royal and princely families, which set about colonizing time among the wider aristocracy after 1100.” Francis Inglewood, “The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae”, Speculum 69 no. 3 (1994), 674-675; Georges Duby, "French Genealogical Literature: The Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries", in The Chivalrous Society, trans. Cynthia Postan (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977).
\textsuperscript{26} Some of the names given to this event include secunda Iherosolimorum profectio, or viae Iherosomitanam secondo, or Motio secunda christianorum. Philips, The Second Crusade, 104.
from an earlier historical event, and it was not new. Despite the continued flow of pilgrims during the intervening period, this expedition was only considered in light of that first, legendary movement that wrested control of the Holy Land from its Muslim overlords.

Eugenius and those who drafted the bull were successful in uniting a connection to ancestry that was strongly felt among its recipients to the call for crusade. Despite the fact that the First Crusade was not well attended by the German nobility, *Quantum Praedecessores* was just as successful there. This bull and the Cistercian preaching which disseminated it were in large part responsible for the recruitment of the German nobles to the Second Crusade. It sought to build on crusading connections where they existed and to create new ones where they did not, a strategy which could not have succeeded—and succeeded so wildly—were it not for the importance of dynasty and heritage in the self-conception of the lay nobility. The resulting German contingent was as large (if not larger) than the French, and was the first to arrive in the Holy Land in 1147.

The bull opens with an immediate connection to the past, stating that Eugenius (the authorial voice, regardless of the degree of his personal involvement) learned from the accounts of the first crusaders, and read in their histories the extent to which his own predecessors had worked to free the Eastern Church from the dominion of Islam. This statement draws a parallel between the pontiff and those to whom he was appealing. Both, it will be seen, had responsibilities towards their predecessors, whose actions had some bearing on the expected conduct of their successors. Just as the crusaders’ obligation to act stemmed from the past, so too did the pope’s. A brief reiteration of the successes of the First Crusade set the stage for the bull’s subsequent assertion of its audience’s standard of conduct. The bull, however, does not discuss the origin of this imperative, simply drawing on a pre-existing notion. This suggests that by the time the rhetoric of *Quantum Praedecessores* reached the ears of the French and imperial nobility, ideas about dynastic responsibility were firmly entrenched principles of conduct, as well as defining

---

27 Otto of Freising reports the events of a Christmas assembly at Speyer at which Bernard convinced Conrad III to finally go on crusade. He later reports, in Book I, 43, the way in which Adam of Ebrach, one of Bernard’s Cistercian deputy preachers and *Quantum Praedecessores* were successful in persuading a major contingent of the imperial nobility to take the cross. See below, and also Giles Constable, *Crusaders and Crusading in the Twelfth Century* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2008), 229-300.

characteristics of lay noble identity. In the recap of the First Crusade, it is not the salvation-historical implications of the capture of the holy sites that take central stage, but rather the actors, specifically the fathers of the generation to which Eugenius appeals.

Quae per gratiam Dei et patrum vestrorum studium, qui per intervalla temporum eas defendere, et Christianum nomen in partibus illis dilatare pro viribus studuerunt, usque ad nostra tempora a Christianis detentae sunt, et aliae urbes infidelium ab ipsis viriliter expugnatae. In the next few lines, the bull explicitly joins the responsibility of upholding the standard of conduct set by the fathers with nobility. Social and political standing were, as we have seen, inextricably tied to dynastic concerns, and the pressure exerted by the bull leverages this crucial point of self-reference and lay noble pride.

Maximum namque nobilitatis et probitatis indicium fore cognoscitur, si ea quae patrum strenuitas acquisivit, a vobis filiis strenue defendantur. Verumtamen, si, quod absit! secus contigerit, patrum fortitudo in filiis imminuta probatur. Indeed, the bull maximizes the force of its appeal to a dynastic imperative by adding a spiritual dimension to it. Nobilitas et probitas are situated side by side here in a rather skillful maneuver that allowed a simultaneous pursuit of lay honour and piety. Quantum Praedecessores made a religious vocation out of lay social and political norms; the acquisition of worldly honour through the emulation of ancestors was now a religious ideal that could be pursued by an armed expedition to the Holy Land to everyone’s gain. The bull builds to a crescendo in which all of these elements are wound together and the spiritual rewards are expressly stated, rather than vaguely posed.

Universitatem itaque vestram in Domino commonemus, rogamus, atque praecipimus, et in peccatorum remissionem injungimus, ut qui Dei sunt, et maxime potentiores et nobiles, viriliter accingantur, infidelium multitudini, quae fere semper victoria super nos adepta laetatur, sic occurrere, et Ecclesiam Orientalem tanta patrum vestrorum, ut praediximus, sanguinis effusione ab eorum

29 Jonathan Philips, The Second Crusade, 52.  
30 “These [holy sites] have been held by the Christians down to our times, by the grace of God and the zeal of your fathers, who strove to defend them over the years and to spread the Christian name among the peoples in the area, and the other cities have been manfully cleared of infidels by them.” PL 180.1064.  
31 “It will be seen as a great indication of nobility and uprightness if those things acquired by the efforts of your fathers are strenuously defended by you, their sons. But if, God forbid, it should happen differently, the bravery of the fathers will have proved diminished in the sons.” PL 180.1064
The bull is very carefully constructed, with an introduction that engages its audience through a recollection of the achievements of their ancestors in the realms of profane and sacred history. It encourages them to rise to this standard, and describes the concrete social, material, and spiritual benefits if it is met. All of the would-be crusaders’ property was ensured by the papacy, and so too the legal protection of their families in the absence of the household’s head. Eugenius secured the authenticity of his claims by invoking the authority of his office as a representative of divine will. The ingenuity of the bull in bringing together lay and religious ideals in such a powerful way was a marvel, and the response it evoked is a testament to that fact. So successful was this approach, that Quantum Praedecessores served as the basis for crusading rhetoric for several subsequent crusading bulls well into the thirteenth century. Inter Omnia (1165), Cor nostrum (1181, reissued in 1185) and Audita Tremendi (1187) borrowed heavily from the text of Quantum Praedecessores and its wildly successful rhetoric of fathers and sons.

The bull of 1145 was reissued frequently, and it travelled everywhere Bernard of Clairvaux went. We can be certain that audiences in the Low Countries, France, Switzerland, England, and the Empire all heard Eugenius’s words. When the demand for crusade preaching outstripped Bernard’s ability to carry it out personally, he deputized local Cistercian preachers to spread the word. The abbot of Clairvaux equipped each with a sermon in his own words and a copy of QP

---

32 “We exhort all of you in God, therefore, we ask and command, and, for the remission of sins we enjoin, that those who are of God, and especially the very powerful, are manfully prepared, and that you strive thus to oppose the multitude of the infidels, which now rejoices in a victory gained over us, and to defend the Eastern Church, freed from their tyranny by such a great spilling your fathers’ blood, as we have said, and to snatch many thousands of your captive brothers from their hands...” PL 180.1064
33 Ibid., 37.
34 Cole, Preaching the Crusades, 42.
to be read in conjunction. In Bavaria, for example, Bernard contracted abbot Adam of the Cistercian house of Ebrach to carry the crusading message to the nobles there. Adam’s most notable contribution came at a Regensburg assembly in February 1147, where he preached to an assembly of imperial nobles, most of whom immediately declared their willingness to accept the cross. The text was powerful and the preachers who carried it were able to effectively market its discourse to a lay audience.

The extent to which the crusading movement influenced theological development from the end of the eleventh century onward—not in the least part due to the need to justify mass armed conflict—is a generally well-documented field, so too its influence on lay spirituality. Crusade preachers understood the importance of framing the act of crusading in a way that would best appeal to the spiritual and social self-fashioning of their target audience, the lay nobility. It is not, therefore, surprising that those engaged in rallying support and manpower for the Second and Third Crusades employed specialized vocabulary that made use of deeply engrained and universally understood social norms and practices among the laity. The language of the epic and of feudal bonds supplied crusade preachers with a convenient way to express the spiritual relationships between crusader, Christ and God in terms of well-established mores from the profane world. This borrowing of heroic and worldly language is one of the hallmarks of those on the home front drumming up support for distant campaigns against pagans in the north-east and Muslims in Spain and the Holy Land. Christ was a king and lord whose lands (patrimonium, hereditas) had been taken by the pagans, and crusaders were his vassals (vassalus, homo ligius, armiger, signifer, claviger, cancellarius). Humbert of Romans, the thirteenth-century Dominican master-general and preacher compared the gifts bestowed by one’s lord to God’s gift

39 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 43.
41 Characterizing crusading obligations toward God as feudal relationships can be frequently and consistently observed in both ‘official’ crusade preaching (by clerics in the employ of the papacy), as well as in vernacular texts such as the crusading songs of the jongleurs and Minnesänger. See note 15.
of life and body and equated the obligation of service which proceeded from each.\textsuperscript{43} In return for their due service, again echoing feudal relationships, crusaders were endowed with gifts (\textit{beneficia, dona, donaria}) in the form of indulgences.\textsuperscript{44} Appeals of this kind were extremely effective because these political and social relationships were held in such an emotional regard by lay lords. The message constituted a petition to the core values that knit society together through the coopting of feudal metaphors for religious purposes.\textsuperscript{45}

Preachers also found biblical exempla that appealed to the armed classes. The book of Maccabees constituted an important scriptural reference point for those who preached the crusade and those whose spirituality was increasingly influenced by the crusading movement.\textsuperscript{46} A scriptural precedent produced at some point in the eleventh or twelfth century allowed preachers to establish a typological relation between their audience and a biblical figure who fought a righteous conflict for the sake of his faith. Mattathias, the priest who violently repudiated the attempts of the Seleucid Greeks to force their religion on the Jews and incited a war that led to the first period of independence in four hundred years, fit the role perfectly. In the lead-up to the Third Crusade and into the thirteenth century, the story of the Maccabees as a whole became a very popular and often used metaphor for the efforts of the crusaders and the worthiness of their cause.\textsuperscript{47} In the twelfth, Mattathias was the example chosen by the papacy in its preaching campaign as well. \textit{Quantum Praedecessores} itself compares the crusaders to the

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{43} Notandum quod sicut reges in magnis negotiis guerrarum insurgentium solent congregare militiam magnam et aperire thesauros suos ad damnum larga donaria, ita Rex Glorie per vicarium suum in terris pro negotiis fidei et ei annexis, que sunt maiora negotia que possint esse in ecclesia, congregat Ædeles suos ad militandum contra infideles et eorum fautores et de thesauris suis profert largissima dona indulgentiarum ad elargiendum istis militaturis. Humbert of Romans, in Maier, \textit{Crusade Propaganda}, 216.

\textsuperscript{44} Maier, \textit{Crusade Propaganda}, 58.

\textsuperscript{45} Riley-Smith points out the deep connections that existed amid these relationships. Riley-Smith, “Crusading as an Act of Love”, 178. The courtly poets of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries found that their subject matter, love, easily transferred to a crusading context. Love of God and obligation to serve him were the two chief motivators for the crusader, a theme that had been well-developed by crusade preachers of the twelfth century, and the dramatic elements of these courtly love stories—unresolved tension, longing, danger, distance—were coopted to describe a crusader’s situation. By the time of the Third Crusade, \textit{minne} could certainly mean love of God in a crusading context, as is the case with Hartmann von Aue’s poem \textit{Ich var mit iuern hulden}. The majority of the surviving poetry of this kind is from Germany, and dates to the time of the Third Crusade, but there is one Occitan example from the Second Crusade (Marcabru’s \textit{A la fontana del vergier}). Michael Routledge, “Songs”, in \textit{The Oxford Illustrated History of the Crusades}, ed. Jonathan Riley-Smith (Oxford: OUP, 1995), 102-103. For more on the German love and crusading poetry from this period see the works cited in note 15 above.

\textsuperscript{46} Maier, \textit{Crusade Propaganda}, 55-58.

\textsuperscript{47} See Maier in the note above. \textit{Quantum Praedecessores} itself likens the crusaders to Mattathias from the book of Maccabees, and both Fulcher of Chartres and Guibert of Nogent draw the same comparison in their own histories of the crusades. Baldwin I’s tomb, moreover, bears the inscription: \textit{rex balduinus, iudas alter machabeus, spes patriae, vigor ecclesiae, virtus utriusque}. See Phillips, \textit{Second Crusade}, 56-58.
\end{footnotesize}
Maccabean, exhorting them to hold him in example and emulate the conviction with which he defended the laws of his fathers.

Sit vobis etiam in exemplum bonus ille Mattathias, qui pro paternis legibus conservandis, se ipsum cum filiis, et parentibus suis mori exponere, et quidquid in mundo possidebat, relinquare nullatenus dubitavit, atque tandem divino cooperante auxilio, per multos labores, tam ipse, quam sua progenies de inimicis viriliter triumphavit.48

Mattathias was an ideal figure not only for his resolution in the face of his enemies and his commitment to his religion, but also for the dynastic element to his story, or at least the way the bull frames that aspect of the episode. His family and ancestors are mentioned several times in this brief extract as the papacy almost certainly sought to combine a scriptural exemplum with something more immediately relevant to a lay noble audience. The rhetoric of fathers, sons, and ancestral honour appeared even in this context.

Another central aspect of the twelfth-century’s crusade preaching sought to develop a personal piety that focused on the figure of Christ himself, and the sacrifice he made.49 The Holy Land, the place where Christ lived and died, was the focus of the crusader’s purpose. From the very beginning of the crusading movement preachers characterized the act of crusading as one of imitatio Christi, a sacrifice of the body for the good of others, and this notion became deeply engrained in the crusader’s self-conception. Eyewitness accounts like the Gesta Francorum, monastic histories such as those of Robert of Rheims and Baldric of Bourgeuil, charters and crusader letters all testify to the pervasive belief among crusaders that they were following the example of Christ.50 For these men, the verse in Matthew (16:24) was more than an admonition

48 “Let the good Mattathias be an example to you, who did not at all hesitate to expose himself, his sons, and his kinsmen to death and to leave all that he possessed in this world in order to uphold the laws of his fathers, and who finally, with the help of divine aid, through many exertions manfully triumphed, together with his progeny, over his enemies.” PL 180.1064.
to follow Christ’s teaching, it was a much more literal summons to go to the place where he lived as a man and reenact his sacrifice. Crusade preachers explained the indulgence crusaders received as a result of their sacrifice as a corollary of Christ’s redemptive act. This type of rhetoric led to a very strong personal association between those who fought in the Holy Land and the saviour of mankind, nourishing a Christocentric conception of spirituality among the lay nobility that likened their activities to Christ’s suffering and the sacrifice of his death on the cross.

A crusader’s version of imitatio Christi was of a particularly literal nature. As knights and soldiers, death was a very real and likely outcome for many crusaders, which was touted as the ultimate act of imitation. Because a crusader’s imitatio was so literal, Christ’s humanity, and hence, his ability to die became a focal point of crusader religiosity. In short, his humanity was a necessary condition of his redemption of mankind. In addition to recreating the manner of his death, a crusader needed to see Christ as a man in order to make his life an imitable phenomenon in the confines of a crusader’s personal experience of the Holy Land. Visiting the sites of Christ’s life and death, literally following in his footsteps, was an experience also shared by pilgrims but it was nevertheless a limited one, lacking the climax (i.e. the sacrifice of the self

52 Maier, Crusade Propaganda, 58.
53 The cross which denoted that a man had taken a crusading vow was a kind of literal interpretation of Matthew 16:24, but its symbolism was focused on the person of Christ and his passion, and represented a crusader’s desire and commitment to follow in his example. Purkis, “Elite and Popular Perceptions”, 54-55.
55 This brand of imitatio is not entirely unique to crusaders, although crusade preacher Gilbert, bishop of Tournai, made specific reference to this privilege (See Maier, 60). Pilgrims would have shared the interest in visiting the sites of Christ’s life, but imitating his sacrifice in death was the particular privilege of the crusader and martyr. The concept of emphasizing Christ’s humanity to inspire pious and charitable action was known outside of a crusade context, as Bernard of Clairvaux demonstrates in commentary on the Song of Songs, in which he explains that Christ used his humanity for the salvation of the world, so that others could imitate him for the good of mankind. I do not find it coincidental that this notion found its way into the ideology of the crusading movement, given that Bernard was the most influential proponent and prolific preacher of the Second Crusade. Lester, “A shared imitation”, 368f.
for others) that was a particular crusader privilege.\textsuperscript{56} In the propaganda campaign in the lead-up to the Second and Third Crusades, Christ’s humanity was an important tool for the largely Cistercian corps of preachers.\textsuperscript{57} It offered a singular opportunity that was carefully crafted to appeal to the warrior classes and exclude all others.\textsuperscript{58} Living a life as close to Christ’s as possible had previously been the province of the monks. This new conception opened the door for other elements of society to pursue the imitatio, and it is not altogether outlandish to imagine a quasi-monastic mentality on the part of crusaders with respect to their task. This cannot be discounted as one of the impulses that led to the advent of the Templars, the Hospitalers, and the other orders of knight/monks who played such a major role in the religious conflicts of the High and later Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{59}

The appeals made to the warrior classes of Europe on behalf of the precarious crusader states in the east were not squarely focused on drumming up martial support, however. The potent combination of spiritual stimuli had the effect of engendering a very agreeable vision of religiosity that was compatible with a deeply-engrained way of life among lay nobles. It was a piety that was natural to pursue and yielded extra-ordinary salvational benefits. It focused on values that were already part of a discourse between nobles and the monasteries they patronized by increasing the importance of family and ancestral connections within a crusading context. The status of the house at which family memory was created, safeguarded, and transmitted was therefore elevated as well. The masses which crusaders often commissioned at their favoured institutions were not sought merely for the sake of a safe journey or for the remission of sins yet un-atoned for. Masses paid for with donations of cash, land, or privilege, and celebrated for a safe journey reminded a community of their lord’s actions, his pious character, and his willingness to surrender his life for Christ and Christendom. After his death, masses established

\textsuperscript{56} Ps. 131:7 (“We shall worship in the place where His feet have stood.”) provided an important scriptural reference point for crusaders in their imitatio. Purkis, “Elite and Popular Perceptions”, 55. Many pilgrims, it should be noted, did die en route and in the Holy Land, but their stated purpose was different from that of the crusaders, who deliberately risked their lives in defense of the faith.

\textsuperscript{57} “Cistercian spirituality was predicated on an understanding of imitation and intimacy with the humanity of Christ on earth. These themes appear throughout Bernard of Clairvaux’s writings, particularly his sermons on the Song of Songs, which explain why God took the form of man and suffered in the physical world.” Lester, “A Shared Imitation”, 368

\textsuperscript{58} In his De laude novae militiae Bernard describes at greater length the comparison of crusaders and Christ. See Roth, “Zisterzienser”, 130.

\textsuperscript{59} Constable, Crusaders and Crusading, 169. Purkis, Crusading Spirituality, 99-111. A great deal of this notion depends on the perception of those serving in military orders as proper monks. On the status of these men see Constable, Crusaders and Crusading, 165-182.
a memory of his crusading actions that were recalled to the collective memory every time they were sung. The same commemorative mechanisms that ensured the creation and continuation of dynastic memory discussed in the previous chapter were at work, and to the same effect. Crusading became a hugely important dimension of family memory, and it became the responsibility of the monasteries to nurture and maintain it. Aside from the immeasurable increase in wealth experienced by monasteries during the crusading period, these campaigns constituted a major point of communal reference for lords and their institutions. The rhetoric and propaganda built on (or created) a repertoire of discursive elements shared between monastery and lay nobility. When crusade preachers asked lay nobles what it meant to be Christian rulers and members of a family with a tradition of pious and social honour, it was the monasteries which held the answers in the form of historiographical works, family histories, and theological expositions which took many forms. Indeed, monastic institutions and clerics were the sources of new material on the crusades, and in many ways they shaped the perception of crusaders for succeeding generations, and gave voice to the essential unity behind the movement and the motives of its participants.

2.3 Crusade Preaching and Propaganda in the March of Styria

The intensive campaign of crusade preaching carried out by the Cistercians in the lead-up to the Second Crusade covered much of Western and Central Europe. It was centrally organized and kept under a fairly strict set of guidelines. At the centre of it all was Bernard of Clairvaux who, even when he sub-contracted other Cistercians to preach in his stead, supplied the materials in the form of a letter from his own hand and a copy of *Quantum Praedecessores*. These two texts were read in conjunction, assuring continuity in the message that was being delivered.⁶⁰ Although Bernard’s initial attempt to recruit Conrad III at a Frankfurt assembly in 1146 failed, he was subsequently successful in convincing the emperor later that year, at Christmas in

---

⁶⁰ Cole, *Preaching of the Crusades*, 41-48; Mayer, *Crusades*, 93-99 provides a brief but detailed account of Bernard and Eugenius’s activities during the crucial period leading up to the Second Crusade, including the preaching campaign undertaken. For a more in depth analysis of the Cistercian involvement (i.e. Bernard and his deputy preachers) see also, Purkis, *Crusading Spirituality*, 86-99. See also B.Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission*, 60-61,66-67, 70-71, 101-107.
At this same Speyer gathering, Bernard contracted Adam, abbot of the Cistercian abbey of Ebrach in Franconia, to spread his crusading message in that territory, and in Regensburg in February 1147, Adam passed along the request from Bernard to abbot Gerlach of the abbey of Rein (founded by Leopold the Strong in 1129) to preach the crusade in Carinthia and Styria. While in Regensburg (February, 1147), Adam preached at an assembly that had major consequences for Styria and its contribution to the crusading movement. It was around this time, reports Otto of Freising, that Otakar III agreed to go on crusade. Although we do not possess a copy of Bernard’s original letter to Adam and Gerlach, a copy of a similar if not identical letter to Bishop Henry of Olomouc to be read in Prague has survived via the annals of Vincent of Prague. Otto of Freising also reproduced a letter sent by Bernard to eastern Franconia around this time with very similar content.

Although Otto of Freising is not clear on when Otakar III of Styria took the cross, later in 1147 abbot Gerlach gave a mass for one of Otakar III’s ministerials, Henry of Dunkenstein, before his departure for his crusade to the Holy Land. The documentary source which relates the events of that day was drafted to attest to the gifts which Henry gave to Rein in exchange for the services of the brothers, who were to pray for his safe journey and carry out commemorative duties in case of his death. This source also clearly states that Otakar III was present, as well as many of his ministerials and vassals. Occasions on which documents were drafted were highly stylized group rituals that affirmed power relationships, and Henry of Dunkenstein wanted this transaction documented because it would stand as a witness to his actions, forever securing his identity as a crusader. Moreover, those who bore witness to his act, if they remained at home, would have a record strongly suggest authenticity.

---

61 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 41.
63 Otto of Freising, Book I, 43.
65 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 44.
66 Although this document is an 1164 reproduction of the original document, the details and specific nature of the record strongly suggest authenticity. Rein, Stiftsarchiv Urkunden (1129-1600) A I/8, in: monasterium.net, URL <http://monasterium.net/mom/AT-StiARein/ReinOCist/A_I%7C8/chartier>, accessed at 2016-06-06+02:00; StUB I, no. 252; Ernst Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese Seckau. Bd. I: Geschichte der Kirche im heutigen Diözesangebiet vor Errichtung der Diözese (Graz: Verlagsbuchhandlung Styria, 1917), 356.
took on the honour of safeguarding his kin and properties, and his crusading identity thus became a community concern.\textsuperscript{67} This event would have been very important for the ministerial who sought to establish his own identity and crusading legacy and cement these by contracting the brothers of Rein. It is very likely that, given the social and political importance of the gesture of crusading and the efforts of this ministerial to secure his \textit{memoria} as a participant, the day’s events would have emphasized the crusading impulse behind his donation. Gerlach, after all, one of the Cistercian deputy-crusade preachers was the one who gave the mass, and likely would not have passed up an opportunity to reiterate the message with which he had been entrusted in the presence of such an audience. The occasion has all the hallmarks of a ritualized, symbolic expression of social status and power—Henry securing his legacy as a crusader, Otakar overseeing the business of his subordinates, and Gerlach preaching the crusade. Ernst Tomek believes that the entire Styrian nobility must have been present on that day; a large proportion of the Styrian nobility would later participate in the crusade, testifying to the impact of Gerlach’s preaching.\textsuperscript{68}

\section*{2.4 The Impact of the Preaching: Styrians on Crusade}

While the Empire was not as heavily involved in the First Crusade as it was in the Second, there was nevertheless a contingent from Swabia and Lotharingia that accompanied the primarily French army to the Holy Land. Archbishop Thiemo of Salzburg was present at that first crusading sermon given by Urban II at Clermont in 1095, and was apparently strongly enough affected that he joined an armed ‘pilgrimage’ led by Duke Welf IV of Bavaria to the east in 1101.\textsuperscript{69} Also present on this occasion was Giselbert, the abbot of Admont.\textsuperscript{70} It appears that the crusading spirit was present in Styria in the immediate wake of the Clermont sermon, carried at

\begin{footnotes}
\item[	extsuperscript{67}] Riley-Smith, “Family Traditions”, 105.
\item[	extsuperscript{68}] Tomek, \textit{Geschichte der Diözese}, 355-357.
\item[	extsuperscript{69}] Franz Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, \textit{Mitteilungen des historischen Vereins für Steiermark} 49 (1902), 6-7; Franz Ilwof, “Steiermärkische Geschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter”, \textit{Deutsche Geschichtsblätter} 4 (1903), 90.
\item[	extsuperscript{70}] The presence of these men on the First Crusade is recorded in the Melk, Garsten, Admont, and Salzburg annals, a group of texts which are interrelated. Vorau possessed two manuscripts from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries that contain modified copies of these sources (codices 171 and 367). Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 22.
\end{footnotes}
least by the region’s leading ecclesiastical figures. Most historians believe that Welf’s expedition of 1101 was a second wave of crusaders who had been delayed in their departure for whatever reason. The group was virtually wiped out by an army of Turks and Archbishop Thiemo was martyred on route. Among those killed was Ida, the widow of Leopold II of Austria, grandmother of Otto of Freising, and great-grandmother of Otakar III and Leopold V, who participated with her own contingent of troops. The French were the target of the First Crusade preaching and the relatively small German cluster appears to have been an exception. Indeed it is difficult to distinguish subsequent expeditions to the Holy Land, such as that made by Welf IV, Thiemo, and Giselbert, from the waves of pilgrims that flooded into Jerusalem once the way was clear. But by the Second Crusade, the situation was rather different. The French, again, were the intended recipients of Eugenius’ bull but the success of Bernard’s preaching campaign bore fruit in Germany. The sentiment for crusade was certainly circulating in Styria in the early twelfth century, and a tradition of pilgrimage, if not always armed, can be traced in the region. Perhaps the first Styrian pilgrim to the Holy Land to be named is Wulfing of Stubenberg, sometime before the First Crusade. A large contingent of Styrians and Austrians, moreover, accompanied Bishop Gunther of Bamberg on his 1065 pilgrimage to the Holy Land, only a small fraction of whom returned. Ten years later, Otakar I travelled to Rome on a pilgrimage where he died and was buried. Styrians, too, were among the tide of pilgrims who made their way east in the decades between the first two crusades. The Holy Land, therefore, was a place that held appeal for Styrians and when the call to crusade arrived again in mid-century, there was a pre-existing tradition of religious travel and pilgrimage (sometimes armed) in which the crusading message could take root.

In the decades between the Second and Third Crusades the zeal for expeditions did not diminish, nor did the flow of pilgrims who sought to visit the holiest sites of their religion. The Second Crusade had been an unmitigated disaster, and the siege of Damascus a ruinous affair that left the crusader states dangerously depleted and vulnerable. While the backlash fell on Bernard and the

71 Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 5-7.
73 Ilwof, “Steiermärkische Geschichtsschreibung”, 90.
74 Ida and the 1101 expedition are discussed in greater detail below.
77 Gaisberger. Lauriacum, 261.
78 Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 4; Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese, 363.
Cistercians, the collective belief in the importance of retaining the possessions in the east was strong. A new crusade was envisioned by the abbot Suger of Saint-Denis and Bernard, who took the vitriolic response to failure of the 1147 expedition to heart. The two set about organizing a synod held in 1150 in Chartres in the hopes of convincing a wary Eugenius to revive the propaganda machine yet again. They asked Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, to attend and throw his considerable weight behind the fresh appeal. Understandably, Europe’s elites were reluctant to commit themselves to yet another expedition so soon after the previous one, given the enormous drain on men, materiel, and money such a course entailed. This reticence, however, was driven by practicalities, and the spirit of crusade survived in individuals and smaller, privately organized armed expeditions to the Holy Land. Sometime shortly before 1160 Rudbert of Gleiß made a donation prior to departing for that east, and facta expeditione Ierosolimitana, he confirmed that action (1160). Likewise, Berthold of Ittersdorf gifted the abbey of Admont the use of some of his property while he was on the road to the Holy Sepulchre. In the first example, the document uses the same phrasing common to crusade donations in the lead-up to the Second Crusade, certainly implying the martial purpose of the journey. In the second, however, the language suggests a pilgrimage, rather than an outright armed expedition, though it ought to be noted that there may have been little practical distinction between these two. Beside perhaps the best known example, namely Otakar III’s trip to the Holy Land accompanied by a large number of ecclesiastical and lay lords, Franz Ilwof notes at least five other Styrian ministerials and nobles who made the trip in the period between the Second and Third Crusades. The result of the mid-century mass crusade had engendered a certain hesitancy with respect to such large-scale endeavours, but the fact that pilgrims and crusaders from Styria continued to feel the draw of Holy Land and risked life and limb to travel there is a clear testament to the status of this region and of the act of crusading in an individual’s spirituality. It also remained an important means of achieving penance or reconciling oneself.

82 StUB I, no. 425.
83 BUB I, 24.
with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and many individuals undertook journeys to the Holy Land as retributive acts in the years between the two crusades.

The crusade spirit, however, was also made manifest in other ways. In the wake of the Third Crusade, for example, we also see the military orders establish themselves in Styria, almost certainly with the consent and even support of the Otakars. The Templars, too, are likely to have established themselves in Styria in the second half of the twelfth century. Indeed, they possessed a church in Ljubljana (Laibach) as early as 1167, and Leopold V of Austria is thought to have settled them in Vienna in 1186. The Teutonic Order followed slightly later, with a presence in the archdiocese of Salzburg in 1203 and Graz by 1223, no doubt part of the same movement which allowed the other orders to take hold. After the mid-way mark of the twelfth century, there is a discernable increase in the amount of pilgrim infrastructure in the region (see the foundation of the Spital am Semmering, Ch. 1), which has been linked to an increased desire to facilitate access to the Holy Land and incorporate that space into a traversable Christian landscape.

News of the catastrophe at the Battle of Hattin on July 3, 1187, where King Guy of Jerusalem and Raymond of Toulouse were defeated by Saladin, and the subsequent fall of Jerusalem three months later spurred another call for crusade. Clement III took up the cause when his predecessor Gregory VIII died almost immediately after initiating the call to arms, and after some difficulties succeeded in convincing Emperor Frederick, Philip Augustus of France, and Richard of England to arm themselves and their vassals for an expedition of liberation. The German princes were specifically targeted by those who carried the papal crusading message, seeking to capitalize on the success of the previous preaching campaign in that region and the powerful dynastic propaganda that now carried the added weight of the previous generation’s

85 Miha Kosi, “The Age of the Crusades in the South-East of the Empire (Between the Alps and the Adriatic)”, in The Crusades and the Military Orders: Expanding the Frontiers of Medieval Latin Christianity, ed. Zsolt Hunyadi and József Laszlovsky (Budapest: Department of Medieval Studies, 2001), 142. For the 1167 charter see Deutsch-Ordens Zentralarchiv Wien, Fond der Kommende Laibach, box 10, no. 11.
86 For the settling of the Order around Vienna see BUB I, 24; StUB II, 203.
87 Ibid, 144 (For archdiocese of Salzburg and Graz). For Salzburg see MDC 4/1, nos. 1692 and 2212. For Graz see StUB III, 303.
88 Tomek, Geschichte der Diöze, 353-354.
89 Thompson, “Family Tradition”, 16.
90 See here Purkis, Crusading Spirituality, 137-151, especially 137-140 for the recruitment of the three kings.
participation. It was from Cardinal Henry of Albano, the newest papally appointed preacher that the emperor took the cross on March 27, 1187 in Mainz. Scenes of mass declarations of crusading intent following the preaching of an influential speaker played out in the build-up to the Third Crusade as well and clearly indicate the continued importance of the public dimension of taking the crusade vow. Despite the duke’s illness and his eventual acceptance of his inability to travel, he encouraged his vassals to take part in the new campaign, and it appears that many Styrians took the cross for this expedition as well. The army of Styrians and Austrians was delayed in setting out, held up by the necessity of settling a long-standing conflict between King Béla III of Hungary and Duke Leopold V, who led the army despite their ongoing conflict. By mid-August, 1190, the force had been assembled and set off shortly thereafter. Despite learning of the emperor’s death while it awaited transport in Venice, the army nevertheless proceeded on to Acre. Ilwof references no fewer than fifteen Styrian noblemen and ministerials whose charters of donation survive as evidence of their participation in the crusade, although the strength of the Styrian and Austrian contingent indicates a number well beyond this under-representative sample. Among these willing recruits was the abbot of Admont, Isenrich, who, like so many others, was following in the footsteps of his predecessors who took part in the First and Second Crusades.

The impending expedition to the Holy Land was regarded as a major milestone event in the lives of contemporaries, just as the Second had been for those of the preceding generation. For members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy the Third Crusade loomed large and its significance in the worldview of these men can be glimpsed in a document given in 1190 in Salzburg. This charter of the archbishop, Adalbert II, that confirmed a delegation from Ulrich of Graz to his archbishopric, is dated not only from the incarnation, but also with reference to the emperor’s crusade. It reads, “Acta sunt hec anno ab incarnatione domini MC nonagesimo, anno secundo expedicionis domini Friderici invictissimi imperatoris contra Sarracenos, pontificatus nostri anno

91 The northern arm of the new preaching campaign was headed by Archbishop Joscius of Tyre and Henry of Albano. Ibid., 140.
95 Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 19-23.
96 Ibid., 22. It should be noted that Isenrich departed with Barbarossa. Freed, Barbarossa, 487.
97 StUB, I, no. 701.
XXIII.” The use of this event as a temporal reference point clearly signals the importance the archbishop placed on the Third Crusade as a major historical occurrence, of sufficient impact on the course of salvation history to serve as a marker of time.

The experience of those who lived the Third Crusade mirrored the Second in so many ways. It was the defining event of the generation, and it occurred under essentially the same set of circumstances. Sparked by a major strategic defeat in the crusader states, it was spurred on by a program of propaganda spearheaded by the papacy and carried by well-known, charismatic and influential—largely Cistercian—preachers. In fact, the message they propagated was nearly identical to that of the mid-1140s; it called on nobles to think about their heritage and the contribution of their fathers and grandfathers, to meet their fine example and unburden their souls of the accumulated sins of a violent lifestyle. The same spiritual rewards were offered, the same Old Testament exempla were called upon. Henry of Albano’s letter to the German princes described above even emphasized the necessity of retaining the Holy Land with reference to the humanity of Christ in the same way that Bernard of Clairvaux did decades earlier. What had succeeded so wildly in the 1140s was put to use again and with similar results. In Styria the same message that played on the social and political pressures of dynastic honour was disseminated and the new campaign was accepted enthusiastically a second time, an indication that the desire for crusading still smoldered in the intervening forty years. The fact that these two generations felt the same pressure to meet dynastic benchmarks of honour by participating in a crusade is the best testament to their prominence in noble self-conception. When the hugely influential and popular Frederick Barbarossa drowned in 1190, morale amongst the imperial troops deflated, and the events of the siege of Acre proved a tipping point, with many, including Leopold of Austria, heading for home. The outcome notwithstanding, the recruitment campaign preceding both crusades had been major successes in the Empire, where the crusading spirit took root early, and deeply, as evidenced by the large imperial presence. In Styria the armed campaigns to the east and their global, historical, and eschatological implications registered among the region’s lay,

98 “These things took place in the year of the incarnation of the lord 1190, the second year of the expedition of the invincible Emperor Frederick against the Saracens, in the twenty-third year of our office.” StUB, I, no. 701.
99 Cole, Preaching the Crusades, 68.
100 Many of the same themes that were at the heart of the preaching of the Second Crusade persisted into the Third. Cole, Preaching of the Crusades, 65-71.
101 Madden, Concise History, 84.
102 Ibid., 81-84.
ecclesiastical, and monastic leaders who responded to both calls for crusade with equal enthusiasm and alacrity.

2.4.1 Otakar III on Crusade

The chief report we possess for the magnates of the Empire taking the cross for the Second Crusade is Otto of Freising and his *Gesta*.

Otto’s narrative, however, is somewhat unclear and it is ultimately uncertain when Otakar III agreed to go on crusade. Otto, Bishop Henry of Regensburg and Bishop Reginbert of Passau took the cross along with Henry Jasomirgott at the Regensburg assembly in February, 1147, in response to Adam of Ebrach’s crusade preaching. The *Gesta* then states, “Guelfo quoque Heinrici prioris ducis frater, de nobilissimis regni optimatibus, in ipsa nativitatis dominice nocte in propria villa Bitengou eandem militiam cum multis professus fuerat. Sed et dux Boemorum Labezlaus et Styrensis marchio Odoacer et Carinthie illustriucomes Bernardus non multo post cum magno suorum comitatu cruces acceperunt.” All we might say with certainty is that Otakar took the cross at, or sometime after Christmas 1146. Whether or not he did so on the same occasion as Welf, is unclear; the phrase *non multo post* is vague at best. This work clearly suffers from the disappointment of the Second Crusade and the entire text seems to struggle to escape the weight of that failed campaign. Otto’s report on the assembly rings with approval as a major section of the imperial nobility accepted the cross and vowed to go to the aid of the Holy Land. The general enthusiasm for the crusade certainly played a part in Otakar’s decision, just as the social pressure to follow suit once the Empire’s leading aristocracy had taken the cross was likely to have swayed him. But in light of the influential dynastic propaganda, perhaps Otakar thought more deeply about his own connections to the heroes of the First Crusade. Otakar may also have been motivated in his decision to take the cross by his kinship with Frederick Barbarossa and Duke Welf VI. Otakar III’s mother Sophie, a daughter of Henry the Black, was a sister of Barbarossa’s mother Judith. Welf VI was Otakar’s uncle on his mother’s side, and the

---

103 Book I, 43.
104 “On the night of the nativity of the Lord (1146) in his house at Peiting, Welf, the brother of the aforementioned duke and one of the noblest men of the kingdom, also declared his intention to take the cross together with many of his men. Duke Ladeslaus of Bohemia, Margrave Otakar of Styria, and the illustrious Count Bernard of Carinthia together with their large retinues also took the cross not long after.” Book I, 43.
former was particularly close with Barbarossa at the time of the crusade. When Otakar III’s father died Welf VI would likely have played a prominent role in the life of the young margrave while his mother, Welf’s sister, ruled Styria as regent in the meantime. 

Through his paternal aunt Kunigunde, Otakar III claimed a connection to Bernard of Spanheim, Count of Carinthia-Trixen (the great-uncle of the reigning duke), who in turn was related to one of the most famous crusading families in Western Europe, the counts of Blois-Champagne. In 1126, Bernard’s sister, Mathilde, married Theobald II, linking these two far-flung houses. Theobald’s father, Stephen, had been one of the leaders and most influential figures of the First Crusade, spending several years fighting in the Holy Land where he met his end at the second battle of Ramle during his second trip. As the French crusaders passed through Austria and Hungary on their way east in 1147, Bernard and the Spanheim contingent would have had the opportunity to meet their illustrious kin. When Bernard was making preparations for his departure in 1147, he made a sizeable contribution to the holdings of the Otakars by bequeathing his lands in Carinthia and the Marchia Transilvana (around Maribor and Radgona [Oberradkersburg]) to the Styrian margrave. When Bernard was indeed killed on crusade, Styria was significantly enlarged. There is reason to believe that the connection between the Otakars and the Spanheims was an important one to the Styrian ruling house. In the Genealogia marchionum Stirensium of ca. 1180, the author emphasized this dynastic connection by providing an amount of detail uncharacteristic for a female relative of the Otakars, namely that Kunigunde was the aunt of Otakar III and that she had married Bernard, the Spanheim. Underscoring the dynastic link between these two influential twelfth-century houses may have served to legitimize one of the most important events in the history of the march, the incorporation of the Spanheim lands, but in an atmosphere of a heightened awareness of dynastic connections and ancestral crusading achievements this emphasis takes on an even greater significance. Bernard’s involvement with the Styrian ruling house became much more intimate

105 Otto of Freising reports that Welf and Barbarossa camped together during the early phase of the campaign on account of their close friendship. Gesta Friderici, Book I, 48. Freed, Barbarossa, 40f.
106 See Ch. 1, note 18.
110 Gaisberger, Lauriacum, 298.
when he also served as regent while the young Otakar III had not yet reached the age of
adulthood, a role which likely included an element of mentorship and fatherly oversight in the
absence of his deceased father.\textsuperscript{112} The inclusion of the Spanheim connection by those producing
the region’s historiographical material was a conscious and conspicuous act that bound the
history of the two houses and allowed the Otakars to create the perception of a shared heritage
that surely included the latter’s crusading exploits.

There is some debate, however, regarding Otakar III’s actual participation in the crusade.
Tomek’s doubt stems from a document given at Graz on August 22, 1147, evidence, he asserts,
that the Styrian margrave could not have been with the crusader army.\textsuperscript{113} Since the crusading
army was already close to Constantinople at the time of the Graz document, it is unlikely that
Otakar could have made up the ground and joined the expedition.\textsuperscript{114} It is, nevertheless, possible
that the charter was issued in Otakar’s absence, the business which it documents having
transpired sometime earlier.\textsuperscript{115} The seeming lack of participation of the Styrian margrave despite
his crusading vow is troubling. Given the margrave’s participation in the build-up to the crusade
and his very public declaration of his intentions in the presence of the other imperial magnates, it
is difficult to imagine him retracting his statement and abandoning the crusade. This would have
undoubtedly entailed major social and political repercussions. But if Otakar did not participate,
this fact does not appear to have affected his standing among the other imperial magnates, nor
with his cousin, Frederick Barbarossa, in whose coronation campaign Otakar took part several
years later.\textsuperscript{116} Otto of Freising, perhaps as a result of the trauma of the expedition is purposely

\textsuperscript{112} Mezler-Andalberg, “Kirchenreform”, 149.
\textsuperscript{113} Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese, 358. StUB I, 263.
\textsuperscript{114} The argument against Otakar’s participation, it must be noted, rests on the authenticity of this document which I
have not been able to verify. Zahn’s edition is old and imperfect and no one else has ventured to comment on this
charter or its veracity.
\textsuperscript{115} A charter bearing the name and seal of Leopold VI was issued June 26, 1218 in Lilienfeld, when Leopold VI was
actually in Egypt. Fichtenau and Zöllner note that the actions which the charter record took place in June of 1217.
This document survives in original bearing the seal of the duke. BUB II, 212, p. 15. It is therefore conceivable that
Otakar III’s charter from August of 1147 could have been created after the actions it records took place.
\textsuperscript{116} Otakar was a first cousin of the emperor’s. His mother Sophie was a sister of Henry the Black, and Judith,
Barbarossa’s mother. As the documentary record (imperial charters edited in Heinrich Appelt, ed., Die Urkunden
Charter numbers will be given after dates) shows, Otakar was a major contributor to the events that shaped the
Empire in the mid-century and was among the most influential of princes. During the period from 1150 to 1155,
Otakar was continually by the king’s (to be crowned emperor 1155) side and took part in the events of this pivotal
period in Barbarossa’s reign. The margrave of Styria appears as a witness in no fewer than 33 imperial chancery
documents, frequently named alongside the magnates of the Empire such as Henry of Saxony, Henry of Bavaria,
Welf VI duke of Spoleto and even Bishop Otto of Freising whose Gesta Friderici makes up the last part of Vorau
brief concerning the actual events of the crusade and there is no mention of Otakar. According to Carl Schmutz, however, Otakar’s donation to St. Lambrecht in February 1147, before the time of the sermon by Gerlach of Rein, was in preparation for his crusade. In the text of the document, Otakar makes reference to his *devotam intentionem intentamque devotionem*, which could be a reference to his prior crusading vow. Albert von Muchar cites a Garsten charter in which Otakar III gave property in Waldlungen, hunting and fishing rights in Gavlenzbauch, a property on the Uchsenberg, and one in the Enns valley to the abbey in exchange for a daily mass for a year to be said for the success of his journey, and in case of his death a mass should be held for him daily, forever. This document closely mirrors other charters recording donations by crusaders. Otakar III clearly intended to take part in Conrad’s expedition, and made the necessary preparations for the care of his soul on the journey.

We cannot determine with any certainty whether or not Otakar III participated in the Second Crusade, and if we accept the evidence of the 1147 Graz charter, it appears rather unlikely that he did. But because the crusading legacy and its effects on subsequent generations has been central to my treatment of the subject, it is worth noting that later sources may have helped to

cod. 276. The documentary record shows Otakar was in the future emperor’s company as early as Spring, 1150 (mere months after returning from the Second Crusade in 1149) at Regensburg [13] where he appears to remain with the royal household for nearly two years before the company departs for Ulm in June of 1152 [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. From Ulm the retinue travels to Speyer (Aug 1152) [26, 27], Augsburg (Oct 1152) [29], Würzburg (Oct 1152) [30, 33, 34, 35], Besançon (Feb 1153) [49], Baume-les-Dames (Feb 1153) [50], Bamberg (Apr 1153) [54], and again to Bamberg (Feb 1154) [70], Roncaglia (Nov-Dec 1154) [92], Casale Monferrato (Jan 1155) [96], Rivarolo Canavese (Jan 1155) [97, 98], Tortona (during the siege of Mar-Apr 1155) [99, 100], Parma (May 1155) [101], Modena (May 1155) [103], Siena (Jun 1155) [109], Tintignano (Jun 1155) [110], Rome, St. Peter’s (June-July 1155) [111, 112, 114], Tusculum (July 1155) [115], and Tivoli (July 1155) [120]. By and large these documents deal with confirmation of possessions, or Barbarossa taking certain churches or monasteries under his protection, but they also show that Otakar was present throughout the entire Italian campaign, taking a personal role in the affairs of the king. In January, 1155, Otakar witnessed the confirmation of the Treaty of Constance, an agreement promising Pope Eugenius III’s help against the rebelling Romans, and a significant step towards Barbarossa’s coronation in Rome. He was certainly present at Barbarossa’s imperial coronation, since a document bearing his name issued by the chancery taking the church of Sta. Maria (Rome) under his protection was redacted at St. Peter’s on the very same day. The new emperor spent the better part of this day (June 18) putting down the rebellion of the Romans which erupted on the occasion of his coronation. There is no reasonable ground to doubt that a steadfast supporter of the king, a virtual fixture of the royal household and consistent participant in the legislative activities of the chancery for a continuous 5-year period would have taken part in the subjugation of the mob; it would seem, therefore, that Otakar III, margrave of Styria, played a personal role in securing the papal coronation for Frederick Barbarossa. For a man of such stature and standing among his contemporaries, it is particularly difficult to imagine him shirking his responsibilities. Görich, *Friedrich Barbarossa*, 247-260. See also Freed, *Frederick Barbarossa*, 430.

117 STUB I, no. 257.
118 Muchar, *Geschichte des Herzogtums Steiermark* 4, 403. Muchar wrote in the mid-nineteenth century and his citations are somewhat lacking. I have been unable to locate this document in any source books. The specificity of the information suggests accuracy. Tomek, too, references this document, even if he doubts Otakar’s participation in the crusade. Tomek, *Geschichte der Diözese*, 272.
establish such a legacy. One such, the *Iohannis abbatis victoriensis liber certarum historiarum*, a work on Austrian history from 1335, which also reaches back to the Carolingian period, describes the departure for the Second Crusade and leaves little doubt that the author believed Otakar was among the itinerant. In the two recensions of this text (C3 and D) that narrate this period, Otakar is named, among many of the other leading imperial magnates, as departing. Recension C3 reads,

Anno Domini MCXLVII rex Chunradus associatis sibi fratre suo Heinrico duce Noricorum, Frederico filio fratris, duce Suevorum, Bernardo comite Karinthianorum, Welfone Norico, Ladezlao duce Bohemorum, Otakaro marchione Styrie, Heinrico Ratisponensi, Ottone Frisingensi, Reginbert Pataviensi, Ratispone Danubium intraverunt, tantaque convenit multitudo, ut naves in aquis ad navigandum et latitudo camporum ad ambulandum vix sufficere videretur.\(^\text{119}\)

The recension D version:

Anno Domini MCXLVII frater regis, Heinricus dux Noricorum, filius fratris sui Fredericis, dux Suevorum, Bernhardus comes Karinthiorum predicto principi se iungentes, Heinricus Ratisponensis, Otto Frisingensis, frater regis Reginbertus Pataviensis presules, Ladezlaus rex Bohemorum, Welfo Noricus, Otakerus marchio Stirie per Bulgaros capiunt iter.\(^\text{120}\)

The *Gesta Friderici* served as a source for this text, and John has conflated the events of the February *Hoftag* at which many of the imperial nobles took the cross with the group’s departure in June of that year. Naturally, this account is at odds with the documentary source that casts such a shadow over Otakar III’s involvement in the Second Crusade, but it is noteworthy that later historians and chroniclers writing the history of Styria believed that Otakar was a participant in the Second Crusade together with the king and imperial magnates. The Styrian margrave setting off in the imperial retinue with all the pomp and pageantry of such an occasion

\(^{119}\) “In the year of the Lord MCXLVIII King Conrad reached the Danube at Regensburg with his brother Henry, duke of the Bavarians, his nephew Frederick the duke of Swabia, Count Bernard of Carinthia-Trixen, Welf the Bavarian, Ladislaus the duke of Bohemia, Otakar the Margrave of Styria, Henry of Regensburg, Otto of Freising, Reginbert of Passau in his company, and he gathered there such a multitude that the ships on the water seemed scarcely to suffice to transport them, and the breadth of the fields to accommodate them.” Johannes Victoriensis, *Iohannis abbatis victoriensis liber certarum historiarum*, MGH SS r.G. in usum scholarum seperatim editi. 36, vol. 1. (Hannover-Leipzig: Hahn, 1910), Book I, p. 85-86.

\(^{120}\) “In the year of the Lord MCXLVII the brother of the King, Henry the duke of Bavaria, the son of his brother Frederick the duke of Swabia, Bernard the Count of Carinthia-Trixen, with the afore mentioned princes joining up, Henry of Regensburg, Otto of Freising the brother of the king, Reginbert of Passau, Ladislaus the king of Bohemia, Welf the Bavarian, and Otakar the margrave of Styria began their journey through Bulgaria.” Ibid., 122.
is a much more powerful and—obviously—enduring image than the one which the charter only hints at. In the context of creating dynastic continuity discussed earlier, the fact that this is the image of Otakar III that subsequent generations were left with is of chief importance.

Whatever happened on the Second Crusade, Otakar’s public act of declaring his crusading intention and the preparations he made for his proposed journey testify to the persuasive power of the crusading rhetoric in Styria. The targeted and effective appeals of the preaching campaign to noble heritage and responsibility as Christian rulers were here directed towards Otakar and his company. The added political and social pressure of equaling the challenge of one’s peers also surely played a part in the decision of these men to go on campaign, making Otakar’s supposed retraction all the more problematic for the tremendous loss of honour it would have occasioned. It has been suggested, though, that Otakar III’s 1164 pilgrimage to the Holy Land was undertaken in atonement for his failure to fulfill the crusading vow he swore twenty years earlier.\textsuperscript{121} This expedition appears to have been motivated by more than personal penance. Accompanying the Styrian margrave in 1164 were the Patriarch of Aquileia, Pilgrim, Bishop Eberhard of Bamberg, Duke Henry of Carinthia, Count Siegfried of Lebenau, Gebhard of Burghausen, the \textit{advocatus} of Admont, and many others.\textsuperscript{122} Hans Pirchegger has suggested that Otakar may have undertaken this pilgrimage to avoid tensions in the Empire.\textsuperscript{123} Otakar retreated from the emperor’s company after he elevated Henry Jasomirgott, a direct rival, to the status of duke.\textsuperscript{124} As a result, Otakar missed the siege of Milan. Whatever the impetus, the strong presence of nobles and representatives from the ecclesiastical hierarchy on Otakar’s pilgrimage is certainly noteworthy, and suggests a rather substantial expedition, one that certainly would have been armed. The creator of the Lambach annals used the same phrasing to describe Otakar’s expedition as that used in charters for crusaders departing for the Holy Land.\textsuperscript{125} Otakar soon fell ill, however, and at some point he was forced to turn back. In late December, 1165, in Pécs, Hungary, the Styrian margrave succumbed to his illness.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{121} Mezler-Andalberg, “Kirchenreform”, 154.
\textsuperscript{123} Pirchegger, \textit{Geschichte der Steiermark}, 21.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{125} i.e. \textit{Iherosolimam iturus}. H. Pertz, ed., \textit{Annales Mellicenses Auctarium Lambacense} MGH SS 9 (Hanover: Hahn, 1851), 559.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Otachker Sitrensis marchio Iherosolimam iturus in Ungaria moritur}. Ibid.
Despite the outcome of the Second Crusade there was no significant dip in the collective zeal for crusading. Otakar himself is evidence of this fact, and the desire to go on crusade is evinced by the Styrian margraves at regular twenty-year intervals (see Otakar IV’s attempted crusade below). The 1164 pilgrimage, which happens to coincide with the founding of Vorau and the birth of his only son and heir, demonstrates the draw of the Holy Land for the Styrian nobility and the impact of the papal preaching campaign and its rhetoric had on the territory. Perhaps Otakar had this rhetoric in mind when he undertook his pilgrimage. Now that he had an heir, and dynastic continuity assured, he may have commenced the journey in order to build a connection between himself, his son, and the crusading spirit, which the young Otakar IV would duly manifest in the lead-up to the Third Crusade. From 1147 to the end of the century Styria was firmly in the grip of the crusading movement, and the interest that the Otakars took in it is clearly discernable and not to be underestimated.

2.4.2 Otakar IV’s Abortive Crusade

Styria’s last margrave, and later duke, died at the young age of twenty-nine. Although his father died while he was an infant and he lacked a paternal example, he seems to have displayed the same devotion to the region’s monasteries that was characteristic of his dynasty. The dozens of charters that document his generosity towards these institutions and his steadfastness in defending their rights also show a desire to honour the legacy of his parents and forefathers (see Ch.1). He can be witnessed frequently confirming privileges and granting new ones for the purpose of ensuring the memoria of those who preceded him, exhibiting a keen awareness of the importance of legacy and heritage. When the call to crusade reached Styria, the young duke was eager to join the emperor and the other princes on their expedition. Otakar IV, doubtless aware of the circumstances of his father’s death, followed in his footsteps by accepting the cross. Although we are not as well informed about the occasion of his oath as we are about his father’s, a document from 1190 makes clear the duke’s intention to undertake a crusade. At Garsten

---

127 Jakob P. Wichner, Geschichte des Benediktiner-Stiftes Admont von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Jahre 1177 (Graz: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers, 1874); Gaisberger, Lauriacum, 305, 331.
128 See StUB, I, no. 702. This, however, is an excerpt from the Garsten Traditionsbuch and the full text can be found in ULE 1, 212.
129 Ibid.
abbey Otakar conferred upon the brothers some property near Hus that used to belong to a certain noblewoman, Gisla of Eussar, for their eternal use. In exchange for which, the brothers, “Pro his et pro ceteris bonis que prenominatis fratribus conferre debemus, iter nostrum Ierosolimam cum una missa de sancta Maria per unius anni spatio domino cottidie commendent et aliam post nostrum de hac luce discessum ob salutem anime nostre singulis diebus celebrabunt...”¹³⁰ This document shows a witness list twenty-nine names long, which amounts to a very public and political declaration of intent that would have been difficult to walk away from. Making a donation to Garsten—the same institution to which his father made a gift before his own planned crusade in 1147—may have been an important statement of continuity for the young duke.¹³¹ The propaganda that preceded both the Second and Third Crusades placed a heavy emphasis on living up to the standard set by previous dynastic representatives while on campaign in the Holy Land. We know that crusaders invested monasteries with special significance, and entrusting an institution with the welfare of one’s soul and the maintenance of their earthly presence were responsibilities that were not parceled out without careful forethought.¹³² Continuity was important to those with a crusader heritage and it needed to be demonstrated and nurtured.¹³³ Perhaps Otakar’s donation was a symbolic first step in his bid to equal the dynastic honour accrued by his father decades earlier. At Radkersburg (Radgona) in 1185, Otakar IV’s chancery produced a document in which he reaffirmed his house’s commitment to protect the monastery of Seitz, a place particularly beloved by his father.¹³⁴ In this charter, the young duke asserted that he desired to follow the pious example of his father with respect to the brothers of the monastery.¹³⁵ The young duke consciously pursued a plan of continuity with his predecessors, striving to meet and imitate their example. Moreover,

¹³⁰ “[For these and for other good [works] that we ought to confer upon the aforementioned brothers, they should commend our journey to Jerusalem to the Lord with a daily mass of Mary for the space of one year, and they should celebrate another for the dead and the salvation of our soul each day after our departure from this light...” StUB, I, no. 702.
¹³¹ Muchar, Geschichte des Herzogtums Steiermark 4, 403. Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese, 272.
¹³² Lester, “A shared imitation”, 359-366. This article in general clearly articulates the importance of monasteries to the crusading effort.
¹³³ Phillips, Second Crusade, 104; Riley-Smith, “Family Traditions”.
¹³⁴ Otakar III founded Seitz. See StUB, II, no. 485. For Otakar IV’s charter confirming his protection of Seitz see StUB, II, no. 644.
¹³⁵ “Because divine goodness never abandoned its followers in its benefits, but always increased them with riches and honours, we confirm the same, desiring to follow the pious example of our father of blessed memory, Margrave Otakar of Styria towards those brothers...” Quoniam diuina bonitas suos cultores beneficiis nunquam destituit set diuitiis et honoribus circum quamque multiplicat, felicis memorie patris nostri Otochari marchionis Styrie pium erga dilectos nobis fratres in Seitz fauorem et inextinctum exequi cupientes, confirmamus eodem... StUB, I, no. 644.
Otakar wanted this to be made known to the beneficiaries of the charter, and anyone else who might have been present on this occasion. A pattern of patronage can be discerned here, driven by a very public desire for continuity and parity with members of a dynasty. If a desire for equivalence with his father motivated Otakar IV’s domestic actions, it is highly likely that it also drove his aspiration to take part in the crusading movement which so overtly publicized the hereditary obligations that accompanied it.

Otakar IV, however, had been ill for quite some time and by 1190, just two years before his death, it was abundantly clear that he would not be physically able to participate in a journey of this magnitude.\(^\text{136}\) Shortly after the death of his mother, he appears to have been afflicted during an outbreak of leprosy in the area in 1184 and his illness is well documented in the historical writing of the region.\(^\text{137}\) Jansen Enikel revealed in his *Fürstenbuch* that while in Vienna he read of the duke’s unfortunate end in a book and reported on his illness.\(^\text{138}\) Having been sick for so long, it should have been apparent that he was in no condition to travel, let alone contribute meaningfully to any military action. Yet in 1190 Otakar IV again gives very public notice of his commitment to campaign in the Holy Land in a document given in Salzburg that has a witness list of twenty-three names.\(^\text{139}\) Otakar confirms the possession of Werchendorf on the Drau (Drava) river by the canons of Salzburg and commands those who will be handling his business while he’s away to honour the donation given by his father and reconfirmed by himself. These documents beg the question: why would a man who has been gravely ill with a debilitating disease for six years still, as late as 1190, the year of the emperor’s death, insist on undertaking a taxing journey well beyond his capability? Perhaps we might glimpse some of the duke’s motivation in this last document, and the conspicuous amount of detail it provides not only about the events which precipitated its drafting, but about the reason for the journey itself. Otakar IV’s proposed journey is not a pilgrimage, and its purpose is expressly stated. The expedition is,

\(^{138}\) wie er Stîr gewunnen hât,/ daz wil ich iu sagen drât./ wan ichz ze Wienn geschrîben vant;/ ze den Schotten tet mirz apt bekant./ dâ las ichz unde hánz gesehen./ daz er der war der Stîrlant/ kouft von einem fürsten kranc;/ der muost vil gar ân sînem danc/ daz lant dâ verkoufen/ amb silberîne houfen./ der selbe fürst ûzsetzic was. Jansen Enikel, *Fürstebuch*. MGH Deutsche Chroniken und andere Geschichtsbücher des Mittelalters 3, ed. Philipp Strauch, (Hannover: Hahn, 1891), 619.
\(^{139}\) StUB, I, no. 720. The following discussion refers to this charter. For a more recent edition of this document see *Salzburger Urkundenbuch* II, 476.
“...pro liberando a Sarracenis sancto domini sepulchro aggressi...”\(^\text{140}\) Among the many charters from the region that deal with donations to monasteries in the lead up to both the Second and Third Crusades, this formulation of the purpose of the trip is unique. The document’s redactor eliminates any potential ambiguity regarding Otakar’s intentions with respect to the Holy Land in conspicuous fashion, suggesting that this was important information in the context of the document and the image of the duke that it commits to posterity.

The confirmation of Otakar III’s donation to the Salzburg cathedral canons (StUB, I, no. 720.) which his son issued in 1190 must be read in the context of creating and maintaining power and rulership in the region. After some misunderstanding about the ownership of the property in question, Otakar IV restores and confirms all the rights conferred by his father and mother—which donation is referenced several times in the text—earlier in the century.\(^\text{141}\) *Memoria* is a central component of this charter which signals its importance in creating that image of dynastic continuity so important to legitimate rulership. It states that Otakar IV had seen the original charter of donation and acknowledged its legitimacy, an act which not only affirms and sustains the authority of the monastery to possess the property, but also the previous instance of the exercise of authority of the preceding dynastic representative, Otakar III. In confirming these rights, the next in the dynastic train makes a statement about the legitimate authority of his father, which, in turn, is rightfully conferred upon, and exercised by, Otakar IV. Following his own confirmation, Otakar IV makes his successor legally responsible for upholding this decision in the future, which projects the authority he inherited onto his lawful heir. The statement concerning the purpose of his journey to the Holy Land stands directly in the midst of this crucial dynastic discourse and must be taken into account in our reading of the statement. Clearly the proposed departure for crusade was a major event in the chain of rulership in Styria. It made the dynastic situation unstable (he might die on crusade, after all), but also held important implications for the future of his house. For those who would come after Otakar IV, this charter is a clear statement of his own efforts to match the achievements of those in his genealogical line.

\(^{140}\) “...for the liberation of the sacred tomb of the lord from the Saracens.” *Sane dum in procinctu Jerosolimitani itineris quod cum aliis plurimis principibus et uiris nobilibvs ac illustribvs pro liberando a Sarracenis sancto domini sepulchro aggressi fueramus...* StUB, I, no. 720.

\(^{141}\) *Salzburger Urkundenbuch* II, 363.
Although he was ill Otakar IV may not have entirely given up on the notion that he might yet produce an heir. Twice the document\textsuperscript{142} refers to Leopold of Austria as potential successor to the rulership of Styria, a matter which had seemingly been settled in 1186 with the so-called \textit{Georgenberger Handfeste} in which the Styrian duke made provisions for his patrimony in the event that he should not leave behind an heir.\textsuperscript{143} In this document, famous for its hardline position on the rights of the monasteries and ministerials, he named his cousin, Leopold V of Austria, as his successor. Perhaps a legal formality, the transfer of the duchy appeared to be contingent on the lack of an Otakarian heir. Leopold shall be named successor, it reads, “...if we should depart without an heir.”\textsuperscript{144} This 1186 charter demonstrates that questions of dynasty and succession were a matter of concern for the duke well before he made the decision to take the cross, likely as a result of his diminished physical state. But in 1190, the duke appears to have been confident enough to retain some hope of producing a male heir, and moreover, was sure enough to state his intention to go to the Holy Land for martial purposes. At the very least, this document is evidence of an environment in which crusading, heritage, and dynasty were connected, and of major importance to the Styrian ruling house around the time the Vorau manuscript was created.

At some point, Otakar IV had to concede that he would not be participating in the crusade and this moment could not have come long after the drafting of the 1190 documents attesting to his intention. He died in May 1192 without an heir.\textsuperscript{145} But the duke took care to ensure that crusading would be part of his legacy, even if he could not personally take part in a campaign. On his death, he donated his estates in San Quirino, Friuli (which lands he inherited from his uncle, Otto of Cordenon), to the Knights Templar.\textsuperscript{146} Although the original charter does not survive, a document given in November, 1219, in San Quirino references the original charter.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{142} StUB, II, no. 720.


\textsuperscript{144} \textit{Communicatio igitur melliorum nostrorum prudenti consilio, nobilissimum, strennuissimum fidelissimumque ducem Austrie Leobaldum consanguineum nostrum, si sine herede decesserimus, successorem nobis designauimus....} StUB, I, no. 677.

\textsuperscript{145} This we know from the Seckau necrology. Herzberg-Fränkel, \textit{Necrologia Germaniae}, 433; The Rein necrology also reports his death. Ibid., 355.

\textsuperscript{146} Joseph Valentinelli, ed., \textit{Diplomatarium Portusnaonense. Fontes rerum Austriacarum} II/24 (Vienna: H. Böhlaus Nachf., 1865), no. 4. See also Pier Carlo Begotti, \textit{Templari e giovanniti in Friuli. La Mason de San Quirino} (Fiume Veneto, 1991), 61ff.

\textsuperscript{147} See note 143.
The document reports on some contentious rulings concerning the ownership of the San Quirino estates, and the redactor is careful to assert twice that the villa and the estate “...data fuit a domino Otkaro duce Styrie”. Otakar IV’s gesture towards the Templars may be indicative of some closer connection that has been lost with the sources that expressed it. Crucially, though, the duke succeeded in ensuring that crusading would be a part of the legacy of the Styrian Otakars, and that his support for the cause would be committed to posterity. Nearly thirty years and a generation after his death, the duke’s dedication to the cause of freeing the Holy Land had an impact on the region, was still remembered, still relevant, and still an important part of his legacy. The charter cites the remission of sins and the salvation of his own soul and that of his parents as the impetus behind the handing over of his Italian possessions to the Templars. Otakarian memoria was now ensured in Styria itself, and beyond the Mediterranean, inextricably bound to the crusades and the ongoing efforts to reclaim the site of Christ’s life. Although he could not participate physically, he made every effort to ensure that he would not fall short of the crusading legacy left by his father, and that the image of the Otakars subsequent generations would see would be one of a dynasty honoured by their contribution to the cause of crusading, Christendom, and salvation history.

2.4.3 A Continued Tradition of Crusading in Styria: The Babenberg Period

The Babenbergs were much more engaged in the crusade campaigns of the period than the Otakars and they most certainly left an impressive crusading legacy through successive generations. Beginning with the Margravine Ida of Formbach, wife of Leopold II, who led her own contingent of troops on the 1101 crusade of Welf IV, the Babenbergs took part in almost every major expedition from that point onward, including several campaigns that fell outside...
those that bear enumeration. Ida, a widow, met her end along with Archbishop Thiemo when they were captured by Turks outside of Heraclea. Even though we are told by Ekkehard of Aura that she was murdered, the legend of her abduction and marriage to a Muslim prince—which union supposedly produced Zengi—persisted well into the twelfth century and was even taken up by the Kaiserchronik author. Perhaps this earliest episode in Babenberg crusading history (though Ida was not born a Babenberg) may not have been as illustrious as those of subsequent generations. Henry Jasomirgott participated in the crusade of Conrad III in 1147, having taken the cross at the Regensburg assembly in February of that year, as Otto of Freising reports. As a result of the royal court’s interaction with its Byzantine counterpart during the campaign, Henry was wedded to Theodora, a niece of the emperor Manuel I, in 1148. Otto’s report on the Second Crusade, as has been noted, is purposefully brief and the German speaking world is otherwise rather silent on the campaign, but we know that Henry did return in 1149 from the east even if many did not. Otto of Freising was himself a Babenberg, the brother of Henry Jasomirgott and son of Margrave Leopold III by his wife Agnes, who was also the mother of King Conrad III by her first marriage to Frederick of Swabia. The bishop was an eye-witness to the disaster of the Second Crusade and although he declined to narrate his contribution to the campaign, he and his group suffered greatly. The crusading army split into two contingents with Conrad III leading an army through Anatolia and Otto guided another group of pilgrims and crusaders along the coast of Asia Minor, supposedly the safe path. Along the way they were ambushed and nearly annihilated. The enthusiasm for crusading among the Babenbergs was represented in both the ecclesiastical and secular spheres by this influential generation of their dynasty.


151 Schröder, Kaiserchronik, 16,600-16,614. The author conflates Ida with Duchess Agnes of Bavaria.

152 Otto of Freising, Gesta, I, 43. Henry is said to have taken the cross eadem hora as the preaching of Adam of Ebrach.


154 Dopsch, Österreichische Geschichte, 131.

155 Freed, Barbarossa, 51-52.
Leopold V, the next in the Babenberg succession, took part in two separate journeys to the Holy Land in 1182 and 1191. The former expedition was undertaken in that year out of a desire to visit the sacred places of the region, according to one documentary source.\(^{156}\) On this journey, Leopold is said to have acquired a piece of the true cross that he donated to the abbey of Heiligenkreuz.\(^{157}\) Leopold’s 1192 expedition brought upon him considerably less glory than his first. On account of a border dispute with the king of Hungary, Leopold was unable to depart with the main body of the crusading army in May, 1189, delaying his departure until at least August 15, 1190.\(^{158}\) He travelled by sea, embarking at Venice, where he received the news of the emperor’s death in the river Saleph on June 10, 1190, and proceeded to Acre where he met with Richard the Lionheart and Philip Augustus.\(^{159}\) The capture of this city sparked a conflict between Leopold and Richard that would have far reaching consequences. Richard and Philip had agreed to divide the conquests between themselves, leaving the duke of Austria out. When Leopold had his banner raised on one of Acre’s towers, Richard had it torn down and cast from the battlements. Furthermore, the Germans and Austrians were excluded from a share in the city’s plunder.\(^{160}\) Shortly after this dispute Leopold returned home and was already in his duchy by the end of 1191.\(^{161}\) If Leopold was not sufficiently ill-disposed towards Richard, he also blamed the latter for the murder of Marquis Conrad of Montferrat, the king-elect of Jerusalem and cousin of Leopold V who was murdered on his way back to his quarters in 1192.\(^{162}\) When Richard’s ship was stranded and he was forced ashore in Aquileia, he had to travel through Leopold’s territory in disguise, but was recognized in Erdberg in December, 1192.\(^{163}\) He was brought to castle Dürrenstein and given over to Emperor Henry VI, and was set free at the request of the pope, but not before a ransom of 15,000 marks of silver was paid, and an oath of

\(^{156}\) BUB I, 61. Leopold made a donation to Garsten, ob amorem sanctissimi et gloriosissimi sepulchri domini nostri Iesu Christi, ad quod invisandum desiderabiliter propero… “for the love of the most blessed and glorious tomb of our lord Jesus Christ, to which I hasten in order to behold [it].”

\(^{157}\) 1182. Liupoldus dux Austrie Ierosolimam ivit, et inde revertitur, afferens porcionem sancte crucis ad mensuram virilis manus, quam crucem in monasterio Sancte Crucis reliquit. “Leopold, Duke of Austria, went to Jerusalem and returned bearing a piece of the holy cross the size of a man’s hand, which he deposited in the monastery of Heiligenkreuz.” Annales Austriæ. Auctarium Sancrucense. MGH SS9, ed. Wilhelm Wattenbach (Hanover: Hahn, 1851), 732.

\(^{158}\) Dopsch, Österreichische Geschichte, 151; Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 23.

\(^{159}\) Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 24.


\(^{161}\) Spreizhofer, “Union von 1192”, 44.


\(^{163}\) Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 24.
fidelity to the emperor was taken on February 4, 1194. For his unseemly conduct towards a fellow crusader, Leopold was excommunicated, under which ban he lived until its hastily performed retraction on his deathbed in 1194. In order to atone for his conduct, Leopold had been planning to undertake another journey to the Holy Land in 1195.

Frederick I, Leopold V’s son, inherited his father’s Austrian duchy and resolved to complete the latter’s pledge. Frederick’s proposed expedition was composed of a large contingent of Styrians and Austrians and did not depart until 1197, pausing in Sicily at Emperor Henry VI’s court. Conrad, archbishop of Mainz was tasked with overseeing the expedition’s safe arrival in the Holy Land and the group departed from Messina, landing at Acre. Frederick enjoyed some success during this brief campaign, as the forces gathered there under Conrad and Duke Henry I of Brabant captured Tyre and Beirut in October. About to lay siege to Damascus, news of the death of Emperor Henry VI and the resulting discord in the Empire arrived, so the German contingent turned homeward. Frederick died at Acre in April 1198.

Frederick’s successor in the duchies of Austria and Styria was his brother, Leopold VI, perhaps the most celebrated crusader of his house. Although neither he, nor his subjects took part in the Fourth Crusade, Leopold responded to the renewed call for crusade issued by Innocent III, and had taken the cross as early as 1208 from his close advisor Nicholas, prior of Seckau, in gratitude for the birth of his son. Instead of travelling to the Holy Land to fulfill his crusading vow, however, Leopold decided to direct his efforts against the Cathars in France. Leopold, with his force of Styrians and Austrians departed in August, 1212, and arrived in Carcassone in mid-to late September where he met with Enguerrand III of Boves. By all accounts, Leopold did not remain long in Southern France, departing perhaps even as early as late October despite

164 Dopsch, Österreichische Geschichte, 303.
166 Among the Styrians who took part in this expedition was Ulrich of Peckau. Ilwof, Steiermark und die “Kreuzzüge”, 26.
167 Johnson, “The Crusades of Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI”, 120-121.
168 Ibid., 121.
170 Leopold probably delayed his departure due to the state of affairs in the Empire after the death of Philip of Swabia.
having laid siege to Foix, and he carried on into Spain to participate in the Reconquista.\textsuperscript{172} When Leopold arrived at the fortress of the Knights of Calatrava in La Mancha, he found a much less hostile climate in which little fighting was taking place, and did not remain long in the Iberian peninsula.\textsuperscript{173} By winter, 1212, he was back in Vienna.\textsuperscript{174}

Leopold VI was a truly distinguished crusader, and demonstrated this during the Fifth Crusade, called by Innocent III in April or May, 1213, in the bull \textit{Quia maior}.\textsuperscript{175} Innocent III and his predecessor Honorius III appear to have looked upon Leopold as one of the most dependable crusaders in Christendom, given his prior service and efforts to eradicate the Waldensians and Patarians from his duchy.\textsuperscript{176} King Andrew of Hungary and Duke Leopold of Austria raised a considerable force that traveled to the Balkan peninsula and embarked at Spalato in August, 1217.\textsuperscript{177} Accompanying Duke Leopold were the Styrians Ulrich of Stubenberg, Reimbert of Mureck, Dietmar of Liechtenstein, Ulrich of Peckau, the Styrian butler Albero of Grimmenstein, the \textit{Truchsessa} Berthold of Emmerberg, and Ulrich of Klamm.\textsuperscript{178} The Austrians landed at Acre and were joined by the forces of Bohemund IV of Antioch, John of Brienne, the king of Jerusalem, and King Hugh of Cyprus. While awaiting the arrival of Frederick II’s army (who did not, in any event, arrive) before undertaking the main campaign into Egypt, the crusaders occupied themselves in the area of Acre, capturing the fortress on Mount Tabor.\textsuperscript{179} But Leopold’s main contribution came during the siege of Damietta which was begun on May 27,

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{173} Leopold had served more than the required forty days to earn his indulgence.
  \item\textsuperscript{174} Leeper, \textit{History of Medieval Austria}, 296.
  \item\textsuperscript{175} Madden, \textit{The New Concise History}, 143. For a brief introduction to the Fifth Crusade, see E.J. Mylod, et al., eds., \textit{The Fifth Crusade in Context: The Crusading Movement in the Early Thirteenth Century} (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 1-5.
  \item\textsuperscript{176} Tyerman, \textit{God's War}, 606. See also Herta Hageneder, “Honorius III. und Leopold VI. von Österreich im Jahr 1219”, in \textit{Geschichte und ihre Quellen. FS für Friedrich Hausmann zum 70. Geburtstag} (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1987), 399-402.
  \item\textsuperscript{177} Powell, \textit{Anatomy of a Crusade}, 127-135 for Leopold’s recruitment of soldiers and early phase of the crusade campaign.
  \item\textsuperscript{178} Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 30.
\end{itemize}
1218, when the crusaders sailed up the Nile and invested the port of that city. Choking off the heavily fortified city from its supply line of the Nile was deemed the only way to capture it, but a chain suspended between the city and a large tower on the opposite bank barred access to the river. It was during the capture of this tower that Leopold and his Austrians distinguished themselves. Oliver of Paderborn’s ingenious siege engine succeeded in allowing the crusaders to enter the tower, the occupants of which surrendered to Leopold himself. When the crusaders desired to press the matter to the other bank of the Nile, Leopold and his men were among the first across the river, where the duke stormed the palisades that had been set up to prevent their landing and succeeded in destroying them. A ferocious storm and influx of seawater nearly engulfed the crusader camp and was followed almost immediately by an outbreak of disease (likely scurvy) and morale among the combatants reached its nadir when Leopold decided to depart in the spring of 1219, having served a year and a half. Damietta would fall in November, 1219, only to be recaptured shortly thereafter.

The zeal for crusading has the appearance of increasing with each subsequent generation of Babenbergs. Henry Jasomirgott’s contribution to the Second Crusade is overshadowed by his son, Leopold V’s, two subsequent journeys to the Holy Land where he supposedly returned with a relic of the holy cross, and took part in a (somewhat) successful military action during the capture of Acre. His untimely death prevented him from carrying out yet another trip east, although this last appears to have been motivated by a desire for atonement rather than a yearning to behold the sacred sites of the Holy Land. Leopold V’s son Frederick’s limited contribution in the late 1190s is not particularly spectacular, but perhaps his death on the journey home added to the luster of his crusading legacy. His brother, Leopold VI, was a truly impressive crusader who, despite his failure to participate in the Fourth and Sixth Crusades,

---

180 It is also worth noting that this event is recorded in the annals of Vorau Stiftsarchiv MS 171, f. 117v-118v, as well as MS 367, f. 108v-109r. Madden, New Concise History, 147. On the siege see Douglas Sterling, “The Siege of Damietta: Seapower in the Fifth Crusade”, in Crusaders, Cottieri, and Cannon. Medieval Warfare in Societies around the Mediterranean, ed. L.J. Andrews Villalon and Donald J. Kagay (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 101-132; Oliverus Scholasticus, Die Schriften des kölnner Domscholasters, späteren Bischofs von Paderborn und Kardinal-Bischofs von S. Sabina, ed. Hermann Hoogeweg (Tübingen, 1894); Madden, New Concise History, 147-152.
184 Tyerman, God’s War, 634-635.
185 Madden, New Concise History, 153-155.
seemed to live constantly under the sign of the cross.\footnote{Ronald Neumann, ―Untersuchungen zu dem Heer Kaiser Friedrichs II. beim Kreuzzug von 1228/29‖, \textit{Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen} 1 (1995), 9.} The presence of many Styrians on the Babenberg campaigns clearly testifies to the persistence of the crusader spirit, as well as the extent to which Styria’s new ruling house fostered support for the movement within the region.

### 2.5 Crusading and the Styrian Monasteries

Monastic houses served as important centres of support for the crusades and in many ways, these expeditions could not have functioned without them. The intercessory and commemorative activities of the brothers constituted an important element in the spiritual support system.\footnote{Lester, “A Shared Imitation”, 365.} But beyond this, the implications of which I will discuss below, monasteries and canonical houses were the places where spiritual interests mingled with those of their secular benefactors as outlined in Chapter 1. The kinds of appeals to heritage and dynasty described above dovetailed very nicely with the efforts of monks to create household histories and \textit{memoria} through the various means available to them.\footnote{Oexle, “Fama und Memoria”, 62.} When norms of lay noble conduct came together with a spiritual vocation in the form of crusading, Styrian monastic institutions enthusiastically supported the project. Gerlach of Rein, the Cistercian abbot of that house preached the crusade in Styria, and three abbots of the Benedictine abbey of Admont, Giselbert, Godfrey and Isenrich—the latter two were honoured participants who accompanied Conrad III and Frederick I on their respective campaigns—each participated in one of the first three crusades.\footnote{Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 22.} When the king stopped in Vienna on his way through the Balkans in 1189, he issued a document to Leopold V of Austria and Otakar of Styria charging them with the protection of the abbey of Admont while its abbot was away on crusade.\footnote{StUB, I, no. 697. In this document the emperor makes it absolutely clear that the abbot has gone on a crusade to the Holy Land, and that he enjoyed a privileged place at the emperor’s side.} An element of prestige certainly accompanied the elevated status Admont enjoyed from its tradition of participation at the highest level in the crusades of the twelfth century. The gesture of approval given by the abbots of Admont is emblematic of the attitude many monasteries held with respect to the participation of the lay nobility in a venture
that so clearly advanced the cause of the Christian religion on a global and historic scale.\textsuperscript{191} On a more personal level, the highly ritualized departure for a crusade often began at the gates of a monastery following liturgical celebrations that purified the crusader’s spirit and prepared the family for the possible death of the departing.\textsuperscript{192} In Styria’s case, we have seen that Rein was the choice for at least one crusader, whose donation was accompanied by all the solemnities of a religious ceremony. This event must surely have been accompanied by the ritualistic pomp that helped imbue the crusaders with the sense of solemnity of their cause.\textsuperscript{193} Moreover, in fulfilling this function, the monastery and its brothers established themselves as key participants in the crusading enterprise, upon whom the laity relied for the success of their campaigns. These houses provided crucial spiritual backing for the enterprise as a whole, and for the individual crusaders who turned to them for protection and pre-departure penitential cleansing.

In the months before the crusaders departed for the Holy Land in June of 1147 they diligently made provisions for the physical journey, and perhaps more importantly, for the spiritual. Monasteries in territories which yielded a large number of crusaders were inundated with donations and requests for masses sung in the hope of a safe journey for the body and the soul of the participants.\textsuperscript{194} This period was one of incredible enrichment on the part of the monasteries whose charge it was to care for the departed.\textsuperscript{195} From the undoubtedly fractional body of documents that survives from the mid and late twelfth century, one receives the impression of a tidal wave of donations of such volume and frequency that scribes seem to have developed stock phrases to note the purpose of the gift. In the Admont cartularies which offer the largest group of surviving crusade donation documents, the phrase \textit{iturus in expeditionem Ierosolimitanam} or a slight variant customarily introduces the circumstances of the donation. Franz Ilwof has noted each of the surviving charters he was able to locate, if only for the purpose of recording the names of those who participated in the Second Crusade, and the surviving documents show

\textsuperscript{192} Lester, “A Shared Imitation”, 365.
\textsuperscript{195} Tomek, \textit{Geschichte der Diözese}, 362. Tomek includes a lengthy list of donations made by Otakar III’s ministerials which runs from 359-362; Khull relates a somewhat lengthier list on p. 66.
Admont as the greatest beneficiary of the swell in donations around the Second Crusade.196 However, gifts to Rein and Garsten are also documented and the unfortunately poor survival rate of charters and cartularies for Styria’s other monasteries is probably to blame for their underrepresentation here.197 For the Third Crusade there is a greater survival rate and the distribution of donations, while still favouring Admont, is correspondingly broader.198

Just as the Second Crusade prompted a spike in the number of donations, so too did the Third Crusade. Charter evidence shows the predictable torrent of donations flowing into the coffers and property registers of the monasteries, with lay nobles offering up parts of their holdings in exchange for intercessory masses on their itinerant behalf. Aside from the many gifts to Admont, charters survive documenting similar actions by crusaders toward the Styrian houses of Göß, Gleink, and even the canons of Salzburg cathedral.199 Although no donations survive from Vorau—and in fact very few charters concerning this house do—it should be noted that Augustinian canons were as engaged in the crusading movement as other orders, with the possible exception of the Cistercians.200 The monastic and canonical institutions of Styria certainly benefitted from the impending crusade at the end of the century, just as they had done in the middle.

196 Ilwof’s citations for Zahn’s Steirische Urkundenbuch are either outdated or erroneous in almost every instance. Care must be taken with these. The documents can indeed be located but under different numbers, and there appears to be no simple formula with which the correct one can be retrieved. Donations to Admont before the Second Crusade have been recorded in the following charters: StUB I, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, and 275. StUB I, 247 and StUB I, 702 respectively.
198 This last donation was made by Otakar IV himself in 1190. StUB, I, no 720. Donations by crusaders to these other houses are represented in the following documents. Göß: StUB I, 688; Admont: StUB I, 695, 708, 725; Gleink: StUB I, 696; Rein: StUB I, 247, 261, 263.
Having learned that such expeditions could put a serious strain on imperial accounts, the emperor issued a decree requiring each prospective crusader to produce three marks of silver to cover their travel expenses.\textsuperscript{201} As a result, monastic houses were now receiving even more property in both outright sale, and that which was given as surety against a loan. The usual straightforward donation documents enter the donator and recipient into the same kind of reciprocal agreement described in the first chapter of this work. Most of the charters make explicit reference to the circumstances of the donation, information that was important for both parties. As we have seen, the historical information contained in charters served a variety of functions, both legal and historiographical. These charters chronicled a relationship between lay lords and monastic houses that was deemed mutually beneficial. Crusaders who already saw monasteries as important players in the process from taking the cross to the care of their soul upon their deaths naturally looked to these places to preserve the records of their participation in such a powerful event as a crusade or pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Families and kin networks, though often separated by great distance, were intricately tied together, and these in turn, were bound to the monastic houses they patronized.\textsuperscript{202}

Under the Babenbergs, the pattern of donations in the lead-up to the various journeys undertaken by Styrians is consistent with that of previous campaigns and we can clearly see that the crusading spirit persisted under this dynasty, and likely flourished under the leadership of the prestigious crusading family. The Styrian contingents that accompanied Frederick I and Leopold VI on their various crusading exploits have been mentioned in general outline above, but several charters also survive from this period that provide more detail on the crusaders of the region.\textsuperscript{203}

In 1197, the archbishop of Salzburg donated a church near Fürstenfeld to the Hospitalers, and in 1213 Herrand of Wildon likewise donated a Hof in that same area to the knights.\textsuperscript{204} Frederick of Pettau, who accompanied Leopold VI to the Holy Land in 1217 donated his house in Friesach to the Teutonic Order in 1218, which also benefitted from the gift of two villages called Kroisbach.

\textsuperscript{201} Schmugge, “Zisterzienser, Kreuzzug”, 62-63.
\textsuperscript{202} Lester, “A Shared Imitation”, 353.
\textsuperscript{203} I will here make note of several charters that have been identified by Franz Ilwof (“Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”), but which I have not been able to locate. Provost Otto of Gurk confirmed the donation of Hartwik of Teufenbach’s properties in Glödnitz near Gurk to Spital am Semmering in preparation for his departure with Leopold VI in 1217 (p. 28). Ulrich of Stubenberg’s son, Wulfing, gave his holdings at Arzburg near Passail to Göß for forty-five marks silver before his crusade in that same year (p. 29).
\textsuperscript{204} StUB II, 27 and 133 respectively.
and Hatzendorf by another of Leopold’s Styrian soldiers, Ulrich of Stubenberg. This latter document was given during the Fifth Crusade and was confirmed by Leopold in the camp at Damietta. These documents demonstrate a desire to sustain and increase the knightly orders that propped up the crusading movement both at home and abroad. Moreover, we see that the pious donations from Styrians continued even while these were actively taking part overseas. Even though Leopold did not participate in the Sixth Crusade, it appears that some Styrians nevertheless did. Wulfing of Stubenberg, for instance gave Rein the advocacy of three Huben in Ratenberg near Fohnsdorf before his journey in 1228. His son, Otto, also accompanied Emperor Frederick II on this expedition. Styrians appear to have been eager to take the cross and continue the tradition of crusading within the region irrespective of the participation of their ducal lords.

Over the course of eight decades of crusading spanning the reigns of both the Otakars and the Babenbergs, we have seen a consistent drawing together of monastic and lay interests inspired by the crusading movement throughout Styria. Snapshots of the spiritual, social, and political bonds that were strengthened between these two are captured in the charters that record exchanges of property, privileges, personnel, blessings, prayers and liturgical operations. The crusades increased the stature of monasteries monetarily, politically, materially, and spiritually, building closer ties between court and cloister.

2.6 Vorau’s Historiographical Interest and the Crusades

Toward the end of the twelfth century and throughout the course of the thirteenth, the canons at Vorau appear to have taken a keen interest in historiography and the recording of local, imperial, and non-European events. In the early days of the Vorau scriptorium, the canons created
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205 StUB II, 152 and 153 respectively.
207 StUB II, 257a.
208 Ilwof, “Steiermark und die Kreuzzüge”, 34.
209 Vorau possessed a number of manuscripts with historiographical content in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Among these is MS 33, containing one chronicle of popes and another that also includes the medieval emperors. MSS 171 and 367 also preserve versions of the Melk and Admont Annals that have been modified and added to by the Vorau canons. See also Ch. 1. Franz Ilwof wrote a very brief summary of Styria’s medieval historiographical tradition which, by his own admission, is far from comprehensive and only touches on the best-known texts. It does
practical codices that brought together useful excerpts from well-known authors such as Bernard of Clairvaux and paired them with authors such as Bede, and Honorius Augustodunensis or added annalistic material that they assembled from various sources including the Admont and Salzburg annals. Four such manuscripts are still kept at Vorau: MSS 33, 170, 171, and 367. All of these codices, with their mix of ecclesiastical and historiographical texts display a distinct and perceptible interest in local history and the crusades. The copyists or compilers clearly saw the events in the Holy Land during these two centuries as formative on a number of levels and the way in which they integrated this knowledge into their texts reflects this. The recording of history at Vorau took some precedence, with the newly formed scriptorium producing historiographical texts while working to stock the fledgling foundation with the material necessary for the day-to-day operations of a community living under a rule. Indeed we are left with the impression that in Vorau, there was a recognition that the events of the world constituted a shared experience between court and canons, an attitude very much influenced by the crusading movement of the twelfth century.

Manuscript 33 in the collection of the Stiftsarchiv is a small codex from the twelfth century that contains a wide variety of material in its 175 folios. Excerpts from Cicero, Seneca, Augustine, Bernard of Clairvaux, Ivo of Chartres, Hugo Metellus, Otto of Freising, songs, sermons, tracts on friendship, a text referred to by Fank simply as de contemptu mundi, moral treatises, and texts of all kinds have been collected here. Its last twenty-five folios, however, are taken up by two texts described by their titles as chronicles: Chronica Papalis (151r-154v) and a Chronica summorum pontificum et imperatorum (155r-175r). The first is a rather brief list of popes that runs to 1191, and was later continued by a fifteenth-century hand up to 1455, and the latter is a much more extensive, annalistically organized body of material that reports notable events from

---

Fank, Catalogus Voraviensis, 33-34.

The Chronicle of popes and emperors in Codex 33 is a version of the Melk annals, expanded with Salzburg and Bavarian content, upon which a continuation is built from 1134 onward that can also be found in the Garsten Annals MS (Wien ÖNB, Cod. 340), in another version of the Admont Annal codex 501, and in an early MS kept at Neuburg (Wien ÖNB, Cod. 1180). Maria Mairold, Katalog der datierten Handschriften ausserhalb der Universitätsbibliothek Graz bis zum Jahre 1600 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988).
around the world, but with a distinct imperial and local preference. This second text terminates in the year 1197, which, suggests a date of the late twelfth century, commensurate with the chronology of the papal chronicle.

Written in two columns, the papal chronicle is a very simple list of popes, each assigned a number in the margin. Dates in office, if known, are provided as well as any notable events which might have occurred during their tenure, such as a synod. With the exception of particularly notable pontiffs, very little information is given. The chronicle of popes and emperors which follows, however, is much more extensive. It begins with the birth of Christ, given ab initio mundi, ab urbe condita and the year of the reigning emperor. The early part of this chronicle is rather more like a set of annals, each year (written in the left margin) receives its own line and when there is nothing of note to report, that space is merely left blank. Major events in the life of Christ are among the first events reported, and when the chronicler reaches the twelfth century, of which he was himself a witness, the entries become much fuller, more detailed, and oriented on the region. Dukes of Bavaria and Austria, archbishops of Salzburg, the margrave of Styria and the emperor are the major characters in this chronicle, and the details increasingly focus on these individuals. For example, the birth of Otakar III’s son is noted, and

213 In the case of these manuscripts, we are not dealing with strictly monastic chronicles or annals in the way that Elizabeth van Houts might define them, and we might be tempted to dismiss her discussion of the extension of local chronicles (beyond their beginnings) into the past as irrelevant. Composers of these sources appear to add universal material to a local history in order to lend legitimacy to the founding of a dynasty or monastic institution by showing its genesis in the broader context of history. The Vorau manuscripts containing annals and the pope-emperor lists appear to be adding a smaller amount of local material to a larger, broader body (the Salzburg annals and pope-emperor lists). Is there truly a difference between these two practices though? Connecting local histories to material beyond the avowedly local scope of a work was a common practice among historical writers at this time. Elizabeth van Houts, Local and Regional Chronicles (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), 27-41, esp. 27-29. See also Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken, Studien zur Lateinische Welchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising (Münster: University of Münster, 1957). Hans-Werner Goetz’s numerous studies on this topic are indispensable. Goetz, Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewuβtsein im hohen Mittelalter (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008); Goetz, “Zum Geschichtsbewuβtsein hochmittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreiber”, in Hochmittelalterliches Geschichtsbewuβtsein im Spiegel nichthistorischer Quellen, ed. Hans-Werner Goetz (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998), 55-72; Goetz, “Die Gegenwart der Vergangenheit im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Geschichtsbewuβtsein”, Historische Zeitschrift 255 (1992), 61-97; Goetz, “The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries”, in Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography, ed. Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 139-166; Goetz, “Zum Geschichtsbewusstsein in der alemanischen Klosterchronik des hohen Mittelalters (11.-13. Jahrhunderts)”, Deutsches Archiv 44 (1988), 455-488; Hans Patze, “Klostergründung und Klosterchronik”, Blätter für Landesgeschichte 113 (1977), 89-121; Patze, ed., Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im späten Mittelalter (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1987); J.P. Bodmer, Chroniken und Chronisten im Spätmittelalter (Bern: Francke, 1976); Bernard Guenée, “Histoire, annales, chroniques. Essai sur les genres historiques au Moyen Âge”, Annales ESC 28 (1973), 997-1016; J. Kastner, Historiae fundationum monasterium. Frühformen monastischer Institutionsgeschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter (Munich: Arbeo Gesellschaft, 1974); Gabrielle Spiegel, Romancing the Past. The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).
so too is the fact that he bore the same name. The deaths of both these men also found their way into the text. Interestingly, however, the author makes note of several important medieval historiographers and the dates they composed their works, suggesting a particular interest in these men, their works, and perhaps his own indebtedness to his intellectual forebears. Under the year 187, Origen’s birth is noted, and under the year 395 the author notes that Eusebius composed his *Ecclesiastical History* at this time. This last entry, moreover, is rubricated in a text which displays a very sparse use of this technique. Also rubricated and underlined is the entry for 714, when Bede, it states, composed his *Ecclesiastical History*.

These annals document the major events of the crusades in this period as well. From a local point of view, the duke of Bavaria’s pilgrimage of 1172 is mentioned, so too is that of Leopold of Austria in 1185. The 1144 capture of Edessa, its subsequent retaking in 1155 (according to the annals), a victory of the king of Jerusalem over the Saracens in 1170, and the capture of Richard the Lionheart in Austria on his return from the Third Crusade are also included. Conrad III’s crusade is present under the year 1147, and so too is the information that he and his German contingent were the first to depart for the Holy Land and were subsequently followed by Louis VII. Earlier in the text, the capture of Jerusalem in 1099 is recorded and distinguished from other events by rubrication. When the city falls again in 1187, there is a lengthy entry that details the events surrounding it and under 1189 is a list of those who participated in the subsequent campaign, including abbot Isenrich of Admont. For the chronicle’s composer, the crusades were a matter of importance at the local, imperial, and global level, with implications for salvation history. By beginning his work with the birth of Christ there is a particular emphasis on the Christian era, on Christendom itself, and on the meaning of these events with respect to the coming of Christ and his redemptive act. Orienting the recorded events on Christ creates an interpretational framework that sets them in relation to mankind’s salvation and ultimate fate. The reader is meant to confront history as a divinely arranged sequence of events, and from the perspective of someone who lived in the twelfth century and thought about the events of the Second and Third crusades, the Holy Land loomed large in this picture.

Vorau Stiftsarchiv codex 33 must be considered in relation to several over manuscripts that also transmit historiographical material, in very similar forms, and originating from similar sources. While the provenance of MS 33 is not definitively known, Mairold has suggested Admont as a
place of origin, given the relation of the material to the Admont annals, though Vorau stands as an equally likely possibility. In any event, it is almost certain that this manuscript was in Vorau in the twelfth century. The case for Vorau becomes stronger when this manuscript is compared to the Vorau codex 170, which is a mixed manuscript rather similar in the nature of its contents to 33. This manuscript contains an inscription on one of the parchment flyleaves that indicates it was collected by the provost of Vorau Bernard (1185-1202). This manuscript also contains historiographical material, including excerpts from Jerome, Peter Comestor’s *Historia scholastica*, and Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*. Of even greater significance is the attention paid to the historiographers and their texts, with the compiler of these two manuscripts—almost certainly the provost Bernard—engaging with not only the material of history but the story of its composition, that is historiography proper.

Two additional manuscripts from the thirteenth century, 171 and 376, also transmit annals, and like the material contained in codex 33, the information is largely drawn from the Melk annals, by way of Admont, and supplemented using the Salzburg annals, Honorius Augustodunensis, Martin of Troppau, and more local content of unknown origin. Unlike the chronicle of popes and emperors of manuscript 33, 171’s chronicle begins with the origin of the world and runs into the 1280’s. Although much of the source material is similar, these two manuscripts diverge drastically in their presentation and content. Written in a single column with the year in red in the left-hand margin, the text is something of a temporal mess. Perhaps a reflection of the variety and number of the sources, dates are often out of order or a single year might be recorded multiple times, sometimes separated by the span of a decade. Events are also sometimes given under the wrong year, such as the Second Crusade, which according to this codex took place in
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214 A list of books kept at Vorau was recorded around the year 1200 in Stiftsarchiv codex 17, folio 183v. One of the entries is given merely as *sermones Bernardi*, and probably refers to this codex. Generally the codices are titled for the first work they contain, and MS 33’s first 44 folios are tracts authored by Bernard of Clairvaux. Pius Fank, “Kam die Vorauer Handschrift”, 382-383.

215 *Hunc librum a Bernhardo praeposito sancte marie sanctoque Thome et uorowensi ecclesie collatvm qui abstulerit anathema sit.* Manuscripts 276 and 277 bear very similar remarks of ownership, both of which refer to Bernard I.

216 On folio 4v of this manuscript, the copyist has made a note in one of the excerpts from Jerome that states, “Our codices do not have this.” *Hoc nostri codices non habent.* This may be a reference to one of Vorau’s other historiographical manuscripts.


218 For example, the entry for 1153 is given on 109r and then again on 110v sandwiched between the years 1166 and 1167. This is just one example. Many more could be given.
The copyist or compiler shows little of the diligence and care that can be found in codex 33. Despite the loose chronology, the crusades feature prominently in this chronicle. While the report on the First Crusade is comparatively brief, that of the Second Crusade is quite lengthy and provides a great deal of detail about the circumstances of the expedition, the major participants, the journey, destinations, and even an anecdote about the treachery of the Greeks who, distrustful of such a large body of foreign soldiers, often skirmished with the German crusaders. Little of the disaster that accompanied this campaign found its way into this depiction, and it concludes with the knowledge that the crusaders, “waged many glorious battles.”

The major events in the Holy Land for the next several decades are also depicted, such as Saladin’s successful campaign in the late 1180’s, the Third Crusade, and the infamous siege of Damietta in 1220. Once the copyist or compiler reached the thirteenth century the entries become much more detailed and expansive with a primary interest in imperial and local affairs, especially the conflict between Austria and Hungary, although he seems rather well provisioned for events in the twelfth century, as well. Generally anything outside the Empire, with the exception of events in the east, receives only cursory attention. This untitled compilation clearly prioritizes local history over the imperial, and the copyist almost certainly had a greater body of material to work with in addition to his own experiences. In the booklist of the Vorau custos Dietrich from about 1300, two chronicles are listed, one of which is likely MS 171.

The second of these thirteenth-century manuscripts also contains a set of the annals compiled from many of the same sources as 171. Codex 367 contains fifty folios of texts by various authors including Seneca, Bernard of Clairvaux, and Isidore. It was copied in Salzburg and Vorau and probably compiled at the latter location. The remaining eighty-four folios are taken up by the chronicle. Leading up to the birth of Christ the text is that of Martin of Troppau’s papal and imperial chronicle, but the format changes drastically thereafter. Each year, given inside a rubricated box in the left margin, receives its own line. When no event worth noting
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219 The chronicle in MS 33, it should be noted, correctly situates the crusade under the year 1147.
220 Huius tempore dux Boamundus cum christianis recuperavit sepulchrum domini sepultus in ecclesia Lateranensis. Fol. 105r
221 multa bella gloriosa gesserunt. fol. 108v. This entry is taken almost verbatim from Martin of Troppau’s chronicle and can also be found in the Anonymi Leobiensis Chronicum, a continuation of the Iohannes Victoriensis’ Liber certarum historiarum.
222 MS 343.
occurred, the year is still given and a line left blank. One of the chief differences between this version and that in 171 is that the compiler/author of the 367 chronicle is not nearly as well-informed about the twelfth century. The purely annalistic form which begins after the birth of Christ really broadens out by the end of the twelfth into full blown entries for each year that go well beyond the synchronic form of Martin of Troppau. Well worth noting is the central place of the crusades within the various narrative threads. Although the capture of Jerusalem is conspicuously absent, the crusade of 1147 is mentioned, including some of the participants. From this point, events in the Holy Land are described in more detail, even though not all campaigns are treated equally. In 1187, the individual cities captured by Saladin are listed and a brief description of the plight of those Christians residing there has also been given. The subsequent crusade makes up a lengthy passage that rolls right into the death of Barbarossa and the persistence of the kings of England and France in reaching the Holy Land after this disaster. Shortly after, the chronicler reports on the cause of the rift between these two, the consequent abandonment of the campaign by Philip Augustus, Richard’s peace with Saladin, his retreat and capture by Leopold of Austria. Strangely, again, the Fourth Crusade does not feature, but the fall of Damietta and the campaign to reclaim it during the Fifth constitutes one of the longest passages in the text. The 1229 surrender of Jerusalem and much of the Holy Land during the Sixth Crusade receives a full half folio, and so too the end of its brief stand in 1239. King Louis IX’s disastrous Seventh Crusade in 1248 is described in significant detail, and the chronicler mentions several subsequent smaller campaigns in correspondingly brief fashion.

Although these three manuscripts share similar sources, they are still distinct from one another. Copyists at Vorau and Salzburg would have had access to many different manuscripts containing these sources and the three codices reflect the idiosyncrasies inherent in manuscript culture. They may have used the same source works, but the manuscripts they drew from were different, as the texts digress often and to varying extents. Moreover, the compiler of MS 33 performed his work before Martin of Troppau, one of the major sources for the subsequent Vorau manuscript chronicles, was alive to compose his work. The three ‘versions’ discussed here were compiled at different times, by different individuals driven by different impulses, which imbue these texts with an individual quality that has been steamrolled by source criticism scholarship, which tends to reduce creative acts of productive reception to manuscript variants in an apparatus. Vorau’s collection of historiographical texts, in particular the twelfth-century codex
33, shows an eagerness to engage with the events of that century as parts of a connected history. The crusades feature prominently in these three expositions of a primarily local history, and the treatment of these campaigns as events of regional, imperial, and Christian-global significance evidence a historical consciousness on the part of the compilers. Monastic and canonical communities like Vorau, centres of crusading support, bear witness to the drawing together of lay and spiritual ideals that were a feature of this movement. Although the historiographical texts such as annals can appear skeletal, or merely committed to parchment without reflection, they are important witnesses to a social phenomenon that brought lay lords and their monasteries into closer connection and created a shared interest. Historiographical forms like the pope-emperor chronicles so popular throughout this period reflect an ever present tension in Christian society concerning the interplay of secular and religious power. The resumption of a (more or less) cooperative position between the wielders of the two swords brought about by the crusades demonstrated the potential of a harmonious attitude. Recording the crusades is a testament to their status in the worldview of the canons, and a statement that would shape the impression of the past for subsequent generations. The sweeping social and religious importance of the crusades is bound up in what was often just a few words.

2.7 The Interplay of Power, Piety, and Salvation in the Iconographic Program of the Johannes-Kapelle in Pürgg.

Otakar III’s many monastic foundations testify to his own strong sense of piety, and the energy and generosity with which he supported them throughout his life, following the example of his predecessors, confirms this impression. Firmly in the camp of the papist party for much of the Investiture Conflict, the Styrian Otakars were also consistently supportive of Europe’s innovative monastic movements. Otakar II supported the archbishop of Salzburg in the second decade of the twelfth century when he was forced to flee to Saxony for four years, even taking over the

---

225 Otakar II was the first of the Styrian margraves to side with the pope. His older brother and predecessor, Adalbero, supported Henry IV, and even went as far as to attack the influential abbey of Admont and the bishop of Würzburg, for which actions he earned himself a papal ban in 1074. Adalbero’s murder is likely the result of the unpopularity of his political positions. Mezler-Andalberg, “Kirchenreform”, 144; Otakar II also rescued the patriarch of Aquileia in 1105 when Engelbert, the Count of Görz imprisoned him. Gaisberger, *Lauriacum*, 298.
advocacy of Admont and St. Ehrentrud in Salzburg in the archbishop’s absence. Otakar II’s son, Leopold, invited the Cistercians to the region when he founded Rein, a most progressive choice that demonstrated his awareness of spiritual trends and an eagerness to be a part of them. His successor continued this inclination toward spiritual innovation when he became the first ruler to found a Carthusian house (Seitz, 1165) in the Empire. Evelyn Weiss has interpreted this progressive act as evidence of the fact that Otakar III was a very pious ruler. She suggests, moreover, that the great number of small chapels he founded within the region is even greater evidence of his devotion, and cites an inscription dedicating one of Vorau’s oldest manuscripts to him as an indication of the margrave’s personal interest in the artistic and architectural production of the region’s religious houses. At least one of these chapels survives with its program of iconography intact, offering us a glimpse of the religiosity these frescoes reflect.

The small Johannes-Kapelle in Pürgg, near the Otakarian seat of Steyr, is generally believed to have originated in the mid-twelfth century, and scholars have suggested that the personal and private nature of the structure indicates a close connection to Otakar III. In fact, it is likely that the margrave, as the founder and funder of the place, played some part in determining the way in which his vision of piety would be expressed, even if the specific iconography would have been developed by a knowledgeable member of the Church. The program is one of contrast and transition. On the south wall near the door at the west end we see the image of the war of cats and mice (fig. 2), an allegory of the virtues and vices with which each must come to terms. Across from this, a devil is torturing an innocent soul. Worldly vice and damnation dominate the first impression of those entering the structure, whose gaze is inevitably drawn

---

227 Ibid., 153.
228 Regarding the manuscript, see Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese, 490 and 543; Evelyn Weiss, “Der Freskenzyklus der Johanneskapelle in Pürgg”, Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte 22 (1969), 11.
229 At the turn of the previous century, Johann Graus dated the frescoes to about 1200, but more recently scholars agree that the two founding figures depicted are most likely Godfrey, abbot of Admont, and Otakar III, suggesting a date around the mid-century. Johann Graus, “Romanische Wandmalerei zu Pürgg und Hartberg”, Mitteilungen des k.k Central-Commission N.F. XXVII (1902), 78ff; Otto Demus, “Salzburg, Venedig, und Aquileia”, in Festschr. für K.M Swoboda (Wiesbaden-Vienna, 1959), 75 ff; Kurt Woisetschläger and Peter Krenn, eds., Alte Steirische Herrlichkeiten. 800 Jahre Kunst in der Steiermark (Graz: Verlag Styria, 1968), p. 16 and plate 9. See also, Walter Frodl, “Ein neuuaufgedeckter Freskenzyklus in Pürgg”, Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege 7 (1953), 49-55.
230 Mezler-Andalberg, “Kirchenreform”, 156.
231 Philipp Dollwetzel, Die romanischen Wandmalereien in der Johanneskapelle in Pürgg-Trautenfels (Steiermark) [Diss.] (Salzburg, 2010) has a much more complete offering of images. See also Monika Kütner, Die malerische Ausstattung der Johanneskapelle auf der Pürgg. Beschreibung, Deutung und Ikonographie der Wandgemälde des Langhauses [Diss.] (Graz, 2000)
towards the opposite end and the choir arch, where Christ, the ultimate spiritual goal, sits enthroned. Between these two extremes, however, a program of progression unfolds that leads the viewer from a state of worldly sin through personifications of the virtues toward an ultimate state of grace. On the choir arch to either side of Christ Cain and Abel make their offerings. Below these two, are the founders, Otakar III (fig. 5) on the Cain, and Godfrey of Admont on the Abel side, both with hands upraised in submission and prayer. The parable of the wise and foolish virgins runs on either side of the upper nave with the wise on the Abel side and the foolish on the Cain side, processing towards Christ as examples—both positive and negative—that lead the way to salvation. The lower portions of the north and south walls depict scenes from the life of Christ, mirroring, through the metaphor of growth and age, the notion of progression from one state to another. Passing through the choir arch into a figuratively holy state, the patrons of the chapel, John the Baptist and John the Evangelist decorate the east wall. On the north and south walls of the choir there are two arcades, with the figures of two bishops opposite two kings, David and Melchisedech (fig. 4). Adorning the ceiling of the choir is the agnus dei, surrounded by the symbols of the evangelist and the four nations.

Of particular interest are the figures that adorn the walls of the choir. The two patron Johns are fairly self-explanatory, but the bishops and the kings stand forth as examples of secular and

232 The conflict of the four virtues (Justitia, Veritas, Misericordia, and Pax), depicted as the daughters of God, was a popular allegorical motif in the Middle Ages among both Latin and vernacular authors. They disagree over the fate of the soul of man in his fallen state. While the first two see him as damned, the latter two see him as pardoned. It is a stalemate only resolved by the redemptive act of God. The allegory originated in the mid-twelfth century with Bernard of Clairvaux (Sermones in Annuntiatione BMV), Peter the Venerable (Tractatus contra Petrobrusianos), and Hugh of St. Victor (Annotationes in quosdam Psalmos LXIII), based on an interpretation of Psalm 84,11f. In addition, the motif appears in several MHG texts roughly contemporary to Vorau 276, such as Das Anegenge (28,3-29,85) and Von gottes barmherzigkeit (mid-thirteenth century). See Waltraud Timmermann, “Streit der vier Töchter Gottes”, in VL, ed. Kurt Ruh (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), vol. 9, cols. 395-402.

233 This is the same Godfrey of Admont who accompanied Conrad III on the Second Crusade. The juxtaposition of Cain and Abel may seem a rather unfavourable comparison for the medieval ruler to make for himself. However, perhaps it is merely meant to underscore the holiness of Godfrey and the contrasting worldliness of his companion. Or, these two figures represent, in an extreme manner, the religious and the worldly. In any case, Otakar III was drawing a contrast between himself and the venerable abbot consistent with the program of decoration that frequently uses juxtaposition to great effect (for instance in the wise and foolish virgins). Indeed it seems somewhat unusual that Otakar might have himself associated with Cain in these frescoes. However, we might read this as an expression of humility. Rather than style himself after the more positive biblical figure, this honour has been reserved for the Godfrey, a man of great spiritual repute. Otakar, a layman, is more fittingly associated with the foolish virgins and Cain, whose offering was rejected. Cain’s initial attempt to please God appears to be the focus of this scene—and not the fratricide—in which both brothers make offerings. Otakar must continue to strive to please God and pay particular heed to the negative example with which he appears to be associated in these frescoes.

235 The bishops are believed to be Saints Rupert and Vergilius, both early bishops of Salzburg. Woisetschläger and Peter Krenn, Alte Steirische Herrlichkeiten, 16.
ecclesiastical or heavenly power on earth, and they constitute a particularly forceful and telling image of the twelfth-century piety of lay rulers. The crusading movement and the establishment of the crusader states provided a kind of reassurance that the pursuit of worldly power could also serve religious ends. Conflict in the previous century between the two representatives of God’s authority on earth, the papacy and the Empire, had shaken the notion of the cooperative wielding of the temporal and spiritual swords, but Christian rulers, especially those like the Otakars who had taken a risky stance against their secular lords, were presented with an opportunity of fruitful reconciliation. James Schultz believes that many of the vernacular historiographical texts of the period are reflections on the interplay of secular political power and the spiritual vocations of lay rulers who commissioned the texts.236 The opposition of the two exemplary biblical kings—certainly chosen for their typological value—and the bishops represent an ideal of unity in the goals of secular and ecclesiastical power. The drawing together of interests prompted by the crusades opened the door to the possibility of worldly power once again working toward spiritual end and this was a particularly attractive notion to lay rulers.

David and Melchisedech embody the idea of worldly rulership in harmony with divine precepts, and the bishops opposite them reinforce the concept of unity between the two hierarchies. In Genesis 14:18, Melchisedech, the king of Salem comes out to meet Abram after his victory over King Chedorlaomer, offering bread and wine. Melchisedech, the king, is also described as the priest of the highest God and he blesses Abram after his victory.237 The value of this example of a king who is also a servant of the lord performing a ritual distinctly similar to the sacrament of communion for a victorious soldier is clear in a twelfth-century crusading context. For Otakar III, who commissioned this chapel and its decoration, the ideal of a cooperation of secular and ecclesiastical authorities to the mutual benefit of both amounted to a veritable domestic policy.238 Otakar’s politics and piety appear united in this example, and we are provided with a pictorial representation in one of his personal places of worship. Above the two kings sits the Lamb of God—the eschatological focus of personal spirituality—and the four evangelists, who here represent the spreading of the faith across the world, depicted in the symbolism of four nations or

236 Schulz, Sovereignty, 1ff.
237 “But Melchisedech, the king of Salem, offered bread and wine, for he was the priest of the highest God.” At vero Melchisedech rex Salem proferens panem et vinum erat enim sacerdos Dei altissimi. Genesis 14:18.
238 See note 41 in Ch. 1. A document given in Otakar’s name in 1138 includes the following statement. “…so that in the guardianship of the servants of God (i.e. the monks of Rein), secular power might increase along with priestly authority.” ...ut in servorum dei tutela, cum sacerdotali auctoritate etiam secularis potestas euigilet. StUB I, no 175.
regions of the world. The program of the choir is a historical reflection of the divine order of the world and the role that rulers and rulership play within it, a mode of piety reinforced by the iconography of progression from a state of sin to one of grace that leads from the western door to the choir in the east. The iconographic program of this small chapel provides evidence that Otakar III’s policy and his piety were inseparable, and his role as a ruler was an essential and defining characteristic of his self-conception as a Christian.

Figure 2. War of the cats and mice. South wall, Johanneskapelle, Pürgg. 239

239 Images courtesy of Phillip Dollwetzel, Die romanischen Wandmalereien in der Johanneskapelle in Pürgg-Trautenfels (Steiermark) [Diss.] (University of Salzburg, 2010).
In order to progress into the choir one must pass beneath the choir arch, which features Cain and Abel, abbot Godfrey of Admont, Otakar III (depicted as founder), and Christ. Along the arch, however, runs a peculiar band of ornamentation that strongly resembles Cufic script (fig. 6). Mezler-Andelberg, a scholar whose work acknowledges the widespread impact of the crusades in Styria, suggests that this borrowing from eastern culture is a remnant, or at least a nod, to Otakar III’s experience in the east.\footnote{Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 155. Evelyn Weiss, however, disputes the assertion that the Cufic script ornamentation is connected to the crusades. Alternatively, she suggests it results from the influence of Byzantine art which she believes arrived in Styria by way of the march’s Italian connections in Friuli. She presents a small number of analogous cases of similar decoration in manuscripts from the period produced in Salzburg and elsewhere. This} Even if Otakar did not participate in the Second Crusade,
his 1164 expedition (described as a crusade in the Lambach Annals) is nevertheless a testament to his interest in the movement. The proximity of the two crusaders (Godfrey and Otakar) to the band of script certainly reinforces Mezler-Andelberg’s opinion that a crusading connection lay behind the inclusion of the script. In thus positioning himself in relation to the crusader Godfrey, Otakar might have been attempting to participate in the former’s crusading glory, in light of his (likely) failure to participate in mid-century. The campaigns to the east were, after all, occasions for significant amounts of cultural transfer, and the power of these encounters with different cultures left their mark in contemporary crusader accounts.\textsuperscript{241}

![Figure 5. Otakar III. Choir arch.](image)

\textsuperscript{241} The Byzantine hypothesis is founded on some other stylistic elements drawn from that region that can be seen in the depiction of the Pürgg chapel’s human figures. The echoes of this school of art do not extend to other decorative elements in the chapel’s frescoes, however. Weiss’s outright rejection of the notion that crusading experience might lie behind the incorporation of these elements does not account for the fact that they might have been popular in the region precisely because they were reminiscent of the east and the powerful symbolism that region entailed. While the Cufic decoration may have come by way of Byzantium, its origin does not account for its popularity or appeal. Weiss nevertheless acknowledges the enormous impact crusading had on the region, (erroneously) citing a document in which the margrave made his crusading intention clear. Precisely why she rules out the influence of the crusades here is unclear.

Perhaps we can read this element as part of a larger statement about the personal piety of Otakar III, who certainly saw crusading and the corresponding indulgence as powerful redemptive tools. Redemption and the journey towards it is a theme of the overall decorative program and the location of this element of ornamentation holds greater significance in this context. Perhaps it acknowledges the east, crusading, and their redemptive power; in order to enter the holiest area of the chapel, one must pass beneath the decorated arch from west to east, which amounts to a symbolic pilgrimage or crusade. This decorative element is widely acknowledged by modern scholars for its distinctiveness with respect to the rest of the frescoes, and twelfth-century visitors, too, would likely have been struck by it, their minds drawn to the east while taking part in the weekly rituals of the mass. The size of the chapel denotes a close group of patrons centred on the margrave himself, who would have been aware of his past and the role that the Holy Land played in his life. Just as many others across Western Europe Otakar III felt the powerful lure of the Holy Land, as evidenced by his (possible) mid-century crusade and a (certain) journey in early 1160’s. It is this personal connection that suggests that the Cufic script, a symbol of the liberating power of the east, was of personal value, even if the experience of many others mirrored his own.

The Johannes-Kapelle in Pürgg presents a window into the piety of a twelfth-century lay lord, rare for both its visual and personal nature. It is an excellent example of the alignment of secular and religious interests among the twelfth-century nobility of this region. A concise and accessible statement about lay rulers and their self-conception as Christians, the frescoes in Pürgg invite reflection on this topic immediately upon entering the structure. As mere men they are confronted with their sinful nature by the devil and the desperate struggle between virtue and vice depicted opposite. The pious founder/crusader and his monastic/crusader ally depicted on the choir arch demonstrate the convergence of lay and ecclesiastical lords along the path to salvation, drawn together visually and conceptually by the symbolism of the east, the Holy Land, as a locus of redemption. Within the choir, the depictions of power and authority exercised within a divinely ordained framework of the universe bring the moralistic program of the western

end of the building to bear on secular lords, prompting reflection on salvation not only as mere men, but now also as rulers and leaders. The crusades played a major part in creating this image of lay piety, and the propaganda that had such an impact on the nobility during the twelfth century played the same angle, appealing to their sense of self as lords and rulers. Crusade propaganda prompted serious consideration of worldly authority in a Christian context, and encouraged the version of piety amongst Styria’s laity which can be glimpsed in the remarkable frescoes of the Pürgg chapel.

Fig. 6. Cufic script band, choir arch.
2.8 Conclusion

The younger paper chronicle of Schachtel 263 in the Vorau Stiftsarchiv notes that the duke, after conceding his inability to take part in the crusade, devoted himself to the monastic and canonical foundations of his fathers. Physically barred from the experience of crusading, Otakar IV turned to his family’s other great tradition—of generous monastic patronage—to demonstrate his piety and prepare for his death. The relation between these two events is telling of the deep
connection between noble piety, crusading, and monasteries in Styria. At some point close to the end of his life, Duke Otakar IV made a gift of his Italian properties to an organization that served as a strong symbol of the union of monastic and knightly modes of life. The Templars were perhaps a natural coming together of lay warrior and monk, two of the crusading movement’s most important figures. Otakar IV’s donation to these knights signaled his desire to support the crusading movement through his patronage, and suggests that the spate of charitable actions around 1190 was driven by the same motivation. Although the Templars may have been an inimitable example for many, the significance of their dual lives as (formerly lay) warriors and monks was apparent, and as Bernard of Clairvaux’s treatise in support of this unheralded fusion of seemingly opposing modes of life makes clear, it was the subject of an interest sparked by relatability. Long before the crusades came about, there was a spiritualization of knightly norms that added an element of sanctity to the mode of life practiced by those who would eventually take the cross. The blessing of swords, for instance, was a ritual that amounted to a virtual sanction of violent conduct, an inclusive gesture that afforded lay violence the sanctity of a liturgical performance. Contracting a group of brothers to pray for one’s physical and spiritual health on crusade, moreover, imparted to an individual a status within that community as a quasi-member. Taking the cross was a sacred oath that brought with it religious obligations. Once the crusader had agreed to fight for Christ, he was, in a very real way, bound to a code of behaviour and honour. Crusaders were less stringent versions of their later counterparts in the military orders, taking on some of the qualities of the brothers who supported their endeavours.

242 Valentinelli, Diplomatarium Portusnaonense, no. 4. See also Begotti, Templari e giovanniti, 61ff.
244 The idea that lay people could become a part of the monastery in a way that was more than symbolic is reflected in the memorial practices of many communities. There was an order or hierarchy to the memorial practices of the monastery. Generalis fraternitatis societas was the lowest general rank on the commemorative scale, and depending on the monastery, there were also sollemnia anniversaria, precipua anniversaria, magna or mediocre, as at Cluny. This is also evidenced in necrologies and anniversarial books from St. Benigne de Dijon and Michelsberg in Bamberg. At Michelsberg, in fact, there were divisions within the books of brotherhood, with the donator listed as either frater, and plenus frater. If one were a frater plenus, one’s memoria and commemorative services were of the same status and priority as one of the cloistered brothers. In this last example, there is a clearly defined parity between the donator being commemorated and one of the brothers, and after death, at the very least, these two shared the same status within the monastery. The Styrian necrologies clearly make distinctions between the names of those they record. Otakar, as noted in the previous chapter, is frequently named fundator, a title that carried particularly high status. Willibald Sauerländer and Joachim Wollasch, “Stiftergedenken und Stifterfiguren in Naumburg”, in Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter, eds. Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1984), 362.
but maintaining the capacity for violence that marked them as lay nobles. *Miles Christi*, after all, was a term originally applied to cloistered monks who had pointedly spurned their lay origin.\(^{245}\)

The monastery was a crucial point of reference as a crusader assumed his role, and his departure from a cloistered community was rich in a symbolism that was fostered by these institutions. It was not the exit itself that bore the significance, but rather the monastery as a point of origin. Men departing for war in the Holy Land were taking a part of these communities with them, not leaving them behind.

The crusades created the conditions for a much closer relationship between lay nobility and monastic houses and the union of lay warrior and monk that the military orders represented demonstrated that some of the dynamics of this relationship involved a certain amount of identity blurring, albeit symbolic. This phenomenon might also be seen in the participation of the leaders of some of the region’s monastic institutions. In the Styrian documents that record donations and proclaim the donator a crusader we have seen the eagerness with which not only the region’s nobility, but also its ruling house seized upon the opportunity to go to the Holy Land, assume the identity of crusaders, and engage with monastic institutions in this new capacity. The events of the Holy Land and those who took part in them were equally relevant to court and cloister, noble and canon, serving as a point of spiritual, personal, and dynastic discourse between them. As we have seen, crusading constituted an important point of reference for Otakarian identity throughout the twelfth century and the Styrian monasteries played a key role in presenting the spiritual, personal, and dynastic significance of these campaigns, which took on such a powerful defining force. This was indeed the scene that had developed in Styria throughout the course of the twelfth century, the context into which Otakar IV was born, Vorau was founded, and the Styrian succession played out. Under the new Babenberg house a vigorous embracing of the crusading spirit within the duchy saw many of that region’s inhabitants continue to take the cross, and these campaigns continued to constitute a relevant theme.

Chapter 3
*Kaiserchronik, Alexander, and Ezzolied. Texts for a Styrian Context.*

3.1 Introduction

Throughout the twelfth century, the crusades and the Holy Land held great attraction for Europe’s lay nobles. Apart from the broader consequences of the movement, a crusade’s redemptive possibilities appealed to many on a personal level.¹ In the previous chapter, I explored some of the ways in which Styria was influenced by, and participated in, the crusades and I emphasized how this movement became an influential dynamic engrained in the relationship between the Otakarian (and later Babenberg) court and the region’s monastic and canonical institutions. Propaganda designed to increase support for armed expeditions in the Holy Land targeted lay nobles by appealing to their heritage and sense of identity as Christian rulers, concepts intricately linked to the monastic communities that created and maintained it.² We have seen this process at work in Styria around the time of the creation of Vorau Codex 276 and we know that the propaganda was influential in the region under the Otakars and Babenbergs but we have yet to see where the Vorau manuscript and its texts fit into a social, political, and literary landscape that was so strongly influenced by the crusading movement.

Looking at the content and the proliferation of historiographical works produced across Europe in the wake of the First and Second Crusades, these campaigns provided a powerful impetus for composition.³ Those responsible for the output of books and texts in the region of Styria were clearly inspired by the events that were playing out on the contested fringes of Christendom. The resulting spate of historiographical production spans several genres and the modes in which authors, compilers, and redactors operated—rewriting, reworking, and updating older texts—shows a thoroughgoing engagement with the subject matter. At Admont, presumably inspired by the crusading zeal of that monastery’s abbot, two texts on Archbishop Thiemo of Salzburg, famed martyr of Welf IV’s crusade of 1101, were composed in the early twelfth century, a *vita*¹

---

³ On this topic see Ch. 2 at note 15.
and a versified passio.⁴ The later versified version was most likely composed by one of the monks who accompanied him east, as that campaign and Thiemo’s martyrdom occupy the bulk of the text.⁵ Admont had a close connection with the archbishops of Salzburg, having been founded by Gebhard in 1074 and settled by monks from St. Peter’s, located in that city.⁶ However, it was undoubtedly the prelate’s participation in Welf’s expedition and his sensational demise at the hands of the enemies of Christ that inspired the work. The versified life of Thiemo is a much different text than its predecessor, which predominantly treats the period of the bishop’s life in the lead up to the crusade. For the Admont monks, the second text must have addressed a gap they found in the first, namely, an exposition of Thiemo’s life that foregrounded his activities during the crusades.

Around that time, an anonymous Admont monk also took the text of Robert of Rheims’s Historia Hierosolimitana, a rewriting of the Gesta Francorum that was too simplistic for the tastes of his abbot, and reworked it into a versified version with some additional material of unknown origin.⁷ The poem, 4,850 lines of Lenonine hexameter, occupies folios 35r-65v in the Admont Codex 267, paired with Metellus of Tegernsee’s Quirinalia and another vita of Quirinus.⁸ Widely believed to be a German, the author elevates the status of the small German contingent present on the First Crusade, lending a kind of patriotic air to the narrative.⁹ Indeed, there must have been a demand for such texts, which took pains to incorporate the Germans in the narration of a historical episode that did not include them in any significant way. Styria is a region in which we might expect an elevated interest in the First Crusade, given the participation of several of its most noteworthy ecclesiastical officials. It is unclear whether the anonymous Admont monk’s text was intended to be a coopting or correction of the narrative in the same way that Robert of Rheims retold the Gesta, but the opportunity to merely copy Robert’s text for the

---

⁴ Ilwof, “Steiermärkische Geschichtsschreibung”, 90. The Vita Thiemonis can be found in Georg Heinrich Pertz, ed., Vita Gebehardi, Thiemonis, Chunradi, Eberhardi, Chunradi II Archiepiscoporum cum chronic Admuntensi MGH SS 11 (Hannover: Hahn, 1881). The text can be found in Admont Codex 497.
⁵ W. Wattenbach, ed., “Passio Thiemonis archiepiscopi”, in Gesta archiepiscoporum Salisburgensium MGH Scriptores in Folo Bd. 11 (Hannover: Hahn, 1854), 51-62.
⁶ Tomek, Geschichte der Diözese, 269-271.
⁹ Jacobsen surmises that the author had a German poem at his disposal when he composed the Wicher episode in his text. Ibid., 162-163.
famed Admont library was rejected in favour of a reworking that produced, for all intents and purposes, a new text.¹⁰

In these examples from Admont, we can see a more clearly articulated manifestation of the deeply engrained monastic interest in the crusades that is present in the historiographical material at Vorau. Indeed, the crusades affected all elements of society and were a natural topic of discourse. Lay and religious elements of society were partnered in sustaining the Holy Land as a locus of salvation and the crusades as a means of advancing simultaneously the cause of Christendom and their own dynastic honour.¹¹ These sentiments formed the core of the rhetoric that moved Styria’s lay nobles and added another defining dimension to their engagement with their monasteries. We cannot, therefore, regard the Vorau manuscript’s inclusion of material that touched on these topics as coincidental. This large and expensive codex is rivaled in its size and grandeur only by two liturgical manuscripts kept at the Stiftsarchiv¹² and no aspect of its appearance or content suggests a haphazard collection of texts.¹³ Rather, the prominent place of crusading rhetoric in this manuscript suggests an envisaged potential reading public that had a distinct interest in the movement. Otto of Freising’s Gesta Friderici transmits two well-known pieces of propaganda—the papal bull Quantum Praedecessores as well as one of Bernard of Clairvaux’s crusading encyclicals—that were highly influential in Styria.¹⁴ We have seen the extent of the impact of crusade propaganda in both the lay and religious spheres of that region, and as a result we can be confident that the group or groups who commissioned and used the Vorau manuscript were part of a cultural milieu influenced by this movement. A desire to engage with the crusades clearly motivated the textual and manuscript production of the Admont brothers and incited them to update or rework older forms to suit their purposes, but at Vorau, due to the nature of the sources, we cannot speak directly of the crusades as motivation. This chapter will examine three texts, the Kaiserchronik, Alexander, and the Ezzolied in order to demonstrate that many of manuscript’s texts, regardless of the circumstances of their original composition, found a renewed relevance in this context because they were germane to the

¹⁰ For more on Admont’s rich codicological heritage and its place in the broader landscape of intellectual monastic life in the twelfth century see Alison I. Beach, ed., Manuscripts and Monastic Culture. Reform and Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007).
¹¹ On this topic see Ch. 2 at note 3.
¹² Vorau Stiftsarchiv HSS 20, and 21.
¹³ Wolf, Buch und Text, 210-211.
¹⁴ Otto of Freising, Gesta Fridericis, Book I, 37; Ibid., Book I, 44.
interest of the intended users.\textsuperscript{15} I will highlight elements that would have derived their cultural relevance, at least in some measure, from the crusading movement. There may have been no need to rework the texts, contrary to the Admont cases, because they were, regardless of their age and original social setting, relevant (again) in this new crusading context.

### 3.2 Crusade Propaganda and the Vorau Manuscript

Crusade propaganda found its most direct expression in the Vorau manuscript in the form of Otto of Freising’s *Gesta Friderici I. imperatoris*. The previous chapter covered this material in much greater detail and I do not intend to reiterate it here, but a clear image of the importance of crusade propaganda in this text is crucial to understanding its place in the manuscript. Otto’s chronicle represents the closest expression of contemporary perspectives on the crusading movement of any of the manuscript’s texts. It also offers direct and unequivocal evidence of the efficacy of the movement’s rhetoric and propaganda within the empire, and Styria itself. It is a crucial point of reference for the other texts and their own expressions of crusader sentiments, whether they were intentional on the part of the author or only perceived on the part of the public. In either case, the material contained in Otto’s work demonstrates the heavy influence of the crusades on contemporary historians.

For a work that took a single emperor as its subject, the *Gesta*’s prologue and first book devotes a considerable amount of space to the Second Crusade and its impact on the twelfth century. Otto describes the people of that period as having been inspired by God to take up arms against the eastern people, as if the entire age were animated by the crusading spirit.\textsuperscript{16} In Book I, he refers to the peace brought about by the Second Crusade and provides a narration of the fractured and violent state of the empire at that time.\textsuperscript{17} He then returns to the subject of the period of peace, and recounts Bernard of Clairvaux’s role in convincing Louis of France to take the cross. At this point (Book I, 37), Otto reproduces in full the text of the bull *Quantum Praedecessores*

\textsuperscript{15} The *Kaiserchronik* was introduced in Ch. 1 of this work. The *Vorau Alexander* (ca. 1160) recounts the early part of Alexander’s life up to and including his defeat of Darius, where it breaks off. The *Ezzolied* (ca. 1063) is a poem that focuses on the historical and theological significance of the life of Christ.

\textsuperscript{16} Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici*, Prologue to Book I. There is some debate about the extent to which Europe’s nobles complied with the Peace of God declaration. See note 10 in Chapter 2 of this work for more on this topic. For a summary of the history of this question see Bull, “The Roots of Lay Enthusiasm”, 177-180.

\textsuperscript{17} Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici*, Book I, 31-32.
and its powerful challenge to the nobility to live up to their fathers’ deeds of a half century earlier. This, in turn, is followed by a narration of Adam of Ebrach’s preaching in Regensburg and the recruitment of the imperial magnates.\textsuperscript{18} It is particularly interesting to note an instance of marginalia in the Vorau manuscript at this point. On folio 147r, a \textit{maniculum} draws the reader’s attention to the passage in which Eugenius calls on the sons to imitate their fathers and to uphold the nobility and honour accumulated by their predecessors. Immediately following this, one of Bernard’s crusading encyclicals is reproduced, with its emphasis on the humanity of Christ and the imitability of his example.\textsuperscript{19} The coronation of Conrad’s son Henry VI in Frankfurt occupies the next two chapters, but a painful lament at the result of the Second Crusade and an explanation for his reluctance to narrate the events of the expedition make up a lengthy section.\textsuperscript{20} Despite aversion to the tragic outcome of the crusade, he reports its beginning and the army’s travel through the Balkans, where a sudden flood nearly wiped out the force together with its train of supplies.\textsuperscript{21} The author discerned some value in narrating the ominous start to the expedition, as an indication of Frederick’s good fortune. Following a very lengthy theological digression that involves a discussion of the heresy trial of Bishop Gilbert de la Porrée of Poitiers, and a few remarks on Abelard, Otto returns to the subject of the Second Crusade. At length he discusses the ultimate virtue of the expedition, and argues that the true outcome should not be regarded as the destruction of the western force, but the good it did in providing salvation for so many.\textsuperscript{22} Book I concludes with the death of Conrad and a pledge to turn, in earnest, to the titular subject.

The first book of Otto’s work was meant to set the scene, describing the years leading up to Frederick’s coronation. Since the Second Crusade was the defining event of the mid-century, it received a great deal of attention. But the lengths to which the bishop went to reproduce the propaganda of the movement is conspicuous. It is clear that Otto believed the Second Crusade was responsible for transforming the empire and this played a part in his description of the state of the realm. The inclusion of both the bull and Bernard’s letter raises the question of whether Otto might have seen his own work as a vehicle for the movement’s propaganda, especially

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., Book I, 43.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., Book I, 43.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., Book I, 47.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., Book I, 48.
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., Book I, 43.
when we consider his apologia for the failed campaign and his insistence that the spiritual rewards reaped by its participants outweighs their violent end. The first book of Otto’s work should make clear the extent to which he and his contemporaries felt the influence of the crusading movement. Moreover, the reference to Styria’s lord participating in such a campaign after bearing witness to its propaganda must have signaled to the Vorau manuscript’s users that their lord and their land were very much a part of this defining movement. If we accept this, and the evidence of the previous chapters, then we have created a possible social, political, and religious backdrop against which to view the texts of Vorau 276.

3.3 The *Kaiserchronik*

3.3.1 Introduction

At 13,401 manuscript lines and 73 folios (1M-73vb), the *Kaiserchronik* is the longest text in the Vorau codex by a wide margin. This massive Middle High German work, 17,283 lines in the modern edition, relates the reigns of thirty-six Roman and nineteen medieval emperors in episodic form. Combining fact, legend, and pure invention, the *Kaiserchronik* is an excellent example of the problems—more popularly typified by Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia Regum Britanniae*—that medieval historiography presents modern readers and scholars. Based on linguistic evidence and a perceived Bavarian bent in its content, the text is widely believed to have originated in that region, most likely Regensburg, although the diversity of the patrons put forward by scholars over the years demonstrates the difficulty pinning down the impetus behind

---

23 Otto was also present on the Second Crusade and played a prominent role as commander of part of the army, a fact which indicates his support for the movement. This also raises the interesting question of whether or not the Vorau manuscript itself (and any other copy of Otto’s text) should also be considered crusade propaganda. While an interesting notion, much more research would be required to develop this argument.

of its composition. The text concludes with a narration of Bernard of Clairvaux’s crusade sermon of 1147 in which King Conrad took the cross, and it is unlikely the work was composed long afterward. Soon after its composition, however, it became a great success, and the surviving manuscripts testify to a sustained interest in the text that stretched into the sixteenth century. Of the fifty complete and fragmentary manuscripts which survive, the vast majority belong to the thirteenth century, although two—Klagenfurt, Cod. GV 6/26 (fragment) and Vorau Stiftsbibliothek, cod. 276—are from the late twelfth century. Vorau 276 is the earliest complete manuscript of the text. Bavaria and Austria appear to have been the regions in which the Kaiserchronik proliferated, though its inclusion in the Sächsische Weltchronik extended its reach north into the Low German linguistic region.

Throughout the span of its transmission, the Kaiserchronik underwent three redactions which, despite the obvious desire to modify the text in some way, never replaced the preceding versions. These, instead, continued to be copied and enjoyed a concurrent popularity. Recension A, the first from a chronological point of view, as previously stated, was composed sometime before 1150. The second recension, B, dates to about 1200 and represents an attempt to modernize the language, meter, and rhyme scheme to conform to the style favoured by courtly poets and audiences rapidly gaining in popularity at this time. In addition to updating the form,

25 Frederick Barbarossa, Emperor Lothar III, Henry the Lion, and Henry the Proud are among those who have been linked with the origin of the text, however tangentially, by those groping for a definitive patron. See Gisela Vollmann-Profe, Lit. Gesch., 44-45. More recently, Mathias Herweg rejected any concrete connection with the Welfs in the afterword to his partial edition of the text. Herweg, Kaiserchronik, 470. Edward Schröder believed that the main author was close to Bishop Kuno of Regensburg (d. 1132), which invites an interesting comparison with the Ezzolied, likewise commissioned by a bishop with an interest in literature, Gunther of Bamberg. Schröder, ed., Kaiserchronik, 52, 67. See also page 46 for a brief discussion of the evolution of Regensburg as the accepted point of origin. All subsequent quotations from the Kaiserchronik have been taken from this edition.


28 Stephan Müller’s dissertation was a review of the textual history and scholarship on the Kaiserchronik that contains much useful information up to the date of its publication. Stephan Müller, Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik. Zu Text- und Forschungsgeschichte einer verlorenen deutschen Reimchronik (Heidelberg: Winter, 1999).

the redactor also abridged the text by some 1,600 lines. Fifty years later, another redaction of the
text, C, appears, in which the meter and rhyme have again been modified to conform to
contemporary tastes. C is yet another redaction of A, which does not use B as an intermediary.
This youngest redaction features a new prologue, unabbreviated content, and 800 added lines
continue the story up to about 1250, the time of its creation. The A recension accounts for
twenty-four of the fifty surviving manuscripts, and of these, fifteen are fragments.

The diversity of the transmission of the *Kaiserchronik* echoes its undefined status with respect to
the equally nebulous categories of fact and fiction in medieval literature and historiography.

For instance, Národní knihovna České republiky, Cod. XXIII G 43 contains the *Kaiserchronik*
and various hagiographic works, while in a Vienna codex, ÖNB Cod. 2779, the *Kaiserchronik* shares
space with courtly texts. The author played fast and loose with chronology, and with the
sequence of emperors. Of the sixty-eight emperors before Charlemagne, only thirty-six can be
found in the *Kaiserchronik*, and these are followed by an indefinite emperor-less period of time
beginning at line 14, 282. In addition, four fictitious emperors have been added to the
sequence, Faustianus, Tarquinius, Narcissus, and Dietrich. Although the contours of fact and
fiction are difficult for modern historians to clearly outline within the genre of medieval
historical writing, many have argued that despite what appear to a modern gaze as blurred
boundaries at best, people did distinguish between invention and truth in history. Precisely
what these audiences considered authorizing principles or authoritative mechanisms at work in
the text naturally depended on the work itself, its presentation, and the expectations of its

---

31 Herweg, *Kaiserchronik*, 475.
32 Gabrielle Spiegel’s work in this area has had a major impact on the way we view medieval historiography. See
Gabrielle Spiegel, *The Past as Text. The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore/London: Johns
Hopkins University Press, 1997); Spiegel, “Theory into Practice: Reading Medieval Chronicles”, in *The Medieval
Chronicle: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle, Driebergen/Utrech, 13-16
Survey* (Leiden and Boston: Classical Folia Editions, 1978); Spiegel, "Social Change and Literary Language: The
Textualization of the Past in Thirteenth-Century French Historiography", *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance
33 These include *Iwein* and Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Die Krone*, and the heroic epics *Dietrichs Flucht*,
University Press, 2012), 5; Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 24; Joachim Ehlers, “Historia, Allegoria,
Tropologia—Exegetische Grundlagen der Geschichtskonzeption Hugos von St. Viktor”, *Mitteleinisches Jahrbuch* 7
(1972), 153-160.
immediate public.36 Scholars have increasingly turned to the notion of the instrumentalization of historical discourse as an approach to the question of what audiences considered true. Historical writing almost invariably served the needs of the present, and the strictly factual was superseded by a perceived worth in the text; the details were less important than what the text offered to its audience.37 Nancy Partner’s characterization of the composition and consumption of historiographical texts as “serious entertainment” has gained a great deal of traction among the scholarly community. For the lay consumers of this material (to borrow Suzanne Fleischman’s terminology) history served just as much to edify as to entertain. Dressing up a historical figure, embellishing or inventing his deeds, therefore, was considered poetic engagement with the subject matter that did not necessarily decrease its perceived truth, and certainly not its value for an audience.38 Naturally, these questions are complicated when the dynamics of an emergent vernacular competing with an entrenched Latinate culture of historiography and literature are considered, and the Kaiserchronik is a particularly puzzling case, given the wide variety of its source material and its subsequent reception and use in diverse works in both Latin and the vernacular.39 As Mark Chinca and Christopher Young point out in a recent article preceding their synchronic edition of the text, historians are too eager to treat the text as a work of literature, and literary scholars dismiss it as historiography, or seek to place the work in a history of German language literature, disregarding its broader, European context.40 Indeed the author or authors drew on an extremely broad base of learning and material that ranged from Ovid, to Hellenistic novels, heroic epic, crusade songs and Chanson de geste, Latin historiography like Ekkehard of Aura and Frutolf of Michelsberg, oral legends, the Mirabilia Romae, saints’ and

36 Although scholars have acknowledged a strong connection between medieval historiography and what we would define as literature, there is a lingering tendency to preserve a kind of conceptual difference between these “categories.” For example, Ruth Morse treats late medieval romance and offers the caveat that she is not as knowledgeable about medieval historiography. Morse, “‘This Vague Relation’”, 85-103.
39 Source criticism was a major part of the early (pre-twentieth-century) scholarship on this text. Since then, the most widely acknowledged authority on the text’s sources is Friedrich Ohly. Ohly, Sage und Legende.
40 Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 19-38. The article raises the valid, yet underdeveloped idea that the Kaiserchronik has much in common with works of medieval historiography with much more notoriety, such as Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae. Ultimately they suggest that there is much work to be done to place this work in the context of both the production of German vernacular texts, and, more broadly, in the landscape of north-western historiographical writing in the period.
martyrs’ lives, and even a roughly contemporary vernacular source, the *Annolied*.\(^{41}\) To add yet another dimension to the confusion surrounding the status of Latin and vernacular literature, the *Kaiserchronik* was also translated into Latin and parts of it found reception in other Latin historiographical works.\(^{42}\) The author of the A recension’s prologue made an important reference to the tensions that clearly affected those producing texts with historical content in this period, lines which have received considerable scholarly attention.\(^{43}\) Here he referenced his vernacular source, a German book (*ze diute getihtet*), and cautioned against others who peddled lies dressed up as poetry and related his fears that these men would suffer in the afterlife as a result.\(^{44}\) Regardless of whether or not this warning was meant in earnest, or whether it was a somewhat cheeky reflection on the author’s own work within its social and literary context, it stands as evidence that these tensions, between truth and fiction, Latin and vernacular, were at the heart of the politics of composition at this time.\(^{45}\) Traditionally the scholarship on early vernacular works of history have clung to the notion that vernaculars and Latin possessed a different status in medieval cultures, yet this image is slowly being eroded, and the *Kaiserchronik* has an important role to play thereby. Following his survey of the *Kaiserchronik* manuscripts and the texts with which it was paired, Palmer concluded that it had, “...the same status as a work in Latin.”\(^{46}\) Jürgen Wolf has more recently echoed Palmer’s position, and goes even further to suggest that the Vorau manuscript might even unseat one of the medievalist’s most deeply held beliefs: the lay noble’s complete ignorance of Latin.\(^{47}\)

---

\(^{41}\) Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 20; Herweg, *Kaiserchronik*, 476ff.


\(^{44}\) Schröder, *Die Kaiserchronik*, vv. 27-42.

\(^{45}\) Christian Gellinek has suggested that a clash of educational ideologies was taking place in Bavaria at the time of the *Kaiserchronik*’s compilation and the narrator’s caution against falsehood represents an expression thereof. Gellinek, *The German Emperors’ Chronicle*, 235.


\(^{47}\) Wolf, *Buch und Text*, 210f.
One of the true limitations of many works on the *Kaiserchronik* produced by historians and literary scholars alike is the failure to come to terms with one of the fundamental aspects of this text: its inherently episodic style. While many attempt to see the work as a pre-conceived whole, others examine isolated episodes, drawing conclusions regarding the entire text which cannot hold. Schröder’s conviction that the *Kaiserchronik* (the original A recension) was the work of multiple authors entirely undermines the former, and the wildly varying character of the episodes rules out the latter. We are presented with a text, which, because it narrates a sequence of emperors in chronological order, naturally begs to be read as a whole; yet this approach is disturbed by the episodic style of narration, whose fascicles display such different characteristics, and which diverges from the sequential subject matter so often that the reader loses the perception of continuity. The resulting tension between these two opposites is one of the hallmarks of the *Kaiserchronik*, and prompts reflection on the text as a piece of literature as well as the way in which medieval historiographers engaged with time and chronology.

The task of fitting an examination of the *Kaiserchronik* into the present work is a difficult one. Its sheer length and the variety of its contents, as many have recognized, make generalizations difficult, and the text offers a seemingly inexhaustible well of topics for scholars across a range of disciplines. Collating information derived from so many extant manuscripts can be difficult, and for a work of primarily local historical concerns such as this, this approach may not be the most productive. I believe that examining the individual occurrences of the surviving texts in their manuscript contexts is one of the most fruitful ways of determining what value those who used these texts derived from them, and what needs compilers or redactors were reacting to. Naturally, much of my analysis is affected by this idea, and my conclusions about the text hold, generally speaking, only for the Vorau manuscript. My analysis in the following pages will demonstrate the ways in which the text fits into the context of Styria in the late twelfth century that I have outlined above. For a text that focuses almost exclusively on the reigns of various emperors and popes, a local interest may not seem immediate, although the Dietrich of Bern episode embeds the history of Styria (real or imagined) within the larger scope of the history of the empire. Leopold IV, the Babenberg margrave of Austria also features in the text during the

---

48 Continuity is one of the crucial underlying themes of this work. The episode in which the German tribes clash with Caesar and ultimately join his army sets up their eventual inheritance of the imperial throne, and connects the two major sections of the text.
Conrad III episode, where his unfortunate defeat at the hands of the rebellious Welf VI near Valley in 1141 is depicted, followed by the desertion of his vassals.\textsuperscript{49} Furthermore, succession is a core aspect of this text, and although the institution of the emperorship supersedes the Styrian dynastic element, the presentation of an (almost) unbroken chain of imperial rulers was nevertheless relevant for those imperial nobles concerned chiefly with their own familial histories. The crusades, too, play a role in this text, which is framed by dynamics of the interrelation of the papacy and the imperial throne throughout the course of their shared existence. The cooperation of the temporal and worldly swords, as we have seen, was a concern that came to the fore with the crusading movement and came into ever sharper focus throughout the twelfth century. With its place at the head of the Vorau manuscript, the \textit{Kaiserchronik} has an important effect on the way in which we read the texts that follow, just as its extraordinarily popular narrative of imperial history and the emergence of the German speaking lands as the heirs to the imperial dignity of Christendom influenced vernacular chronicle writing for centuries to come.\textsuperscript{50}

### 3.3.2 The \textit{Kaiserchronik} and the Presentation of Historical Time

Most manuscripts of the \textit{Kaiserchronik} also contain other texts, and although this material may not have had a determining effect on the interpretation of the Middle High German work, the manuscript context in the case of Vorau 276 is highly significant. Most scholars believe that the rough chronology of the poems amounts to a world history. Though at times the temporal progression is disturbed, it is nevertheless clear that the compiler consciously placed these texts in their order. On the manuscript level, the \textit{Kaiserchronik} is situated within a framework created by the bringing together of multiple elements for a cumulative effect. This larger framework, that is, a narration of historical time from creation to the reign of Frederick Barbarossa, means that even the apparently staccato narrative style of the \textit{Kaiserchronik} must be regarded as a part

\textsuperscript{49} Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv. 17,217-17,229. When Leopold is forced to flee again after his vassals abandon him, the author notes that he won no honour with such conduct, and moves on to Conrad’s siege of Weinsberg. \textit{dâ gewan er grôzzen scaden:/ er nemahte der helfe niht haben,/ die im dâ triwe gehiezen,/ wie gar si in verliezen!/ dô muose er anderstunt entrinnen: er nemahte nehain êre dâ gewinnen.} “Then he experienced great misfortune: he could not obtain any aid; how those who had sworn loyalty to him so abandoned him! He had to flee at that very instant: he won no honour at that time.” vv. 17,224-17,229.

\textsuperscript{50} See again the literature on the text’s transmission in Müller, \textit{Vom Annolied zur Kaiserchronik}. Cf. note 29 above.
of that cohesive narrative. Despite the brief explication of the four empires-theory popularized by Jerome’s interpretation of the Dream of Daniel—a means of categorizing historical time based on a succession of major historical empires—the Kaiserchronik’s method of rendering the passage of historical time is of a much different nature. The reigns of individual Roman and medieval emperors constitute the chronological building blocks of the text, which, like the overall temporal arc of the Vorau manuscript, are imperfectly sequenced at times. This tactic of rendering time can be seen in the broader chronology of the manuscript as well; the Vorau Alexander, discussed below, is an excellent example of a text that narrates a span of historical time defined by the reign of an individual. From the standpoint of the early medieval historiographers, Alexander was a figure who advanced salvation history by destroying the Persian Empire and replacing it with his own, events foretold in prophetic from in the Book of Daniel. Alexander’s reign, like of those of the Roman and medieval emperors, carries the narration forward through history, gives it shape, and allows the narrator to extract and present useful exempla and lessons from a distant past.

Though the use of regnal periods as a narrative tactic may not appear particularly significant, medieval historians had a wide range of forms available to them to convert historical time into text. Annals relate events with reference solely to the year in which they occurred, (generally) independent from their political or social context. Other forms of historical writing provide a much broader rendition of events within a given time span that may include but are not limited to, or defined by, the reigns of individual rulers. But the Kaiserchronik’s author(s) chose to give structure to time by using these individual reigns. This technique naturally lends itself well

---


52 See above for a brief discussion of the fictional elements inserted into the narrative and the omissions.

to a subject like the Roman Empire. It is also significant, though, for rendering historical time narratable in a way that was intelligible and appealing to an audience concerned with dynasty and family histories, in which the individual lifespan of a family member and the events contained therein were of great significance for their successors. Some medieval historiographers, most importantly for our purposes, Otto of Freising, saw the passage of generations as a metaphor for the rise and fall of the empires that helped define salvation-historical epochs. Others, in the tradition of Augustine, also reduced history to the metaphor of a single lifespan. For lay noble audiences, the significance of historical events was directly tied to the identity of the actors. A great deal of prestige might be drawn from such connections, which, as we have seen, was an important part of building and maintaining the legitimacy of a ruling house and establishing a dynasty. For families with illustrious crusading pasts, for example, the sheer fact that Jerusalem was captured by a Christian army in 1099 was less significant (from a practical, personal, and dynastic standpoint) than the fact that a family member had participated in that event.

Some of the tension that many scholars have observed in this text stems directly from the decision to narrate this period in history by means of individual imperial reigns. The halting, staccato form of the text disrupts the narrative flow and troubles the perception of the work as a rendition of continuous time. There are, however, many threads that stitch together this patchwork of episodes. The explication of the names of the seven weekdays (vv. 63ff.) (named for seven pagan gods) parallels the length of time from Constantine’s conversion until he and Silvester Christianize and reorganize the empire. Or, when Charlemagne returns to Rome to restore peace and order after his brother, who had become Pope Leo, was driven out and blinded,

---


55 Each segment concludes with the author presenting the length of each reign in years, months, and sometimes weeks and days. Little ornamentation accompanies the introduction of the next ruler, and a phrase such as Daz buoch chundet uns sus:/ das rîche besaz Herâclîus [vv.11,138-11,139] or some slight variant frequently begins the next section. This formulation is entirely devoid of any temporal marker or even a grammatical indication (dô, for example) that the two periods are chronologically linked.

56 See also Mathias Herweg’s discussion of this topic. Herweg, Kaiserchronik, 493.

57 Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 7,958-8,115.
he reigns over a pacified city for seven days and seven nights. The legend of the Seven Sleepers, too, begins under Decius on line 6,417 and lies dormant until the fulfillment of the legend under Theodosius some 7,000 lines later. These tensions, I argue, are a feature of a text that induces its users to view the continuous arc of historical time through a prism, effectively splitting one harmonious chronology into a series of lifetimes or reigns. It is a relation that is fraught with difficulties, but it is a simplification made for its utility in imparting events, facts, and demonstrative legends. Moreover, a lay noble culture such as that which existed in twelfth-century Styria might have found this style of rendering history particularly effective or fitting, given that their identities were so strongly rooted in the achievements of their predecessors. Consciously pursuing a political strategy of establishing a dynasty naturally meant an awareness of being one ruler in an interrelated chain, and a family history, whatever form it took, would have reflected this outlook.

3.3.3 The Medieval (German) Emperors and their Heritage

Charlemagne’s *vita* marks a turning point not only in the history of the imperial institution, but also in the style of narration, the source material, and the core exemplary characteristics of those who sit on the throne. The legendary and fanciful digressions that bend and bow the narrative arc in the early part of the work give way to a style that is more consistent with the *Kaiserchronik*’s pretension as a chronicle, with far fewer digressions into legend and much heavier reliance on recognized Latin authoritative texts. The material is derived from chiefly Latin sources and treats mainly the empire’s struggles against the invading Magyars and the civil conflicts that routinely pitted the imperial magnates against one another. These episodes or *vitae* are, on average, considerably more compact than those of their Roman predecessors. The

---


60 Mathias Herweg refers to the way in which the author(s) created a logic about the text that was central to the delivery of the thematic content as the *Sinnstiftungsmodus*, and notes that it does in fact undergo a major change as a result of the type of source material used as well as its more sober delivery. *Kaiserchronik*, 492. See also Pézsa, *Studien zu Erzähltechnik*, 117-121.

61 Two notable exceptions include the St. Emmeram legend as part of Arnulf’s reign (vv. 15,518-15581), and the example of the innocent woman accused of adultery in the reign of Charles II (vv. 15,394-15,517).

change in the *Kaiserchronik* is indicative of the importance of heritage for a lay noble audience, and adds further weight to the notion that historiography centred on individual rulers found welcome reception among such a group. Charlemagne’s *vita* owes much to the style of the Roman emperors before him; his route to the throne is heavily embellished, and his fraternal relation to the pontiff who ultimately crowned him is utter invention. However, Charlemagne is the first of the emperors to have his heritage narrated. Pepin, a powerful king, had two noble sons, it reads. Leo became pope and Charlemagne remained at home until a dream vision urged him to travel to Rome as a pilgrim. His life shares many similarities with that of Constantine and his care for the church equals that of his famed predecessor, but the fraternal relationship between two Franks represents a much enhanced bond that goes beyond the archetype. The institutions are linked by a common lineage from that point forward and any conflict between pope and emperor carried the additional connotation of inter-familial discord, which the author particularly laments in a later passage. By invoking family dynamics literally in this passage, the author has suggested that an ideal dynamic in the relationship of future popes and emperors might be that which existed between these two brothers.

Another noteworthy difference in the text, with narratological as well as thematic importance, is in the transition from one ruler to the next. Beginning with Charlemagne, each successive king and emperor is introduced with specific reference to his paternal heritage. No longer are they introduced by a mere statement that they possessed the empire, but rather through an immediate reference to the previous ruler in the dynastic line. Most often both the previous and new rulers are referred to by name in the introductory verses. When the dynastic sequence is broken (as it

---

63 See also Mathias Herweg’s remarks on the way in which Charlemagne’s *vita* affects the structuring of the narrative thereafter. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, 489.


65 Referring to the conflict between Henry IV and Henry V, the narrator concludes the latter’s reign with a remark on the sadness of the clergy that a son bore arms against his father. *daz der sun ie wider dem vater gegraif;/ daz was gaisillichen hêrren lait.* “For the spiritual lords it was sorrowful, that a son ever took up arms against a father”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 16,936-19,637. The precedent set by Charlemagne and Leo in this episode is meant to be projected onto future emperors as a measure of their conduct, and while subsequent pontiffs depicted in the text do not stem from the Carolingian house the persistence of this exemplum and the brotherly metaphor carry forward as well.

66 For example, Louis III is introduced with the lines, *Also der chaiser Arnolt versciet,/ ainen sun er verliez,/ gehaizen was er Ludewîch.* “And as Emperor Arnulf died, he left behind a son named Louis”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 15,582-15,854. This is a common formula, seen again verbatim in the introduction of Otto I. Sometimes this formula was embellished somewhat, as in the case of Otto’s successor: *Alsô der kunich Ottô versciet/ ainen türlîchen sun er liez,/ gehaizen was er Ottô.* “When King Otto died, he left behind a noble son named Otto”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 15,974-15,976
is with Conrad I, Henry I, Henry II, Conrad II, Lothar III, Conrad III), either the newly chosen king’s own lineage is given (Conrad I, Henry I), or the narrator substitutes this with a passage praising his virtues, and assuring the audience of the new king’s suitability to rule. Dynastic connections now form the bridging material between each episode, and provide much more stable chronological links, making the narrative strategy of rendering time through a succession of rulers much more effective. The construction of historical time in its narrative form is now distinctly tied to dynastic succession.

Dynastic concerns also constitute one of the most prominent exemplary elements in the text after Charlemagne. During the reign of Louis the Pious the precedent set by the previous ruler, his father, is a particularly forceful element in his decision making throughout the narration. The narrator thereby underscores the importance of the newly introduced dynastic dynamics for subsequent German kings and clues the audience into their prominent place in the narrative moving forward. When Louis’s kingdom fell into disarray with two lords, Gêrmâr and Guotwin, rebelling, the solution came from falling back on his father’s example; he pronounced a *pax dei* meant to reconstruct his father’s peaceful rule, and the empire calmed down.

Do gedâchte der chunich Ludewîch, 
daz bi sînes vater zît 
niemen den andern sluoch. 70
... 
Der fride wuochs dô in dem rîche. 
der chunich rihte gewalteclîche, 
alse der vater dâ vor. 
ganz bestuonden diu urbor,  
unberoubet unt unverbrant,  
daz kint nâch sînem vater vant 
daz erbe alsô lussam. 71

---

67 Henry II’s election is accompanied by one such passage. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 16,142-16,168. 
68 For a very brief account of the characterization of this figure in the *Kaiserchronik* see, Pézsa, *Studien zu Erzähltechnik*, 121-122. 
70 “Then King Louis recalled, that during his father’s time no one killed each other”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 15,122-15,124. 
71 “Peace then grew throughout the kingdom. The king ruled forcefully, as his father had before. His territory survived intact, unpillaged, and unburned. The child found his inheritance pleasant after his father”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv.15,148-15,154.
Charlemagne’s powerful example drives his son’s actions and has an undeniable bearing on how he governs his territory. The narrator draws the comparison at the beginning and end of the episode outlined above, framing the major events of Louis’ reign as the result of the dynastic connection between the two rulers and all the tacitly understood responsibility bound up in that relationship. Throughout the episode of Louis’ reign, the narrator builds this motif and presents it as both a private motivation and a part of the emperor’s public persona. If the author intended to produce a text with exemplary value for contemporary rulers, this aspect of Louis’s reign clearly stands out as one of the core components of successful and legitimate governance. Furthermore, he presents a case study in how a consciousness of dynastic duty ought to be brought to bear publicly in the realm of governance. For example, in the wrap-up of Louis’s time on the imperial throne, the author demonstrates how the monarch’s awareness of his heritage determined the manner of his governance.

von diu gedāht er ouch an daz,  
daz er von adele geborn was,  
er verkōs der armen miete,  
er rihte wol der diete,  
als ez diu pfahṭ gebôt.  

The examples drawn from the life of Louis the Pious present a much-idealized image of dynastic politics at work. Pressures emanating from a sense of responsibility to the character of one’s forebears offered a way forward for Louis, but in the reign of Lothar I’s son Louis the German, this harmony between generations is disturbed and the forces that previously inspired the ruler are redeployed by the author to signal distress within the empire. When Lothar I finally succeeds in putting down a rebellion sparked by his coronation, the narrator turns to the subject of his four sons, two of whom, Charles and Pepin, went to war with one another and caused the

---

72 It is worth noting that the next twenty lines (vv. 15,160-15,178) describe the outcome of Louis’ policy of peace, and the foremost of these is the assurance that a man’s property, titles, and privilege will be peacefully transmitted to his son.
73 Pézsa also acknowledges this dimension of Louis’s vita. Pézsa, Studien zu Erzähltechnik, 121-122.
74 “From this, he also remembered that he was of noble birth; he forgave the poor their rents, and he ruled the people well, just as the law demanded”. Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 15,212-15,216.
75 In reality, Louis the German was not Lothar’s son. On the Carolingians see Pierre Riché, Les Carolingiens: une Famille qui fit l’Europe (Paris: Hachette Littérature, 1983); For Louis the Stammerer, see Rudolf Schieffer, Die Karolinger (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1992), 73-178.
empire serious unrest.\textsuperscript{76} In an episode that inverts the example of Charlemagne’s and Leo’s (literal) brotherly cooperation, two brothers destroy the unity of the empire and Louis II is unable to curtail the violence.\textsuperscript{77} The magnates take their concerns to Pope Adrian, complaining that their king had not done enough to ensure peace.\textsuperscript{78} It is Hadrian who recognizes the utility and advantage of putting dynastic politics into play and decides that Louis should rule according to Charlemagne’s example, using his methods and his laws to settle disputes and govern his kingdom.

While Louis the Pious succeeded in drawing on his father’s example to lay conflicts to rest, his grandson failed to recognize the same value in precedent, resulting in an intervention by the pope. The outcome of both of these \textit{vitae} is essentially the same, but the differences are just as important in the ultimate affirmation of the supremacy of dynastic precedent. A ruler who fails to live up to the standard of honour set by those who came before suffers politically from this deficiency; it was Louis’s own lords who demonstrated the erosion of his authority when they were compelled to circumvent the normal dispute resolution mechanisms and seek external aid. It is not until Adrian put Louis back on track, aligning his governance with the highly regarded policies of his grandfather and great grandfather that he was crowned emperor.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{76} See Schieffer, \textit{Die Karolinger}, 170-186. On the presentation of these figures in the \textit{Kaiserchronik} see Pézsa, \textit{Studien zu Erzähltechnik}, 122-123.

\textsuperscript{77} On the presentation of Louis in the \textit{Kaiserchronik} see Pézsa, \textit{Studien zu Erzähltechnik}, 123; Max Ittenbach, “Über die Kaiserchronik als strophische Dichtung”, \textit{Dichtung und Volkstum} 42 (1942), 30.

\textsuperscript{78} Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv. 16,358-15,365.

\textsuperscript{79} “The Pope Hadrian settled the conflict thus: Louis should judge according to Charlemagne’s laws again, which had not been done before, and that he should bring together the noble residences, inheritances and estates from the king’s chamber”. Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv. 15,366-15,376. It is also worth noting here that one of the main conflicts that Louis’s solution addresses involves succession and the transmission of property and titles from generation to generation. This episode shares a great deal with that of the previous Louis.

\textsuperscript{80} Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv. 15,379.
In the episode discussed above, there is no indication that the nobles who appealed to Adrian for guidance were motivated by anything other than the king’s failure to subdue his sibling upstarts. However, the public expectation that a ruler will recognize and accept his dynastic responsibilities is given voice by the Kaiserchronik’s author in the vitae of some later emperors, most notably Otto I, and Otto III.\(^\text{81}\) In these examples, the author depicts dynastic pressures from the perspective of those surrounding the king, showing how these operated as an external force, rather than an internal or personal one. When Henry I, a wise and well-regarded king, died, the nobles chose Otto, his young son, based on the merits of his father.\(^\text{82}\)

Alse der kaiser Hainrîch versciet, 
ainen sîn er verliez 
gehaizen was er Ottô. 
die wursten rewunden nie dô, 
unze si Otten den jungen 
ze nîm er rihtære gewunnen. 
want der vater alsô biderbe was, 
sô lobete si den sun deste baz.\(^\text{83}\)

The final two verses hammer home the dynastic connection by omitting names and substituting the nouns father and son. Here the personal qualities of Henry and Otto are subordinate to the abstract formulation of the dynastic imperative, and all of this in turn is seen from the perspective of the magnates. Their expectations of Otto are based on their estimation of his father, and on the belief that the son will accept the standard of behaviour and conduct set by him, striving to meet and exceed his accomplishments. Underscoring the importance of this dynamic in the scene is the fact that Otto, according to the text, is still quite young, and whatever personal attributes make him a suitable leader cannot have manifest themselves yet. The

---


\(^{83}\) “When Emperor Henry died, he left behind a son named Otto. The lords would not rest until they had secured the young Otto as their ruler. Because his father was so noble, they praised the son all the more”. Schröder, *Kaiserchronik*, vv. 15,850-15,857.
magnates chose Otto because he had an excellent example to follow and they were entitled to expect that Otto would endeavour to meet Henry’s high standard.

Otto’s grandson, too, was chosen in similar fashion with the author giving voice to the burden of expectation the magnates placed on the son of a well-regarded ruler from a line of likewise respected monarchs.

Alse der chunich Ottô versciet,
ainen sun er liez,
er newas niht alt,
wan ze zwelf jâren gezalt:
daz was der dritte Ottô.
die vursten gesameten sich dô
ze Mâgenze ze aim hove,
biscove unt herzogen
gerieten alle under in,
doch er wâre ain kindelîn
unt der vater wære
geriwe unt gewære,
si rewelten in ze hêrren.84

This episode shares many similarities with that depicting the election of Otto I. Both are young lords whose leadership qualities are not widely tested or recognized, yet the reputation of their fathers was enough to secure the kingship for the sons. The Kaiserchronik’s depiction of this dynamic in the succession of the kingship suggests that it was a powerful force, even if it was not necessarily a reliable barometer for the quality of the next ruler. So powerful, in fact, that MHG authors appear to have believed that there was a precedent for this belief that emanated from the divine order of the world. In the Lob Salomonis, for example, God offers his favour to Salomon on account of his father’s conduct.85 Either the poets composing these MHG texts saw the origins of their expectations of dynastic continuity in such biblical exempla, or they interpreted the scriptural material in the idiom of their own experience. In either case, the rooting of their notions of dynastic continuity in sources of such authority is certainly noteworthy.

84 “When King Otto died he left behind a son. He was not old, only twelve years-old. This was the third Otto. The lords then gathered themselves together at a court in Mainz. Bishops and dukes all decided amongst themselves to elect him as their lord even though he was a child, because his father was loyal and honourable”. Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 16,064-16,076. In reality, Otto III was two when he succeeded to the throne.
Honour, however, was not necessarily an inherent quality, hence the importance of having worthy examples to follow, and the text does present at least one instance in which the honour and reputation of the father, while sufficient to ensure the accession of the next generation, proved to be a standard too far out of reach. Henry IV was elected because of the reputation his father enjoyed, but his disastrous reign—some of the lowlights of which are conspicuously absent from the narration—is underscored by the implicit comparison with Godfrey of Bouillon, whose story interrupts that of the German king.86

Contrary to the expectation this passage clearly voices, Henry’s reign was troubled by civil war, rebellion, and marred by his personal conduct, which included charges of lasciviousness and maligning respectable women.88 Henry’s vita in turn is interrupted by an account of the First Crusade, which revolves around a single figure, the leader of the expedition, in accordance with the narrative structure of the text.89 Godfrey’s positive qualities are contrasted with Henry’s own poor ones and the behaviour of his subordinates and the successes of his reign serve as the indicators of good rulership. The discord and disunity of Henry’s kingdom is contrasted with the unity of the Christian force when they elect their king (v. 16,770) and their resilience in the face of extreme drought (v. 16,730) and famine (v. 16,651). Godfrey’s cause is so virtuous that he and his campaign are the recipients of divine aid along the way and the narrator concludes by asking


87 “The lords then decided together upon Henry, who was the son of the above [Henry]. Because of the great renown that his father had won, they entrusted it [the kingdom] to the youth”. Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 16,532-16,537.

88 Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 16,548-15,661.

89 Schröder, vv. 16,618-16,790.
the audience whether they had ever heard of another who has won so much worldly honour.  

The narration then returns immediately to another of Henry’s campaigns against his subjects. Here the spilling of Christian blood and the bitter scenes of civil war are starkly rendered against the uprightness of the First Crusade. Particularly striking is the fact that although the First Crusade appears unconnected to the events of Henry’s reign, the author included it in the text, while omitting some of the more salient points of imperial history, such as the Gang nach Canossa. In the context of Henry’s vita, the implied and intended juxtaposition appears to be the major point of interest. Henry IV stands as proof that a noble heritage is no guarantee of virtuous rulership and thus underscores the importance of following the example of a ruler’s forebears.

Historically, most emperors generally tried to arrange for the acknowledgement of their son as heir well before they died, and the matter of succession owed as much to politics and maneuvering as it did to the innate virtue of the departing monarch. However, in a twelfth-century environment where the economy of dynastic honour was inflamed by the rhetoric of crusade preachers we must appreciate that such conditions would produce an audience acutely aware of this dimension of the narration. Furthermore, the author presents only this element in the succession of emperors in his narration and none of the political or legal components of establishing an acknowledged heir. This particular version of the imperial succession dovetailed nicely with a Styrian audience connected to the Otakars—a dynasty, as we have seen, that clearly pursued a policy of dynastic legitimation. Moreover, after Otakar IV died in 1192, Styria was

---

90 Two such instances occurred during the siege of Jerusalem (16,711) and in the quenching of the drought (16,730). For the final verses of praise for Duke Godfrey see vv. 16,781-16,784.  
91 See also Herweg, Kaiserchronik, 425.  
93 I will return below to the notion that the rendering of the First Crusade shares some similarities with the lead-up to the Second.  
ruled by a dynasty with no hereditary claim to the territory which was, therefore, in need of legitimation. As we saw in Chapter 2, this bid for legitimacy rested on that of the previous dynasty, the memory of which was actively fostered by the Babenberg dukes of Styria.

In the first chapter of this work I examined several documents in which the Otakars demonstrated an awareness that their own actions would have a bearing on those who came after them, and that, as a member of a dynasty, a ruler also had a responsibility toward those who come after. While the Kaiserchronik is, by its nature, concerned with the relevance of the past for the present, it also rounds out its take on dynastic politics by depicting this forward-looking aspect. After Henry II’s evangelization of the people east of the empire and his defeat of the Hungarians, he turns to the business of his empire and how he might best honour God.\(^95\) However, Henry’s desire to serve his spiritual lord is also tied to his legacy and his desire to leave an example for those who succeed him.

do gedäht er aver des pesten:
die er an der erde
gote ze dieneste mahte werden;
sô er lange nêwêre,
das ñîne nâcechomen pilde der bî sæhen.\(^96\)

The work to which this passage refers is the founding of the bishopric of Bamberg. Henry’s actions echo the ideal of cooperation between empire and church that runs through so many of the vitae in the Kaiserchronik. Henry’s establishment of the bishopric was part of a strategy to consolidate his gains in the east, and this convenient strategy allowed him to appear piously beneficent in his example to subsequent generations while also expanding the empire’s territorial holdings. The Kaiserchronik’s twelfth-century audience, some having lived through two similar campaigns, certainly would have seen echoes of their own experience in the campaigns of previous emperors, and understood the significance of his act.

The Kaiserchronik’s reflection of the role of dynastic concerns for the emperors of the German period is consistent with what we know about Styria based on the documentary evidence presented in the previous two chapters. Indeed, the treatment of heritage would have likely have

---


\(^96\) “Then he thought about how he might best serve God on the earth; so that when he was no longer there, those who come after him might see an example in it”. Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv.16,183-16,187.
held broad appeal for many ruling houses throughout the empire. In the narrator’s eyes, emperors felt the pressure to conform to standards of conduct set by their forbears and the impulse to pass along this accumulated honour intact, and if possible, enhanced. The text cannot reproduce the dynamics at play in the reigns of long-dead emperors, but medieval historical writing was not necessarily concerned with offering an objectively accurate portrait of events, but rather the instrumentalization of these for the use of the present. 97 What we see in these vitae are the social and political concerns of the author’s day projected backward, in part unconsciously, and in part to ensure the relevance of that material for a contemporary audience. In both cases the simple fact that we can see the impact that a ruler’s heritage had on his conduct and his view of his role within the family and the world at large in the narrative is of chief importance. Any lay ruler concerned with establishing legitimacy for his house likely would have seen an affirmation of this strategy in the reigns of the early medieval emperors, who, as one might gather from the Kaiserchronik, set the ultimate precedent.

3.3.4 The Kaiserchronik and the Crusades

First and foremost, the crusades as a social movement serve as the cultural underpinning for the Kaiserchronik, and as an important point of reference for many of the values that animate the text in both its episodic and overall forms. 98 Friedrich Ohly acknowledged this aspect of the text without dedicating much specific attention to his use of the term “crusader spirit”, and Harald Tersch sees the Kaiserchronik’s author as being “under the spell” of the crusading mentality. 99 At the time of its composition, the movement had ballooned and invested so many aspects of Christian life in the regions where it took root. It affected personal and communal piety, helped

97 On this practice with respect to the Kaiserchronik see Stackmann, “Erzählstrategie und Sinnvermittlung”, 63-82. 98 For a general work on the crusade spirit see Werner Goetz, “Wandlungen des Kreuzzugsgedankens in Hoch- und Spätmittelalter”, in Das Heilige Land im Mittelalter. Begegnungsraum zwischen Orient und Okzident, ed. Woffdieterich Fischer and Jürgen Schneider (Neustadt an d. Aisch: Degener, 1982). For more in-depth studies see also, Erdmann, The Origin of the Idea of Crusading; Purkis, Crusading Spirituality; Hiestand, “Gott will es; Iben Fonnesberg-Schmidt, The Popes and the Baltic Crusades 1147-1254 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Maier, Crusade Propaganda; Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Kreuzzugsdichtung. 99 For example, Ohly rather casually refers to a Kreuzfahrergeist that surfaces at several points in the text. This statement is made in reference to the disputation toward the end of the legend where Constantine declares himself and his people enemies of the enemies of Christ. Ohly, Sage und Legende, 171. More broadly, Christopher Wells agrees with Jan Cöln’s assertion that the crusades had a major influence on the religious texts of this period. Christopher Wells, “The Shorter German Verse Texts”, in German Literature of the Early Middle Ages, ed. Brian Murdoch (Boyدد and Brewer, 2004), 187; Harald Tersch, Unruhe im Weltbild. Darstellung und Deutung des zeitgenössischen Lebens in deutschsprachigen Weltchroniken des Mittelalters (Vienna: Böhlau, 1996), 139.
knit a warrior’s sense of honour with a religious imperative, defined the medieval Christian
west’s interaction with foreign cultures for centuries to come, and provided the laity with a new
tools to construct their identity. In the realm of politics, the crusades complicated long-standing
questions about the nature of the relationship of papacy and empire and even offered a means of
conflict resolution that was often beneficial to all parties. The force of the crusading
movement also had an impact on the way historiographers of this period framed the events of the
past. A tendency to instrumentalize the historical material for the benefit of contemporaries is
one of the hallmarks of medieval historiography, but this unidirectional model projects slightly
too much calculating objectivity on the figure of the author. The composers of historiographical
works were every bit the product of their time as we might expect, and when an author described
an event using contemporary vocabulary or teased out a thematic example by imbuing it with the
concerns and tensions of his own time, we see that he imagined people of the past were troubled
by the same things as his own world. We can observe the way in which the crusades formed one
of the most important cultural reference points of the Kaiserchronik in the Heraclius vita. When
news reached Rome that the Persian king Cosdras had captured Jerusalem and only the presence
of an angel prevented the destruction of the Holy Sepulchre itself, Heraclius led an army of
Romans to the city. To encourage his troops before the final assault on the city Heraclius
delivered a speech reminiscent of the model crusading sermons discussed in the previous
chapter.

“owol ir helde snelle,
ich sage iu ze aim bîspelle:
ain liut haizet Hebrêî,
den zeicte got ain vil guot lant,
dô er si nôthaft vant,
unt hiez si ir laides darinne vergezzen,

100 Kaeuper, Holy Warriors, 71-79, 169-193; Riley-Smith, Oxford Illustrated History, 77-84.
101 The episode takes place through Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 11,138-11,351.
102 The following lines draw on a tradition that goes deeper than the crusades, one that is fundamental to a Christian
understanding of salvation history. The failure of the Jews to take the opportunity for salvation offered them by God
is one of the chief differences between the chosen people of the Old Testament and those of the New. We cannot,
therefore, ignore the importance of this motif when we examine this passage, but as we will see in my analysis of the
Vorauer Bücher Mosis, the failure of the Hebrews was adapted to a crusading context. See Ch. 4 of this work and
also, D.A. Wells, The Vorau Moses and Balaam. A Study of their Relationship to the Exegetical Tradition
(Cambridge: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1970), 144; Cole, Preaching of the Crusades, 60.
want ez sîne widerwarten hêten besezzen.‖

He continues to narrate the way in which these people [Hebrêî] were doubtful, passed on their opportunity, and were barred from entering the land. Now this privilege has passed to the Romans if they will only seize it. The parallels between this brief excerpt and the approach of crusade preachers is too similar to ignore. A typological relationship between the Romans and the Hebrews of the Old Testament people is drawn, followed by an explication of the divine reward the soldiers who participate can expect to receive. The Kaiserchronik author has chosen to depict the Heraclius story in a more modern parlance, characterizing the entire episode as one that could (and did) play out in the twelfth century. The crusades constituted such an important cultural reference point that we find events utterly unconnected to the crusading movement depicted as if the same impulses were at work in both periods. This example helps us understand both how the movement operated as part of the text’s cultural framework, and why, perhaps, it found reception in Styria.

3.3.5 The Imperial-Papal Paradigm and the Crusades

Much more than a series of armed campaigns, the crusading movement had such a major impact on the political and social situation in some areas that historiographers of the period, such as Otto of Freising, reported the shift in their society these campaigns brought on. Indeed, the empire was in a rather fractured state under Henry IV, and the events of his reign are important in

---

103a:’Hark to, you bold heroes, I will give you an example: you should take a people called the Hebrews as your model. God showed them a very good land when he found them in danger, and commanded them to forget their suffering there, but his enemies then possessed it‖. Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv.11,208-11,215.

104 The example comes from Numbers, 13-14.

105 Typological comparisons derive from the tradition of Biblical exegesis and constitute an important meaning-building strategy in many medieval texts, particularly historiographical ones that seek to create associations between contemporary events and those of importance from the perspective of salvation history. On this topic see Erich Auerbach, Typologische Motive in der mittelalterlichen Literatur (Krefeld: Sherpe Verlag, 2nd ed.1964); Friedrich Ohly, “Typologie als Denkform der Geschichtsschreibung”, in Internationale Beiträge zur Poetik, ed. Volker Bohn (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1988), 22-63; Ohly, “Synagoge und Ecclesia: Typologisches in mittelalterlicher Dichtung”, repr. in Schriften zur mittelalterlichen Bedeutungsforschung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977), 312-337; Earl Miner, ed., Literary Uses of Typology From the Late Middle Ages to the Present (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

106 See my brief discussion of this topic in Ch. 2 of this work, in addition to Landes, “The Dynamics of Heresy”, 467-471, 478-487. Chroniclers such as Ekkehard of Aura also noted the instability of the period before the Second Crusade. F-J Schmale, ed., Frutolfi et Ekkehardi Chronica necnon Anonymi Chronica Imperatorum (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972), under the year 1116 on p. 324, 1121 on p. 350, 1123 on p. 362 and 1125 on p. 374.
understanding the impact of the crusades on the period when the Kaiserchronik was composed.\textsuperscript{107} The Investiture Conflict and the Saxon Rebellion demonstrated the vulnerable position of royal authority when succession was complicated by the young age of the successor. Anno of Cologne’s kidnapping of the young Henry IV in 1062 and the indignity of having to surrender the imperial regalia were also detrimental to the perception of royal authority.\textsuperscript{108} Timothy Reuter has even called this period (roughly 1050-1150) a “crisis of confidence” in the empire and links it to a revival of interest in both Roman and local history.\textsuperscript{109} A centrifugal effect meant that lords greater and lesser turned to their own domains and sought to secure the bases of their own power and legitimacy, perhaps made uneasy by the way in which royal authority suddenly appeared to rest on weak foundations.\textsuperscript{110} We have seen the interest in local and family history at work in Styria in the twelfth century, and though this was a period of expansion of Otakarian influence and power for its own sake, the extent to which this household was involved in the rift between the church and the empire suggests these concerns were also at play.\textsuperscript{111} The Kaiserchronik might also be seen in this context, and the thematization of the relationship between the emperors and popes in this text indicates its relevance for contemporaries.\textsuperscript{112}

The crusades, however, were a powerful social force that ultimately, in the case of the Second Crusade, led to a level of cooperation between the papacy and the empire not seen for several decades. That the Kaiserchronik appeared around this time and in this milieu with its catalog of historical examples of the interaction of popes and emperors is not at all surprising. Herweg notes that the text often presents relationship between the two as brotherly, with the highest praise reserved for those emperors who excelled in their role as vogt and advanced the cause of

\textsuperscript{107} See I.S. Robinson, Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: the Polemical Literature of the late Eleventh Century (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978); Johannes Laudage, ed., Der Investiturstreit: Quellen und Materialien (Cologne: Böhlau, 1989); Hartmann, Investiturstreit; Robinson, Henry IV; Althoff, Henry IV.


\textsuperscript{109} See in particular, Reuter, “Past, Present and No Future”, 15-36.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 29.

\textsuperscript{111} Mezler-Andelberg, “Kirchenreform”, 145-146.

\textsuperscript{112} Herweg, Kaiserchronik, 496. Nellmann believes that this is a central aspect of the text, and most agree. Eberhard Nellmann, Die Reichsidee in deutschen Dichtungen der Salier- und frühen Stauferzeit. Annolied – Kaiserchronik – Rolandslied – Eracleus (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1963). However, Tibor Pézsa, examining the prologue, does not see this ideal represented in the author’s formulation of the purpose of his text. Pézsa, Studien zu Erzähltechnik, 17.
Above I described the importance of the precedent of Constantine and Sylvester, and the author’s assertion that Charlemagne and Leo III were actual brothers; both of these figures are representative of the ideal union of worldly and spiritual honour, the conduct of a ruler laudable from a secular perspective that also guarded and enhanced Christendom. For Mathias Herweg, this is a pre-Gregorian vision of an *Imperium Christianum* that resurfaces with the crusading movement. We have observed a drawing together of lay and ecclesiastical interests that coincided with the crusades in Styria, a region where the *Kaiserchronik* found reception quite early.

### 3.3.6 The First Crusade vv. 16,618-16,790

Given the unequal character of the *Kaiserchronik*’s reporting of historical events, it is difficult to determine what material was deliberately included or discarded and what simply might have been lacking in the sources available to the compiler. Some events seem to have been rather conspicuously omitted, especially given their relevance for some of the central motifs of the text. Henry IV’s capitulation at Canossa, for example, is absent despite the considerable implications for the relationship of the emperor and the pope and the standing of the church within the empire. The inclusion of a somewhat lengthy narration of the First Crusade appears much more significant in light of this fact. Above I described the way in which Godfrey’s exemplary conduct in the service of the Lord forms a clear counter-example to the sinful conduct of Henry IV, but the length of the passage and the observable impact of the crusading movement on the text indicate a greater significance. Roughly half of the version of the First Crusade presented in the *Kaiserchronik* was taken from Ekkehard of Aura, although there is much that cannot be pinned to any known source. Raymond of Aguilers also may have served as a source here but

---

113 This term is used frequently throughout the *Kaiserchronik* to characterize the role of the emperor with respect to the church. See for example the Heraclius *vita* or, more importantly, Charlemagne’s. See my discussion of the term as it applied to the Styrian margraves in Ch.1.


115 Herweg, *Kaiserchronik*, 496.

116 Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 23. On Canossa and its consequences see note 90.

117 Stephen J. Kaplowitt, “Reflections of the Crusades in the ‘Kaiserchronik’”, *Neophilologus* 48 no. 3 (1964), 230. See Kaplowitt for a slightly more detailed account of which elements can be traced and which cannot. For a comparison between the *Kaiserchronik* and Ekkehard on the crusades see: Heinrich Welzhofer, *Untersuchungen über die deutsche Kaiserchronik des zwölften Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Ackermann, 1874), 48-50. Ekkehard’s account comes from a crusader letter to Pope Pascal II, which the *Disibodenberger Annalen* relate in 1100.
Kaplowitt has suggested that the Kaiserchronik’s author did not possess a written copy of the text. While the Middle High German work does not include any of the more popular and orally circulating tales of Godfrey in the Holy Land, the author appears to have embellished the capture of Jerusalem. This campaign had little to do with Henry IV and events in the empire, and indeed only a small contingent of German speakers participated (some of these from Styria and Austria, see the previous chapter). Aside from the interpretive value of this episode as a counter-example, it appears otherwise disconnected from the text, a fact underscored by the abrupt beginning and conclusion of the episode. Nevertheless, the author created a space for an event, the historical import of which was apparent to contemporaries. Therefore, we ought to read this passage in two ways, as an exemplum consistent with our reading of most of the other vitae and episodes, and as an essentially disembodied passage meant to highlight the significance of this event in a broad sense. With the first reading, we maintain a consistent image of the narrative presenting example and counter-example, generally in the form of imperial vitae or a digressive, moralized legend grafted onto an episode. By presenting the crusade as a process that unfolded under a leader, the Kaiserchronik author made the narration consistent with the rest of the work, disguising the events as a quasi-vita in order to integrate them. This tactic has the added appeal of styling the undertaking in a fashion that was imitable for lay nobles who would themselves mount a martial expedition to the Holy Land. Godfrey’s service to the Lord and Christendom is heavily emphasized and mirrors the approach of crusade preachers who sought to convince would-be crusaders that their talents could be put to use in a religious capacity to the benefit of the Christian world. Moreover, the author concludes the episode with a passage in praise of Godfrey, posing a final question to the audience.

wâ fraiscet ir è oder sît
ie dehain man sô spæhen,
dem der ie só wol geschæhe
ze allen wëltlichen èren?120

Ekkehard was the middleman through which this information passed into the Kaiserchronik. Schröder, Die Kaiserchronik, 68.

118 Kaplowitt, “Reflections of the Crusades”, 232.
119 The narrator introduces the episode with a simple chronological link (Under diu chom daz zît v. 16,618) but before this he closes the previous narrative thread (nû lâzen wir die rede sûn v. 16,615). The episode ends with the narrator acknowledging his diversion and a reminder of the context of the previous excerpt (Nû suln wir wider grîfen/ze dem kaiser Hainrîche. vv. 16,790-16,79).
120 “Where have you ever heard since, any other man so skillfully conduct himself, for whom everything turned out to all worldly honour?” Herweg, Kaiserchronik, vv. 16,781-16,784.
This rhetorical assertion that Godfrey’s actions had earned him the earthly honour merited by a warrior and leader is followed by a confirmation that these same actions earned him a sacred burial in the Holy Sepulchre.\(^{121}\) These closing verses encapsulate what a crusader might hope to derive from a crusade (and what he was led to believe he might derive from a crusade by its advocates). Crusade preachers rousing support in the mid-century made similar use of the events of the First Crusade, and these lines reflect the ideology of holy war that developed in the aftermath of that expedition.\(^{122}\) It is a characteristically mid-twelfth-century formulation of the benefits of crusading that fits very well with the convergence of spiritual and worldly interests around the crusades at this time.

In the second reading, as a disconnected episode, Godfrey and his success also possesses exemplary value independent of his inverse, Henry IV. Kaplowitt makes reference to a great deal of lore that grew up around Godfrey and his exploits which does not find its way into the Kaiserchronik, and in his overall judgment, the narration of the First Crusade is a generally factual one.\(^{123}\) This passage, in my opinion, also holds as a piece of historical writing in itself, with enough interest stripped of its (textual) context for a twelfth-century audience. In both cases there was sufficient motivation to include it, and in the former, enough interest to give it a form that would allow it to be integrated into the rest of the text. The specter of these conflicts cast a long shadow over the twelfth century and constitutes a crucial point of references for the culture of that period, and to deny them a place in a work of history that is so clearly animated by the spirit of the movement seems unthinkable in this context.

### 3.3.7 The Second Crusade 17,248-17,283

The Kaiserchronik breaks off just before the Second Crusade, and it is not entirely clear whether the author intended to narrate it. Vorau is the only complete text that survives from the twelfth century and the other fragments from this time do not transmit either the First Crusade section or

\(^{121}\) Schröder, Kaiserchronik, vv. 16,785-16,789.


\(^{123}\) Kaplowitt, “Reflections of the Crusades”, 230.
the lead-up to the Second.\textsuperscript{124} Although it breaks off before the campaign itself, the last line of the Vorau \textit{Kaiserchronik} ends on a very high note, and perhaps it was intended to: King Conrad III prepares to go on crusade following the preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux.

Der bâbes Eugênûs
der gewarf dô alsus:
er hiez iz chlagen drâte
dem chunige Chunorâte
und dem chunige Ludewîge.
daz enstuont niht lange wîle,
unze der abbât Pernhart
den wursten geliebte die vart.
er chom ze dem chunige Chuonrâte,
er manet in harte
mit sîner suozen lêre.
er sprach, daz selbe unser hêrre
in dar zuo erwelte.
der chunich niht langer netwelte.\textsuperscript{125}

Herweg has suggested that it might have been a fitting end to the text, having depicted an instance of the king and the pope working together to advance the cause of Christendom.\textsuperscript{126} In many ways this represents a much better example than the First Crusade which appeared to be the work of some zealots acting more or less independently of papal directives. But here we see Conrad responding directly to the pleas of Eugenius, with Bernard’s preaching—of which we see a small snippet—ultimately convincing the king of the worthiness of the cause. Conrad had already been to the Holy Land in the 1120s, which might have played a role in his taking of the cross. If the narration of the First Crusade established how great the merits of the endeavour were for the participants, the lead-up to the Second portrays the campaign as an instance of cooperation between the pope and (a would-be) emperor within that same context. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{124} The thirteenth-century codex Heidelberg, cod. pal. 361 is the closest manuscript that contains the entire A (Vorau) version. See Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, 16-25 for a detailed account of the fragmentary versions with specific references to the lines they transmit.

\textsuperscript{125} "Pope Eugenius then made sure that the complaints reached King Conrad and King Louis. It was not long before the abbot Bernard convinced the lords of the journey. He came to King Conrad, and admonished him strongly with his sweet words. He said that our Lord himself chose him [Conrad] for this task. The king did not wait any longer.” Schröder, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, vv.17,270-17,283. Note: I have chosen to end this last verse with a period, siding rather with Mathias Herweg’s suggestion—against Schröder and most—that there is no reason why this verse could not constitute a sentence in itself. Herweg, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, 469. See also Karl-Heinz Hennen, \textit{Strukturanalysen und Interpretationen zur Kaiserchronik} [Diss.] (Cologne, 1977), vol. 2, 165ff. There are many examples of this verse—a very common formula in this text—ending as a complete sentence. For example, v. 14,411 \textit{er newolte niht langer beliben}.

\textsuperscript{126} Herweg, \textit{Kaiserchronik}, 469.
not only could the audience attribute to Conrad all of the same worldly and spiritual honours as Godfrey, but his cooperation with the papacy also imbues him the same honour as Constantine, Charlemagne, and all the emperors who have been praised for their support and protection of the church. In this way, the First Crusade is a very important point of reference for the audience’s interpretation of the Second. It is clear that Conrad responds directly to the admonitions of the church and the eagerness with which the author portrays him underscores this fact. Although, historically, Louis of France was the first to agree to take on the crusade, having previously and independently of the papacy resolved to go to the Holy Land, the *Kaiserchronik* portrays Conrad as the leading figure. The author usurped the initiative from Louis and stylized the entire campaign in such a way that the audience would receive an image consistent with much of the work. Imperial-papal cooperation is again the leitmotif at the conclusion of the text, but the added dimension of the context of the crusade builds Conrad into an extremely admirable figure. The *Kaiserchronik*’s version of the events leading up to the Second Crusade are quite accurate. The rise of Zengi—and here the author departs from reality; Zengi was not the son of Agnes of Bavaria—and the fall of Edessa were the major triggers. Like the portrayal of the First Crusade with its factually faithful spine, the unfolding of the Second Crusade appears to receive the same generally accurate treatment. Aside from shifting the impetus to the German-speaking world, there seems to have been little need to embellish this episode. The church and its worldly protector were, at the conclusion of the text, united against the enemies of Christendom in a way that no other pair had achieved. If an ideal Christendom involves a harmonious relationship between church and empire, an emperor who answers the call to defend the church when its leader beckons, then perhaps Conrad’s reign was a suitable point at which to conclude the narrative. This is not to suggest that author or any audience would look to Conrad as the most exemplary ruler in the long history of the empire, but there is no doubt that the *Kaiserchronik* chose to highlight his willingness to cooperate with the papacy in this matter. Not depicted is Conrad’s initial reluctance to accept the cross—it took Bernard more than one attempt to break

127 It is worth bearing in mind that the Vorau manuscript was likely conceived and completed when some of those who had taken part in the Second Crusade were still alive.

128 This is also consistent with the depiction of the crusade in the annals contained in Vorau MS. 171. *Chunradius itaque imperator cum innumerabili multitudine peregrinationum ingressus yconium pervenit. Cui Lodwicus rex Frincorum cum multa militia per ungariam descendens ibidem aduenerit. “And so Emperor Conrad, together with an innumerable multitude of pilgrims reached and entered Iconium. Louis the king of the French, descending through Hungary with a great number of soldiers, reached him there.”* fol. 108v.

129 Madden, *Concise History*, 51-53.
down the German king’s resistance. What the audience receives from this text is an image of Conrad eagerly fulfilling his role as voget of the church, not a reluctant crusader who only gave in under significant pressure. Conrad was meant to be counted with those emperors who worked hand in hand with their spiritual counterparts, and given the extent to which the crusades and the crusading movement underwrote this text, we have strong reason to believe that Conrad’s crusade represents a high point in the Kaiserchronik and its ideal of papal-imperial harmony.

3.3.8 Conclusion

The Kaiserchronik had a broad appeal throughout the centuries in which the text was actively copied and used. While other works rose to popularity and fell out of fashion, the Kaiserchronik possessed a timeless quality that kept interest high for hundreds of years. This fact is telling of the author’s ability to craft a version of history that so effectively addressed the needs of present (and future) audiences. It could not have been intended as a straightforward catalogue of emperors; the massive gaps and invented rulers preclude this notion. Its didactic, and at times playful, approach to the subject matter suggests rather a text to be enjoyed for entertainment and edification. For many medieval historiographers, knowing what happened in the past for its own sake was less important and less urgent than deriving some sort of utility from it, and the Kaiserchronik is no exception. It uses history, legend, and invention to confirm social norms and values held by twelfth-century audiences, and subordinates most other concerns. In the above analysis we have seen the ways in which this text presented a version of imperial history that was heavily influenced by the twelfth-century’s concern with dynasty and heritage. Nobles who based their identity in part on their ancestry felt a great pressure resulting from the memory of their deeds and that burden of expectation very clearly plays out in the reigns of several of the medieval emperors. The spirit of cooperation between ecclesiastical and lay institutions that stands out in the text must have appealed to an audience thoroughly immersed in the crusading culture of the twelfth century and affirmed what for many, including the Otakars of Styria, was a central component of their social, political, and spiritual existence.

The Kaiserchronik’s presentation of historical time as a series of reigns or lifetimes falls into a category of historiography that we find in other instances in the Vorau manuscript. An excellent

---

130 Herweg, Kaiserchronik, 494.
example is the Alexander text that renders a critical juncture in the passage of historical time. Twelfth-century lay nobles, with their emphasis on the deeds carried out by previous dynastic representatives well understood the importance of a single reign and the knock-on effect for the future. Even if salvation history is not a defining characteristic or a consistently executed leitmotif in this text, the lives and reigns of individual rulers were the fundamental markers of the passage of time and constituted an access point for those seeking to extrapolate the value of past.\footnote{Chinca and Young argue against the idea of salvation history as an overarching interpretational principle for the text. The issue is complicated by the distinct change in the narration of the medieval emperors and warrants greater discussion. Furthermore, these scholars have ignored a crucial factor in the interpretation of this text, namely the context of the (Vorau) manuscript, whose compiler clearly utilized this text in part for its ability to slot into a salvation historical macro narrative. Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 26.} This type of narration provides an ideal medium through which to channel the motifs outlined above and allowed any lay noble public engaged in a leadership role with an interest in legitimacy to easily internalize them. In the context of the crusades, where spiritual and social imperatives grew increasingly intertwined, the medium of imperial \textit{vitae} as a vehicle for comment on an idealized unity between lay and ecclesiastical is particularly effective. Perhaps the crusades of decades to come were responsible for driving this mentality on and so buoying the \textit{Kaiserchronik’s} popularity. All speculation aside, this text was received early in its life in Styria, where both lay, clerical, and monastic communities understood their place in the world and the ways in which each sustained the other. Here the \textit{Kaiserchronik} was a welcome and relevant explication of the history of the papal and imperial institutions that possessed a significance for that region.

3.4. The Vorau \textit{Alexander}

3.4.1 Introduction

The version of the Middle High German \textit{Alexander} in the Vorau manuscript represents a significant departure from its other, near contemporary versions. Its 1,500 verses (in modern edition) span the folios 109ra-115va, and it sits between the \textit{Jüngere Judith} and the \textit{Leben Jesu} at a crucial juncture in the codex’s program bridging the Old and New Testament material. In addition, it represents the first German reworking of a French source, a trend best exemplified in the following century by the great courtly romances. It was composed about 1160 by a priest,
Lambrecht, who named himself in both this text, and a fragmentary Tobias roughly a decade before. Both works exhibit Mosel-Frankish linguistic tendencies and it is believed that Lambrecht was working in or around Trier. Aside from the Vorau version (V), the Alexander survives in two substantially longer versions, the 6,854 line Strasbourg (S) likely composed between 1170 and 1185, and the Basel (B) text of 4,734 lines from the end of the thirteenth century. Lambrecht’s original text is itself a reworking of a French work by Alberic of Besançon, which only survives as a small fragment (105 lines), composed around 1100 in the form of a chanson de geste in eight-syllable rhymed laisses. While it is impossible to know what Alberic’s original text contained, and how much of this material Lambrecht chose to include, Christoph Mackert’s study has demonstrated that the German went well beyond merely translating his source and he presented his audience with his own, nuanced depiction of the well-known ruler.

Some fascinating questions continue to surround this text, and almost every discussion of the Vorau Alexander has revolved around several key issues. The desire to place this text on the spectrum of medieval culture has been driven by the poem’s somewhat uncharacteristically

136 Mackert, Die Alexandergeschichte.
profane subject matter, which is, nevertheless, coloured with scriptural and spiritual undertones. Its unclear status raises questions of authority in vernacular texts vis-à-vis their Latin counterparts, and of what we might learn from the author’s deployment of material from both traditions. The depiction of Alexander himself has garnered much attention, as scholars grapple with what to make of the text and its utility to its audience. Is this Alexander the biblical and historical one who conquered the world as part of God’s plan, or is he the legendary figure who travelled to the limits of the physical world? Does his value lie purely in the realm of the moral, as an example of pride and vanity? The great number of texts that deal with Alexander from the classical period through the Middle Ages across many genres complicate any interpretation of this figure, and each author seems to have his own take. Or, scholars become mired in the debate about V’s conclusion, a small group of verses describing the death of Darius, whose somewhat hurried aspect has led to questions about the intended extent of the text, and whether or not the conclusion originates with Lambrecht himself.


138 On the discussion of the vanitatum vanitas motif in the Alexander material see Schröder, “Zum Vanitas-Gedanken”, 38-55. This interpretation was largely based on S, before V was even discovered; Julius Schwietering, Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters (Potsdam: Athenaios, 1932). Lambrecht addresses the issue of idleness and vanity in his prologue, and interpretations of this passage vary. Urbanek, Fischer, Brummack, and most recently Mackert have convincingly argued that this refers not to the interpretation of the poem, but rather to the author’s own motivations for writing. Mackert, Vorau Alexander, 90-109; Jürgen Brummack, Die Darstellung des Orients in deutschen Alexandergeschichten des Mittelalters (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1966), 14; Ferdinand Urbanek, “Umfang und Intention von Lamprechts Alexanderlied”, ZfdA 99 (1970), 115; Wolfgang Fischer, Die Alexanderkonzeption des Pfaffen Lambrecht (Munich: Eidos, 1964).

139 Aside from the Book of Maccabees, the Alexander biography of Quintus Curtius Rufus (first century A.D.), the Gesta Alexandri Magni, or Alexandri Magni historiae, is the major historiographical source for knowledge of Alexander in the Middle Ages. Justinus and Orosius also devoted some space to the Macedonian in their universal chronicles and Peter Comestor’s twelfth-century Historia scholastica, a text well represented in Styrian libraries, was also influential. The vernacular tradition, with its much more legendary depiction of Alexander’s further campaigns into India, leaned more heavily on the Greek work attributed to the Pseudo-Callisthenes, who also transmitted the Nectanabus legend. His much more fantastical trips to paradise and the bottom of the sea stem from the Talmudic tradition of the twelfth century. Pseudo-Callisthenes was available to the Latin west via several reworkings, the first of which was the Res gestae Alexandri Magni by Julius Valerius in the fourth century. The archpriest Leo of Naples, too, produced a version of this text in the tenth century, which is known as the Historia de preliis Alexandri Magni. For a fuller discussion of the Alexander material available in the twelfth century see Trude Ehler, Deutschsprachige Alexanderdichtung des Mittelalters. Zum Verhältnis von Literatur und Geschichte (Bern/Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 1989), 12-17; Alfred Ebenbauer, “Antike Stoffe”, in Epische Stoffe des Mittelalters, ed. Volker Mertens and Ulrich Müller (Stuttgart: A Kröner, 1984), 268-280.

140 This is a fascinating question that has yet to receive a satisfactory answer despite the creative ways in which scholars have approached it. Cölln, “Sprachliche Herkunft”, 29-30; Cölln, “Arbeit an Alexander”, 184; Mackert, Vorau Alexander, 17-20; Klaus Grubmüller, “Die Vorauers Handschrift und ihr Alexander. Die kodikologische Befunde: Bestandsaufnahme und Kritik”, in Alexanderdichtung im Mittelalter, ed. Jan Cölln, et al. (Göttingen:
All of these questions contribute to a broader discussion of the Vorau Alexander’s place in a literary landscape, and in a world with the complex dynamics of a growing confidence in the vernacular coming to terms with an entrenched and authoritative Latinate culture. Very few studies, however, deal with the reception of the individual instances of these texts. Christoph Mackert notes that no one has attempted to place the Vorau Alexander or the manuscript in a social-historical context. Shortly after, Jan Cölln attempted to identify what he calls a Kommunikationsgemeinschaft, a group, or groups, of people who saw this text as a relevant expression of some aspect of their (inter)relationship. My analysis of the Vorau Alexander will take into account what we already know about the political and social climate of Styria and where the interests of the court and the monastic institutions overlapped at the time of the manuscript’s compilation. Although some of the questions listed above would undoubtedly contribute a great deal to this discussion, I am chiefly interested in reception, and what those who heard or read this text in twelfth-century Styria might have seen in it. Whether or not the ending of V comes from Alberic, Lambrecht, an intermediary, or the Vorau compiler is not, strictly speaking, integral to the following discussion, and in freeing myself from these contested and perhaps ultimately unanswerable questions I will offer an analysis of this work that is consistent with the current of crusading propaganda that was so influential at this time.

The three versions, although related, diverge in several highly significant ways. The Vorau version covers only the events of Alexander’s life up to his defeat of Darius, the Persian monarch of Maccabees. None of the Macedonian’s further conquests in the Far East or his Iter ad paradisum are present in this version. The Strasbourg version, however, offers a much-expanded depiction of the story which includes the Darius episode, Alexander’s conquest of the known world, and his efforts to subdue even the heavenly realm of paradise. Around a century later, another author produced the Basel version, the content of which mirror quite closely that of the S version. S and B, however, differ greatly in their depiction of the Alexander figure who is presented as the supernatural son of an Egyptian sorcerer Nectanabus in B, but as the wholly human son of Philip and Olympias in S. The interpretational implications of this distinction

Wallstein Verlag, 2000), 209; Urbanek, “Umfang und Intention”, 96-98. Henrike Lähnemann has suggested a parallel between Alexander’s beheading of Darius and the fate of Holofernes in the Judith texts, which in turn might add weight to the argument that the Vorau redactor adapted the text to mirror the previously narrated historical events and draw attention to a similarity there. Henrike Lähnemann, Hystoria Judith. Deutsche Judithdichtung vom 12. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 129 and 179.  
141 Cölln, “Arbeit an Alexander”, 166.
within a Christian context are absolutely clear; the audience’s perception of Alexander and his actions depended heavily on whether or not he was human. In V, widely held to be a rather faithful reproduction of Lambrecht’s original, the author—mirroring his French source—goes to great pains to rehabilitate Alexander’s heritage, clearly establishing at the outset of the narrative that he was the human son of a conventional union between his parents. As Mackert and others note, the rehabilitation of Alexander’s heritage in the V and S versions is clearly meant to satisfy a lay noble audience, whose own self-conception as rulers was an integral part of their engagement with the text.142 The location in the text of the author’s rejection of the Nectanabus legend betrays its importance to the narrative. It begins on just line ten of the prologue and constitutes one of the core interpretational elements of the text. It is, moreover, the most important difference between V and S on one side, and B on the other. Because S is much longer and presents a narrative that contains so much more material not contained in V that influences an interpretation of the story and its Alexander, the theme of his heritage must be considered in a different light. The uniqueness of the Vorau version consists in the limited scope of its narration in comparison to the other versions, and the particular role that Alexander’s heritage plays therein.

A text that chiefly thematises the importance of heritage in the context of rulership would have resonated with a lay noble audience in a territory that was so receptive to the crusading impulse and so conscious of the dynastic pressures associated with it. For the Vorau manuscript’s canonical compilers, the integrity of their founder and patron’s dynasty had a direct bearing on the status and well-being of their institution, and the region’s religious houses were certainly aware of their own role in maintaining the perception of a well-established and legitimate Otakarian dynasty. Even though Otakar IV died around the time of the manuscript’s production,

we have seen the ways in which texts with such themes would have continued to hold relevance for the incoming Babenbergs.\textsuperscript{143} There was a great variety of Alexander material available in the twelfth century, offering depictions that highlighted one or another aspect of Alexander’s life that held value from a moral, exemplary, or purely biblical-historical perspective. The appearance of an Alexander text in the Vorau manuscript that places so much emphasis on his heritage is particularly noteworthy in a twelfth-century Styrian context.

### 3.4.2 Dynasty and Heritage in the Vorau *Alexander*

The Vorau *Alexander*’s limited scope focuses our interpretation on a much more historical Alexander. Lambrecht’s mention of the Book of Macabees suggests that he is presenting the biblical/historical Alexander, and not the much more fantastical version of the Pseudo-Callisthenes and Talmudic traditions. It is an Alexander whose conflicts resulted from pressures recognizable to a twelfth-century lay audience. Lambrecht frequently reorients material generally interpreted in a spiritual light toward his noble audience; when he describes Solomon as a *frumer kunic*, for example, he translates the biblical king’s worth into a lay noble context by instilling him with the lordly virtues of bravery and military aptitude associated with the adjective.\textsuperscript{144} The audience, it seems, is meant to look to the world of feudal politics and socialization for its interpretational cues. Initially the conflict of the narrative appears to result from Alexander’s refusal to submit to the demand for tribute (*zins*) that Darius had been collecting from Philip. This interpretation has been thoroughly analyzed and largely rejected as an insufficient premise from a narrative standpoint, and, I argue, from a socio-historical one.\textsuperscript{145}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{143} See Ch. 2, pp. 40-42, 54-62.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Mackert describes a much more extensive effort to feudalize the vocabulary of the biblical allusions in the Vorau text. Mackert, *Vorau Alexander*, 108. The MHG adjective *vrum* or *frum* has a much broader range of meanings than its NHG counterpart (*fromm*), most importantly it does not carry the same religious connotation. Generally speaking, *vrum* refers to an admirable quality, something that befits the attributee. In the case of a king, for example, it means rather brave or honourable and signals a recognition that the subject possesses the qualities expected of his office. For a very useful discussion of MHG vocabulary set within its courtly context and with specific reference to royalty and the lay aristocracy see, Joachim Bumke, *Höfische Kultur. Literatur und Gesellschaft im hohen Mittelalter* (Munich: Taschenbuch Verlag, 8\textsuperscript{th} ed. 1997), 382-450, with a particular example of the use of the word on p. 445. See also the entry in Lexer, vol. III, col. 428b, s.v. *vrum*.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Although Urbanek believed that the *zins* motif is the major driving force behind the narrative action, Mackert believes it was deployed more as a marker in the narrative to give structure to the work. He suggests that the mention of the tribute after the death of Darius is meant rather to signal the conclusion of that episode. Urbanek, “Umfang und Intention”, 98; Mackert, *Vorau Alexander*, 333. Schröder does not believe the *zins* motif is well
\end{itemize}
Rather, the poet makes absolutely clear at the outset of the poem that dynastic concerns will play a major role in the narration, serving as the driving force of the action.

At the beginning of the narrative, having presented himself, the poet proceeds to introduce the topic of his work (wer Alexander wêre), which he has chosen to do by means of reference to not only some noteworthy biographical information, but also by naming his father. The Book of Maccabees is the source of his genealogical knowledge, an authority which supersedes the untrustworthy accounts of the Pseudo-Callisthenes tradition claiming that Alexander’s father was an Egyptian sorcerer.

Iz tihte der phaffe Lambret.
Er tâte uns gerne ze mâre,
wer Alexander wâre.
Alexander was ein wîse man,
vil manec rîche er gewan,
er zestôrte vil manec lant.
Philippus was sîn vater genant.
Diz mugit ir wol hôren
in libro Machabeorum.\textsuperscript{146}

And after a lengthy passage in praise of Alexander’s nobility and the expanse of his kingdom, the Pfaffe returns to the subject of Alexander’s heritage in much greater detail. Here Lambrecht directly addresses the Nectanabus legend.

\begin{quote}
Nû sprechent bôse lugenâre,
daz er eines goukelâres sun wâre.
Di ez ímer gesagent,
dî liegent alsô bôse zagen,
oder di es î gedâhten.
Er was rehter cheiser slahte.
Nimer geloube ez nehein frum man.
Sînen vater ich wol genennen kan:
Sîn geslahte daz was hêrlîch,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{146} “The Pfaffe Lambrecht composed this. He would like to tell us, who Alexander was. Alexander was an intelligent man, he conquered a great many empires, many lands he laid waste. His father was called Philip. You can indeed hear this in the book of Maccabees.” Lienert, Alexanderroman, vv. 4-12. All subsequent quotations have been taken from this edition.
ubir al Chrîchen was er gewaltic.
Philippus hîz der vater sîn,
al Macedonenlant was sîn.
Sîn ane was ein gût kneht,
uber al daz mer gî sîn reht.
Er trûc eine tugentliche maht.
Awî, wî manic volc wîc er vaht
wider den kunic Xersen!
Harte ellenthafte überwant er den.\textsuperscript{147}

Alberic, the French poet, was the first to rehabilitate Alexander’s heritage, but Lambrecht is
much more thorough in his efforts and reinforces his claim by citing the book of Maccabees as
his source.\textsuperscript{148} Although it is tempting to view this as an act of faithfulness to a biblical source by
a priest, the space Lambrecht devotes to genealogy indicates that the desire to demonstrate
Alexander’s true heritage motivated his selection.\textsuperscript{149} The subsequent description of Alexander’s
pedigree is founded on the indisputable truth that his father was a king. But Lambrecht’s
concern with family and lineage goes beyond merely establishing his paternal lineage. Alexander
himself is described as being of proper imperial stock, and his father’s was \textit{hêrlich}; his
grandfather (\textit{ane}), is also singled out for his virtuous rulership and rivalry with Xerxes.\textsuperscript{150} He is
not described as Philip’s father, but rather Alexander’s grandfather, strengthening the connection
to Alexander himself and underscoring the claims about his heritage.\textsuperscript{151} While many, including
Mackert and Schlechtweg-Jahn, have correctly argued that the description of the military
prowess of these individuals is important in establishing their reputations as good rulers, they
have simultaneously underrepresented the significance of the depiction of this dynasty’s
achievements.\textsuperscript{152} These lines establish a benchmark of honour and conduct that Alexander will

\textsuperscript{147} “Now wicked liars claim, that he was the son of a sorcerer. Those who say this or ever thought it lie like evil
wretches. He was of proper imperial stock. No brave man would ever believe otherwise. I can well name his father.
His house was noble, he held power over all Greece. His father was called Philip, all Macedonia was his. His
[Alexander’s] grandfather was a good warrior, his authority stretched across the entire sea. His strength was born of
virtue. Oh! how many battles he waged against King Xerxes. So bravely he overcame him.” Lienert, \textit{Alexanderroman}, vv. 71-89.

\textsuperscript{148} Alexander appears in the Bible twice: Maccabees 1, 1-10, and Daniel 7.

\textsuperscript{149} Mackert, \textit{Vorau Alexander}, 115; Cölln, however, believes that Lambrecht’s depiction of Alexander as a
salvation-historical figure necessitated an agreement with scriptural sources. Cölln, “Heide als Vorbild”, 89-90.

\textsuperscript{150} Kokott, \textit{Literatur und Herrschaftsbewusstsein}, 122.

\textsuperscript{151} Mackert, \textit{Vorau Alexander}, 113-114.

\textsuperscript{152} The ideals of honour and conduct Mackert and Schlechtweg-Jahn describe in these lines necessarily encompass
the element of standards, however, by omitting an explicit discussion of these they have failed to identify their
influence on the narrative. Schlechtweg-Jahn does, however, allude to the insufficiency of a mere genealogical
be expected to match and exceed. In fact, Lambrecht informs the audience that Alexander was the most distinguished of his line, and thus the audience proceeds under the belief that this was a story of success in that respect, the fulfillment of every noble’s responsibility to match the honour accrued by the previous generations.\textsuperscript{153}

The poet proceeds to address the maternal side of Alexander’s heritage as well, in what amounts to a particularly comprehensive treatment of the subject.

\begin{verbatim}
Philippus nam im ein wîp,
si trûc einen frumeclîchen lip.
Ich sage eu, wî ir name was:
Si hîz die scône Olimpias.
Daz was Alexanders mâter.
Diu frowe hete einen brûder,
der was ouh Alexander genant,
ze Perse heter daz lant.
Der was ein vurste alsô getân,
er ne wolte neheimen kunige wesen undertân.
Er ne wolte ouh nâ úz neheineme sturme geflîhen,
swî im sîniu dinc dâ irgîngen.
Er was ein tiurlîch degen
unde [wolte] ouh rehter hêrscefte phlegen.\textsuperscript{154}
\end{verbatim}

By qualifying Olimpias’s own suitability to produce worthy kings by reference to her male kin, Lambrecht clearly emphasizes the importance of dynasty—carried by the male line. This passage detailing Olimpias’s familial network should not be read as an extension of the author’s earlier effort to restore the dignity of Alexander’s lineage because his maternal parentage was never in question.\textsuperscript{155} Instead, Lambrecht has expanded Alberic’s original thirteen lines detailing Alexander’s lineage into a thirty-one line section, with eight lines devoted to each male relative. Because Lambrecht has already staked his Alexander’s reputation on the authority of the book of description to establish Alexander’s suitability to rule. Mackert, Vorau Alexander, 113; Ralf Schlechtweg-Jahn, Macht und Gewalt im deutschsprachigen Alexanderroman (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2006), 47.

\textsuperscript{153} Der von Chrîchen was geborn / unde wart dâ ze einem kunige irchorn /unde was der aller êrste man, / den î Chrîhlant ze kuneg gewan. “He came from Greece / and was made king there / and he was the most famous man / that Greece ever had as king.”. Lienert, Alexanderroman, vv. 47-50.

\textsuperscript{154} „Philip took a wife, she was beautiful. I’ll tell you what her name was: she was called the beautiful Olimpias. This was Alexander’s mother. The lady had a brother also called Alexander, whose lands were in Persia. He was a lord of such a kind that he never wanted to be subject to any king. Nor did he ever want to flee from any battle, no matter how it was going. He was a brave warrior and also wanted to be a just ruler.”. Lienert, Alexanderroman, vv. 89-102.

\textsuperscript{155} While the details vary, the essential story has Alexander as the product of an Egyptian sorcerer’s seduction of his mother Olimpias.
Maccabees, this passage is more appropriately read with reference to the elevated importance of dynasty and heritage in the German version.

In the prologue to the *Gesta Friderici*, too, the rhetoric of fathers and sons makes up a key element of the narrative strategy. Otto discusses the deeds of Frederick Barbarossa’s father and grandfather so that he might demonstrate that the emperor’s qualifications for rulership are properly rooted.¹⁵⁶ This material is not merely biographical, he states, but is expressly linked to Frederick’s identity as a ruler. Although undoubtedly linked to subject matter and genre, the similar ethos at work in these significantly different texts is noteworthy. One of the empire’s leading ecclesiastics writing in Latin and an obscure priest whose vernacular text is clearly geared towards a lay noble audience qualified the portrayals of their respective subjects through reference to the outstanding achievements of their dynastic forebears. What lay behind the similarities in these works and their depictions is of great interest, especially since Otto’s text could only be accessed by a limited lay audience. Moreover, a certain stratum of the religious audience that was made of members of the aristocracy would have known Latin and felt the same dynastic pressures. The audiences of these texts shared a common interest in the qualities of rulership and understood the bearing that ancestry and heritage had on the perception of these. Perhaps the underlying compatibility of these texts—I refer to the *Alexander*, the *Gesta*, and the Vorau manuscript’s texts in general—despite their significant differences, lay in a recognition of a shared expectation for rulership between lay and clerical audiences enhanced by the crusade propaganda of the twelfth century, now much less perceptible to a modern audience.

The narrative value of setting a standard for the main character and creating anticipation and expectation is apparent, though one might not think it necessary in a much more self-consciously biographical work like the *Gesta*. However, the use of heritage in these works is not purely literary, and in both cases reflects a deeply held belief on the part of the audience(s) that the actions of a predecessor ought to have a bearing on the current dynastic representative, and most certainly creates a burden of expectation from the standpoint of outsiders. It is not clear to what extent those who heard or read the Vorau *Alexander* regarded the content as fictitious, or indeed, what influence the form of the text might have exerted on that perception in contrast to the more

---

straightforwardly serious Latin *Gesta*. Nevertheless, each author made use of a social convention that simultaneously satisfied their audience’s expectations for a legitimate ruler, and created a natural and anticipated narrative arc for the character, who would have been expected to go on and outstrip those who came before.

This tactic initiates a process, whereby the character must become self-sufficient and able to meet the standards set. As a young man Alexander demonstrates his awareness of these dynamics through his deference and demure attitude with respect to his father’s position during his education, for he has not learned the use of weapons and did not yet possess the qualities to rule. When a knight refers to Alexander as king, the young prince reacts by countering that he has not earned the title, in what is surely a comment on the nature of rulership and the economy of honour and nobility that existed between generations. Alexander’s recognition that his pedigree is not a sufficient condition to be made king is followed by a statement in which he acknowledges the standards Lambrecht alluded to in the early part of the text.

Er sprach: "*Woldet ir eine wîle gerûwen, unze ich aine tugent mahoë getuon: an einem chunige wil ich es beginnen, unt mach ich den uberwinden, dac ich dem die chrôni abe ziehe unt üz dem velde tuon geflihen,*

---

157 This is a particularly difficult question to approach. In recent decades debate about fictionality and historicity in medieval writing (a modern reader might distinguish between historiography and fiction) has yielded no consensus about medieval categories of truth in writing, or about categories of writing in general. Scholars have increasingly rejected the relevance of modern conceptions of fiction and non-fiction with respect to medieval literature. Dennis Green has pointed out that the breakdown of these categories raises the importance of the audience’s role in the reception and performance of texts and he describes a contract between purveyor and consumer (Fleischman’s terminology) in which both parties participate in the construction of truth or fictionality. Green’s article raises further questions about individual instances of reception and the importance of examining particular versions in their manuscript contexts. The works accompanying a text in a codex can offer valuable information about its function or value for those who used it and my work is heavily influenced by this belief. In the case of the Vorau manuscript where a clear program has been presented by the compiler, manuscript context is particularly relevant. Fleischman, “On the Representation of History”, 278-310; Peter Damian-Grind, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell, 1999); Green, “Was verstehen wir unter Fiktionalität um 1200?”, 25-37; Karl Hauck, “Heldendichtung und Heldensage als Geschichtsbewußtsein”, in *Alteuropa und die moderne Gesellschaft: FS für Otto Brunner*, ed. Alexander Bergengruen and Ludwig Deike (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1963), 118-169; Knapp, “Historiographisches und fiktionales Erzählen”, 3-22; Knapp, *Historie und Fiktion*”; Morse, “‘This Vague Relation’”, 85-103; Otter, “Functions of Fiction”, 109-130; Partner, *Serious Entertainments*”; Roest, “Medieval Historiography”, 47-61.


159 Lienert, *Alexanderroman*, vv. 344-349.
Alexander’s assertion that he must first defeat a king and retrieve his crown in order to be considered worthy of the royal title is born directly from the standards of dynastic honour outlined above. In the following lines, he defeats a king called Nycolaus at Caesarea, a city not far from Jerusalem. Alexander duly removes the defeated king’s crown and turns homeward. This scene finds yet another parallel in the *Gesta Friderici* in which Otto of Freising narrates a young Frederick attaining the same rite of passage. The opening lines of the chapter set up the subsequent action in the context of Frederick’s coming of age and becoming a fitting representative of his dynasty. The incident might have been an embarrassing one for Frederick, however, as Henry of Wolfratshausen was a kinsman of Conrad III’s queen. Otto might have included it—leaving out the connection between Henry and Queen Gertrude—for its value in demonstrating the maturity of Frederick’s martial qualities, if it left doubts about the maturity of his judgement. The defeat of Henry unfolds immediately after the narrator informs his readers that the duke has completed his education and is duly following in the footsteps of his father. That his father is described as still in possession of his duchy is yet another indication of the function of this passage within Otto’s work. The burden of expectations set by dynastic forbears weighs equally upon Frederick in his Latin biography, and Alexander in Lambrecht’s vernacular poem.

The vernacular author underscores the importance of this rite of passage for Alexander’s status as heir by following up the briefly narrated capture of Nycolaus with a major dynastic crisis in the text. Upon returning, he finds that his father has divorced his mother and married a woman called Cleopatra. The end of his parents’ marriage could have complications for Alexander’s own status within the line of succession. For Christoph Mackert, this scene is meant to showcase

---

160 “If you would wait a while until I can accomplish a noble deed: I’ll begin it with a king, and if I should overcome him, remove his crown, and drive him from the field, then you may give me the name of king as long as I live.” vv. 366-373.

161 *Creverat autem Fridericus Friderici strennuissimi ducis filius miliciaeque cingulum iam sumpserat, nobilis patris futurus heres nobilior. Igitur bonae indolis virtutem non dissimulans, educatus, ut assolet, ludis militaribus, ad seria tandem tyrocinandi accingitur negotia, patre adhuc vivente terramque suam plenarie tenente.* “Frederick, moreover, the son of the most vigorous Duke Frederick, had grown up and taken on the belt of knighthood, about to become the nobler heir of a noble father. Therefore, not hiding the virtue of his good character, and already educated in military sport, as is customary, he finally girded himself for the proper business of soldiering while his father was still alive, and fully controlling his land.” Book I, 27.
the maturity of Alexander’s judgment, and hence his suitability to rule, but considering the lengths to which Lambrecht has gone to establish the true and noble heritage of Philip’s heir, the dynastic connotations cannot be ignored. Schlechtweg-Jahn, too, acknowledges that the implications for Alexander’s accession to the throne are overtly present in this episode.\textsuperscript{162} Characterizing his actions negatively as adultery (\textit{uberhûr}), Alexander confronts his father with his clear breach of honourable conduct. Moreover, a charge of adultery implies that the marriage which produced Alexander as heir is a legitimate one.\textsuperscript{163} Framing the accusation as one of misconduct offers Alexander an opportunity to undermine the grounds for his father’s action and protect himself against the ramifications of a legitimately dissolved marital bond.

One of Philip’s knights, Lisias, rebukes Alexander for his accusations, for which he receives a blow to the mouth from the prince armed with a golden cup. Lambrecht describes Lisias as \textit{stolz unt redehaft}, words which connote the exemplary performance of his social/political station and excellent judgment. The narrator hints that Lisias’s reaction might be a just one, since his judgment and character were praised when he was introduced, and some tension is created here between Alexander’s version of events and the version against which Lisias reacts. For this knight, Alexander spoke out of turn (\textit{erre}) and Lisias’s honour compelled him to defend his lord.

One important variation between the Vorau and Strasbourg texts in this episode illuminates some of the tensions surrounding this dynastic incident. In the S version Lisias is part of Cleopatra’s retinue (\textit{der was mit der brûte dar comen}), and so the lord he defends against Alexander’s accusations is not Philip, but rather the Egyptian. While the nub of the conflict in S centres on a knight’s defense of his superior against the slander of an outsider, the Vorau version keeps the problem a domestic one. The awkward position in which the audience is thrust, sorting out where the dishonour lies, is perhaps meant to highlight the ambiguity of the matter and the shaky position of Alexander’s defense.\textsuperscript{164} When Philip jumps from his seat in outrage Alexander loses

\textsuperscript{162} Schlechtweg-Jahn, \textit{Macht und Gewalt}, 51.
\textsuperscript{163} Lambrecht also implied some wrongdoing on Philip’s part when he described the action with the verb \textit{gelouben}. Lienert, \textit{Alexanderroman}, v. 382.
\textsuperscript{164} Both of the authors or redactors responsible for the V and S versions are making a play on the scriptural authority of the Maccabees in this episode. In Maccabees I, 3:32 Lysias is first mentioned as one of Antiochus’s generals, who the king leaves in charge when he needs to go to Persia to collect tribute to pay his soldiers. Lysias launches repeated and failed attacks on the Maccabees led by Judas Maccabeus, son of the figure beloved by crusade preachers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Mattathias. Savvy readers or listeners might also know that in I, 6:17, Antiochus dies and his son succeeds him, having been placed there by Lysias. By inserting this prominent figure from Maccabees into the narrative at a moment of dynastic crisis, the author or redactor of V might have been playing on this story. The opinion of a biblical figure who successfully directed the legitimate succession of his lord
control, swinging his sword around wildly in a scene so chaotic the narrator admits neither he nor anyone else he has met knows what became of the bride. Alexander’s violent outburst appears to have carried the day, as he reconciles his parents and brings this episode to an end.

Conflicts around the issues of succession and dynasty continue to drive the action in the text, and Alexander is soon confronted with yet another crisis. Now the consummate war leader after his defeat of Nycolaus, the prince is dispatched by his father to rescue the city of Thelemone after a messenger made known that a treasonous plot was being hatched there. While returning, Alexander encounters a margrave named Pausonias who has abducted his mother and left his father mortally wounded. The significance of this kidnapping is contained in the line Alexander deliver’s upon defeating Pausonias:

_Dis stîffvaters ich niuht bedarf!_  

This scene recalls the earlier succession crisis involving a disruption in the dynastic trajectory, and since the Pausonias episode directly leads to Alexander’s accession to the throne (Philip dies of his wounds), this line has much greater significance. In capturing Pausonias and declaring his intention to prevent the margrave from interrupting his parents’ marriage, Alexander has now twice prevented the dissolution of the union, which, intact, established him as heir to the throne. There is a completeness to this element of the text as well, as Alexander thwarts attempts of both a male and female interloper to insert themselves into the royal marriage; Alexander has fully taken on the responsibility of being the dynastic representative of his generation. Philip’s deathbed command to slay his captured killer conveys his expectation and desire for his son to surpass his own achievements, a process metaphorically (yet also quite blatantly) cast as the besting of a man who bested Alexander’s father.

Having taken the throne, the desire to increase his honour compels Alexander to declare war on Darius and the Persians. Previously, Alexander had been furious that his father agreed to pay a tribute to Darius, a gesture which indicated submission, and which, as Alexander makes abundantly clear, is incommensurate with the dignity of his dynasty.  

At the heart of the king’s

---

165 “I have no need of this step-father!”. Lienert, _Alexanderroman_, vv. 537.
166 Lienert, _Alexanderroman_, vv. 472-475.
speech to his vassals inciting them against Darius is a reminder that the kings of Greece, and hence his own lineage, have always been of the highest quality.

Er sprach: "Herre, wirne haben niuht ze bîtene, 
wir mûzen her laiten,  
Chriechlande zêren;  
Dar an gedenchent, hêren,  
daz man ie uber unser lant  
die aller tûriste chunege vant."

This effective appeal makes use of the same devices crusade preachers of the twelfth century employed in their own pleas, as we have seen. Citing the events of the past and the outstanding character of predecessors in an attempt to raise an army against a foreign power in the east is precisely what Bernard of Clairvaux and his Cistercian deputies did. My intention here is not to suggest interpreting the narrative as a crusading allegory, as there seems to be little evidence to suggest it was read in this fashion in the Middle Ages, but as I will demonstrate below, the text makes use of some elements drawn directly from the crusading experience of the twelfth century.

3.4.3 Some Crusading Elements in the Vorau Alexander

One of the most distinctive aspects of the Vorau Alexander is the use of real locations drawn from biblical or, as some have argued, contemporary historiographical sources. A comparison between the Strasbourg and Vorau texts demonstrates that the use of these names can be traced back to Lambrecht. The S redactor also made use of most of the material in V, and in this early section of the poem thirty-eight biblical/historical place names are given, and in the remaining part (well over half), completed after V, there are only nine. For Brummack, these place names belong to the realm of general knowledge, allowing the narration to play out in a familiar setting that is intelligible and relatable. The referencing of biblical citations is an authorial technique that conditions the audience’s response to the Alexander material, creating an

---

167 “He said, “Lords, we have no reason to wait, we must launch a campaign to honour Greece. Remember, lords, that the most noble kings could always be found in our land.” Lienert, Alexanderroman, vv. 562-5567.
168 While there is some debate about the nature of Alexander’s conflict with Darius, the tribute explanation is not a particularly compelling one. See my discussion of this question in note 109.
169 Brummack, Darstellung des Orients, 125.
170 See Green, “Alexanderlied”, 251ff. for a complete list of these. Many of these place names are accompanied by a biblical reference. Schröder, “Vanitas Gedanke”, 39-40.
interpretational framework that makes use of the audience’s knowledge of these places and any associations therewith. Brummack in particular notes that the crusades of the twelfth century constitute a context in which these places carried particular associations with recent and current events.171

Two episodes in the texts stand out in this light. The first is Alexander’s brutal march through Palestine and the Holy Land, which is rather briefly related and presented without comment or judgment.172 Even the intentional destruction of Jerusalem and Bethlehem receive only a line each before the narration moves on to the Tyre scene. There is no scene comparable to the Palestine episode in any of the Latin or vernacular Alexander materials prior to the Vorau text and it appears to be the unique property of this version.173 The second episode that stands out is the siege of Tyre, one of the lengthiest episodes in the text and one in which Alexander is explicitly criticized for his arrogance, recklessness, and disregard for his vassals.174 In addition to the interpretation of these incidents, the origin of the material presents a point of interest. Brummack was perhaps the first to assert that Lambrecht or the Vorau redactor had a contemporary source for his description of Tyre, which, by all accounts, bears a striking resemblance to historiographical accounts of the city.175 It appears, in fact, that the source for the description of the city’s great walls and towers was drawn from William of Tyre’s account (composed 1170-1184) of the 1124 siege, in which the crusaders, led by the Patriarch of Antioch, the Doge of Venice, and William de Bury, captured the city with the help of siege engines.176

Only two descriptions of cities can be found in German literature before 1160, with the other present in the Jüngere Judith text where Ebbanatis is described in some detail.177 It is an important scene in which particular attention is drawn to the location, and hence, to the

171 Brummack, *Darstellung des Orients*, 43; See also Urbanek’s use of Brummack’s argument. Urbanek, “Umfang und Intention”, 116.
172 Lienert, *Alexanderroman*, vv. ca. 663-693. This scene has been interpreted as a prelude to the Tyre scene in which Alexander’s cruelty and ferocity are put on full display. Mackert, *Vorau Alexander*, 256.
173 Mackert makes note of a vaguely similar scene in the *Historia de Preliis* but is ultimately unconvinced of any real relation between the two. Mackert, *Vorau Alexander*, 252-253.
174 Lienert, *Alexanderroman*, vv. 694-1005. At 316 verses, it is rivaled for length only by the depiction of Alexander’s youth (322).
175 Brummack, *Darstellung des Orients*, 125.
audience’s own knowledge or experience of that place. The 1124 siege was a major event in the twelfth century, among the first in a series of victories in the Holy Land that would see the Kingdom of Jerusalem expand to its greatest extent before the battle of Hattin in 1187. Cölln believes that the expansive nature of the passage is due directly to the prominence of this event in the collective memory of a group deeply influenced by the crusades.¹⁷⁸ This strategy of anchoring the events of the narration in a real location that bore distinct and clear associations with the events in the Holy Land a few decades earlier creates interpretational cues born of relatability and context that Brummack, Green, and Schröder consider crucial.¹⁷⁹

Cölln takes his interpretation even further, and he sees Lambrecht’s Alexander as an exemplary figure within a salvation-historical context. His function beyond the text is directly tied to his identity as a pagan, suggesting to a lay noble whose worldview was partially determined by their experience with the crusades: as Christian conquerors of Holy Land they should be mindful of their conduct.¹⁸⁰ Alexander’s destruction of Jerusalem and Bethlehem gain an added significance in this respect.¹⁸¹ The two most important cities in the life of Christ carried an enormous eschatological weight—especially for crusaders—and their destruction by a non-Christian would certainly have resonated in an environment where the crusader presence in the Holy Land was constantly under threat. The prospect of maintaining Latin colonies so far from their support network was a dismal one, and the destruction of Jerusalem and the crusader states remained a distinct, and constant, possibility. Alexander’s callous treatment of these holy regions to which a twelfth-century lay noble audience would have felt a particular connection must have played on the anxieties of those who were charged with the burden of maintaining and expanding the territories won by the previous generations of crusaders. The episode of the Holy Land presents those confronting their failure or the failure of the previous generation to secure

¹⁷⁸ Cölln, “Heide als Vorbild”, 94.
¹⁸⁰ Cölln, “Arbeit an Alexander”, 188.
¹⁸¹ Mackert has interpreted this scene as a prelude to the siege of Tyre. According to Mackert, we see the first instances of the breakdown of Alexander’s wisdom and courage during campaign in the Holy Land, a process which is complete at the siege of Tyre. In my view, however, Alexander’s conduct in the Holy Land would have been much relevant to crusaders as a potential negative example. Even those who set out with pure intentions might neglect their obligations as Christians and thus incur the wrath of God. Such was the narrative in the wake of the failure of the Second Crusade. The cautionary example of Alexander’s campaign in the Holy Land is only effective if the audience has hitherto subscribed to the positive depiction presented to them, allowing them to draw a parallel between the Macedonian and themselves. For Mackert’s interpretation see Mackert, Vorau Alexander, 253-256.
divine favour in that second expedition with a depiction of the destruction of those regions. In the years after the Second Crusade that exhibited hesitancy on the part of Europe’s lay magnates to assemble in such large numbers we can see the persistence of such anxieties. They manifested themselves in the blame leveled at those who had so zealously lobbied for the expedition and who came under pressure to take responsibility for the disastrous outcome and provide some kind of explanation. Bernard of Clairvaux, the chief target of this anger and frustration, was quick to suggest that the crusaders had not been humble enough and their sinful conduct had precluded the divine favour of which they had been assured.\textsuperscript{182}

Aside from the episode involving the siege of Tyre, the relation between the text and specific historical occurrences cannot be determined with any degree of specificity. One of the key—and underexplored—implications of Cölln’s analysis of the depiction of Tyre is that there was some intention on the part of V’s author or redactor to appeal to an audience based on its experience of the crusades in the twelfth century. This assertion is quite compelling, based on the originality of the destruction of the Holy Land scene, and the conspicuousness of the description of Tyre and its roots in contemporary crusade historiography. It appears these were used strategically in order to create associations between an audience’s knowledge and experience of these places and the text itself. Place names function almost as triggers that funnel the text through the interpretational framework of the lived experiences associated with them. We might not be able to make this claim about the other texts in the Vorau manuscript—perhaps only for lack of concrete evidence like the Tyre episode—but the possible connection to crusading experience exhibited by this text lends further weight to the argument that an influential crusading spirit is responsible, in some measure, for the appeal of these works to the compiler of the codex and an audience in late twelfth-century Styria that was receptive to these elements.

\textsuperscript{182} Roth, “Zisterzienser”, 129. The best example of Bernard’s literary efforts at self-defense are is his \textit{De consideratione}. Pfeiffer, “Die Stellung des hl. Bernhard”, 310-311.
3.5. The **Ezzolied**

3.5.1 Introduction

The long silence in the record of vernacular German literature that coincided roughly with the reign of the Ottonian kings and emperors ended with the *Ezzolied* (ca. 1063), followed a few decades later by the *Anmolied*. The extent to which the *Ezzolied* represents continuity with the Old High German Biblical epics or commentaries is a matter of some debate.\(^\text{183}\) What is clear, however, is that the literature of the early Middle High German period looks beyond the Bible for its source material and, with an undeniably didactic character, broadens out to include more complex theological and historical topics.\(^\text{184}\) The *Ezzolied*, for example, can be thought of as an explication of the historical and theological significance of Christ and his redemptive act with digressions describing Trinitarian theology and the role of Old Testament worthies like Noah, David, and Abraham. These poems mark the emergence of vernacular poetry with spiritual content from, quite literally, the margins of learned Latin culture as they begin to be copied as feature texts in costly manuscripts reserved for book-worthy material.

Increasingly, scholars like Eckhart Conrad Lutz have argued that the lines between clerical and lay were not lines at all, but overlapping spheres of interest embodied in individuals like Bishop Gunther of Bamberg, the commissioner of the *Ezzolied*, who were at once ecclesiastical officials and lay lords.\(^\text{185}\) This *Mischkultur* carried an interest in literature, supported and fostered its

---


\(^{184}\) Kössinger, “Neuanfang oder Kontinuität”, 139;

production, and imprinted works produced in this milieu with the competing and coexisting influences of religious piety and heroic-epic traditions that were popular among the lay aristocracy. Others, like Dieter Kartschoke, believe this new literature represents the beginning of *Adelsliteratur*—material composed at the behest, and for the education of, lay lords. Indeed some scholars, looking for the roots of the culture which so enthusiastically embraced, supported, and drove the composition of the great courtly romances of the thirteenth century see connections with the groups that produced the early Middle High German lyrics. Given that we are so well-informed about the individuals involved in its composition, the *Ezzolied* constitutes an important source for exploring the intersection of lay and clerical interests and the resulting literary output.

The *Ezzolied* survives in two versions, in two very different manuscripts separated by roughly fifty years: the Strasbourg version (Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire de Strasbourg ms. 1, fol. 74v, formerly cod. Germ. 278), and the Vorau version (Stiftsbibliothek Vorau, cod. 276, fol. 128rb-129vb). While the Strasbourg version (S) contains only seven stanzas and breaks off abruptly before the end of a line, the Vorau version (V) is considerably expanded (thirty-four stanzas), reworked, and linguistically distinct. We are uncharacteristically knowledgeable about the date and circumstances of the composition of the original work. The prologue of V itself informs us that Gunther, Bishop of Bamberg, engaged the priest (*phaphe*) Ezzo to write a worthy song, for which a colleague, Wille, composed the tune.

**Der gvote biscoph guntere**

---

186 Lutz, “Literaturegeschichte”, 96; See also note 170 above.
189 This is not the same manuscript that contained the Strasbourg *Alexander*. The following discussion of the differences between these two versions is severely limited by the vast discrepancy in length between the S fragment and V. While I will briefly note the divergence between the first few stanzas of each, I will necessarily focus on the manuscript context as the chief distinguishing characteristic of these versions, and the best avenue for approaching the question of interest surrounding the creation of the Vorau manuscript.
190 A Wille is named as abbot from 1082-1085 in the necrology of the Benedictine monastery Michelsberg (Staatsbibliothek Bamberg Ms. Lit. 144, fol. 85v). It is entirely likely that this is the person named in the Vorau prologue. Christoph Lange, *Das Ezzo-Lied in der Vorauer Überlieferung. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Erlangen und Jena: Verlag Palm & Enke, 2005), 28.
Incredibly, we are also aware of an external reference to the text and the circumstances of its composition. The *vita* of Bishop Altmann of Passau (ca. 1015-1091) provides even more detail than the text itself. It reports a pilgrimage of Frankish and Bavarian clerics and laymen (*multi nominati viri et clerici et laici, tam de Orientali Francia quam de Bavaria*) that arrived in Jerusalem in 1065 after a great deal of hardship. The impulse for the journey was the widely held belief that Christ would return when Easter fell on the same day as it did in the year of his crucifixion and resurrection. Among those who undertook the pilgrimage with Altmann, was a certain *scholasticus* Ezzo, “vir omni sapientia et eloquentia praeditus, qui in eodem itinere cantilenam de miraculis Christi patria lingua nobiliter composuit.” There is little reason to doubt the veracity of this independent report. The *vita*, composed at Göttweig around 1130, seems an accurate witness, as Ezzo himself is named in a cathedral calendar that gives November 15th, 1100, as his date of death.

---

191 “The good Bishop Gunther of Bamberg had a very good work made. He asked one of his priests to write a worthy song. They undertook the work because they knew the books; Ezzo began to write, and Wille found the tune.” All subsequent quotations from V have been taken from the MS itself. Karl K. Pohlheim, *Die deutsche Gedichte der Vorauer Handschrift (Kodex 276 - 2. Teil)* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1958). For the sake of reference, the equivalent lines in the modern edition have also been supplied in citation. Werner Schröder, ed., *Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts. Band I* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), 13, vv.1-8. The most recent edition of V was produced by Christoph Lange, who likewise chose to preserve the manuscript version and its orthography. Lange, *Das Ezzo-lied*. Hugo Kuhn, *Dichtung und Welt* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1959), 19-20; H. Schneider, “Ezzos Gesang”, *ZfdA* 68 (1931), 14.


193 *Eo tempore multi nobiles ibant Ierosolimam, invisere sepulchrum Domini, quadam vulgari opinione decepti, quasi instaret dies iudicii, eo quod pascha illo anno evenisset sexto Kalend. Aprilis, quo scriptur resurrectione Christi.* “At that time many nobles travelled to Jerusalem to see the tomb of the Lord, deceived, however, by the popular opinion that the day of judgement was imminent because Easter fell on the sixth kalend of April in that year, when, it is written, the resurrection of Christ [will occur]”. Ibid.

194 “...a man gifted in all wisdom and eloquence, who nobly composed a song on the miracles of Christ in his mother-tongue while on that same journey.” Ibid.

195 Staatsbibliothek Bamberg, Msc. Lit. 161, fol. 23vir. Lange, *Ezzo-lied*, 27; Hugo Kuhn has pointed out the similarities in wording between the *Vita Altmanni* and the prologue of the V version, and he believes that the *Vita Altmanni* is probably the source of the information in V, though perhaps via several intermediary steps in transmission. Kuhn, *Text und Theorie*, 162. The fact that V omits the reference to the pilgrimage has led to some
At thirty-four stanzas and 420 lines in modern edition, the Vorau version of this text represents not necessarily a full recreation of its exemplar, but a reworked, expanded, and regionalized one.\footnote{197} Running from fol. 128rb-129vb, the text is written continuously in two columns, with a four-line initial at the beginning of the poem and single-line initials introducing each stanza.\footnote{198} The poem stands between the Vorauer Sündenklage and the Frau Ava poems in what can be characterized as the devotional or eschatological section of the manuscript made up by these three, as well as Priester Arnold’s Von der Siebenzahl, Das Himmlische Jerusalem, and the Gebet einer Frau. Lutz has pointed out that the Ezzolied disturbs the relatively consistent OT-NT division of the texts since it begins with creation, but there are conceivable explanations for this chronological detour.\footnote{199} In the Strasbourg manuscript there is a correlation between the Ezzolied
and its carrier text, Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*. The copyist of this codex appears to have mobilized the Middle High German poem in the service of theological and moral commentary on Gregory’s work, but V points to a much different conception and use of the text, nevertheless dependent on the other texts transmitted with it. The program behind the arrangement of texts in the Vorau manuscript has drawn much attention, with scholars outlining in broad strokes the overarching ‘narrative’ of the manuscript as a kind of moralized history of the world. Without knowing precisely for whom this manuscript was intended, it is difficult to comment on how much theological and doctrinal weight ought to be ascribed to this occurrence of the text, but it is nevertheless clear that the *Ezzolied* has been repurposed, having been set in relation to a series of other texts to produce a roughly coherent narrative. Those who inscribed the *Ezzolied* in the Strasbourg manuscript were interested in it for its exegetical worth, for what it could contribute to a moral interpretation of the Biblical book of Job; the interests of those who incorporated it into the Vorau manuscript will be the focus of the following section.

The content of the work, too, has undergone considerable debate, with scholars arguing for variously nuanced interpretations. As a whole, the poem relates the events of creation and outlines the construction of Adam from elements of the physical world, proceeds through the ejection from the garden, the birth of Christ, his life, miracles, and death on the cross, wrapping up with a kind of devotional, prayer-like section. The extended metaphor of light followed by

---

**Ezzolied** of material from Genesis. Its presence in the poem serves only to provide context to the significance of Christ’s sacrifice, which only underscores the focus of the text and makes it more effective within the overall conception of the manuscript arrangement. Additionally, and I would argue more importantly, there is a clear element of interpretation at play in the manuscript which does not suggest that its users were concerned with preserving a strict chronology. The Moses books, for example, which follow the *Kaiserchronik* as the second group of texts, contain a poem of praise for Mary. It is evident that the copyist did not perceive this as an individual work, but part of the Moses books, and read it with an exegetical eye rather than a literal-historical one. This fact has implications for our reading not only of the individual texts of this manuscript, but of the arrangement of the whole. Out of sheer necessity I omit a more indepth discussion of this topic; however, I will offer a few words to provide context. At the beginning of Part III Gregory reiterates the central interpretation of Job as a prefiguration of Christ who represents the church, its suffering and persecution in the world. To the copyist assembling this manuscript, the broad thematic relationship between the two texts is immediately evident. Towards the end of Part III, which closes with Job’s third answer to Eliphaz (Job 24, 9-20), Gregory engaged with the excerpt, *si subito apparuerit aurora arbitrantur umbram mortis et sic in tenebris quasi in luce ambulant* (Job 24, 17), and proceeded to describe the metaphor of the light and the darkness as the minds of those who have respectively remained in the sinful mire of the world and of those who have turned to righteousness. The narrative in the section of the *Ezzolied* which follows Part III of the *Moralia* in S is supported by an extended metaphor of light and dark, which represents periods in history in which mankind is alternately in, and out of, God’s grace. Gregory the Great, *S. Gregorii Magni moralia in Iob*, ed. Marci Adriaen (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979-1985), Part III, Book XVI, lxiii.

For an outdated yet useful overview of the debate about the structure of the manuscript, see Polheim’s introduction to his partial facsimile. Polheim. *Die deutsche Gedichte der Vorauer Handschrift*, XV-XVI.
darkness initiated by man’s disregard of God’s command, and the reintroduction of the light through Christ’s sacrifice, highlights the core function of the narrative as it concerns salvation history. Events contained in Genesis are relevant to the work only insofar as they are essential to conveying the historical significance of Christ’s fate on earth. Allusions to Old Testament figures are worked into the narration by incorporating them into the light-dark metaphor—as stars punctuating the dark but insufficient to overcome it—providing examples of how to please God. The language is relatively unadorned, and the sentences and verses very short. Helmut de Boor described the adjectives as more theologically practical than ornamental, and Heinz Rupp sees the simplicity of style as indicative of a more colloquial use of language. In terms of its content, form, and style, the poem is straightforward, its edificatory function driven by the emplotment of biblical material framed as the great salvation-historical narrative.

Both Freytag and Lutz recognize the significance of this poem’s vitality into the late twelfth century, and correctly turn to the influential spiritual and social currents of the period to understand why it persisted. The transmission of the *Ezzolied* into the twelfth century is clearly the result of its relevance, not only as a text theologically sound enough to be of exegetical use, but also for its relation to a social phenomenon that began to exert its influence on Christendom at the end of the eleventh century, and penetrated to the core of European social and religious values. Ezzo’s song was originally composed for a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which, foreshadowing events several decades later, turned violent with pilgrims—most notably the heroic Bishop Gunther himself—resorting to armed resistance in order to attain their destination. The influence of the crusades on society has been well-charted, but its effects on the production and transmission of vernacular literature remain an underexplored topic. Aside from the upswing in crusading songs, driven by the emergence of jongleurs and Minnesängern, how did the massive phenomenon of the crusades affect the demand for vernacular literature?

---


203 Lampert of Hersfeld reports that Gunther distinguished himself in these clashes, most certainly due to his noble upbringing. He skillfully defended the pilgrims, killing the leader of a band of attackers on one occasion. Lutz, “Literaturgeschichte”, 131; Holder-Egger, *Lampert monachi Hersfeldensis Opera*, 94-98.

204 There was considerable interest in the events of the crusades and their historical significance among lay individuals without a knowledge of Latin. The *Canzo d’Antioca* of Gregory of Bechada, a knight of southern France, was composed in the vernacular and covers the First Crusade up to the Siege of Antioch in 1098. The *Chanson de Jerusalem* of ca. 1135 and the *Chanson d’Antioche* of 1170 represent two more twelfth-century examples. Phillips, *The Second Crusade*, 19-21.
The context of Gunther’s pilgrimage brings the *Ezzolied* into contact with the increasingly appealing trend of pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Although a fully-fledged crusading movement was still several decades away, the fact that Gunther’s expedition sparked the production of vernacular literature is noteworthy, at the very least. When a papally sanctioned military campaign to the Holy Land was declared at the end of the century, a movement began which influenced lay piety in Styria (among other places) by raising the profile of the Holy Land as a locus of salvation among the lay nobility that was less thoroughly versed in doctrine as their clerical counterpart.\(^{205}\)

### 3.5.2 The *Ezzolied* and Crusader Piety

The version of the *Ezzolied* found in the Vorau manuscript, as described above, gives pride of place to the crucifixion scene and comparatively little attention to the resurrection and miracles for which it was named by the author of the *Vita Altmanni*.\(^{206}\) It is not difficult to imagine a group of people whose spirituality involved a personal association between their vocation as crusaders and Christ himself—a conception which links their faith to the social prestige acquired by taking the crusading vow and fighting—finding this vernacular expression of the historical significance of their exemplar relevant and of particular interest. The author of the Vorau

---

\(^{205}\) Roswitha Wisniewski also raises this question, though I must admit my doubts about much of her work on the *Ezzolied*. Roswitha Wisniewski, *Kreuzzugsdichtung. Identität in der Wirklichkeit* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984), 49.

\(^{206}\) The poem centres on the significance of Christ in the history of mankind and the author spends very little time on the miracles themselves. Given that the text was composed in connection with a pilgrimage that was set to coincide with the occurrence of Easter in 1065, scholars such as Hartmut Freytag have pointed out the connection between the *Ezzolied* and the yearly commemoration of Christ’s resurrection. He suggests that the poem represents an attempt to draw a deeper focus to Easter and the celebration of the memory of Christ’s redemptive act, and notes the popularity of the Easter liturgy among authors of this period writing in the German vernacular. In addition, he points out that *Genesis* was an important part of the Easter mass, and, therefore, the author of the *Ezzolied* incorporated it as an important part of his narration. Freytag’s interpretation at first appears consistent with the Christocentric theme, however, the text seems to place comparatively little emphasis on his resurrection. The poet briefly narrates Christ’s rise from the grave and immediately returns to the central leitmotif, the significance of his death. The depiction of the crucifixion, on the other hand, receives much more attention. Prefaced by a lengthy moralistic explication of the details of his life and the lessons that can be drawn from them, the author proceeds to depict in some vivid detail the manner in which Christ was bound to the cross, the blood flowing from his side through which mankind was redeemed, and the two thieves who were crucified beside him. Hartmut Freytag, “Ezzos Gesang. Text und Funktion”, in *Geistliche Denkformen in der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ed. Klaus Grubmüller, *et al.* (Munich: Fink, 1984), 154–170. Moreover, Green very convincingly demonstrated that the Easter liturgy and Genesis were connected as part of a crusader piety that developed between the first two crusades and which begins to find expression in vernacular literature around this time. D.H. Green, *The Milstätter Exodus. A Crusading Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 228-285.
Ezzolied communicates a distinct interest in the dual nature of Christ and in particular his humanity. Careful to counteract the tensions of this depiction, the audience is provided with occasional reminders (Er was mennisch unt got) and a careful paraphrase of the Chalcedonian doctrine on his divine and human nature (the final stanza, 34). These statements seem more significant when juxtaposed with the author’s interest in Christ’s human life, his birth, growth and age.

[...] der wuhs unter den iaren ; der ie ane zit was . unter tagen gemerter sin gewahst dvo wuohs daz chint edele ; der gotes atem was in imo dvo er drizzich iar alt was [...]208

In the lead-up to the crucifixion scene the author returns to the theme of Christ’s humanity by reiterating his age at the time of his death and distinctly placing him in a real and human historical context.

[...] mit unser wantelote driv unte drizzihe iar [...]209

This emphasis on Christ’s life and humanity would certainly have found resonance among crusaders and those who left behind their lives, property, wives, and all their affairs to undertake a dangerous expedition to the places in which he lived.210 It would have been of interest to a

207 While confirming the dual nature of Christ, the document represents a strong statement of his humanity.
208 “He grew amid the years, he who was without time. Amid the days his stature increased, as the noble child grew. The spirit of God was in him at 30 years of age.” Schröder, Kleiner d. Gedichte, 19, vv. 194-199.
210 The figure of Christ was of particular importance for crusaders; they saw themselves as uniquely able to follow in his footsteps through a physical presences at the site of his life, and by literally offering their lives as a sacrifice for the salvation of others. Because a crusader’s version of imitatio Christi was of such a literal nature, it depended heavily on Christ’s human aspects. A crusader needed to see Christ as a man in order to be able to view visiting the places he lived as an act of imitatio. Psalm 131:7 (intremus in tabernacula eius adoremus scabillum pedum eius—let us enter his temple and worship the places where his feet stood) provides scriptural basis for the desire to worship and imitate Christ by visiting the places in which he lived. This brand of imitatio is not entirely unique to crusaders, although crusade preacher Gilbert, bishop of Tournai made specific reference to this privilege (See Maier, Crusade Propaganda, 60). Pilgrims would have shared the interest in visiting the sites of Christ’s life, but imitating sacrifice in death was the particular privilege of the crusader and martyr. The concept of emphasizing Christ’s humanity to inspire pious and charitable action was known outside of a crusade context, as Bernard of Clairvaux demonstrates in commentary on the Song of Songs, when he explains that Christ used his humanity for the salvation of the world, so that others could imitate him for the good of mankind. I do not find it coincidental that this notion found its way into the ideology of the crusading movement, given that Bernard was the most influential proponent and prolific preacher of the Second Crusade. Lester, “A shared imitation”, 368f; Purkis, Crusading Spirituality, 30-47; Erdmann, Origin of the Idea of Crusade, 345-348; William J. Purkis, “Stigmata on the First Crusade”, in Signs,
group of lay nobles in Styria whose spirituality was largely imprinted by the kind of Christocentric crusader piety described above. We know this type of rhetoric was present in the region around the time of the Second Crusade and we have seen its effects on the region’s nobility. In his letter, Bernard emphasizes the humanity of Christ and how important it was to protect the places that he lived in for so many years. Like the Vorau Ezzolied redactor, Bernard stresses the humanity of Christ by providing the number of years he dwelt in the Holy Land ( [...] in qua visus est et annis plus quam triginta homo cum hominibus conversatus est).

There is little to suggest that Bernard’s crusade rhetoric was a direct source for V, though his crusade preaching had tremendous reach and had an undeniable impact on lay culture in the twelfth century. It is safe to say that those same individuals whose conception of their faith and place in society and in history was impacted by the crusading movement would have recognized the Ezzolied, at least in part, as an expression of a spirituality that echoed their own self-image.

At times the Ezzolied of the Vorau manuscript reads more like a piece of crusade rhetoric meant to stir the hearts of potential (or repeat) crusaders against the enemies of God through an impassioned appeal to their deeply held sense of social and political responsibility. The

---

211 See also Cole, The Preaching of the Crusades, 48.
212 “...in which he was seen and for more than thirty years he lived as a man among men.” Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 44.
213 The anonymous twelfth-century crusader song Chevalier, mult estes guariz contains a verse which testifies to the importance of the imagery of Christ’s human body and its central place in the popular conception of the salvation narrative. In Routledge’s English translation, the text reads, “God gave up his body to the Jews that he might free us from bondage. They wounded Him in five places so that he suffered passion and death. Now He is calling upon you...” The last sentence invites the crusader to follow in Christ’s sacrifice. Phillips, The Second Crusade, Appendix 2. An edition of the Old French text can be found in J. Bédier and P. Aubry, eds., Les chansons de croisade avec leurs mélodies (Paris: Champion, 1909 and Geneva: Slatkine Reprints, 1974), 8-11.
214 Penny Cole demonstrates how pervasive this type of language was during the early years of crusade preaching, while Christoph Maier, in his examination of thirteenth-century crusade sermons, shows that by this time the feudal model had become widespread and formulaic. This is as true in the world of Latin preaching and writing as it is in the world of vernacular literature, and crusade songs from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries made use of the same vocabulary and characterizations of the crusader’s responsibilities toward God. For example, in one of the best-known twelfth-century songs Chevalier, mult estes guariz, a line in the opening verse relates the capture of the Holy Land by Muslims as the wrongful seizure of God’s feudal holdings. It reads, “They have wrongfully snatched his fiefs; our sorrow at this should be great since it was there that God was first offered service and acknowledged as Lord.” Note that in this one excerpt we can see the importance of Christ’s humanity, the places he lived as a man, and an appeal to the emotions engendered in feudal bonds. Phillips, The Second Crusade, Appendix 2.
thirtieth stanza has been singled out by several scholars for its conspicuous use of distinctly political language to describe the rehabilitated state of man.215

[...] Spiritualis
israel . nu scowe wider din erbe . want du
irloset bist . deiugo pharaonis . der unser [129r]
alte uiant . der vvert uns daz selbe
lant . er wil uns gerne getaren den
wec scul wir mit wige uaren . der
unser herzoge ist so gut . ub uns ne
gezwieuet daz muot . uil michel ist
der sin gewalt . mit im besizze wir
div lant ;216

Christoph Lange prefers to remain within the narrative in his interpretation of this stanza: namely the presentation of a redeemed mankind represented by the spiritual Israel and the promised heavenly kingdom as the erbe.217 This reading is entirely consistent with the major theme of the work, and he rejects Wentzlaff-Eggebert’s suggestion of crusading motifs based on the consistency of this paradise lost/paradise regained dynamic.218 However, given the pervasive presence of crusading rhetoric at the time of the compilation of Vorau 276, and its attestable presence even within that manuscript, there is no reason to rule out this valence of the text.219 The spiritual Israel still represents a redeemed mankind, but in its vocabulary of conquest also calls to mind those who battled to regain Israel after the flight from Egypt, or the Maccabees fighting against the enemies of Israel, both wildly popular episodes among contemporary crusade

215 These include Wisniewski, and Wentzlaff-Eggebert, Kreuzzugsdichtung.
216 “Spiritual Israel, now look upon your inheritance again, for you have been released from the yoke of the Pharaoh, our old enemy wishes to keep this land from us. He wishes to harm us. We shall travel the path with courage. Our lord is so good, his intention toward us has never wavered. Great is his power; with him we shall possess the [promised] lands”. Schröder, Kleinere d. Gedichte, 24, vv. 359-370.
217 Lange, Das Ezzo-lied, 197-199; The use of the word erbe to designate the state of grace that God intended for man is a recurring theme. It resurfaces in stanza 29, where Christ’s sacrifice is described as reopening the way to salvation, [...]daz gab uns friliche wider uart / in unser alt erbe lant beidu wege unte lant/
dar hab wir geistlichen ganc [...] “This granted us free return to our old inheritance, both the path and the land, we have the spiritual path hence”. Schröder, Kleinere d. Gedichte, 24, vv. 351-354.
218 Ferdinand Urbanek, in a contribution on the persistence of Germanic war metaphors and Redekunst in this section, also points to stanza 28 in which Christ is referred to as wigant. Lange rejects this interpretation as well. Ferdinand Urbanek, “Das Ezzolied in den Traditionen der Redekunst”, ZfdPh 107 (1988), 45.
219 Bernard’s letter to Adam of Ebrach, read by the latter to the assembled nobles at Regensburg in 1147, is preserved in the Gesta Friderici, makes use of the same erbe-hereditas language to describe the Holy Land. Otto writes, Numquid abbreviata est manus Domini aut impotens facta est ad salvandum, quod ad tuendam et restituendam sibi hereditatem suam exiguos vermiculos vocat? “Is the hand of God made weak or powerless to save just because he calls the meager worms to protect and restore his own possession?” Book I, 44.
preachers.\textsuperscript{220} The pharaoh and the old enemy who desired to bar access to the Promised Land can easily be read as the enemies of Christ who held power in the Holy Land. The last four lines on their own—praise to a worthy war leader (\textit{herzoge})—would be perfectly suited to a courtly context; the unswerving uprightness (\textit{muot}), his prowess in battle (\textit{sin gewalt}), and the reward for his courage and dedication (\textit{diu lant}) speak to an audience whose sense of honour and piety were inextricably linked to martial skill in the service of a worthy lord. In the thirty-second stanza this relationship of service and duty rendered to a rightful lord is made explicit in the form of prayer that testifies to the importance of this relationship in the audience’s conception of their piety. Calling upon God—the stanza opens, \textit{Trehtin}—the text exhorts him to keep our (\textit{unser}) hearts close to him.\textsuperscript{221}

\begin{quote}
\textit{[\ldots] nuziuch du chunihe himelisc unser herce dar da du bist . daz wir di dinest man . uon dir ne sin gesceiden .}\textsuperscript{222}
\end{quote}

As deeply as the feudal characterization of the man-God relationship runs in this text, there is another metaphor that reinforces the theme of service by highlighting the cost and rewards of such a relationship. Christ’s blood, or a prefiguration thereof, appears in the \textit{Ezzolied} no fewer than six times. In stanza twenty-one, the blood flows from Christ’s wounded side during the crucifixion scene, and the text leaves no doubt about its significance.

\begin{quote}
\textit{[\ldots] von siner siten floz daz pluot . des pir wir alle geheili got [\ldots]}\textsuperscript{223}
\end{quote}

The second occurrence in stanza twenty-four is a citation from Isaiah, 63:1 that posits the prophet as a prefiguration of Christ by equating the blood-spattered robe with the one laid upon Christ by his mocking captors.\textsuperscript{224} These two instances serve a very clear function within the

\textsuperscript{220} Maier, \textit{Crusade Propaganda}, 55.
\textsuperscript{221} The poem concludes with \textit{Amen}, an obvious borrowing from liturgical celebrations. The fact that it is included within the meter of the poem suggests that we ought to think about this last section (stanzas 30-34) in a devotional light, as an expression of a theologically sound piety fit to be dressed up in the more strictly controlled trappings of the liturgy. See Ohly, “Zum Dichtungsschluß”, 1-34.
\textsuperscript{222} “Now draw our hearts to where you are, you heavenly king, so that we, your servants, might never be apart from you”. Schröder, \textit{Kleindere d. Gedichte}, 25, vv. 391-394.
\textsuperscript{223} “The blood, by which we are all saved, flowed from his side”. Schröder, \textit{Kleindere d. Gedichte}, 20, vv. 253-254.
\textsuperscript{224} See Lange, \textit{Das Ezzo-lied}, 172-173.
major program of the poem, highlighting the passion as the moment of transition in the salvation-
historical narrative. In much the same way, stanza twenty-five reminds us that during the
harrowing of Hell all the retrieved souls were paid for with Christ’s blood. But Christ’s blood
was a powerful devotional symbol in the Middle Ages, and during the twelfth century, a time in
which crusading lay lords were increasingly identifying with Christ, the blood took on a
particularly specific connotation.\textsuperscript{225} Aside from the obvious connection between Christ and
crusader spilling their blood for others, preachers like Gilbert of Tournai and Odo of
Châteauroux are known to have explained the relationship between Christ’s sacrifice and the
effect of the indulgence by describing the crusaders as being washed in the blood of the
Saviour.\textsuperscript{226} Even the emblem of the avowed crusader, the cloth cross, recalled the real suffering
and bloody death of Christ and served as an important symbol of a person’s commitment to
follow him and recreate his fate. The blood of the Saviour \textit{des pir wir alle geheiligot}, would be
spilled again by the crusaders living out their piety not only for others, but for themselves in the
form of the salvation-bringing indulgence thus purchased.

Stanza twenty-seven describes the sacrifice of the lamb by Moses, an event that very clearly
prefigures the events of the crucifixion, and the text makes this interpretation clear (\textit{Daz was
allez geistlich}). Moses used the blood of the Passover lamb to mark the doors of the houses of
the Jews so that God would not destroy those within when he came to decimate the Egyptians.
The \textit{Ezzolied} narrates this part of Exodus 12 as well.

---

\textsuperscript{225} Bettina Bildhauer, “Blood in Medieval Cultures”, \textit{History Compass} 4 no. 6 (2006), 1049-1059; Bildhauer,
\textit{Medieval Blood, Religion and Culture in the Middle Ages} (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2006); P.
Dinzelbacher, “Das Blut Christi in der Religiösigkeit des Mittelalters”, in \textit{900 Jahre Heilig-Blut-Verehrung in
“Wolftrams Blustroppenszene. Versuch einer magiologischen Deutung”, \textit{PBB} 128 no. 3 (2006), 431-466; Peggy
McCracken, \textit{The Curse of Eve, the Wound of the Hero. Blood, Gender, and Medieval Literature} (Philadelphia:
University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003); S. Beckwith, \textit{Christ’s Body: Identity, Culture and Society in Late Medieval
Writings} (London: Routledge, 1993); Heinrich Schipperges, “Blut in Altertum und Mittelalter”, in \textit{Einführung in die
Geschichte der Hämatologie}, ed. Karl Georg von Boroviczény, Heinrich Schipperges and Eduard Seidler (Stuttgart:
Thieme Verlag, 1974), 17-44;

\textsuperscript{226} Maier, \textit{Crusade propaganda}, 59.
er streichez andaz uber ture , der sla
hente engel uvor da uure ! sva er daz
plvot ane sah . scade da inne ningescah ;227

Easily read in the context of the poem as an allegory of Christ’s redemptive act and its salvific
effects, another interpretation arises when the poem returns to the metaphor in stanza twenty-
nine, immediately before launching into the stanza most imbued with crusading imagery (see
above).

[...] der gotes prunno ist daz
plvot swa daz stvont andem uberture . der
slahente engel uvor da fure228

The poem then proceeds to call upon the new Israel to look upon its rightful home again
(Spiritalis/ israel . nu scowe wider din erbe). Crusaders who already associated the salvation-
bearing indulgence with the redeeming blood of Christ were singled out by preachers because
they enjoyed the privilege of not only the indulgence, but the comparison to the saviour. In an
eyear thirteenth-century crusading sermon, James of Vitry iterates the notion that crusaders were
distinguished by the mark of the blood of Christ in an analogy that corresponds to the allegory in
the Vorau Ezzolied.

Ad litteram pastor habebat virgam sanguine tinctam et quicquid decimum de
grege transibat tangebat et sanguine signans Domino sanctificabat. Virga enim
crucis et sanguis Christi Domino sanctificamur et ab alis non signatis
discernimur.229

Several decades later, the Franciscan Gilbert of Tournai made use of this explication of a verse in
Leviticus, but proceeded even further and provided an interpretation of Apocalypse 7 that posits
the crusader as the object of the verse, who stands in front of Christ, marked with the blood of

227 “Then God, with his might, struck the Egyptian land. He afflicted the land with ten plagues. Moses, God’s holy
messenger, had a lamb slaughtered; very secret was his intent. He blessed the doors with the lamb’s blood, he
marked the doorposts; the destroying angel came before them, and wherever he saw the blood, no harm occurred
within”. Schröder, Kleiner d. Gedichte, 23, vv. 323-334. These lines are nearly identical to those that relate the
same events in the Vorauer Moses (see chapter 4).

228 “The blood is the font of God: wherever it was found on the doorpost, the destroying angel passed it by”.
Schröder, Kleine d. Gedichte, 24, vv. 356-358.

229 “Literally, the priest had a staff coloured with blood and he touched every tenth of the flock going by signing it
for the Lord with the blood and sanctifying it. For we are sanctified to the Lord by the wood of the cross and the
blood of Christ and distinguished from those who are not.” Quoted in Maier, Crusade propaganda, 108. See also;
Analecta novissima spicilegii solemensis altera continuatio Tusculana, ed. J.B. Pitra, (Paris: Roger et Chernowitz,
1888), 424.
the lamb. It reads, “Propter hoc Apoc vii dicitur de electis crucesignatis quod ipsi sunt in conspectu agni...et dealbaverunt [stolas suas] in sanguine agni.”

The imagery and language in the Vorau Ezzolied and the crusader rhetoric current in that period exhibit distinct similarities, but as I stated above, it is impossible to determine the extent to which this version of the text was influenced by the movement. It is, unfortunately, impossible to know just how much of the original Ezzolied S represents, or just how derivative or distinct V is from either. We can assert, however, that based on the comparable matter transmitted in each (ie. the first few stanzas) that V is a considerably reworked version. It is not possible to speculate on what has been added or altered beyond those initial stanzas, and it is not the purpose of this work to do so. Nevertheless, the possibility remains that the redactor of V made changes to update or tailor his version to a new audience. But it is not surprising, given the persuasive power of crusade preaching and its undeniably deep impact on the spirituality of the twelfth century that a song composed for a pilgrimage found resonance a century later, when pilgrimages had in part become armed movements that were ideologically supported, motivated, and directed by the central institution of the papacy. The reading of V that I outlined above fits well with this picture and the realities of the period as they are reflected in Otto’s Gesta Friderici. This last text strongly suggests that the Ezzolied in the Vorau manuscript carried the valence of crusader piety, and perhaps the same impulse behind the inclusion of the Gesta lay behind the erstwhile pilgrimage song.

3.6 Conclusion

It is fascinating to observe—belatedly—the members of a monastic community reach into the past and rewrite a history of one of their members, or reshape another for their own purposes. Indeed history was a most malleable medium in the Middle Ages and the achievements of the dead could be remolded by the living when deficient or obsolete. At Admont this involved an active intervention in texts themselves, but at Vorau we see a rather different situation in which

---

230 “On account of this, it says in Apocalypse 7 concerning the elect crusaders that they are in front of the lamb...and they marked [on their robes] with the blood of the lamb.” Quoted in Maier, Crusade Propaganda, 200.

231 The text was reworked sometime in the first third of the twelfth century and a Bavarian linguistic aspect has replaced the Alemannic of the earlier S version. See U. Schulze, “Ezzolied”, in Lexikon des Mittelalters, 10 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler, [1977]-1999), vol. 4, cols 198-199.
texts were brought together because they already seemed to fit, or fit well enough. This act of productive reception—a kind of repurposing—necessarily means that each work imparts a new or altered meaning to its counterparts. For example, while salvation history does not appear to be a defining element in the Kaiserchronik, when viewed as a part of a manuscript whole, salvation history emerges as a fundamental aspect of the codex, of which the German chronicle is a contributing and constituent part. Manuscript context has been a fundamental aspect of my argument in this chapter, just as the notion that texts can be brought together in a creative act specific to a time and place has been for this work as a whole. The Vorau manuscript can be said to possess the same system of meaning building that we find in the Kaiserchronik, namely a self-referential model in which texts or aspects of texts have a bearing on the interpretation of others. Just as the episode of Silvester and Constantine influences our reading of the Charlemagne-Leo section, so too must our reading of Vorau 276’s texts be influenced by what is contained in each individual constituent element. Otto of Freising’s Gesta Friderici, the text most contemporary to the manuscript’s compilation offers a glimpse at the concerns, interests, stresses and tensions of the culture which produced it. Naturally, the circumstances of its authoring, the types of sources it used and whence these were acquired (along with innumerable other factors) skew the image that we receive, but we can nevertheless discern the influence the Second Crusade had on the depiction of the events of that period. One need not venture deep into the prologue to gain this impression. Otto’s work gives an indication of the power of the crusade movement and the influence of its propaganda in the twelfth-century empire, and direct evidence of its impact in Styria. My preceding analyses bring to the fore the interests in dynasty, heritage, and the drawing together of lay and ecclesiastical interests connected to the crusades evinced by the texts.232 But taken in concert with the Gesta Friderici, the elements of crusader culture in the

---

232 Since Edward Schröder first examined the Vorau manuscript there has been a persistent belief that the German and Latin sections of this codex were not intended for one another and were not bound together until much later. See Schröder, Kaiserchronik, 8; Schneider, Gotische Schriften, 38ff. This assertion is reiterated continually by each generation of scholars (even as recently as 2016 in Chinca and Young, “Uses of the Past”, 23), yet I find it utterly unconvincing. For the most part, the argument rests on the fact that a different hand copied the Latin part and the script has a different aspect, although this is hardly sufficient evidence, merely a reflection of the capacity of the Vorau scriptorium. Only recently have some scholars begun to accept not only that the two parts of the manuscript were intended as part of the same project, but also that it was created in Vorau itself. On the first point see Christa Bertelsmeier-Kierst”, Aufbruch in die Schriftlichkeit”, in Wolfram-Studien XVI, ed Wolfgang Haubrichs, et al., (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2000), 171 and Wolf, Buch und Text, 210. On the latter point see the most recent discussion of the status quaestionis by Schafferhofer and Schubert, in which a rather definitive statement has been issued on this topic. Schafferhofer and Schubert, “Vorau”, 520-525: for a more in-depth look at the Vorau scriptorium and the origin of some of the twelfth-century codices see Wind, “Die Entstehung des Vorauer
Vorau manuscript link the various texts and create a structure in which meaning is created through reference. The self-referentiality of the Vorau manuscript and its texts contributes to the rooting of values associated with the crusading movement of the twelfth-century in an ancient, almost legendary past. This supports the desire (and pressure) to compete with the past inherent in the self-conception of lay noble dynasties. When we consider the importance of the dynastic concerns intensified by the crusading movement with respect to the Styrian court’s interaction with its monasteries, we can easily understand how these texts found relevance here.

Furthermore, having personally viewed each and every twelfth-century manuscript in the Stiftsarchiv of Vorau, I can confidently say that the Vorau manuscript is conspicuous for its size. It is, by a wide margin, larger than any of the other twelfth-century manuscripts, and only two later liturgical codices can boast a similar size (see above). In the richness of its execution only the Vorau Gospel book (Cod. 346) rivals it. Wind, Vorauer Evangeliar.
Chapter 4
Personal Salvation and the Treatment of Crusader Violence in the Vorau Manuscript

4.1 Introduction

The preceding analysis has focused on the crusading movement as a social phenomenon that brought the interests of the Styrian nobility into close alignment with those of the region’s monastic and religious institutions. The construction of legitimacy and permanence in which both monasteries and lay rulers participated involved creating a public perception of continuity with the past and an expectation of its extension into the future. Rhetorical appeals made to lay nobles in France and the Empire in the lead-up to the Second and Third Crusades played upon these concerns and elevated their importance by adducing a spiritual element. Crusading allowed nobles to pursue spiritual rewards in the same way that they accrued social honour and prestige for their family and dynasty. But as the overwhelming majority of the documents examined in Chapter 1 show, a concern for the souls of those for whom the recorded transactions were enacted was a fundamental part of the crusading experience. As we have seen in Chapter 2, a crusade was billed by those who preached it as an outstanding opportunity to atone for personal sins, and it was correspondingly viewed by the participants as a deeply personal activity as well as a communal and social one. Chapter 3 was an examination of some of the major texts that carried the most overt crusading valences, or emphasized certain themes discussed in the previous two chapters, the relevance of which would have been heightened by the crusading movement. The final chapter will address the texts of the section of the manuscript central to this thesis that are based on scriptural and apocryphal sources, works in which the moral and tropological elements of the historical narrative are more strongly emphasized. This will bring to light a personal-salvational theme at work within certain texts that would have been particularly relevant to a twelfth-century Styrian setting with respect to the overlap in interests between the region’s religious institutions and its ruling house. The Vorauer Marienlob inserted into the
Vorauer Bücher Mosis, the Sündenklage,¹ the Frau Ava poems, the Himmlische Jerusalem, and the Vorauer Frauengebet (Gebet einer Frau) clearly establish an eschatological theme that directs the reader’s or hearer’s attention to the next life, while works such as the Summa Theologiae, and the Vorauer Bücher Mosis suggest modes of conduct that provided the path toward it.² The poems of the recluse Frau Ava, although not treated in great depth here, are important in establishing the eschatological direction of this part of the Vorau manuscript, and like the Gebet einer Frau, establish the concern for the salvation of the individual soul.³ In this

² I regret to leave out a treatment of the Summa Theologiae (fol. 97ᵃ-98ᵇ). For the sake of space difficult decisions had to be made and even though the ST is an excellent example of a text that sustains a crusading valence and would have contributed added weight to my argument; but the point has been made elsewhere. The centrality of the symbolism of the cross in this work has been likened to that of the Ezzolied, and much of what has been said about that work earlier in Chapter 3—the importance of the example of Christ for crusader piety—also holds for the Summa. For more on the crusading elements of this text see Wentzlaff-Eggebett, Kreuzzugsdichtung, 38-40. For a summary of the state of the research up to 1970, see the introduction to Hartmut Freytag, Kommentar zur frühmittelhochdeutschen Summa Theologiae (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1983), 402. For a fairly full bibliography of scholarship on the text up to 1990 see Francis G. Gentry Bibliographie zur frühmittelhochdeutschen geistlichen Dichtung (Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1992), 196-200. In general, and for scholarship on particular aspects of this text see Hartmut Freytag, “Summa Theologiae”, in Verfasserlexikon (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), vol. 9, cols. 506-510; Heinz Rupp, Deutsche Religiöse Dichtung des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts (Tübingen: Francke, 1971), 84-133; Rudolf Suntrup, “Typologische Heilsge- schichts-Konzepte in mittelalterlicher geistlicher Literatur”, Germanistische Mediävistik 14:4 (2002), 277-308; Hartmut Freytag, “Jenseitsvorstellungen im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. Paradies und Erde—Erde und Paradies”, Jahrbuch der Oswald von Wolkenstein-Gesellschaft 13 (2002), 45-59. This chapter will also not treat the Marienlob. For an introduction to this text and its place within the broader category of Mary lyrics in the German language, see G.M. Schäfer, Untersuchungen zur deutschsprachigen Marienlyrik im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert (Göttingen: Kümmerle, 1971), 10-18, 41-44. See also F.J. Schweitzer, “Vorauer Marienlob”, in Marienlexikon, ed. R. Bäumler and L. Scheffczyk (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1994), Bd. 6, 670; Ralph Anderschek-Holzer, “Das ‚Marienlob’ aus dem Vorauer Cod. 276. Untersuchung und kulturhistorische Zusammenhänge”, ZdhVfS 82 (1991), 19-31.
five-part work (one part of which, the life of John the Baptist, is absent from the Vorau manuscript) Ava lays out a kind of salvation history that terminates in the Last Judgment. 4 Johannes is followed by the Leben Jesu, Die Sieben Gaben des heiligen Geistes, Der Antichrist, and Das Jüngste Gericht. 5 This last part of the work sets out the events of the last days of mankind and combines them with a powerful admonition to a correct mode of life. The structure of this group of poems, like that of the manuscript as a whole, mirrors the order of texts in the Bible in a rough way. Most notable is the progression from Genesis (Vorauer Genesis) texts to material drawn from Revelation (Himmlische Jerusalem). The latter is the penultimate poem of Vorau 276 and describes the heavenly city of Jerusalem, the true destination of human souls. 6 It elaborates on the significance of the architectural features of the city (twelve gates, their dimensions and adornment) in an allegorical fashion, with the four cardinal directions representing the various ages at which a person could renounce sin and the consequent manner of the entry into the heavenly city. 7 The image of the otherworldly Jerusalem was an extremely common eschatological symbol throughout the Middle Ages and this poem makes clear use of that tradition, as well as its function within the structure of the Bible. 8

---

4 The Ava poems were also transmitted in a fourteenth-century manuscript from Görlitz which is now destroyed.
5 Folios 115v-123a; 123a-123a; 123a-125a in Vorau 276 respectively. The Sieben Gaben was conflated with the Leben Jesu.
In this biblically-centred section of the manuscript the crusades of the twelfth century still constitute an important frame of cultural reference, and some of the texts deal with the personal-salvational theme as it might have pertained to those whose redemption was offered to them through violent means. In *Balaam*, the Judith poems, and *Drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen*, for example, themes such as faith in the face of heathen opposition would have stood out for those who had experience crusading in the east, and they nuance the moral and eschatological section of the manuscript with crusader undertones. And while some of the texts in Vorau 276 certainly suggest a favourable attitude towards the crusades on the part of the compilers and/or recipients, the more eschatologically oriented elements also complicate this view with some equivocal sentiments on the place of violence within a Christian context. Styria’s monasteries, as we have seen, actively participated in preparing those who had taken the cross for the physical and spiritual journey to be embarked upon; both sides, it appears, saw the armed campaigns as opportunities for the salvation of the participants’ souls. But despite the officially sanctioned status of the crusades, there were concerned voices emanating from those whose duty it was to administer to the souls of crusaders that questioned the theological and moral foundation of the justification of crusader violence. Aside from an inherent abhorrence of violence, opposition to

---

9 Although a fascinating example of the conditions under which divine aid might be rendered in battle, and with particular allusions to the eschatological *Himmilische Jerusalem* text, the *Vorauer Balaam* is yet another highly relevant text that must be sacrificed for space. It tells the story of the heathen prophet Bileam who rode his donkey to Moab in order to curse the army of Israel encamped there but was prevented in this by God (Numbers 22-24). Every time Bileam went to pronounce the curse over the encamped Israelite army God changed the words in his mouth into a blessing. The story breaks off after the last blessing. Wilhelm Scherer, *Geistlichen Poeten der deutschen Kaiserzeit: Studien. 2. Drei Sammlungen geistlicher Gedichte* (Strasbourg: Trübner, 1875), 49-51; D.A. Wells, *The Vorau Moses and Balaam. A Study of their Relationship to the Exegetical Tradition* (Cambridge: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1970); Cölln, “Arbeit an Alexander”, 192; Vollmann-Profe, *Lit. Gesch.*, 94-98; Ursula Henning, “Vorauer Bücher Mosis”, *VL* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1999), vol. 10, col. 515; Hartmut Freytag, “Die frühmittelhochdeutsche geistliche Dichtung in Österreich”, in *Die österreichische Literatur. Ihr Profil von den Anfängen im Mittelalter bis ins 18. Jahrhundert (1050-1750)*, ed. Herbert Zeman (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1986), Teil I., 134-136. Fols. 94a-96a in Vorau 276.

10 During the early stages of the spread of the Christian faith, the original pacifism stressed by Christ was largely upheld, but as the religion began to take hold among those holding power, Christianity and warfare increasingly intersected. Augustine’s *De civitate Dei* (Book I, 5; Book II, 18 in the Corpus Christianorum edition) is generally credited with the development of the just war doctrine, according to which certain conditions needed to be met in order to excuse a Christian from the sin associated with violence. Ronald H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960), 89-100; Brundage, *Medieval Canon Law*, 20-21. While Gratian’s Decretum (Causa XXIII) does address the concept of just war, he does not connect the idea to religion or religious war (though it could be argued it forms the backdrop to his work). See Frederick H. Russell, *The Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 55-85. There were different categories of opposition to crusading and these need to be taken into account here. Some opposed the doctrine for the influence it awarded...
the crusades was focused on the individual, and whether or not the killing of other human beings could serve as a legitimate vehicle for the remission of sins. St. Bernard’s De laude may have been a response to criticism of the Templars and the morality of their enterprise and of crusading as a whole. For some, the killing of Muslims was a worse sin than allowing their faith to spread. The Annalist of Würzburg responded to the outcome of the Second Crusade by claiming that those who had preached it were false prophets serving the devil, bringing damnation upon the souls of those who had agreed to take the cross by inducing them to commit the sin of murder. The hesitancy about killing Muslims was even current in the Holy Land itself, where one might expect a much greater appreciation for the topic. Sometime after 1150 the Patriarch of Jerusalem wrote to Peter of Troyes on the permissibility of the killing of infidels. Peter replied in the form of a quaestio, and cited various Christian authorities including Gratian. Those who killed in the service of God were not committing murder, he concluded. We find echoes of these dubious sentiments in the Vorau manuscript as well, most conspicuously in the papacy in directing European affairs, some objected on financial grounds, unwilling to levy or pay the taxes demanded of them to furnish the expeditions. Others disapproved of the use of the crusade as a salvational vehicle, citing the Christian prohibition against murder. Elizabeth Siberry, Criticism of Crusading 1095-1274 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 109-149. In general see Hiestand, “Gott will es!” Much of the polemic against crusading originates in the late twelfth century and picked up momentum throughout the thirteenth. Though we should not count out the treatment of the topic by the Minnesänger and Troubadours. On these see L.T. Topsfield, Troubadours and Love (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 5; A. Jeanroy, La Poésie lyrique des troubadours (Paris: Didier, 1934), 177-78; M. Colleville, Les Chansons allemandes de croisade (Paris: Didier, 1936), 148-149, 155-156; G. Wolfram, “Kreuzpredigt und Kreuzlied”, Zfda 30 (1886), 97-132; Morris, “Propaganda for War”, 94; Siberry, Criticism, 4-11. For an introduction to the opposition to crusading in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, see Joshua Prawer, Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem (Paris: CNRS, 1969-70), 379-396.

11 Pacifist objections were nevertheless present before the Second Crusade, but generally we are only aware of these because of the crusade apologists who addressed the concerns. Gratian for example lists the pacifist arguments before refuting them. Siberry, Criticism, 208-209; K. Haines, “Attitudes and Impediments to Pacifism in Medieval Europe”, Journal of Medieval History 7 (1981), 385-386. One notable exception to this is a letter from Hugh of St. Victor to the Templars written between 1128 and 1136 in which he reassures the order that those claiming the professional killing of the enemies of the faith is sinful are incorrect. Jean Leclerq, ed., “Un document sur les débuts des Templiers”, Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique 70 (1957), 86-89. In the thirteenth century, both James of Vitry and Humbert of Romans, whose sermons have already been treated, felt it necessary to counter the arguments of those who objected to the crusades on moral grounds. Siberry, Criticism, 211-212. The Cathars were also responsible for pacifist arguments against the crusades, but few of their treatises survived their suppression. Not surprisingly, these were likely connected to the crusade that was declared specifically against them. For a study of crusading criticism that does not generally include any significant treatment of the twelfth century, see Palmer A. Throop, Criticism of the Crusade: A Study of Public Opinion and Crusade Propaganda (Amsterdam: Sweets and Zeitlinger, 1940). Throop’s work presents a more thorough English treatment of the involvement of critics in the vernacular, as well as an expanded discussion of Humbert of Romans and his encounter with pacifist arguments.


13 Cole, The Preaching of the Crusades, 54; Siberry, Criticism, 198-201.

Moses and Solomon texts. The presence of such uncertainty regarding the nature of crusade violence does not necessarily indicate outright rejection by the compilers and users of the codex. The question appears to be treated from both lay and religious perspectives, and points, therefore, to an audience group that was comprised of elements from both laity and clergy. Those who departed on crusade appointed their affiliated monastic houses to care for their souls, and any debate about the salvational efficacy of crusading, therefore, involved both monastery and the lay noble crusader.

Violence and conflict have much deeper roots in the Christian consciousness and cannot be considered the sole property of crusading culture; they are essential theological and doctrinal elements of the Christian narrative of world and salvation history. The metaphor of a *bellum spirituale* can be found among patristic authors and may be rooted in the passage from Ephesians 6:11-18. Tertullian’s *De Spectaculis* also makes use of this idea, which was later continued in the Carolingian period with Theodulf and Walafrid Strabo. The phrase became quite popular throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries through Peter Damian (*De spirituali certamine*, and *Liber qui dicitur dominus vobiscum*) and Honorius Augustodunensis (a sermon in *Gemma animae*). Moreover, in the *Psychomachia* tradition we can see violence deployed as a metaphor for the internal struggle to resist sin and pursue a virtuous lifestyle. In the treatment of personal salvation that we find in the Vorau manuscript, violence tends to play a role, whether it was in the less literal sense of the *Psychomachia*, or in a way that was more directly related to the crusading experience of twelfth-century lay nobles. It is not surprising that the eschatological section of the Vorau manuscript treats the topic of salvation from such a range of perspectives; perhaps the most significant point of intersection between lay noble and monastic interests was not the creation and maintenance of an image of political legitimacy, but the fate of the souls of those individuals.

---

15 The first specific usage of the phrase can be traced to the pseudo-Basilian “Admonitio ad filium spiritualem” found in the first chapter of *De militia spirituali* incorporated into Benedict of Aniane’s *Codex regularum* (Migne, ed. P.L. 103, col. 683).
17 I treat the *Psychomachia* allegory in much greater detail below. For an edition of Prudentius’ work see Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, *Carmina*, ed. Maurice Cunningham (Turnhout: Brepols, 1966).
4.2 Dissenting Voices or Reserved Acceptance? The *Milstätter Exodus* and the *Vorauer Bücher Mosis*

The *Vorauer Bücher Mosis* occupy folios 74\textsuperscript{ra}-96\textsuperscript{ra}, 4,080 lines in modern edition, and are made up of five distinct poems that have been incorporated into the Vorau manuscript as a unit. The *Vorauer Genesis* is followed by *Joseph in Ägypten, Vorauer Moses, Vorauer Marienlob*, and *Balaam*.\(^{18}\) While *Balaam* is the youngest text, ca. 1140, the rest are somewhat older, and little is known about their authors or places of origin, although Knapp has suggested somewhere in the Danube valley or Carinthia.\(^{19}\) Almost certainly the work of discrete authors, the texts were all transmitted together by the time they were copied at Vorau, and the manuscript divisions clearly support this.\(^{20}\) The incomplete state of several of the poems, despite their almost seamless compilation suggests a corrupted exemplar.\(^{21}\) The Joseph text has been taken directly out of the *Altdeutsche Genesis*, surviving only in the Vienna manuscript (ÖNB, Cod. 2721, last quarter of the twelfth century), although the Vorau text was not copied directly from this manuscript, but rather the two were copied from the same exemplar.\(^{22}\) The Genesis text in the Vorau manuscript leaves off at chapter 35 in the Old Testament version, and the Joseph text takes up the narrative at chapter 37. *Vorauer Moses* relates the story of Moses’s birth, his calling to lead the Israelites, and their journey out of Egypt into the Promised Land as it is told in the Books of Exodus and Numbers, spilling over into the Book of Isaiah and concluding with the fall of Jericho.\(^{23}\)

\(^{18}\) Fols. 74\textsuperscript{ra}-78\textsuperscript{rb}; 78\textsuperscript{rb}-87\textsuperscript{vb}; 87\textsuperscript{vb}-93\textsuperscript{va}; 93\textsuperscript{va}-94\textsuperscript{ra}; 94\textsuperscript{ra}-96\textsuperscript{ra} respectively.


\(^{20}\) Henning, *VL*, col. 514. While Diemer initially believed they were all the work of the same author, De Boor suggested three authors, and Münster divided them even further. Evelyn Jacobson, “Die Stellung des Marienlobs innerhalb des Aufbaus der Vorauer Bücher Moses”, *Studia Neophilologica* 50 (1978), 71.


Marienlob, unlike the other texts, obviously does not spring from Old Testament material, but the story of the prophet Balaam is derived from Numbers, 22-24.  

The Moses text has a corollary in the so-called Milstätter Exodus (ME) of around 1120, a selective retelling of the same material contained in the Vorau version but only as far as the fifteenth chapter of the biblical source. Transmitted in a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century manuscript of Bavarian-Austrian provenance now kept at Klagenfurt (M), the M version is probably the oldest of three and presents the material in a manner quite distinct than the Vorau
Moses text. D.H. Green’s study is by far the most detailed analysis of the M text and he highlights the importance of the crusades as a motif in the presentation of the Exodus material. He argues that crusading literature should include “…not merely works with an explicitly crusading theme, but also literature indirectly influenced by the crusades or whose crusading theme is no more than implicit.” Interpretations that outline connections to the Easter liturgy and commonplace baptismal allegories, argues Green, while relevant and worthwhile, do not adequately account for the “military atmosphere” of the text. Crusaders might, though, have appreciated both of these valences as a part of their own experience with the crusades. The text abounds with military terminology, descriptions of armies, feudal vocabulary, and occasions on which the author equates the Israelite army with a Christian one. A parallel can be drawn between this text and the Ezzolied, which both characterize man’s relationship with God in terms of a reciprocal relationship based on service that mirrored the organization of lay society. The plague of frogs is described as a host of human warriors, the locusts as snelle helede and wigante, and the gnats are even characterized as knights of God. When the author describes the lion on the shields of the Israelites as a prefiguration of Christ, he typologically associates this army with a Christian one setting out under the sanction of God. Green’s analysis is a great deal more detailed and complex than I have here represented, and I will return to his work later in the chapter. However, it is not an oversimplification to assert the central place of crusading motifs in the Milstätter Exodus, or that the presentation of the material was influenced by the crusading tenor of the period and would have been recognized later as a crusading allegory by those with some experience in the east.

26 The Milstätter Handschrift provides an interesting foil for the object of this study, however, without a detailed examination of the local circumstances of its production, a comparison in the current context would yield little of value.
27 Green, Milstätter Exodus, 1.
28 Wells also concedes this point. Vorau Moses and Balaam, 13.
30 Green, Milstätter Exodus, 173-174.
31 Ibid., 90-92.
32 Ibid., 94.
33 For example, when the author addresses the herren in one episode of the Israelite army setting out, “the audience is meant to regard themselves as the knightly peers of the Israelite herren whose knightly splendour and equipment show how close they stand to the social and knightly ideals of the present.” Ibid., 95.
knights to the implicit responsibility which has now fallen to them of continuing religious knighthood in the name of Christ.”

When the authors of the *Wiener Genesis* and the *Milstätter Exodus* delve into Scripture for quotations, they concern themselves with the relevance of their biblical sources for their twelfth-century audiences. The Millstatt author, for instance, intimates that Christians living *sub gratia* are the fulfillment of the types and prophecies set out in the Old Testament. By contrast, the *Vorauer Moses* (VM), which covers the same biblical books as the ME, prefers a moral explication of the material. An audience steeped in crusading rhetoric and the conventions of epic narration seems to have been the ME author’s target, but the VM text is continually interrupted by exegetical excurses to which the narrative flow is subordinate. Just like many other MHG poems, it contains no direct evidence for readership or audience, and we cannot be certain of an intended clerical public, suggested by some. However, that such an assertion might seem plausible to some is indicative of the disparity between the presentation of the material in ME and the Vorau version. The ME author seems to have chosen his material for its suitability to the tastes of his intended lay audience, while Ursula Hennig notes that the content of the VM has been chosen for its ability to be interpreted typologically, tropologically, and ecclesiologically, which suggest an audience well-versed in exegetical methods. The extensive use of exegetical tracts in the VM gives it a much more theological and dogmatic aspect that contrasts markedly with that of its counterpart in the Millstatt manuscript.

More importantly, the Vorau version appears to be noticeably less inclined towards the possibility of violence as a vehicle for personal salvation. The ME author stops short of actually depicting the Hebrews in battle, and the *Wiener Genesis* poem that also treats this episode tends to subject the idea of violence to a criticism of Christian ethics. The Vorau text is perhaps

---

34 Ibid., 95.
35 He appears to play down the fact that the Israelites were a people quite distinct from his Christian contemporaries. Green, *Milstätter Exodus*, 32-33.
37 Indeed the difference in aspect is marked and universally acknowledged by the scholarly community.
40 Wells believes he has identified the chief source for the exegetical passages in VM, namely the *Glossa Ordinaria*. Wells, *Vorau Moses and Balaam*.
41 Green, *Milstätter Exodus*, 389.
more openly about salvation, and the standard of conduct one must uphold to attain it. Frequent references to the doubt and murmuring of the Israelites are accompanied by clear statements that they have, consequently, lost God’s favour. For example, after the crossing of the sea and the entry into the desert, God gives the starving Israelites manna, which was variably received.  

Si namen ez mit un-zvhte. mit murmelen und mit ubele. des irbalch sich got uone hi-mele.  

But the difference in emphasis and in attitude toward violence between the ME and VM is perhaps best illustrated by each author’s treatment of the plagues. As I mentioned above, the ME author’s characterization of the frogs and gnats as knights of God visiting retribution upon the enemies of the chosen people would have been difficult to divorce from crusading in the context of the twelfth century. The Exodus material had a specific relevance for the crusades and crusaders as well; when Eugene wrote to console Conrad III after the Second Crusade, he tried to explain the failure as part of a divine plan, which necessarily included calculated adversity. The pontiff compared Conrad and his people to the Israelites who were forced by Pharaoh’s violence to flee from Egypt. In much the same way, Conrad ought to see the outcome of the Second Crusade as an indication of where his salvation might lie, and an impetus to turn away from the world. In the Vorau text, the plagues are not accompanied by any such military terminology, but each is interpreted as an example of a particular mode of righteous or virtuous conduct. Particular attention is paid to the plague of frogs representing the murmurers and those who

---

42 The author returns to this episode later (Diemer, 58, ln. 6ff) to explain that the manna represents Christ, and the manner in which the bread was received mirrors the ways in which man might receive Christ.

43 “They accepted it ungraciously, with complaint and with scowling. For this God in heaven became angry”. Diemer, 47, ln. 18-21.


45 The episode of the plagues begins on p. 38, ln. 5 of Diemer’s edition. On account of a gap in the manuscript, the description of the ninth and tenth plagues are not present. Space was left in the manuscript on fol. 89r for these verses, which suggests a corrupt exemplar and an expectation of a second supplementary one.
speak ill and falsely, which will become particularly relevant to the conduct of the Israelites after their departure from Egypt.\textsuperscript{47} The author frequently interrupts the narrative to digress on long passages of tropologically oriented exegesis, enjoining his audience to think about its conduct and the way in which it might impact their standing with God. Where the Millstatt author crafts his depiction of events in such a way that a twelfth-century noble/knightly audience might see its own struggles against those opposed to the Christian faith in a typological relation to the Israelites of Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, the Vorau author clearly favours the value of the material from a moral/tropological standpoint. If the path to salvation (prefigured as the land of Canaan) can be trod by an army in the \textit{Millstatt Exodus}, it can only be taken by those whose behaviour is just and honest in the Vorau Moses.

Even in the biblical source, however, the Israelites are organized as an army that fights and the VM author does not shy away from these facts. When Moses prepares his people for departure, he arranges them as an army (\textit{sunderote}), and the text acknowledges that they were ready and willing to fight.\textsuperscript{48} At times, though infrequently, he also has recourse to refer to some martial aspect of the people.\textsuperscript{49} These attributes, however, seem isolated, and appear without the epic ornamentation that is characteristic of the descriptions of armies in the Millstatt text. Military matters are of far less consequence from a narrative or thematic standpoint for the Vorau author. This is nowhere more evident than when the author transforms the entire Israelite army itself into an allegory for turning away from the world and directing one’s mind to spiritual things. As the Israelites reach the Red Sea, they grow concerned with Pharaoh approaching and the lack of a way across. The Israelite army passing through the Red Sea, explains the narrator, represents those who turn from the world and are filled with virtue. He proceeds to describe Moses as the people’s spiritual guide in these endeavours.

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Daz andere wurden froske. di slussen/ uz den posken. ir wart ein Michel menige. uber alle di geginne. daz/ bezeichenet ze ware. di tumben spot-/tare. di mit unnuzzeme chose. go-/tes hulde urlisent. di snaterent den abent unde den morgen. alse der froske in deme horewe. “The second [plague] was frogs, which came out of the swamps. They were a great many and they covered the area. These indeed represent the foolish and the mockers who speak without sense and lose God’s favour. They natter evening and morning like the frogs in the muck”. Diemer, 38, ln. 11-18.}

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Wie vil/ der ware. die ze gwæfene frum we-/ren. wichaftes livtes. “How many there were who were ready to bear arms, a warlike people”. Diemer, 43, ln. 1-3.}

\textsuperscript{49} For example, when the army divides itself on the bank of the Red Sea, one group is referred to as \textit{gvote chnechte}. Diemer, 45, ln. 15. See G. W. Coats, “The Traditio-Historical Character of the Red Sea Motif”, \textit{VT} 17 (1967), 253-265.
[…] unde
wir unsere sinne. rihten zu ge[i]stlichen dingen. wir suchen unser erbe. daz land ist da ze himele. daz uns got geheizen hat. unde sver di werlt uarn lat. unser herre git uns in den muot. manege tugen uil guot. innen den willen. wir ne megen si niht irfullen. daz bezeichenet daz here. so uare wir gerastet an daz mere.  

The tropological exegesis that is the hallmark of the Vorau Moses’s presentation of the Old Testament material continues throughout the remainder of the poem, with the author pausing the narrative to expound on the episode of Moses bringing water from the stone, on the tabernacle and all its constituent parts. The focus of these excurses—if they should even be called excurses, given their central importance to the text—never changes; what moral lessons we can derive from an interpretation of the Exodus-Numbers-Joshua narrative of the Israelites leaving a state of bondage for the Promised Land is the author’s goal. From the perspective of the twelfth-century Styrian audience, the crusading connection may not have been particularly strong, but Wells concedes that the valence is nevertheless present. The conduct of the crusaders was a major topic in the wake of the Second Crusade, the failure of which was attributed by Bernard of Clairvaux to the sinful behaviour of the crusaders themselves, who, much like the Jews of Exodus, incurred the displeasure and disfavour of God. In Bernard of Clairvaux’s De consideratione, his crusade apology, he uses the example of the Israelites to characterize the crusaders. He writes that their loss of divine favour, like that of the Israelites, was due to their own conduct and not that of their leaders: “Since the Israelites fell and perished because of their

50 “And we raise our mind to spiritual things, we seek our inheritance. The land that God commended to us is there, in heaven. And God will place many good virtues in the minds of whoever lets the world pass by; we can never fulfill them in our intentions. The army represents this, thus we travel, at peace, upon the sea”. Diemer, 49, ln. 8-15.
52 Aside from occasions on which the author calls Moses der gotes degen (Diemer, 54, ln. 15. Admittedly, he is more frequently referred to as der guote). Wells describes one passage that might be read more literally as a reference to the crusader whose spiritual regeneration was felt to be closely akin to baptismal purification. sver daz insigele guot./ du het an sinen muot./ wil erz offenenlichen tragen./ ime mac der slange niht gescaden./ deme wirt daz cruce tivre./ ein stap unde ein stivre. “The serpent can do no harm to whoever holds the good example in his mind and will display it openly. For him the cross will be dear, a comfort and a support”. Diemer, 35, ln. 14
iniquity, is it surprising that today those who have done the same thing suffer the same fate?”

Perhaps this parallel itself might have been more obvious to an audience of that period and in that context the Vorau version of the text could have been interpreted as a relevant expression of the sentiments surrounding the end of the Second Crusade. For an audience that was both clerical and lay noble, outright questions regarding the legitimacy of a violent pursuit of salvation that might be suggested by the text may have been commuted into an admonition to crusaders to conduct themselves in a manner befitting Christians. Indeed, the relevance of this text for its readers and users likely did not lie primarily in the sphere of the crusading movement. Much more likely is the text’s treatment of proper conduct and the consequences of deviating from a virtuous lifestyle fitting into the broader rhetoric of religious admonition to the laity. The leaders of the crusading movement did seek to explain the failure of the Second Crusade with the same logic that saw the Hebrews of Exodus lose favour with God, and the leap between the two contexts is not a great one. But the examples from Exodus were no less pertinent for those who did not take part in the armed campaigns themselves; essentially, the texts presents a universally applicable set of exempla that might have been internalized by crusaders in a more literal way than by those who did not conceive of themselves in quite such martial terms.

53 Quoted in Cole, *Preaching of the Crusades*, 57-58. *De Consideratione* 2.2. Their chief sins, as noted, were doubt and ingratitude. Bernard held this belief until his death, as evidenced by a letter he wrote to his Templar uncle in 1153. Epistle 288, in *Opera vol. 8*, 203-204. On blame for the Second Crusade focused on the crusaders themselves and their conduct see, Jonathan Riley-Smith, “An Approach to Crusading Ethics”, *Reading Medieval Studies* 6 (1980), 9-10; Jonathan Riley-Smith, “Peace Never Established: the Case of the Kingdom of Jerusalem”, *TRHS* 28 (1978), 89, 98-99; E. Stickel, *Der Fall von Akkon* (Frankfurt a.M: Peter Lang, 1975), 190-217, and chiefly Siberry, *Criticism*, 69-108. The perception that crusader conduct was the chief fault of the second expedition informed the presentation of the proposition for the Third Crusade. Alexander III’s *Audita Tremendi* admonished would-be crusaders to behave as if they were performing a penance rather than setting out for worldly glory. He followed *Quantum Praedecessores* as well by urging participants to be modest in their dress and their comportment. For more general literature on the failure of the Second Crusade, the repercussions, and contemporary attitudes, see G.A. Loud, “Some Reflections on the Failure of the Second Crusade”, *Crusades* 4 (2005), 1-14; Alan J. Forey, “The Failure of the Siege of Damascus in 1148”, in *Medieval Warfare 1000-1300*, ed. John France (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 411-421.
4.3 The Place of Violence in Twelfth-Century Piety

4.3.1 Faith in a Heathen World: *Drei Jünglinge*, *Ältere Judith*, and the *Jüngere Judith* in a Crusading Context

Between these three texts there exists a codicological relationship beyond that which is thematically evident. The DJ runs straight into the ÄJ text without pause, and the next text which is marked by an initial is the JJ. The *Lob Salomens*, generally believed to be the first of the complex that was integrated into the Vorau manuscript is characterized by a three-line initial. Most scholars agree that at least these four texts were brought into connection with one another before the compiler of the Vorau manuscript encountered them, and the group was integrated as such.\(^{55}\) It is chiefly the binary opposition between the faithful and non-believers that connects them from a thematic point of view.\(^{56}\) The antagonist is introduced in the *Drei Jünglinge*, the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar, and the episode closes with the death of his general Holofernes at the hands of Judith. The *Jüngere Judith* text, which holds much closer to its source and differs from the older version in considerable measure, must be considered an important interpretational foil, even if it might not have been part of this text-group.\(^{57}\)

In each of these works the central tropological theme derives from the juxtaposition of the heathen and the believer. At the outset of the DJ, in fact, the author reveals the setting of the story and also the most important interpretational criterion: a heathen world in which God

---

\(^{54}\) The distinction between these works is partially the invention of modern scholarship, and there is good reason to treat at least the *Drei Jünglinge* and *Ältere Judith* as one and the same text. I treat them here separately in name only, as if referring to episodes in the same work. As the following will make clear, the association between the two poems is very strong. See also, Lähnemann, *Hystoria Judith: Deutsche Judithdichtung vom 12. bis zum 16. Jahrhunder* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 94-96.


\(^{56}\) Although I do not agree with Waag in this respect, I cite his discussion of the topic with a caveat. On the place of these three texts within the manuscript see Albert Waag, “Die Zusammensetzung der Vorauer Handschrift”, *PBB* 11(1886), 119-122. In contrast to Waag, see Polheim, “Die Struktur der Vorauer Handschrift”, in his Facsimile edition, pp. V-XXII. See also Werner Schröder, *Die drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen. Die Ältere Judith. Überlieferung—Stoff—Form* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1976), 106-113; Vollmann-Profe, *Lit. Gesch.*, 73-74. Theodor Frings believes that the Judith texts were included because they were beloved, but also because Otto of Freising praised her chastity in the *Gesta*. Theodor Frings, “Die Vorauer HS und Otto von Freising”, *PBB* 55 (1931), 226. For more on Judith texts in the Empire at this time see W. Stammler, “Zur Staufischen Judith-Ballade”, *ZfdPh* 70 (1948/49), 32-36; Erich Henschel, “Zur Älteren Judith”, *PBB* 73 (1951), 304.

\(^{57}\) This is one of the central theses of Lähnemann’s work. See Lähnemann, *Hystoria Judith*. 
nevertheless maintained a favoured people among the races. What follows is a succinct narration of the episode from Daniel 3 in which three young Hebrews refuse to worship the golden idol that Nebuchadnezzar has created. As punishment, the three are cast into an oven. Miraculously, they are preserved from the heat by the Son of God, all the while singing hymns to the Lord. When the crowd perceives the wonder that has transpired, they declare their fealty to the power that kept the three unharmed. In the midst of the action, the youths decry the falsity of Nebuchadnezzar’s idols in a refrain that resurfaces verbatim in the ÄJ (this time uttered by the burghers of the besieged city), and cements the transposition of the same interpretive framework onto that text. This explicit rejection of false gods and steadfast expression of faith in the face of a heathen threat is a very clear statement about the purpose of the story, one that carries through to the ÄJ along with the same antagonist. The readiness with which the three youths go to their deaths and their unwavering proclamation recalls the martyr topos and the countless examples—many recorded—of that ultimate expression of faith and rejection of doubt. In the Judith narrative to follow, the story is fleshed out in greater detail and some nuance is added. The DJ episode is quite brief and quite straightforward. The counterparts to the youths in the ÄJ, the Israelites, present a more complex example of a faith only superficially maintained, which bears some correcting. In the end, the result is the same and these two episodes of faith challenged by heathen violence offer complementary examples of how one ought not to doubt God in the face of persecution.

The opposition between the heathens and God’s elect would likely have been understood by an audience involved in the crusading movement as pertinent to the present situation in which Christians were engaged in continuous violence with the enemies of their faith. But there is yet another aspect shared between these two texts that makes the exempla of trust in God much more

---

58 E got giborin wurdil/ do wilt er aller dirri werldi./ daz lut was heidin/ undi was doch undirscheidin./ dar undir warin,/ di dir von goti larin: daz warin di herrin,/ di gutin Israhelin. "Before God was born he veiled the world. The people were heathen and divided. Among them were those who read of God, they were the good lords of Israel”. Albert Waag and Werner Schröder, ed. Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts. Nach der Auswahl von Albert Waag. Band I (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), 60-62, vv. 1-8.
59 kunc Nabochodonosor, dinu abgot sint ein drugidinc! “King Nebuchadnezzar, your idols are false!” Waag/Schröder, Drei Jünglinge, v. 56; Waag/Schröder, Ältere Judith, v. 48.
60 The episode ends with Nebuchadnezzar, scorned and embarrassed, retreating to Babylon.
relevant to a twelfth-century audience. Both the youths of DJ and the Israelites of the ÄJ declare Christ the object of their faith when faced with their respective perils.

du dru kint sprachin vor demi vuri:
‘dinu abgot sint unghuri;
wir giloubin an den Crist,
der gischuf alliz daz dir ist,
[...]’

And the Hebrew leader of city:

‘swigint, Oloferni!
wir giloubin an den Crist,
der dir gischuf alliz daz dir ist,
[...]’

Henrike Lähnemann has correctly pointed out the importance of these references to Christ in establishing a salvation-historical trajectory within the work, and within the manuscript as a whole. The intention is to engender a contemplation of these events within the broader context of salvation history, and of Christians as the heirs to the Hebrews, albeit in a more complete way. Although this conception appears to present the events of the two episodes as historically distinct from the present period, the fluidity of the Christian concept of history, its repeatability, its typologies, its prophecies and the fulfillments thereof, coupled with the highly metaphorical and pregnant nature of the scriptural sources mean these events could hold relevance for the present. Salvation history has a reflexive quality that derives significance for past events from the present (and future), and vice versa. Typological references to Christ would have been understandable outside of a crusading context, although the additional dynamic between the faithful and the non-believers would have been especially poignant. Although it is completely absent from the Old Testament, the evangelical quality in the DJ episode, in which the crowd declares itself for the God of the youths, contributes to an image of the text that is much more relevant for the realities of the time. The poem does not make use of a military idiom, and the conflict itself is not of a military nature, but the martyrdom topos is the dominant aspect of this text. “What results”

62 “The three youths spoke before the flames: ‘Your gods are monstrous. We believe in Christ, who created all there is […]’”. Waag/Schröder, *Drei Jünglinge*, vv.49-52. Additionally, the narrator relates that the youths praised Christ while in the oven (v. 72).
63 “Quiet, Holofernes! We believe in Christ, who created all there is […]”. Waag/Schröder, *Ältere Judith*, vv. 42-44.
according to Green, “is a Christian martyrs’ legend, but one which derives its appeal from the contemporary experience of the crusades...”

Green proceeds to state that the conflation of the DJ and JJ texts—a work that he believes has strong crusade associations—in the Vorau manuscript underscores this movement as a point of reference for this poem. While history and Sacred Scripture will always render the martyr topos pertinent irrespective of contemporary conditions, we cannot ignore the specific contextual material we have before us in favour of a more general, universally relevant reading, even when the text can sustain both.

4.3.2 The Conditions of Victory Explained — Jüngere Judith and its Relationship to the VM and DJ.

This poem occupies folios 100va-108vb, situated between the Ältere Judith and the Vorau Alexander, and though it is much longer than its older counterpart (1,820 lines in Monecke’s edition), it is generally considered less interesting in the scholarship that is predominantly concerned with tracing the origins of courtly romance and plotting the history of German literature. Composed sometime around 1140 in Austria, this version of the Judith story holds much closer to the biblical source. The style of presentation appears to be quite simple, and the characterization of Judith’s actions as a “ritterliche Erlösungstat” would suggest an audience for which this kind of heroism might resound. And much like the Vorauer Moses, the Jüngere Judith offers a message which, in a twelfth-century context, carries the same ambiguity toward Christian violence and the same tension between presenting a people who are firm in their piety, but nonetheless prepared to fight. It should be noted that the broad strokes of the situation depicted in VM and JJ are very similar; in both instances the Israelite people face a dire threat from a heathen power, only to be released by the intervention of God through a human agent.

The Middle Ages offered (somewhat) conflicting images of Judith arising from the biblical episode. In one interpretation, she was an outstanding example of the power of faith, piety, and

---

66 Green, Milstätter Exodus, 224. On this point, see also Schwietering, Die deutsche Dichtung des Mittelalters, 74.
67 Green, Milstätter Exodus, 224.
70 There is a large body of literature on the figure of Judith in the Middle Ages. The following is a list of works that treat either Judith in German literature, the interpretation of the Judith figure in the Middle Ages, or contain some
the resulting divine mercy granted to a worthy person, and by extension her people. On the other hand, Judith’s violent deliverance of her people from a heathen attack came to have increasing relevance during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when this episode was enormously popular among the Teutonic Order. A number of vernacular versions of the text date to this period.\textsuperscript{71} The Vorau manuscript offers two very different renderings of the Judith story, which, based on codicological evidence and confirmed by scholarship, cannot be read in isolation.\textsuperscript{72}

The two Judith texts have increasingly come to be seen as complementary, rather than two versions of the same text rooted in different traditions (one heroic and oral, the other religious and scriptural). Henrike Lähnemann asserts that the younger text was appended to the older to provide a much fuller portrayal of the story (including the DJ episode) for the audience to better understand the older version’s significance.\textsuperscript{73} A much more scripturally rooted explication of the story naturally has a bearing on our reading of the previous texts, and the themes I have

---


\textsuperscript{72} Here I refer to the integration of several poems that are believed to have been transmitted as a unit in the Vorau manuscript’s exemplar. These include the Judith poems, the Drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen, and the Lob Salomons.

\textsuperscript{73} Lähnemann’s point holds even if her reading of the prologue is unlikely. She suggests that the narrator’s use of the phrase ze dûte could be read as indicative of interpretation. Nâ vernemet, ir lîben lûte:/ ich wil û sagen ze dûte/ eine rede vil wunnesame:/ dâ muget ir gerne denchen ane. “Now listen, you dear people. I would like to tell you a wonderful story as an interpretation: so that you might ponder it”. Hilgunt Monecke, ed., Die Jüngere Judith aus der Vorauer Handschrift (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1964), vv. 1-4. All subsequent references and quotations are drawn from this edition. Lähnemann, Hystoria Judith, 89 and 127.
identified at work in the DJ and ÄJ do appear to be elaborated in much greater detail. Moreover, as the following analysis will demonstrate, Lähnemann’s reading of this text complex is supported by the referential meaning-building we have seen at work both within individual texts (the Kaiserchronik), and the manuscript itself. The characterization of the Hebrews and the criticism leveled against their flagging trust in God when faced with a heathen military threat creates thematic continuity with the Vorauer Moses, the Drei Jünglinge, and the Ältere Judith and its recurrence here suggests its importance for the Old Testament narrative the Vorau manuscript presents. 

Although the JJ exhibits a much different character than the VM, in that there is very little in the way of exegetical explication on the biblical source, this text owes much to the characterization of the plight of the Hebrews in the latter. In Vorau 276’s Exodus narrative, the faith of Moses’s people is central to the action of the story, and the instances in which they doubt God or begin to complain are singled out by the MHG author for their significance. I believe that this same theme is central to the JJ. While Schröder points out the importance of the exemplarity of the central figure, her conspicuously late appearance on line 944 suggests that the value of the story lies, at least in part, elsewhere in the poem.\textsuperscript{74} The author’s prologue makes known his intention to deliver an example of the Lord saving his people with a mere woman.\textsuperscript{75} But it also introduces the central theme of the faith of the Israelites, without which Judith’s involvement, and the story itself are devoid of meaning.

swenne aver sî gechêrten
von dem ir trehten,
daz sî sinem gebote nîne wâren undertân,
daz múse sâ an ir schaden gân,
sô wurden sî von den heiden
bedwungen mit manigen leiden,
[...]\textsuperscript{76}

The author presents the same conflict as the author of the VM—the consequences of doubt or a loss of faith in, and obedience to, their God. Judith is spurred into taking action in the narrative

---

\textsuperscript{74} Judith’s name does not appear in the prologue.

\textsuperscript{75} Monecke, Jüngere Judith, ln. 28.

\textsuperscript{76} “Whenever they [the Israelites] turned away from their lord, so that they were no longer abiding by his laws, they suffered on account of this. Thus they were oppressed by the heathens with great burdens”. Monecke, Die Jüngere Judith, vv. 33-38.
after she hears the bishop of Bethulia, Ozias, deliver what she believes amounts to an ultimatum to God to save them within five days or they will surrender.\textsuperscript{77} It could be argued that Judith’s chief accomplishment in the narrative takes place when she chastises the Hebrews for their misperception of their situation, and corrects their errant faith.\textsuperscript{78} Although the Israelites have been praying devoutly since the threat of Holofernes and his army appeared—a point to which the author goes to great lengths to make—they have not been humble enough. She specifically details the instances in which God has granted them mercy in the past and then pins down the origin of their distress, prescriptively outlining a way forward using an example drawn from the Exodus narrative, with which a reader would have been familiar through the VM.

ir wizzet wal, daz aver dî
dî er âne bechorunge lî,
dî der zû nîne wolden gedultich sîn
unde in ir nôten murmelôten wider in,
dî mûsen erwerden
unde bôslîchen ersterben!
dâ sule wir nemen bilde bî
[...]\textsuperscript{79}

The Israelites have been praying constantly for help, but their failure to recognize the cause of their situation has skewed their faith and their perception of their relationship with God. Judith’s appearance and her address to the people mark a major turning point in the narrative. The author almost certainly makes use of the audience’s familiarity with the story (the \textit{Ältere Judith} precedes the \textit{Jüngere}), and the anticipation of the heroine’s arrival built up over the course of

\textsuperscript{77} Earlier in the narrative, the Archbishop, Heliachim gathers the people together to pray for aid after he has dispatched letters to the surrounding communities. He brings up the example of Moses, and how the Israelites overcame the Devil by banishing doubt in their Lord. This passage directly engages the Exodus story and the VM as a context for interpretation. It indicates the correct the path forward with recourse to history, even if the Israelites are still somewhat misguided. That the archbishop references the consequences of doubt indicates that it is playing a role in the events unfolding. \textit{Heliachim der gotes êwarte/ der trôste sû vil harte,/ er hîz sû an ir gebete stân:/ sî rüfen vaste got an./ âne aller slahte zwîvel/ sô überwunden sî den tîvel.} “Heliachim, the priest of God comforted them greatly. He asked them to stand by their prayers, and they entreated God much. They would overcome the devil, with all of their doubt banished”. Monecke, \textit{Die Jüngere Judith}, vv. 491-496.  

\textsuperscript{78} Monecke, \textit{Die Jüngere Judith}, vv. 1005-1080. 

\textsuperscript{79} “You know well whom he left without conversion, those who did not want to be faithful to anyone, and complained about him in their distress, they perished and died wretchedly! We should take this as an example”. Monecke, \textit{Die Jüngere Judith}, vv. 1070-1075.
some 900 lines is an important signal to the audience that the conditions for victory have been met, as the one who will bring about the triumph has entered the narrative.  

Strangely, however, we are meant to expect a victory without a battle. During Achior’s address to Holofernes in which he recounts the history of the Israelites, he specifically states that they have no recourse to violence because their God protects them. This confirms Bishop Heliachim’s remarks earlier in the narrative, recounting the defeat of Pharaoh’s army without so much as a spear or shield. Judith’s act does preclude the necessity of a battle, yet it is, at the same time, violent. After Judith’s slaying of Holofernes, the Israelites relentlessly pursue their erstwhile heathen oppressors, destroying the routed mob and despoiling them of everything of value. The violence done is matter-of-fact, and there is no question regarding divine approbation. In the end, we are left with the quite clear impression that the narrative does not take into account the morality of violence. It is much more a narrative of the kind of piety and steadfast faith that are preconditions of divine favour in violent confrontations. The moral of this example almost functions metaphorically, with the earthly outcome of events serving merely as a symptom of the state of spiritual health of the Israelite people.

It is clear that Judith and the narrator see her actions as those of God carried out by a human agent, which reinforces the notion that divine help in battle cannot be expected unless the motivations of the combatants are pure. This is again underscored by the fact that said divine aid was concentrated on the one figure in the narrative who steadfastly trusted in the Lord. Recalling the Israelites of the VM, we are presented with a similar image of errant faith, this time emended by the intervention of a corrective figure. She delivers spiritual and worldly salvation in virtually the same breath. The Judith material helps bring together the examples of the failing Israelites and the resolute youths in the DJ. That which allowed the youths to triumph becomes an

---

80 The author’s role in creating tension within the narrative of this particular version of the Judith text must be viewed with some restraint, given that he stays close to his scriptural source. However, if the value of the biblical episode in itself corresponds to that which the JJ’s author wished to deliver—as one would expect—there is no reason that we cannot attribute some dramatic significance to the presentation of events. Furthermore, it is uncertain how a twelfth-century audience might have perceived this text with respect to the apocryphal source and whether or not they would have considered it a paraphrase or a dramatic presentation on par with works that used their sources more freely.


82 *dû hâlf im unser trehten,/ daz er âne schilt unde sper/ uberwant ein vil michel her...* “Our Lord helped him then, so that he overcame a great army without shield or spear”. Monecke, *Die Jüngere Judith*, vv, 500-502.
instrument to be wielded against the deficient faith we observed in the VM. Again, Bernard of Clairvaux’s explanation for the failure of the Second Crusade appears relevant, and the collective anxiety of a group preparing to undertake another crusade at the end of the twelfth-century probably made this text a poignant and pertinent treatment of the conditions of divinely sanctioned violence.

4.4 Jüngere Judith and Crusader Experience—Shifting the Context from the Old Testament

The message that Judith brings to her compatriots—and the implied audience—is delivered in the midst of a military struggle between believers and non-believers. This dichotomy is essential to all the narratives that comprise this cluster of poems. For Henrike Lähnemann, the simplification of the geography of Holofernes’s campaign into a straight march westward toward Jerusalem in the older Judith text plays an important role in setting the limits of interpretation. This region is one that programmatically stands for the demonstration of God’s power. The author intends to set the action within a concrete geography that is present in the Vulgate, one in which places are imbued with theological and salvation-historical depth. Contemporary readers, she asserts, were thus meant to be able to plot the advancing army of heathens within a sacred geography, but also, to understand the Assyrian general’s army as a metaphor for the Muslim occupiers of that same sacred space. Indeed, the anxiety of the Israelites that Holofernes might capture Jerusalem would have played on contemporary fears of a similar event, and reinforces the metaphor. Even though the action of the narrative takes place at a remove from Jerusalem, the Israelites’ ultimate fear is that city will fall and that Holofernes will desecrate their sacred buildings, making way for his master to supplant local deities as he had done throughout the campaign. In a somewhat muted way, anxiety about Jerusalem is a constant throughout the text. In a century that saw one major expedition defeated, followed by a string of Muslim victories ultimately culminating in the recapture of Jerusalem in 1187, the fear of the Israelites in

83 Lähnemann, Hystoria Judith, 112f.
84 We see several expressions of this concern throughout the narrative. For example: sî vasten al gelîche/ arme und riche,/ bêdâ chint unde wîp,/ è sî wurden zevuoret/ unde ir gotechs zëstòret,/ daz sî iht dînen muosen/ den heiden vil bösen,/ daz Jerusalem wurde zevuoret/ noch ir heilictûm zëstòret. “They all fasted together, rich and poor, child and woman, before they might be captured and their temple destroyed, and they would have to serve the evil heathens, and Jerusalem would be captured, and worse, its sacred objects destroyed.” Monecke, Die Jüngere Judith, vv.477-486.
the Judith texts would have resonated. Redrawing the geography of the apocryphal Judith narrative to centre the action on the same theatre where the battle between Christians and Muslims was playing out invites the comparison to a contemporary twelfth-century setting that is only underscored by the text’s play on anxieties around the fate of Jerusalem.

4.5 Lob Salomons—A Rex Pacificus in the Family

The MHG poem in praise of the biblical King Solomon runs from folio 98va to folio 99va.\(^8^5\) Composed in a Rhine-Frankish dialect, the poem is only transmitted in the Vorau manuscript and there is no evidence to suggest its date of composition. At 258 lines in Waag/Schröder’s edition, the poem is the longest of the three transmitted together, and stands between the Summa Theologiae and DJ.\(^8^6\) On account of the central role of kings and the thematic emphasis on rulership in the group that also comprises the DJ and ÄJ, these poems can be read in relation to one another.\(^8^7\) The Lob Salomons relates the episodes of the king’s choice between wisdom and riches, his capture of the dragon that divulges the secret to building the temple, the construction of the temple itself, and the visit of the Queen of Sheba.\(^8^8\) Concluding the poem are several lines

---

\(^8^5\) Vollmann-Profe, Lit. Gesch., 83; Most include the Summa Theologiae in the group described above based on the integration of the texts in the manuscript and a perceived hierarchy of initials. Hartmut Freytag, “Summa Theologiae”, in VL (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1995), vol. 9, col. 508.


\(^8^7\) Vollmann-Profe, Lit. Gesch., 83.


In addition, the architecture of the Temple, completed under Solomon, was a popular focus of exegesis in the Middle Ages, and served as an important source for design and symbolism in ecclesiastical building. Daniel H. Weiss, “Architectural Symbolism and the Decoration of Ste-Chapelle”, Art Bulletin 77 no. 2 (1995), 308-320; Friedrich
of exegetical material that detail the allegory and tropological value of the preceding narration. The material comes chiefly from the biblical books Kings, 3-10 and Chronicles 2, 1-9, which the author uses freely.  

To open his work the author makes a supplication to God, invoking divine aid in carrying out his goal: relating a knowledge of the gifts God gave to Solomon, chiefly that of wisdom. The didactic function of the poem appears to be carried on three levels. A tropological intention that was implicit in God’s approval of Solomon’s choice of wisdom over riches is made explicit by the author on line 225 when he exhorts his audience to imitate the king’s virtues. The poem also concludes with the author stating his desire that he and his audience should attain to the heavenly Jerusalem by the gift of grace we received in the same way that Solomon was given the gift of wisdom. Beginning with line 209, the author launches into an allegorical exegesis of his narrative, explaining that Solomon represents God, and the queen of Sheba is ecclesia, his bride. The king’s court and his servants are the bishops and clerics who perform service at the altar and communicate faith and truth to Christians. But the poem also operates on the historical level, a mode initiated in the opening stanza and picked up again close to the end (line 239/258). Bi Salmonis zitin, clearly positions the following lines detailing the peaceful state of the kingdom squarely in the realm of the historical and thus invites comparison with contemporary events.

In the lines that depict Solomon as a peaceful king who was nevertheless revered for his power and strength, most scholars have highlighted a very conventional example of good rulership as

---


du sol i mo gilichen/ in dugintin richliche. “you should imitate him in the richness of his virtues”. Schröder/Waag, LS, 225.

daz wir in mussin geshenin in der himilischen Hiersalem. “that we might see him in the heavenly Jerusalem”. Schröder/Waag, LS, 257-258.

Schwietering, Die deutsche Dichtung, 71.
the poem’s intended message. Indeed, when the narrator explicitly states that there were no battles fought, that armies and their warriors were still, we are meant to understand this stability as a result of his virtue. However, the sentiments these lines express seem to undermine the prevailing notions of the acceptability of Christian violence as an historical force bringing about the Christian world empire, and as a vehicle for salvation for lay rulers. Perhaps we are seeing some of the same reservations that could be read in the Vorauer Moses text that stands in such stark contrast to the Milstätter Exodus and its preoccupation with the military aspects of the story.

Bi Salmonis zitin
was sulich vridi undir din lutin,
swelich enti dir man wolti varin,
niheinis urlougis wart man giwari.
di heriverti warin stilli,
do dagitin di helidi snelli.
niheinis urlougis wart man giphacht,
man nistillit iz alliz mid sinir craft,
als iz got selbi gibot.
rex pacificus do richosti.

Initially it seems difficult to see these lines as anything other than a ringing endorsement for peace. When scholars have ventured to characterize the poem in any general way, these lines have served as the basis for any intimation that it might display a reluctant stance towards violence. But we cannot view these lines outside of the broader context of the poem, and we cannot characterize the poem without a discussion of its social and historical setting. Indeed, the question of reception is what primarily concerns us here, and more specifically what elements of this poem might have been relevant to a twelfth-century audience in Styria. Vollmann-Profe believes that there is a certain theological quality to the narrative, but it seems to be oriented much more towards a lay noble audience, specifically one that exercised some form of rulership

---

94 “During Solomon’s time, there was such a peace among the people, that wherever one went, no battle was allowed. The armies were still, and the brave heroes were silent. No battles were begun, and he kept everything in order with his power, just as God himself had ordered. A rex pacificus most powerful.” Schröder/Waag, LS, 239-248.
and performed violence.\textsuperscript{95} After all, without the violence of David’s reign, Solomon would not enjoy the peace so highly praised by the author.\textsuperscript{96} The exegetical material’s focus on the structure of the upper echelon’s chief theatre of public display, the court, is clearly directed towards a ruling class for whom this setting was familiar. By demonstrating how the court and those fulfilling the various functions all have parallels in the divine realm, the author emphasizes how the worldly political order mirrors the divinely ordained order of the Christian universe. When he equates Solomon the ruler, with God, the statement is clearly meant to admonish the secular ruler implied in the comparison to minister to those in his care with the same benevolence and justice as the Lord.\textsuperscript{97} For instance, the author praises Solomon’s worldly rule when God speaks to him and divine wisdom flows through him.

Do chom du gotis stimmi
zi demo kuneclichin manni;
der wistum imo zu vloz.
er newissi an dir erdi sinin ginox,
der imo gilich wari
in sinir vrambairi.\textsuperscript{98}

The phrase \textit{an dir erdi} is a form of hyperbolic praise common to MHG narratives, but in addition to the noun \textit{vrambairi}, the worldly context is undeniable.\textsuperscript{99} A ruler should be like God, in that he is just and wise beyond measure. As the tip of the secular pyramid, moreover, the worldly ruler must naturally symbolize God, and the queen of Sheba who visits Solomon and praises the richness and dignity of his court represents \textit{ecclesia}. While a seeming subordination might be implied here, the author precludes this interpretation immediately, stating that the king ought to love the church, his bride, publicly and privately.

Du kunigin, so ich iz virnemin kan,
bizeichinot ecclesiam.
du sol wesin sin brut,

\textsuperscript{95} Vollmann-Profe, \textit{Lit. Gesch.}, 85.
\textsuperscript{96} Schröder/Waag, \textit{LS}, v. 42. See below.
\textsuperscript{97} The exegesis of the symbolism of Solomon takes places on line 209.
\textsuperscript{98} “Then the voice of God came to the royal man; the wisdom flowed into him. He never knew anyone like him on this earth who was equal to him in lordly nobility”. Schröder/Waag, \textit{LS}, vv. 183-188.
\textsuperscript{99} The author praises his rulership in the two lines (181-182) leading up to this passage as well.
If we might turn to the context of twelfth-century Styria, a lesson directed towards secular rulers regarding their conduct with respect to the church would certainly have found some resonance. There was a centuries-long discourse on the relationship between the imperial office and the ecclesiastical establishment in which service, protection, and support (which could easily be subsumed within the purview of the marriage metaphor) were part of the secular ruler’s responsibilities. The author’s phrasing here clearly lays the burden of the exegesis on the lay noble ruler. The modal sol in line 221, here functioning as a hortative, would likely not be used to describe a behaviour (desired) of God, whose conduct is beyond reproach. sol is directed towards one who is capable of being found wanting in this respect, one for whom a lesson on ideal conduct would be appropriate. The tropology of the exegesis is naturally bound up in the overarching allegory of the narrative. It suggests a standard of behaviour, including wisdom, justice, and support for the church, which is most befitting of secular rulers, and really only seems to function well if we see this text as one designed for an audience that exercised power.

My final argument concerning this poem disturbs the clear favour the author displays toward a ruler who is able to maintain peace, directly mandated to rulers from a peace-loving God. We have seen that dynastic concerns—specifically the father-son dynamic and the transference of rulership in the Kaiserchronik and the Vorau Alexander—helped make those texts relevant in a twelfth-century Styrian context where the importance of paternal-filial relations was highlighted by the crusading rhetoric of the period. These same dynamics are at play in the Lob Salomons as well, but with an added element of gravity which the scriptural nature of the source material demands. Immediately following the prefatory lines containing the invocation of God and the introduction of the subject matter, the author makes known that Solomon was the son of David using a formula that is very similar to that which we see frequently in the Kaiserchronik.

Salomon Davidis sun was,

100 “The queen, if I have understood, represents ecclesia. She should be his bride, whom he should love privately and publicly”. Schröder/Waag, LS, 219-222. Another instance of the author clearly establishing the subordinate role of the worldly king occurs in lines 245-247 in which Solomon preserves the peace that was commanded by God.

101 Perhaps the equation of the dinistmin of Solomon’s court with the bishops might have had a particular poignancy within the German-speaking world. Schröder/Waag, LS, 229-230. Recall, also, that one of the central themes of the Kaiserchronik is the relationship between lay rulers and the church, and the text may contain a veiled statement on the primacy of divinely sanctioned worldly power with respect to the Church.
du richi er sit nach imo bisaz.\textsuperscript{102}

The dynastic connection is not mere context in this instance. Solomon’s heritage and the events of his father’s reign inform our understanding of the poem as a whole, and thus we can understand the proximity of these lines to the beginning of the narrative section proper. The gifts which God gave to Solomon, as we learn in the next lines, and which form the subject of the narrative in the author’s own words, were given to him on account of his lineage.

durh sinis vatir sculdi
gond imo got sinir huldi.\textsuperscript{103}

In the \textit{Kaiserchronik} we saw that an identical mechanism was at play in the succession of the kings and emperors, but in this case it is God himself who recognizes the connection between father and son. This divine acknowledgement of the significance of dynasty and heritage is truly telling of its importance for lay audiences of MHG literature at this time, and the role it must have played in their worldview. For the German princes involved in selecting the king, there was a certain entitlement to an expectation of a standard of conduct based on the deeds of the father that acted as a social and political force upon the next in line. In the \textit{Lob Salomons}, we see that God might also intervene in these situations and bestow his own blessing on these individuals and their future conduct.

The author returns to the topic of Solomon’s lineage some twenty lines later when he briefly introduces the Temple that the biblical kings erected. Here he states that it was David who began the Temple and Solomon who completed it.

David ein duirir wigant,
der alli sini not ubirwant,
der bigondi also werdi
allir erist her in erdi
got ein hus zimmiron:
des giwanner michilin lon.
daz volwohrti sit Salomon,
[...]\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{102} “Solomon was David’s son. He ruled the empire after him”. Schröder/Waag, \textit{LS}, 11-12.
\textsuperscript{103} “On account of his father, God bestowed his favour upon him”. Schröder/Waag, \textit{LS}, 13-14. \textit{sculdi} in this context means something much more akin to \textit{Ursache or Pflicht} rather than \textit{Schuld}.
Here David’s commencement of the building is presented as the reason for Solomon’s subsequent completion of the work. In addition, the wisdom with which Solomon went about his business was granted him by God on account of the righteousness of his father.\textsuperscript{105} We see here the burden of expectation—envisioned also by the audience—fulfilled when Solomon takes up the very same work that earned his father so much honour and favour. When Solomon chose wisdom over riches, God’s faith in him was validated, and we are presented with a figure who is an ideal ruler by worldly standards and also by divine approbation, depicted/rendered in the feudal idiom of the dynastic imperative.

The discussions of the function of heritage and dynasty in the Vorau manuscript’s texts in the preceding chapters took place in the context of the crusades, and that movement’s role in heightening the relevance of these issues for a twelfth-century noble audience. While it is certainly possible that the audience of this text could have made the connection between the depiction of dynastic concerns in the *Lob Salomons* and crusading rhetoric, these dynamics were also important outside of an explicitly crusading context. It was the innovation of the preachers of the Second Crusade to tap into the pre-existing sense of responsibility to one’s forebears, and as we saw in Chapter 1, cultivating a public image of the relationship between generations helped rulers and institutions create political legitimacy. Violence, even stripped of crusading connotations, is nevertheless a theme in this work that is connected with dynasty. When the author praises the martial qualities of the two rulers, depicting David as a *duirir wigant*, we could read the peaceful reign of Solomon as a consequence of the violence with which his father overcame all his hardships (v. 42) and prepared the way for his son. This is further symbolized in David’s founding of the Temple, a work that was later completed by Solomon. The implications of the dynastic connection between the two kings that begins the narrative certainly conditions our reading of what follows, and an audience in the twelfth-century, when this text resurfaced, likely would have found the father-son ruler dynamic depicted therein of particular relevance. The image of the *rex pacificus* is certainly troubled, and there appears to be an unresolved tension in the work that perhaps mirrors the debate surrounding the compatibility of (crusade) violence with an avowedly non-violent faith. It is not possible to reject with any

\textsuperscript{104} “David, a noble warrior, who overcame all of his hardship, began to build a worthy temple to God for the first time on this earth: for this he acquired great honour. Since then Solomon completed it”. Schröder/Waag, *LS*, 41-47.

\textsuperscript{105} While Solomon himself chose between wisdom and riches, the author clearly states the grounds for God’s initial granting of the choice.
degree of certainty the possibility that the author’s praise for Solomon’s peaceful conduct struck a chord with some members of an audience that was unsure about the morality of Christian violence, and because these kinds of doubts existed, we should preserve this important interpretational possibility in our reading of the poem in the context of Styria and Vorau manuscript. In any event, the *Lob Salomons* and its treatment of the relationship between two generations of exemplary biblical kings is clearly geared towards a lay noble audience for whom the ideals of rulership were of great concern.

4.6 A Partial Resolution: Morality and Crusader Violence in the Vorau Manuscript

So many of the Vorau manuscript’s texts treat violence in some way or another, and we have seen confident endorsement of armed conflict as a direct means of attaining salvation, as well as the unease and hesitancy that also came to be voiced at times. Violence, though, was a part of the Christian consciousness even aside from the crusades. The story of creation is one marred by the violent rebellion of Lucifer (treated in the *Vorauer Genesis* and the *Summa Theologiae*), and mankind itself was redeemed through the brutal death of Christ on the cross. Through typological relation, the campaigns of the Israelites helped Christians understand the unfolding of God’s plan throughout the course of history, and on the purely historical level there was a fundamental understanding that armed conflict had been indispensable in establishing the faith in a lasting way among the peoples of the world. Texts such as the Judith poems clearly demonstrate that violent clashes could be accompanied by divine intervention, which amounted to an acknowledgement of the righteousness of the Christian cause and de facto approbation of the means with which it was carried out. And while the crusading movement certainly intensified the Christian engagement with the topic of violence, conflict as a metaphor for the fate of the souls of humankind constituted an enduring and effective device for characterizing the

---

106 See note 7 above.
107 Emperor Heraldius’ speech to his men in the *Kaiserchronik* makes clear that the embattled Hebrews of the Old Testament were seen in typological terms in the twelfth century. The emperor explains the significance of the opportunity that lay before his men through reference to these Old Testament figures. See my discussion of this episode in Ch. 3.
condition of human souls on earth from Prudentius’s fifth-century *Psychomachia* onward. The text allegorizes man’s struggle with his sinful nature; personified Christian virtues led by Faith are assailed by their vicious counterparts, specifically depicted as pagan characteristics. The imagery of the virtues and vices as soldiers doing battle with one another for control of the Christian mind was an independent tradition within the moral and doctrinal writings of Christian authors throughout the Middle Ages, but in the course of the twelfth-century, with the increasing popularity of the notion of crusading violence as a path to salvation, the *Psychomachia* imagery became much more relevant. Joanne Norman and Linda Seidel both note the increased interest in *Psychomachia* imagery around the time of the crusades and point to the preaching campaigns of the period that focused on a spiritual battle with the devil that mimicked the physical one undertaken by the warrior aristocracy on crusade. Seidel’s work is centred on the iconography of Aquitainian churches whose primary patrons were crusaders. In these buildings she identifies a very popular iconographic program that featured imagery from Prudentius’

---


The struggle, after all, is not merely one of the virtues and vices, but of pagan against Christian, non-believer against believer. In the context of the twelfth-century, this conception of the struggle of vice with virtue that takes place in every human as a violent, military encounter would have dovetailed snugly with a crusader’s image of himself and his vocation as a warrior contending against the enemies of the faith. Each victory of the virtues is cheered by a thousand martyrs, themselves the victims of pagan violence against Christians. This audience of martyrs diminishes the metaphorical/allegorical force of the role of violence in the narrative and contributes a much more concrete example of conflict, death, and salvation that would have been directly applicable to crusaders.

Dennis Green’s interpretation of the Milstätter Exodus, in part, makes use of the Psychomachia tradition, and he describes the way in which the author, dwelling on descriptions of armies, draws on the depiction of virtues and vices in military garb. Because the passage through the Red Sea was often interpreted as either a baptismal metaphor or as the emergence from a state of sin to one of grace—both of which are, nevertheless related—he argues that we can see the ME as a kind of twelfth-century Psychomachia that was intimately tied to the crusading theme of the

---


111 Macklin Smith, among others, has pointed out that Prudentius’ text has a distinctly historical quality and the narrative also serves as a complex presentation of salvation history with a moral focus. Moreover, this history is directly concerned with the opposition between pagan and Christian worlds. “...Prudentius relates his allegory of soul-struggle to divinely revealed salvation-history and to the pagan distortion of history as embodied in Vergil’s Aeneid.” Macklin Smith, Prudentius’ Psychomachia (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 4-5, 8-9.

112 Norman and Seidel have identified one set of wall painting in the friezes of Angoulême cathedral that shows two different scenes of combat taking place. One, with its human knights riding down monsters is clearly indebted to the Psychomachia allegory, but the other is less clear. Seidel has suggested that this might be a reference to a famous cavalry charge at the battle of Cutanda in which the French knights destroyed their Muslim adversaries. What results, is a characterization of a battle between good and evil (set in clear association with the Psychomachia imagery) that has been drawn from real historical events, and has moreover been depicted in the idiom of crusading. Norman, Metamorphoses of an Allegory, 55-56; Seidel, “Holy Warriors”, 36.

113 Green, Milstätter Exodus, 14-15, 387.
work.\textsuperscript{114} In turn the entire episode, allegorical interpretation and all, was seen to pertain to the knightly classes in twelfth-century Germany, according to Green who cites two miniatures from Regensburg from 1165 that depict the struggle of individual virtues and vices by means of Old Testament episodes, one of which is the crossing of the Red Sea. The actors are themselves dressed as contemporary knights.\textsuperscript{115} In the Exodus material a crusader might have seen an allegory for his own personal spiritual situation as knight, struggling to achieve a state of redemption through his vocation. The explicitly military imagery with which medieval authors and image makers depicted, and by which audiences were accustomed to consume, the struggle of virtues over vices was highly compatible with the Exodus story. For crusader-knights, this would have been a compelling combination. It is likely, then, that those who heard or read the \textit{Vorauer Moses} text would have also perceived this valence, and the text would have appealed to their identity as noble knights and crusaders.

Earlier in this chapter I discussed the \textit{Vorauer Moses} in greater detail and outlined the instances in which the author made use of military imagery. Violence and the military aspects of the original source were toned down by the author, who himself preferred a moral interpretation of these events. Quoted above is the passage in which the author describes the army of the Israelites at the Red Sea as a metaphor for those who have turned away from a life of sin, echoing the familiar imagery of the \textit{Psychomachia} tradition. It is highly significant to the narrative that the Hebrews organize themselves as an army before they depart from Pharaoh’s dominion; the connection to the \textit{Psychomachia} tradition is created by the characterization of the journey from bondage to freedom and the promised land as a campaign undertaken by soldiers who will have to defend themselves from evil. Even more explicit is the author’s tendency to refer to Pharaoh as the devil as he does in the episode referenced above.\textsuperscript{116} The author makes clear that the audience ought to see itself in the Hebrews, and during one’s own passage we must


\textsuperscript{115} For more on these miniatures see Adolf Katzenellenbogen, \textit{Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 57; Albert Boeckler, \textit{Die Regensburg-Prüfeniger Buchmalerei des XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts} (Munich: A Reusch, 1924), 24ff.; Green, \textit{Milstätter Exodus}, 14.

\textsuperscript{116} For example: Diemer, 43, ln. 24-25.
be careful to preserve our virtues, unlike the Jews. Those who do not begin to waver on the shores of the Red Sea and maintain their virtuous faith in God are also described as *gnachnechte*, who proclaim their willingness to turn and fight Pharaoh (the devil).

It is clear that the author of the VM had personal piety and salvation in mind, and though the message is directed to a collective audience (*wir*)—in which the author includes himself—the nature of the tropological exegesis concerns the individual. At the close of the German section of the Vorau manuscript we see how this personal dimension of the *Psychomachia* tradition played out in a much different way than it did in the VM. In the latter text the author makes use of the conventions of oral and written literary presentation, piggy-backing his moral explication of Exodus on a mode of public presentation. But the *Vorauer Frauengebet*, or *Gebet einer Frau*, is styled as an individual’s plea to God to guard her against her enemies. In the process she invokes several biblical examples of God protecting one who was faithful to Him, including

---

117 *So si wir durch daz mere geua-/rn. so scule wir dar nach bewaren./ daz wir niht unrehte geraten. so/ di iuden taten. “As we ourselves pass through the sea, we should beware not to fall into sin as the Jews did”.* Diemer, 127, In. 28-128, In. 1.
118 Diemer, 45, In. 15-19.
119 In a fragment of 108 verses, a woman invokes Susanna and Tobias while asking God for protection against her enemies and their weapons. The genre of *Frauengebet* is quite well represented in MHG literature, as the vernacular was quite popular among cloistered women especially in Styria, as we have seen. See Ernst Hellgardt, “Seckauer Handschriften als Träger frühmittelhochdeutscher Texte. Hugo Kuhn in Memoriam”, in *Die mittelalterliche Literatur in der Steiermark. Akten des Internationalen Symposiums Schloß Seggau bei Leibnitz 1984*, ed. Alfred Ebenbauer, Fritz Peter Knapp, and Anton Schwob (Bern: Peter Lang), 130-139. Stutz draws several parallels to the *Muri-Gebet*, and Heinrich’s *Rede vom Glauben* as well. The most comprehensive work on this poem is Elfriede Stutz, “Das Vorauer Frauengebet”, in *Die Mittelalterliche Literatur der Steiermark. Akten des internationalen Symposiums Schloß Seggau bei Leibnitz 1984*, ed. Alfred Ebenbauer, Fritz Peter Knapp, and Anton Schwob (Bern: Peter Lang), 269-298; Scherer, *Geistlichen Poeten*, 90; Freytag, *Dichtung in Österreich*, 142; Vollmann-Profe, *Lit Gesch.*, 146. The *Vorauer Sündenklage* is similar to the *Gebet einer Frau*, in that both are prayer-like texts that call upon Mary and Christ respectively to intervene on behalf of a sinner. In the *Vorauer Sündenklage*, a long prayer to Mary is followed by a lengthy list of the narrator’s sins and then a request for forgiveness with special reference to some biblical figures who were redeemed by God’s mercy, such as Susanna. In the last part of the poem, the narrator asks for protection against Satan in the form of armour made up of virtues. The personal tone of the poem and the use of the first person pronoun clearly invite the reader to imitate the narrator’s plea for forgiveness and add a distinctly individualistic dynamic to the Vorau manuscript. Read in conjunction with the other eschatological and tropological texts the concern for the salvation of the individual is apparent within the larger scope of the codex’s program. The poem has a parallel in the *Milstätter Sündenklage*. Marion Gibbs and Sidney Johnson, *Medieval German Literature: A Companion* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 89-91; Werner Schröder, *Vom “Rheinauer Paulus” zur “Milstätter Sündenklage”. Aspekte der Poetisierung volkssprachiger kirchlicher Gebrauchstexte im 12. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1986); Werner Schröder, “Vorauer Sündenklage”, in *Verfasserlexikon* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1998), vol. 10, col. 529-530; Werner Schröder, “Noch einmal zu F. Maurers Neuedition der Rel. Dicht.”, *PBB* 93 (1971), 109-138. For an edition see Werner Schröder, ed. *Kleinere deutsche Gedichte des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts. Nach der Auswahl von Albert Waag. Band II* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1972), 193-222.
Susanna, whom He guarded against the ill intentions of two men.\textsuperscript{120} The military imagery is generally absent from this text (except for the instances in which she invokes the heavenly host as protection), but the poem’s author characterizes herself as beset by enemies, a term that implies adversarial conflict.\textsuperscript{121} She prays that God will not allow her enemies to bring their will to bear against her, in the same way that He preserved Tobias from the devil.\textsuperscript{122} The poem’s placement in the manuscript, immediately after the \textit{Himmlische Jerusalem} and its very clear eschatological focus suggests that it may have been read in a metaphorical mode, in which the enemies themselves become sins, vices, or other salvation-sapping phenomena to be avoided. By characterizing her situation as a conflict with her enemies, the author alludes to the \textit{Psychomachia} tradition, even if no specific military terminology is employed, which one might not expect anyhow from a poem presented from the perspective of a woman.

Calling on God for protection from one’s enemies was a popular mode in early Middle High German literature devoted to lay piety, and it can likewise be seen in the \textit{Muri-Gebet} and the vernacular \textit{Speculum Ecclesiae} from the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{123} At times, this formula has even been used to pray for the preservation of worldly honour, as it was in Arme Hartmann’s \textit{Rede vom Glauben}, and the \textit{Tobiassegen}.\textsuperscript{124} For a lay-noble audience of the twelfth century this text’s eschatological and moral focus playing out in the context of opposition between adversaries with personal salvation in the balance might have held a particular relevance during the crusading movement. Worldly honour, as we have seen, was directly tied to a crusader’s vocation. His worldly (and violent) opposition to an adversary was cast as a religious duty during this period, and a prayer for protection against worldly enemies was in fact a prayer for protection against spiritual ones as well. The practice of characterizing the struggle for salvation in martial terms makes this text so much more appealing to an audience that saw its path to deliverance as a violent one, its version of virtuous conduct intimately bound to actions on the battlefield. The \textit{Vorauer Frauengebet}, with its place at the eschatological end of the manuscript certainly suggests that those users of the codex who were looking toward their salvation saw it in terms of the connection between their worldly opposition to their enemies and their spiritual fate.

\textsuperscript{120} There are several other references to the Susanna story in the Vorau manuscripts. Stutz, “Vorauer Frauengebet”, 276-277.
\textsuperscript{121} \textit{durch allez hime-/liske here}. “by the heavenly host”. Diemer, 377, ln. 6-7.
\textsuperscript{122} Diemer, 377, ln. 8-17.
\textsuperscript{123} Stutz, “Vorauer Frauengebet”, 287-288.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
The battle of the vices and the virtues was a motif that was pertinent to all those who were faced with the choice between the two, and this broad applicability makes it particularly difficult to place or attach it to a particular religious phenomenon. It was undoubtedly connected to the Exodus material in the Bavarian-Austrian region during the twelfth century, however, and was certainly a topic that was popular among early MHG authors. There is also some evidence to support the notion mentioned earlier, that the *Psychomachia* was an apposite interpretational tool for the Styrian nobility and those who were connected to the *Vorauer Moses* and *Frauengebet*: the frescos of Otakar III’s chapel at Pürgg, discussed in Chapter 2, bear several images connected to the *Psychomachia*’s allegory.\(^{125}\) Recall that in the chapel’s west entrance the patron is immediately confronted with an image of the devil tormenting a soul, and directly across from this stands an image of the war of the mice against the cats. This image has been interpreted in the *Psychomachia* tradition as the struggle between sin and virtue (or good and evil, more broadly) that takes place within men.\(^{126}\) Proceeding through the small nave, the personified

---

\(^{125}\) The variety and complexity of pictorial representation of the virtues and vices has been addressed by Joanne Norman. She focuses chiefly on the human depictions, their dress and armament, but she also touches on several instances of the vice figures becoming more grotesque and less human. See Norman, *Metamorphoses of an Allegory*, 28-47. On the deviations from the depiction of the virtues and vices as human figures see pp. 53-70.

\(^{126}\) Weiss, “Der Freskenzyklus der Johanneskapelle”, 37, 39; For more on the iconography of the virtues and vices see Jennifer O’Reilly, *Studies in the Iconography of the Virtues and Vices in the Middle Ages* (London: Garland Press, 1988); A. Katzenellenbogen, *Die Psychomachie in der Kunst des Mittelalters* [Diss.] (Hamburg, 1933); Norman, *Metamorphoses of an Allegory*. In truth little is known of the origin of this motif, and a connection to the twelfth-century Byzantine author Theodoros Prodromos’ *Katomyomachia*, a work in which the king of the mice calls his people to war against the cats for eating some of his subjects has been subsequently rejected by Herbert Hunger, who compared images in the manuscripts of the text to the chapel. Herbert Hunger, *Der Byzantinische Katz- Mäuse-Krieg* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1968), 66. The war of the cats against the mice is chiefly found in Roman and Greek literature, and in sparse visual representations. Such a scene can be found in one of the Turin Papyri, but there is no architectural element as in the Pürgg frescoes. A fresco in Augsburg, now destroyed, from 1295 depicted a similar scene, though here it was the cats, rather than the mice, that were defending the castle. This is also the case in the wall paintings at Schloss Moos-Schulthaus in Eppan from about 1400. See Monika Küttner, *Die malerische Ausstattung der Johanneskapelle auf der Pürgg. Beschreibung, Deutung und Ikonographie der Wandgemälde des Langhauses* [Diss.] (Graz 2000), 69-71; Dollwetzel, *Romanischen Wandmalereien*, 13-14. Dollwetzel raises the valid point that the painting in Pürgg is rather unclear; neither the mice nor the cats could be definitively identified as the party representing good or evil, but perhaps the meaning would have been clearer to a contemporary audience. In addition, the image on the wall opposite the war of cats and mice depicts the devil torturing a soul, which itself conjures a strong image of the consequences of sin and creates an iconographic association between the two images. Dollwetzel also points out that the same cruciform decoration on the stones in the walls of the castle can be seen in the structure which holds the Christ child at the opposite end of the church. Here Christ is not in a crib, but in a walled-basin constructed of the same stones as the castle. On this evidence, he concedes that the image is most likely a depiction of the struggle of good and evil. Dollwetzel, *Romanischen Wandmalereien*, 15. It is interesting to note here that the war between the cats and mice is depicted as an assault on a fortification. In Prudentius’ text the victory of the virtues is crowned with the construction of a Temple to wisdom, which also recalls Solomon’s construction of the temple after he concludes the wars of his father, David, and brings peace to his kingdom. Prudentius’ temple itself is modeled on the heavenly Jerusalem. Friedrich Ohly notes a connection between all of these. Ohly, *Zum ‘Himmlichen Jerusalem’*, 36.
virtues of Mercy, Truth, Justice, and Peace—denoted by inscriptions—occupy the niches between windows on the north and south walls.\textsuperscript{127} Leading up to the crossing arch that divides the altar from the nave are the wise and foolish virgins, each occupying opposing walls and underscoring the division of sin and virtue and the choice that must be made. In the iconography of the Strasbourg cathedral, the wise and foolish virgins occupy a central position in the decoration of the west porch, and to their left the personified virtues of the Psychomachia can be seen. The combination of these two elements to demonstrate reward of virtuous conduct was also common to Aquitaine in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{128} In light of this reading of the images, the Cain and Abel figures seem to fit much more nicely into the program: one virtuous and loyal to God and one who chose sin to remind the viewer of that same choice in their own lives.\textsuperscript{129} The same Styrian milieu that generated the Vorau manuscript also produced this visual program and brings each into contact with the other, creating a common frame of reference in which the allegory of sin and virtue in combat was a relevant and poignant expression of lay spirituality at this time and in this region.

We have already seen the ways in which the imagery of Johanneskapelle at Pürgg was part of a lay religiosity in which the crusades played a central, even defining role for Otakar III and his circle (that included the crusader abbot Godfrey of Admont, depicted in the chapel alongside the Styrian margrave). Taking into account the clear use of the Psychomachia allegory in the iconographic program in this small chapel, we are left with an image that is more complicated than our previous one. The iconography of the chapel suggests that the patrons saw themselves as multifaceted figures existing in a world where rulership and power (represented by the biblical kings in the western end), religiosity, and social roles were all connected by the crusade movement, and which could all nevertheless be reduced to a very personal inner struggle against a sinful nature. The imagery of the Psychomachia allegory, with its fundamental adversarial character, its ties to the opposition between believers and non-believers, and its use of a violent, knightly idiom that was easily internalized by lay lords, is extremely well-suited to those whose

\textsuperscript{127} Woisetschläger and Krenn, \textit{Alte Steirische Herrlichkeiten}, 16 and plate 9.
\textsuperscript{128} Norman, \textit{Metamorphoses of an Allegory}, 64; Seidel, \textit{Holy Warriors}, 51.
\textsuperscript{129} There is at least one surviving instance in which Cain and Abel are depicted in iconographical association with the Psychomachia imagery. At Tavant, France, the figures appear alongside the personified virtues and vices toward the rear of the crypt. Norman, \textit{Metamorphoses of an Allegory}, 62.
religious and secular identities were so intimately tied to their crusading experience. Otakar III’s Johanneskapelle is an excellent example of the interplay of the various elements of a lay-noble’s image of himself as a Christian ruler within the twelfth-century context, and it is precisely the personal nature of the building and its program of images that make it such a compelling witness to the importance of moralized violence in the Styrian margrave’s self-conception as lay lord and Christian. The presence of the *Psychomachia* allegory within the same social, political, and religious context as the Vorau manuscript helps flesh out our image of how a crusader’s personal spirituality operated, and the ways in which lessons of the *Vorauer Moses* and the Judith texts could be distilled into something much more personal. Bernard of Clairvaux and several of our MHG authors stressed the importance of a crusader’s spiritual health and the impact it could have on the outcome of a campaign, and perhaps we can see the popular martial allegory of sin and virtue as particularly relevant to a crusader because it reduced the scale of the collective Christian enterprise to the level of individual contribution. It was familiar, it allowed them to combine their secular and religious identities in a way that made them part of a divinely shaped order of the universe. One must battle sin as one would battle against the enemies of the faith. The popularity of the allegory arises from the same set of conditions that made the texts of the Vorau manuscript relevant for a twelfth-century Styrian audience. In the latter part of the German section, in which tropology and eschatology are more explicitly explored, we find texts that ring with an allegory relevant to crusaders and their fortunes not only on the battlefields of the holy land, but their spiritual fate as well.

4.7 Conclusion

Christian rulership and power playing out within the salvation-historical narrative is a well-represented theme within the Vorau manuscript with texts such as the *Kaiserchronik, Vorauer Alexander, Lob Salomons*, and the two works on Judith offering various positive and negative exempla. Participants in the crusading movement thus became actors in the march of history on the grandest scale. There was nevertheless an individual element in all this, since one of the major motivating factors was the promise of salvation offered to crusaders for their service. The real success of the movement, as we have seen, consisted in bringing together a religious

---

vocation with entrenched social and political roles among the laity, effectively using its identity as a warrior class in the service of the faith. Naturally this involved affecting an individual’s piety in such a way that s/he was also moved to action. I have previously discussed the kind of specifically crusader piety that might have rendered the texts of the Vorau manuscript relevant for such a lay-noble audience, but the codex’s distinctly tropological and eschatological elements suggest that users of this codex had a personal-spiritual stake in the matter as well.

As we have seen in the donation records from the twelfth century, crusaders turned to the monastic institutions they patronized and to whom they entrusted their memoria to safeguard their souls while on crusade. These houses were also instrumental in propping up the crusading movement, by accepting gifts exchanged for prayer, preaching the crusade itself, and in part by performing some of the rituals that imbued crusading with the solemnity of religious observance so crucial in convincing participants that they were taking steps toward their spiritual salvation. Abbot Gerlach of Rein (see Chapter 2) is an excellent example of the way in which a monastic figure was able to publicly foster the movement by preaching and holding large, crusade-themed masses for the laity. We know those departing for campaigns in the east placed great trust in the ability of the monastic institutions to see to the safe passage of their souls should they perish. Potential participants often received the crusading impetus from these houses, and with it a course of action recommended for the salvation of their souls. Many of the Vorau manuscript’s eschatologically and tropologically minded texts support a reading within a crusading context, offering their spiritual advice to an audience that looked to monastic houses for guidance on the journey. Perhaps the laity’s willingness to accept the crusading message from monastic affiliates in turn boosted the ability of the latter to deliver exhortations to pious conduct, and texts which outlined a path to salvation while simultaneously carrying a crusading valence would have been ideally suited to such a task. The Judith poems, in particular, provide strong evidence that the manuscript’s biblical material contributed to a salvation-historical narrative on one level, and to a moral/eschatological treatment of history and Scripture on another level that were both pertinent to the Styrian lay lords.

But the crusades were not the sole determining factor in the inclusion of the eschatological texts in this section of the manuscript and in the case of the Vorauer Moses we might be able to detect some skepticism or cautious restraint with respect to the salvational efficacy of violence. The
salvation of souls, after all, was the essential pivot around which the relationship between lay lords and the monastic houses they patronized turned. This section of the Vorau manuscript concerns the fate of individuals after death, and what one might do in this life to avoid damnation. Because crusading was billed as a means of salvation, naturally the texts in this section touch upon it, but we ought not to lose a broader perspective. The violence of lay society was not confined to the crusades, and conflict in the Christian imagination was a phenomenon that stretched further into history than 1095. In its literal and metaphorical forms, violence was part of the discourse surrounding salvation and the diversity of its representation in the eschatological section of the Vorau manuscript reflects this. Even when we cannot discern a tangible connection to the crusade movement in some of the texts examined here, they still concern that essential aspect in the connection between monastery and patron. The reflections on virtuous conduct that are offered by the compiler(s) of Vorau 276 nevertheless clearly focus on the areas that bound Styria’s religious houses and its lay nobles in an intricate relationship of mutual interest.
Conclusion

That the Vorau manuscript presents a universal history is beyond a doubt. In which direction that history was focused, for whom it was composed, and to what purpose are the questions with which the present work is concerned. Historical writing was a purposeful act that offered a specific image of the past with some utility for the present.¹ Establishing this present as precisely as possible is the best way to answer the questions set out above. I have attempted to provide a study of the political and social history of Vorau in the twelfth century that focused on the two groups that were engaged, in some significant way, with the Vorau manuscript’s history: its producers, the provost and canons of Vorau, and the lay audience at the Styrian court (of the Otakars as well as the Babenbergs) for which its vernacular texts would have been accessible.² In so doing, I have addressed the question of why Bernard and the Vorau canons created this history, why they did so in such a distinctive manner, and where the image of the past they present fits into the context of twelfth-century Styria. Below I will describe in greater detail what the Vorau manuscript actively contributed to group for whom its more passive relevance has already been established.

Chapter 1’s examination of the intersection of monastic and courtly interests in twelfth-century Styria brought to light the importance of establishing a publicly demonstrable textual record of history and genealogy in a territory, as well as its role in maintaining a political and legal stability for the institutions (lay and religious) of the region. The issue of legitimacy and the protection of rights and possessions acquired under the outgoing dynasty would have been sharpened by the Styrian succession crisis of the 1180s and remained an ongoing concern for both the monasteries and the new Babenberg rulers. These same themes became the mainstays of a widely disseminated campaign of papally sanctioned Cistercian preaching in the service of


² I have relied on a great deal of scholarship in identifying these two circles which I briefly outlined in the introduction.
crusade recruitment around the mid-century mark. Chapter 2, in which the texts of the Vorau manuscript itself served as key witnesses, explored the impact of this crusading propaganda in Styria under the last two Otakars, and the degree to which the Babenbergs—as both margraves/dukes of Austria and dukes Styria—participated in the campaigns to the Holy Land of this period. Crusade preachers likened crusaders to the Maccabees of the Old Testament and used typological relationships to impress upon recruits the importance of their work for the unfolding of God’s plan for the history of mankind. Thus the crusades constituted a point of connection to the events of the Bible and salvation history for contemporaries. We should not forget that the Vorau manuscript contains Otto of Freising’s description of the Regensburg meeting where Henry Jasomirgott and his fellow nobles took the cross, a highly significant moment. Otto also relates that Otakar III took a crusading vow around the same time, even if his participation in the campaign is doubtful. The importance of crusading for the Otakars was nevertheless demonstrated by Otakar III’s 1164 expedition to the Holy Land and in his son’s desire to take part in the Third Crusade despite a severe and debilitating illness. The crusades were important to the Otakars and perhaps even more so to the Babenbergs, and they were important to their history and the image of continuity they cultivated, as demonstrated in the documentary record examined in Chapter 2. Combined, the first two chapters of this dissertation address one of the major concerns raised in the introduction: they bring to light the ties that existed between Vorau 276’s public by outlining the importance of dynasty and heritage for court and canonical house, the way in which these institutions saw themselves fitting into their society and worldview, and the dynamics that shaped the interaction between these institutions. Against this political and social backdrop, I offered a reading of several of the Vorau manuscript’s texts in Chapter 3, arguing that it was precisely the context previously outlined that


4 Phillips, Second Crusade, 56-58; Maier, Crusade Propaganda, 55.

5 Otto of Freising, Gesta Friderici, Book I, 43.

would have made them relevant for the lay nobles of Styria’s ruling elite and those involved in
the codex’s production. The final chapter addressed the undeniably personal-spiritual aspects of
the manuscript’s more eschatologically minded texts, suggesting that in some cases the crusading
movement can still be considered a relevant contextual milieu. It also argued that the salvation
of the individual was itself a defining aspect of the relationship between court and monastery,
and was thus a relevant topic in its own right. The documents examined above establish an
extensive program of patronage that was motivated by a concern for the fate of the souls of those
in the Otakarian household, which was subsequently continued by the Babenberg dukes. While
my analysis prior to Chapter 4 emphasized the political utility of cultivating a history of a ruling
house, the spiritual element cannot be overlooked. The Augustinian canons who produced the
Vorau manuscript, after all, distinguished themselves from cloistered monks by their ministration
in the lay community. Naturally, crusading and salvation overlap considerably, but even without
the influence of the former, admonitions to think upon the next life were perfectly suited for
inclusion in such a codex, since one’s final judgment was a necessary consequence of the
conclusion of history. The eschatologically focused works that conclude the Vorau manuscript’s
vernacular section might be considered part of a fully fleshed out salvation history, one that does
not sacrifice the importance of the conclusion of history for the political expediency of
emphasizing the past.

In the summary above, the Vorau manuscript appears to be more reflective of the elements that
constituted the relationship between court and canons and we can easily see why the codex’s
arrangement was so relevant in twelfth-century Styria. The anxiety around the ensuing
Babenberg succession is reflected in the lengths to which the Styrians went to secure their rights
in the Georgenberg Pact, making Vorau 276’s dynastic elements of much greater significance,
particularly for the new ruling house. For Brian Stock’s textual communities, though, texts and
their interpreters played a major role in generating social ties and creating community

7 For the Augustinians in the archdiocese of Salzburg (to which Vorau belonged), see Weinfurter, Salzburger
Bistumsreform, esp. pp. 67-69 for Vorau; J. Avril, “Recherches sur la politique paroissiale des établissements
monastiques et canoniaux (XIe-XIIIe s.)”, Revue Mabillon 59 (1980), 453-517; C.N.L. Brooke, “Monk and Canon:
Some Patterns in the Religious Life of the 12th Century”, Studies in Church History XXII (1985), 118; Caroline
humanistica 4 (1973), 3-24; Karl Bosl, Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und Seelsorge in Kirche und
Gesellschaft des europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,
1979); Bernhard Brenner, Normen und Reformen in ostschwäbischen Augustiner-Chorherrenstiften: ihre Bedeutung
für Ordensverfassung (Augsburg: Wissner, 2011).
allegiances as well. What did the Vorau manuscript contribute to this relationship, and what, therefore, was its value for the group whose interests intersected? The answer to this question can be found in the uses of historical writing in this period. We can say with certainty that there was an interest in committing local, regional, and imperial events to parchment in Styria, perhaps with the aim of serving some practical purpose for the community in the future. Vorau’s canons also evinced an interest in the much more distant past and the logic of history as whole. Codex 367 of the Stiftsarchiv contains, among other things, a chronicle of the early history of the world up to the birth of Christ by Honorius Augustodunensis, continued with the Salzburg annals and notes about the capture of Jerusalem and the flight from Troy, terminating in a list of the archbishops of Salzburg (in whose diocese Vorau lay). It demonstrates the process of embedding a local history into a much broader one, a practice frequently seen in medieval historical writing. In cases such as these, where a compiler has gathered material from disparate sources and stitched it into a roughly coherent chronological progression, we can clearly observe the desire to bring events into relation to one another. The impulse to contextualize a list of twelfth-century archbishops of Salzburg with material drawn from a period long before the territory existed might seem unusual to a modern reader. If the goal of creating such manuscripts was the preservation of general historical knowledge, the local information is difficult to rationalize. Likewise, a history on the region would not need to include the biblical material. Yet the medieval compilers perceived a logic in the arrangement. Reuter has made note of this phenomenon as well with respect to monastic chronicles and those which recount dynastic histories. Seldom do they appear on their own or as objects of interest in their own right. Far more often there is a great deal of contextual historical information. Althoff notes that even larger scale histories often have local interests at their core when he describes how the Annalista Saxo composed his work to settle a dispute between the archbishop of Bremen and Henry the Lion. There is a clearly discernible desire on the part of many medieval authors composing historical works to embed their own object in the grand narrative of salvation history.

---

8 Here I refer to the various works of history I have discussed in the preceding work that were copied or composed in Vorau. These discussions took place chiefly in Chapter 1 (Vorau’s historical writing), and at the beginning of Chapter 3 (Admont’s crusading texts).
9 Pius Fank, *Catalogus Voraviensis*, 210-211.
10 See immediately below and references contained in the next two notes.
11 Reuter, “Past, Present and No Future”, 27.
Genealogical works like the twelfth-century *Genealogia marchionum de Stire* from Vorau are perhaps motivated by the same desire for continuity, context, and integration.\(^\text{13}\) This document survives in a later manuscript copied at Vorau, which also includes a list of emperors, popes, archbishops of Salzburg, a text on the origin of the Normans, an account of the Lombards entering Italy, charters of the archbishops of Salzburg, the chronicle of Honorius Augustodunensis, and two texts on Bede and Isidore.\(^\text{14}\) Participation in the larger historical narrative seems to imbue local histories with a legitimacy and weight that was a highly desirable quality for those who used historical writing in the twelfth-century Empire, and certainly at Vorau. The “Otacher” in the margin of the Dietrich of Bern episode in the *Kaiserchronik*, the account of Otakar III feuding with the king of Hungary, the margrave’s role in Barbarossa’s Italian campaign, and his taking the cross recorded in the *Gesta Friderici*, lend a local character to the Vorau manuscript.\(^\text{15}\) The Babenbergs, too, are represented in this text and the conflict between Henry the Lion and Henry Jasomirgott plays a central role throughout the first two books. Otto concludes his second book with the reorganization of the southeast of the empire in 1156 and the granting of the *Privilegium minus* that elevated Austria to the status of a duchy.

Perhaps we can see the embedding of local connections in the manuscript’s overarching program motivated by a desire to show the place of Styria and its Otakarian and Babenberg rulers in the salvation historical narrative and legitimize the history of these thereby. As we have seen, the relevance of the Otakars and their deeds persisted well into the Babenberg period in Styria, and Vorau 276’s local elements might have helped create continuity between the two dynasties after 1192. Vorau’s leader, after all, was heavily involved in the creation of the document which brought an end to the succession crisis of the 1180s and established the Babenbergs as heir to the Styrian duchy.

The Vorau manuscript was relevant in twelfth-century Styria because its image of the past touched on some of the most pertinent aspects of the relationship between the court and its monastic houses that were commonly expressed through historical writing. It was useful because


\(^{14}\) The manuscript in question: ÖNB cod. 389.

\(^{15}\) The marginalia can be found on fol. 60r of Vorau 276. For Otakar’s feud with the king of Hungary see, Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici*, Book I, xxxi. For Otakar taking the cross see *Ibid.*, Book I, lxii. On his participation in the emperor’s campaign through Italy in the 1150’s, see, *Ibid.*, Book II, xxxviii.
it creates a space in the narrative of history for Styria, authorizes its existence and legitimizes its rulers by situating them in a past that is founded on unimpeachable scriptural sources, buttressed by the continued cultural relevance of the institution of the Roman Empire and some of its leading figures, from whom many contemporaries could still claim to have descended. For the next ruling house after the Otakars, this deeply-laid foundation served as a platform for their own legitimate rule in the duchy. Beyond securing the footings of the secular court, the canons and their manuscript helped deepen the bonds between their house and the Styrian ruling elite, a group whose fortunes depended on one another, especially given the uncertainty the Babenberg succession might have entailed. Indeed, it must be stated that the Vorau manuscript is much more a universal or world history than a local one, but the Vorau canons showed a documented interest in local history and clear preference for appending information drawn from a wider geographic and chronological pool to that with a more indigenous focus. Many explicitly local, familial, or monastic histories are accompanied in their manuscript contexts by works offering a wider perspective. Rather than obscuring it, this material made regionally important events of universal significance and elevated their status through integration. The story of the creation, fall, and redemption of mankind—salvation history—is the master narrative with which all others must be compatible. This same salvation history was also an important part of understanding how one might find his or her own salvation. In the crusading movement we saw what influence the historical example of Christ might have in motivating individuals and groups to take the cross in imitation. The Vorau manuscript’s eschatological texts convey this crucial aspect of history and historical writing by taking the narrative to its conclusion and reflecting on the implications for those who derived historical knowledge from the codex. If history served political ends, fixing individuals, their families, and actions within an authorized and authorizing narrative of history, then we can easily see how the Vorau manuscript would have been a fitting creation on the part of a canonical house so closely tied to its founders. If history served to educate and to admonish one to think upon the fate of one’s own soul and the inevitability of judgment in the presence of God, the Augustinian house of Vorau likewise seems an appropriate setting for the codex. At Vorau, we are presented with a community that understood the political, social, and legal benefits of establishing an authoritative document that helps root those responsible for its continued existence in a powerful history. But these individuals were also accountable for the spiritual health of these same patrons, and the history they created that could
be seen to support more worldly ambitions could also simultaneously serve a spiritually didactic function. The Vorau manuscript’s image of history helped historically orient the region and its rulers in an accessible medium. It offered them the pride in their past that was crucial to their standing in the present. Its narrative prompted reflection on the past in a manner that encouraged (socially) honourable and virtuous conduct that was tied to the influential crusading movement, and was, ultimately oriented toward the future and afterlife. Vorau 276’s compilation presents a history in a complete way. It illustrates the importance of the past from a political and social standpoint in a way suited to a lay noble audience without sacrificing its spiritual explication of the significance of history for an individual’s salvation, demonstrating the distinctly medieval conception that history not only makes sense of the past, but looks forward, too.
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